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Déjà Vu: Feminism Revisited

Barbara B. Stern, Rutgers, New Jersey

WHERE WE ARE NOW:
SECOND GENERATION FEMINISM

Since the publication of Betty Friedan's The Feminine Mystique in 1963 -- the catalyst for the first generation of the modern women's liberation movement -- "feminism" has become a catchall term for a variety of women's issues. These issues touch on a number of inter-related concerns in the academic world -- personal, political, and professional -- affecting the careers, lives, and research paths of men and women in all disciplines, including our own. Feminism in academia first surfaced on the East Coast in 1969 as an outgrowth of a conference organized by a group of (mostly) women faculty at Cornell University. This conference was devoted to issues raised by the women's movement of the 1960's (Chamberlain 1990), and resulted in an interdisciplinary course on women, followed in 1970 by the establishment of one of the first interdisciplinary women's studies programs.

Interestingly, consumer research interest in women's studies dates back to still an earlier generation. One of the earliest research guides -- Christine Frederick's 1929 book, Selling Mrs. Consumer -- was written by, for, and about the consuming woman. Nevertheless, until the late 1960s, women's issues were eclipsed by changes in the orientation of the discipline and of business education as a whole. Once interest in women as a topic of study in their own right resurfaced, however, a spate of books and articles emerged in the related fields of advertising, marketing, and consumer research. Evidence for this sustained interest is found in the by-now voluminous bibliography on gender. Further testimony to the importance of gender issues is the range and number of presentations at this conference -- a historical "first" that is a milestone in the history of consumer research. But it is worth noting that this marker event follows two decades worth of earlier milestones in allied disciplines. In that sense, we are well into the second generation of feminism, and can benefit by examining historical precedent.
Earlier waves of feminism in the humanities and social sciences have brought to the fore two aspects of women's lives worthy of attention. The first is the feminist concept of the gestalt of gender -- the pluralistic influence that gender exerts on all facets of life. This view of gender as a construct of social reality is evident in the number of domains where an educator's sex is relevant -- as a student and faculty member; in a choice of research topics; in a decision to adopt a methodology; in one's status in the profession; and in the very nature of the language one uses to report research. The bundle of strands comprising feminism acts synergistically, so that women educators must face or not face (a negative response takes as much energy as a positive one) the implications of being a woman in the multiplicity of inter-related areas known as "real life."

In addition to the gestalt of gender, the second aspect of feminism not yet fully explored in marketing and consumer research is the politics of gender -- the agenda for change that is the goal of most feminist scholarship. The aim of feminist research often goes beyond "pure" research for research's sake. Instead, it is polemic, calling for inclusion of the feminine point of view to balance the masculine outlook dominant in patriarchal society. This praxis takes the form of suggesting areas where improvements are needed -- the "shoulds" -- and setting forth change programs -- the "oughts." The preceding papers in this session -- and, indeed, those heard throughout the conference -- begin to address these two neglected areas of feminism. They explore the pluralism and complex interweaving of gender issues, while at the same time furthering the political aims of feminist ideology by calling for change. The papers thus direct attention to the many ways feminist issues touch on the interwoven fabric of life and work, and insist upon redressing some of the inequities of androcentrism by introducing a feminist perspective.

BACK TO THE FUTURE:
THE FIRST GENERATION

Since feminism is now in its second generation, some of us who come out of the first generation feel that the time is right to pass along reflections on our experiences. One anonymous reviewer of this session proposal stated my somewhat introspective mission better than I did. S/he said that open avowal of feminism's influence on one's own life helps to create "a candid environment for discussing these issues -- one that can result in catharsis, empowerment, and solidarity." This trilogy of "results" is so well-put that I am adopting it to describe my sequential and rather irregular early travels along the feminist road in two disciplines -- women's studies and management.

CATHARSIS:
DENIAL AND PURGATION OF RAGE

Women's studies expressed the catharsis that followed the eruption of rage in the women's movement of the mid-1970s. Gail Sheehy captures the fury that women like myself felt, intensified by years of denial that we had anything in common with unliberated problem-laden "others." Her story of Charlotte is an object lesson on why "intellectual girls" turned into some of the angriest middle-aged women around (1976, p. 313):

"Charlotte was such a woman, and this was the set of directions she bought: She should finish college, marry, but postpone children while she finished graduate school. Toward the end of her twenties, she should begin having her children and take ten years out. Around 40, she would be ready to reenter her field."

The only catch was this: By the time she was ready, the field had moved light years beyond her grasp. Theories and methods in any academic discipline change too fast in a decade for anyone to refresh himself quickly. She found she could only reenter her field at a demeaning level, as an assistant instructor with a teaching load of seven hours a day. It was too late to launch any serious research project.... While her contemporaries who did remain current were now being given chairs at universities... Charlotte is still trying to catch up.

Charlotte was luckier than I was: her field moved beyond her grasp, but mine fell off the edge of the earth. Like Charlotte, I had followed an appropriate socio-cultural script, secure in the assumption that a Ph.D. in English would guarantee a satisfying post-motherhood career as a college professor. As a result, I was deep into denying that major feminist events of the 1960's -- the publication of The Feminine Mystique, the founding of NOW in 1967, the eruption of women's studies at Cornell (my undergraduate
alma mater) -- were personally relevant. Despite exposure to questions about why I was "taking up a seat in graduate school that belonged to a man" (from a fellow student) or why I was demanding a "man's salary when I was married to a rich man" (from a department chair), I internalized negative messages rather than suspecting any sexist bias in the outer world.

Denial was exacerbated by an unfortunate coincidence: although I was determined to teach college English, albeit on a limited basis during my children's pre-school years, the opportunity to do so disappeared almost overnight. The lack of part-time teaching positions for anyone with a doctorate in English -- male or female -- turned my attention toward problems in academia that did not seem definable as "women's issues." At no point during those years of frustration did I consider not blaming the job market in the humanities for closing up or myself for being in precisely the wrong place at the wrong time. It was not until the mid-1970s, when I re-read The Feminine Mystique, that I realized the extent to which I had denied my anger, turning it inward and crystallizing it into unquestioning acceptance of the world as an unexamined given. Friedan's descriptive passage -- I had underlined it more than a decade after the book came out -- summed up my life at the time (1963, p. 233):

"The woman with two children, for example, bored and restive in her city apartment, is driven by her sense of futility and emptiness to move, 'for the children's sake,' to a spacious house in the suburbs. The house takes longer to clean, the shopping and gardening and chauffeuring and do-it-yourself routines are so time-consuming that, for a while, the emptiness seems solved. But when the house is furnished, and the children are in school and the family's place in the community has jelled, there is 'nothing to look forward to,' as one woman...put it. The empty feeling returns, and so she must redecorate the living room, or wax the kitchen floor more often than necessary -- or have another baby....Yet none of it is quite as real, quite as necessary, as it seems."

Anger: Exposure to Women's Studies

The "empty feeling" of walking through a life that was not my own ended when I finally confronted anger, in large part as a consequence of a teaching assignment. By the mid-1970s, I had found a part-time job teaching English at a small Jesuit college. I was asked to develop a course on "Women and Literature," an odd assignment based on one criterion alone: biological sex. Despite the presence of a (male) faculty member whose background was more appropriate (he specialized in Jane Austen) and my own lack of relevant credentials (my dissertation was on James Joyce), I was the only woman around. In retrospect, acceptance of an offer that I could not very well refuse (it had taken six years to get any college teaching job at all, other than one in remedial English) became a turning point professionally and personally.

Preparing the course necessitated an eclectic adventure in feminist reading, for having started at square zero, I had to eke out a respectable background by cutting across disciplinary boundaries. I concocted an interdisciplinary reading list, not surprising in view of the origins of feminism as an offshoot of older and more established disciplines. My first course syllabus reflected a knowledge base related only distantly in spots to literary criticism: history, sociology, psychology, "pop-soc" and "pop-psych," sexuality and feminism, and even the then-incipient men's studies. By 1978, this original "Women and Literature" course had metamorphosed into a "Seminar in Women's Studies," and I was teaching it not as an English instructor but as an academic administrator on the branch campus of the same college. For the first time in my adult life, I not only had a full-time academic job, but also one that involved working with adult women -- the majority of day students on that campus -- as well as teaching women's studies.

The coalescence of feminist reading, day-to-day interaction with adult women, and teaching challenging material (as opposed to grammar or spelling, the mainstays of remedial English) broke through years of denial. Once I realized how much my life had been shaped by automatic acceptance of socio-cultural "reality," intense anger was inevitable. Indeed, during the turbulent years of the mid-1970s, it was difficult not to be an angry feminist. The titles of books that were cultural icons indicate the widespread firestorms raging in many disciplines -- for example, Germaine Greer's The Female Eunuch, Martha Vicinus's Suffer and Be Still, Ingrid Bengis's Combat in the Erogenous Zone, with its opening chapter on "Man-Hating." By the late 1970s,
however, I was ready for catharsis, since at that point numerous feminist strands came together at once. At the same time as I was taking an active part in the women's studies movement (reading, teaching, writing papers, attending conferences), I was also getting a divorce, moving out of the suburbs and back into Manhattan, working full time, and -- not part of the original game plan -- facing a career change.

The culmination of this catharsis and the impetus for moving forward was attendance at the first National Women's Studies Association conference in 1979, at the University of Kansas. It was a profound culture-shock on many levels. To begin, this was the first all-women gathering I had attended -- Modern Language Association conferences were dominated by men. Next, it was permeated by collective anger and revolutionary fervor bent on overthrowing the traditional scholarly establishment -- again unlike the Modern Language Association, which was the establishment. Last, and perhaps most important, it was an occasion for intense sexual confrontation by women wearing labels denoting their sexual orientation (mostly lesbian or bisexual). I was one of the few heterosexual presenters, and not only was my paper denounced on grounds of "heterosexualist" bias, but I, too, was condemned as a willing maidservant of the oppressor.

This culture was not one in which I felt comfortable, for women's studies seemed to ignore issues concerning women like myself -- middle-class mothers, heading towards middle-age, whose careers had long since been aborted. I realized that I had to pass through intense anger and get somewhere beyond this cramped and confrontational world to begin reconstructing a useful and satisfying life. Nevertheless, I am honor-bound to acknowledge a debt to those leaders of the women's movement who first articulated the nature of patriarchy and who enumerated the problems that women -- all women, not simply those visibly victimized -- encounter in the androcentric world. Even though I left the anger along with the movement, the cathartic experience left me with enough sense of self to move on to a happier place.

Empowerment: Management and Networking

In the late 1970s, I no longer had the luxury of denying the power of patriarchal society or thumbing my nose at it. My academic job was phased out at about the same time as the final divorce decree was in sight, and both events hastened the need to become self-supporting. My solution was to enroll in an M.B.A. program, since it seemed the fastest way to increase a four-figure academic paycheck. In the course of switching from liberal arts to business, I developed a sense of empowerment via the women's "networking" movement of the late 1970s and early 1980s. This movement took as its first goal the breakdown of isolation that many women felt as "tokens" in all-male environments and the nurturance of communal feeling among business/professional women. Its more distant goal was the consolidation of women in industry and the professions into a critical mass that would eventually develop into an "old girl's network" as influential as the "old boy's network."

My involvement in the founding of the New Jersey Women's Network and the Fordham Graduate Business School Women's Network represented an early source of stability and self-esteem directly connected to womanhood. The reification of self-worth was so powerful that it led to the resumption of writing -- something I had not done since doctoral student days. This feeling of empowerment eventually led to publication of a book in 1981: *Is Networking for You? A Working Woman's Alternative to the Old Boy System.*

Networking activities also represented a first step in the direction of business, for they put me in contact with women to whom I could relate, despite differences in life choices and career paths. These women were role models, for they had succeeded in areas where I felt I had failed. As a result of networking, I became involved with the Institute for Women and Organizations, a coalition group formed by members of the Academy of Management to bridge the gap between academia and the business community by bringing together educators, corporate trainers, and developers of women's programs (Ramsay 1985). At the 1984 conference, the keynote speaker -- Rosabeth Moss Kanter -- was living proof that a woman could succeed in education, business, and personal life. This conference was meaningful not so much because of the papers as because of the networking -- the "informal sharing ... in the hallways, at the receptions over wine, at the breaks over coffee, around the table at meals, wherever two or more people came together and
The opportunity to engage in informal conversation with many of the women influential in management education, especially those in the women's division of the Academy of Management, led to the start of my first research program. Although I was teaching marketing, I was in a combined "management studies" department at a medium-sized state college, and could develop management courses and publish in that field with no stigma. The first articles I wrote in the early 1980s were on networking and education for women, and in 1984 a course on "Women in Managerial Roles" that I had developed won a Leavey Award for Excellence in Education, a tax-free $7500, most of which was spent on computer equipment. In sum, the experience of writing a book, founding women's groups, getting a business degree, speaking to professional women's organizations, and writing on women's issues empowered me by giving me an identity. Networking was a permission slip to join the sisterhood of women committed to lives that included careers. Sustained by this sisterhood, I no longer felt alone and an aberrant failure (as an English professor, a wife, a mother), but instead, came to see myself as one of many women who had bought the wrong life package but now had a second chance at a better one.

Solidarity: Marketing/Consumer Research and Gender Issues

By 1985, when I assessed the impact of research in management on my career, I saw that it could not get me very far in marketing. I was growing increasingly unhappy at a state college, and wanted to move to a first-class research university. To make this change and to earn "credibility" in the field, I worked with co-authors on articles peripherally related to gender issues. But in 1986, when I came to Rutgers, I was advised to develop a solo research program. Although I began by writing a few articles on women's issues, a wise and benevolent mentor pointed out that my best shot at a research niche was to go where I was strongest -- English, not women's studies. Thus, I returned to my roots and began incorporating literary criticism into consumer behavior and advertising research. Since I now had enough literary theory to occupy me cheerfully for several lifetimes -- all I had ever wanted to do was to read books and to write about them -- there seemed little reason to think about feminism except as a remnant from the past.

However, feminism was not to be shunted aside -- the wheel never stays still. In consequence of timing as good in the 1990s as it was bad in the 1970s, the field of consumer research is moving towards the inclusion of feminism and new ideas from the humanities at the same time as the demand for business degrees (and faculty) is robust. Our discipline is a "have" rather than a "have not," and is sufficiently prosperous to offer a generous welcome to newcomers. This is quite a change from my birth discipline, and I view ACR as a haven of solidarity, a home where those interested in gender issues can freely meet and exchange ideas. This solidarity has been building over the past two years, since the 1989 conference in New Orleans. At that conference, a session on "Research, Teaching, and Professional Issues for Women in Consumer Behavior: Do Women Have a Different Experience" was the first manifestation -- as far as I know -- of a new interest in all aspects of feminism. One of the panelists was Elizabeth C. Hirschman, the first woman president of ACR. Over a hundred men and women packed the room, and feelings of solidarity and good-will were tangible. The session ran long past its targeted 90 minutes, and just as participants in the 1984 management conference "networked" on their own, so too did ACR attendees continue discussing common concerns long into the night.

This 1991 gathering in Salt Lake City -- another "first" for ACR -- continues the momentum of that session. To me, this occasion marks a coalescence of the strands of my own life that parallels the unification of many disparate threads in our discipline. One sign of convergence, I think, is the reappearance of the same people at different times in one's life and in different contexts. In this regard, I have re-met several people here whose lives touched my own over the past decade. A discussant at this conference -- Reba Keele -- was a panelist at the 1984 Conference on Women and Organizations in Boston. A presenter today -- Mary Gilly -- was also a presenter at the first American Marketing Association Women's Breakfast (Scottsdale, 1990). An author -- Jerome Cosgrove -- was an advertising professor at Fordham when I was starting the Women's Network. These re-meetings suggest that women's issues have become my
personal locus of solidarity, the place where ideology, friendship, and intellectual and professional concerns merge.

I am grateful for this solidarity, and want to use the sense of belongingness that ACR has nurtured to begin work on a legacy for those who follow. Feminism to me means trying to change the world so that our descendants -- our metaphorical marketing sons and daughters -- can live joyous and productive lives. Since conferences are "marker" events, and since this one represents the official introduction of gender issues into the consumer research field, it seems a natural setting in which to propose changes. The goal of these changes is to improve the discipline by sensitizing researchers to gender and sex biases and in this way, to help researchers eliminate overt or covert sexism.

The Feminist Agenda: A Praxis for the Future

Our discipline -- the new kid on the feminist block -- can implement change without reinventing the wheel. Instead, we can use the one already in place to roll on to the future. The efficiency of ACR as a change agent lies in utilization of mechanisms already at hand. The key task here seems to be communication, and we currently have in place an infrastructure that facilitates the process -- conferences and publications, advisory councils, and, perhaps most important because most underutilized, a newsletter. The six following "to-do" suggestions depend on using this infrastructure to combat sexism and to encourage non-biased multicultural research. While these suggestions deal with gender issues (the topic of the conference), it is important to note that true multicultural research deals fairly with men and women of all color, ethnic and national origin, social class, and sexual orientation. Thus, a feminist agenda should not be interpreted as sending anyone to the back of the bus.

Writing Herstory: Preserve or Perish

A starting point in feminist consciousness-raising has often been writing history to reflect "herstory." One hard-won lesson from the past is that historians have been hampered by lack of preservation of materials concerning women, an "invisible" population (see Bullough 1974). To insure visibility, we ought to begin at once the preservation of documents that a twenty-first century historian of consumer research might need to trace the origins of feminism. There is some urgency in this plea, for it is best to start when the events are still fresh in the participants' minds.

We can do so, first, by chronicling the 1989 ACR session (see above) on women's issues. To date, no published record except a listing in the ACR Program (Goldberg, Gorn, and Pollay 1990, p. xxxi) memorializes this event. Yet compilation of a written record should be undertaken as soon as possible, lest details be forgotten or incorrectly recalled as time passes. To understand the urgency, let us imagine the problems of a historian a hundred years from now trying to establish something as basic as the chronology of session formation and implementation in the absence of written data. Can we be sure that such a historian will be able to trace even the dates and mechanics of a session from idea generation up to final publication (the following year)? If the ostensibly simple determination of when things happened becomes increasingly difficult to pinpoint as time passes, think how much more difficult it becomes to determine what happened. What we can learn from the many historical gaps that will never be filled is the importance of contemporaneous recording of events. At this point, it is an easy task to create an information base for future researchers, but the longer it is put off, the more information vanishes.

Outreach to Other Disciplines

In addition to creating and preserving an information base within our discipline, ACR scholars can reach outwards to make contact with those who have already done much of the spade work. In this regard, the relative lateness of our attention to gender issues can be seen as a plus, for we can profit from communication with others who have a longer history of attention to these matters. Three sets of disciplines -- ACR affiliates, allied business disciplines, and women's studies/liberal arts -- are rich resources.

Since ACR is an association of several affiliated groups that share a common interest in studying the consumer, inter-organizational dialogue about the status of gender issues seems appropriate. A number of these affiliates, including the American
Psychological Association, American Sociological Association, and International Communication Association have pioneered in setting up "women's divisions" or sections, and are likely sources of useful information. If ACR facilitates contact with these groups, we can shorten our own learning curve by seeing what others before us have done. Since the Policy Board of JCR includes representatives from our affiliates, it can serve as the means for initiating and maintaining inter-group contact.

But outreach can and probably should extend beyond the ACR coalition to allied business disciplines -- leaders and laggards alike -- to see how they deal with gender issues. For example, management has a well-organized women's division (the Academy of Management's "Women in Management") and a long-standing commitment to the education of women, research on women in business, and institutional recognition and support. So, too, does communication, especially in terms of recognizing and publicizing women's issues: the Organization for Research on Women and Communication publishes Women's Studies in Communication, and an interdisciplinary Organization for the Study of Communication, Language, and Gender (OSCLG) publishes Women and Language.

Contact with these older groups can permit a view of gender research in kindred business disciplines and can suggest salutary future directions for consumer research to take.

Outreach from consumer research should also extend to marketing, just now beginning to show awareness of women's issues. In 1990, the winter AMA conference was the site of the first Women's Breakfast, attended by a core group of men and women who self-identified as interested in gender. Many of these people are at this conference, for there seems to be considerable overlap in ACR and AMA membership. The timing of the AMA event -- about six months after the first ACR women's panel -- suggests that growth in interest is taking place simultaneously in both groups. Even though AMA differs from ACR in terms of organization, structure, mission, and so forth, there seems to be a commonality in terms of a nucleus of people interested in gender. Perhaps both organizations might work together to take steps on issues (see below) such as language and research guidelines so that duplication of efforts need not occur.

One of the best ways to avoid wasting effort and re-doing things already done elsewhere is to open lines of communication with women's studies and other liberal arts disciplines. Despite a history of antipathy that has contributed to the erection of boundaries between business and liberal arts, much of the anger has died down, and a new era of cooperation seems to be dawning. For example, ties between business disciplines and women's studies are currently being forged as a result of government-funded projects on integrating the study of race, gender, and ethnicity across the curriculum. To take one instance, a Department of Higher Education grant awarded to Rutgers (Newark Campus) resulted in positions on the Women's Studies Council for business faculty who contributed gender material to the bibliography or course curricula. Some advantages of communication with women's studies faculty are practical assistance in sorting through bibliography, helpful comments from knowledgeable readers, and exposure to new perspectives. Outreach on many fronts encourages sharing ideas with the scholarly community at large, and benefits all of us by breaking down barriers of distrust and misperception.

NETWORKING

Sharing ideas within the discipline is equally beneficial, especially when it leads to the growth of formal and informal networks. If a conference such as this one were held every two years, as has been suggested, it would serve as a regular forum for communication. In addition to this "outcome" event, an ongoing processual mechanism for facilitating interpersonal networking can help those men and women with common interests keep in touch informally. Informal networking can be stimulated by publication of a conference directory that includes addresses, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and so forth, so that interested parties can easily reach each other.

Since a directory only identifies those interested in gender issues at one point in time, additional communication outlets are needed to enable people moving into and out of the research stream to connect. Such outlets exist, although not much used for this purpose, in the form of newsletters: for example, the ACR Newsletter, the Society for Consumer Psychology's Communicator, and the American Marketing Association's Marketing Educator. A newsletter is...
a ready-made clearing-house, for it serves as a public forum announcing works in progress, conferences, paper calls, and personal data. At little extra cost, space can be reserved for a "bulletin board" -- a column in which gender researchers can exchange names and addresses, report on working papers, and request/offer information on specific topics.

Mentoring

An added benefit of networking is that it goes hand-in-hand with mentoring: the process whereby men and women established in the discipline take on the "wise tutor" role and teach newcomers the ropes. Mentoring, of course, is a dual-sex process, although it has been studied more extensively in reference to male mentors and women mentees. However, my suggestion for mentoring should not be interpreted as excluding men. In fact, a formalized mentoring structure for matching junior and senior faculty such as the one at Western Michigan University benefits everyone involved.

This having been said, it still seems likely that women may need special assistance from the discipline at this time -- catch-up tutoring to help them succeed in academic life. The mechanism for setting up a structure to provide such assistance exists in the newsletter. This widely-read publication is a vital link in our communication, one which can serve as an information-exchange for matching mentor to mentee. A discipline-wide meeting place such as a regular column can be invaluable in spreading the word that help is available, especially if doctoral students and beginning instructors must look beyond their own institutions to access such help.

Statement of Non-Sexist Language

"Spreading the word" about mentorship opportunities brings to mind the subject of language used in research. While many valuable suggestions for future research topics have been put forth in the past few days, the following suggestion turns attention away from content to style. My purpose is to make what I hope is a strong case for the incorporation of a statement about non-sexist language in the JCR style sheet. As of June, 1990, no such statement appears. Although I think that the lack of stated policy is an unintentional omission, it is a gap that should be filled as quickly as possible to bring us in line with other disciplines. One example of a policy statement in an allied discipline is the following paragraph on objectionable practices in the *Academy of Management Review*. It is offered here as a starting-point to stimulate thoughts about how we might want to frame our own statement:

Avoidance of Sexist and Other Biased Language

Authors must avoid terms and usages which are or may be interpreted as denigrating to ethnic or other groups. Authors should be particularly careful in dealing with gender, where long established custom (e.g., the use of "the men and girls in the office," or of "usually if the employee is given a chance, he will make the right choice") can imply inferiority where none exists or the acceptance of inequality where none should be tolerated. While phrases such as "his or hers" in place of the more common "his," may seem clumsy, they can and should be used.

Statement of Non-Sexist Research

Last, the role of language as a shaper of reality leads to consideration of the larger issue: research that is non-sexist in matter as well as in manner. Again, what is needed is a statement of research guidelines that codifies the many individual suggestions found in this volume and elsewhere into an organizationally-sanctioned policy. In addition to a simple avowal that the discipline will not tolerate biased language (see above), a more complex document addressing gender and sex-fair research is needed to show that the discipline is committed to non-sexist research. Many such documents have been generated in related disciplines, and one recent example worth examining is the Organization for the Study of Communication, Language and Gender Statement of October, 1990. OSCLG's approach is useful in that it first identifies ten generic ways that sex bias is manifested, and then provides typical examples in each category. I would like to see a consumer research statement that goes even further, providing positive as well as negative examples. The rationale is that pointing out good practices is even more likely to encourage good research, for the carrot rather than the stick holds out a reward (doing the right thing) instead of a punishment (doing the wrong thing).
In conclusion, the preceding suggestions -- mostly simple things that can be done quickly and economically -- are likely to become unnecessary as the discipline evolves. Overt mechanisms for networks and mentoring, for example, fade away over time as connections are made more naturally. Once our collective consciousness has been raised, solidarity will follow, and obvious devices can be left behind. But meanwhile, to keep the spark alight, we must guard against complacency -- the notion that because there has been one conference, everything is settled. Let us recall that the history of feminism is irregular -- one step forward, two steps back -- and the battles are far from over. In this session, Gilly’s overview of conflicts implicit in the "career versus mommy track," Young’s discussion of male bias against female ethnographers, Anderson’s presentation of power issues in male-normed scholarship, and Hirschman’s review of androcentrism in marketing scholarship all indicate a continuing need for vigilance. Let me end, then, by reminding my daughters (biological and metaphorical) that we all have to be feminists for at least one more generation and maybe even longer -- to co-opt a favorite masculinist tag-line, "it ain't over till it's over."
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