



Gender and Society: An Interdisciplinary Perspective

First Term Seminar 2020-2021

Organised by Prof. Klarita Gërxhani

Contact: Claudia.Fanti@eui.eu

Course Description and Objectives

This seminar aims to offer a broad and critical understanding of the relationship between gender and society. Due to globalization, immigration and increasing participation of women in the labor market, gender as a social construct has become increasingly prominent in workplace arrangements, political discussions, societal debates and academic research. An interdisciplinary overview of trends and theoretical perspectives will be applied to a number of substantive issues of societal concern. Sociological, economic, political, and historical perspectives will be considered. As a result, besides a broader knowledge on the topic, researchers will be able to discuss and analyse the relationship between gender and society. Moreover, by covering a range of empirical designs implemented to study gender, the seminar will provide the researchers with more specific knowledge on how one can do empirical research on this relationship.

More specifically, at the end of the seminar, researchers will be able to develop:

- an understanding of the most important interdisciplinary literature on gender;
- a critical and analytical capacity to evaluate its scholarly validity from different methodological angles and within both a disciplinary and interdisciplinary context;
- the capacity to fully participate and adopt a clear position in academic discussions on substantive theories and methodological design;
- the ability to independently present social science research findings on gender both orally and in writing.

Each week, for eight meetings, researchers will read and discuss the selected readings. During the last two meetings, researchers will present an application of the theories and approaches covered in the seminar into: either their ongoing research or a new research proposal.

The default teaching format is online. Conditional on a number of factors, such as (1) the number of participants; (2) all of them being physically present at the EUI; (3) the regulations in place at the moment the seminar will take place, there is flexibility in either teaching the seminar at the EUI (indoor/outdoor) or offer a hybrid option (physical & online attendance).

Teaching Methods/Learning Formats

Weekly two-hour class meetings, weekly active participation and discussion, weekly discussion memos, individual or group presentations in the last two meetings.

Schedule

This seminar takes place on **Tuesdays at 15:00-17:00** in **Seminar Room 2** at the Badia Fiesolana.

The full list of seminar sessions is the following:

Tuesday	6 th October	Seminar Room 2
Tuesday	13 th October	Seminar Room 2
Tuesday	20 th October	Seminar Room 2
Tuesday	27 th October	Seminar Room 2
Tuesday	3 rd November	Seminar Room 2
Tuesday	10 th November	Seminar Room 2
Tuesday	17 th November	Seminar Room 2
Tuesday	24 th November	Seminar Room 2
Tuesday	1 st December	Seminar Room 2
Tuesday	15 th December	Seminar Room 2

Teaching Criteria

This seminar is worth 20 credits.

Researchers who choose to take this seminar for credit are required to meet Departmental attendance, *participate actively*, complete the *discussion memo* tasks, and *present* their progress in the end.

Researchers also have the option of writing a term paper for this course as part of their general term paper requirements. Should they wish to do so, they must discuss their proposed topic with Professor Gërxhani well before the Department's deadline for Term Papers.

In detail:

- Researchers are required to *participate actively*. This implies that they are required to read the designated literature before each meeting and participate actively in class discussions.
- *Discussion memos*: It is important to carefully study each week's readings prior to the meetings. This improves the quality of the discussion since researchers come to the meeting well prepared. For this reason, researchers are requested to prepare a brief discussion memo on the readings programmed for each week. Discussion memos should consist of max 250 words and must include: (1) a reflection of what you find most engaging, exciting, and/or puzzling from the weekly literature; and (2) what you would like the class discussion to focus on (in the form of one or two questions).

The Discussion memos are not meant to be mere summaries of the readings. Instead, they are meant to be food for thought, by reflecting your own intellectual engagement with the material; specifying what is obscure or confusing in the readings; taking issue with some core idea or argument; or, exploring some interesting consequences of an idea. The Discussion memos will be the basis for the meetings' discussions. Each

researcher submits them to the course website at the latest *every Monday prior to the meeting at 23:00*, and takes them to class for the discussion.

- *Presentations*: By collectively reading a list of studies, researchers get to know the different traditions of theory and research in diversity, how the theory is connected to empirical research, how particular research designs and methods may be chosen for different research questions, and how new research projects can build on existing studies. In the last two meetings, researchers are asked to present the extent to which this added knowledge has affected their ongoing research or has stimulated new research ideas.
- *Term paper*: Researchers who chose to submit a term paper are required to make significant use of the selected literature and provide an application to their research topic. The term paper must be submitted via email to Professor Gërzhani with the administrative assistant in copy (Claudia.Fanti@eui.eu). Please see the 2020-21 Researchers' Guide for more information regarding the term paper and the deadlines for submission.

Credit is only given to researchers who meet the tasks outlined here above. Moreover, researchers are required to take part in the meetings. Taking part in a meeting implies timely presence, good preparation, and active participation in-group discussions.

Should a researcher decide to submit a term paper for this course, it must be handed in by the deadline indicated in the 2020-21 Researchers' Guide. A term paper which is handed in late will not be considered.

Feedback

Researchers can expect to receive brief individual feedback on their discussion memos and their presentations. Group feedback will also be provided, as part of the learning process in class discussions.

Background literature

Researchers wishing to further their knowledge of gender and ethnic diversity can consult these core texts.

1. Ridgeway, Cecilia L. (2011). *Framed by gender: how gender inequality persists in the modern world*. Oxford University Press.
2. Becker, Gary (1971). *The Economics of Discrimination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
3. Hochschild, Arlie R. (1989). *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Viking.
4. Pateman, Carole. (1988). *The Sexual Contract*. Polity Press
5. Guilligan, Carol. (1982) *In a Different Voice*. Harvard University Press.

Readings

Session 1: Introduction

1. England, Paula and Nancy Folbre (2005). Gender and Economic Sociology. Ch. 27 (p. 627-650), in Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg (2005). *The Handbook of Economic Sociology* (2nd edition). Princeton University Press. © (2005) Princeton University Press.
2. Reskin, Barbara F. and Denise D. Bielby (2005). A Sociological Perspective on Gender and Career Outcomes. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19(1): 71–86.
3. Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Tamar Kricheli-Katz (2013). Intersecting Cultural Beliefs in Social Relations: Gender, Race, and Class Binds and Freedoms. *Gender & Society* 27(3): 294–318.
4. Paxton, Pamela and Melanie M. Hughes. 2007. *Women, politics, and power: A global perspective*. Sage Publications: Pine Forge Press. Third Edition. Chapter 1: Introduction to Women and Politics

Optional:

1. Foschi, M. (1996) ‘Double Standards in the Evaluation of Men and Women’, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(3): 237-254.
2. Niederle, Muriel (2016). Gender. In: *Handbook of Experimental Economics*, second edition, by John Kagel and Alvin E. Roth (eds). Princeton University Press: 481-553.
3. Celis, K, Kantola, J., Wailen, G and Weldon, S. L. 2013. “Introduction: Gender and politics. A gendered world, a gendered discipline”. In *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics* (DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199751457.013.0034)

Session 2: Socio-economic perspectives on gender diversity

1. Burt, Ronald S. (1998). The Gender of Social Capital. *Rationality and Society* 10: 5-46.
2. Reskin, Barbara F. (2002). Rethinking Employment Discrimination and Its Remedies. Ch. 9 (pp. 218-245), in Guillen et al. (Eds.) *The New Economic Sociology: Developments in an Emerging Field*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
3. Correll, Shelley J. and Cecilia L. Ridgeway (2003). “Expectation States Theory.” Pp. 29-51 in the *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by John Delamater. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.
4. Correll, Shelley J. and Stephen Benard (2006). Biased estimators? Comparing status and statistical theories of gender discrimination. *Advances in Group Processes* 23: 89–116.

Optional:

1. Hanming, Fang and Andrea Moro (2011). “Theories of Statistical Discrimination and Affirmative Action: A Survey.” In Jess Benhabib, Matthew O. Jackson and Alberto Bisin editors: *Handbook of Social Economics*, Vol. 1A, The Netherlands: North-Holland, , pp. 133-200.

Session 3 : Demand-side mechanisms

1. Goldin, Claudia and Cecilia Rouse (2000). Orchestrating Impartiality: The Impact of “Blind” Auditions on Female Musicians. *American Economic Review* 9(4): 715-741.
2. Castilla, Emilio J. and Stephen Benard (2010). The Paradox of Meritocracy in Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55 (4): 543-576.
3. Rivera, Laurie A. (2017). When Two Bodies Are (Not) a Problem: Gender and Relationship Status Discrimination in Academic Hiring, *American Sociological Review* 82(6): 1111-1138.
4. Quadlin, Natasha (2018). The Mark of a Woman’s Record: Gender and Academic Performance in Hiring. *American Sociological Review* 83(2): 331–360.

Optional:

1. Barbara, R.F. and McBrier D. (2000). Why Not Ascription? Organizations’ Employment of Male and Female Managers. *American Sociological Review*, 65: 210-33. © (2000) ASA
2. Correll S.J., Benard, S., and Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty?, *American Journal of Sociology* 112(5): 1297-1338.
3. Godechot, O. (2016). The chance of influence: A natural experiment on the role of social capital in faculty recruitment, *Social Networks*, 46: 60-75.

Session 4: Supply-side mechanisms

1. Correll, J. Shelley (2001). Gender and the Career Choice Process: The Role of Biased Self Assessments. *American Journal of Sociology* 106(6): 1691-1730. © (2001) ASA
2. Willer, Robb, Christabel L. Rogalin, Bridget Conlon, and Michael T. Wojnowicz (2013). Overdoing Gender: A Test of the Masculine Overcompensation Thesis. *American Journal of Sociology* 118: 980-1022.
3. Auspurg, Katrin, Thomas Hinz, and Carsten Sauer (2017). Why Should Women Get Less? Evidence on the Gender Pay Gap from Multifactorial Survey Experiments. *American Sociological Review* 82(1): 179–210.
4. Schram, Arthur, Jordi Brandts, and Klarita Gërkhani (2019). Social-Status Ranking: A Hidden Channel to Gender Inequality under Competition. *Experimental Economics* 22(2): 396-418. © (2018)The Author(s)

Optional:

1. Niederle, Muriel and Lise Vesterlund (2007). Do Women Shy Away From Competition? Do Men Compete Too Much? *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122(3): 1067-1101.

2. Reuben, Ernesto, Paula Sapienza, and Luigi Zingales (2014). How Stereotypes Impair Women's Careers in Science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111: 4403–4408.
3. Smith-Lovin, Lynn, and J. Miller McPherson (1993). “You Are Who You Know: A Network Approach to Gender.” Pp. 223–51 in *Theory on Gender/Feminism*, ed. Paula England. Hawthorne, N.Y.: Aldine de Gruyter.

Session 5: A historical perspective (guest lecturer: Pieter Judson)

1. Laura L. Downs (2010) From Women’s History to Gender History in Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner and Kevin Passmore, eds., *Writing History : Theory and Practice* (London, Bloomsbury, 2010), 261-82.
2. Thomas Laqueur (1086) Orgasm, Generation, and the Politics of Reproductive Biology in *Representations*, Spring, 1986, No. 14, *The Making of the Modern Body: Sexuality and Society in the Nineteenth Century* (Spring, 1986), pp. 1-4. Published by: University of California Press
3. Joan W. Scott (1986) Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis in *The American Historical Review* , Dec., 1986, Vol. 91, No. 5 (Dec., 1986), pp. 1053-1075. Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of the American Historical Association

Session 6: Gender and political representation (guest lecturer: M. Fraile)

1. Lawless, Jennifer L. and Richard L. Fox. (2010). *It still takes a candidate: Why women don't run for office*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 3.
2. Preece, Jessica and Olga Stoddard. (2015). Why women don’t run: Experimental evidence on gender differences in political competition aversion. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 117: 296-308.
3. Funk, Kendall K., Magda Hinojosa and Jennifer M. Piscopo. (2019). Women to the rescue: The gendered effects of public discontent on legislative nominations in Latin America. *Party politics*. DOI: 10.1177/1354068819856614.
4. Karpowitz, C.F., Monson, J.Q. and Preece, J.R. (2017), How to Elect More Women: Gender and Candidate Success in a Field Experiment. *American Journal of Political Science*, 61: 927-943.

Optional:

1. Funk, Kendall D., Magda Hinojosa, and Jennifer M. Piscopo. (2017). Still Left Behind: Gender, Political Parties, and Latin America’s Pink Tide. *Social Politics* 24 (4): 399–424.

2. Dittmar, Kelly. 2015. Encouragement is not enough: Addressing social and structural barriers to female recruitment. *Politics & Gender* 11: 759–765.
3. Franceschet, Susan, and Jennifer M. Piscopo.(2014) Sustaining Gendered Practices? Power, Parties and Elite Political Networks in Argentina. *Comparative Political Studies* 47 (1): 85–110.

Session 7: Gender and security: Approaches to Terrorist and Counter-terrorist Mobilization (guest lecturer: Inés Bolaños Somoano)

1. Herschinger, E. (2014). Political Science, Terrorism and Gender. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 39. 3 (149): 46-66.
2. Hansen, Lene (2000). The Little Mermaid's silent security dilemma and the absence of gender in the Copenhagen School. *Millennium* 29.2: 285-306
3. Davis, Jessica (2017). “Conclusion: Trends in Female Terrorism”, in *Women in modern terrorism: from liberation wars to global jihad and the Islamic State*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
4. Cook, Joana (2020). “Chapter 1: Analyzing Women in Counterterrorism”, in *A Woman's Place: US Counterterrorism Since 9/11*. Oxford University Press.

Optional:

1. Zalewski, Marysia (2019). “Introduction: From the "Woman" Question to the "Man" Question in International Relations”, in *The "man" question in international relations*, Zalewski, Marysia, and Jane Parpart, eds., London: Routledge.
2. Kimmel, M. and Ferber, A.L. (2000), White Men Are This Nation: Right-Wing Militias and the Restoration of Rural American Masculinity. *Rural Sociology*, 65: 582-604.

Sessions 8-10

Presentations of researchers (approximately 20 minutes per presentation, depending on the number of participants).