

Argument Unit
Practice #2

Please follow all instructions carefully. Points will be deducted if you don't complete all the steps. **Read all of this before you begin.**

Topic: Gender roles in dating. Specifically who should pay for dates in a heterosexual relationship? You need to consider several different ideas such as: Tradition, gender equality, male/female roles, your own expectations, etc.

Argument: Decide who should pay for dates.
(Examples: men, women, each pay their own way, or take turns).

Research and educate yourself: Before you decide on your argument, read all four articles in their entirety. Take good notes as you read to make it easier to come back and find certain points.

After you have read all the articles and considered all the sides, **choose your argument.**

You will be writing a 6-paragraph argument essay.

Fill-out the graphic organizer (you will need to add a column on the backside). You will turn this in.

Write your 6-paragraph essay and include:

Intro paragraph with thesis or argument statement.

3 paragraphs with your reasons and supporting evidence (quotes sourced)

1 paragraph that is a counter claim with rebuttal and evidence (quote sourced)

1 conclusion paragraph with the thesis idea re-stated.

Remember to: Stay in 3rd person (avoid the words: your, yours, I, we etc.)

Use proper grammar and spelling as best you can.

Write legibly.

When using a quote and citing a source, watch punctuation—quotation marks, parenthesis, author last name, page number, period (see example below).

Example:

“Men have always paid for dinner on the date. It’s what men do” (Smith 2).

Self check. You will be the first person to critique your own paper.

Circle:

-Thesis statement

-Reason statement (topic/minor claim) for paragraph 2-4

-Counter claim and rebuttal paragraph 5

-All quotes with citations

-Thesis idea restated in the conclusion

THE HUFFINGTON POST

TOP NEWS AND OPINION

Men *Still* Paying For Dates ... And Women Are Partly Responsible

August 13 2013

By Catherine Pearson

You only have to look at the fact that online dating has become the [second most popular form of matchmaking](#) in the United States to know that dating has changed fundamentally in the past few decades.

But one courtship convention remains steadfast: who pays for dates.

New research presented at the American Sociological Association's annual meeting this week found that 84 percent of men and 58 percent of women say men pay for most entertainment expenses -- even after they have been dating for some time.

And while 57 percent of women say they offer to help pay, 39 percent admitted that they hoped men would reject their offers, while 44 percent were bothered when men expected them to chip in. Nearly two-thirds of men believe women should contribute to dating expenses.

"One of the reasons we are interested in looking at who pays for dates is because it is one arena where women may be resisting gender changes more than men," study researcher David Frederick, an assistant professor of psychology at Chapman University in California, told The Huffington Post. "As social roles start to change, people often embrace the changes that make their lives easier, but resist the changes that make their lives more difficult."

More than 17,000 unmarried, heterosexual men and women whose average ages were 38 and 35 respectively took the survey, which was posted on NBCNews.com.

On the whole, respondents' answers did not differ dramatically with age, although there were exceptions. Younger men were more likely to agree that if they paid the bill, women should engage in sexual activity. "The good news is that the overwhelming majority of men disagreed with this statement," said Frederick.

As relationships develop, many men and women expect a more egalitarian split: 75 percent of men and 83 percent of women said they shared expenses by the time they'd been dating for six months. "On the first few dates, I usually expect to pay for everything because I think it shows strong dependable commitment," one male respondent said. "Then if everything works out, I expect my partner to take some responsibility."

The researchers argue that it is important to look at who pays for dates because, in many cases, the initial arrangement persists as the relationship progresses. Men who pay for dates early on may continue to serve as the sole providers as the relationship unfolds, although no formal research has looked at that before, said Frederick. One potential problem with embracing chivalry is that men who engage in more benevolent forms of sexism, like paying for a check, may also engage in more hostile forms, seeing women as subservient and acting negatively toward women who step outside of typical gender roles, he said.

But the study suggests that women are at least partially responsible for the persistence of this particular gender norm, Frederick argued.

"Men typically embrace their partner having a stable income and being in the workplace, but many men resist stepping [up] their efforts in terms of housework and child care," he explained. "Similarly, many women resist changes to gendered practices such as chivalry, and paying for dates, because paying for dates places a burden on them."

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/13/men-paying-for-date_n_3749104.html

The New York Times

Respecting Our Differences

July 31, 2013, 5:22 PM

By Brett McKay

Many folks chafe at the idea of chivalry because it implies that women are weaker and more vulnerable than men and thus need special protection. It's sexism with a courteous hat tip, or so the argument goes.

Yet a few months ago Congress passed and the president signed (to great fanfare) an extension of the [Violence Against Women Act](#), which allots federal funds to help fight violent crimes against women.

If we can have legislation that implies that men are (generally) physically stronger and women are (generally) more vulnerable and thus require federally mandated protection, is it really wrong, and could it not actually be beneficial, to have some social rituals that serve as a symbol and reminder of these differences between the sexes?

Small chivalrous acts like opening a door for a woman are symbolic ways for a man to signal that he recognizes that while men are physically stronger on a whole, he himself intends no harm. Chivalry is not about either the inferiority or the lofty superiority of women. Instead, it can foster mutual respect and remind us of our underlying biological differences and the complementary nature of the sexes. Some women will bear children, and some men will step up to be protectors should danger arise (see the [boyfriends who took a bullet](#) for their girlfriends during the Aurora shooting or the firefighters who rushed into the Twin Towers on 9/11). One need not oppose the strides toward equality we've taken to honestly acknowledge and appreciate this fact.

In a gender-neutral modern world, chivalric acts are non-onerous rituals that faintly echo our relationship to each other when all the layers of civilization are stripped away; they serve to remind us that we need and should respect, appreciate and quite frankly enjoy each other.

<http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2013/07/30/can-chivalry-be-brought-back-to-life/chivalry-is-a-nod-to-differences-between-the-sexes>

***From Merriam-Webster

chivalry

-an honorable and polite way of behaving especially toward women

-gallant or distinguished gentlemen

ArcadiaPatch

Women's Equality Day: Are We There Yet?

Posted by [Shawna Burreson](#) , August 25, 2012 at 10:08 AM

Nearly a century after winning the right to vote, women are enjoying hard-fought strides but the battle for equality soldiers on.

Commemorating the day women won the right to vote August 26, 1920, Women's Equality Day is not only an observance of hard-fought battles in the past, but a current call to arms.

It's easy to forget the recent designation females held in society—that of second class citizens required by law to be obedient to their spouses and who were left out of decision-making processes entirely.

It wasn't really so long ago a lack of representation in government, dismal labor conditions and social inequities drove suffragettes to withstand setback after discouraging setback before the realization of the Nineteenth Amendment.

Somehow, like many others, I squeaked through the school system without knowing much about the suffragette movement at all, aside from the fact that they ultimately won and that they had suffered in their pursuit (I've since learned suffrage refers to an ancient voting tablet.)

But like any other accomplishments by a minority group, it was an incredibly long and disheartening journey, with numerous jailed activists and failed attempts spanning a tumultuous time in America.

From when the women's movement was first sparked at the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 to when it finally culminated in the right to vote 72 years later, two of the country's bloodiest wars had already erupted and concluded—the Civil War (1861–1865) and World War I (1914 -1918).

The first amendment to the constitution granting women the right to vote was introduced in 1848 by California Sen. A.A. Sargeant, 42 long years before it happened.

Amid turbulent times, on the heels of two wars, a recession and a foreclosure crisis, women are still fighting for their equality—and they're still losing battles.

And just like the original suffragette movement, the “they” standing in the way of womankind include women—often likely of some sort of privilege, those who have never stood in the shoes of sisters marginalized by poverty, race or as victims of brutal violence.

Distracted by all the rights we women do have, it can be easy to underestimate what's at stake.

It never fails to amaze me when people choose to vote against their own self-interest ...maybe that wouldn't happen as much if there were more women in government.

For all the progress made that's been made in the last century, immeasurable more remains. To achieve full equality we must first be aware that even in 2012, the fight for it is far from over.

How will you celebrate Women's Equality Day?



Do These Traditions

Prevent Gender Equality?

By Natasha Burton

Some of our time-honored relationship traditions have not-so-gender-equal histories. While we might scoff at marriage dowries of the past, many don't bat an eye at the bestowing of a multi-carat engagement ring—or see a connection between the two. So, have we really come a long way, baby? We asked leading relationship experts, historians and psychotherapists to weigh in on five dating, marriage and family customs that may be holding us back.

In 2010, *Time* [reported](#) that median full-time salaries of young women were 8 percent higher than those of men in their peer group in 147 of 150 of the United States' biggest cities. Yet paying for the first date—as well as others thereafter—is still seen by many women, and *men*, as not only a man's responsibility but also his obligation.

"I've interviewed hundreds of women, and the majority have admitted that they expect a man to offer to pay on a first date, and actually lose interest if they don't," says Andrea Syrtash, author of the upcoming book [Cheat On Your Husband \(With Your Husband\)](#). "That said, a guy shouldn't feel pressured to wine and dine a woman on a first date or feel like he has to take out a line of credit to treat her."

"Dating rules divert our attention from the more important issues, such as how we're going to build a caring relationship that meets the needs of both partners" says Mari Ruti, Ph.D., author of [The Case for Falling in Love](#). "In the larger scheme of things, who pays for the first dinner really doesn't matter. Personally, I don't mind a man paying on a date, as long as I know that I can reciprocate in the future. But it would definitely be a red flag if a guy didn't let me pay the next time around."

"I think we're fooling ourselves if we think that money doesn't come with power," Ruti says. "A lot of women are taught to think that men are supposed to pay for things to show that they value women. But there're also guys who, consciously or unconsciously, use money as a way to gain the upper hand, so that if they pay for everything, you might find it harder to disagree with them or otherwise hold your own. It can be difficult to avoid the feeling that if you're not contributing financially, somehow you're not quite on equal footing."

Chivalry is largely associated with the male-dominant culture of the Middle Ages, and more recently of the 1950s, when men had the upper hand in society, notes Scott A. Farrell, chivalry scholar and the founder of [ChivalryToday.com](#). Plus, isn't the concept "dead" today, as many a modern headline has declared?

"We expect the social conventions of our grandparents' time, such as opening the door for a lady or standing when she enters a room, to still apply," Farrell says. "That's as mistaken as if we still expected people to drive Model T cars." He says we need to rethink the concept for today, and allow men and women to share equal responsibility. "The basis of chivalry is respect. It's not bringing flowers and it's not paying for the first date. It's being honest with your partner, being respectful, being supportive."

"We have to give guys a break. They've been told that we want to be treated as equals (we do!) but they're sometimes criticized when they don't open doors, pay for the tab or take initiative and 'be a man,'" Syrtash

says. "There's a fine line, and it's hard for a guy to know which side he'll fall on. For the most part, though, women want to be pursued and courted, even when it's a little old-fashioned."

"If a guy holds the door open for me because he gets to it first, that's nice," Ruti says. "But if he makes a big deal out of it, well, then I think it's borderline sexist, as in, 'Look at me, Tarzan, run to the rescue of you, the helpless female.' And it drives me absolutely nuts when a man refuses to go through a door that I'm holding open for him because I got to it first. In those cases, I just want to smack him to the 21st century."

While some engagement ring companies [have encouraged](#) women who want to pop the question, the practice is still referenced mainly in conjunction with a centuries-old tradition that says women are allowed to propose to men only during a leap year, and on Leap Day specifically. Otherwise, women are usually left to wait expectantly for the guy to make the grand gesture.

According to a 2003 survey performed by Korbel Champagne, 31 percent of Americans know a woman who proposed to a man. However, we were hard-pressed to find a trustworthy statistic on how many engagements, or marriages, began this way. "I think it'd be fine—and great—if women proposed to men more often," says Mara Altman, who extensively researched the history of engagement for her acclaimed e-book [Sparkle](#). "I hate to say this, because it'd be so lovely if all seemed more equal, but I think there is a reason it has not caught on."

"I know couples in which both people decided, mutually, to tie the knot. Power to them!" Syrtash says. "But in my research, the majority of women would like to be proposed to, and most men would like to ask for a woman's hand in marriage. In fact, I've heard some men say that it's emasculating to take that role away from them."

"In a perfect world, it wouldn't matter if the man asks you to marry him," says Michael Batshaw, LCSW, author of [Before Saying I Do: The Essential Guide to a Successful Marriage](#). However, he says, many equate a man *not* proposing with his having commitment issues, and a woman should address that concern rather than popping the question herself. "If a couple is on the same page and he doesn't have an issue, given our cultural norms, he should propose."

According to Altman, this tradition's roots are irrelevant today. "When women were expected not to have sex before marriage, the engagement ring sometimes served as a motivation and sense of security for her to feel comfortable losing her virginity," she says. "Men did not, in the same sense, need an expensive trinket in order to be motivated to have premarital sex." But given that, even today, only women wear rings in the engagement period, is this tradition outdated?

"Some anthropologists posit that because a woman takes care of her offspring for so long, she needs a sign that her mate will be in it for the long haul," Altman says. "Coren Apicella, a biological anthropologist at Harvard University, calls this an honest signal: 'Engagement is cheap talk unless you have something to back it up.' This might be why we've adopted the two to three-month salary rule. The ring has to show more than that the man can *provide*—it has to show that he is planning to stay."

"I've always thought that the ring represented the man marking his territory, kind of like how a dog pisses all over its yard" Altman says. "Of course, once I was proposed to, I realized that the ring is not just for you and your fiancé. It is an object that other people tend to look at as a representation of your couplehood, not to mention your positioning on the social hierarchy. Though I found the practice

disagreeable on many levels, one being the inequality it seems to represent, I still found myself happily gazing at my ring."

"Although there are various ideas around the origin of the engagement ring, it is my sense that the reason the woman wears the ring comes from chauvinistic practices of ownership of women: If a woman is wearing an engagement ring, it is a sign that she is taken and the property of another man," Batshaw says. "It would be nice if we could move past chauvinistic cultural norms so that both sexes could wear engagement rings as a symbol of love and commitment to each other."

In July, morning show host Kelly Ripa declared, "We give birth. You pick up the check." Her statement sparked debate on both family and feminist-minded websites, yet the idea of monetarily rewarding women for giving birth is indeed a growing trend. According to a survey by *BabyCenter.com*, 38 percent of new mothers received a gift from their partner after birthing their child and 55 percent of pregnant women thought they deserved one, [*The New York Times* reported](#).

BabyCenter's executive editor, Linda Murray, [*told the Times*](#) that "push presents" are "more and more of an expectation of moms these days, that they deserve something for bearing the burden for nine months, getting sick, ruining their body. The guilt really gets piled on."

"Any excuse for a couple to do a nice gesture for each other is great in my book," Syrtash says. "Couples who take opportunities to honor each other and acknowledge their love and appreciation on a consistent basis are able to weather conflicts in their relationship a little better. Giving birth is a milestone, and couples should celebrate each other's milestones thoughtfully."

"Giving birth is an extraordinary thing; I understand the impulse to [reward it](#)," says Ruti. "But [if the gift emphasizes] that this is the only accomplishment women are capable of, it runs the risk of reducing them to just one facet of their being. One-sided generosity—that is, financial generosity flowing from men to women, exclusively—is one step away from sexism. But even here, there're qualifications. If he makes a six-figure salary and you're dirt poor, well, that complicates things, doesn't it?"