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Letter from the Editor

This is my first year as Editor-in-Chief of Social Dialogue, and I have sought to maintain the quality of scholarship of this edition at a level commensurate with the fantastic editions that have come before. The quality of submissions I had the pleasure to review during the 2014-2015 year, have made my job easy, as they represent outstanding pieces of scholarship and demonstrate the committed academic rigor of undergraduates throughout the state of Utah.

The articles in this issue carry on this proud tradition. They address a wide variety of topics, all of which speak to the key political, social, cultural and demographic concerns of our time. Grant Holyoak takes a provocative look at the parallels between the economic decline of the Midwest and the market growth of the Mountain West. Montana Throne provides a succinct overview of the Equal Rights Amendment, and argues that achievement of gender equality in the U.S. requires equitable political representation. Sarah Burton tackles the controversial concept of “rape culture,” and provides evidence indicating that rape culture is perpetuated by media, cultural behavior and language in our modern society. Amberli Falk provides an overview of gender socialization, arguing that children learn about gender in their early years through both the gender specific toys they encounter as well as socializing interactions from parents and peers. Matt Britt echoes the sentiments of Falk in his review of gender roles and play; however, Britt argues that allowing children to engage in active play may shift stereotypical gender reasoning toward more equal grounds for all gender choices. Trevor Bishop addresses the important topic of gender and learning-style preference bias in the academic setting, and argues that, instead of a one-mold-ﬁts-all teaching method, teachers should expand teaching styles to be more inclusive of different students’ learning abilities. Finally, Wendy DeMill provides a ﬁrst-hand, ethnographic account of Wal-Mart associate culture and the ever expanding “Black Friday” phenomena, arguing that associates are made to feel like their traditions, religion, and families do not matter anymore when forced to work Thanksgiving Day as well as other major holidays.

We hope you enjoy this edition of Social Dialogue. Our goal has always been to challenge the preconceptions that our readers may hold while simultaneously creating a dialogue between undergraduate students, graduate students, professors and community members with regard to local and global social issues. To contribute to the dialogue, send comments to socialdialogue2016@gmail.com or consider submitting a paper to Social Dialogue for our next edition!

Jennifer Tabler
Editor-in-Chief
June 25, 2015
Post-1970 Corporate Restructuring:  
The Rise of a New Nation  
Grant Holyoak, Utah State University

Introduction

Until recently, the American Northeast and Midwest almost exclusively dominated the nation’s industrial and manufacturing markets. Centered in such metropolitan powerhouses as New York, Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, Pittsburg, and Detroit, these two regions utilized their geographic and labor force advantages to secure themselves as the centers of American corporate power. Benefits that they accessed included “excellent deep-water ports, extensive inland rail and waterway systems, well-developed inter and intrametropolitan highways, rich nearby coal deposits, ubiquitous public utilities, a diverse and relatively well-educated labor force, ready access to investment capital, and strong local markets” (Kasarda, 1995, p. 216).

However, beginning in the year 1970, America’s corporate landscape began to change when the American Mountain West, along with other regions, experienced both an economic and a population expansion.

The year 1970 marked the beginning of a population explosion in the Mountain West region. The eight states that compose the region (Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming) continue to collectively undergo one of the most dramatic population spikes in American history (Perlich 2006). Every state in the region, with the exception of Colorado, had populations under 1 million people in 1950.

Today, only Montana and Wyoming remain under the 1 million mark while the next largest state, Idaho, currently has 1.5 million residents. Arizona and Nevada took the lead in this population boom, with current populations of over 6 million and 2.5 million, respectively. Their populations are expected to double yet again in the next twenty years, and Arizona is projected to be the 10th most populous state in the nation by the year 2030 (Perlich 2006).

Migration theory postulates that this boom of the American Mountain West is a result of the steady economic decline of the American Midwest, or the “Rust Belt.” Multiple analyses of the Rust Belt demonstrate its decreasing significance as an American economic kingpin, specifically in the manufacturing sector.

Intriguingly, the new age of corporate management and global competition did not damage the growth of the Mountain West as it did the Midwest. Rather, the economic evolution since the 1970’s seems to have greatly benefited the West in terms of both its economy and its population.

This project is an attempt to reconcile the economic decline of the Midwest with the growth of the Mountain West through a comprehensive analysis of the United States’ changing corporate structure. It investigates the roles of corporate and sectorial investment on the population shifts to the Mountain West, the push and pull factors that influence such corporate migration, and will most importantly attempt to establish the Mountain West’s role in the modern national and international corporate
migration stories.

The Mountain West’s economic and political significance is projected to increase as the 21st Century progresses, and analyses like this will be vital to portray the evolution of the region from an isolated national footnote to a key economic hub.

**Methodology**

This analysis relies on a state-of-the-art investigation of existing work already published in the field, or meta-research. Specifically, the analysis is a collection and consolidation of theories, maps, statistics, and other figures contained in numerous scholarly articles, government reports, and sociological studies. The majority of studies related to the topics discussed here were conducted in the 1980s and 1990s, when the phenomena of outsourcing and deindustrialization were new and highly-researched. This study, however, is the first to attempt to weave together the stories of the Midwest and the Mountain West.

**Analysis:**

**The Perfect Storm of Midwestern Decline**

The history of the Rust Belt is defined by the successes and failures of corporations within the region. Holloway and Wheeler (1991) write:

*As most of these metropolitan areas themselves evolved with industrialization as their economic base and at advantageous locations on the water, rail, and highway networks, the economic success of the metropolitan areas went hand-in-hand with the successes of the major corporations. Indeed, the history of many urban areas is written inextricably in the business decisions and actions of local corporations, especially industrial firms.*

Considering this quote, the shift in corporate structure that began in 1970 caused the Midwest to experience dramatic economic declines, especially in the manufacturing sector. These declines caused mass emigration out of the Rust Belt as migrants searched for new employment, which exacerbated the region’s economic troubles even further, causing more emigration. Thus, the Midwest’s deterioration of both economy and population occurred through a feedback effect that damaged both spheres simultaneously. The combined economic and population declines served to effectively drown the Rust Belt in a wave of corporate restructuring that perpetuated itself through what I refer to as the ‘Feedback Effect of Regional Decline’. This section will analyze the catalysts that initiated this effect in the Rust Belt.

**Economic Decline.** The economic dominance of Midwestern metropolises is unquestionably deteriorating (Kasarda 1995; Lyons 1994; Ward 1994; Wheeller 1987; Wheeler 1988a). Between 1980 and 1990 alone, the Rust Belt lost 1.5 million manufacturing jobs and $40 billion in aggregate manufacturing worker earnings (Kasarda 1995). Wheeler (1987) found that five of the eight metropolitan areas experiencing the most drastic manufacturing declines from 1980 to 1985 were located in the Midwest. The following map demonstrates the metropolitan employment change in manufacturing areas across the United States from 1980 to 1985 (Wheeler, 1987). The losses experienced in the Midwest represent the most drastic losses in the nation at the time by a significant margin.

This manufacturing decline occurred systematically beginning in the 1970s. Noyelle and Stanback (1983) identify four phases that metropolitan areas in the Rust Belt experienced, with some overlap between each phase. Chronologically, these four phases are termed as “Suburbanization”, “Regionalization”, “Decentralization”, and “Internationalization.”

Corporate suburbanization is the movement of large manufacturing plants from the interiors of major cities to their outskirts. As the pattern of corporate suburbanization continued, corporate headquarters and manufacturing firms began to move farther away from traditional industrial centers in a pattern known as Regionalization. In this second stage, industries transported their corporate headquarters and manufacturing plants away from metropolises in the Midwest and Northeast towards large cities in nontraditional regions, including Denver and Phoenix in the Mountain West. Regionalization distributed industrial clout across the nation, allowing new cities to expand.
Decentralization refers to the movement of corporations away from major cities altogether, instead favoring smaller metropolitan centers or even nonmetropolitan areas. In their 1983 article, Noyelle and Stanback point to the electronic industry’s dispersal as a typical example of this process, specifically acknowledging the move of Digital Equipment to the relatively rural area of Colorado Springs. In another example of decentralization, Kasarda (1995) indicates the declines experienced by major American metropolises (including the Midwest’s: Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit) from 1960 to 1990. As Decentralization continued, the diverse nonmetropolitan and rural areas of the United States gained access to economic growth in ways that had not previously existed.

The final stage of dispersal is Internationalization. Corporate headquarters, low-skilled jobs, and manufacturing plants are relocated (or “outsourced”) to Third World countries so that businesses can take advantage of the low wage labor in such regions. Wheeler (1988a) refers to this phenomenon as a “new international division of labor” and points to the increasing competitiveness of foreign markets in the manufacturing sector as a by-product of Internationalization. The Midwest, previously an industrial giant, found itself crippled by the waves of outsourcing that took jobs and money directly from the region. Internationalization, along with the other three phases, continues to contribute to the economic deterioration of the Rust Belt.

Population Decline. As Midwestern jobs were lost to other regions, millions of employees searched for new opportunities and migrated to regions that could offer work. Because of Regionalization and Decentralization, many migrant destinations lay in relatively new corporate areas including the Mountain West and the South (Semple 1973).

As Midwestern metropolises experienced population decline due to decreases in manufacturing employment opportunities, they also experienced declines in service employment sectors that are directly tied to regional population. This is exemplified in the Midwest’s service sector job losses from 1969 to 1989, in which the the banking (-6%), insurance (-4%), retail (-12%), and utilities (-6%) industries all declined (Ward 1994). These declines came at a period when the United States economy transformed from one dominated by manufacturing to one predominately reliant upon services for growth (Holloway & Wheeler 1991). Because the metropolises of the Rust Belt prior to 1970 were so singularly devoted to industrial production, the region missed out on the expansion into service sector employment at the same time that it experienced declines in manufacturing dominance due to Noyelle and Stanback’s (1983) four phases. While the Midwest was attempting to float amidst the flood of corporate restructuring, other regions were booming. Corporate growth since 1970 was not merely a matter of industrial and service-sector shifts, but also a time of continued innovation in the world of American business. New corporations were born at the same time that others died. Due to the effects of Regionalization and Decentralization, however, much of this growth occurred outside the Rust Belt (Lyons 1994). Thus, the region was excluded from a generation of corporate growth that began to catapult new regions, including the Mountain West, into the economic limelight (Richetto 1990). The Midwest was left alone to experience the majority of “corporate death”, including the dramatic decline of the American steelworks industry.

The Corporate Response to a Changing World

Beginning in 1970, both the national and international corporate strategies began to change in major, measurable ways in favor of non-traditional economic centers. Two notable changes are discussed here: the distribution of subsidiary corporate headquarters and the allocation of foreign direct investments. Both trends contributed to a more equal geographic dispersal of both money and power in the United States’ economy.

The role of subsidiary headquarters grew increasingly more important as corporations adjusted their marketing and manufacturing models to adapt to continuing advancements in media and technology, seeking to serve greater numbers of people. Tracing the dispersal patterns of subsidiary headquarters, therefore, provides insight into the “minds” of modern corporations. The locations that are chosen for subsidiary headquarters can be seen as
corporate investments. Corporations expect subsidiary regions to blossom into economic productivity, hence their investment in regional headquarters. The investigation of subsidiary headquarters carried out by Rice and Pooler (2009) indicates that the Rust Belt continues to receive less subsidiary growth, while non-traditional regions (including the Mountain West) grew substantially through subsidiaries from 1996 to 2004. Three of the top ten growth regions were in the Mountain West specifically, while four of the bottom ten were in the Midwest. These numbers represent not only geographic dispersal of corporate subsidiaries, but also provide an indication of corporate “confidence” in areas of the United States that are worthy of significant investment.

The second, perhaps more significant trend, is the spatial distribution of foreign direct investment (FDI) in the United States today. Richetto and Moitra’s 1990 study of FDI indicates that much of the industrial growth in the country comes as a result of it, with foreign-owned manufacturing firms employing over eight percent of the labor force and controlling more than fifteen percent of national assets. In 1978 the United States surpassed Canada as the world’s single largest recipient of FDI inflow. If the distribution of subsidiary headquarters allows us an insight into the corporate “mind” on the national level, patterns of foreign direct investment indicate perspectives held by international corporations towards regions of the United States. Intriguingly, patterns of FDI indicate a “trend toward parity” (Richetto & Moitra 1990); Midwestern and Northeastern industrial regions no longer receive near-exclusive preference from foreign investors. Richetto and Moitra’s 1990 analysis finds that a “new regional preference for the Southeast and Far West has emerged” and that this investment distribution is advancing rapidly. The following figure from their analysis illustrates the trend toward parity from 1974 to 1988. Patterns of investment continue to be dispersed across the country.

Patterns of geographic dispersal have other effects as well. Central metropolises are not only losing subsidiary headquarters investments, but corporate headquarters themselves are leaving these cities, further contributing to the stagnation of the region (Wheeler 1988; Semple 1973). The map below illustrates the mass exodus of Fortune 500 corporate headquarters (both manufacturing and service-based corporations) from major metropolises in the Midwest and Northeast from 1980 to 1987. In keeping with the Decentralization and Internationalization phases described above, Fawson (1998) writes that this dispersal of corporate headquarters indicates a new preference for nonmetropolitan or even rural areas as corporate investments. He argues that international competition (usually in the form of outsourcing) has decreased the competitiveness of central metropolises, leaving a place for nontraditional centers to overtake their positions of corporate leadership. He also postulates that diversified economies are more likely to exhibit employment stability and growth. The highly specialized economies of the Rust Belt (specifically comprised of the steel and automobile industries) damaged their flexibility in the face of the changing corporate world. The diverse economics of the Mountain West and other regions, however, opened them up to new investments (Fawson 1998).

Finally, as has already been discussed, the continuing deterioration of the manufacturing sector in the United States and the redistribution of the population occurred parallel to the growth of the service sector (Kasarda 1995, Ward 1994, Holloway 1991). As illustrated in the figure below, Kasarda’s 1995 study indicates that manufacturing is the only industrial sector that did not increase from 1970 to 1990, while services experienced the most drastic increases by a significant margin.

Intriguingly, manufacturing centers are unlikely to experience growth in the service sector. This is partially due to the direct correlation between service growth potential and population distribution discussed in the previous section, but also relates to Fawson’s (1998) discussion on the potential for growth in diverse economies. The service sector’s purpose is to provide for the needs of many people, so regions experiencing population influx experience the greatest growth in the service industry. The “recipe”, therefore, for a successful service sector in today’s economy is the presence of a “newer corporation, located in smaller, economi-
cally diverse, and rapidly growing” regions (Holloway & Wheeler 1991). Due the ‘Feedback Effect’, the Rust Belt does not fit this definition. It was in this search for a small, diverse, and growing region that the Mountain West was discovered as an investment location and began to expand.

The Rise of the “New West”

Since 1970, the American Mountain West has emerged as a center of nontraditional manufacturing areas, drastic population growth, rural tourist attractions, and diverse economies. Whereas the Rust Belt found itself a victim of the Feedback Effect, the Mountain West experienced perpetual growth as a result of corporate migration and evolution (Ward 1994; Richetto & Moitra 1990). Between 1980 and 1990 alone, the West added 450,000 manufacturing jobs and gained $21 billion in manufacturing worker earnings (Kasarda 1995).

According to Richetto (1990) foreign direct investment into the Mountain West continued at an even more rapid pace than migration from within the U.S. manufacturing sector. These expansions of manufacturing corporate headquarters in the region led to increases in the service sector—a pattern of investment that continued as more migrants entered the region.

As the corporate structure continued to progress through Noyelle and Stanback’s (1983) phases of dispersal, the Mountain West became a key player in the Regionalization and Decentralization phases. Regionalization, which by definition reallocates economic prestige between central metropolises, favored expanding cities like Phoenix, Denver, Boise, and Salt Lake City. As these urban areas grew through investment, nonmetropolitan areas grew through Decentralization, which refers to the dispersal of economic clout to rural areas. Because of the Mountain West’s advantages in the development of tourist and recreation centers, rural areas grew rapidly. (Fawson 1998) Thus, the combined effects of Regionalization and Decentralization revolutionized both the urban and rural regions of the Mountain West simultaneously, causing scholars to refer to it as the “New West” (Hunter 2002).

As previously mentioned, the raw diversity of the Mountain West was key to the region’s increase in investment (Fawson 1998). The double-growth effect of Regionalization and Decentralization was catalyzed by the Mountain West’s lack of dependency on any single industry. As Holloway and Wheeler (1991) predicted, newer corporations located in smaller, economically diverse, and growing communities “came of age” in the Mountain West. In Fawson’s analysis of dominant labor sectors in Utah counties, he discovered that every economic sector found a home in the Mountain West (Fawson, 1998). Not only that, but the majority of counties exhibited dominance in two or three sectors while two did not display a dominance of any single sector. This diversity sustained a pattern of economic growth that led to population increases in the region.

This population increase is unprecedented in the Mountain West. The four fastest-growing states in the nation are in the region: Nevada, Arizona, Utah, and Idaho (Census 2010). According to 2010 census figures, the region has already surpassed the Midwest in population. This population explosion began in 1970 and is projected to continue (Perlich 2006). Holloway and Wheeler (1991) write that population has a direct correlation to corporate dominance, and as one increases the other is certain to do the same. The drastic population boom fuels continuing growth in service sector jobs, leading to yet more advances in regional economic dominance.

A large portion of initial population increase came as a result of the region’s characteristic National Parks, beautiful landscapes, and other amenity-based characteristics that were key to the creation of tourism and recreation in the Mountain West. Writing about this phenomenon in Utah, Fawson (1998) explains:

“Although retail trade and service sectors are growing nationwide, much of the growth in Utah’s trade and services sector can be directly attributed to various tourism-based development schemes, as well as to rapidly expanding visitation to federal lands by an increasing number of tourists from across the world who value access to rural Utah’s unique recreation resources. Some suggest that tourism and recreation are part of the new paradigm for rural development.”
As these (mostly rural) tourist areas continued to develop, the necessity for maintenance labor forces and accompanying service and retail jobs became more pronounced, leading to economic increases that followed behind population increases. This is another example of the Feedback Effect.

New Regionalization and Decentralization trends favored the budding region, its sectorial diversity allowed it to flourish in multiple industrial and service sectors, and its newly utilized amenities continued its patterns of growth. The Mountain West, receiving the declining Rust Belt’s money and migrants, was catapulted into the national limelight and stepped up as a key player in the America’s new economy.

**Conclusion**

The story of the Midwestern decline is inextricably connected to the story of the Mountain West’s growth. While the Rust Belt found itself prey to the “perfect storm” of manufacturing deterioration and middle class flight, the Mountain West grew through its diverse economy, access to natural resources and other amenities, and its continual influx of migrants that contributed to its booming service sector. While the Rust Belt has certainly not lost all of its corporate dominance, recent trends of geographic dispersal indicate that it can never again expect to control the same proportion of national business that it did prior to 1970. Redistribution patterns of labor, headquarters, and investment seem to indicate that not only a “New West”, but a “New Nation” has developed.

The evolving nature of America’s population and economic dispersals are highly relevant in a number of spheres. Policy advocates and lawmakers must consider reallocation of infrastructure funds, welfare programs, and dozens of other social benefits as populations continue to be concentrated in the West. If current trends hold, then economic growth will continue in the West and employment opportunities will continue to decline in the Midwest.

On the note of further examination, I must stress the need for continued research on the subject of corporate restructuring in the wake of the 1970s. Concepts like outsourcing and deindustrialization are intriguingly described as “recent tendencies” in the articles of the 1980s (Noyelle & Stanback 1983). Considering that these are far from “recent” from a contemporary perspective, it seems obvious that reconsideration of the implications of corporate changes is necessary in order to understand the Rust Belt’s decline. Although there has been extensive contemporary research on human migration patterns (especially unauthorized immigration) to the Mountain West, there has been very little investigation of corporate migration trends (neither national nor international) since the 1990s. It is vital that this topic be resurrected in order for contemporary scholars to piece together current corporate growth and migration trends. I invite scholars to build upon my work and to recreate past research in order to tell these stories.
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Gender Equality Needs Should Be Enshrined
In the U.S. Constitution
Montana Throne, University of Utah

The right to vote, the right to equal pay, and the right to have an abortion represent considerable progress in the establishment of women’s rights in the United States (US). Equality in the eyes of the law is clearly moving in the right direction. However, the US Constitution does not explicitly protect against sex discrimination, and any attempt for a change has been thwarted by strong opposition—much of it coming from women themselves.

After the Civil War, Congress passed the 14th Amendment in an effort to end racial discrimination. Section 1 of the 14th Amendment states:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws (US Constitution, 1868).

This section of the 14th Amendment is also known for the Equal Protection Clause, which is considered by some to protect citizens from any kind of discrimination. Since this section includes the term ‘all persons,’ it is reasonable to assume that it applies to both males and females and can serve as a bulwark against discrimination on the basis of sex and/or gender. However, given the 14th Amendment’s explicit focus on ending racial discrimination, it has typically not been interpreted as providing consistent or reliable protection against sex discrimination (Wharton, 2005). In light of this strict interpretation of the original intent of the 14th Amendment, many women saw the need for additional Constitutional protections.

Shortly after the 19th Amendment was passed, the Equal Rights Amendment was written by Alice Paul and introduced to Congress (Hawranick, Doris, and Daugherty, 2008). The ERA states, “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex” (US Statutes at Large, 1972).

The bill sat in a committee throughout the Great Depression, World War II, and finally emerged from both the House and Senate with sweeping majority votes in 1972 (Freeman 1988). The next step was to have at least 38 states ratify the bill in order for it to become an amendment. Within the first year, 30 states had ratified the bill (Noble 2012). With strong support from Congress, the bill was considered to be an easy win (Freeman 1988). It probably would have been if it had not been for conservative activist and lawyer Phyllis Schlafly. Schlafly, founder of the notoriously conservative Eagle Forum, touched on many different issues in her opposition to the bill, effectively garnered support from women all over the US (Critchlow and Stachecki 2008). In the demographics of women who supported her, 98%
were religious and consisted of, but were not limited to, fundamentalist and evangelical Christians, Mormons, Orthodox Jews, and Roman Catholics (Critchlow and Stachecki, 2008). Graham Noble explains that Schlafly “expressed the view that far from being oppressed or victimized within a patriarchal society, American women were immensely privileged” (2012).

In her grassroots campaign, “Stop ERA,” she claimed that the ERA would destroy the privilege given to women in the United States by removing protective labor laws, removing right of financial support by husbands, drafting women into combat, and allowing abortion. She also asserted that it would lead to considerable social change in the form of the legalization of gay marriage and the establishment of unisex bathrooms.

Furthermore, she capitalized on conservatives’ enthusiasm for local government by suggesting that the issue of gender discrimination ought to be resolved in states’ legislatures rather than via federal fiat (Critchlow and Stachecki, 2008).

In Stop ERA’s opposition efforts, they created paranoia in the right wing by claiming that the ERA would destroy family values (Freeman, 1988). This strategy proved to be highly effective. Schlafly’s operatives were able to convince five states to rescind their ratification and stopped the swing states from supporting the bill. The bill ultimately fell just three states short of ratification.

Although the ERA has been introduced in every congress since its defeat in 1982, still remains unpassed. In preventing its ratification, Schlafly believes she protected the rights and privileges of women, but many see her accomplishment as doing quite the opposite.

Schlafly’s arguments seem to stem from an inherent belief that women are inferior to men, a notion implicitly or explicitly endorsed by many major religions throughout the world. Such beliefs tended to be highly correlated with opposition to the ERA. Ernest Wohenberg (1980), for example, found that states that failed to ratify the ERA had more conservative religious and/or political views (1980). Additionally, states that opposed the ERA were found to be enforcing subordination of women in a variety of ways, not protecting their privileges (Nice, 1986).

Jimmy Carter, a Southern Baptist, spoke at a World’s Religion conference and is quoted as saying:

At their most repugnant, the belief that women are inferior human beings in the eyes of God gives excuses to the brutal husband who beats his wife, the soldier who rapes a woman, the employer who has a lower pay scale for women employees, or parents who decide to abort a female embryo. It also costs many millions of girls and women control over their own bodies and lives, and continues to deny them fair and equal access to education, healthcare, employment, and influence within their own communities (2009).

Seventeen states who ratified the Federal ERA have adopted a version of the equal rights amendment into their state constitutions (Wharton, 2005; Huckabee, 2004). In her study, Jocelyn Elise Crowley concluded that in the states that had ratified the Federal ERA, there was evidence of more women participating in government. This created a more representative democracy and also encouraged more women to think about what they could do to improve American society (2006).

Passing the Federal Equal Rights Amendment is important because it would provide judges with sufficient guidance on how to interpret the constitution (Wharton 2005). The Equal Protection Clause and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 have gone as far as they can to protect against sex discrimination (MacKinnon 2014).

The ERA would be the product of a macro institutional policy which would be a product of, and influence, the individual and micro levels. As Michael Kimmel points out, “The gendered identity of individuals shapes those gendered institutions, and the gendered institutions express and reproduce the inequalities that compose gender identity” (2013).

Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, who is notorious for his dogged adherence to the doctrine of original intent, was recently quoted as
saying, "Certainly the Constitution does not require discrimination on the basis of sex. The only issue is whether it prohibits it. It doesn’t" (Terkel, 2011). Judges like Scalia who follow the philosophy of original intent will most likely view the 14th Amendment within the context it was originally written. This threatens protection against sex discrimination at the highest level.

**Conclusion**

Somewhat ironically, women were the biggest opponents to the Federal Equal Rights Amendment. However, it is the responsibility of all Americans to engage in politics and create equality if they want it. Yale Law Professor Reva B. Siegel states, “Bluntly put, the nation never made a collective constitutional commitment to respect women as equals of men” (2002). A grassroots campaign against the ERA succeeded and a grassroots campaign in support of the ERA can too. Americans have the power to protect all citizens against sex discrimination, but gender equality will need representation first.
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Understanding Rape Culture: Correlates and Contributing Factors
Sarah Burton, University of Utah

Ongoing research into the related phenomena of victim-blaming and stigma surrounding rape and other forms of sexual assault has given rise to the idea of rape culture, a little phrase that has made a big impact since becoming part of the popular vernacular in recent decades.

Rape culture is the term defined by the attitude certain societies have toward rape and rape victims, which includes but is not limited to: normalizing, condoning, or excusing sexual violence. As evidence of this phenomenon, rape culture has been shown to be substantiated by media, cultural behavior, and language in our modern society.

In a focus group, which included 29 New Zealand men and women, it was apparent that the mistaken concept of whether rape was “that big of a deal” was one of the origins of rape culture attitudes and myths.

In 1974 there was a discovery and defining of the condition of “rape trauma syndrome.” Knowledge of this syndrome was subsequently used to combat the rape culture that had previously perpetuated the belief that “no harm was done” by rape (Gavey and Schmidt, 2011).

In the focus group a portion of the women involved “encountered disbelieving, blaming or unsympathetic responses, and some faced a reaction that was unhelpful albeit empathetic” (Gavey and Schmidt, 2011). One correspondence between a researcher and a participant in the study demonstrates the insensitive beliefs of some of the group members. The account is as follows:

Participant: I’d probably call it rape now but 20 years ago I wouldn’t have.

Researcher: What do you think it would have been called 20 years ago?

Participant: Her fault. (laughter and talking over each other)

According to this study, these types of responses to rape victims are affected by the public “discourses relating to gender and sexuality as well as to rape and responsibility” and the misunderstandings of the impacts of rape (Gavey and Schmidt, 2011). The focus group’s reactions outlined in this study are representative of the views of many men and women in today’s society.

The concerning “widespread acceptance of rape myths” and their desensitizing effects can be illustrated by a study which demonstrated that men with a past history of sexual aggression report that they might rape a woman if the chance of getting caught was out of question (Burt, 1980).

One way to observe evidence of the permeation of rape culture in society is to measure the prevalence of rape myths in the media. Rape myths are defined as, “false but persistent beliefs and stereotypes regarding forced sexual intercourse and the victims and perpetrators of such acts” (Kahlor and Eastin, 2011).

A few examples of rape myths are: when regretting consensual sexual acts women manufacture
rape claims, that women who are raped were “asking for it” or deserved it because of the way they dressed, or they have it “coming to them” because they put themselves in bad situations or have bad reputations.

To illustrate the prevalence and influence of rape myths in the media, one study found that within 26 prime time television storylines each one contained at least one reference to a rape myth, 46 percent accounted for the victim being to blame for the assault, 42 percent of the storylines proposed that the victim wanted to be raped, and 38 percent asserted that the victim lied about the assault (Kahlor and Eastin, 2011).

Data from this study also indicate that even among college women, those who watched more television, had a higher likelihood of believing rape myths. For example, one of the prominent myths stating that “the majority of rape accusations are false,” was positively and significantly correlated to daily television viewing (Kahlor and Eastin, 2011).

Of the women participating in the study, their responses to the question, ‘What percentage of rape accusations are false, in your opinion?’ it was presented that one in four respondents believed that 30 percent of rape accusations are false, whereas only one in eight depicted the correct percentage (Kahlor and Eastin, 2011). The accurate statistic is that only “5% of the more than 90,000 complaints received in 2003 from law enforcement are deemed false accusations” (Anderson et al., 2003).

In addition, there is a substantiated linkage between pornographic media, violent media, and the perpetuation of rape myths and behaviors. As support of this, “research has shown that people who consume pornographic movies and magazines are more likely to accept rape myths” (Kahlor and Morrison, 2007).

In addition, the study notes that consumption of violent television and films, video games, and music reveals unequivocal evidence that media violence increases the likelihood of aggressive and violent behavior in both immediate and long-term contexts” (Kahlor and Morrison, 2007).

In another experiment, researchers found a positive correlation between viewing pornography and the trivialization of rape (Zillmann and Bryant, 1982). These findings also establish that men and women who viewed pornography were both found to have these beliefs.

Another positive statistical relationship was found between exposure to pornographic media portrayals and the approval of violence against women. The societal cost of viewing pornographic material can be exhibited by violence against women, and is supported by a study stating that even nonviolent pornography viewing causes an increase of acceptance of rape myths, aggressive reactions toward women in laboratory settings, increased likelihood of committing rape, and a diminished perception of the suffering of rape victims (Zillmann and Bryant, 1982). Conversely, another study confirms an opposite effect of viewing consensual egalitarian forms of sexually explicit stimuli may actually reduce misogynistic responses (Baron and Bell, 1977).

Additional factors which also contribute to rape cultures are alcohol, drug use, and male peer pressure to demean women and encourage gender segregation. Current research also suggests that language using sexist humor may have an impact on men’s self-reported rape inclinations. In one particular study, findings stated that sexist jokes provide a means to produce a “local norm” that promotes discrimination and prejudice (Ford and Fergeson, 2004).

This local norm, in turn, provides a social context that allows men to feel comfortable participating in sexist humor and perpetuates sexual aggression. In similar studies it has been found that males who rate high in hostile sexism are “more prone to engage in different forms of discrimination against women following exposure to sexist humor” (Manuela and Tendayi, 2013).

Rap music is another form of language that often perpetuates rape myths and attitudes. Misogyny is a popular topic in many contemporary rap songs where women are portrayed as nothing more than sex objects. Much of contemporary rap music incorporates degradation of women in many ways but the ultimate tone of these particular songs, “support, justify, instill, and perpetuate ideas, values, beliefs, and stereotypes that debase women” (Adams and Fuller, 2006).
Conclusion

Rape culture has been shown to be substantiated by media, cultural behavior and language in our modern society. In today’s society violent media perpetuates rape myths and behaviors. Pornography and sexist humor influences our culture’s behavior by condoning the objectification of women. The lyrics in rap music propagate and normalize the defaming of women. All of these factors combine to contribute to, and provide evidence of, the prevalence of rape culture in our modern society which can lead to violence against women.
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Teaching and Toys: Gendering Children in the Early Years
By Amberli Falk, University of Utah

Imagine walking down the aisles in a child-
ren’s toy store. It becomes very easy to tell which
sections are designated for girls and which are
designated for boys. There are princesses, baby
dolls, and an overwhelming amount of pink coming
from one section. There are superheroes, cars, and a
variety of guns coming from another.

Advertisements on television are geared
towards children, and are striving to sell specific
toys to girls and others to boys. In many early child-
hood classrooms, toys are presented in a way that
courages children to play in the area they “belong
in.” There is a dramatic play area set up with a full
kitchen, food, ironing boards, and babies, complete
with their blankets, bottles, and cribs. These activi-
ties are typically thought of as girl jobs, and this is
emphasized through the layout of the classroom.

Parents and loved ones often buy toys for
children that are considered to appropriately match
their gender. Thus, it is no shock that from a very
young age, children are taught that there are “boy”
toys and “girl” toys. They learn that there are differ-
ences in toys and that their preference is supposed
to coincide with their gender. The thesis of this pa-
er is that children learn about gender in their early
years through both the gender specific toys they
encounter as well as socialization from their parents
and peers.

According to research by Nancy Freeman
(2007), children construct gender stereotypes as
early as age three and when asked, believe that their
parents will react to them playing with toys in a way
that reinforces gender stereotypes. Because of this,
children begin to construct gender roles and stere-
types from a very young age that are continually
reinforced throughout their life.

Freeman (2007) conducted a study where
she asked three and five-year-old children to cata-
gorize “girl” toys and “boy” toys into different
groups. She also asked these children to explain
how they thought their parents would react if they
were playing with a particular toy. It was found that
girls predicted their parents would only approve
between 20-40 percent of playing with cross-gender
toys, while boys predicted that parents would only
approve between 9-36 percent of cross-gender toys
(Freeman, 2007).

The author makes the point that, “Their re-
ponses indicate that it is the developmental nature
of preschoolers to rigidly apply prevalent gender
stereotypes…This study also illustrates that these
children believed that their parents were supportive
of their play with gender-typical toys but less ac-
cepting of cross-gender toys” (Freeman, 2007, pp.
362-363). Both gendered toys and socialization
from parents teaches children about gender at this
young preschool age.

Gender is also taught to young children
through television advertisements targeted specifi-
cally to young girls and boys. In their research on
advertisements, Fern L. Young and Karren Young
conducted a study to find out whether advertisers
script the language different for girls than for boys,
and if they do this to link their products to gender
roles. They found that, “boy-oriented ads contained
more elements emphasizing action, competition and
destruction, and agency and control. Girl-oriented ads contained more verb elements emphasizing limited activity and feeling and nurturing. The speaking roles scripted for boys and girls also revealed polarized gender voices and gender relations” (Johnson & Johnson, 2002, pp. 461). Gender stereotypes are explicitly taught and reinforced through television advertisements.

Gender is not only taught through toys prevalent in our American culture. Gender is also taught through the influence of parents, caregivers, and peers. Parents may teach their children sex-typing of toys. Researchers Yvonne A. Caldera and Mary A. Sciaraffa, conducted a study using dolls and stuffed clowns to see if toddler-aged boys could be provided with the same type of feminine play that toddler-aged girls do when playing with dolls.

The authors show that parents teach their children sex-typing of toys by reacting more positively when their children are playing with sex-appropriate toys, and more negatively when they are playing with toys considered not sex-appropriate (Caldera and Sciaraffa, 1998). This approach encourages children to play with these toys exclusively, knowing that their parents would react in a negative way if they played with toys that are considered not sex-appropriate.

Children lean towards gender appropriate toys because they are able to categorize them and understand gender stereotypes in order to please their parents. Anne Campbell (2002) conducted a study to determine if children could label toys according to gender and if she could strive to understand children’s knowledge of his or her own sex-typed preferences. In this study, research was conducted both at the children’s home and in a group setting where gender-neutral toys were presented. She found that children had a significant tendency to play with toys that are considered sex-congruent (Campbell, 2002).

The author states, “Both at home (where there could be no cueing effect of other children’s choices) and in the group situation (where gender neutral toys were available) we found a significant tendency for children to prefer toys that were sex-congruent” (Campbell, 2002, pp. 212). Thus, children really do tend to prefer toys that coincide with gender stereotypes that they learn at a very young age.

It is also noteworthy that parents are more accepting of their female children playing with toys of the opposite gender, but in the case of male children, it is different. Emily Kane (2006) conducted qualitative interviews with the parents of preschool children. Her research found that parents are generally more accepting with gender nonconformity amongst girls, but the same thing amongst boys is much more complicated.

Regarding parents teaching gender to their female children, the author states, “Although many parents of daughters reported positive responses to what they considered typical interests and behaviors for a girl, most also celebrated the addition of atypical pursuits to their daughters’ lives…” (Kane, 2006, pp. 157). There was leeway in parent’s attitudes towards their female children fitting interests and behaviors that are typically considered appropriate for boys.

On the other hand, parents did not consider feminine interest and behaviors as appropriate for their male children. The author states, “...these various examples indicate clearly the work many parents are doing to accomplish gender with and for their sons in a manner that distances those sons from any association of femininity” (Kane, 2006, pp. 162). It is noteworthy that there are differences between female and male children and their parent’s attitudes towards their interests and behaviors involving gender.

On this subject, it is also important to note that male peers typically influence other males to follow gender-appropriate stereotypes. Julia Grant (2004) gives a historical overview of boys who are raised to be “boys” or “sissies”. She concludes that the 20th century has shown that gender is much more fluid than it has been in the past, and parents play an important role in ensuring that their young boys are developing the appropriate sex characteristics and orientations.

It is also found that male children’s peers have had a large influence over their boyhood and gender preferences in the past and that this continues on today. The author states, “Early childhood was posed as an increasingly important period of
life, with parents playing an important part in helping to ensure that their boys developed sex-based characteristics and orientations” (Grant, 2004, pp. 845).

Children are also influenced by and learn about gender through their peers. Their peers may condemn them for playing with the “wrong toys”. Karen Wohlwend (2012) conducted a study to see how young boys would play with Disney Princess dolls in a classroom setting. Two young boys challenged that these dolls were only for girls, so they began to play with them. Other children became very concerned about the boys playing with “girl toys”. This shows that play can reinforce gender roles children typically believe. The author articulates, “...gender stereotypes are pervasive and persistent in children’s play” (Wohlwend, 2012, pp. 8). Children are not only taught about gender through their parents, but also through their interactions with their peers.

Although this thesis is credible, there is also some opposition to it. Some researchers believe that children select toys to play with based on their innate biological preferences; Janice M Hassett, Erin R. Siebert, and Kim Wallen (2008) conducted research with rhesus monkeys, and in this, they found similarities to male and female children. The authors find that toy preferences can be made without gendered socialization, and that it can be more of a genetic predisposition. (Hassett et al., 2008).

Even though socialization from parents, peers, and teachers is thought to be the biggest influence of teaching gender to children, these researchers also found that children’s preferences to specific toys can have a biological, innate characteristic as well. Although biology may play into this, it is also explicitly known that children are largely influence by the socialization of gender that they learn from their parents and caregivers as shown in the examples listed above.

Conclusion

Children learn about gender through toys. Children are influenced by parent’s opinions, and they learn about gender through play with their peers. Although some researchers believe biology plays a part in toy preference, it is arguable that socialization plays a much bigger role in teaching gender to children. Children learn about gender in their early years through both the gender specific toys they encounter as well as the socialization from their parents and peers.
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Gender Roles at Play
Matt Britt, University of Utah

Children love to play with toys. Not only do toys provide hours of entertainment, but they can also be great tools to help teach children about the world and society in which they live. Traditionally, in order to instill what is considered a healthy perspective of social gender roles, we have set in place specific types of toys for girls and specific types for boys. For example, Power Rangers go out and fight bad guys, while Barbie stays home and does her hair. Our idea of healthy gender roles for young people may not be so healthy after all. Gender-typed toys are reinforcing gender inequality through assigning specific gender roles to children.

To help illustrate the concept of inequality in gender-typed toys, Carol Auster and Claire Mansbach (2012) researched the availability of types of toys on the Disney Store Website. Visitors to the site could choose between two tabs under the “toys” heading which provided one tab for “girls” and one tab for “boys”. Nowhere on the site did it have a tab for “children’s toys”. Another point which Auster and Mansbach (2012) stressed was the color palette used in promoting the differences in the sexes, with soft pastels for girls, and bold, bright colors for boys, insinuating that colors have a gender.

The prevalence of these gender stereotypes were also analyzed by Kahlenberg and Hein (2010) in their study of gender stereotyping by toy commercials on the Nickelodeon children’s network. They viewed 455 toy commercials airing during after school hours to observe the placement of gender portrayal and gender orientation presented by toy companies. They observed that toy companies tend to exploit formative-stage children who are developing gender identities, values, and schemas by playing on the social significance of “power” toys for boys and “makeup and fashion playthings” for girls. (pp. 830-832). This differentiation in types of toys teaches boys to be outward oriented toward success and confidence in the realms beyond the home, and teaches girls to be inward oriented by working to be beautiful and caring in the realms of the home, which creates an element of inequality.

In modern society, there seems to be no escape from gender orientations projected upon young children. Klinger, Hamilton, and Cantrell (2001) point out that 85% of American households own at least one television, leaving children little protection from an onslaught of exposure from unsupervised advertising. Children observe aggressive scripts related to gender from the media, peers, and parents. They then encode the scripts internally by playing or rehearsing the observed acts. Parents who allow their children to watch violent content and buy toys associated with aggression give their children permission to behave under those antagonistic gender schemas.

Children have their own reasoning behind their views of toys. Barton, Eisenbud, and Rose (1995), in their efforts to understand children’s gender-based reasoning, suggested that it is important to more fully understand why children would feel certain toys are a good choice for themselves, and also to investigate why and how children determine the types of toys in which they would consider appropriate for others. These observations can lead
to a better understanding of the influence that gender scripts have on children’s reasoning power of how they compare themselves to others. Barton et al. (1995) related a researcher’s experience who was observing a young boy playing happily with a race car. He took the driver out and the helmet fell off, revealing the driver as a female with blonde hair. The boy then dropped the car like it was a “hot potato”. (p.1-2). This type of gender reasoning can limit the spectrum of play activities experiences by boys and girls alike.

Children begin gender reasoning at a very young age. Nancy Freeman (2007) claimed that toddlers at about 24 months old begin to identify themselves as boys or girls. By age 5, children have developed unbending definitions of how girls and boys behave. When parents were asked about concerns related to their child playing with a toy meant for a child of a different gender, many were under the belief that girls will “outgrow” their tomboyish ways and eventually return to playing with girl toys, but boys who continue to play with girl’s toys will become increasingly more feminine in their behavior if they are not stopped abruptly. Becky Francis (2010) discusses this type of learning and found that children do not initially identify toys as gender items, but quickly and rapidly learn that some playthings are for girls and some are for boys. Francis (2010) points out that this type of reasoning has future effects on a child’s choices in curriculum selection and preference throughout the educational spectrum. She observed further that curriculum related learning is more apparent in toys for boys by teaching technical skills. Girl’s toys emphasize emotional literacy, concern for their aesthetic presentation, and the “mastery of submission” to males.

The level of gender-typed knowledge a child acquires is often predicted by their family structure. As Hupp et al. (2010) explains, parents and families are the greatest influence of gender knowledge. Children from more traditional typed families have more gender-typed knowledge than those from less traditional family structures. Characteristics of mothers are what seem to be more important than that of the fathers in shaping and predicting gender role development. By age 4 or 5, children relate household chores to their particular gender. This may stop a child from exploring certain life tasks by assigning gender to them and placing them in a “hands off” category. This inequality of toy play and gender concepts has been further explained by Green, Bigler, and Catherwood (2004). When a child conforms to “gender appropriate” play with toys, it can result in “a failure of girls to develop athletic and spatial skills and a failure of boys to develop nurturing skills” (pp. 372-373). They also agree that boys are treated more harshly than are girls for playing with toys designated for the other gender.

It is important for Societies to be aware of the gender-specific messages we are sending to our young children through their toys and activities. They receive these scripts from historically based gender inequalities which are perpetuated and reinforced by the disparities observed in nearly every culture, which are directly influenced by the marginalization of females and the undeserved empowerment of men. If equality is to be reached, it must begin with how we teach young children to interpret gender scripts in a positive, more balanced way.

Conclusion

Through efforts in educating adults and allowing children to explore a further realm of active play, stereotypical gender reasoning can be shifted toward more equal grounds for all gender choices. Adults can observe new verification related to the true nature of humanity just by allowing children to play for the sake of playing, rather than playing for the sake of learning unequal activities and ideals pushed upon them by an outdated system of gender norms.
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Teachers Should Expand their Ways of Teaching: Accounting for Sex and Gender Preference

Trevor Bishop, University of Utah

While sex and gender are not perfect determinants of preferred learning styles among students, they are nonetheless factors teachers must consider when determining the most effective ways of reaching their students.

In the past, a common assumption was that men and women were champions of their own spheres in education (i.e., math and science for men and English and language for women). Sociologists have now found other alternative explanations for any performance gap that exists, such as the influence of and susceptibility to stereotypes (Kiefer 2007). With this set of past assumptions came different learning styles distinguishing the two sexes.

However, these differences are not perfectly constrained by a sex or gender dichotomy. While neither sex nor gender are perfect predictors of preferred learning styles, there are definite learning differences among students around the world -- both in the classroom and in the online environment. This is in part due to the gendered experience that creates different expectations for each sex. For this reason, it is important for teachers to be sensitive to different learning styles and incorporate as many as possible into their classroom setting.

The history of gendered academica is a history of unequal treatment. Before Title IX in 1972, higher education in the United States was single-sex (Shelton & Berndt 1974), meaning if you were a female that you attended a different school than if you were a male. A history of assumptions regarding sex and education is what gave basis for this sex discrimination in schools. It is no secret that men dominated the public sphere in our industrialized nation, creating unequal opportunities for both sexes, so it should come as no surprise that education was no different. Different prestigious schools with high funding like Harvard accepted only male students.

Even in a classroom of mixed sex, discrimination was prolific. In the Gendered Society, Kimmel references how male teachers responded differently to their male students versus their female students (Kimmel 2013). The male students were more likely to receive positive reinforcement for participating in a class discussion and less likely to receive penalties for shouting out answers rather than raising their hands. Culture has engrained fundamental differences in the way male and female students are respectively treated.

There is a great body of literature on sex and gender differences in the classroom. Some research concludes by supporting different treatment of each gender based on their inherent learning differences. A study by Loori focused on students learning English as a second language (ESL) in upper-level institutions. The researchers included 90 ESL students at three different American universities. The researchers discovered that males preferred activities that were logical and mathematical while females preferred activities using intrapersonal intelligence (Loori 2005).

Another study by Philbin et al, using a survey with 45 females and 25 males aged 21-60, concluded that men preferred a traditional style of
learning -abstract and reflective- while the women in the study preferred hands-on and practical settings (Phillbin et al 1995). However, these findings are limited because they look at the results of a gendered experience.

Some studies use a socio-cultural lens to examine the origin of this gendered experience. A study by Ten Dam and Severiens looked at educational influences on gender differences during the learning process. The researchers used a meta-analysis of the Learning Study Inventory and of the Approaches to Studying Inventory. Their results still found that males tended to prefer abstract conceptualization. There were also differences in learning-related emotional factors (Ten Dam & Severiens 1995).

Another study made a distinction between gender and gender identity, allowing to see if there was a difference in preferred learning style between expected gender (based on cultural and societal expectations) and identified gender (what the individual actually identified as). This study by Sabin and Ten Dam looked at 432 adult students ages 16-71 that completed inventories on learning style for one of four different subjects: Dutch, mathematics, biology, or history. Results showed that gender identity explains variance in learning styles more than gender itself. The gender differences they found did not differ across subjects or teachers (Sabin & Ten Dam 1997).

It is important to note that gender differences are in more than just math and English classrooms in the United States. Reported differences in preferred learning-styles are a multi-national issue. A study by Andrea and Rita looked at high school aged male and female learning style similarities and differences across Bermuda, Brunei, Hungary, Sweden, and New Zealand. The study included 1,637 adolescents. The researchers analyzed twenty-two different learning style elements across the different countries as well as across the two binary genders. The results of this study again showed gender differences in learning styles (Andrea & Rita 2003). Clearly, the gendered classroom is not limited to the United States.

Nor are preferred learning styles and gendered expectations limited to a physical classroom. Ames studied preferred learning styles in an on-line environment and found that students had different attitudes toward computers. The results showed that there were clear gender differences when students manifested a dominant style. This finding indicates that modifications to the curriculum could increase female enrollment in technology courses (Ames 2003).

In another study by Barrett, the social and interactive behaviors were highly variable. Males sent more messages, wrote messages twice as long, and made more contributions than females. However, the females contributed more interactive messages than the males. These dialogues showed the researcher that females followed a different role in the on-line environment (Barrett 1999).

One online study by Bolliger and Supanakorn even showed clear differences in the way gender affected the perceived use of online interactive tutorials. Researchers used a questionnaire to determine different learning styles and assess gender and class standing. The relationship between gender and learning style was statistically significant (Bolliger & Supanakorn 2011). Even when the online atmosphere does not include a group discussion or activity, differences between genders are still visible.

The interaction between sex or gender and learning styles is a serious matter for institutions to consider because it affects more than just the classroom itself; it also affects enrollment. A study by Moshe showed that entry exams were under-predicting female intelligence. This study took scholastic aptitude test scores from 1,778 Jewish and 1,017 Arab students. The researchers found that, within the Jewish subgroup, these aptitude tests under-predicted female students’ grade point average during their first year of college. This result shows sex bias existed in the test (Moshe 1987). By working to erase bias from standardized testing, institutions will influence male vs. female enrollment, creating more equal opportunities for all sexes.

These articles examined many sex and gender differences with learning styles, but there are no clearly consistent differences when looking at the whole body of research. These studies were all limited to exploring those differences through a socio-cultural lens and were unable to pinpoint any
genetic or evolutionary origin for these differences. While it remains feasible that there be some physiological or historically necessary explanation for these differences in learning styles, cultural influences such as stereotypes and gendered expectations remain a likely culprit for perceived differences in learning styles.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, bias exists within academia, favoring certain sexes, genders, and learning styles over others. As such, students comprising the minority receive unequal treatment and expectations for their performance. By creating an atmosphere of equal expectation in classrooms around the world (whether they are physical classrooms or an online environment) teachers can begin to appreciate individual learning differences in their students. Instead of a one-mold-fits-all teaching method, teachers can expand teaching styles to be more inclusive of different students’ learning abilities, thus letting their assessment reflect the student ability more accurately and reducing the gendered experience.
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Examining the Subculture of Wal-Mart Associates on “Black Friday”
Wendy DeMill, Salt Lake Community College

It is Black Friday - (EVENT DAY) as it is called at Wal-Mart. Everyone is wearing bright yellow vests with the words “EVENT STAFF” on the backs of the vests. This is what all associates working the “Superbowl of Retail” will be wearing for the next six hours. I walk from Q line to Q line making sure each associate is wearing his or her yellow vest and is prepared with what he or she will need for the sale, which starts at 6:00 PM on Thanksgiving day.

I hear the unhappiness in each associate’s voice with whom I speak. Not one of them is happy about being there on Thanksgiving day, including myself. The buzz going around the store from the associates that I have talked to is typically along the lines of “Just what we wanted to trade our holiday for! Anxiety from angry customers yelling at us all night, and working so hard we want to fall asleep standing! Happy Thanksgiving to us!”

The term “Black Friday” was coined in the 1960’s to mark the kickoff of the Christmas shopping season. Police officers originally labeled the day after Thanksgiving as “Black Friday” because all of the street congestion. Retailers eventually adopted the term “Black Friday” because this was when the retail stores would go from loss to profit. Back when accounting records were kept by hand, black ink was used to indicate gains, while red ink denoted loss. The large amounts of money spent the day after Thanksgiving were often sufficient to move a given store out of the red and into the black, as they say.

Over the years the “Black Friday Event” has changed drastically. It use to be that Wal-Mart would close its doors on Thanksgiving Day, then open at midnight on Friday morning. This practice was (more or less) in line with the image Wal-Mart tried to project: that of a family-friendly company interested in ensuring its employees had time off to spend with their respective families during the holiday season. The promise of spending Thanksgiving at home was also good for morale; it gave all the associates something to work hard for prior to the holiday. The associates felt that they were valued and appreciated and were proud to be a part of the Wal-Mart culture.

Over the years, however, the Black Friday sales have changed. What was once a fun tradition or an opportunity to save money has for some consumers devolved into chaos resulting in confusion, injuries, and even death.

In recent years, when the doors would open at midnight for the sales to start, customers would completely disregard safety, common sense and social decorum, seemingly on a winner-take-all mission to be the first person in the store or get the best deal. This rabid consumerism caused harm and even deaths in some states, as shoppers were trampled in the initial rush to enter the store.

In response to such issues, the Wal-Mart corporate offices reconsidered their existing policies on crowd control for Black Friday, which in turn brought about many unwelcome changes for associates.
When sales started kicking off on Thanksgiving Day, the name changed to “The Event” since “Black Friday” was felt to sound too chaotic (that no one considered the ridiculousness inherent in holding Black Friday sales on a Thursday reason enough to change the name speaks volumes about the general obliviousness of the average Wal-Mart corporate Yes-man).

This change created considerable conflict among the associates that work Black Friday—now known as “Black Thursday” to those of us on the ground. With the sales now starting on Thanksgiving Day, associates are being forced to forfeit any semblance of a Thanksgiving Day with their respective families. Associates are effectively being told, “It is what it is and there is nothing any of us can do about it, so just get over it.”

Wal-Mart corporate offices have tried to soften the blow of not being able to spend the holiday with our families by taking the annual 25 percent discount we receive on a single item and changing it to 25 percent off one’s entire purchase for those of us who work on Thanksgiving Day and Black Friday.

Far from being viewed as a magnanimous gesture, however, associates see this change in policy as a slap in the face. After all, we used to get 25 percent off one item just as a thank-you for being an associate. Now associates feel as though the promise of a discount is being used as a threat. Employees now feel as though this fringe benefit is contingent on their willingness to work on the busiest shopping days of the year. In other words, if an associate calls in sick on either of those days, he or she will have his or her thank-you for being an associate taken away.

Of course, company policy all but requires that associated work on Thanksgiving Day and Black Friday. These days are black-out days, which means that associates cannot ask for either day off. In fact, most associates end up working several hours over what they are scheduled simply because customer demand is such that they cannot shut their register down to leave. If an associate does happen to get sick on those days, he or she had better at least show up to prove to his or her manager that he or she is truly ill, otherwise, he or she risks being written up for a “poor business decision.”

Because there is considerable racial, ethnic and religious diversity with among the associates at Wal-Mart stores, the company’s new policies affect a variety of people. There are families that have religious traditions on Thanksgiving Day that much now have to take a proverbial back seat to work. Mothers are forced to work Thanksgiving Day instead of being able to cook a meal for their respective families. The older generation of women that work in the stores, many of whom are accustomed to spending Thanksgiving Day with their children and grandchildren, are now being forced to work instead. Fathers that use to take their children and grandchildren out to cut down a Christmas tree after Thanksgiving dinner are working now instead of enjoying that family tradition.

Being forced to work on Thanksgiving has contributed to threats of deviant behavior from many associates. Some of my peers such have threatened to quit if they are not given the day off, while others see a write-up as a small price to pay for being able to spend Thanksgiving with their families. Underneath it all is the idea, shared by many associates, that Wal-Mart has little respect for its employees and will gladly sacrifice their happiness in order to pad the company’s bottom line.

Two years ago, Wal-Mart made the change to move the “Black Friday” sales to Thanksgiving Day. It is my theory that since then the stores are having a difficult time keeping staffing where it needs to be for adequate coverage. They are losing long-term associates because the associates feel unappreciated and discriminated against. Most Wal-Mart stores in Utah start associates out at $8.25 an hour, which is poverty level, and not worth it to many associates now losing their Thanksgiving. Associates are now made to feel like their traditions, religion, and families do not matter anymore by forcing them to work Thanksgiving Day as well as other major holidays. The company should change its focus from early morning on Black Friday to late afternoon on Black Friday. This would help with crowd control while also giving the Thanksgiving holiday back to Wal-Mart associates.