lecture 11N:

a. Heteronormativity & sex norms
b. Sex Work and Sexual Harassment

sex & law, policy, & identity

- Same-sex marriages
  - over 50% approval and rising
  - religious marriage: church recognition
  - more favor civil unions: a legally protected relationship available to all
- Sexual orientation as a “protected class”
- Careers
  - individual (coming out)
  - social movement
- Nate Silver’s 538 data

Updates from 10/14
social construction of sexuality

• Creating and enforcing sexual norms
  – Recognition or creation of separate categories based on sexual orientation
  – Sexuality is learned, at least in part, in interaction with others
  – Labels and stigma in discussing sexual orientation

• RW Connell’s “hegemonic masculinity”:
  – A gender system privileging one vision of adult heterosexual masculinity over all femininities and alternative masculinities

• Judith Butler: gender as performative
  – Identities shaped by action or performance rather than some preexisting reality
  – West and Zimmerman 1987: “doing gender”

Video clip: Boys Don’t Cry

Bemiller (2005)
Men who cheer

• Method: 8 men and 9 women on squad
  – Focus groups + Individual interviews (why?)
• Stigma is “discreditable” – not immediately visible
  – Perceived as a feminine sport or “sport”
  – Failure to do gender appropriately → face-saving
  – Sexual identity questioned (discrimination)

• “Saving Face” and hypermasculinity
  – Territoriality – dominating females
  – Masculine toughness, aggression (fighting, injury)
  – Sexual objectification of women (“the most heterosexual males I’ve ever met”)
  – Redefining cheerleading (and other actions) to emphasize masculinity and subordinate femininity

• Wozniak & Uggen, 2009 “Real Men Use Non-Lethals” – marketing tasers to police officers
When and where is sexual orientation considered deviant?

- **heteronormative** -- heterosexuality taken as normative in society
  - Deviance as violation of norms that draws social disapproval and negative sanctions (v. statistical, absolutist, reactivist)
  - **Queer** as antonym of heteronormative and gender binary; LGBTQI (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex) plus sex and gender "rulebreakers"

- **norms and laws are changing**
  - Legalization -- same sex marriage (SCOTUS 10/6/14)
  - Repeal sodomy laws (Lawrence v. Texas 2003)
  - Public Acceptance 65 percent said "same-gender sex is always wrong" in Laumann (1992) but by 2006 Gallup poll (Saad), 54% agreed "homosexuality is an acceptable alternative lifestyle"
  - De-Medicalization -- American Psychiatric Association 1973: not a disorder

- **bisexuality**
  - Weinberg, Williams, & Pryor (1995)
  - **sexual identity - careers**
    - careers in heterosexuality and LGBTQI
    - identity formation as bisexual
    - interviews in SF subculture (better design? biases?)
  - **stages (fluidity or stability? Change since ’95)**
    - Initial confusion - strong feelings for both
    - Finding and applying label – naming
    - Settling into identity – social support
    - 60% stable bisexual orientation, but 85% could be exclusive in behavior/relationships
    - Minority remained uncertain – 25% still doubted
      - due to societal reaction or a stable relationship
  - **bisexuality, non-monogamy, and polyamory**
    - NYTM 3/14: Scientific Quest to “Prove” Bisexuality
    - Mimi Schippers on non-monogamy, polyamory
“homosexuality” & LGBTQI demographics

- Elements of definition
  - Gender of sexual partners (behavior)
  - Identity and self-concept (orientation)
- Prevalence: Laumann's National Health and Social Life Survey (1992)
  - 3% of males, 2% of females report sex with someone of same gender in past year
    - too low? UK, Canada, France, Denmark similar
  - 5-10% report experience since puberty, or same-sex attraction
- Gary Gates (UCLA): estimates 3.5% of US adults self-identify as lesbian, gay or bisexual; .3% as transgender
  - Up to 12.5% in Minneapolis (4th in ACS); 15% San Francisco
  - Up to 5.7% in MSP metro (8th)

homophobia

- Homophobia – prejudicial attitudes and feelings against non-heterosexuals, often manifest in overt discrimination or hostility
  - Like racism, homophobia is now deviant in the contemporary US, but subcultures still support it
  - Fear and disease
- HIV/AIDS and Homophobia (CDC data)
  - Men who have sex with men, injection drug users, and sex workers remain at high risk, but...
  - Half of 35 million HIV cases now female (new infections declining since 2001)
  - Most new infections transmitted heterosexually – esp. in Africa and South and SE Asia
  - 2.1 million new cases/yr; 1.5 million deaths in 2013
- homophobia and/or assault? HIV+ Mpls. man charged w/ assault

homophobia and women’s sport (Blinde and Taub 1992)

- What sexual stereotypes are applied to women athletes? Why? Which sports?
  - Linking masculinity to athleticism
  - What is a “courtesy stigma” (Goffman)? Why is it applied to female athletes?
- Method – 24 intensive interviews
- Findings
  - Didn’t want to talk about sexual orientation (internalized stereotypes)
  - Management techniques
- Still true? Are female athletes a social threat to hegemonic masculinity in 2014?
11A social facts & deviance

• Catch up on basic social facts (i-v)
  – i. Masturbation; ii. Adolescent sex / hooking up; iii. Adultery; iv. Pornography; v. prostitution
  – Defining deviance: issues of consent, relationships, acts, and settings
• Commercialization and Sex Work
  – Pornography and Prostitution, plus legal activities (Nude Dancing; [some] Phone Sex/Cybersex)
• Sexual harassment

NHSLS data (Laumann et al. 1994)

I. Masturbation
  • NHSLS: 60% of adult men and 40% adult women report masturbating in past year
  • Masturbation is positively correlated with sexual activity with partners (not a substitute, but a complement)

II. Adolescent Sex (v. Premarital)
  – **Attitude:** 61% say “teenage sex is always wrong”
  – **Behavior:** cohort differences (58% of youngest females had sex by 18 vs. 30% of oldest females)
    • Change in baby boom cohort, not your cohort
  – Are “hookups” good or bad for women?
    • Hookup sex v. relationship sex

Percentage of High School Students Who Ever Had Sexual Intercourse, by Sex, Grade,* and Race/Ethnicity,* 2013

*Based on t-test analysis, p < 0.05.
Black and White races are non-Hispanic.

National Youth Risk Behavior Survey, 2013
Significant decrease in percent of HS students who ever had sexual intercourse; % with 4 or more HS partners; had sex less than age 13; increase in condom use, 1991-2013


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ever Had Sex</th>
<th>Multiple Partners</th>
<th>Used a Condom During Last Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Four or more lifetime partners
**Among sexually active students (those who had sexual intercourse during the three months before the survey), those who say that they or their partner used a condom the last time they had sexual intercourse


Percentage of High School Students Who Had Sexual Intercourse for the First Time Before Age 13 Years, by Sex* and Race/Ethnicity,** 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* M > F
** B > H > W

National Youth Risk Behavior Survey, 2007

NHSLS data (Laumann et al. 1994)

III. Adultery
- **Prevalence:** NHSLS: 25% men; 10% women (most studies higher)
- **Correlates:** marital satisfaction, reference groups, and opportunities

IV. Pornography, obscenity, and sexually explicit materials (heterogeneous category)
- **Prevalence:** NHSLS: 23% men, 11% women reported x-rated film or videos (too low? Bimodal dist.)
- **Effects:** some link (violent) porn to aggression (Donnerstein); others find no effects
- **Social learning:** A cause, a reflection, or both?
- **Potter & Potter:** cyberporn as media-induced moral panic; reinforcing “good parenting”
v. prostitution – sex for money

- Prevalence: 4-5 million in US (lifetime); 80,000 arrests/year; Stratification
- Correlates: early sexual experience, abuse, family problems, running away, substance use
  - Customers: 16% of men have paid (NHSLS)
  - Managing stigma: providing a service
- Voluntary vs. involuntary “work”
  - Legalization (NV; Bombay; Hamburg; Amsterdam)
  - Organizations: (COYOTE v. WHISPER (MN))
- Social Control: stings, publicity and stigma

law: Minnesota Statute 609.324

Subd. 3. HIRE TO ENGAGE IN PROSTITUTION.
- Whoever intentionally does any of the following may be sentenced to imprisonment for not more than 90 days or to payment of a fine of not more than $700, or both:
  1. Engages in prostitution with an individual 18 years of age or above.
  2. Hires or offers or agrees to hire an individual 18 years of age or above to engage in sexual penetration or sexual contact.
- Except as otherwise provided in subdivision 4, a person who is convicted of violating clause (1) or (2) while acting as a patron must, at minimum, be sentenced to pay a fine of at least $500.

prostitution and “pimp chic”

- Pimp chic in culture
  - Demi Moore v. Kim Kardashian on “pimpin’”
  - Diffusion and globalization
  - Prom pictures
  - Pimp n’ Ho parties
- Harmless or misogyny?
  - Pimps Up, Ho’s Down and hip hop connection
  - Connection to harassment, assault, discrimination?
  - What accounts for rise of pimp culture? Why now?
Williamson & Cluse-Tolar (2002) pimp-controlled prostitution

- Snowball sample
  - 21 former street prostitutes in midwest
- Rules of "the game" ("pimpology" & subcultural norms)
  - The pimp must get paid (no shame)
  - Game is "sold and not told" (rap)
  - Stable or "pimp family" (love? "wife in law")
  - "bros before hos" (free enterprise/choose up)
  - Hierarchy: macks (top), players, and "tennis shoe pimps"
  - Demeanor: deep, mysterious, cruel (ice)
- Turning out: exploiting needs & vulnerability
  - "thoroughbreds" and objectification
  - Violence (fear): Leaving the "ho stroll," freelancing, missing quota [may buy into rules]
  - Analogies to battering and other abusive relationships
- How and when do we romanticize pimps and prostitution?

Draus and Carlson: Sex-Crack Exchanges (JCE 2009)

- "crack whore" image fueled by myths about addictiveness and hypersexuality
- Method
  - Respondent-driven sampling in Ohio, N=349, plus 3 years of ethnographic field research; focus groups with 97
- Findings
  - Hypersexuality? "never horny"
  - Threats, coercion: kidnap and rape
  - "Dope boys" v. "Sugar daddies" (age, race)
  - "girls use the lure of sex, guys use the lure of drugs"
  - Male power (not desire), but female agency too
- Risk reduction strategies?

Durkin (2007) cybershrews and "money slavery"

- Method: Unobtrusive/passive online observation
- Money slavery: erotic humiliation
  - men (money pigs) pay money or gifts (tributes) to be "degraded, humiliated, or blackmailed"
  - No physical meeting; paying as sexually stimulating (S&M?); fake photos
- Social control through discussion forums
- Learning/reinforcement
  - sexual gratification and financial remuneration
  - Accounts as stigma management technique
- Adaptation to technology (what's new?)
  - Cybershrew as "character in cyberspace"
Lisa Pasko (2002): Stripping as a confidence game [not in reader]

- Confidence games? Trust, power, and deception in false social relationships
  - Who are the marks?
  - “Cooling the mark” – consoling after the con
- What do customers buy?
  - Fantasy sex object vs. fake girlfriend role
- How does it affect “real” relationships?
  - P. 428: “The sexual objectification and commodification of women reinforces notions of possession, authority and aggression in masculinity.”

11/7/2014 Chris Uggen – Sociology 4111

Sexual harassment: sociological definitions

- Sexual harassment
  - Conduct that is unwelcome or unsolicited, is sexual in nature, and is deliberate or repeated [Barr]
  - NOW: “Any of these may constitute sexual harassment: leering; wolf whistles; discussion of sex partner’s sexual inadequacies; sexual teasing, mocking, taunting; false promises of job, promotions, etc.; sexual language, gestures; obscene or suggestive clothing; sexual propositions; sexual teasing, taunting; lewd or suggestive remarks; suggestive glances; eliminating a person’s space; indecent exposure…”
  - Data (Local: Uggen and Blackstone; McLaughlin et al)
  - Interviews, national (GSS), and community (YDS) surveys
- Methods challenging
  - Which behaviors count; how gender affects perceptions; use of subjective or “objective” behavioral measures

11/7/2014 Chris Uggen – Sociology 4111

University of Minnesota

Section 2: Policy (app. by Regents December 11, 1998)

- Sexual harassment is prohibited. Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and/or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when:
  1. Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual’s employment or academic advancement.
  2. Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment or academic decisions affecting this individual, or
  3. Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment.

Note: [#1 and 2 are quid pro quo, #3 is hostile work environment; see Meritor v. Vinson 1986, SCOTUS]
### Harassing Behaviors in YDS Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harassment during high school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive jokes/gossip about you**</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-2.81</td>
<td>big diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions about your private life</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasion of personal space*</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive materials*</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assault**</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment as young adults:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive jokes/gossip about you</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions about your private life</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasion of personal space***</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>big diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted touching***</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>big diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive materials</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assault</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting any of 6 behaviors</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>no diff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global Indicator (both periods):
...Would you consider these experiences sexual harassment?*** 33% 14% 5.97 big diff

* p<.10 ** p<.05 *** p<.01

---

### McLaughlin, Uggen, Blackstone: Sexual Harassment & “Paradox of Power”

- **Power and Authority: “Vulnerable victims” or “Power threat”?**
  - Are women supervisors more or less likely to experience harassment?
- **Gender and Hegemonic Masculinity:**
  - Men rating themselves as more feminine are somewhat more likely to experience harassment
- **Other**
  - Rates of harassment higher in male-dominated industries

---

### Sexual Harassment by Gender and Supervisory Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Harassment in 2004</th>
<th>Female Respondents</th>
<th>Male Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors (N=84)</td>
<td>Non-Supervisors (N=214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Harassment</td>
<td>47.6%*</td>
<td>31.8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Harassment</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Harassment</td>
<td>17.9%*</td>
<td>8.4%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.10 ** p<.05 *** p<.01 (two-tailed tests)
supervisor paradox: Holly

- **first woman manager at her company**
  - "If we had somebody with balls in this position we'd be getting things done."
- **groped by male client at company dinner**
  - "Somebody from our company noticed that [client] had his hands all over my lap and [coworker] goes, 'Where are his hands?' and I go, I was sitting like this [shows legs crossed tightly] and I go, 'Exactly where you think they are.' And I pushed [client] away and so that's when [coworker] realized and motioned and said, 'I want the bill. We're outta here.'"

supervisor paradox: Marie

- **harassment as gendered “equalizer”**
  - "It wasn't maybe necessarily the cat calls and that type of thing, but more 'oh women can't do this,' And what are you doing out here, you're not going to be able to do this."
- **"This isn't the job for a woman."**
  - "Just being a female in management is difficult, and guys don't like it-- especially the guys that work in the field. They think that women should be secretaries."

Take-home: 2004 and 2012 studies

- **Males & youth less likely to name behaviors sexual harassment**
  - More women experience strong form of harassment
  - Yet same males targeted repeatedly (less powerful at work and more egalitarian than other males)
- **Sexual harassment about control and domination, not desire:**
  - "Contra-power" - undermining authority of supervisors
  - broaden cultural image of sexual harassment to clients and coworkers – not (just) bosses
- **"Managing" validity problems**
  - interviews and surveys; some men "won't go there"
- **Support for MacKinnon and Connell**
  - sexual harassment deriving from power and heteronormative masculinity
  - for males and adolescents as well as adult women
Characteristics of targets and harassers: staring or leering

next: substance use, moral panics, and rulemaking

A. Lecture: Drug Use, Rulemaking, and Other Crime (6 min. video: Traffic or Reefer Madness)
Read: Adlers: IV. Constructing Deviance pp. 149-158
Read: Adlers: 15. Reinaman, Construction of Drug Scares pp. 159-170

B. Lecture: Drugs and Subcultures in Emerging Adulthood
Read: Adlers: 32: Sirles, Drug Use and Disordered Eating among College Women pp. 389-400

*Local: Michael Vuolo, Christopher Uggen, & Sarah Lageson.
“Taste Clusters of Music and Drugs: Evidence from Three Analytic Levels.” 2014. British Journal of Sociology. [Note: focus on subcultures connecting music and drugs and how this is measured using radio ratings, self-report surveys, and Alpine Valley concert data]