

Gender, Work, and Worth

LSOC 2058
Spring 2020

Instructor: Guillermina Altomonte
Email: altog301@newschool.edu
Office Hours: by appointment

Tuesdays & Thursdays 12:00 - 1:40
6 East 16th Street Room 1004

Overview

In this course we ask how gender matters in the work we do. We will discuss the multiple ways in which gender organizes economic life and our perceptions of the value of different kinds of paid and unpaid labor. Whose work counts, and whose doesn't, and how do these valuations change or become contested? How does gender intersect with inequalities of race, class, sexual orientation, and citizenship in segregating workplaces and markets? And how is gender itself shaped by the changing nature of modern economies? We will explore in what ways domains of activity—from the household to the military to reproductive technologies—are gendered, and how the work that happens in them relates to social beliefs about production and reproduction, gift-giving and commodification, family and sexuality.

Learning outcomes

After completing this course you will be able to do the following:

- Recognize and evaluate how gendered processes shape divisions of labor and understandings of work
- Identify entanglements and tensions between paid and unpaid work; productive and reproductive labor
- Develop a critical sociological approach to the ways gender inequalities related to work are produced and maintained
- Understand how race, class, sexual orientation and citizenship matter in constructions and valuations of gendered work

Requirements

Participation and guiding class discussion	25%
Reading responses (total of four)	40%
Final paper	35%

Readings

This is a seminar class based on discussions of readings, therefore it is fundamental that you read and come to class prepared to comment. Readings are available in Canvas, grouped in “Modules” as well as in the “Files” section. Please bring all required readings

to class. You are not required to read the materials in the “Recommended” sections of the syllabus, but you may write about them in your assignments if you choose.

Assignments

Participation & Guiding Discussion. Participation matters greatly because it builds dialogue and community; critical conversation is also crucial for developing your own ideas. Your grade will reflect the degree to which you contributed to discussion. Participation in this course includes:

1. Individual participation: Every week you should come to class prepared to share comments/questions in response to the readings to be addressed in the session. There are several ways I will evaluate participation in addition to speaking up in class: Throughout the course we will have short pop quizzes, we will break into small discussion groups and engage in other class activities. If you do not feel comfortable with how your participation is assessed, please come see me and we will find an alternative arrangement.

2. Peer-reviewing exercise on February 13th: Each student must bring to class, in hard copy, their first reading response (see below). In this session students will exchange papers with a partner and carefully review each other’s work, pointing out strengths and opportunities for improvement. The goals of this exercise are to develop your capacities to engage critically with your colleagues’ work, provide helpful feedback, and advance your own work based on the feedback you receive. The first response paper will be evaluated in its final version, after students incorporate the comments received in class.

3. Weekly discussants: Every student will sign up in advance and serve as discussion leader for one session during the semester. You will prepare a brief (not more than 10-minute) introduction to the readings assigned for the session and pose some thoughts or questions to start off our class discussion (not just a summary!).

Reading Response Papers. Students are required to write four short reading responses during the semester, each worth 10% of the final grade. Reading responses are due **via Canvas by 9 am on the day you choose to hand it in**. Each response should address 2-3 readings, and at least one reading should be among those discussed in class the day the response is handed in.

Except for the first one (**due in class on February 13th**), you may choose when to turn in your other reading responses. Please plan ahead so that you respond to the material that most interests you! However, you must have turned in your responses by these dates:

- Second response paper by March 12
- Third response paper by April 9
- Fourth response paper by April 30

Reading responses are not summaries. A good response should: 1) provide a very brief outline of the main argument or arguments presented in the texts; 2) discuss what parts of the arguments you find particularly compelling, provocative, or interesting; 3) explain how the issues raised in the articles relate to themes discussed in the class in previous weeks. Therefore, a good response should set the readings in conversation with each other. (Please refer to the Evaluation Rubric at the end of the syllabus for guidelines on how your written work will be assessed.) You may re-write one of your responses during the course. Format: 2 pages each; double spaced; typed using size 12 font.

Final Paper: This paper will give you a chance to reflect further on the topic(s) you found most compelling in the course. You are required to submit a short proposal three weeks before the paper is due, which includes a list of readings you plan to use (I will give further instructions on the proposal and the paper later in the semester). We will share what everyone chose to write about on our last session on Thursday, May 7th. The final paper is due **Friday, May 8th via Canvas**.

Policies

Attendance: This course follows the requirement to take attendance through Starfish. Absences may justify some grade reduction and a total of four absences mandate a reduction of one letter grade for the course. More than four absences mandate a failing grade for the course, unless there are extenuating circumstances, such as the following: an extended illness requiring hospitalization or visit to a physician (with documentation); a family emergency, e.g. serious illness (with written explanation); observance of a religious holiday. Two instances of lateness will count as one absence.

Academic Honesty: Students are responsible for understanding the University's policy on academic honesty and integrity and must make use of proper citations of sources for writing papers, creating, presenting, and performing their work, taking examinations, and doing research. It is your responsibility to learn the procedures specific to your discipline for correctly and appropriately differentiating your own work from that of others. The full text of the policy, including adjudication procedures, is found at:

<http://www.newschool.edu/policies/>

Plagiarism is the unacknowledged use of someone else's work as one's own in all forms of academic endeavor (such as essays, theses, examinations, research data, creative projects), intentional or unintentional. Plagiarized material may be derived from a variety of sources, such as books, journals, internet postings, student or faculty papers. This includes the purchase or "outsourcing" of written assignments for a course. Resources regarding what plagiarism is and how to avoid it can be found on the Learning Center's website: <http://www.newschool.edu/university-learning-center/student-resources/>

I take plagiarism to be unacceptable. This course will strictly abide by The New School policies regarding the breach of academic integrity, which may lead to serious consequences, including (but not limited to) one or more of the following: failure of the

assignment, failure of the course, academic warning, disciplinary probation, suspension from the university, or dismissal from the university.

Disabilities: In keeping with the university's policy of providing equal access for students with disabilities, any student with a disability who needs academic accommodations is welcome to meet with me privately. All conversations will be kept confidential. Students requesting any accommodations will also need to contact Student Disability Service (www.newschool.edu/student-disability-services/). SDS will conduct an intake and, if appropriate, the Director will provide an academic accommodation notification letter for you to bring to me. At that point, I will review the letter with you and discuss these accommodations in relation to this course.

Student Ombuds Office: The Student Ombuds office provides students assistance in resolving conflicts, disputes or complaints on an informal basis. This office is independent, neutral, and confidential. <http://www.newschool.edu/intercultural-support/ombuds/>

Evaluation: You will be evaluated according to the logic and clarity of your argument, the structure and style of your writing, and your grasp of the materials covered. Please see the Evaluation Rubric for detailed guidelines. I strongly encourage you to take advantage of the Learning Center: <http://www.newschool.edu/university-learning-center/>

Grades will be assigned along a standard academic scale:

A	93% - 100%
A-	90% - 92 %
B+	87% - 89%
B	83% - 86%
B-	80% - 82%
C+	77% - 79%
C	70% - 76%
D	60% - 69%
F	0 - 59%

Late Work: Late response papers (past the deadlines outlined above) will be penalized by the reduction of one-half letter grade per day. Late final papers will NOT be accepted, no exceptions. Please note that no incompletes will be given for this course.

Course Outline

Week 1

Jan 21: Introduction to the course

Overview of the syllabus and group introductions

Jan 23: Introduction to the course (continued)

Acker, Joan. 1992. "From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions." *Contemporary Sociology* 21(5): 565-569.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2): 125-151.

Video: The stall in gender equality: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eGu8l3fHksc>

Recommended:

Williams, Christine. "Introduction." Pp. 1-19 in *Gender Differences at Work: Women and Men in Non-traditional Occupations*.

PART I: UNPAID LABOR IN THE HOUSEHOLD

Week 2

Jan 28: Production vs. reproduction

Folbre, Nancy. 1993. "The Unproductive Housewife: Her Evolution in Nineteenth-Century Economic Thought." *Signs* 16(3): 463-484.

Recommended:

Engels, Frederick. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, part IX: Barbarism and Civilization.

Jan 30: Production vs. reproduction: Debates over housework

Federici, Silvia. "Wages against housework." Pp. 15-22 in *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*.

Davis, Angela. 1981. "The Approaching Obsolescence of Housework: A Working-Class Perspective."

Recommended:

Hartmann, Heidi I. 1981. "The Family as the Locus of Gender, Class, and Political Struggle: The Example of Housework." *Signs* 6(3): 366-394.

Davis, Angela. "The Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves."

Week 3

Feb 4: Household division of labor

Mainardi, Pat. "The politics of housework."

Hochschild, Arlie. 1989. "Joey's Problem: Nancy and Evan Holt." Pp. 35-61 in *The Second Shift*.

Recommended:

Podcast: <https://www.npr.org/2019/05/12/722173367/all-the-rage-isn-t-about-moms-having-it-all-it-s-about-moms-doing-it-all>

Feb 6: Household division of labor (continued)

Carrington, Christopher. 1999. "Housework in Lesbian Families", pp. 77-107 in *No Place Like Home. Relationships and Family Life among Lesbians and Gay Men*.

Recommended:

New York Times. 2018. "How same-sex couples divide chores."

Goldberg, Abbie. 2013. "'Doing' and 'Undoing' Gender: The Meaning and Division of Housework in Same-Sex Couples." *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 5: 85–104.

Week 4

Feb 11: Parenting

DeVault, Marjorie. 1991. "Doing family meals." Pp. 1-20 in *Feeding the Family*.

Stone, Pamela. 2007. "The Rhetoric and Reality of 'Opting Out'." *Contexts* 6(4): 14-19.

Recommended:

Third Way. 2014. "The fatherhood bonus and the motherhood penalty."

Susan Walzer, 1996. "Thinking About the Baby: Gender and the Division of Infant Care." *Social Problems* 43(2): 219-234

Feb 13: Parenting (continued)

Shows, Carla and Naomi Gerstel. 2009. "Fathering, Class, and Gender: A Comparison of Physicians and Emergency Medical Technicians." *Gender and Society* 23(2): 161-187.

Recommended:

The Guardian. "Low income black fathers want to be good dads. The system won't let them."

* Bring your first reading response to class, in hard copy!

PART II: COMMODIFYING WOMEN'S WORK

Week 5

Feb 18: Paid reproductive labor

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 1992. "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor." *Signs* 18(1):1-43.

Recommended:

Tronto, Joan. 2002. "The 'Nanny' Question in Feminism." *Hypatia* 17(2), Feminist Philosophies of Love and Work: 34-51.

Feb 20: Care work

Stacey, Clare. 2011. "The rewards of caring" (selection), pp. 102-136 in *The Caring Self*.

Recommended:

England, Paula and Nancy Folbre. 1999. "The Cost of Caring." *Annals of the American Academy of Social Science* 561: 39-51.

Week 6

Feb 25: Emotional labor

Hochschild, Arlie. 1983. "Exploring the managed heart." Pp. 3-23 in *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*.

Feb 27: Emotional labor (continued)

The Atlantic. "Housework isn't emotional labor."

Clip: Emotional labour is a heavier burden for some of us
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Db074Wfmzqs>

Recommended:

Arruzza, Cinzia. 2014. "The Capitalism of Affects." Public Seminar:

<http://www.publicseminar.org/2014/08/the-capitalism-of-affects/#.VTu5dGauRt1>

Week 7

Mar 3: Service economies

Ehrenreich, Barbara. 1999. "Nickel-and-Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America."

Harper's Magazine.

Rosin, Hanna. 2010. "The end of men." *The Atlantic*.

Mar 5: Service economies (continued)

Kang, Miliann. 2010. "I Just Put Koreans and Nails Together': Nail Spas and the Model Minority." Chapter 4 in *The Managed Hand: The Commercialization of Bodies and Emotions on Korean-Immigrant-Owned Nail Salons*.

Week 8

Mar 10: Sex work

Zelizer, Viviana. 2005. "Dating, Treating, and Going Steady." Pp. 114-118 in *The Purchase of Intimacy*.

Bruckert, Chris. 2002. "Managing Stigma," pp. 125-149 in *Taking it Off, Putting it On*.

Padilla, Mark. "Gender, Space, and the 'Putas' vs. the 'Maricón'" (pp. 62-66), and "Global Sex Work, Tigueraje, and Stigma Management" (pp. 132-140), in *Caribbean Pleasure Industry*.

Recommended:

Bernstein, Elizabeth. 2010. "Bounded Authenticity and the Commerce of Sex." Pp. 148-165 in Eileen Boris and Rhacel Salazar Parreñas (eds.), *Intimate Labors. Cultures, Technologies, and the Politics of Care*. Stanford University Press.

Mar 12: Invited speaker: Stephanie Szitanyi, author of *Gender Trouble in the U.S. Military*.

-- SPRING BREAK ☺ MARCH 16 TO MARCH 20 --

PART III: WORKPLACES AND LABOR MARKETS

Week 9

Mar 24: Measuring women's worth

Kessler-Harris, Alice. 1990. "Introduction" and "The Wage Conceived: Value and Need as a Measure of Women's Worth," pp. 1-32 in *A Woman's Wage*.

Recommended:

Podcast: Why women volunteer more at work: <https://www.wnyc.org/story/why-women-volunteer-work/>

Mar 26: Gendered corporations

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. "Secretaries," pp. 69-103 in *Men and Women of the Corporation*.

The New York Times. "A Seat at the Head of the Table."

Recommended:

Roth, Louise Marie. 2006. "Making the Team: Managers, Peers, and Subordinates" (selection), pp. 71-89 in *Selling Women Short: Gender and Money on Wall Street*.

Week 10

Mar 31: Masculinities at work

Paap, Kris. 2006. "'We're Animals ... And We're Proud of It': Strategic Enactments of White Working-Class Masculinities." Pp. 131-157 in *Working Construction*.

Video: Raewyn Connell on masculinities:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OYboMmQS0tU>

Apr 2: Masculinities at work (continued)

Williams, Christine. 1992. "The Glass Escalator: Hidden Advantages for Men in the 'Female' Professions." *Social Problems* 39(3): 253-267.

Ray, Raka. 2000. "Masculinity, Femininity, and Servitude: Domestic Workers in Calcutta in the Late Twentieth Century." *Feminist Studies* 26(3): 691-718.

Recommended:

Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2009. "Racializing The Glass Escalator: Reconsidering Men's

Experiences with Women's Work." *Gender & Society* 23(1): 5-26

Week 11

Apr 7: Non-conforming identities

Schilt, Kristen. 2010. "Manufacturing Gender Inequality: Workplace Responses to Stealth Transmen." Pp. 88-108 in *Just one of the guys? Transgender Men and the Persistence of Gender Inequality*.

NBC News. 2019. "['Laughed out of interviews': Trans workers discuss job discrimination.](#)"

Apr 9: Non-conforming identities (continued)

Bérubé, Allan. 2011. "'Queer Work' and Labor History." Pp. 259-269 in *My Desire for History: Essays in Gay, Community, and Labor History*.

Podcast: Mind the LGBTQI pay gap! <https://www.ebrd.com/news/2019/mind-the-lgbtqi-pay-gap-.html>

Recommended:

Anderson, Eric. 2002. "Openly Gay Athletes: Contesting Hegemonic Masculinity in a Homophobic Environment." *Gender & Society* 16(6): 860-877.

Week 12

Apr 14: Pricing bodies

Mears, Ashley. 2011. "Pricing Looks: Circuits of Value in Fashion Modeling Markets." Pp. 155-177 in *The Worth of Goods: Valuation and Pricing in the Economy*, edited by Jens Beckert and Patrik Aspers.

In-class documentary (excerpt): *Student Athlete* (HBO)

Recommended:

Andrews, David L., Ronald L. Mower, and Michael L. Silk. 2010. "Ghettocentrism and the Essentialized Black Male Athlete." Pp. 69-93 in *Commodified and Criminalized: New Racism and African Americans in Contemporary Sports*.

Apr 16: Pricing bodies (continued)

Almeling, Rene. 2007. "Selling Genes, Selling Gender: Egg Agencies, Sperm Banks, and

the Medical Market in Genetic Material.” *American Sociological Review* 72(3): 319-340.

PART IV: GLOBALIZATION AND THE GIG ECONOMY

Week 13

Apr 21: Global (re)productive labor

Pande, Amrita. 2010. “Commercial Surrogacy in India: Manufacturing a Perfect Mother-Worker.” *Signs* 35(4): 969-992.

Apr 23: Global (re)productive labor (continued)

Hochschild, Arlie. 2004. “Love and Gold.” Pp. 15–30 in *Global Women: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Owl Books.

Fuentes, Annette and Barbara Ehrenreich. 1983. “The New Factory Girls.”

Recommended:

Mills, Mary Beth. 2003. “Gender and Inequality in the Global Labor Force.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 32: 41–62.

Week 14

Apr 28: Digital economies

duffy, brooke erin. 2017. “The Instagram Filter” (pp. 185-215), and “Aspirational Labor’s (In)Visibility” (pp. 216-229) in *(Not) getting paid to do what you love: Gender, social media, and aspirational work*.

Video: How Did Tech Become So Male Dominated? <https://youtu.be/OZ7zX6LalLI>

Apr 30: Revaluing women’s work

Fraser, Nancy. 1994. “After the Family Wage: Gender Equity and the Welfare State.” *Political Theory* 22(4): 591-618.

Recommended:

Cobble, Dorothy Sue. 2010. “More Intimate Unions.” Pp. 280-296 in Eileen Boris and Rhacel Salazar Parreñas (eds.), *Intimate Labors. Cultures, Technologies, and the Politics of Care*. Stanford University Press.

Week 15

May 5: Revaluating women's work (continued)

Invited speaker: Tatiana Bejar, Hand in Hand

May 7: Wrap-Up: Discussion of Final Paper Topics and Course Evaluation

Evaluation Rubric for Written Work – LSOC 2058 – Spring 2020

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Content: grasp of materials	Putting pieces in conversation with each other and responding to their arguments. This can include substantial critiques, informed agreement / disagreement reasoning, and alternative arguments of your own. Points for including relevant examples from texts.	Offering a synthesis of the articles in ways that expand and elaborate on a few key ideas.	Paraphrasing the texts, i.e. repeating the argument without your own elaboration; making judgments that do not go beyond "I like it" or "I don't like it."	Basic misreading and insufficient coverage of texts.
Clarity and structure of the argument	Clear argument (well-defined train of thought that unfolds step by step), substantiated by relevant examples and direct references to readings. Evidence of critical thought and careful analysis.	Clear argument, using topic sentences at the beginning of each paragraph. Central idea(s) remains visible throughout the paper.	One or two understandable points, but no clear structure or logic connection between them.	Ideas are unclear and in no particular order. The reader cannot understand what is being said or follow the ideas in the paper.
Style and writing	Writing style that is expressive and clearly communicates ideas. Well-proofread paper with almost no grammatical or spelling errors.	Clear and well-structured sentences with relatively few grammatical errors.	Irregular writing, including some unclear or ungrammatical sentences. Some typos and spelling errors.	Ungrammatical sentences, serious misspelling and typos (i.e., the paper is not proofread.)