The field of Communication Studies has traditionally dismissed the gender question as trivial, or incorporated it through a view of the 'sexless audience.' The integration of feminist questions remains for many a non-issue in media studies. Unfortunately, this is true for both the more traditional sectors of our scholastic community and for those committed to teaching communication within a critical perspective. It is interesting, for example, that a recent issue of *Media, Culture and Society*, devoted to the subject "Critical Communications Research in North America," does not include one piece on the gender issue and its place within a critical perspective. The special issue of the Journal of Communication entitled, "Ferment In The Field," was comprised of thirty-five original essays which the editors argued were 'representative' of the 'critical issues' and 'research tasks' facing our discipline today. Again, the gender issues does not appear on the agenda. If the question of social and economic power is central to any critical perspective, and I would argue that it is, then the failure of such work to come to terms with sex-based power differentials and their role in cultural production and reproduction is symptomatic of serious flaws in our theoretical traditions.

My intention in this article is not, however, to demonstrate how the gender issue can and should be made a key element of mainstream communication curriculum although I consider this task a crucial step in the development of a critical tradition in communication theory. Rather, I intend to demonstrate how a critical perspective can inform the construction of a course in media studies centered around the gender issue.

**CRITICAL TEACHING**

A beginning point in this exercise is to clarify one's objective in teaching a critical perspective. What can one hope to contribute in providing a critical frame of reference to the students? Perhaps the best we can do is to enable them to make sense of their own experience. In the words of C. W. Mills:
What they need, and what they feel they need, is a quality of mind that will help them to use information and to develop reason in order to achieve lucid summations of what is going on in the world and of what may be happening within themselves (1959, 5).

These words have particular significance when applied to the subject of media and gender. Most students, and indeed most consumers of popular culture, have a loosely-defined understanding of 'sexism' in the media. When asked to articulate that understanding, the common response runs the gamut from "busty blondes in skimpy outfits who are always rescued by handsome male heroes" to "fat women with their heads in their ovens"! Underlying assumptions about the sources of media sexism, the mechanisms by which it is re-created and transmitted, the cultural context in which gender is constructed or even the contradictory levels of meaning regarding femininity, are seldom questioned. Therefore one of the major tasks in a course of this type is to teach students how to ask these questions. To do so requires providing a critical frame of reference which links questions of power with questions of communication. As a broad definition of a critical perspective, Robert White's is a useful beginning point.

The point of departure is the recognition that social relations are radically though variably inegalitarian. This leads to a focus on the relations between the unequal distribution of control over systems of communications and the wider pattern of inequality in the distribution of wealth and power...

Secondly, research must explore and unmask how communication systems maintain, reproduce and continually legitimate the prevailing structure of advantage and inequality as natural and inevitable.

Thirdly, research must consider the sources of social dissent and political struggle and how communication systems contribute to the dialectical relations between challenge and incorporation of disadvantaged groups within the established order (Smythe, 1983, 211).

A feminist critical perspective would further attempt to situate the analysis in the context of patriarchal economic and social relations. In other words, what is the interrelationship of capitalism and patriarchy in the area of cultural production and reproduction? The feminist "answer" to this question is in no sense monolithic, just as feminist theory in general does not lend itself to unitary analysis. Therefore the first 'unit' in this course addresses the divisions within what is popularly called feminism, and attempts to trace the articulation of these divisions within feminist analyses of mass media.
THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

It is perhaps not surprising that much of the work that has dominated the "media and women" area has been theoretically and methodologically aligned with the dominant paradigm of North American social science. The consequence of that alignment needs to be examined.

Two issues have been central to our research on the role mass media play in the gender issue. The first, what may be broadly called the content issue, has reflected a concern with the image or representation of women within the cultural products of mass media, i.e., woman as object. The second, the control issue, has focussed on questions of access to and participation in the media, i.e., woman as subject. The various manners in which these issues have been contextualized in theory and operationalized in research raises significant questions about the efficacy of our analysis.

The liberal feminist problematic has predominated the scholarly work in this area. The explanatory thrust of liberal feminist theory in general focuses on ideological factors in the culture of a society, factors which serve to exclude and subordinate women. Their key analytical concept, patriarchy, defines a power system in which male privilege is maintained through sexist ideas and attitudes. Liberal feminists do not deny the existence of material factors in discrimination. Rather they argue that patriarchal ideas give rise to other practices of exclusion. The problem, then, becomes one of removing the cultural attitudes that block women and attacking the socialization practices which perpetuate these attitudes. It is a problem classic to meritocratic analyses; one does not raise structural questions about the system, one attempts to ensure equal competition for the unequal rewards.

This has important implications for how the media/gender debate has been framed. On the one hand it has led to an attempt to "catalogue" the range and extent of patriarchal images of women in media content. On the other hand, it has located the origin of these images in the male-controlled hierarchies of media organizations. The strategy has been firmly wedded to traditional content analysis. We are thus presented with study upon study which attempts to quantify the exclusion of women in popular culture, the frequency of women in limited roles, the association of women with glamour and/or motherhood, etc. These studies are not useless. They do serve a purpose in illustrating the various components of patriarchal imagery. The problem lies in the limited use of content analysis itself. As a methodology which tabulates the visible image and the manifest meaning within content, it does not allow the investigation of different levels of meaning. As Burgenin (1972) has argued, the focus on discrete meaning symbols (i.e., age, occupation, appearance, etc.) does not tell us anything regarding the overall fit among these various symbols in the overall text. Furthermore, it does not facilitate the examination of contradictory levels of meaning, e.g. how are we to 'read' the presence of a
female physician in an ad selling hair coloring? Finally, as Janus (1977) notes, it predetermines our research categories as "Male vs. Female."

All males are counted together as a general category and contrasted with an all-female category, with no reference made to the class, race or cultural divisions within each of these categories. Instead the subjects are distinguished on the basis of visible personal traits (marital status, age, physical appearance and so forth). Consequently the questions are ahistorical, apolitical, and in no way indicate how the images of women or men are related to the fundamental structures of society (Janus, 1977, 21).

The endpoint of such analyses is usually a demand for an increase in the presence of women in those media categories from which they have been traditionally excluded, e.g., ranging from more female news anchors to more heroines in T.V. cartoons. Thus an increase in female detective/police programs would be scored as progress on the liberal feminist tally sheet, even though the representation of the female characteristics may be firmly rooted in a traditional construction of femininity and sexuality. A similar point could be made regarding the new 'liberated woman' stereotype which is being widely propagated in everything from situation comedies to soap commercials. The common theme, that of individual liberation through self-improvement, only serves to divert attention from structural power and reconstitute patriarchy (see Baehr, 1980; Jaddou and Williams, 1981).

Content analysis strategy has been, for the most part, linked to investigations of access. In other words, in order to demonstrate why patriarchal ideas are produced and reproduced in popular culture, one must look at its producers. We therefore have available to us a decade's worth of statistics compiling evidence on the exclusion, marginalization, and peripheralization of women as creative agents in media production. Again, such evidence is not useless, rather the manner in which it is used is at issue. When evidence on the under representation of women in media production is combined with content analyses on the under representation and 'distortion' of women in media culture, the message is clear. The source, (and, hence, solution) of media sexism lies in the attitudes, predispositions and biases of those who produce the images. In noting this argument in a 1979 UNESCO study, Jaddou and Williams correctly point out:

Thus the structures of media organizations escape scrutiny, the nature of ideology is not even considered, and the cause is laid at the feet of the psychological make up of the producers who are free to operate with total autonomy. It results from a qualitative process-individual decision-making, for which a quantitative process, the increased participation of women in the media, is put forward as the necessary and sole solution (1981, 106).
Thus the liberal feminist objectives of balance, fair access and equal participation become the touchstone on which the gender issue ultimately rests. The circularity of their argument is complete: content and control have been unmasked as patriarchal, and media sexism has been 'explained.' Male control of media production leads to the exclusion and distortion of women in content. Patriarchal ideas contained in cultural content legitimate and perpetuate the continued exclusion from control!

In order to challenge this dominant frame, students in a media and gender course need to be exposed to alternative modes of conceptualizing the problem. One such alternative can be found in the recent alignment of radical feminist work with structuralist semiotics. The nature of that alignment and its implications for strategic interventions in cultural production need to be addressed in any theoretical discussion of the media/gender issue.

As with liberal feminism, the central focus of radical feminism has been with the ideological factors in culture which justify subordination. They share a view of patriarchy as a sex-based power system which consistently reproduces the social subordination of women. The split between the two approaches stems from several sources but the most significant concerns the nature of a strategy of intervention.

The liberal meritocratic assumptions underlying liberal feminist work are rejected by radical feminists who argue that patriarchy is rooted in psychic structures which "seize" the individual at birth (Firestone, 1970). The foundations of that psychic structure are thus not various socioeconomic practices which might exclude women from equal opportunity. The 're-discovery' and appropriation of psychoanalytic theory by feminist scholars (Mitchell, 1974) has served to reorient radical feminist work to a focus on the origins of consciousness. Essentially, the argument is made that patriarchy has its roots in the transcendental forces that drive the unconscious psyche.

In attempting to then deal with the cultural subordination of women, radical feminists have recently turned to Barthes' work (1972) on signification and meaning, Althusser's (1966) philosophy of the relative autonomy of ideology, and Lacan's psychoanalytic model (1968) in which domination is posed as an essential feature of systems of signification. The upshot is a radical feminist analysis which attempts to locate the representation of gender within the context of a patriarchal discourse. The objective, therefore, becomes the "unveiling" of the ideology of femininity in terms of the signification process by which it is reconstructed and reproduced. As a result, the research strategy focuses on the production of meaning and the process in which patriarchy is embedded in cultural production. It is perhaps not surprising, then, that the political agenda for intervention is largely reduced to a question of aesthetics; i.e., how does one 'smash' the dominant, patriarchal structures of signification and replace them
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feminist aesthetics? The problem of identifying feminist cultural interventions is not a simple one. Rather it raises a multiplicity of issues regarding the author, the cultural text itself, and the audience. Most significantly, it concerns the task of identifying the relation between feminine and feminist in cultural practice. On this point A. Kuhn argues:

...that dominant modes of representation constitute forms of subjectivity -- the subject fixed by closure, for example -- characteristic of a masculinist or patriarchal culture, and that to write "in the feminine" is in itself to challenge the ideological constitution of dominant modes of representation. It is in this respect that such a cultural practice may be considered feminist (1982, 18).

This argument illustrates precisely the problem in radical feminism's alignment with structuralist semiotics. Ideology is divorced from material structures and feminist practice has little relation to socioeconomic processes of subordination. The aesthetic structures of a patriarchal discourse are uprooted from any sense of historical specificity or institutional location. Rather, we are treated to an ahistorical, static conception of ideology as necessarily patriarchal in every instance, and a transformation of feminism into "acts of individual aesthetic terrorism" (Jaddou and Williams, 1981, 116). This approach denies the possibility of contradiction in the patriarchal construction of femininity as ideology and ignores the historical specificity of women's role. This is, again, not surprising in an analysis that decries all social formations and all signification systems as patriarchal. Nevertheless, the utility of such an analysis, epistemologically or politically, is limited.

Theoretical alternatives to liberal feminist and radical feminist analyses of the media/gender issue do not abound in the literature, unless one wishes to return to the tried-and-true grounds of conservatism, and many do! Janus (1977) argues that what is needed is a recognition of the two "facets" to mass media: one the one hand, they constitute an industrial structure within an advanced capitalist economy, and, on the other hand, they constitute an ideological structure in the process of cultural practice. What we need to do is situate these facets in the overlapping issue of patriarchal social relations. The theoretical grounds for accomplishing this lies in the articulation of a socialist feminist position.

Socialist feminist analysis (or feminist materialism) engages two crucial questions:

1) the relationship of patriarchal relations to historical modes of production; and

2) the relationship of the organization of the household to the organization of production.
Essentially their position involves:

...[a] conceptualization of history as the site of the transformation of the social relations of production and reproduction. As far as an analysis of the position of women is concerned, (feminist) materialism would locate that position in terms of the relations of production and reproduction at various moments in history (Kuhn and Wolpe, 1978, 7).

Their links with other feminist analyses lie in the recognition of patriarchal ideology as a factor in the reproduction of inequality. However, they reject the ahistorical primacy this concept occupies in feminist theory. The analytical links with Marxism are found in the focus on the material base of sex inequality and on the historical variability of status. Their point of departure from both feminist and Marxist analyses of sex inequality lies in their reconceptualization of patriarchy as a set of historically-situated relations of sex subordination within the overall organization of production and symbolic structures. Patriarchy, therefore, has both a material face (expressed in the sex division of labour) and an ideological face (expressed in the social construction of gender). As a force in history, patriarchy interacts with other sets of relationships within varying modes of production for example, patriarchy interacts with class relations in a capitalist mode of production.

Socialist Feminist research in the area of cultural production focuses on the interrelationship of ideology and changing material factors. Ryan (1977), for example, notes the emergence of a prototypical 'feminine mystique' which prepared women for a particular relationship to production during the early stages of American capitalism. In an examination of the U.S. clerical work force in the early twentieth century, Davies (1979) found a distinct shift in the ideological assumptions and prescriptions regarding the position of women in the office work. Whereas in the late nineteenth century, office work was considered the preserve of a male labour force, the expansion of business firms and their office structures engendered an increased demand for educated women workers to fill the low status, dead-end positions. In her examination of the Ladies Homes Journal, Davies found a shift between 1900, when women were advised of the physical strains of office work on their 'delicate' nature, and 1916, when it was argued that female 'nature' was well-suited to this type of employment (1979, 258). This shifting cultural image of women is reflected in other periods as well, and socialist feminist research has attempted to document the construction and reconstruction of femininity historically. In so doing, it can be usefully aligned with two streams in critical communication work -- political economic analyses and cultural studies. The former directs our attention to the investigation of the structures of control in media production, the latter directs our attention to the content of cultural production and the process of cultural reading. Thus the remarriage of socialist feminism and critical communication
analyses permits us to ask questions which address both the place of women within the process of media production and the representation of women in cultural practice. In both sets of questions, however, the historical specificity of social and cultural production is central to our analysis.

The above discussion of theoretical underpinnings has been, of necessity, lengthy. A course on the media/gender issue encompasses both communication theories and feminist theories. While the instructor may reasonably assume some familiarity with the communication literature on the part of advanced undergraduate Mass Communication students, one is likely to find no understanding of feminist theoretical positions. My argument is that the historical/empirical research on this question needs to be contextualized by first providing a frame of reference with establishes the 'feminist terrain' and indicates its alignment with communication research. I will now turn to a brief discussion of how these theoretical issues can be linked with the available historical/empirical material.

**SUBSTANTIVE CONCERNS**

The primary purpose in the first unit of a course on media and gender should be, as I argued above, to familiarize the students with a sense of the theoretical positions which inform the questions addressed. It is then necessary to link the issues raised in the theoretical analysis to the kinds of available substantive research. In so doing it is important to both provide a wide range of historical and empirical research, and to interrogate the underlying theoretical assumptions contained within the research. It is also important to clearly establish the major questions which dominate the various debates in the research literature. This can and should be more than a taxonomy of research issues. Rather, this articulation of the major questions should provide the infrastructure for establishing the links between research in various 'specialities.' In other words, can one uncover a common set of concerns in research on pornography and research on advertising, a commonality which reflects roots in a liberal feminist position? The objective in this exercise is two-faceted. On the one hand, I think it is essential that students be able to link their understanding and critique of theoretical positions to their 'reading' of research. This is a skill which they gradually develop as the course evolves and as they are exposed to a range of research material in each issue-area. On the other hand, the consistent reference back to underlying theoretical assumptions is an important exercise in elucidating and extending theoretical analysis. One is able to examine, for example, the internal consistency of liberal feminist work on the mass media.

In order to organize the substantive concerns, I begin with the framework suggested in the preceding section: investigations of the control issue and investigations of the content issue. Following these two larger course units, I select two specific sub-areas where an
attempt is made to link the questions of control to the questions of representation. A very brief discussion of the manner in which this is accomplished and the specific objectives which guide the presentation of the material follows.

(I) STRUCTURES OF CONTROL

The essential objective in this section of the course is to examine the literature on 'gender access' to positions of control in the mass media and consider the implications of this research from a variety of contending perspectives. The endpoint is the articulation of a political economy of position for women in relation to mass media industries. This is done in two ways: by looking at the data on ownership structures and by looking at the data on the nature of female participation as workers in the mass media. In both areas the data are examined for overall patterns and for sectoral trends. The available research on these questions is both national and international in scope, and historical as well as contemporary in focus. The question of ownership involves issues such as direct control of media enterprises as well as managerial control. In the consideration of the participation question, students examine data on overall media participation rates and data on the context of that participation (for example, data on sectoral differences, permanence of employment, skill level, degree of control over work, monetary rewards, level of unionization, etc.).

The compilation and assimilation of these data sets is an important stage in conceptualizing the control issue for students. But it needs to be carried out in tandem with another exercise, i.e., comparing the patterns uncovered in media ownership and participation with (i) overall socioeconomic research on women and with (ii) political economic investigations of structural change in media industries. It is imperative that students realize one cannot treat the question of power and gender in the media in abstraction from overall social and economic structures.

The consistency of the data demonstrates the clear presence of a sex division of labour which both allocates women to particular positions in a hierarchy of control and excludes them from others. Allocation and exclusion point to the existence of a female ghetto of labour characterized by marginalization and peripheralization. The politics of exclusion is illustrated in the institutionalized restriction of access to positions of control.

The final stage in the unit on control examines how contending explanations and policy concerns can be linked to the historical/empirical research. Essentially we look at three arguments concerning the sex division of labour -- social barriers, male domination, and political-economic factors -- and isolate the strategic policy concerns emerging from each position. The third position, which addresses the structural causes underlying sex subordination in media ownership and
participation, is argued to be the most satisfactory analysis of the patterns uncovered and is, therefore, more comprehensive as a form of political intervention.

(II) CONTENT

The central objective in this unit of the course is to examine a range of published research on the subject of media content and gender with a view to establishing a critical perspective on that research. In order to do this we clarify the kinds of questions that are posed, examine the theoretical and methodological positions from which these questions are derived and critique the efficacy of these analyses. The organizational strategy I use is to compare traditional content analyses on the image of gender in the mass media with cultural studies analyses on the representation of gender. The image vs. representation approach is obviously more than a question of semantics, rather it reflects fundamental distinctions between the two approaches. Whereas quantitative content analysis measures discrete symbolic units, i.e., images of women, which are fixed in time and place, cultural studies research, which incorporates semiotic and social analysis, links the multiplicity of symbolic units in any cultural text to examine both the process in which meanings are encoded and the sociocultural context in which meanings are decoded. In so doing, cultural analysis goes beyond a role or image reading of media content to an ideological reading, i.e., dominant meaning systems are seen to be linked to actual material relationships.

This allows us to investigate the nature of ideological transformation in cultural practice in terms of gender. We can consider, for example, what ideas of early feminist oppositional movements have been incorporated into dominant cultural codes, e.g. the 'working mother' stereotype, the material conditions under which this occurred, e.g. an expansion of capital's need for cheap, educated labour, and the nature of oppositional ideas not incorporated, e.g. the lesbian mother. The central thematic focus to our analysis is the interrelationship between social structure and the form and content of media messages.

The research in the empirical tradition of content analysis is presented by establishing a taxonomy of concerns. I list a number of issues which seem to be central, i.e., frequency of appearance, personality characteristics, physical features, occupational distribution, marital and parental status, portrayal of feminist issues, etc., and the students examine a wide range of studies on different media sectors -- formats in terms of these concerns. The outcome of this inquiry is a recognition of the limited usefulness of this research. Certainly it establishes that the roles/images of women are different than those of men. Beyond that, however, discussion usually gets bogged down in the old 'reflection/distortion' debate and in the attempts to prove that the mass media do one or the other in terms of women's social position while ignoring that both are usually present to some degree.
(III) LINKING CONTROL AND CONTENT

In the above discussion and in the course itself, I separate political-economic questions about control from ideological questions about content for analytical purposes only. It is therefore important to illustrate to the student how one can and should integrate these two sets of questions. The manner in which one chooses to do this can vary. I have found it useful to examine two specific sub-areas -- advertising and pornography. The objective is to demonstrate how one cannot divorce the cultural product from the larger process of cultural production.

In the unit on advertising and gender we first examine the structure of advertising as an industry in relation to woman's role as a consumer. This necessitates an historical inquiry into the emergence of the so-called 'consumer society' and the changing position of women. The profile that develops is of a particularistic economic relation of women to advertising that reflects both the domestic responsibilities of women as housewives and the increased entry of women into social production. At the same time it facilitates a recognition of the advertisement as a commodity in and of itself which plays a part in the cycle of production and consumption, and which is subject to particular economic determinations of the market.

The next stage is to examine the construction of gender in advertisements and link it to the ideology of femininity which is represented. For example, we might ask how a commodity like oven cleaner is marketed as opposed to perfume, and how are the respective ads mediated by an ideology of femininity? Are different discourses created which reflect different constructions of femininity, i.e., woman as caretaker of domestic tasks versus woman as sultry seductress? What are the different structuring elements in each case and what are the inferred meanings?

Finally, the objective of this unit is to see advertising as a text which is mediated by: 1) the particular role of advertising as an industry plays in the cycle of production and consumption, 2) the particular socioeconomic role played by women as consumers, and 3) patriarchal ideologies on the nature of femininity.

The unit on pornography adopts a similar mode of inquiry. It is first necessary, however, to present and critique the classic liberal position, wherein pornography is seen as a medium for sexual expression and excesses are related to the social repression of sexuality. The alternative is generally posed by radical feminists who see power relations, not sex, manifested and argue that pornography is a mechanism for maintaining the subordination of women. This position is closely aligned with the attempt to document a climate of violence against women as well as experimental evidence of behavioural effects on male readers. While it may be useful to see pornography as a metaphor for patriarchal society, it is problematic to argue that a
decrease in pornography will lead to a decrease in violence against women. This ignores the location of pornography as an industry and as a cultural practice within a set of other socioeconomic relations. In this course unit, then, we attempt to shift the focus to pornography as an industry with specific features in its conditions of production and consumption, and pornography as a set of cultural practices in which various sexualities are constructed and represented. We examine in a historical context the growth, concentration and diversification of the industry and consider the role of women as participants and/or consumers in that process. We then look at analyses regarding multiple readings' of sexuality and how pornography operates on different levels such as class and age (see, for example, Stern, 1982; Barrowclough, 1982). As with advertising, the objective is to see the pornographic text in terms of the various relationships which mediate its construction.

CONCLUSION

There are obviously additional substantive concerns linked to the media/gender issue. If there is sufficient time a brief exposure to some of the literature on language and gender is a valuable learning experience. This research illustrates the difference between an empirically-oriented tradition of documenting sex differences in language use, and a sociocultural analysis of a language of subordination which reflects a hierarchy of power, not sex, relations. Then again, a unit on regulatory issues is useful to illustrate the context in which the Canadian state frames the question and the failure of its content-oriented solutions.

The opportunity to address these and equally significant concerns often depends, unfortunately, on the simple question of whether the course option is seen to merit a half or full credit. One way to integrate these and other issues is through the establishment of student research groups in the course. I have found them excellent to get students to apply the critical skills this course seeks to develop to specific areas of inquiry. Whether it is an analysis of the link between violence and female sexuality in music videos or an examination of the transformation of gender construction in Chatelaine, the value of this exercise for students is the opportunity it provides to 'think is a critical mode' about their own experience viz-a-viz media culture.

The preceding discussion has addressed the issue of how to teach media and gender from a critical perspective, and one could write an entire article on the subject of how to get this offered as a course in the first place. In a field in which women are often invisible, the politics of pedagogy cannot be taken too lightly. There is the additional question of whether courses such as this are the optimal strategy for interjecting a feminist perspective into the mainstream of communication theory and research. Certainly this problem is not unique to our field. The ghettoization of women's studies courses throughout the social sciences has isolated these issues outside of
mainstream concerns. The long term viability of an educational strategy that restricts integration to ad hoc course options is questionable. The critical question is to what extent the gender issue has penetrated the traditional bastions of core curriculum? The evidence so far is not encouraging, and until such time that our core theory and methodology courses take account of these issues it remains strategically necessary to expand the ghetto.
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