

Sociology 190
Sociology of Discrimination
Fall 2013 – Tuesdays, 10am-12noon – 402 Barrows Hall
REVISED

Samuel R. Lucas
438 Barrows Hall
Phone: 642-4765 or 642-4766
E-mail address: lucas@demog.berkeley.edu
Home page: <http://www.samuelroundfieldlucas.com>
Office hours: Thursdays, 10am-12noon (**but check web-site for updates**)

Introduction

We will examine the social scientific literature on discrimination. We will investigate causes of discrimination, definitions of discrimination, effects of discrimination, and possible policy responses to discrimination.

Grades

Grades will be based 25% on effective participation, and 75% on the written work.

Written Assignments

There are two types of writing assignments: 1) weekly reactions and 2) a final paper.

Weekly Reactions

Participants must prepare a short reaction to the reading for the week and e-mail it to socpost@gmail.com by 5pm on the Monday preceding the class. Please do *not* include attachments in your e-mail; just place your reaction in the body of the e-mail message and place "Soc 190" in the subject line of your e-mail message. If you do not put "Soc 190" in the subject line your e-mail will probably be lost.

These short reactions should reference specific pages of the reading, and can be your assessment of the reading (whether you believe it accurate or not and, if so, why?), questions you would like answered, or issues you would like clarified.

Weekly reactions will count 25% of the seminar grade. They will be evaluated on their thoughtfulness and promptness—late reactions will not receive credit.

Final Paper

This course requires a final paper in which you delve more deeply into a particular dimension of discrimination. However, to improve the quality of the final paper you will write the paper in multiple stages. You will receive each stage back with comments you need to incorporate into the next stage, culminating in the final version of the paper.

The final paper makes up 50% of the seminar grade.

Class Meetings

Attendance and verbal participation (i.e., speaking in class) is required each class period. Seminars depend crucially on each student speaking in class. But, speaking in class does not mean simply conveying one's own experience. The discussion of the class is to center on the readings—what do they say, how do we interpret what they say, what do the words in the reading imply concerning other viewpoints we have read and discussed. Thus, useful discussion will reference the reading assigned for the class as well as readings we have already completed, probing the logic and implications of that reading and the previous ones. Hence, only those who do the reading and reflect on it ahead of class time will be able to participate helpfully.

As you can see, therefore, seminars run on the dialogue we have together. Seminars are not lecture classes. When a seminar is running well it does so because the students arrive prepared to discuss the readings; they have read the material and they have thought about it before class. The professor in such a class does not lecture, ideally; instead, the professor brings forward questions to help the discussion move along. Thus, the professor's job is to keep us probing, searching, questioning. The only way this can work, of course, is if every student is prepared to engage each week. Because I want to establish that kind of "supportive for learning" environment, in which each is ready to participate throughout every class, I will call on persons to respond to questions and aspects of the reading regardless of whether or not they have volunteered to do so.

I will describe the grading of participation at our third class meeting.

Class Norms

Computers

Discussion requires attention. Computers also require attention. To preserve space for our seminar dialogue, computers of various kinds (e.g., laptops, pdas, cellphones) are to be off during class. If you require a computer for note-taking as part of an accommodation please bring to the professor a letter of accommodation from the Office of Disabled Student Services (ODSS). If you do receive the professor's consent to use a computer as part of an ODSS accommodation, but you are found to be using the computer for something other than note-taking (e.g., using e-mail, twittering about anything, surfing the web for something (*even something that could be class-related* (because the aim of an accommodation for this seminar if needed is to facilitate note-taking, not create a competitor for attention to the dialogue of the seminar))), then the professor's agreement to the accommodation will be revoked for the remainder of your enrollment in the course.

Reading Materials

Discussion requires access to the materials; it is far easier to reference the material with it in front of us. Thus, please bring the reading to class. I also encourage you to "read with a pencil" (e.g., <http://www.thebeanshooter.com/1/post/2008/02/i-learned-to-read-after-college.html>), noting particularly insightful or challenging passages in the text. These can be the point of departure for part of our discussion.

Obtaining Handouts

I will from time to time hand material out during class. If you miss class and a handout is handed out, I advise you to obtain that material (although, admittedly, there will be no way for you to gain access to the discussion that may have attended the handout). One solution for obtaining missed handouts that many students find efficacious is to borrow the handout from a friend and make a copy. What is not efficacious is approaching the professor before or after a subsequent class and asking for the handout that was handed out at some earlier class. Obviously, the professor cannot carry multiple copies of every handout of the term to every class. However, I am happy to give you the handout if you come to office hours, but please note: peeking your head in and interrupting the conversation I am having with another, or taking another person's time by trying to slide in "between" appointments, are not advisable approaches.

Office hours

My office hours are listed on the syllabus, above, and I invite you to visit me for that's why I have office hours. There is a sign-up sheet outside my door with 15 minute blocks of time. Sometimes no one signs up for a slot. If no one has signed up for a slot, the slot is available and anyone may use it.

Occasionally, a late development may mean I am forced to move the office hour time. At the same time, given all that you have going on in your life, it is quite possible that you may fail to memorize my office hours. No problem! My office hours are posted on my web-site, listed above; any changes will be posted on that site. So, I encourage you to check my web-site if you wonder about my office hours for a particular week.

E-mail

E-mail is a wonderful tool. Despite appearances, however, it is no substitute for raising substantive, theoretical, or logistical questions in class. An example of a substantive question is "Does Becker show that discrimination has always existed?" An example of a theoretical question is "Does Becker base discrimination on inequality?" An example of a logistical question is "Will we be required to use Becker in our final papers?" These kinds of questions are good questions—the first two are the point of the course, and the third is often necessary for the work of the course. Given their centrality, many people have such questions. Thus, were the professor to commit to answering such questions via e-mail the professor would be 1)draining the class of the task for which it is designed and 2)committing to potentially answering the same question once for every student in the course. Because a better example of inefficiency masquerading as technological sophistication I cannot imagine, I will not answer any e-mail I receive that contains such questions.

What questions sent via e-mail *will* I answer? Not many, as far as I can see. Any intellectual dialogue in which we might engage (e.g., asking about literature you might read to follow-up on a point discussed in this or some other class) is, again, much better addressed face-to-face, where the full pleasure of the intellectual task can be obtained. Any issues pertaining to your own personal situation (e.g., family emergency) should be addressed face-to-face in office hours, not via impersonal e-mail or on the fly before or after class. Upon receiving such e-mail, I will probably simply ask you to sign up to see me in office hours, even as I will acknowledge the

matter (e.g., family emergency, theories of interest).

Thus, I am not ruling out the possibility that I may respond to e-mail messages. But, it is likely that any response is simply going to ask you to stop by to discuss the matter in office hours.

Reading Materials

Everyone is expected to read the material before class and come to class prepared to discuss the reading. The reading is located in a few different places. Some of the articles are in a reader that you may purchase at Copy Central at 2560 Bancroft. Some readings are available via electronic depositories that can be reached from the UC-Berkeley network. One that sociologists frequently use is JSTOR; articles that can be accessed on JSTOR are noted in the syllabus with a bold **JSTOR** after the citation. At least one other reading is available in a non-JSTOR electronic archive; any such article will have **OskiCat** or **Google Scholar** after the citation. If it says OskiCat then you should use OskiCat to find the electronic version of the journal, and then find the paper. If it says Google Scholar, you'll need to search for the paper using Google Scholar.

Because students are adept at finding books cheaper than bookstores can offer them, bookstores often have to pay the cost of returning books to publishers. To avoid this dynamic, a dynamic that further drives bookstores toward bankruptcy, I have not ordered the books assigned for this class. However, all are available in paperback at amazon.com and perhaps at other locations as well.

The only book on the syllabus follows and, as you can see, I am the author of that book. (NOTE: I deleted the one other book, by Loury, to avoid having a mandatory class meeting during RRR week. Unfortunate, but, well, what can you do.) If you present to me a receipt from University Press Books for a new copy of the book, I will refund to you the author's royalty of 20 percent of the list price. This is my way of supporting local businesses and education.

Lucas, Samuel R. 2008. *Theorizing Discrimination in an Era of Contested Prejudice: Discrimination in the United States*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Course-plan

– **Sep 3** – Introduction to the Course and the Participants

– **Sep 10** – Selected Proposed Possible Causes of Discrimination

Blalock, H.M. 1956. "Economic Discrimination and Negro Increase." *American Sociological Review* 21: 584-588. **JSTOR**

Fiske, Susan R., Amy J.C. Cuddy, and Peter Glick. 2007. "Universal Dimensions of Social Cognition: Warmth and Competence." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 11: 77-83. **Google Scholar**

– **Sep 17** – Possible Psychological Causes of or Grounding for Discrimination

Link, Bruce G., and Jo C. Phelan. 2001. "Conceptualizing Stigma." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 363-385. **Google Scholar**

Hewston, Miles, Mark Rubin, and Hazel Willis. 2002. "Intergroup Bias." *Annual Review of Psychology* 53: 575-604. **Google Scholar**

Banaji, Mazharin R., and Curtis B. Hardin. 1996. "Automatic Stereotyping." *Psychological Science* 7: 136-141. **JSTOR**

Merritt, Deborah J. 2008. "Bias, the Brain, and Student Evaluations of Teaching." *St. John's Law Review* 82: 235-287. **Google Scholar**

– **Sep 24** – Taste Theory of Discrimination

Becker, Gary. (1957) 1971. *The Economics of Discrimination, second edition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (pp. 9-18). **READER**

Badgett, M.V. Lee. 1995. "The Wage Effects of Sexual Orientation Discrimination." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 48: 726-739. **JSTOR**

– **Oct 1** – Statistical Discrimination and Marxist Views of Discrimination

England, Paula. 1992. *Comparable Worth: Theories and Evidence*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter. (pp. 45-60). **READER**

Bonacich, Edna. 1976. "Advanced Capitalism and Black/White Race Relations in the United States: A Split Labor Market Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 41: 34-51.

JSTOR

Szymanski, Albert. 1976. "Racial Discrimination and White Gain." *American Sociological Review* 41: 403-414. **JSTOR**

– **Oct 8** – Selected Alternative Explanations of Inequality

Herrnstein, Richard J., and Charles Murray. 1994. "Ethnic Differences in Cognitive Ability," pp. 269-315 in *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York, NY: The Free Press. **READER**

Fordham, Signithia, and John U. Ogbu. 1986. "Black Students' School Success: Coping With the 'Burden of Acting White'." *Urban Review* 18:176-206. **Pathfinder**

Udry, J. Richard. 2000. "Biological Limits of Gender Construction." *American Sociological Review* 65: 443-457. **JSTOR**

Killingsworth, Mark R. 1985. "The Economics of Comparable Worth: Analytical, Empirical, and Policy Questions," pp. 86-115 in *Comparable Worth: New Directions for Research*, edited by Heidi I. Hartmann. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press. **READER**

– **Oct 15** – Challenges of Estimating Discrimination Effects & Selected Methodological Responses

Blank, Rebecca M., Marilyn Dabady, and Constance F. Citro. 2004. *Measuring Racial Discrimination*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. (pp. 77-89) **READER**

Kirscheman, Joleen, and Kathryn M. Neckerman. 1991. "'We'd Love to Hire Them, But . . .': The Meaning of Race for Employers," pp. 203-232 in *The Urban Underclass*, edited by Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute. **READER**

Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2003. "Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination." *American Economic Review* 94: 991-1013. **JSTOR**

– **Oct 22** – An Epistemological Response: Discrimination as a (Damaged) Social Relation

Lucas, Samuel Roundfield. 2008. *Theorizing Discrimination in an Era of Contested Prejudice*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press. **BOOK**

– **Oct 29** – Simple Demographic Causes of Discrimination & Additional Possible Complexity

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 965-990. **JSTOR**

Reskin, Barbara. 2000. "The Proximate Causes of Employment Discrimination." *Contemporary Sociology* 29: 319-328. **JSTOR**

– **Nov 5** – Policy Response: Enforce Anti-Discrimination Law?

Goldin, Claudia, and Cecilia Rouse. 2000. "Orchestrating Impartiality: The Impact of 'Blind' Auditions on Female Musicians." *American Economic Review* 90: 715-741. **JSTOR**

Hudson, Mildred J., and Barbara J. Holmes. 1994. "Missing Teachers, Impaired Communities: The Unanticipated Consequences of *Brown v. Board of Education* on the African American Teaching Force at the Precollegiate Level." *Journal of Negro Education* 63: 388-393. **JSTOR**

Bell, Derrick A., Jr. 1980. "*Brown v. Board of Education* and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma." *Harvard Law Review* 93: 518-533. **JSTOR**

– **Nov 12** – Policy Response: Revise/Restore Affirmative Action?

Loury, Glenn C. 1992. "Incentive Effects of Affirmative Action." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 523: 19-29. **JSTOR**

Collins, Sharon M. 1997. "Black Mobility in White Corporations: Up the Corporate Ladder but out on a Limb." *Social Problems* 44: 55-67. **JSTOR**

Holzer, Harry J., and David Neumark. 2000. "What Does Affirmative Action Do?" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 53: 240-271. **JSTOR**

– **Nov 19** – Policy Response: Re-Evaluate Jobs and Reward Structures?

Steinberg, Ronnie J. 1990. "Social Construction of Skill: Gender, Power, and Comparable Worth." *Work and Occupations* 17: 449-482. **Pathfinder**

Baron, James N., and Andrew E. Newman. 1990. "For What It's Worth: Organizations, Occupations, and the Value of Work Done by Women and Nonwhites." *American Sociological Review* 55: 155-175. **JSTOR**

– **Nov 26** – Policy Response: Use Indirect Methods?

Wilson, William Julius. 2000. "Rising Inequality and the Case for Coalition Politics." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 568: 78-99. **JSTOR**

Gilens, Martin. 1996. “‘Race Coding’ and White Opposition to Welfare.” *American Political Science Review* 90: 593-604. **JSTOR**

Kane, Thomas J. 1998. “Racial and Ethnic Preferences in College Admissions,” pp. 431-456 in *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, edited by Christopher Jencks and Meredith Phillips. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. **READER**

– **Dec 3** – Provide Reparations?

Van Dyke, Jon M. 2003. “Reparations for the Descendants of American Slaves Under International Law,” pp. 57-78 in *Should America Pay? Slavery and the Raging Debate on Reparations*, edited by Raymond A. Winbush. New York, NY: Amistad Publications, an imprint of HarperCollins. **READER**

McWhorter, John. 2003. “Against Reparations,” pp. 180-196 in *Should America Pay? Slavery and the Raging Debate on Reparations*, edited by Raymond A. Winbush. New York, NY: Amistad Publications, an imprint of HarperCollins. **READER**

Ogletree, Jr., Charles J. 2004. “Tulsa Reparations: The Survivor’s Story.” *Boston College Third World Law Journal* 24: 13-30. **Google Scholar** or if that does not work, try http://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/schools/law/lawreviews/journals/bctwj/24_1/03_FMS.htm

van Wormer, Katherine. 2009. “Restorative Justice as Social Justice for Victims of Gendered Violence: A Standpoint Feminist Perspective.” *Social Work* 54: 107-116. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2013. “Discrimination and Earnings in the United States.” (Paper will be provided).

– **Dec 10** – Optional Wrap-up Discussion

– **Dec 17** – Final Papers due at my office at 12noon