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The paper addresses the incorporation of feminist theory into the marketing curriculum to make it more equitable to women. It begins with a short history of women in business schools, and then discusses feminist theory as a curriculum change agent in terms of an overview of its impact on six stages of curriculum change. It then locates the position of feminist issues in the present marketing curriculum. Last, it discusses the competing theories of integration of feminist theory into existing courses versus development of autonomous feminist-oriented marketing courses, ending with a syllabus for a free-standing course called "Feminist Issues and Marketing."

The absence of attention to girls in the current education debate suggests that girls and boys have identical educational experiences in school. Nothing could be further from the truth. Whether one looks at achievement scores, curriculum design, self-esteem levels, or staffing patterns, it is clear that sex and gender make a difference in the nation’s public elementary and secondary schools. There is clear evidence that the educational system is not meeting girls’ needs (The American Association of University Women Report: How Schools Shortchange Girls, 1992, p. 2).

One change that has become evident in the educational system since the first wave of modern feminism in the 1960s is the increased presence of women in business classrooms. While they were virtually absent in the 1960s, the proportion of women rose through the 1980s to become one-third of the students in graduate marketing classes and more than half of the students in some undergraduate elective courses such as advertising and consumer behavior. However, at the start of the 1990s there was a reversal of this upward spiral, for the numbers of women in MBA programs declined. This fall-off has caused business academics to re-ask questions first posed by 1970s feminists about whether business education meets women’s needs and treats them equitably.

An aspect of educational inequity that compounds the disadvantage women students face in the absence of women faculty as role models is the concomitant lack of women’s visibility in the curriculum. The confluence of both is doubly disadvantaging, for it leads to classroom training that "day in, day out, delivers the message that women’s lives count for less than men’s" (Chira 1992). This message begins in kindergarten and is...
reinforced throughout the educational system. It has come to the attention of administrators in business schools, who are beginning to take notice of ways that their programs may be turning off women -- such as a shortage of women faculty, "possible differences" in the way professors grade men and women on classroom participation (Cowan 1992), and androcentric curricula that exclude women and minorities by including too little or too biased material about them (Chira 1992).

The purpose of this paper is to address the need for curriculum change as a hitherto neglected way to advance the goal of educational equity. It aims at incorporating feminist theory in the marketing curriculum in the hopes of heightening sensitivity to the presence of women's issues in the academic community. Feminist theory has always had the practical goal of social change, but the feminist praxis has not yet reached marketing classrooms. At present, its theoretical import has been mostly confined to research issues (see Bristor and Fischer 1993; Hirschman 1993; Stern 1993). To connect theory and practice, the paper will begin with a short history of women in business schools, and then discuss feminist theory as a change agent in terms of an overview of its impact on six stages of curriculum development. It will then locate the position of feminist issues in the current marketing curriculum. Last, it will discuss the competing theories of integration of feminist theory into existing courses versus autonomy of feminist-oriented marketing courses, ending with the author's syllabus for a free-standing course called "Feminist Issues and Marketing."

1992: Women in Business Schools
Since 1970, women's massive entry into the business disciplines has been part of the movement of women into traditionally male-dominated fields. In that year, on the undergraduate level 18% of men but only 14% of women freshmen chose business areas as a major field; by 1986, 26.6% of men and 27% of women chose business. Between 1970 and 1984, the aggregate number of women baccalaureates in business programs increased more than nine-fold to just over 100,000, and the proportion of women entering college with the intent to major in business has exceeded that of men since 1986 (Chamberlain 1991). On the graduate level, in 1970 women made up 4% of all business school graduates, and in 1971, just over 1000 women earned MBAs. By 1990, the percentage of women MBAs had risen to 34% of the total -- over 26,000 women earned MBAs.

The increase is part of a fundamental change in women's higher education patterns, for the 1970s saw a shift away from conventional "women's work" (teaching, social work, library science, nursing) toward formerly mostly-male professional specialities such as business, law, medicine, and architecture. In this growth context, the discovery of declining numbers of women seeking admission into MBA programs is especially disturbing, for it reverses a long upward trend. As of 1992, fewer women are applying to MBA programs, and fewer are entering programs after admission. Since 1987, for example, there has been an 11% decline at MIT, versus a 24% rise in male applicants. The most common reason offered for the decline is the faltering economy of the late 1980s, which seems to have hit women harder. As a result of the downturn, women may be postponing or foregoing business school, and concentrating their efforts on maintaining their current career status. However, administrators fear that improvement in the economy may not be sufficient to re-attract women to business education if women perceive that the MBA has little relevance to them. To make graduate business programs more hospitable to women, schools such as Northwestern and Columbia are showing more women in brochures, hiring more women as administrators and faculty, and re-examining curricula to make women more visible.

CURRICULUM CHANGE: SIX STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT

Womens' visibility raises the issue of the marketing curriculum's relevance -- do women see themselves at all in marketing education? Relevance in a representative curriculum means not simply the avoidance of sexist, racist, and classist prejudice, but more importantly, a positive commitment to inclusion of the experience of women, minorities, and lower class ideologies. This kind of curriculum change in the humanities has occurred in six stages (Schuster and Van Dyne 1985), first described by Gerda Lerner in reference to the study of women's history (1979). The stages are sequential, with different strategies utilized in each to represent women and minorities. Understanding of these stages can improve marketing education insofar as a heritage of integrated and well-developed feminist theory removes the need to reinvent the wheel. To study
these stages and see how they apply to the marketing curriculum, we now turn to a discussion of the following characteristics, treating the stages in chronological order (Schuster and Van Dyne 1985):

--- the perspective for seeing women's experience
--- the incentives to motivate faculty in terms of research and teaching
--- the means used to represent women on the syllabus
--- curricular outcomes: types of courses generated and changes in student's role in his/her education
--- obstacles to change: faculty and student

Stage 1: "Great Minds" - to late 1960s

The first stage, "great minds," excludes most women and non-white cultures because they do not fit traditional criteria of worthwhile objects of study. The fundamental presumption of the "Western canon" (Celis 1993) is that there is general scholarly agreement about the cultural standard of excellence that forms the core of learning. This standard was expressed in Matthew Arnold definition of culture: "a pursuit of our total perfection by means of getting to know, on all the matters which most concern us, the best which has been thought and said in the world" (1869, p. 6, underlining mine). It is the foundation of the core curriculum designed after World War II and dominant until the late 1960s.

In this curriculum -- designed to educate the predominantly male population flooding into college on the GI bill (Schuster and Van Dyne 1985) -- women and minorities were mostly ignored. Courses developed in this stage centered on those ideas acknowledged as great and on individuals singled out as eminent thinkers or doers. Even when women did appear on syllabi -- for example, Jane Austen in literature or Queen Elizabeth I in history -- they did so as isolated exemplars of greatness. The notion of received ideas as "gendered"was unheard of, and the exclusionary nature of the "great minds" curriculum went unnoticed by male and female professors alike. One reason is that women faculty who were trained before the late 1960s were indoctrinated with the belief that the "generic man" is a "universal"model of women as well as of men. In consequence, women and men educators alike assumed that male-derived standards of greatness applied equally well to women.

Professors accepted conventional knowledge paradigms and handed them down to students, with little perception on either side of the lectern of the absence of women. Faculty viewed their role in the educational process as neutral and apolitical transmitters of excellence, and students viewed themselves as passive beneficiaries of higher learning. Faculty motivation for research focused on the calibration of accepted (and unquestioned) standards of greatness, for in Arnold's terms, education alone could encourage the spread of culture that was civilization's bulwark against intellectual anarchy. The curriculum concentrated on basics, and education was viewed as a guided progress from ignorance to enlightenment.

While this kind of curriculum has been challenged in the past two decades (see Celis 1993), it has by no means been discarded. On the contrary, controversy over curriculum transformation rages, reflecting the proliferation of women's studies and multi-cultural studies that pits proponents of these newer disciplines against those who are advocates of traditional learning. The traditionalists adhere to Arnold's belief in education as a beacon guiding "the progress of humanity toward perfection" (1869, p. 202), and reject newer areas of study -- those with "relevance"-- as frivolous and misguided.

Stage 2: Women Worthies - early 1970s

Over twenty years ago, traditional views were challenged by the first wave of post-war feminists. The original impetus for curriculum change was the women's studies movement that emerged in 1969-1970 simultaneously on both coasts, at Cornell and San Diego State. In this stage, there was an active search for outstanding but heretofore ignored women, for disciplines were becoming newly-sensitized to the needs of women and minority students. A revised ideological perspective permitted reframing of the exclusionary core curriculum into a more flexible and inclusive one. Indeed, women were explicitly sought to fit into the "great minds" paradigm, and a conscious effort was made to overcome their under-representation in course syllabi. Nonetheless, the criteria for excellence that guided inclusion of material remained unchallenged, for while "women worthies" were allowed entry, they were usually categorized as anomalies.
within their gender and were ordinarily treated in isolation from each other. Characteristically, the women included have as their outstanding trait the fact that they think or act like men.

Faculty interest in changing the curriculum by seeking out and including great women was motivated by affirmative action's push for compensatory measures. An early force for curriculum restructuring was the liberal tendency in many -- though not all -- institutions to move toward equitable treatment of women and minorities. Often at this point the departmental response was to hire a "token woman" and assign her to teach a "Women and..." course. However, token women rarely took the risk of departing radically from the established curriculum, for their position was fragile (untenured, clustered in lower ranks, not represented in departmental administration). Under these circumstances, they were likely to avoid challenges to the male power base -- department chairs, administrators, and the majority of their colleagues.

Nonetheless, they pioneered in the means used to represent women in the curriculum by adding "exceptional" women to male-dominant syllabi, and by openly acknowledging women students' need for affirmation. However, even though this stage enlarged the traditional canon, the newly discovered "missing women" were treated as additions to a still largely patriarchal body of knowledge. The end result of the effort to add women worthies was often frustration, for most women's histories in any discipline do not measure up to those of men. Women's ideas seem minor, subordinate, or flawed when compared to the male standard. Acceptance of women's secondary status was widespread, and was attributed to individual inadequacy -- Jane Austen's novels, for example, were considered flawed by miniification, and her restricted "domestic" subject matter often commented upon. When knowledge production was evaluated according to male norms, women's output was found to be scanty and limited in scope.

Stage 3: Subordinated Women - late 1970s
The frustrating search for missing women worthies led to inquiry into the reasons for failure to find more than a few who were exceptional and influential. Stage three focused on "subordinated women," looking beyond the exemplary few to analyze the disadvantaged many. Virtually all of the women's studies literature of the late 1970s emphasized the scarcity of visible women and traced it to the societally-sanctioned gender asymmetry that disadvantaged women and non-whites. In this stage, attention was paid to the devaluation of women's roles, the exclusion of women from leadership positions, and the disempowering of women in a patriarchal society.

This was a stage marked by great anger. The incentive for faculty research on women as a disadvantaged group was social justice, fueled by the rage that erupted in the women's movement at the end of the decade and was expressed at the first National Women's Studies Conference (1979) in Lawrence, Kansas. Back at the university, faculty and students openly expressed anger, deliberately discarding the "good girl" mien of the token academic woman when the limitations on women by male-defined cultural values became viewed as discriminatory. However, even though women scholars questioned the existing paradigms, the questioners themselves continued to embody the perspective of the dominant androcentric group. The leaders of the women's studies movement were conflicted, for even though they were usually (but not always) women, they too had been trained to think like men. They carried the baggage of patriarchal standards and accepted methods of generating knowledge. Despite their labeling of paradigms as "male-dominant," the early women's studies scholars were themselves products of the oppressor's culture.

Students in this era were also conflicted, for they often tried to disassociate themselves from the disadvantaged position of "women as a group," taking the position that their personal merit was sufficient to overcome the handicap of gender. While students accepted the notion of the general disempowerment of women in the past, they did not feel that it applied to them in the present or in the future, dismissing male chauvinism as a relic of an older age. In consequence, they often denied the existence of a "woman problem."

Even though the early years of women's studies were marked by internal conflict and rage at men and society, the examination of women's experience as subordinate did lead to curriculum changes. Curricular outcomes such as "Images of Women" courses in literature (courses in "Women's Roles in Literature" were developed from the early 1970s on) and examination of
gender stereotypes and roles in the social sciences ("Women in Politics," "Women and Work") brought women as a group into syllabi, rather than isolating them as singular and unconnected individuals who only occasionally became visible.

Stage 4: Ordinary Women - early 1980s
In stage four, the impetus of black studies gave women's studies another perspective, for when the black experience was viewed in its own terms (that is, when blacks were viewed outside the context of slavery as the dominant experience), the narrow perspective of the androcentric white Western syllabus became clear. This stage of curriculum change incorporated the study of ordinary women from their own point of view, and in so doing opened up the area of women's experience expressed by women themselves. The point of view is that of the insider, for gynocentrism was proposed as a legitimate binary opposite to androcentrism. In this stage, attention was directed to women in two ways: study of the similarities that bind women together, and study of the differences that divide women as a result of race, class, and culture.

The participants in this stage of the change process often experienced liberation of the intellect and a sense of expanding possibilities when they came to view "half of the world's work and much of its products" (Lerner 1979, p. 12) as women's work. The faculty incentive for gynocentric research was mostly inner-directed, for intellectual satisfaction was more operative as a goal to achieve equity than was institutional pressure or reward. New fields of inquiry were explored, and new areas for research emerged motivated by the desire for intellectual growth. Interest in multi-cultural comparisons grew, for at this point complex questions about the inter-relationship of gender and race, class, and ethnic identity began to be articulated. Additionally, the experience of minority men formerly excluded from the curriculum -- those nine-tenths of the world population ignored in the "great minds" core -- also were re-evaluated as worth study.

The means for including women went beyond existing paradigms to internalize the insider's perspective, and innovative methods relevant to women's experience were developed. One reason was that non-traditional materials were uncovered -- non-public writings such as letters and journals, domestic art such as quilts, music such as nursery rhymes -- that allowed students to understand the nature of domestic life but that had to be studied in new ways. Since the newly-found letters, journals, and diaries were often the only remnants of women's writings -- the "private" words of ordinary women -- they could not be studied and evaluated as if they were Greek tragedies or American novels.

The curricular outcomes were interdisciplinary courses linking women's studies with ethnic, cross-cultural, and minority studies (Black Studies, Hebraic Studies, and so forth), and women-focused courses that taught women's experience directly (as opposed to "images" of women constructed by men). The emphasis on domestic life and ordinary women in these courses enabled women students to reflect self-consciously on their own lives. Students were encouraged to value their own experience and to see their own responses to words and events as legitimate. In literary criticism, the rise of reader-response criticism -- a branch of theory that elevates the reader as a co-creator of meaning -- is closely tied to feminist scholarship.

Stage 5: Challenging Women - late 1980s to present
The new knowledge generated as a result of including the insider's point of view led to profound questions about the frameworks that organize traditional courses. In the fifth stage, women openly challenge the discipline, criticizing the paradigms that heretofore excluded or marginalized them. The challenge calls attention to women's experience, diversity, and difference as legitimate aspects of knowledge. From this perspective, re-evaluating historical norms for behavior and current definitions of gender roles is the key issue. The incentive for such study -- a radical restructuring of the field -- is epistemological, for the paradigms themselves are questioned and usually found wanting. When gender is added as a category of analysis, the failure of existing paradigms to account for women's diversity is writ large. The addition of race and class to gender is a change-agent for transformation of the entire apparatus of scholarship that often takes shape in the development of new theory courses taking women into account. Student collaboration in learning is encouraged, and the student is seen as an active participant in the educational process.

The impetus of women's studies programs drives this stage, for these programs have been available
on most campuses since the 1980s and now number about 30,000 (Chamberlain 1991). In the past five years, universities have taken steps to incorporate women's studies material into other disciplines by means of faculty development programs, summer training institutes, and organized curriculum revision projects sponsored by the government or by the university itself. However, transference of a focus on women from women's studies as a separate course of study to the use of feminist ideas to transform other disciplines is fraught with difficulty. For many faculty members trained in the stage one curriculum, the need for change appears to be an attack not only on the discipline, but also on the integrity of education as an institution. Even faculty who accept the validity of feminist critiques and who agree that the scientific method may be more androcentric than gender-neutral may nonetheless be turf-protective when it comes to their own field. Resistance is based on a fear of loss of subject matter and methodology with no real gain, for feminist scholarship is frequently condemned as restricted in scope and particularly deficient in methodological alternatives.

These criticisms raise pragmatic questions -- is it possible to change the curriculum along feminist lines? And if so, how? The feminist answer is that the old certainties must first be discarded to pave the way for discovery of previously invisible disciplinary dimensions. The claim is made that once the gendered nature of the conventional syllabus and its attendant texts is recognized, material can be recovered that was formerly viewed as trivial, wrong-headed, or corrupt, and it can then be re-evaluated in a new light. In this re-evaluation, the old syllabus is not necessarily totaled. Rather, it is re-conceptualized as containing valuable descriptions of what it means to be a "DWEM" (dead white European male) that are helpful to understand white male upper-class culture. However, it is now seen as a piece of social reality, not the entire pie.

Stage 6: The Postmodern Vision - A Multicultural Future
The sixth stage, a future one not yet achieved, embraces postmodernism and aims at a multicultural vision of men's and women's diverse experiences. The perspective incorporates class, race, sexual orientation, and ethnicity as influences that interact with gender, and the focus of attention is the exploration of all facets of human interaction. It is pluralistic, in that it includes human differences as well as similarities, and postmodern, in that it acknowledges the context-bound limits of all paradigms rather than viewing any one as a repository of universal truth. This is a stage of process rather than of product or fixed principle, and it is very much an ideal rather than a real-life happening. To date, no institution has adopted such a curriculum.

However, the incentive for adoption is its inclusive vision of human experience based on diversity rather than on generalization. Diversity is the keynote of the 1990s, for the unisex urge of the 1970s has been replaced by the postmodern acceptance of difference. The means used to represent women is transformation of the paradigms by reconceptualizing all courses -- those in the core as well as in each discipline -- to include formerly excluded points of view. Students are empowered in this process to become active forces for co-creating education. The problems hampering achievement of this stage are as much practical as ideological. Educators are impatient for a finished product, and tend to underestimate the time it will take the system to evolve into one that more equitably represents gender, race, and class. In view of the patriarchy's domination for most of recorded history -- nearly two millennia, -- it is not surprising that one generation has not succeeded in radically transforming the curriculum into a fully multicultural structure.

Where is the Marketing Curriculum Today?
Understanding where the marketing curriculum is today requires information about how it got to this point. The six-stage developmental process can be used as a framework for comparing marketing with other disciplines. To begin, since marketing grew out of economics, it was rooted in the "great ideas" perspective that characterized the humanities and the social sciences up until the end of the 1960s. Marketing's origins account for its lack of attention to women at the outset, for economics was -- indeed still is -- a particularly male-dominant discipline. From 1920-1979, under 10% of the doctorates in economics were awarded to women, rising only to 15% by 1986 (Chamberlain 1991). This is an indicator of an institutional culture that is unlikely to be pro-feminist, and it is this culture out of which marketing emerged. It seems reasonable to assume that the early curriculum was influenced by its androcentric parent, for at the time when marketing was becoming independent, it was doing
In the 1970s, some efforts were made to include women into the curriculum, although the discipline's culture remained male-dominant. By 1979, only 4% of all AMA educators were women (Waller-Zuckerman 1989), a figure that suggests that the impact of women marketing educators and feminist ideas was limited. However, a 1977 issue of the Journal of Marketing was devoted to women's issues, and "women-worthies" were recognized -- women market researchers such as Pauline Arnold and Herta Herzog and women in advertising such as Rena Bartos, Mary Wells, and Lois Wyse (See Waller-Zuckerman 1989). Nonetheless, marketing curricula compartmentalized women's research by associating it with women's issues (much as Jane Austen was acknowledged as a proponent of the domestic novel) and situated women consumers as objects of marketing efforts. The dominant conventional marketing paradigms did not empower female or minority views, and in many basic marketing courses -- principles of marketing, channels of distribution, pricing -- women still went largely unnoticed.

As of 1985, women's studies knowledge was barely integrated into the marketing curriculum, for a 1985 work called Integrating Women's Studies into the Curriculum: A Guide and Bibliography (Schmitz) has no references for marketing at all. Since that time, some marketing educators have developed gender and consumer behavior courses co-sponsored with other departments (Janeen Costa at University of Utah, Barbara Stern at Rutgers), but at present there has been no systematic way to share this knowledge or to build on it. Further, a critical mass of feminist research has only just entered the consumer research stream -- March of 1993 -- when three articles appeared in the same issue of the Journal of Consumer Research. To date, there have been no feminist articles in the Journal of Marketing or the Journal of Marketing Research. At this point, then, it seems fair to conclude that profound changes in the marketing curriculum have not yet taken place, and to turn to ways that such changes can begin.

Integration versus Autonomy: Including Women
The practical issue of how to change the curriculum so that it incorporates women's point of view is controversial, for two competing models present different change mechanisms (Bowles and Klein 1989). The first is the integrative approach - - adding a module of women's issues to standard marketing courses in order to integrate gender issues into extant material. This approach was supported on the Newark Campus of Rutgers University by a three-year (1988-1992) Department of Higher Education grant for a project titled, "Integrating Gender, Race, and Ethnicity into the Curriculum." The aim of the project was to revise the undergraduate curriculum to incorporate recent scholarship on gender, race, and class in all disciplines. Three types of activities were undertaken: first, the creation of discipline-specific annotated bibliographies to assist faculty members in course revision and development; second, sponsorship of seminars, workshops, and discussion groups to address general issues of integration and specific issues within the various disciplines; and third, facilitation of the design of new courses. My role in the project was to supply an annotated marketing bibliography, which became part of a larger bibliography of women's issues made available to any faculty member who wanted to include material on women in his or her course.

The creation of bibliographies for disciplines such as marketing, anthropology, and history was completed by the end of the first year, and curriculum revision was undertaken in many departments (English, History, and Sociology/Anthropology). However, as of 1993, notwithstanding the fact that the Rutgers project generated sophisticated bibliographies in some business disciplines, the business faculty did not use them to revise existing courses. The marketing bibliography has not been used by any faculty member other than myself, and no curriculum revision that incorporates issues of gender, race, and class has ensued. Thus, even though I had been enthusiastic about the general goal of curriculum revision by means of the integrative route, my optimism diminished when no implementation occurred. The reality of the situation is that unless administrative pressure and/or faculty self-motivation is strong, design of an equitable curriculum becomes stalled. In retrospect, I reluctantly conclude that radical integrative curriculum change is not likely to emerge as the outcome of "pull"strategy.

In consequence, I decided to adopt "push"strategy by taking the autonomous course route. Recall that the third component of the Rutgers project
was stimulation of the design of new courses to enable students to study new research on gender. In 1993, this pedagogical goal was reiterated when the newly-established Rutgers Teaching Excellence Center was formed to encourage teaching improvement by means of enhancement, extension, or change in current teaching programs and practices. Awards in terms of financial support and released time were given for course development, and the relationship of the aims of the Center coalesced with my interest in enhancing the marketing curriculum by including gender issues. The time was ripe to propose a free-standing course called "Feminist Issues and Marketing," which was successful in receiving a Teaching Excellence Center award. The award was granted for the design of an interdisciplinary undergraduate course to be co-sponsored by the marketing and women's studies departments. The course will include feminism across marketing topics, and prerequisites will be negotiated between the sponsoring departments.

Thus, pragmatism ultimately dictated my decision to develop an autonomous course as opposed to expending further energy on trying to facilitate the inclusion of feminist modules into existing marketing courses. The political map was such that an autonomous course represented a more easily achievable direction as well a pedagogically viable one. From the pedagogical perspective, development of a feminist-oriented marketing course is theoretically sound, for there is a sufficient body of theory in other fields to use as a foundation. Perhaps the most important guideline is a body of cardinal tenets for courses including women's experience that has been developed in other disciplines (Schuster and Van Dyne 1985):

-- use of gender as a category of analysis

-- presentation of gender issues in a context regarded as historically and socially constructed, not as immutable or fixed

-- development of an interdisciplinary perspective to contrast the language of discourse and assumptions in marketing with those of other fields

-- reorganization of knowledge by incorporating analysis of race, class, and culture along with gender

-- study of intersections of race, class, and cultural differences within gender

-- pluralistic examination of women's issues in marketing on their own terms, not as non-normative departures from the Western point of view

-- emphasis on testing paradigms rather than merely adding women's issues

-- empowerment of student experiences and learning as part of the explicit course content (student diaries, etc)

-- recognition that culture reproduces itself in the classroom, and avoidance of sexist comments and language

-- respect for all students and equitable treatment for diverse groups

"Feminist Issues and Marketing": A Course in Progress

The mission of this course is to introduce feminist issues into undergraduate marketing education in an effort to enable women students to see themselves in the marketing system in roles other than consumers. The course title reflects the need to emphasize marketing as the target discipline, and to position "feminist issues" as a general source domain in order to avoid misperceptions conjured up by terms such as "women's studies" (often interpreted as a focus on women only) or "gender studies" (often interpreted as a focus on androgyny in opposition to biological sex). The preliminary syllabus has been influenced by feedback from marketing educators who heard the proposal at the Winter Marketing Educators' Conference in Newport Beach, February, 1993. It reflects the responses of colleagues who generously shared their ideas, and is especially indebted to Caroline Henderson (Letter, March 2, 1993), who provided a structural outline and to Janeen Costa, who provided a full course syllabus. My course syllabus is still evolving, for a second iteration is planned to take advantage of input from the participants at the Second Gender and Consumer Behavior Conference. In this way, the continuation of an ongoing dialogue can contribute to the eradication of gender bias in the classroom and the achievement of full equity for all, no matter the sex, race, class, religious or ethnic background, or sexual orientation.
"Feminist Issues and Marketing: Preliminary Syllabus

I - Feminist theory and the marketing system

A: Introduction to terminology -- sex, gender, sex-role, gender role
B: Introduction to feminist theory -- language, ideas, concepts -- theories of power, domination, men's and women's "place"
C: Influence of androcentric language used in marketing

II - Managerial issues: The marketing mix

A: Attitudes toward women in relation to product development
B: Retail environments and the feminine perspective
C: "Relationship" marketing and services
D: Sales management and women in the sales force
E: Successful women marketing/advertising practitioners - influence on the marketing mix

III - Advertising and the portrayal of women

A: Cultural stereotypes -- men's and women's roles
B: History of depiction of women in advertising
C: Current status of depiction of women in advertising
D: Sexism in advertising
E: Role of women in advertising

IV - Consumer Behavior

A: Role of consumption in American society
B: Women as consumers
C: Dark side of consumption -- prostitution, addiction
D: Moral issues in consumption -- sale of body parts, surrogacy, adoption

V - Feminism and Marketing Research

A: State of feminist research in marketing - philosophy of science
B: Stereotyping in marketing texts

VI - Personal and Professional Career Issues

A: Career issues for women in traditional/non-traditional careers (marketing, law, medicine vs. nursing, social work)
B: Attitudes of managers towards female consumers
C: Women marketers in the workforce -- equity, work patterns, lifestyle

REFERENCES

Academe, (1992), 78 (July-August), 41-42.


