

**Race, Gender, and Class Inequities in the United States**  
**Yale University**  
**SOCY S348 Summer 2022**

**Class Dates/Times:** May 31-June 30, 2022 (Session A) | Tuesdays and Thursdays, 1-4:15p EST

**Class Location:** TBD (open to in-person or virtual course offering)

**Instructor:** Demar F. Lewis IV (he/him), [demar.lewis@yale.edu](mailto:demar.lewis@yale.edu)

**Office Hours:** Tuesdays and Thursdays by appointment (via Zoom)

**Cross-listings:**

African American Studies: AFAM S348

Ethnicity, Race, & Migration: ER&M S348

Women, Gender, & Sexuality Studies: WGSS S348

---

## COURSE DESCRIPTION

What is race? What is gender? What is class? How do they operate individually or collectively to shape contemporary inequities? This course investigates these questions and the diverse methodological and theoretical approaches that scholars have taken to highlight matters affecting Black people and racially-minoritized populations in the United States. Likewise, it examines how persisting inequities are observed and experienced in the domains of education, employment, population health, food access, housing, incarceration, and policing, among others. This course encourages students to use course readings, discussions, and assignments to think critically about the world and their place in it. Assignments include: weekly readings, reflective writing, essay writing, in-class exercises, and an end of semester creative project. No previous background in Sociology or any social science discipline is assumed.

---

## COURSE GOALS/OBJECTIVES

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. Gain a deeper understanding of social theories of race, gender, and class
2. Distinguish between “inequities” and “inequalities”
3. Explain major empirical topics in sociological research impacting racially-minoritized or resource deprived populations
4. Read intradisciplinary scholarship efficiently and effectively
5. Interpret and critique secondary literature
6. Understand and apply social scientific methodologies
7. Design an original research study
8. Convey information clearly and compellingly in a short amount of time

---

## COURSE POLICIES & EXPECTATIONS

- **Prerequisites:** This course is an *introductory survey* course. It is intended for undergraduate, students interested in the social science of race, gender, and class. It will be given as a lecture course. Students should be comfortable reading journal articles and thinking critically about

contentious social/political topics. Readings and other course materials will span a wide range of disciplines. While there are no statistical prerequisites, students may be asked to think about the logic of statistical analysis and should be comfortable reasoning about numbers.

- **Attendance:** Attendance is mandatory, and I expect you to be present during all scheduled meetings for the duration of the session. Lectures will not be recorded. If you must miss class, please contact me directly.
- **Zoom (if necessary):** Please do your best to keep your video on during class, as circumstances allow – I consider our class to be a shared learning community, even though we can't physically be together. Please upload a profile picture to your Zoom account, and make sure you are signed in before joining the session, so that your picture will be displayed if/when you need to turn your camera off. I expect you to behave respectfully at all times, including in the chat and in breakout rooms. Students who disrupt the learning of others will be removed.
- **Diversity Statement:** We strive to create an environment that supports and affirms diversity in all manifestations, including race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, age, social class, disability status, region/country of origin, and political orientation.
- **Expectations:** We will be talking about racism, colonialism, sexism, classism, xenophobia, etc. in this course. Studying these topics will invariably make some students uncomfortable. It is important to keep in mind that students will be approaching the topic from different positions. Some will have experience as targets of race, gender, class-, or citizenship-based discrimination (among others). Other students may have relatively little first-hand knowledge of being targets. And, because the subject matter can be personal and we will be attempting to relate the course work directly to people's lives, we should expect that we will be learning about ourselves in the course. What that requires is that every member of the course takes on a responsibility to protect and preserve the classroom as a "[brave space](#)." A commitment to be generous with each other does not obligate anyone to submit to disrespectful treatment. But if we each take responsibility to make the course one in which it is safe to learn about dangerous things, my experience is that everyone is able to learn better.
- **Wellness and Health Statement:** As your professor, I value your health and wellbeing. In order to succeed in this class, in college, and beyond, you must work hard *and* balance the work with rest, exercise, and attention to your mental and physical health. This class will be challenging, but take the time to also enjoy your summer.

## ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

---

Your grade is based on four areas of assessment. All written assignments must be submitted on time by email through the Course Canvas Website. All **file names** must be in this format:  
**YourLastName\_AssignmentName.docx.**

**Reflective Writing (15% final grade):** In place of submitting discussion questions for individual course readings, each student is required to complete a course-long round of sociological correspondences with another student in the class. Please see the "Sociological Correspondence Instructions" handout for detailed information on this assignment.

**Mid-Term Paper (25% final grade):** What is your definition of 1) race, 2) gender, and 3) class? How would you describe the way they operate individually and collectively in the U.S.? What are the outcomes that are produced by the systems built around these constructs? The purpose of the mid-term paper is to allow you an opportunity to synthesize the reading, thinking, learning you have been doing into a cohesive framework. Your three definitions should be no more than a paragraph each, totaling 2 pages. The rest of the paper should address the following: 1. Why are these the “right” definitions of these concepts? 2. What definitions from class (or elsewhere) inform your own? 3. How does your framework engage micro-, meso-, and macro-level forms of racism, sexism, and classism? 4. Does your framework apply equally to all domains (e.g., law, social norms), or does it speak more narrowly to a subset? 5. What is the role of intent in your individual definitions of race, gender, and class, and the overall framework? 6. What potential targets, perpetrators, or minoritized populations does your framework allow one to see that they otherwise might not? 7. Why is there a need for your framework? All undergraduate student papers should be 5-7 pages and should cite a minimum of 5 scholarly sources from course readings. Page numbers are not including title page, abstract, references, or figures. The mid-term paper should be double-spaced, 12-point font, 1-inch margins, and is ***due June 17th by 12:00pm ET to the canvas course website.***

**Term Project (50% final grade):** The final project for this course is a multi-component assignment. In this project, you will choose a topic of your choice that is an example of a race-, gender-, or class-based inequity in the United States that you believe deserves critical attention. You will diagnose this inequity using concrete definitions of race, gender, or class developed in your Mid-Term papers and present evidence to substantiate your case based on existing research, data sources, personal/vicarious experiences, observations, or observations at your disposal. Then, based on the known evidence you gather, you will pose a sociological research question that *could be studied* using social scientific methodologies to further advance knowledge on your topic of interest, describing the research design of the study in rich detail. Although you are not required to perform this proposed study by the conclusion of the course, it may serve as an incubator for students seeking to pursue writing undergraduate theses in various disciplines.

The Principal Instructor and/or your TF must approve your topic before you begin writing it. Term project proposals will be one paragraph summaries of your intended topic and must be submitted by ***5:00pm ET Friday June 10th*** for approval by Monday June 13th. Term project proposals are not graded and may be submitted earlier. All deliverables for the term project are due by ***5:00pm ET Friday July 1st*** to the canvas course website and will include the following four items.

1. **Infographic (10%):** Using the free [Canva website](#), students should create a 1-page infographic which conveys why their topic of interest is a social problem worthy of attention. Students with experience in graphic design may elect to customize their infographic outside of Canva using another digital software package.
2. **Research Proposal (20%):** 3-4 pages. This is the most “academic” final deliverable associated with your term project. Your proposals should explicitly answer the questions listed below.
  - What is the inequity you are interested in? Why does it matter? What is the status quo right now (i.e., what are the stakes)?
  - What books, articles, or research exists on this topic? What are the findings of these studies? What is the structure of the data used in existing research (i.e., what kinds of information does it capture, at what level, produced by what method, etc.)?
  - What is the research question that you think future researchers should explore to expand knowledge about your inequity of interest?
  - What specific definitions of race, gender, and class are most appropriate to pursue this research question, and how do they inform your diagnosis of this inequity?
  - What are the specific data sources that future researchers should use to answer your question? What is the structure of this data (i.e., what kinds of information does it capture, at what level, produced by what method, etc.)? How might this data be collected?
  - What methods/tools should be used to analyze this data? What processes or procedures should be carried out while conducting research activities (i.e. Describe the recruitment/eligibility criteria for including participants in this study)?
  - What are the implications/limitations of this prospective study? Which audiences might stand to benefit from the execution of this proposed research project?
- All research proposals should be 4-5 pages and should cite a minimum of 5 scholarly sources, with at least one coming from outside of the syllabus. Page numbers are not including title page, abstract, references, or figures. The paper should be double-spaced, 12-point font, 1-inch margins.
3. **Lightning Talk (15%):** Record a short presentation on the topic, question, proposed methods, and implications of your research proposal. Presentations will follow a “lightning talk” format, meaning you will have exactly three minutes and up to three static slides to convey your message. This format requires you to distill your presentation to only the most essential and impactful information. Think of this like a TikTok or YouTube video highlighting your issue of interest for an educated but uninformed audience.
4. **Twitter “Mini Thread” (5%):** Translate core messages from your term project topic into three hypothetical tweets that constitute a “mini thread”, max 140 characters per tweet (including hashtags). You may use the infographic as an attention-grabbing image for the first tweet. Include twitter handles for up to three individuals, organizations, or entities that you want to engage in conversation about your topic. *You are not required to post this “mini thread” to Twitter publicly to receive a grade for this course.*

**Class Participation (10%):** Active listening and engaged participation are essential to your success in this course. Participation grades will be assessed on the basis of attendance and engagement in class activities.

**Grading:** Your final grade breakdown looks like this:

Reflective Writing	15%
Mid-Term Paper	25%
Term Project	50%
Class Participation	10%

Grades will be assigned fairly and will not be curved. If you wish to dispute a grade you must make the case in writing to the instructor within two days of receiving your grade. If the instructor deems this case fair, the assignment will then be re-graded (by a different grader—so it is possible that your grade may go down). Clarifications on grades are readily given. Final grades are not negotiable and will only be changed if there is a miscalculation. All tests and other gradable material will be destroyed within one month of final grades being submitted. I will not be able to discuss your grade after that.

## ACCESS AND ACCOMMODATIONS

---

I am committed to providing an inclusive learning environment. If, at any point in the term, you experience barriers to learning, you are welcome (but not required) to contact me to discuss your specific needs. If you have established accommodations with Student Accessibility Services and have a letter from that office confirming accommodations, please send it to me as soon as possible. For more information on how to access Student Accessibility Services and secure formal accommodations, please visit: <https://sas.yale.edu/>. If you have any feedback on how to make this course more inclusive, please reach out to me directly, or use the anonymous feedback form, available here: <https://forms.gle/JG1PzmUJrjhFnSbA>

## ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

---

The strength of the university depends on academic and personal integrity. Plagiarism is the use of someone else's work, words, or ideas as if they were your own. Plagiarizing hurts your intellectual development – you won't learn anything by copying the words or ideas of others. You will do better in this course by giving credit where it's due and adding your own critical reflection than by putting your name on someone else's work. Yale punishes academic dishonesty severely. Penalties include lowered or failing assignment or course grades, suspension, or possible expulsion.

You can find resources on using sources and avoiding plagiarism at the Writing Center: <https://poorvucenter.yale.edu/using-sources>. Please review this material carefully. If you are ever in doubt about the proper use of a source, ask – ignorance is not an excuse.

## COURSE READINGS

---

This is a summer course, which means we are condensing a semester's worth of material into five weeks. I've chosen readings that are compelling in content and accessible in style, which makes them easier to read. I've also provided resources to help you develop efficient and effective critical reading skills. If you're having trouble keeping up with the readings, **please reach out**, to me and/or to one another. I'm happy to work with you to develop strategies to get through the required material

**All readings for this course will be posted to the course Canvas website.** All required readings should be read before the lecture during the week when they are assigned.

You will notice that Week 3 includes a “Methods Spotlight” for the June 16th. These readings are **mandatory** (unless otherwise noted). They are meant to give you concrete information about the methods employed by one or more of the authors assigned, and to serve as a resource for your final projects. If you are particularly interested, and/or will be using the method for your project, you may want to read in depth. If not, you can set aside for later – I will be covering these methods in lecture and will not assume more than a general understanding gleaned from the required readings.

You will notice that the last two weeks of class include multiple readings which are split between quantitative and qualitative chapters/articles. It is **mandatory** for you to read two quantitative and two qualitative readings per day, but you can select which readings to read – the caveat is that each reading must be on a different topic (e.g., two readings cannot come from the incarceration list, even if one is qualitative and the other is quantitative). This portion of the course is interdisciplinary and designed to show you how sociologists and scholars from different disciplines study similar topics & are in conversation with one another, intended to help you think through the deliverables for your term projects. I will be covering each of these readings and their related topics in lecture and will not assume more than a general understanding gleaned from the required readings.

## COURSE SCHEDULE

---

### Week 1 | Foundational Theories of Race, Gender, and Class Formation in the U.S.

May 31

1. Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2016. "A critical and comprehensive sociological theory of race and racism." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 2(2): 129-141.
2. Robinson, Cedric. 1983. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. **Chapter 1** (p. 9-28).
3. Glenn, Evelyn N. 2015. "Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1(1): 52-72.

June 2

1. Molina, Natalia, Daniel M. HoSang, and Ramón A. Gutiérrez (Eds). 2019. *Relational Formations of Race: Theory, Method, and Practice*. University of California Press. **Chapter 3** (p. 60-79)
2. Cox, Oliver. 1959. *Race, Caste, and Class: A Study in Social Dynamics*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press. **Chapter 12** (p. 222-244) and **Chapter 15** (p. 298-313)
3. Du Bois, W.E.B. 1935. *Black Reconstruction in America: An Essay Toward A History of the Part in Which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1861-1880*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. **Chapters 1-3** (pp. 1-43).

### Week 2 | Interlocking/Interdependent Systems of Power

June 7

1. Mills, Charles. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press. **Chapter 1** (p. 9-40)
2. Collins, Patricia H. 2018. *Intersectionality: As Critical Social Theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. **Chapter 4**, p. 121-154.
3. Bonacich, Edna. 1972. A theory of ethnic antagonism: The split labor market. *American Sociological Review* 37(5): 547-559.
4. Haney Lopez, Ian. 2000. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York, NY: New York University Press. **Chapter 1** (p. xxi-26), **Chapter 2** (p. 27-34); **Appendix A** (p. 163-167).

June 9

1. Quiñones-Rosado, Raúl. 2007. *Consciousness in Action: Toward an Integral Psychology of Liberation & Transformation*. Caguas, Puerto Rico: ilé Publications. **Chapter 3** (p. 73-96).
2. Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books. **Chapter 1** (p. 1-10) and **Chapter 3** (p. 25-39).
3. Ray, Victor. 2019. "A Theory of Racialized Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 84(1): 26-53.
4. Ross, Luana. 1998. *Inventing the Savage: The Social Construction of Native American Criminality*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. **Chapter 4** (p. 92-107).

### Week 3 | Part A= Seeing the Consequences Produced by Interdependent Systems of Power

June 14

1. Miller, Reuben Jonathan and Forrest Stuart. 2017. "Carceral Citizenship: Race, Rights and Responsibility in the Age of Mass Supervision." *Theoretical Criminology* 21(4):532-548.

2. Scott, James. 1998. *Domination and the Art of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. **Preface + Chapter 1** (pp. ix-xiii, 1-16).
3. Williams, David R., Jourdyn A. Lawrence, and Brigitte A. Davis. 2019. "Racism and Health: Evidence and Needed Research." *Annual Review of Public Health* 40(1): 105-125.
4. Ren, Jingqiu, and Joe Feagin. 2021. "Face Mask Symbolism in Anti-Asian Hate Crimes." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 44(5):746–758.
5. Benjamin, Ruha. 2019. *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Medford, MA: Polity Press. **Chapter 1** (p. 44-76)

### **Week 3 | Part B= Social Scientific Methods Spotlight**

June 16

1. Noble, Safiya. 2018. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York, NY: New York University Press. **Conclusion + Epilogue** (p. 171-186).
2. Zuberi, Tukufu and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (Eds). 2008. *White Logic White Methods: Racism and Methodology*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. **Chapter 3** (p 47-62), **Chapter 7** (p. 127-134), **Chapter 20** (p. 329-341). (\*\*\*pick 2/3 Chapters that you want to read)
3. Hall, Stuart. 2000. "Racist ideologies and the media." In Paul Marris and Sue Thornham (Eds.) *Media studies: A reader*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. pp. 271-282.
4. Lewis IV, Demar F. 2021. "Troubling America's Historical Waters: Towards the Transdisciplinary Study of U.S. Lynchings as an Active Present." *Sociology Compass* 15(11): e12931, **Section 1 and Section 5 Required** (pp. 1-2, 10-15).

#### **Pick one reading from each methodological approach**

##### *Ethnography/Participant Observation*

1. Jones, Nikki. 2018. *The Chosen Ones: Black Men and the Politics of Redemption*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press. **Preface** (p. ix-xiv) and **Introduction** (p. 1-30).
2. Jack, Tony. 2018. *The Privileged Poor: How Elite Colleges Are Failing Disadvantaged Students*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **Appendix** (p. 199-224).
3. Anderson, Elijah. 1976. *A Place on the Corner*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. **Appendix** (p. 235-267).
4. Cox, Aimee. 2015. *Shapeshifter's: Black Girls in the Choreography of Citizenship*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. **Introduction** (p. 3-37).
5. Van-Cleve, Nicole G. 2016. *Crook County: Racism and Injustice in America's Largest Criminal Court*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. **Methods Appendix A-Appendix D** (p. 195-216).

##### *Interviewing/Oral History*

1. Brown, Karida. 2018. *Gone Home: Race and Roots in Appalachia*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. **Introduction** (p. 1-8) and **Research Appendix** (p. 193-205).
2. Watkins-Hayes, Celeste. 2019. *Remaking a Life: How Women Living With HIV/AIDS Confront Inequality*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press. **Appendix A** (p. 259-272).
3. Prowse, Gwen, Vesla M. Weaver, and Tracey L. Meares. 2019. "The State from Below: Distorted Responsiveness in Policed Communities." *Urban Affairs Review* 00(0): 1-49, Required (pp. 1424-1425, 1429-1434, 1451-1461).
4. Claytor, Cassi Pittman. 2020. *Black Privilege: Modern Middle-Class Blacks with Credentials and Cash to Spend*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. **Chapter 1** (p. 1-19).

- Martinez, Monica M. 2018. *The Injustice Never Leaves You: Anti-Mexican Violence in Texas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **Introduction** (p. 8-29).

*Descriptive Statistics and Regression Analysis*

- Wells-Barnett, Ida B. 2015 [1895]. *The Red Record: Tabulated statistics and alleged causes of lynching in the United States*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing. **Chapter 1 and Chapter 2** (p. 9-23).
- Work, Monroe N. 1913. Negro criminality in the South. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 49(1): 74–80.
- Johnson, Odis, Christopher St. Vil, Keon L. Gilbert, Melody Goodman, and Cassandra Arroyo Johnson. 2019. “How Neighborhoods Matter in Fatal Interactions between Police and Men of Color.” *Social Science & Medicine* 220: 226–235.
- Lopez, William D., Daniel J. Kruger, Jorge Delva, Mikel Llanes, Charo Ledón, Adreanne Waller, Melanie Harner, Ramiro Martinez, Laura Sanders, Margaret Harner, and Barbara Israel. 2017. “Health Implications of an Immigration Raid: Findings from a Latino Community in the Midwestern United States.” *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health* 19(3):702–708.

*Causal Inference (Survey Experiments/ Audit Studies/ Quasi-Experimental Designs)*

- Enos, Ryan. 2017. *The Space Between Us: Social Geography and Politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **Chapter 4** (p. 79-107).
- Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. 2008. “Not yet human: implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94(2): 292-306.
- Pager, Devah, Bart Bonikowski, and Bruce Western. 2009. “Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market: A Field Experiment.” *American Sociological Review* 74(5): 777-799.
- Legewie, Joscha. 2016. “Racial Profiling and Use of Force in Police Stops: How Local Events Trigger Periods of Increased Discrimination.” *American Journal of Sociology* 122(2): 379–424.

*Mixed Methods*

- Shedd, Carla. 2015. *Unequal City: Race, Schools, and Perceptions of Injustice*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation. **Appendix A-Appendix C** (p. 167-183).
- Brunson, Rod K. (2007). “Police don't like black people”: African-American young men's accumulated police experiences. *Criminology & Public Policy* 6(1): 71-101.

## Week 4 | Persisting Inequities Part I: Education, Employment, Food Access, and Housing

June 21

*Education*

- Qualitative**= Ray, Ranita. 2021. “School as a Hostile Institution: How Black and Immigrant Girls of Color Experience the Classroom.” *Gender & Society* XX(X): 1-24.
- Quantitative**= Cross, Christina. 2020. “Racial/Ethnic Differences in the Association Between Family Structure and Children's Education.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 82(2): 681-712.

### *Employment*

1. Qualitative= Farley, Reynolds. 2018. "Detroit Fifty Years After the Kerner Report: What Has Changed, What Has Not, and Why?" *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 4(6): 206–241.
2. Qualitative or Quantitative= U.S. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. 1968. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. National Institute of Justice. Available at: <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015000225410&view=1up&seq=254&q1=recommendation%20for%20national%20action>. **Summary + Chapter XVII** (pp. 19-35, 215-265).

### *Food Access*

1. Qualitative= Reese, Ashanté M. 2019. *Black Food Geographies: Race, Self-Reliance, and Food Access in Washington, D.C.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. **Introduction + Chapter 5** (pp. 1-18, 111-130).
2. Quantitative= Ginsburg, Zoë A., Alexander D. Bryan, Ellen B. Rubinstein, Hilary J. Frankel, Andrew R. Maroko, Clyde B. Schechter, Kristen Cooksey Stowers, and Sean C. Lucan. 2019. "Unreliable and Difficult-to-Access Food for Those in Need: A Qualitative and Quantitative Study of Urban Food Pantries." *Journal of Community Health* 44(1):16–31.

### *Housing*

1. Qualitative= Tillman, Korey. (Forthcoming, 2022). "Carceral Liberalism: The Coloniality and Antiblackness of Coercive Benevolence." *Social Problems*
2. Quantitative= Howell, Junia, and Elizabeth Korver-Glenn. 2021. "The Increasing Effect of Neighborhood Racial Composition on Housing Values, 1980–2015." *Social Problems* 68(4): 1051–1071.

## **Week 4 | Persisting Inequities Part II: Population Health, Policing, Incarceration, Resource Deprivation**

June 23

### *Population Health*

1. Qualitative= Krieger, Nancy. 2019. "The US Census and the People's Health: Public Health Engagement From Enslavement and 'Indians Not Taxed' to Census Tracts and Health Equity (1790–2018)." *American Journal of Public Health* 109(8): 1092–1100.
2. Quantitative= Rodriguez-Lonebear, Desi, Nicolás E. Barceló, Randall Akee, and Stephanie R. Carroll. 2020. "American Indian reservations and COVID-19: Correlates of early infection rates in the pandemic." *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 26(4): 371–377.

### *Incarceration*

1. Qualitative= Robinson, Brandon Andrew. 2020. "The Lavender Scare in Homonormative Times: Policing, Hyper-Incarceration, and LGBTQ Youth Homelessness." *Gender & Society* 34(2):210–32.
2. Quantitative= Western, Bruce. 2006. *Punishment and Inequality in America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation. **Chapter 1 and Chapter 2** (p. 11-51).

### *Policing*

1. Qualitative= Malone Gonzalez, Shannon. 2020. "Black Girls and the Talk? Policing, Parenting, and the Politics of Protection." *Social Problems* 2020(0): 1-17.
2. Quantitative= Crutchfield, Robert D., Martie L. Skinner, Kevin P. Haggerty, Anne McGlynn, and Richard F. Catalano. 2012. "Racial Disparity in Police Contacts." *Race and Justice* 2(3): 179-202.

### *Resource Deprivation*

1. Qualitative= Wilson, William J. 1978. *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. **Chapter 5** (p. 88-121).
2. Quantitative= Sampson, Robert. 2009. "Racial Stratification and the Durable Tangle of Neighborhood Inequality." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 621(1): 260-280.

## **Week 5 | Persisting Inequities Part III: Segregation, Gentrification, Legacies of Anti-Blackness and Lynching**

June 28

### *Segregation*

1. Qualitative= Rothstein, Richard. 2017. *Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government Segregated America*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company. **Chapter 3, Chapter 4, Chapter 8**, or **Chapter 9** (p. 39-57, 59-75, 115-137, 139-151) (\*\*\*pick 2/4 Chapters that you want to read)
2. Quantitative= Grigoryeva, Angelina and Martin Ruef. 2016. The Historical Demography of Racial Segregation. *American Sociological Review* 80(4): 814-842.

### *Gentrification*

1. Qualitative= Rucks-Ahidiana, Zawadi. 2021. "Theorizing Gentrification as a Process of Racial Capitalism." *City & Community* 00(0):1-20.
2. Quantitative= Papachristos, Andrew V., Chris M. Smith, Mary L. Scherer, and Melissa A. Fugiero. 2011. "More Coffee, Less Crime? The Relationship between Gentrification and Neighborhood Crime Rates in Chicago, 1991 to 2005." *City & Community* 10(3): 215–240.

### *Legacies of Anti-Blackness + Legacies of Lynching*

1. Qualitative= Shange, Savannah. 2019. *Progressive Dystopia: Abolition, Anti-Blackness, and Schooling in San Francisco*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. **Chapter 5** (p. 92-122).
2. Quantitative= Ward, Geoff, Nick Petersen, Aaron Kupchik, and James Pratt. 2019. "Historic Lynching and Corporal Punishment in Contemporary Southern Schools." *Social Problems* 68(1): 1–22.

## **Term Projects Due**

June 30

**In Class:** Presentations of Lightning Talks

Demar F. Lewis IV  
SOC 348S – Summer 2022  
Race, Gender, and Class Inequities in the U.S.

### **Sociological Correspondence Instructions**

This activity is borrowed from the pedagogical practices of my mentor Dr. Kristie Dotson, inspired by her enthusiasm for reviving the nearly-extinct tradition of “philosophical correspondences.” Instead of writing weekly discussion questions, you will develop your critical sociological thinking through writing weekly correspondences with one of your peers in the course. This form of peer mentorship is critical for achieving the learning objectives of the course, particularly in lieu of not having a formal discussion section as you otherwise might during a semester-long course.

The following are instructions for completing the correspondence assignment of this course. Please read them carefully. Since this is most likely a new sort of exercise for you, you may have some questions. Please do see me at any time during the summer session if you have any questions or concerns about the assignment.

#### **General Instructions**

First, find a partner or be assigned a partner by the instructor (if the enrollment size of the course is exceptionally large, all partners will be randomly assigned by the instructor). Together, your task is to create and maintain an ongoing, semester-long, written sociological exchange about the assigned readings. Each week you and your partner will write to each other about a reading or readings. One partner will write a page commenting on the reading, and give or transmit that page to the other partner; then, the other partner will write a page responding to the first partner's commentary. You will weekly alternate the roles of commentator and respondent. If these roles eventually blur, as is the case in most vital correspondences, this is fine, unless, of course, the correspondents feel that the basic distribution of tasks has become too uneven or burdensome. In that case, some correction will be in order.

The means of correspondence are your choice, with the restriction that you must each be able to submit all entries electronically to me periodically, and at the close of the course, for review. So, if you carry on your correspondence by email, you still must be able to submit an electronic copy via pdf. (Please note also that you are responsible for producing a second copy of any assignments submitted for evaluation in this course in the unlikely event that the first one should be lost.) Some students use (digital) folders and exchange them at/before class meetings; others get together outside of class hours. Please discuss this with each other and find an agreement that is suitable for both partners' schedules and preferences. Note: It is your joint responsibility to arrange the details of managing entries so that your assignments are complete and handed in on time. Do see me as soon as possible if you have any difficulties with this or any aspect of the assignment.

#### **Guidelines**

We are reading a great deal of work. Ideally, your correspondence can serve as a way to come to understandings of the readings that are better than those you could arrive at by yourself. In addition, you can create a partnership of inquiry that will help you develop your ideas for the outlines and papers you will write. So, correspondents who consider each other's work seriously and thoughtfully, as well as the readings, of course, will be on track to making the most of this assignment. You need not write an essay for your entry; you may write several paragraphs: notes, objections, arguments,

illustrations, refutations, examples, counter-examples, expressions of puzzlement, etc. You may find it helpful to number the paragraphs of your writing to make it easier for both of you to make reference to particular points you've made. You should also be kind to your correspondent by providing accurate page/paragraph references to the texts about which you are writing. Do not try to address all the readings assigned for a given week, nor indeed, all of a given reading. Focus more narrowly and be concise; these are short writing assignments.

**Quantity:** With regard to quantity, *one single-spaced page is the minimum length for an entry*. You certainly may write more than that, up to a maximum limit of two pages single-spaced. You will write a total of five weeks of entries, with one entry per partner each week.

**Commenting:** In commenting, try to give your partner some substantial idea, observation, position, or argument to which to respond. Write about what interests you. Express your thoughts as clearly as you can. Avoid endlessly explicating the text. Avoid too much personal opinion that reflects a lack of engagement with the material. And above all, engage the text by making sure to incorporate it in your commentary (do not forget to cite!) All citations should be either endnotes or footnotes.

**Responding:** In responding, address your partner's comments as directly, carefully and specifically as possible. In principle, a good response is as good as a good commentary. Avoid simply repeating what your partner has written. Be kind, but be thorough in expressing your thoughts on your partner's initial response. All citations should be either endnotes or footnotes.

**Audience:** Your partner is your audience. Despite the fact that, yes, your instructor will be reading what you write, you are to write to each other, *not* to your instructor.

#### **Review and Grading**

During the summer course, there will be two periods of review for this assignment, in addition to a final evaluation of your correspondence by your instructor.

**Instructor reviews:** Instructor reviews will consist in check or minuses with potential written instructor comments on, and suggestions for, the entries. Entries for weeks 1 and 2 should be submitted *via Canvas* on Sunday June 12<sup>th</sup> by 11:59pm EST. The completed correspondence, including entries for weeks 3, 4, and 5 should likewise be submitted *via Canvas* on Monday June 27<sup>th</sup> by 11:59pm EST. Each time you turn in your correspondence, make sure that the names of both correspondents are on the entries.

**Grading:** You will be graded, ultimately, on an individual basis, but a part of that grade will necessarily reflect your joint performance as co-participants in your ongoing correspondence. Therefore, it is to each partner's advantage that the other partner succeeds and develops. Though, it is possible for partners to receive different grades on this assignment.