Cofer / Tannen Seminar

Tyler’s Ten Minutes

* Described Cofer’s ethos as an author with credibility.
* Deborah Tannen: Work = social linguistics. Spent much time on ethos, qualification…
* Social stigmas for Cofer, professional recognition for Tannen.
* Gave an overview of “The Myth of the Latin Woman”
  + Justified stigmas with Latino/a traditions.
  + Solution = personal and individual approach…
    - Quincy: Group generalizations are bad…
    - Tyler: Individual approach?
    - Quincy: MS13… Latino gang (El Salvador)
    - Eble: But everyone is not the same…
* Gave an overview of “There is No Unmarked Woman”
  + Men are unnoticed, bear resemblance to each other.
  + 1993… markings = prevalent or not?
  + Men are unmarked, while women are marked… so much can be told from simple distinguishing factors…
  + Distinctions between men, women in terms of feminism…
  + Focus on Tannen’s anecdote with the talk show
  + Gave the biological approach…
* Focused on each claim:
  + Cofer: Policy—Transformation at an individual level.
  + Tannen: Claim of Fact—no unmarked woman…
  + Kyle: Shared exemplification of women going out dressed up or not… open to judgment…
  + Quincy: My thoughts can gel with Tannen… males have become metrosexual recently…
  + Tyler: Went to his question about fashion, ideas being outdated…

Tyler’s Question:

* Cofer’s essay=more or less effective with personal evidence?
* Tannen’s references to biological explanations of gender differences bolster her ideas, or does it counter her thesis?
* Tannen’s essay was written in 1993…outdated?
* Where do men fall in Cofer’s essay?

Tory: Cofer or Tannen?

* Tory: I liked both, but the second one particularly because it dealt with smaller, tinier aspects of our lives.
* Eble: Clarify…
* Tory: Language implications, social implications, genetic implications of markedness. More conceptual.

Tyler: Cofer = complaining?

* KZ: Complaining = petty; she seems to be seeking change with this article. It really affected her life.
* Verrilli: Problem to which we don’t know how to relate…
* Quincy: You’re all white dudes…
* Tory: Cofer’s essay = stool. Claim of policy = transformation… discriminating between women and race… racism, sexism, culturalism…
* Quincy: Provocative dress…brother beating the shit out of people coming on to sister. Acknowledging the stereotype, the basis…
* Tyler: Misconstruing it… but gave historical background… everyone knew
* Tory: Maslow… Puerto Rico = safety, protection…
* Kyle: Back to Gould… watch blanket statements…
* Tory: A cultural norm of physical pain, suffering. In the U.S., people don’t discriminate against women…
* Quincy: Difficult to generalize…
* Nick Schlueter: No sexual abuse in our country… women would be open to dressing more freely…
* Quincy: Spoke of women dressing, personal experience…
* Eble: Can men dress provocatively?
* Tyler: Women have self-confidence issues…
* Evan: Men and women aren’t equal, but one isn’t better… I agree with the whole “individual thing.” Spoke of Malcolm Gladwell in *Outliers*…
* Quincy: Off MG… essay about new immigrant groups as causes of crime. Caribbean- Jamaicans in NYC. Gladwell of anecdote… no culture is “hard-working”; this depends on the situation…
* Evan: Men as being marked? Homosexuality…
* Eble: Explain…
* Evan: Clothes, words, way you think…
* Quincy: Malcolm Gladwell… advertisers prey on certain fears, emotions… Dockers had an ad in which they focused on the pants, not the people. Men don’t want to be characterized as worrying about fashion. Now, though, men have more of a license to think about fashion.
* Evan: In the same way, she says that women are marked… contended with Tannen.
* Schlueter: Woman not privy to the struggles of a man
* Eble: Anecdote, recognition of women competing fashion-wise.
* Quincy: Men / women notice things…
* Kyle: Men look at the whole…
* Eble: Attractiveness / sociological roots?
* Schlueter: Society, shaping how women / men act… woman in the house…
* Quincy: Women = more detail oriented? Attractiveness in each sex’s eyes.
* Kyle: Looks … disparity between looks in men / women and attractive women liking classically unattractive men.
* Eble talked.
* Quincy questioned Nick…
* Nick: Women—do guys… hmmm….
* Zimmerman: I would almost say that in a competitive environment, men will look at other guys. Anecdote about interviewing for the college program.
* Quincy: In an academic setting, women aren’t intimidating to men?
* Eble: Are there male-dominated professions?
* Himes: More women in college, more women writing…

Eble: Masculinity / definition?

* Verrilli: Masculinity doesn’t necessarily need definition…
* Quincy: Other than South American, African cultures… heavy maternal presence… analogies between mother / son…
* Eble: Italy… maternal focus in faith.
* Verrilli: Patriarchal societies…Oedipus Complex…

Fritz: Marked, unmarked… figure skating = you don’t watch the guy.

* Verrilli: Watching with mom… “She has no chest…”
* Eble: Dancing… men as frames, women as the portrait…
* Fritz: Focus on women…
* Schlueter: Women have huge girl-crushes on her.
* Eble: Sure… Alfrie Woodard…
* Tory: Doctor, Doctorette…

Tyler Himes: No such think as an unmarked man… but is there such a think today that isn’t focused on as much?

* Quincy: Guys size up guys as much as girls. Moeller as a place where guys can be sacks of shit…
* Eble: Confounding variables with age, geography?
* Quincy: Brother’s experience with Soho, Manhattan—both male and female.
* Schlueter: How in-depth was he?
* Quincy: No case study…
* Schlueter: …
* Tyler: Downtown at Aronoff…
* Eble: Context…

Conversation…

Kyle: Hot tamales… no intentions of sexuality…

* Tory: Diminishing traditions of America…
* Zimmerman: That wouldn’t happen in America…