

SOCIOLOGY 6019H1F GENDER RELATIONS
Gender Differences, Divisions and Inequalities

Instructor: Bonnie Fox
Office: Room 382, 725 Spadina Ave.
Office hours: Tues. 12:30 & 3:00-4:00
Email address: bfox@chass.utoronto.ca
Phone number: 416 978-4213

Time: Tues., Thurs. 1:00-3:00
Location: rm. 240

Summer 2018

Sociology of gender is an immense field, featuring very fluid boundaries with other disciplines. It has developed in leaps and bounds over the five decades since the start of the Women's Liberation Movement. Scholars' initial concern was understanding women's unequal social position – conceptualized in terms of “sex roles” in sociology or power/oppression due to either “patriarchy” or patriarchal capitalism by feminist theorists. While concern about inequality persists, the issues, questions, methods and theoretical approaches have multiplied over time, and the understanding of gender inequality has deepened. As a concept, gender has many meanings. But it is now conceptualized less as a characteristic of individuals and more in terms of historically specific and socially constructed social relations, social practices, subject positions, systems of meaning, or a structural division (and even as a social structure itself). Moreover, the influence of postmodernism/post-structuralism has meant that materialist perspectives have become less popular and cultural analyses more popular; and post-structural critiques have moved scholars' attention from social structure (or social organization) to individual agency. To an extent, attention has shifted from questions about the nature and sources of gender inequality to questions about meaning and identity. At the same time, questions about inequality have also become more complicated, as gender is increasingly understood to be entangled with social class and race, as well as sexuality. In short, the field continues to grow, and to diversify, so it is an incredibly interesting area to explore.

This is a survey course, meant to acquaint you with many of the major areas of inquiry, questions, debates and arguments – and the work of influential and/or interesting researchers – on gender. Although I aimed to choose topics and readings that are most important for sociology students to be familiar with, my own interests and knowledge are clearly reflected in the course outline. Different approaches to the study of gender are represented here, but the issue of identity is given much less attention than is structural (or systemic) inequality, for example.

Each day's topics and readings are given in the outline below, and in class I will provide background, and an overview of the research on the issue, as well as make connections among the different topics and groups of readings. In general, readings include both theoretical or conceptual works and empirical works. Overall, the course attempts to address issues about both social structure

and individual agency in its survey of a range of issues and approaches to the study of gender.

Course requirements

This course is focused on reading, critical thinking and writing, and it assumes that every student has a solid foundation in sociology. Everyone is expected to do all of the reading and to take part in class discussions. In order to help you consolidate your understanding of the readings, and prepare for the discussion, you will hand in a short (one- or two-page) comment on at least one of the assigned readings for each class. This very short comment piece should briefly state one of the writer's **main arguments** (or points), and comment on that argument (i.e., talk about any weaknesses or flaws in the argument (sociological or logical), or otherwise evaluate it; you might also talk about its implications for understanding gender, or discuss an empirical question it suggests to you). This short essay will be handed in before each class.

The other written work will consist of three short (10- to 12-page) critical essays on all of the readings assigned in a particular day. These essays should be critical reviews of the central questions and **arguments** (and evidence, if relevant) presented in a day's readings. Each essay must discuss ALL of the readings for one day. The essay should clearly summarize the main arguments in each of the readings, and then evaluate them critically. Two of these essays is worth 25 percent of the grade; and one (the strongest) will be worth 30 percent.

The critical essays should be handed in on the day the readings in question are being discussed, but may be handed in later – in which case the standards for grading will be higher (as the essay should reflect the understanding gained from the class discussion). One of these essays must be handed in by **May 29**. The second of these essays must be handed in by **June 18**. **All essays must be in by June 25.**

Grading

Class participation [and short daily comments]-----20%

Two critical essays, each worth 25% -----50%

Third critical essay -----30%

Readings

The readings consist almost entirely of articles and book chapters; the latter will be made available on the first day of class, the former are available in the library's E-journal holdings.

Two books should be purchased, and will be available at the U of T bookstore:

Pamela Stone, 2007. *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Arlie R. Hochschild with Anne Machung, 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Viking

COURSE OUTLINE

May 1 Office hour only (1:00-2:00) – for students with questions about the course

May 3 Introduction [in room 41 today]

May 8 Ongoing Gender Inequalities: Different Issues, Different Approaches

Readings:

Meg Luxton, forthcoming. Never done: the challenge of unpaid work in the home

Paula England, 2010. The gender revolution: uneven and stalled. *Gender & Society* 24, 2: 149-166

Angela McRobbie, 2009. Pp. 1-5, 11,12, 14-28 in Post-feminism and popular culture: Bridget Jones and the new gender regime, in *The Aftermath of Feminism*. Sage

Susan J. Douglas, 2010. Introduction: fantasies of power. In *How Pop Culture Took Us from Girl Power to Girls Gone Wild*. St. Martin's Griffin

These essays review changes and lack of change in a range of matters central to gender relations, from unpaid and paid work to popular culture's images of girls and women – and offer a good introduction to feminist work on gender inequality. The first two are by sociologists, the last two by feminist scholars who study culture. These readings represent different kinds of feminism (with different ideals and goals). These different types of feminism are related to different theoretical approaches to the study of gender and gender inequality. They introduce the first part of the course which focuses on different theoretical approaches.

May 10 Gender as a Social Construction & Gender as a Social Structure (or Institution -- perhaps 'patriarchy')

Readings:

Judith Lorber, 1994. Chap. 1, Night to his day. In *Paradoxes of Gender*. Yale University Press

Heidi Hartmann, 1981 [1979]. The unhappy marriage of Marxism and feminism: toward a more progressive union. Pp. 1-41 in *Women and Revolution*, ed by Lydia Sargent. South End

Barbara Risman, 2004. Gender as a social structure. *Gender & Society* 18, 4: 429-50

Bonnie Fox, 1988. Conceptualizing patriarchy. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 25, 2: 163-82 [a critique – read if you have time]

How we conceptualize gender, both in terms of individuals and society, is a complicated one. Sociologist Judith Lorber provides an introduction to how many sociologists studying gender think about it. She assumes a tremendous influence of childhood socialization, but also argues that gender is continually socially constructed in daily interactions. Lorber also proposes that we think of gender as a “social institution.” This argument that gender is a distinct structure or institution bears resemblance to Heidi Hartmann’s influential argument that “patriarchy” is a distinct system. Hers is what used to be called a “dual-systems” argument. (Be aware that Hartman’s is a very early argument in second-wave feminism. It was written in response to the impact that Marxist feminism had on feminist writing in the 1970s.) More recently, Barbara Risman makes a similar case for thinking of gender as a distinct structure or institution (rather than as sets of social relations or assumptions/beliefs that are now embedded in the capitalist economy, and this society generally). My article is old, but I have you read it for its critique of the idea that gender should be conceptualized as a separate structure (or system/institution). See Anna Pollert (below) and Meg Luxton (2006, May 15 reading) for a more thorough but similar critique (in the case of Pollert) and an alternative, single-system model (outlined by both writers).

Supplementary readings: Anna Pollert, 1996. Gender and class revisited: Or the poverty of patriarchy. *Sociology* 30, 4: 639-659 [a powerful critique of dual-systems arguments]

Sylvia Walby, 1989/ Theorizing patriarchy. *Sociology* 23, 2: 213-234 [a dual systems argument]

Cecilia Ridgeway and Shelley Correll, 2004. Unpacking the gender system. *Gender & Society* 18, 5: 510-531 [based on social-psych. findings -- ‘expectations-states’ research – an argument that gender is a system]

Deniz Kandioti, 1988. Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society* 2, 3: 274-90 [an example of a thoughtful and fruitful use of the concept of patriarchy]

May 15 Canadian Feminist Political Economy (and its predecessor, Marxist Feminism/Socialist Feminism)

Readings:

Meg Luxton, 1980. Chap.3, Husbands and wives. In *More Than a Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home*. Women's Press

Meg Luxton, 2006. Feminist political economy and social reproduction. In *Social Reproduction*, edited by Kate Bezanson and Meg Luxton. McGill-Queen's University Press [Skip the pages on the Women's Movement]

Daiva Stasiulis and Abigail Bakan, 2005. Chap. 3, Underdevelopment, structural adjustment and gendered migration from the West Indies and the Philippines, and chap. 5, Marginalized and dissident non-citizenship. Pp. 40-62 and pp 86-106 in *Negotiating citizenship: Migrant women in Canada and the global system*. University of Toronto

Genevieve Le Baron and Adrienne Roberts, 2010. Toward a feminist political economy of capitalism and carcerality. *Signs* 36, 1: 20-44 [OPTIONAL]

This approach, a fairly common one among Canadian feminist researchers, developed from Marxist theory. Meg Luxton's 1980 book, *More Than a Labour of Love* – a study of women's 'domestic labour' by an anthropologist that has become a Canadian classic – made the case for a Marxist-feminist approach. (Note the date of this reading; it is a very early piece that presents a different argument from Hartmann's.) The 2006 essay by Luxton describes a way to think about the relationship between gender and capitalism that does not see gender and the economy as different systems, but instead as different sets of relationships in our society. She argues that gender is most fruitfully conceptualized and studied with a focus on the way "social reproduction" is shaped by and embedded in the neoliberal-capitalist political economy. The chapters from Daiva Stasiulis and Abigail Bakan's book provide a good example of the kinds of research that Cdn. feminist political economists have done – analyzing the global economy and social policy as well as the material situation of paid domestic workers. Finally, if you have time, Genevieve Le Baron and Adrienne Roberts, Canadian political scientists, offer a very provocative argument about some of the less obvious impacts of capitalism on daily life. You have read a critique of this (political-economy) approach last week, in Hartmann.

Supplementary readings: Barbara Laslett and Johanna Brenner, 1989. Gender and social reproduction: historical perspectives. *Annual Review of Sociology* 15: 381-404

Johanna Brenner and Barbara Laslett, 1991. Gender, social reproduction, and women's self-organization: considering the U.S. welfare state. *Gender & Society* 5, 3: 311-33

Anna Pollert, 1996. Gender and class revisited: or, the poverty of patriarchy. *Sociology* 30, 4: 639-59

Rhacel Parrenas, 2005. Ch 1, The global economy of care. In *Children of Global Migration*. Stanford UP

Kate Bezanson and Meg Luxton, eds. 2006. *Social Reproduction*. McGill-Queen's UP

Isabella Bakker and Rachel Silvey, eds., 2008. *Beyond States and Markets: The Challenges of Social Reproduction*. New York: Routledge.

Shirin Rai and Georgina Waylen, eds., 2014. *New Frontiers in Feminist Political Economy*. Routledge

May 17 Intersectionality: Race, Class and Gender

Readings:

Kimberle Crenshaw, 1991. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43, 6: 1241-1299 [read enough to understand her argument and its value, given the examples she describes]

Evelyn Nakano Glenn, 1999. The social construction and institutionalization of gender and race: an integrated framework. In *Revisioning Gender*, ed. by Myra Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, Beth Hess. CA: Sage

Sedef Arat-Koc, 2014. The politics of family and immigration in the subordination of domestic workers in Canada. Pp. 316-341 in *Family Patterns, Gender Relations. Fourth Edition*, edited by B. Fox. Toronto: Oxford Univ. Press

Hae Yeon Choo and Myra Marx Ferree, 2010. Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory* 28, 2: 129-149

Kimberle Crenshaw's is an early article that makes the case for using this approach (and you should read as much of it as you need to understand her argument). Evelyn Nakano Glenn's chapter from *Revisioning Gender* explains how gender and race are "mutually constituted systems of relationships." She discusses what an intersectional approach involves, and provides some applications of that approach. Sedef Arat-Koc's description and analysis of paid domestic labour in Canada (originally published in 1987 and recently revised) is a good example of an early intersectional argument (as well as a political-economic argument). And the article by Hae Yeon Choo and Myra Marx Ferree offers a critique of some respected sociological work, to show how the absence of a consideration of the joint axes of gender, race and class inequalities weakens the research.

Supplementary readings: *Patricia Hill Collins, 1990. *Black Feminist Thought*. Harper Collins [a classic]

*Evelyn Nakano Glenn, 1992. From servitude to service work: Historical continuities in the racial divisions of paid reproductive labor. *Signs* 18, 1: 1-43

Daiva Stasiulis, 1999. Feminist intersectional theorizing. Pp 347-97 in *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada. Second Ed.*, ed. by Peter Li. Oxford UP

Dione Brand, 1999. Black women and work: the impact of racially constructed gender roles in the sexual division of labour. In *Scratching the Surface: Canadian*

Anti-Racist Feminist Thought, ed by Enakshi Dua and Angela Robertson.
Women's Press

Evelyn Nakano Glenn, 2002. *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Harvard Univ. Press

Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2001. *Domestica*. University of California Press

Leslie McCall, 2005. The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs* 30, 3: 1771-1800

May 22 "Doing Gender" -- a Popular Social-Constructionist Approach Focusing on Interpersonal Interaction

Readings:

Candace West and Don Zimmerman, 1987. Doing gender. *Gender & Society* 1, 2: 125-51

Patricia Yancey Martin, 2003. "Said and done" versus "Saying and doing": gendering practices, practicing gender at work. *Gender & Society* 17, 3: 342-66

Myra Marx Ferree, 2003. Practice Makes Perfect? Notes on Yancey Martin's Gendering Practices, Practicing Gender. *Gender & Society* 17, 3: 373-78

Dorothy E. Smith, 2009. Categories are not enough. *Gender & Society* 23, 1: 76-80

Francine Deutsch, 2007. Undoing gender. *Gender & Society* 21, 1: 106-27

This ethnomethodological approach has been very influential, especially in American sociology of gender. It could be argued that it has been influential in shifting the focus of inquiry away from social organization and to the individual. Only fairly recently has criticism of it developed. West and Zimmerman's is the article that has inspired so many researchers, although they were not the first to make the argument. Patricia Yancey Martin's article is one of over a hundred that use the approach. Right after this article appeared three critical comments were published in *Gender & Society* (and those by Myra Marx Ferree and Dorothy Smith are two of them). Psychologist Francine Deutsch's article was the first critique of "doing gender" to be published in *Gender & Society*, and it offers more than just criticism.

Supplementary readings: Suzanne Kessler and Wendy McKenna, 1978. *Gender: an Ethnomethodological Approach*. John Wiley [the argument, earlier]

Sarah Fenstermaker and Candace West, eds., 2002. *Doing Gender, Doing Difference*. Routledge [contains some good critiques, and their replies]

Candace West and Don Zimmerman, 2009. Accounting for doing gender. *Gender & Society* 23, 1: 112-22

Kate Cairns, Josee Johnston and Shyon Baumann, 2010. Caring about food: doing gender in the foodie kitchen. *Gender & Society* 24, 5: 591-615

Laurel Westbrook and Kristen Schilt, 2014. Doing gender, determining gender: transgender people, gender panics, and the maintenance of the sex/gender/sexuality system. *Gender & Society* 28, 1: 32-57

May 24 Transnational Feminist Analyses with a Focus on Discourse

Readings:

Chandra Talpade Mohanty, 1991. Under western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. Pp 51-80 in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. by C. T. Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres (Indiana UP).

Chandra Talpade Mohanty, 2003. "Under western eyes" revisited: feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles." *Signs* 28, 2: 499-530

Hae Yeon Choo, 2013. The cost of rights: migrant women, feminist advocacy and gendered morality in South Korea. *Gender & Society* 27, 4: 445-468

Gokce Yurdakul and Anna Korteweg, 2013. Gender equality and immigrant integration: honor killing and forced marriage debates in the Netherlands, Germany and Britain. *Women's Studies International Forum* 41: 204-214

Intersectional analysis widens our lens, and transnational analysis widens it even more. One way it does so is to raise questions about the state as well as the economy. Chandra Mohanty's "Under Western Eyes" has become a classic, raising important questions about how Third World women have been thought about by Western scholars, and also presenting a broad approach for studying gender. The article was apparently widely misunderstood, so Mohanty later wrote the *Signs* article to clarify. The articles by Hae Yeon Choo and Gokce Yurdakul and Anna Korteweg tackle important issues, from an approach that attends to discourse as well as agency.

Supplementary readings: Saskia Sassen, 2003. Strategic instantiations of gendering in the global economy. Pp 43-60 in *Gender and U.S. Immigration*, ed. by Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo. U of Cal. P

Leslie Salzinger, 2003. *Genders in Production: Making Workers in Mexico's Global Factories*. University of California Press

Anne McClintock, 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*. Routledge

Saba Mahmood, 2001. Feminist theory, embodiment and the docile agent: some reflections on the Egyptian Islamic revival. *Cultural Anthropology* 16, 2: 202-236.

May 29 Sexuality: Heteronormativity, Heterosexuality/Homosexuality

Readings:

Julia Ericksen, 1999. Chap. 1, Asking questions about sex, and chap. 3, Sex in the service of the conjugal bond. Pp. 1-13 and 36-66 in *Kiss and Tell: Surveying Sex in the Twentieth Century*. Harvard UP

Laura Hamilton and Elizabeth Armstrong, 2009. Gendered sexuality in young adulthood: double binds and flawed options. *Gender & Society* 23, 5: 589-616

Barry D. Adam, 2006. Relationship innovation in male couples. *Sexualities* 9, 1: 5-26

Some feminists have argued that gender follows from heteronormativity – the institutionalization and cultural dominance of heterosexuality – while others see gender, and specifically male dominance, as the necessary precondition for heteronormativity. Since Michel Foucault's *History of Sexuality*, much thought has been given to the discursive construction of sexuality, and its regulatory effects. Julia Ericksen describes some of the history of American research on sexuality, and argues that the researchers themselves significantly influenced popular ideas about sexuality. L. Hamilton and E. Armstrong's article is one of several by them (and Paula England) that report the findings of a very large study of the sexual practices of young adults, with a focus on gender differences and inequalities. And Barry Adam describes his findings on the nature of intimate gay relationships.

Supplementary readings: *Gayle Rubin, 1975. The traffic in women. In *Toward An Anthropology of Gender*, ed. by Rayna Reiter. Monthly Review Press.

[classic argument, often cited, on the relationship between heterosexuality and gender, & on compulsory heterosexuality in societies organized around kinship]

*Adrienne Rich, 1980. Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs* 5: 631-60 [important early feminist argument]

Beth Bailey, 1988, *From Front Porch to Back Seat: Courtship in Twentieth-century America*. Johns Hopkins

Mary Louise Adams, 1999. *The Trouble with Normal: Postwar Youth and the Making of Heterosexuality*. University of Toronto Press

Steven Seidman, ed., 1997. *Queer Theory/Sociology*. Blackwell

Yen Le Espiritu, 2001. 'We don't sleep around like white girls do': family, culture and gender in Filipina American lives. *Signs* 26, 2: 415-440

Ellen Lamont, 2014. Negotiating courtship: reconciling egalitarian ideals with traditional gender norms. *Gender & Society* 28, 2: 189-211

Joane Nagel, 2007. Sex and war: fighting men, comfort women, and the military-sexual complex. In *Feminist Frontiers. Seventh Edition*, ed. by Verta Taylor, Nancy Whittier and Leila Rupp. McGraw-Hill

Stevi Jackson, 2005. Sexuality, heterosexuality and gender hierarchy: getting our priorities straight. In *Thinking Straight: New Work in Critical Heterosexuality Studies*. Routledge

Special Issue of *Gender & Society* 19, 2 (2005) Gender-Sexuality-State-Nation: Transnational Feminist Analysis, editors: Jyoti Puri, Hyun Sook Kim and Paola Bacchetta

Adam Isaiah Green, 2006. Until death do us part? The impact of differential access to marriage on a sample of urban men. *Sociological Perspectives* 49, 2: 163-89

Elizabeth Bernstein, 2007. *Temporarily Yours*. University of Chicago Press

May 31 On the Study of Masculinity and Men

Readings:

R.W. Connell, 1995. Chap. 3, The social organization of masculinity. In *Masculinities*. University of California Press

R.W. Connell and James Messerschmidt, 2005. Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society* 19, 6: 829-59

Jennifer Carlson, 2015. Mourning Mayberry: Guns, masculinity, and socioeconomic decline. *Gender & Society* 29, 3: 386-409

C.J. Pascoe, 2007. Chap. 3 in *Dude, You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School*. Univ. of California Press OR

Kris Paap, 2006. Bodies at Work: the Social and Physiological Production of Gender. In *Working Construction: Why White Working-Class Men Put Themselves – and the Labor Movement – in Harm's Way*. Ithaca: ILR Press/ Cornell UP

The study of masculinity is a much newer enterprise than the study of women's inequality. R.W. Connell's book explains how a leading scholar in the field thinks about masculinity – or at least did at the time of the writing. Connell's concept of "hegemonic masculinity" has been central to conceptualizing and studying men and masculinity. Connell and James Messerschmidt's review of research and consideration of how the concept has been used is an important place to begin discussion. The three empirical articles, by Jennifer Carlson, C.J. Pascoe and Kris Paap, offer very rich analyses of what masculinity means – in specific contexts and groups of men -- and how it is created and enacted.

Supplementary readings: Michael Messner, 1990. Boyhood, organized sports, and the construction of masculinities. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 18, 4: 416-44

Michael Kimmel, 1994. Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. *Theorizing Masculinities*, ed by H. Brod and M. Kaufman. Sage

Michael Kimmel, 2005. *Men and masculinities*. Sage

Gillian Creese, 1999. *Constructing Masculinities: Gender, Class and Race in a White-collar Union, 1944-1994*. Oxford UP

Nicholas Townsend, 2002. *The Package Deal*. Temple Univ. Press

Jennifer Randles, 2013. Repackaging the 'package deal.' *Gender & Society* 27, 6: 864-88

June 5 Bodies and Beauty

Readings:

Susan Bordo, 2003 [1993]. Hunger as ideology. In *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body*. Univ. of California Press

Debra Gimlin, 2002. Intro, Chap. 1 & Conclusion in *Body Work: Beauty and Self-Image in American Culture*. Univ. of California Press

Becky Thompson, 1994. Chaps. 1 & 4 in *A Hunger So Wide and So Deep: A Multi-Racial View of Women's Eating Problems*. Univ. of Minnesota Press [Just skim chap. 4; it presents her empirical evidence]

Michelle Lazar, 2013. The right to be beautiful: postfeminist identity and consumer beauty advertising. In *New Femininities: Postfeminism, Neoliberalism and Subjectivity*, edited by Rosalind Gill and Christina Scharff. Palgrave Macmillan

Josee Johnston and Judith Taylor, 2008. Feminist consumerism and fat activists: A comparative study of grassroots activism and the Dove Real Beauty campaign. *Signs* 33, 4: 941-66

We turn to the issue of bodies to consider beauty ideals, one of their consequences -- eating disorders -- and resistance to those ideals. Cultural analyst Susan Bordo offers an insightful argument about the gender messages in ads for food (and her book offers rich analysis of popular culture and its body ideals, and of postmodern analyses of them). Debra Gimlin's ethnographic study of various forms of "body work" done in salons, nail parlours and aerobics classes challenges any implicit or explicit argument that women are victims. And Becky Thompson's study of eating disorders examines one of the most obvious negative consequences of this culture's obsession with thinness, eating disorders, but does so with a focus on Black women and lesbians (who are typically ignored in analyses of eating disorders). Michelle Lazar's essay takes up the argument that Angela McRobbie made, about so-called post-feminist messages in the commercial media. Josee Johnston and Judy Taylor examine important questions about resistance to and subversion of beauty ideals, in their look at a corporate campaign and a grassroots campaign to do so.

Supplementary readings: Susan Bordo, 2003 [1993]. *Unbearable Weight*. U of California Press

Dawn Curry, 1999. *Girl Talk: Adolescent Magazines and Their Readers*. Toronto: UTP

Dorothy Smith, 1989. Femininity as discourse. In *Becoming Feminine*, ed by L. Roman and L. Christian-Smith. Falmer.

Rose Weitz, 2001. Women and their hair: seeking power through resistance and accommodation. *Gender & Society* 15, 5: 667-686

Michelle Lazar, 2011. The right to be beautiful: postfeminist identity and consumer beauty advertising. In *New Femininities*, edited by Rosalind Gill and Christina Scharff. Palgrave Macmillan

Angela McRobbie, 2009. Top girls? Young women and the new sexual contract In *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture and Social Change*. Sage

Bonnie Fox and Elena Neiterman, 2015. Embodied motherhood: Women's feelings about their postpartum bodies. *Gender & Society* 29, 5: 670-93

June 7 Motherhood: Analyses from Several Different Approaches

Readings:

Martha McMahon, 1995. Motherhood as moral transformation: middle-class women. Pp 129-159 in *Engendering Motherhood: Identity and Self-Transformation in Women's Lives*. NY: The Guilford Press

Tina Miller, 2007. "Is this what motherhood is all about?" Weaving experiences and discourse through transition to first-time motherhood. *Gender & Society* 21, 3: 337-358

Glenda Wall, 2013. 'Putting family first': Shifting discourses of motherhood and childhood in representation of mothers' employment and child care. *Women's Studies International Forum* 40: 162-171

Bonnie Fox, 2001. The formative years: How parenthood creates gender. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 38, 4: 373-390

Patricia Hill Collins, 1994. Shifting the center: race, class, and feminist theorizing about motherhood. In *Mothering: Ideology, Experience, and Agency*, ed, by Evelyn Nakano Glenn, Grace Chang and Linda R. Forcey. NY: Routledge

Aside from examining the issue of motherhood, these readings also illustrate a variety of theoretical (and methodological) approaches to the study of gender. Recent feminist sociological work on motherhood has focused on its social construction, especially through a discourse that Sharon Hays (1996) has called "intensive mothering." Martha McMahon is a symbolic interactionist; her award-winning book shows how motherhood reinforces gender identity, and this is a chapter from it. Tina Miller's article typifies a focus on the power of discourse or ideology; it involves a narrative analysis. Glenda Wall's article is also an analysis of discourse, but one informed by political economy. My piece – an early summary of some of the findings in my book -- focuses on changes in social relations (gender relations) when (heterosexual) couples become parents. And Patricia Hill Collins's essay, and its intersectional analysis, reminds us of a limitation in the other works.

Supplemental readings: Emily Martin, 1987. *The Woman in the Body: A Cultural Analysis of Reproduction*. Boston: Beacon Press

*Hays, Sharon, 1996. *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood*. Yale UP

Verta Taylor, 1996. *Rock-A-Bye Baby*. New York: Routledge

Glenda Wall, 2001. Moral Constructions of Motherhood in Breastfeeding Discourse. *Gender & Society* 15, 4: 592-610

Glenda Wall, 2010. Mothers' experiences with intensive parenting and brain development discourse. *Women's Studies International Forum* 33: 253-63

Bonnie Fox, 2009. *When Couples Become Parents: the Creation of Gender in the Transition to Parenthood*. Univ. of Toronto Press

Andrea Doucet, 2006. *Do Men Mother?* Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press

Susan Prentice, 2009. High stakes: the 'investible child' and the economic reframing of children. *Signs* 34, 3: 687-710

Sharmila Rudrappa and Caitlyn Collins, 2015. Altruistic agencies and compassionate consumers: moral framing of transnational surrogacy. *Gender & Society* 29, 6: 937-959.

June 12 Gender Inequality in the Labour Force, and “Work/Family” Conflict

Readings:

Pamela Stone, 2007. *Opting Out? Why Women Quit Careers and Head Home*. University of California Press [especially chaps. 4, 5, and 9]

Joan Acker, 1990. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society* 4, 2: 139-58

Diane Elson, 2017. Recognize, reduce and redistribute unpaid care work: how to close the gender gap. *New Labor Forum* 26, 2: 52-61

Opting Out? is a fine example of sociological research that systematically examines a question that journalists had been writing about for years (and making assumptions about, without any empirical evidence): Why do *some* successful career women abandon their jobs to stay home with their children? Stone’s findings and argument offer a good illustration of Joan Acker’s very influential argument that workplaces are “gendered organizations,” in that assumptions about gender are embedded in their organization, practices and culture. These readings address the so-called work/family conflict that so many women (and men, to a lesser extent) in dual-earner families face daily; more, they offer some understanding of gender inequality in paid work. Diane Elson’s article gives us a good sense of what causes the gender gap in earnings.

Supplementary readings: *Sonya Rose, 1992. *Limited Livelihoods: Gender and Class in Nineteenth-Century England*. Univ. of California Press [an exceptionally rich study, both theoretically and empirically, of how gender shaped the development of industrial capitalism and how working-class masculinity was constructed as trade unionists fought for better working conditions and for dignity]

Paula England, 2005. Gender inequality in labor markets: the role of motherhood and segregation. *Social Politics* 12, 2: 264-88

Mary Blair-Loy, 2003. *Competing Devotions: Career and Family Among Women Executives*. Harvard Univ. Press

Christine Williams, Chandra Muller, Kristine Kilanski, 2012. Gendered organizations in the new economy. *Gender & Society* 26, 4: 549-573

Jerry Jacobs and Kathleen Gerson, 2004. *The Time Divide: Work, Family and Gender Inequality*. Harvard Univ. Press

Ronnie Steinberg, 1990. The social construction of skill: Gender, power, and comparable worth. *Work and Occupations* 17: 449-82

Christine Williams, 1992. The glass escalator: Hidden advantages for men in “female” professions. *Social Problems* 39: 253-6

Cynthia Cranford, Leah Vosko and Nancy Zukewich, 2003. The gender of precarious employment in Canada. *Industrial Relations* 58, 3: 454-79

Jennifer Glass, 2000. Envisioning the integration of family and work: Toward a kinder, gentler workplace. *Contemporary Sociology* 29, 1: 129-42

Christine Williams, 2013. The glass escalator revisited: gender inequality in neoliberal times. *Gender & Society* 27, 5: 609-29

June 14 Juggling Employment and Family Responsibilities

Reading: Arlie Hochschild with Anne Machung, 1989. *The Second Shift*. Omit chapters [7, 10, 11, 16+] TBA. New York: Viking

Sharon Sassler and Amanda Millier, 2017. *Cohabitation Nation*. Pp. TBA

Arlie Hochschild's now-classic book, *The Second Shift*, has been the most important study of dual-earner couples' negotiations of household work. The study is important for the insights that Hochschild provides on these complex gendered negotiations but also for its rich understanding of gender. Like Hochschild, Sassler and Miller's examination of couples' cohabiting relationships offers us more than the usual analyses of how housework is allocated between men and women; their study provides findings on decision making on contraception and other important matters, as well as a focus on class differences among couples.

Supplementary readings:

Meg Luxton and June Corman, 2001. *Getting By in Hard Times: Gendered Labour at Home and on the Job*. Univ. of Toronto Press

Marjorie DeVault, 1991. *Feeding the Family: the Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work*. Univ. of Chicago Press

Veronica Tichenor, 2005. *Earning More and Getting Less: Why Successful Wives Can't Buy Equality*. Rutgers Univ. Press

Note: see these works for references to the many articles featuring statistical analyses of the gendered division of work in households.