An Empty Room of One’s Own
A Critical Look at the Women’s Studies Programs of North Carolina’s Publicly Funded Universities

By Melana Zyla Vickers

Summary: Programs in “Women’s Studies” have been established at many American colleges and universities, including several UNC-system campuses. An analysis of the programs at five of those universities — East Carolina, N.C. State, UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Charlotte and UNC-Greensboro — reveals that interest in them is weak and declining among students, that the course readings are strongly biased and often unscholarly in their treatment of differing points of view and counter-arguments, and that Women’s Studies programs attract almost no outside support from interested parties. Therefore, Women’s Studies programs fail to achieve academically worthwhile objectives while imposing a cost burden upon university budgets.

Introduction

For several decades, women’s studies programs have found comfortable sinecures at publicly funded universities of North Carolina including UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Charlotte, UNC-Greensboro, NC State and East Carolina University. Heralded by feminists as the symbols of women’s equality in academe, the programs were set up to offer majors and minors in women’s studies, advance scholarship in the field, host their own special events, and design and teach their own classes. Women’s studies programs also had their own administrators, faculty, and office space. In their way of thinking, feminists had secured in the ivory tower, what Virginia Woolf described as “A Room of One’s Own.”

Yet at a time when more than half the undergraduate population at North Carolina’s publicly funded universities is female, women’s studies programs are flailing. More precisely, they never took off. Their sickly state can be measured in a variety of ways, ranging from the fact that these programs have sought and attracted very little independent funding and are on life-support from taxpayer-backed university operations budgets, to the intellectually biased and repetitive material presented in their courses, to the negligible and ever-declining number of students interested in actually majoring or minoring in women’s studies. In particular because of the tiny group of students they have served, the women’s studies programs might best be described as “An Empty Room of One’s Own.”
Methodology

Given that these programs are unpopular with women students, intellectually brittle, and a drain on the universities’ taxpayer-funded budgets, it’s high time to ask whether they are meeting the broader teaching and research goals of the state’s public universities. To help answer this question, this study proposes to examine closely the women’s studies programs at the five campuses. The study will use three tests:

- Do students want them?
- Do the programs’ faculty members teach meritorious, rigorous academic material, as measured by mainstream academic standards?
- Are the programs dependent on taxpayer money?

Requests for information for this report were put to staff at each of the five programs studied here, and all five cooperated on providing the academic material. They were less forthcoming with their financial data, though ultimately four of the five programs did provide some information. Additional information was obtained from university websites and other open sources.

Do Students Want Women’s Studies?

Across the state’s publicly funded universities, Women’s Studies programs are for the most part either stagnant or shrinking. Not one of the five schools, whose undergraduate populations range from 11,000 to 23,000, has an undergraduate Women’s Studies program that attracts more than 12 students who ever declare a first major, or graduate with a first major, in the field. The Women’s Studies programs are consistently among the smallest at the universities.

**UNC-Chapel Hill**

As the undergrad population at UNC-Chapel Hill grows, the popularity of Women’s Studies at UNC-Chapel Hill appears to be declining. UNC-Chapel Hill had 15,089 undergraduates in 2003, according to data on its website. That same year, merely four students graduated with a first major in Women’s Studies. In 1998, when the undergraduate student body was 14,374, seven undergrads earned a BA in Women’s Studies.

It’s worth noting that the field of Women’s Studies at UNC-Chapel Hill, as at the other campuses in the state, attracts women almost exclusively. It has graduated only three men in 10 years.

**UNC-Greensboro**

This campus had 10,751 undergraduates in the year ending spring 2003. It attracted only 12 students interested in a Women’s Studies major. The number of students who actually graduate with that major may be smaller, but those data weren’t readily available.

### Women’s Studies Programs Are Not Popular with Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University (Year of data)*</th>
<th>Total Undergraduate Population</th>
<th>Women’s Studies Program Students/Graduates*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina (2003)</td>
<td>16,225</td>
<td>1 graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State (2004)</td>
<td>22,971</td>
<td>9 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Chapel Hill (2003)</td>
<td>15,089</td>
<td>4 graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Charlotte (2003)</td>
<td>15,572</td>
<td>17 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC-Greensboro (2003)</td>
<td>10,757</td>
<td>12 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chart uses slightly different data for each campus because equivalent data not available.
UNC-Greensboro’s program has been in decline since the early 1990s. Where it attracted eight students declaring a Women’s Studies major in 1995 and again in 1996, it attracted none in 1997. That year, the campus had 9,741 undergraduates. The program is consistently among the smallest on campus.

**East Carolina University**
This school, which had 16,225 undergraduates in the year ending spring 2003, supports an undergrad Women’s Studies program which in the same year had only one graduate. Women’s Studies is consistently the smallest department in the whole university.

Moreover, like its counterparts elsewhere in the state, East Carolina’s Women’s Studies department is shrinking in proportion to the undergraduate population. Between 1991 and 2003, a period during which the undergrad student body grew from 13,883 to 16,225, the Women’s Studies department never graduated more than two students in a single year, and had six no-hitters: Between 1991 and 1994, as well as in 1996 and 2000, it failed to graduate a single student with a Women’s Studies major.

**UNC-Charlotte**
This campus offers only a minor in Women’s Studies — its administrators having perhaps read the writing on the wall about students’ interests lying elsewhere. Possibly because of the flexibility that a minor offers students, UNC-Charlotte is one of two campuses where Women’s Studies is on an upswing, albeit a marginal one, with 17 undergrads out of a total 15,572 listing Women’s Studies as a minor in 2003. This is up from six students out of 12,972 in 1995. The program remains among the university’s least popular, however.

**North Carolina State University**
As with its counterparts, NCSU sees only a tiny proportion of its student body interested in Women’s and Gender Studies. The major is folded into “multidisciplinary studies” at the university, and its popularity is therefore hard to isolate and measure. This study gauged popularity by breaking out how many first-year students took the introductory course required to major in Women’s and Gender Studies. In the year ending Spring 2004, when NCSU had 22,971 undergraduates, only nine students took the Introduction to Women’s Studies course. That’s up from the two students who took it in 1999, when the university had 21,684 students.

This freshman picture appears to be improving, though it’s hardly an indication of great popularity for Women’s Studies. Moreover, the picture gets worse as students advance through their schooling. The upper-level course required of all Women’s and Gender Studies students, called “Theoretical Issues in Women’s Studies,” attracted only one student in 1999, and three students in 2003. It seems that the few NCSU students who begin university with an interest in the program don’t necessarily sustain it.

**Do Women’s Studies Faculty Teach Meritorious Academic Material?**

An examination of course syllabi from the five campuses suggests that the material taught in the Women’s Studies programs is better described as polemical, doctrinaire and highly selective rather than meritorious and rigorous. The syllabus material is also highly repetitive across courses.

**UNC-Charlotte**
The school’s Women’s Studies program “seeks to provide academic leadership in addressing women’s issues,” according to its home page. The author studied three course syllabi from the program: “Women and the Media,” “Women’s Autobiographies,” and “Sociology of Women.”

The leading objective of the “Women and the Media” course is to “analyze the images of women in the contemporary media (popular culture) to determine the messages these media convey about women.” While this suggests the class will objectively or at least thoroughly assess a range of images of women and messages about women, the syllabus quickly dispels any such conclusion. After the class introduction, the students’ first task is to define the following words: “feminism, women’s studies, patriarchal, sexist, denigrating, derogatory,
marginalize, misogyny and subversive.” These words, which together form a distinctly victim-oriented, anti-male prism, then shape the rest of the syllabus.

The media issues that the course omits are manifold. The course never looks explicitly at data on the preferences of women consumers of popular media, the high proportion of woman reporters, anchors and producers on television newscasts, daytime television, the popularity of heroines and superheroines in both adult and child-focused television, the proliferation of “girl power”-style programming and writing, the popularity of women-in-distress fiction, pre-television media, or any other phenomenon whose analysis might not fit the lexicon introduced at the beginning of the term. This selectivity contrasts starkly with, say, a media studies course that would cover a range of genres or opposite genres, or a political science course that would cover a spectrum of ideologies.

A course on popular culture is by definition trite rather than scholarly, but this one takes triteness to an extreme. “Women and the Media” devotes more than half of its class time to magazine pictures, television and music videos as opposed to the printed word or even audio-visual media production. Television imagery gets the greatest single chunk of attention - seven classes - followed by music videos with six.

The course breaks from its negativity a few times, most notably to devote two classes to feminist musician and producer Ani DiFranco. Minor artist DiFranco is one of America’s most important women, according to the department, as students who study her in “Women and the Media” also learn about her in the “Autobiographies” class.

Indeed, DiFranco fits perfectly the type of woman covered in the Autobiographies course. No conservatives, no overtly religious figures, no politicians or figures from any historical period or trend besides slavery and the baby-boom feminist movement are included. There’s no discussion of women in the suffrage movement, in elected politics, in war and the military, or in business - to name just a few sidestepped slices of American life.

The only figure of significance outside the 20th century is Harriet Ann Jacobs, a North Carolina woman who wrote a popular account of her life in slavery. And the highly selective list of visual and musical artists, as well as writers, is composed of women (Ellen Glasgow, Frida Kahlo, Louise Bogan) who all fit comfortably in the anti-patriarchy, leftist school of thought to which traditional feminism so closely binds itself. Needless to say, native North Carolinian one-time presidential hopeful Senator Elizabeth Dole is not among the worthies.

The saving grace is that at least the course outline for Autobiographies doesn’t actually claim objectivity, but rather says the class will “explore select ... voices of various American women.” Whether the inclusion of the Mexican painter Kahlo on the course’s list of “American women” is a joke or a paternalistic, chauvinistic slight goes unexplained.

The material covered in the Autobiographies course shares the Media course’s triteness. A third of the autobiographies are not written but rather “visual,” and student assignments are for “visual autobiographies” as well.

The third course, “Sociology of Women,” appears somewhat more substantive, advertising itself as writing-intensive and covering the waterfront of sociological milieu including the period of “nurture,” education, media, religion, the workplace and family.

But the leftward ideological leaning remains. This bias begins with the required text for the class, a popular Women’s Studies textbook called Thinking About Women, which is discussed at greater length later in this paper.

The course also has other standard feminist biases. For example, the syllabus first introduces questions of whether gender is a function of nature vs. nurture as “debates among scholars.” But by week three of the class, the syllabus asserts that “social construction and social structure are better explanations for gender” than is the fact that one is born male or female.
Later in the term, the class on women and religion focuses on “fundamentalist beliefs about women” as opposed to, say, the importance of faith to women, representations of women in religious texts, or the high numbers of women choosing religious ministry as an occupation.

A class on work, meanwhile, focuses on the glass ceiling and economically discredited arguments about pay inequity. The outline on a class on sexuality begins with the self-consciously ginger assertion that “many people believe that proper behavior for women includes heterosexuality” and ends with “why is sexuality so closely identified with gender?” Finally, a session on politics doesn’t focus at all on women governors, cabinet members, or heads of state, but rather turns quickly to the lack of representation for women in some nations and a discussion of quotas. “These gender gaps have caused scholars to even begin to question the concept of power itself,” the syllabus says, drawing a conclusion about the marginalization of women in politics without looking thoroughly at the subject of women in politics.

The last class of the term asks students “what are the varieties of feminist thought?” and “which have been most useful to you this semester?” With those questions, worded as they are, one sees how the course has strayed from its advertised intention to assess the “variety of frameworks” for answering “what does it mean to be a woman in today’s world” and “what problems do women face and what are people doing to try to solve the problems.” The course does not offer a variety of women or a variety of thought, only a variety of feminist thought. Yet two-thirds of American women reject the label “feminist.” Many would be more comfortable calling themselves Republicans or Democrats, Conservatives or Liberals, professionals, community activists, or stay-at-home moms. Surely, a course that purports to answer such broad questions needs to reach beyond feminism for its answers. If this syllabus is any measure, there’s very little “variety” in left-of-center feminist thought at all.

This traditional-feminist tilt appears to be encouraged or at least tolerated by the universities as a whole. Women’s Studies at UNC-Charlotte, as at the other campuses, asserts the “feminist” label right on its home page. Unlike most other programs in the arts or social sciences, women’s studies programs are free to pick this ideological bias, or “ism,” and shape all their courses around it, in a way that a political science department never could - at least not overtly. No such department could shape itself around some sort of inherent Marxism or fascism, for example.

UNC-Charlotte’s “Introduction to Women’s Studies” course, like the introductory courses at the other campuses, offers students a standard diet of selective history plus a few topics that include a focus on women’s bodies and women’s victimization through male violence and males in general. Specifically, the syllabus shows that the course provides students with several weeks of history of the women’s movement, coupled with readings from the “first wave” of feminism, generally seen to begin with the suffrage period, and “second wave” of feminism, generally starting in the late-1960s. The course doesn’t devote any attention at all to conservative or libertarian feminists of our current times, or to women’s groups that don’t wear the feminist label. The course devotes two sessions to what it calls “History of ‘Patriarchy,’” two to violence against women, and two to women’s reproductive functions and the legal system.

**UNC-Chapel Hill**

The syllabus for the required course “Introduction to Women’s Studies” at Chapel Hill identifies six seemingly reasonable goals. They range from drawing on insights into women’s identity from a wide variety of disciplines, to understanding U.S. feminist history, to understanding the diversity of U.S. women’s experience.

In practice, though, the week-by-week class outline veers away from these promised goals, devoting almost half of the year’s class time to women’s physiology and sex-related subjects. For example, one such class covers “The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm,” another delves into “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence,” and a third seeks to understand “why controlling reproductive function is crucial to the creation and perpetuation of patriarchal societies.”
As for the claim to cover the diversity of women’s experience, the Chapel Hill intro course, like those at the other colleges, limits itself to the traditional feminist world-view, which includes only racial, sexual and ethnic diversity. There is no legitimate political diversity among U.S. women, as far as the course is concerned. To wit, the course’s main history text, *The World Split Open*, makes reference to only one conservative female activist, Phyllis Schlafly, in its 344 pages, and then only to disparage Schlafly’s opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment and the pro-abortion movement. Politically conservative women are never actually mentioned in the UNC-Chapel Hill course outline.

Strangely, the intro course, like most Women’s Studies courses at the other colleges, never actually mentions the Clinton era, either. The omission is glaring, given the way the feminist movement hailed that president’s ascent to power, his policies, his feminist wife, and given the way it supported him through his impeachment, triggered though it was by behavior that showed his disrespect for his wife. It’s as though the ‘90s and ‘00s didn’t exist, despite claim of the Women’s Studies department to cover “scholarship on women that has emerged in the last two decades.” One is left wondering whether this period is just too problematic for feminist scholarship to tackle. If that’s the case, the omission shows a real lack of academic courage and rigor.

The introductory course reveals the same biases against traditional institutions that the courses at the other campuses show. For example, the course’s sole class devoted to marriage has as its primary objective “to understand why and how the family has functioned historically and continued to function as a key institution in the construction and maintenance of patriarchy.”

The sole class on motherhood, meanwhile, claims as its objectives “to understand that the term ‘mother’ is social constructed” and “to recognize and appreciate the varieties of motherhood that exist in our own society.” Yet of the eight readings for the class, covering lesbian motherhood, single-motherhood, and other topics, only one is on the dominant form of motherhood in the country: traditional mothering in a two-parent, male-female household. Even then, this last reading serves to meet the class objective of understanding “the function of the motherhood in creating and preserving patriarchal societies.” It’s not at all clear how such a focus on subgroups of the population, and a relegation of the majority of women’s experience to the fringe, meets the overall Women’s Studies objective of reflecting “the experience, perspective, concerns and needs of women for the first time.”

Another Women’s Studies course at Chapel Hill, entitled “Gender, Communication and Culture,” delves into inaccessible feminist, transsexual rhetoric from the very start. The first sentence of the course description poses these questions: “What is gender, how do we acquire it...and how do we change and/or maintain it to better serve ourselves and our communities?” A reader unschooled in feminist jargon might be forgiven for understanding these words only in terms of physical sex change.

The week-to-week class syllabus isn’t much more comprehensible. Two weeks are devoted to “theorizing gender development.” Another week covers “gendered violence” and “performativity of gender.”

The papers assigned in the course are more experimental, still. The first requires students to “violate one verbal or nonverbal prescription for your sex with both people who know you well and people who are strangers or casual acquaintances. In your paper...explain why/how what you did violated expectations for your sex.” The outline of the final assignment first argues that “meaning is never ‘solidified’ within any communication event” and then tells students to describe how they might “revise or re-read” some element of popular culture “to address the dissatisfying gendering in the original version (for example, would you “switch” the genders in Shrek, so the feminine woman was the strong protagonist and the masculine male was in need of saving? Would you disrupt the traditional straight masculinity in a movie like Lethal Weapon by “reading” it as a homosexual romance?)” These assignments are not only peculiar, they are also far from rigorous, as they seek to draw on students’ seat-of-the-pants impressions rather than on scholarship the students have studied and analyzed.

**UNC-Greensboro**

The Greensboro introductory course on “Women and Gender Studies” has the unusual distinction of being the only one among the five colleges to assign a reading from a non-feminist perspective: During a class on the
“backlash” against feminism, students are to read a single excerpt from a Catholic women’s group called Women for Faith and Family. The excerpt appears in an otherwise conventionally feminist textbook, though, and it is juxtaposed against feminist readings that are critical of its stance. The non-feminist piece is also the sole such reading in the whole course, possibly the whole program. When the intro course does touch briefly on why the majority of young women don’t identify themselves as feminists, for example, it lets a feminist writer explain the reasons rather than letting any one of the legions of non-feminist writers speak for themselves.

The rest of the intro course is fairly conventionally feminist and left of center. It covers the history of the feminist and homosexual movements, puts its economic lessons rather selectively in terms of labor-movement history, and devotes five of 19 lectures to homosexuality-related topics. It doesn’t have a single lecture devoted to, say, straight, married women with non-union jobs and children. Like the other campuses, Greensboro identifies women’s principal issues as violence against women, eating disorders, and cultural stereotypes such as the “Disney heroine.” There’s no discussion of women in mainstream politics, non-feminist women’s organizations, or white-collar jobs.

UNC-Greensboro perhaps more explicitly than the other schools sidesteps the Clinton era. A course entitled 20th Century U.S. history ends its coverage in 1990.

The program manifests another standard bias of this academic subject: obsession with the human body and sexuality. (Women’s Studies at UNC-Greensboro devotes one-fifth of its courses to the body and sex, as opposed to women’s history, sociology, literature, etc.) The outline of one class called “Human Sexuality” even advertises that “an emphasis is placed on students recognizing and expressing personal aspects of their sexuality.”

Another UNC-Greensboro course, “Introduction to Feminist Theories,” makes explicit the way in which Women’s Studies programs stick exclusively to academic feminism’s Marxist roots. The course’s leading objective is to “examine leading ideas in feminist theory” and indeed the syllabus covers only liberal, radical, cultural, Marxist/Socialist, Ecological and Phenomenological feminism before moving on to racial and ethnic breakdowns of the topic. It’s as though the more conservative or libertarian feminism of, say, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese or Camille Paglia, the conceptions of womanhood supported by such prominent activists as Phyllis Schlafly, or such popular online publications as SheThinks.org and iFeminists, didn’t exist.

North Carolina State University

At first glance, NCSU’s introductory women’s studies course appears to resist the impulse of its sister courses at other campuses to throw students into a ‘history of radicals, victimization, patriarchy, body’ vortex. Rather, the course promises to look at the “complexities of gender” and to “place contemporary issues about women and gender within a larger historical framework.”

But these promises aren’t kept. The course quickly joins the vortex. By October, the syllabus is asking students “how does family life perpetuate sexism?” and “in what ways can women’s bodies be described as ‘contested terrain?’” The first assignment requires students to write about male, white or heterosexual privilege, or about the female body, or about oppression of women. The final assignment requires students to write about lesbian relationships in history, more on the body (reproductive technology), or about homophobia, heterosexism and rape.

There are a few bright spots. The syllabus at one point poses a question that presumes a positive answer rather than a “woe is us” answer: “What economic changes do you see as most beneficial for freedom from gender and sexual oppression?” And in the section on families, the syllabus hints that families have “strengths.” But that’s not saying much.

Just like the syllabus for the intro course, the list of Women and Gender Studies course outlines at NCSU shows the tiniest bit of promise at first. Unlike the other colleges, NCSU offers a course on “Women in Music,” one on “Gender Law and Policies,” and one on “Women and Gender in Science and Technology” that promises to look at how scientific research influences “contemporary understanding of gender,” and a class on “Gender and
Politics.” Moreover, NCSU offers only one class on sexuality and none that clearly suggests it is about the female body. Whether NCSU’s courses break from the mold in practice, or whether they fall into traditional traps the way the intro course does, is not clear.

If the upper-level course “Women in Literature” is any indication, the traditional feminist academic biases remain. The course focuses on such writers as Virginia Woolf, Margaret Atwood, Toni Morrison and Leslie Marmon Silko, all charter or honorary members of the feminist left. To be sure, the course also has students read Cinderella and a passage from the Bible. But these short pieces are not among the course’s major works, and the course outline’s promise to draw its critical readings primarily from feminist literary criticism and postmodern theory suggests the class doesn’t stray far from traditional Women’s Studies fare.

**East Carolina University**

East Carolina’s “Introduction to Women’s Studies” course makes no bones about sticking to the feminist playbook. They syllabus demands only that students read *Feminism is for Everybody* by feminist bell hooks, chapter by chapter. Writer and professor hooks is best known for characterizing society as a “white supremacist capitalist patriarchy.” Besides reading her book, students read front to back an edited volume called *To Be Real* as well. The outline strays only once from these two required texts, to include the feminist, albeit Pulitzer-Prize-winning novel *The Color Purple.*

Week to week, the students cover all the standard bases in the discipline — the feminist movement, women’s bodies, labor history and the oppressiveness of capitalist economies, race, violence against women, the oppressiveness of traditional families and marriage, lesbianism, obsession with beauty, and a little more on lesbianism.

None of this is any surprise, considering the syllabus’s defense of feminism as a philosophy of life: A section on the “course objective” says the class “is often categorized as a class for women only or a class simply about feminism and nothing else.” But rather than go on to explain why the class is in fact broader, the passage outlining the course objective then embraces the criticism: “Undeniably, having a working knowledge of feminism provides any person with the basic premise for gaining an understanding of women’s lives. Even though feminism may not be all-encompassing, it is a very powerful entity....” The key for students is to work so that “this great entity may be all encompassing — for all of us.” This attempt to indoctrinate students would be sinister if it weren’t so amusing.

A course on “Gender, Economy and Development” is equally if not even more doctrinaire. The syllabus promises the course will “examine the role of gender in economic and development processes” but it does so by reviewing only theories “emanating from liberal, Marxist-Socialist, and multicultural/post-colonial feminism.”

The course covers agricultural and factory work in developed and developing countries. Readings include such titles as “From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor” and “Gendered Fields: Rural Women, Agriculture & Environment.” Meanwhile, the course’s only nod to white-collar professions or management is a showing of the David Mamet film “Glengarry Glen Ross” (in whose title the syllabus manages to make three errors), by way of illustrating “masculinity and work.” There’s also a discussion of an article on “gender, power and sexuality in merchant banking,” but it’s in a class where it’s paired with a piece on sex tourism in Southeast Asia.

The economic development course makes many other omissions. Neither the role of women as managers, business owners, heads of economic households, or consumers, nor the role of global economic growth in improving women’s lives, nor the gains that developing-country women have experienced from international trade, appear to be covered in the syllabus.

**What is the Quality of Women’s Studies Textbooks and Readings?**

Across the programs, the textbooks and readings used for Women’s Studies display the same biases that are
evident in the course syllabi. The books tend to focus on the same litany of complaints and false assertions that the programs in general focus on: Women as victims of patriarchy, women as unequal to men in the workforce and as victims of a wage gap, and women as victims of male violence. The books encourage lesbianism, represent marriage first and foremost as a perpetuator of male dominance, advance almost exclusively Marxist and proto-Marxist economic and social views, and fully omit discussing important female figures and movements that don’t fit the left-of-center, feminist category. Thus, the books, like the course syllabi, drive an outside observer to the conclusion that North Carolina’s publicly funded Women’s Studies programs are characterized primarily by insularity and narrowness, ideological bias, and a tendency toward misinformation.

There’s something else that’s distinctive about the books as well. Whereas they are all similar, there are no two classes in the whole public system in North Carolina that use the same book. Meanwhile, there are big gaps in the scholarship that could be covered in Women’s Studies, as this report has noted: The Clintons are never studied, globally influential female politicians (i.e. former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice) are not studied, nor are — to name but a few categories — women in religious work, women as soldiers, women as founders and leaders of charitable organizations and philanthropies, women as business-owners and economic decision-makers, women as conservatives, nor post-baby-boom women who are leaving the workforce in larger numbers than ever to have families. One is tempted to conclude that feminist scholars write the same textbook (victimization, violence, patriarchy) over and over with slightly different titles, collect royalties, and avoid new or controversial areas of academic endeavor.

Because there was no overlap in the reading lists, the selection of books for this report was somewhat arbitrary. The first two are textbooks that conservative women’s-history scholar Christine Stolba looked at in her excellent, comprehensive examination of Women’s Studies textbooks in 2002, entitled *Lying in a Room of One’s Own*. These books are *Thinking About Women* by Margaret L. Andersen and *Women’s Realities, Women’s Choices* by the Hunter College Women’s Studies Collective. The third is an economic tract entitled *Women in the Global Factory* by Annette Fuentes and Barbara Ehrenreich, chosen for the relative name-recognition of its co-author Ehrenreich and for the fact that it illustrates how dated the scholarship in Women’s Studies often is. The last book, *The World Split Open*, is an acclaimed, new-ish women’s history that quite plainly illustrates the selectivity and ideological bias of this women’s studies sub-field.

*Thinking About Women* by Margaret L. Andersen and *Women’s Realities, Women’s Choices* by the Hunter College Women’s Studies Collective

*Thinking About Women* is used at UNC-Charlotte in a course called “Sociology of Women.” *Women’s Realities, Women’s Choices* has been used in the UNC-Charlotte “Introduction to Women’s Studies course.”

*Thinking About Women* author Margaret Andersen wastes no time in getting to what she sees as the crux of women’s problems: men. By page 5, she is pointing out to the reader: “Perhaps at school you see that most of the professors are men and that, among students, men tend to be more outspoken in class, or perhaps at work you notice that women are concentrated in the lowest level jobs and are sometimes treated as if they were not there. It may occur to you one night as you are walking through city streets that the bright lights shining in the night skyline represent the thousands of women — many of them African American, Latina, or Asian American — who clean the corporate suites and offices for organizations that are dominated by White men.

“Recognizing these events as indications of the status of women helps you to see inequities in the experiences of men and women in society. Once you begin to recognize these patterns, you may be astounded at how pervasive they are. As the unequal status of women becomes more apparent, you might feel overwhelmed by the vast extent of a problem most people have never acknowledged.”

**Workplace Inequality**

The man-blaming inequality argument is backed a few pages later by a single opinion poll — one whose findings are not even strongly supportive of the author’s argument: The poll shows only some 30 percent of women agree that “women in this country have equal job opportunities with men” and that some 50 percent of women “prefer to have a job outside the home if free to do either.”
The author does not dwell on the poll’s flipside revelation: That another 50 percent of women would prefer to stay at home if given the choice. The author also does not report other findings about perceived workplace inequality. For instance, the same polling organization whose data she uses, Gallup, found in February 2000 that 70 percent of working women in the U.S. do not believe they would be paid more if they were men.11 Nor does the author point out that a quarter of working women choose to work part-time, or that three-quarters of women say flexibility is important to them when they choose a job, according to Pew Research Center polling data. Yet such sidestepped data expose a fundamental preference among women, one that rather obviously influences their decisions about the working world. Ignore them and it’s easy to conclude that women are sidelined by men rather than that they sometimes make choices that are different from men’s.

At a minimum, the author should recognize the well-documented preference for work/family flexibility among a majority of women. The author should also note that that preference may influence women’s slower advancement and choices — and perceived inequality — in the workplace. But the author doesn’t recognize these preferences. Rather, she has an a priori position about women’s inequality, about it being caused by men, and about workplace inequality being a suitable measure of women’s entire lives.

*Women’s Realities* makes similar arguments about women’s inequality in the workplace and life in general. “Pink Collar” jobs such as clerical and sales positions are represented as the result of male-driven “gender segregation in the workplace.” The book asserts baselessly that “regardless of our educational background or career aspirations, women looking for work nearly everywhere are met with the question, “Can you type?”12 The authors go on to argue men don’t support women’s workplace equality because it threatens them and the exploitive system of capitalism on which they depend. Revealing the essential leftism of feminist scholars, the authors call for “social reform or revolution which would eradicate the exploitive effects of capitalism and make production more directly responsive to social interests.”13 They recommend Ursula LeGuin’s anarchic society in *The Dispossessed* or kibbutz life.14 They add a slight caveat in their summary, though, noting that “while communist systems of government have provided some advances in work force participation by women, they have done little to change social attitudes or relieve women of household care.”15 So that’s the main problem with communism...

**Patriarchy and Victimization**

As noted earlier, *Thinking About Women* stresses to student readers that they live in a patriarchal society that victimizes them. “Feminists describe men’s power as a system of patriarchy, meaning an organized social structure whereby men as a group hold more power than women .... [I]n such a system patriarchy structures the many social institutions that regulate and determine the nature of women’s lives. In this sense, the United States is a patriarchal society.... Patriarchy in an institutional sense means that social institutions have been organized over time to give men more advantage than women.”16 Then, the first and only illustration the author gives of patriarchy in the U.S. is “marital violence ... an expression of men’s power ... in the actual marital relationship.” She asserts that “women who turn to (patriarchal) institutions for help often find that the system does not work on their behalf.” The assertion is not backed by any proof. That may be because there isn’t much. Searching the literature on the topic, this author could not find any convincing aggregate data about anti-woman bias in courts or law-enforcement institutions handling cases of marital violence. What may have once been the case no longer appears to prevail.17 The author’s claim that marital violence is widespread also goes unsubstantiated. Consider that about 1 percent of emergency-room visits by women are for domestic violence — a figure that translates into far less than 1 percent of the married female population.18 To be sure, violence against women does exist and it is a grave problem. But to position it as a common characteristic of contemporary U.S. marriage and our so-called patriarchal society is dishonest and misleading.
Marriage

The other textbook, Women’s Realities, Women’s Choices, puts patriarchy squarely in the center of marriage and families as well. The authors talk about a “connection between the development of the feminine personality and a patriarchal society that devalues women.... [O]nly a radical transformation of society can bring about changes in family relationships that now undermine the confidence of women and our sense of solidarity with one another.” Mothers are their daughters’ “first love object,” according to the passage in the book, but because of patriarchy daughters “must suppress our desire for the mother and transfer our sexual feelings to the more powerful father, as society is currently organized.” This “rejection of the mother” “leaves a legacy of rage and contempt for the mother,” the book claims. It leads to heterosexuality, which allows women to function in patriarchal society, but this heterosexuality is “based on contempt for mothers and hatred of sisters” which “alienates women and is “an identity based on self denigration and dependency.”

It might be news to heterosexual women reading the book that their identity is based on rage against their mothers and sexual feelings for their fathers. But in a book that also argues “warriors ... tend to be more highly valued than mothers,” the reader is quickly inured to baseless assertions.

The authors go on rather naturally to denigrate marriage. Women’s Realities says most feminists “believe that there is considerable scope for molding marital agreements according to principles of equality and fairness.” But “as for the more conventional concepts of wifehood, there seems little that can be said in their defense.... Perhaps many of us would freely choose to subordinate our own interests to those of our husbands as conventional ‘wifehood’ would imply .... But it is at least equally likely that our ‘choice’ is governed by those role expectations in life that most women have been socialized to accept.”

Thinking About Women also offers some standard put-downs of heterosexuality and marriage. These views are not surprising given the author’s views of marriage as an underpinning of U.S. societal patriarchy. “Male-female relationships ... have to be understood in the context of power relationships that stem from men’s institutionalized power over women,” the author asserts. She calls the dominant organizing form of our society — male-female intimate relationships and marriage — “compulsory heterosexuality.” She argues that it is “shaped by “phallocentric thinking — that which sees men as powerful and women as weak.”

Both books betray a fundamental philosophical belief that women do not have free will. If they did, they would not choose marriage or heterosexuality. Yet the vast majority do — a phenomenon that feminists tautologically explain as evidence of the continued influence of patriarchy rather than as evidence that their theories are full of holes.

Thinking About Women later explains marriage in Marxist terms, as a byproduct of “the development of private property (which) creates the need to determine lineage for the purpose of inheritance.” The same section argues, using the words of Friedrich Engels, that “within the family (the husband) is the bourgeois and the wife represents the proletariat.” This Marxist definition of marriage is the only one the author offers in the entire 407-page book.

Latent Marxism

The author’s endorsement of Marxist views isn’t unique to her. It is evident in Women’s Realities, too. And as the course-syllabus section of this report shows, Marxism is the prevailing ideological framework of feminism, although some feminists might that they’ve moved beyond it. Thinking About Women devotes a whole chapter to feminist theory, and presents the spectrum as Socialist Feminism, Radical Feminism, Multiracial Feminism, and Postmodernist Feminism. All of those schools of thought are alloys of Marxism. Conservative, libertarian or other distinctive schools of thought about women are not even listed in the chapter. Absent, too, is any argument that men’s and women’s principal problems and issues, forms of political and social organization, and history are essentially similar. Such a view is anathema to the whole field of Women’s Studies.
The World Split Open by Ruth Rosen

The World Split Open is used at UNC-Chapel Hill in the introductory Women’s Studies course. As a prototype of the feminist-history genre, The World Split Open is exemplary. It begins with a long quotation about the putatively unhappy prison that is home life, by Anne Sexton. Sexton, who considered herself “a victim of the American Dream, the bourgeois, middle-class dream,” was a poet who ended her life with suicide. While she lived, her children were taken to stay with relatives after she was repeatedly institutionalized. “Many housewives shared her depression and her demons,” the author asserts.

From there, the author traces the contemporary history of the women’s movement, arguing that the majority of women were in step with the feminists much of the way. She marshals some admittedly interesting data along the way. A 1962 Gallup Poll showed “only 10 per cent of mothers hoped their daughters would follow the pattern of their lives,” the author writes, going on to quote some interesting letters of misery from housewives to feminist Betty Friedan.

But other data points are less convincing: In an effort to show that through the middle of the century women had fallen into a kind of ignorant enslavement in the home, the author points out that while women earned half of all bachelor’s degrees in 1920, they earned only 24 percent of them in the mid-’50s. She says the U.S. was the only country to see this happen. She leaves the statistics floating, implying a conspiracy to relegate women to intellectual darkness. She never points out the basic demographic influences on her statistics: the absence of young men from universities in the late ’teens because they’d been drafted to serve in World War I, and the surfeit of men returning from World War II and getting on with their previously deferred education in the 1950s.

After arguing women supported the feminist agenda in the early years, the author pushes the female majority away when that group’s opinions stop suiting her interests. She argues that in the 1980s, once the abortion issue had divided women voters and even feminists such as Betty Friedan were having second thoughts about some of radical feminism’s anti-family positions, the average woman became a dupe and a stooge of men on the Right, while feminists themselves became their victims. “The growing engagement of women in the religious and secular New Right legitimated an increasing fusillade of attacks on feminism by right-wing male religious and political leaders .... Some of those disgruntled women now felt overwhelmed by the double responsibilities they bore at home and at work; they blamed feminism for their plight. The media took its cue from such women.”

In other words, as long as average women were with the feminists, they were clear-thinking; as soon as they began to have doubts, they became cogs in the patriarchal male system.

That idea of Rosen’s is pretty standard fare. Meanwhile, she’s almost unique among feminist writers for noting that conservative women have a movement of their own. She devotes a whole four pages to them.24 However, the author is shameless in pillorying these women as stooges of right-wing men. And not satisfied that her descriptions trample them quite enough, she hints that conservative women have violent tendencies: “Unlike the women’s movement, the fringes engaged in actual terrorism at abortion clinics,” she writes.25

Unlike the women’s movement? The same author notes a few hundred pages earlier that the founder of the feminist Society for Cutting Up Men (S.C.U.M.), Valerie Solanas, in 1968 shot and wounded Andy Warhol “whom she blamed for her own marginality” as a woman artist.26 The New York president of NOW (the National Organization of Women) quite publicly attended Solanas’s trial, and later formed a new feminist organization, in solidarity. The author also notes that many feminists including Gloria Steinem publicly supported Jane Alpert, a “member of a freelance bombing collective” who later surrendered to the FBI.27

The author tries to smooth over another rough edge of feminism, too. After devoting some 300 pages to women’s physical victimization at the hands of men, professional and educational stymieing by men, and domestic imprisonment by men, she offers this throw-away phrase: “It’s important to recognize that the women’s movement did not invariably pit men against women. This was not a battle between the sexes; it was part of the highly gendered and radicalized cultural wars that polarized Americans in the wake of the 1960s.”28
words, feminism’s anti-man agenda is not a characteristic of feminism, it is the result of a culture war that feminism can’t be blamed for.

The author’s excuse-making for her own side is reminiscent of feminist textbook-writers’ blind spots. To use but one example, neither Thinking About Women nor Women’s Realities, Women’s Choices notes that early 20th century birth-control crusader Margaret Sanger, a much-lionized feminist, held racist and pro-eugenics views.

The rest of The World Split Open is devoted to the minutiae of the Leftist movement’s contemporary history. For example, the author devotes 46 pages (“Chapter Four, Leaving the Left”) to schisms between radical Left feminists and less-radical Left feminists. She devotes another 33 pages (“Chapter Seven, The Politics of Paranoia”) to FBI investigations of suspected communist feminists and feminist members of the Marxist-anarchist Weathermen, a domestic terrorist group. This history book, published in 2000, is as good a piece of proof as any of Women’s Studies fundamental bond with Marxism and its ideological fellow-travelers.

Women in the Global Factory by Annette Fuentes and Barbara Ehrenreich

The UNC-Chapel Hill introductory course still uses a pamphlet called Women in the Global Factory, written in 1983, as a principal text on globalization. The pamphlet covers the experience of female manual laborers and factory workers in Asia and Mexico and the difficulties of developing-country labor-union organizers during the Cold War.

It’s perplexing why the course relies on this 21-year-old tract, considering the immensity of change in the global economy since it was published. It’s been 11 years since the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement, with resulting, huge effects on the female workforce in Mexico and the U.S. Female employment in the world’s poorest countries by 1998 had surpassed 60 percent, according to the United Nations Development Fund. And several large, developing countries mentioned in the leftist pamphlet, such as South Korea and Mexico, have made great strides in economic growth. Indeed, South Korea is now a member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, a club of the world’s wealthiest nations.

Not least because of its age, the pamphlet is rife with inaccuracies. It offers incorrect figures for women’s average wages, argues American companies support sterilization of developing-country workers, and describes an atmosphere of violent resistance by governments and U.S. companies to labor organizing. Students are reading about murderous government crackdowns against labor organizers in South Korea as if they were the status quo, at a time when the South Korean reality is that left-leaning labor lawyer and activist Roh Moo-hyun is actually the country’s president.

As a snapshot of feminist-labor movement propaganda, penned by a woman — Barbara Ehrenreich — who continues to be central in the anti-globalization, pro-feminist debates, the pamphlet is vaguely interesting. As a classroom text, however, it is wholly inadequate.

Illustrative Case: How the Class Texts Cover the “Wage Gap”

No feminist academic publication is complete without indoctrination about the “wage gap.” The wage gap argument posits that women today earn a fraction of what men earn because of anti-woman discrimination in the workplace and women’s forced “gender segregation” into clerical, service-industry and other low-level jobs. The edition of Women’s Realities used in this report says women earn less than two-thirds of what men do. Thinking About Women describes “this inequality” as women earning 74 percent of what men earned.

That calculation, however, is skewed and does not compare equivalent female workers and male workers. It is derived from a comparison of men’s and women’s median wage. The median, male full-time worker is the one below whom stands half the male workforce earning less than he, and above whom stands half the male workforce earning more than he. The median, female full-time worker has that same middle rank among women. A median figure pays no heed to the fact that more of the female work force than male is in lower-paying jobs, and consequently the median woman ranks lower in pay than the median man.
What’s more, the median-pay statistic, collected by the U.S. Census Bureau, makes no distinction between a full-time worker doing 35 hours a week and one doing twice that — and earning more wages as a result. Yet a fair assessment of the pay difference between men and women should look at this distinction, because hourly wage-earning women work fewer hours than hourly wage-earning men, and consequently a comparison of men’s and women’s median pay is not in fact an accurate measure of the gap between equivalent men and women. Other important distinctions, such as years in the workforce, age of the worker and educational level, are ignored by the median statistic as well.

No matter, says Women’s Realities. When economists “hold constant the variables of age, experience and duration of the job (they) find that women still get paid less than men, and are still promoted more slowly. There is no doubt that discrimination is still rampant.”33 But the misinformation continues, here. This “adjusted wage gap” has actually shrunk dramatically in recent decades, and is in some instances almost nil. Already six years ago, the gap between men and women of equal age, time in the work force, and experience was less than 10 percent, according to Department of Labor statistics.34 And among childless women, the pay gap between them and comparable men workers was 2-3 percent.35

The authors of Women’s Realities and Thinking About Women do not present any data on this more statistically valid adjusted wage gap. Nor do they dwell for any length of time on women’s preferences for flexibility in the workplace, women’s common strategy of slowing down at work (going part time or leaving for a few years) when they have children, and working fewer overtime hours, all of which put understandable, if frustrating, downward pressure on women’s wages and advancement.

As mentioned before, the textbook authors also do not report that 70 percent of women do not believe that they are paid less than they would be if they were men, according to the Gallup Organization.

The textbooks’ omissions are not surprising, since the findings would deny the textbook authors entire sections of their books, and undermine their premise that workplace inequality is evidence of women’s continued inequality society-wide. The quasi-disappearance of the wage gap would also deny Women’s Studies programs months-long sections of curriculum, and a rather fundamental Women’s Studies raison d’être.

Ultimately, the class texts fail to acknowledge, much less seriously discuss, the many criticisms that economists have leveled against the facile argument that the pay gap results from discrimination against women in the labor market. Some of the strongest refutations of that idea have in fact been written by women, pointing out that discrimination is actually a very weak and implausible explanation for the pay gap. For instance, there’s Anita Hattiangadi and Amy Habib’s “A Closer Look at Comparable Worth,” Employment Policy Foundation, May 2000, and Diana Furchtott-Roth’s “Equal or Equivalent: Feminist Activists Ignore the Data About Women’s Pay,” Investor’s Business Daily, May 11, 2000. If the feminist-text authors had any pretense of scholarly objectivity, it’s destroyed by their failure to inform readers that there are strong counterarguments to the positions they take. Their blinders on pay equity are but one example of this lack of objectivity.

How are Women’s Studies Departments Supported Financially?

The women’s studies programs and their faculty attract little if any private financial support.36 This puts them in contrast with liberal-arts programs and departments in which faculty attract grant money and fellowships for their research and teaching. The shortage or absence of private funding for women’s studies, combined with the ever-declining number of students interested in women’s studies, should raise the question whether there’s a market out there for the scholarship these programs and departments produce.

Because the programs hardly attract any independent funding, they’re almost wholly dependent on the college’s main budget — usually operating or overhead funds — for support. In other words, they’re dependent on North Carolina taxpayers.37
Here is a program-by-program breakdown of funding:

- Women’s Studies at UNC-Charlotte received $41,030.94 from the university’s state appropriation in 2003-04. It received no private funds. That’s 100 percent taxpayer funding.

- Women’s Studies at North Carolina State University received at least $50,233 from the university’s state funds in 2003-04. It received no private funds. That’s 100 percent taxpayer funding.

- Women’s Studies at UNC-Greensboro received about $92,000 in funds from the university for 2003-04. It received approximately $5,000 in grants. That’s 94 percent taxpayer funding.

- Women’s Studies at UNC-Chapel Hill attracted $418,190 in state-government dollars in 2004, versus $83,402 in gift/trust funds. That’s 83 percent taxpayer funding.

How unusual is the dependency of Women’s Studies programs on taxpayer life-support? Consider the findings of a briefing paper for the UNC-Greensboro Faculty Budget Committee, which shows the distribution of the university overhead budget for the year 2000-01: That year, $24,000 in overhead funds went to Women’s Studies, the only individual program or department in the whole university to be given such a blanket, line-item allocation. The remaining overhead funds went to such traditional items as lease of office or lab space for particular institutes, the research provost’s development fund, and a general fund for faculty research grants.

Or consider the situation at UNC-Chapel Hill. The $418,000 in taxpayer money that flows to Women’s Studies works out to roughly $139,000 per professor. Seen another way, it means that $52,000 per student graduating with a B.A. in Women’s Studies in 2004. By contrast, the much larger Sociology Department’s $2.3 million in taxpayer funds works out to $110,000 per professor, or $47,000 per student graduating with a Sociology degree in 2004. There is no question that Women’s Studies is feeding at the more generous end of the taxpayer trough.

Conclusion

Women’s Studies programs fall short of their own promise to “explore the experience, perspectives, concerns and needs of women [with the help of] new scholarship on women that has emerged in the past two decades,” as one program’s website put it. Without exception, the programs’ curricula focus on a short, narrow list of so-called women’s issues first identified decades ago. These issues include women’s supposed identity as victims of male domination at home and at work, as victims of men’s violence against women, and as victims of patriarchal societal institutions. The list of Women’s Studies pet issues also includes the flawed nature of traditional institutions such as marriage and motherhood, and the forced nature of women’s heterosexuality, which the feminist school suggests is partly imposed by men. Not only is the list of women’s issues highly selective and obscure, it is interpreted in all five programs through an exclusively leftist-feminist prism. Moreover, a cursory look at the readings used to support feminist teaching on these topics suggests the teachings are not strongly supported by facts.

Perhaps more than any other liberal-arts program, Women’s Studies is doctrinaire and ideologically biased. All five programs, across all their courses, give exclusive billing to Marxist and proto-Marxist theories. Not one of the programs devotes a single course or even book on a reading list to a dissenting — conservative, free-market, libertarian or other — view of women. None of the courses covered in this report even takes a look at the alternative views of women, even though excellent literature by women scholars of the non-Leftist persuasion is plentiful. Ultimately, it is hard to imagine a university community tolerating in any other academic department or program the kind of total censorship and ideological indoctrination that Women’s Studies programs practice.

Ironically, it’s not as though Women’s Studies programs lack a rich vein to mine for research and teaching. The trouble is that the programs largely ignore the raw material available to them. The list of women’s issues and interesting topics for research that Women’s Studies departments ignore is much longer than the list they cover. From women politicians of global stature, to women in the country’s dominant organized religions (as opposed
to women in, say, shamanism or goddess worship), to women in Muslim societies, to women business owners, to women’s behavioral tendencies as managers or leaders, to women soldiers, to conservative women who have periodically given feminism a run for its money, none is covered by Women’s Studies programs.41

Other omissions are easily explained by the programs’ natural Leftism: This author could not find any courses that study the Clinton era. None studies prominent North Carolina women such as Senator Elizabeth Dole. None studies a single “women’s issue” that might be said to have arisen in the last 20 years, like the preponderance of women in university, the startling degree to which the ranks of educated black women outstrip those of educated black men, the large-scale departure from the workforce of post-baby-boom women as they have children, or the fact that two-thirds of U.S. women reject the “feminist” label, according to a Gallup poll. Because of the sheer number of topics Women’s Studies programs ignore, they leave themselves wide open to charges of intellectual laziness, bias, and irrelevance.

For those reasons, it is perhaps not surprising that Women’s Studies programs don’t arouse much interest among students. The programs are tiny and shrinking, by and large. What’s more, the programs and their scholars don’t have much success attracting private funds to support their scholarship. In the marketplace of ideas, the Women’s Studies product is growing stale on a shelf in that room of its own.

Yet North Carolina taxpayers support Women’s Studies with tens of thousands of dollars per B.A. degree per year. Indeed, in most instances studied here, state taxpayers are the one-and-only source of financial support for Women’s Studies: In two of the five Women’s Studies programs studied here, government funding for the university props up the programs in their entirety.

Taxpayers must simply be unaware of what their higher-education dollars are going to: doctrinaire, proto-Marxist teaching on subjects that are dated and largely hostile to the majority of women’s views of work, family and heterosexuality. Because if taxpayers did know what the teachings were and that very few students are interested in them anyway, it’s doubtful that many would favor continuing their current level of support — if at all.
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Notes

1. The author wishes to thank Shannon Blosser of the Pope Center for invaluable help collecting the research material.

2. The data used are the most recent available for each campus. Not all campuses compiled data the same way, or had the data for the same years, and consequently direct comparisons from campus to campus were not possible.


4. Nine students had Women’s Studies as a second major.

5. The spring 2004 data were not available on the website.

6. Please see section of this report on the “wage gap.”

7. Syllabi for the remaining four women’s studies programs will be discussed slightly more briefly, for no other reason than to avoid repetition because their content is rather similar to that of UNC-Charlotte.

8. To be sure, feminist scholarship’s antipathy toward ‘inherently patriarchal’ science and technology has been widely noted, most notably by Sally Satel.


16. Andersen p. 292

17. The very existence of the federal Violence Against Women Act shows the inclination of the legal system to assure that women get a fair hearing on questions of violence. The VAWA had a provision which tilted rather egregiously in favor of the accused over the accuser, and that provision was struck down by the Supreme Court in 2000. The opinion noted that if the accuser’s allegations of violence: “are true, no civilized system of justice could fail to provide her a remedy.” As to anti-woman bias in other court proceedings, such as custody battles, a variety of father’s-rights groups have aggregated examples of custody decisions and laws that favor the mother over the father.


19. Hunter College Women’s Studies Collective, p. 240


21. Andersen, p.100


24. There are passing mentions of conservative women on a total of seven pages in the book.
25. Rosen, p. 332
29. Stolba, p. 29
31. Hunter College Women’s Studies Collective, p. 503 (This is the 1983 edition. The report author did not verify whether newer editions use newer data.)
32. Andersen, p.130
33. Hunter College Women’s Studies Collective, p. 503
36. East Carolina State University’s Women’s Studies program did not provide financial data for this report. The other four programs did. The names of revenue sources were not consistent across the programs.
37. The operating and overhead funds are typically drawn from state coffers, or in some instances from small amounts culled from the research grants attracted by the various other departments.
38. North Carolina State University provided budget data and separate department-salary data. Requests to clarify whether the data were the full budget picture for the department were not answered before this publication went to press. The information about zero private funds in 2003-04 was clear, however.
39. The Greensboro Women’s Studies department provided grants data for 1999-04 and the figures here estimate a one-year tranche. The estimate may be slightly high or low. In addition, the Greensboro figures may not reflect the whole Women’s Studies program budget. Requests for clarification were not answered before this publication went to press.
40. Two entities, called the Institute for Health, Science and Society and the Center for the Study of Social Issues, received funds for “operations” out of this account. Neither is a program or department, however.
41. UNC-Chapel Hill has in the past offered an out-of-the-ordinary Women’s Studies course called “The World of the Nun: Convent Culture in the Renaissance.” It was taught by a visiting professor in the History department. It also offers an interesting course on the Geisha in Japanese culture. UNC-Charlotte for its part offers a course on “Female Adolescence in America” with a fairly contemporary reading list.
Appendix: Women’s Studies Offerings at UNC Institutions
(All information taken from individual university Web listings.)

East Carolina University

Undergraduate Major and Minor
The undergraduate major requires 36 semester hours from the following list, including 12 hours in Women’s Studies core courses. The undergraduate minor requires 24 semester hours from this list, including 6 hours in Women’s Studies core courses.

Women’s Studies
- WOST 2000, 2200, 2400 Introduction to Women’s Studies
- WOST 3000 Motherhood of God in Asian Traditions
- WOST 3500 Selected Topics in Women’s Studies
- WOST 3910, 3920, 3930 Directed Readings in Women’s Studies
- WOST 4000 Senior Seminar in Women’s Studies
- WOST 4200 Feminist Theory
- WOST 4500 Internship in Women’s Studies

Anthropology
- ANTH 2025 Sexual Behavior from an Anthropological Perspective
- ANTH 3009 Motherhood of God in Asian Traditions
- ANTH 3200 Women’s Roles in Cross-Cultural Perspective

Child Development & Family Relations
- CDFR 5300 Sex Roles

Classical Studies
- CLAS 2400 Women in Classical Antiquity

Communications
- COMM 4035 Gender and Communication

English
- ENGL 3100 World Literature in English
- ENGL 3250 Introduction to Native American Literatures
- ENGL 3260 Black Literature in America
- ENGL 3300 Women in Literature

Ethnic Studies

Foreign Language
- FORL 2600 Literature in Translation: The Holocaust
- FORL 3660 Hispanic Women Writers

Geography
- GEOG 4320 Gender, Economy, and Development

Health
- HLTH 3020 Health Problems II

History
- HIST 3110 History of African-Americans
HIST 3140 Women in American History

Nursing
NURS 5327 Women's Health

Philosophy
PHIL 3690 Women and Religion

Political Science
POLS 3040 Women in Politics

Psychology
PSYC 4335 Psychology of Women
PSYC 4350 Psychology of Sexual Behavior

Sociology
SOCI 3400 Introduction to Gender and Society
SOCI 4345 Racial and Cultural Minorities

North Carolina State University

WGS (MDS) 200 Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies
Introduction to women’s and gender studies as an interdisciplinary field spanning the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. Study of historical perspectives and contemporary understanding of women and gender. Theory, systematic analysis and experimental accounts used to explore complexities of gender, and other identity determinants, mechanisms of power and privilege, and avenues for social change.

WGS (SOC) 204 Sociology of Family
Contemporary American family structures and processes and their development. Focus on socialization, mate selection, marital adjustment and dissolution. Includes core sociological concepts, methods, theories.

WGS (MDS) (STS) 210 Women and Gender in Science and Technology
Interdisciplinary introduction to the reciprocal relationships between scientific/technological research and contemporary understanding of gender. Special emphasis on social factors influencing scientists and engineers in their professions.

WGS (SOC) 304 Women and Men in Society
Preq: 3 cr. in SOC, 200 level

WGS (ENG) 305 Women and Literature
Nineteenth- and twentieth-century womens’ literature, as shaped by the intersecting and competing claims of gender, race, sexuality, and culture. Focus on fiction, accompanied by critical readings from American studies, feminist literary criticism, and postmodern theory.

WGS (PS) 306 Gender and Politics in the United States
Preq: PS 201
This course explores the role of gender in contemporary American politics. The course examines the historical
course of gender politics to see how we have arrived at the present state. It investigates the activities that women and men play in modern politics-voting, running for office, serving in office, etc., and how women and men perform these activities in different ways. The course also focuses on major areas of public policy that affect women and men in different ways.

WGS (MDS) 310 Women’s and Gender Studies Internship
Internship program. Introduction to careers that deal specifically with women’s issues. Ten-hours-per-week work at a nonprofit or governmental organization. Contextualization of that experience through additional academic requirements.

WGS (ENG) 327 Language and Gender
Preq: ENG 111, ENG 112
Introduction to the use of language by men and women. Research in Linguistics and Women’s Studies addressing issues such as the acquisition of gender-differentiated language, gender and conversational interaction, sexism in language, gender issues in society, and the relationship between language, gender, and other social constructs (e.g., class, culture, and ethnicity).

WGS (MUS) 360 Women In Music
The role of women in music as patrons, teachers, composers, and performers, placing them within the social, economic, and political framework to which they belong. Emphasis on Western Art Music and the role of women in popular music. No previous formal training in music is required.

WGS (COM) 362 Communication and Gender
Preq: Junior Standing; COM 112
Effects of gender on the interpersonal communication process. Construction of gendered identities via communication practices. Examination of theories of gender and the role of gender in organizational, institutional, and media communication practices.

WGS (PSY) 406 Psychology of Gender
Preq: PSY 200, 201 or HSS 200
Credit cannot be given for both PSY 406 and PSY 506
Current theory and research on perceived and actual biological, social, cognitive, personality and emotional similarities and differences of men and women throughout the lifespan. The construction and consequences of gender in our society and others.

WGS (SOC) 407 Sociology of Sexualities
Preq: 3 hours SOC 200 level, 300 level, or equivalent research methods course
Exploration of sexuality in a social context. Relationship between sexuality, gender and power in the U.S. Historical trends in behaviors and identities; social movements and sexual issues; current behavioral trends. Some issues covered; identity, social construction, sexual meanings.

WGS (ENG) 410 Studies in Gender and Genre
This course examines the ways in which writers have revised the literary genres to include gendered experience. It will focus on a different generic area, such as poetry, fiction, drama or autobiography, depending on its instructor.

WGS (PS) 418 Gender Law and Policies
Preq: Nine hours of Political Science or Permission of Instructor
Law and policy pertaining to contemporary gender issues. Examination of agenda setting, policy formation, implementation, judicial interpretation and evaluation of selected issues, such as reproductive policies, equal employment and sexual abuse.
WGS (ANT) 444 Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Women  
Preq: 3 hours cultural anthropology  
Comparison of women in a variety of societies: western and non-western, hunting and gathering to industrialized. Cross-cultural perspective on the similarity and diversity of women’s statuses and roles. Effect of gender on social position.

WGS (HI) 447 History of American Women to 1900  
The historical experience of women in America from the colonial period to 1890. Women’s work, education, legal and political status, religious experience, and sex roles: age, class, race, sexual preference, and region as significant variables in women’s experience.

WGS (HI) 448 American Women in the Twentieth Century  
Credit will not be given for both HI 448 and HI 548  
Women’s historical experience in America, 1890-1990. Changes in women’s work, education, legal and political status, and sex roles, age, class, race, sexual preference and region as significant variables in women’s experience.

WGS (REL) 472 Women and Religion  
Preq: one course in religious studies or women’s and gender studies  
Historical, literary, and theological sources dealing with portrayals of women and women’s religious experience in several religious traditions of the world through different historical periods, from ancient to modern. Impact of feminist theory on the academic study of religion; methodological issues surrounding the study of women’s religious history; role of religion in shaping attitudes toward women and their status in society.

WGS (MDS) 492 Theoretical Issues in Women’s and Gender Studies  
Preq: MDS 200  
Examination of feminist theory. Study of formative texts in modern feminism, drawn from various disciplines within the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. In-depth exploration of feminist perspectives on issues of race, class, gender, sexuality, work and mothering, among others. Analysis of local and global cultural practices using feminist theoretical frameworks.

WGS (MDS) 493 Special Topics in Women’s and Gender Studies  
Examination of varying topics on women and/or gender from a multidisciplinary perspective.

WGS (PSY) 506 Psychology of Gender  
Preq: Permission of Instructor  
Credit for both PSY 406 and PSY 506 is not allowed  
Current theory and research on perceived and actual biological, social, cognitive, personality, and emotional similarities and differences of men and women throughout lifespan. Construction and consequences of gender in our society and others.

WGS (ECD) 540 Gender Issues In Counseling  
Preq: Grad. standing or 6 hrs. of ED or PSY  
Exploration of gender as primary identity and social construct. Emphasis on gender dynamics in counseling, client empowerment and preventive approaches.

WGS (HI) 547 History Of American Women To 1900  
Preq: 6 hrs. of advanced history  
Credit for both HI 447 and HI 547 is not allowed  
Historical experience of women in America from colonial period to 1890. Women’s work, education, legal and political status, religious experience and sex roles: age, class, race, sexual preference and region as significant variables in women’s experience.
WGS (HI) 548 American Women In the Twentieth Century
Credit for both HI 448 and 548 is not allowed
Women’s historical experience in America, 1890-1990. Changes in women’s work, education, legal and political status, and sex roles; age, class, race, sexual preference and region as significant variables in women’s experience.

WGS 593 Special Topics
By permission of instructor
Examination of a core topic on women and/or gender from an interdisciplinary perspective at the graduate level.

WGS (SOC) 704 Feminist Thought in the Social Sciences
Preq: SOC 701 and SOC 702 or Permission of Instructor
This course is designed to provide an overview of feminist thought in the social sciences. We evaluate theoretical writings on social structure, social processes, the development of consciousness about gender inequality. We include both discussion of and distortions within mainstream theory and the recent development of alternative theory using the standpoint of women as a point of departure. We begin with general theoretical issues and move quickly to the complexity of matrices of domination within U.S. and global contexts.

WGS (SOC) 737 Sociology Of Gender
Preq: SOC 736 or 731 or consent of instructor
Graduate Student Status
Theories about the development and maintenance of gender. Historical development of gender stratification. How individuals “do gender” in their daily lives. Contemporary research and substantive readings about gender in public and intimate relationships.

WGS (SOC) 739 Social Psychology Of Inequality
Preq: SOC 746 or 508 or equivalent
The effects of race, class and gender inequality on the formation of group consciousness, self-evaluations, emotions, values, attitudes and beliefs. Attention to interpersonal processes through to reproduction of inequality in everyday life.

UNC-Chapel Hill

WMST 50 INTRODUCTION TO WOMEN’S STUDIES — Barbara Harris
In interdisciplinary exploration of women and men in American society. Topics explored include: family and work; sexuality and sexual identity; gender roles and images in language, literature, religion, art and science; and the impact of the contemporary feminist movement. Course readings are drawn from the humanities and the social sciences.

WMST 95 SPECIAL TOPICS IN WOMEN’S STUDIES — Staff
Topics are announced in advance and reflect the interest of the particular instructor. Each course will concern itself with a study in depth of some problem or issue in Women’s Studies.

WMST 98A/WMST 98B WOMEN’S STUDIES HONORS
Permission Required
Introduction to research methods in women’s studies leading to the completion of an Honors essay. (Fall, Spring)

WMST 190 PRACTICUM IN WOMEN’S STUDIES
Negotiated
Supervised internships designed to provide experience working in organizations concerned with women’s is-
sues. Prerequisite: WMST 50 or WMST 169. Written paper required. Either of these courses may be taken concurrently with WMST 190. 2-4 credit hours. Interested students should contact Denise Currin, Administrative Assistant, Women’s Studies, 962-3908, prior to the beginning of the semester. Permission required.

**WMST 199 INDEPENDENT READING AND RESEARCH — Staff**

Intensive reading and research in a student’s chosen area of interest under faculty supervision. Results in a written report. Open to Women’s Studies majors and other qualified undergraduate and graduate students. Permission of the Director and faculty member required.

**CROSS-LISTED COURSES**

**WMST 24/SOCI 24 SEX AND GENDER IN SOCIETY — Lawrence Rosenfeld — Richard Udry/Staff**

An examination of the social differentiation between men and women. Attention to the extent, causes and consequences of sexual inequality, and to changes in sex roles and their impact on interpersonal relations.

**WMST 42/CLAS 42 SEX AND GENDER IN ANTIQUITY — Cecil Wooten — Cynthia Dessen**

Exploration of gender constructs, what it meant to be a woman or a man in antiquity, as they are revealed in literary, historical and archaeological sources. Readings from Homer, Euripides, Plato, Ovid, Virgil, Juvenal, Petronius, and other ancient authors.

**WMST 43/FREN 43 FRENCH WOMEN WRITERS — Staff**

Works by French women authors read in translation along with pertinent theoretical texts. Course content will vary each semester, incorporating text from different periods and genres.

**WMST 44/GERM 44 WOMEN IN GERMAN CINEMA — Alice Kuzniar**

Introduction to feminist aesthetics and film by the examination of the representation of women in German cinema from Expressionism to the present; subtitled films. English is the language of instruction.

**WMST 46/PHIL 46 PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES IN FEMINISM — Staff**

Moral issues of equal rights and justice; sex role stereotypes; equal opportunity and reverse discrimination; abortion; philosophers’ theories of feminism.

**WMST 56/SPCH 56 GENDER IN COMMUNICATION — Beverly Long**

Examines multiple relationships between communication and gender. Emphasize how communication creates gender and power roles and how communicative patterns reflect, sustain and alter social conceptions of gender.

**WMST 58/HIST 58 WOMEN IN EUROPE I — Judith Bennett/Barbara Harris**

Examines the images and realities of women’s lives in pre-industrial Europe. Our focus will stretch from prehistoric societies up to the beginnings of industrialization in the eighteenth century.

**WMST 59/HIST 59 WOMEN IN EUROPE II — Judith Bennett/Barbara Harris**

When he first factories opened in England in the late eighteenth century, they inaugurated a process of economic change that has radically transformed the human experience. In this class, we will study how these changes have affected the lives of European women.

**WMST 61/AFRI 61 AFRICAN WOMEN — Staff**

Introduction to recent literature, theoretical questions and methodological issues concerning the study of women in Africa. Topics include women in traditional society, impact of colonial experience and modernization on African women.

**WMST 62/HIST 62 WOMEN IN AMERICAN HISTORY — Staff**

Using a variety of sources including monographs, diaries, autobiographies, fiction, and film, we will explore the public and private lives of American women of different class, racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds from
the colonial period to the present. Our goal is to understand women’s role in American life and the ways they have shaped our society, culture and politics.

**WMST 63/PHYE 63 WOMEN IN SPORT — Staff**
The changing level of women’s involvement in sports and the socio-historical perceptions of this phenomenon, examines how women’s participation in sports has been impacted by their racial, economic, and regional status.

**WMST 64/ART 64 WOMEN IN THE VISUAL ARTS I — Mary Sheriff**
This course will analyze the representation of women in Western Art, placing special emphasis on works made by women.

**WMST 65/AFAM 66 BLACK WOMEN IN AMERICA — Staff**
An examination of the individual and collective experiences of Black women in America from slavery to the present and the evolution of feminist consciousness.

**WMST 72/POLI 72 WOMEN AND POLITICS — Pamela Conover**
A comparison of men and women as political actors at the mass and elite levels in America. Topics include the “gender gap”, the women’s movement, abortion and the Equal Rights Amendment.

**WMST 80/HIST 80 WOMEN IN LATIN AMERICA — Sarah Chambers**
Women and gender in Latin American history; examines the experiences of women and gender relations in Latin American Societies from pre-Columbian times to the present.

**WMST 86/ENGL 86 AMERICAN WOMEN AUTHORS — Linda Wagner-Martin**
This course is a study of major American women authors from the seventeenth century into the twentieth century.

**WMST 87/ENGL 87 SOUTHERN WOMEN WRITERS — Staff**
Southern Women Writers examines thematic and stylistic aspects in the fiction, drama, and poetry of major authors, and explores recurrent motifs in works by lesser known writers, particularly those from North Carolina.

**WMST 90B/ENGL 90B FEMINIST THEORY AND LITERARY CRITICISM — Staff**
Examines the importance of feminist theory across the curriculum. Topics include language and linguistics; psychoanalysis; anthropology, and myth; women’s labor, production, and reproduction; history, political science, and religious studies; and literature, predominantly French and English.

**WMST 91/ECON 91 WOMEN AND ECONOMICS — Rachel Willis**
An economic history of women, an economic analysis of women’s time allocation patterns, and an application of economic techniques to contemporary policy issues.

**WMST 92/CMPL 92 WOMEN AND WORK — Lilian Furst**
Explores the possibilities, problems, and limitations of work for women during the Victorian period.

**WMST 94A/FREN 94A COURTSHIP — Jane Burns**
Interdisciplinary study of western views concerning love between the sexes, focusing on courtly love in the Middle Ages and Romantic love in the Victorian era. Literary, historical and art historical materials.

**WMST 96/CMPL 96 MODERN WOMEN WRITERS — Diane Leonard**
An analysis of literary techniques in the works of such writers as Jane Austen, George Sand, George Elliot, Kate Chopin, Isak Dinesen, Colette, Virginia Woolf, Gertrude Stein, Anais Nin, Marguerite Duras and Nathalie Sarraute.
WMST 101/LSRA 101 WOMEN, WORK AND LEISURE — M. Deborah Bialeschki
Implications of the relationship between women and leisure from a lifestyle perspective. Analysis of the changing role of women and changing leisure concepts from a feminist perspective.

WMST 103/MHCH 103 REPRODUCTIVE PHYSIOLOGY AND CONCEPTION CONTROL — Jaroslav Hulka
The course describes the basic anatomy and physiology of the male and female reproductive organs and discusses methods of contraception to suppress normal fertility. The course also presents the subfertile or infertile causes and treatments. A major portion of the course is in the discussion of pregnancy physiology and complications, including clinical management and newborn care, with a visit to the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit in North Carolina Memorial Hospital. The course is designed to make nonhealth professionals as thoroughly familiar with the concepts and language of reproduction and its clinical concerns as physicians and nurses.

WMST 115/OMC 115 WOMEN AND MASS COMMUNICATION — A. Johnston/Jane Brown
An examination of women as media producers, subjects, and audiences with a focus on current practices and possibilities for change.

WMST 120/SPAN 120 WOMEN IN HISPANIC LITERATURE — Rosa Perelmuter
A study of the inscription of femininity in texts by Spanish and Spanish American authors. Readings will be available in Spanish or in English translation. Lectures will be conducted in English.

WMST 121/MUSC 121 WOMEN IN OPERA — Terry Rhodes
An examination and exploration of women’s changing roles, onstage and behind the scenes, in the 400-year history of opera; the influence of women on the course of opera.

WMST 129/SOCI 129 RACE, CLASS AND GENDER — Sherryl Kleinman
Conceptualizations of gender, race, and class and how, separately and in combination, they are interpreted by the wider society. Emphasis on how black and working class women make sense of their experiences at work and within the family.

WMST 140/ANTH 140 GENDER AND CULTURE — Staff
Cross-cultural perspectives on the social uses of gender distinctions. Focus on women’s lives outside the U.S. and Europe. Comparison with students’ social context.

WMST 141/ANTH 141 GENDER, HEALTH AND ILLNESS — Staff
Explores the social and cultural patterns and practices that differentially influence health and illness among women and men.

WMST 142/PLAN 142 GENDER ISSUES IN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT — Helzi Naponen
This course examines gender differences in the economic development process in the Third World and explores methods of incorporating a gender analysis in the work of development planners and policy makers.

WMST 145/RELI 145 THE FIGURE OF THE FATHER — Tomoko Masuzawa
The relationship between the figure of the father and the authority of the law (religious, societal, or familia) studied through such writers as Flaubert, Kafka, and Freud.

WMST 146/SPCH 146 PERFORMANCE OF WOMEN OF COLOR — Soyini Madison
The course explores contemporary poetry, feminist discourse, and performance traditions by Latina, Native American and African American women. Study of culture and performance will culminate in the enactment of poetry.

WMST 150/ENGL 50 GENDER AND LITERATURE — Staff
This course will examine the ways women have portrayed their view of the south in fiction and drama. It will consider both the individual concerns of women artists and the cultural contexts which shape their art.
WMST 151/ART 151 WOMEN IN THE VISUAL ARTS II — Mary Sheriff
This course will focus on a limited number of topics related to the representation of women and/or the status of women as producers of art.

WMST 160/HIST 160 WOMEN & RELIGION IN US HISTORY — Staff
An interdisciplinary consideration of women’s roles, behavior, and ideas in the religious life of Americans from 1636 to 1982.

WMST 161/HBHE 160 WOMEN’S HEALTH & HEALTH EDUCATION — Jo Earp
An overview of women’s health emphasizing their specific interest as family and community members, as patients, and as health professionals. Implications for health education practice and research. Permission of instructor.

WMST 164/POLI 164 FEMINISM AND POLITICAL THEORY — Stephen Leonard
Explores continuities and discontinuities between feminist and “traditional” political theory, including conceptions of “woman”, and how feminists have critically interpreted traditional ideas.

WMST 168/HIST 168 WOMEN IN THE SOUTH — Jacquelyn Hall
An exploration of the distinctive themes in southern women’s lives, using the evidence of history and literature.

WMST 169/HIST 169 WOMEN AND PUBLIC POLICY — Staff
Explores the various areas and levels of women’s involvement in the political process before and after suffrage.

WMST 173/SPCH 173/HIST 173 ORAL HISTORY AND PERFORMANCE — Jacquelyn Hall/Della Pollock
Permission of one of the instructors. Examines performance as means of interpreting and conveying oral history texts. Performance-centered approach to underscore gender distinctions in the telling and making of history; to enhance students’ identification with narrators as historical agents; and to promote public presentation and discussion of historical research.

WMST 176/NURS 176 WOMEN OVER 50 — Eleanor Taggart
The course will view the population group of women over 50 years of age from several perspectives—sociological, psychological, economic and political—looking at their numbers, their health and their roles in the family, work and community.

WMST 178/RELI 178 GENDER IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION — Joanne Waghorne
Developments in the use of gender as a religious symbol and a religious structure from primal religion to the beginning of philosophical traditions in Asia, Africa and Europe.

WMST 183/PSYC 183 CONTEMPORARY SEX ROLES — Staff
Covers theories and research in the areas of constitutional and social learning influences on sex differences in such areas as intellectual accomplishment, achievement, dependency and aggression; sex differences in relation to behavior disorder.

WMST 184/NURS 184 WOMEN, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY — Margarete Sandelowski
Permission of instructor. Examines women as creators and beneficiaries of science and technology. Considers women as scientists and inventors; gender bias in scientific theories; reproductive, household, child care technologies; feminist approaches to inquiry.

WMST 185/ENGL 185/FOLK 185 WOMEN IN FOLKLORE AND LITERATURE — Staff
Explores images of women pictured in the folk imagination and traces those conceptions through created literature. Broadly based in folklore, literature, history and classics. Interdisciplinary approach reveals how writers are influenced by the folklore that surround them.
WMST 186/ RUSS 186 RUSSIAN WOMEN’S LITERATURE — Staff
A study of Russian women’s writing after World War II. Includes both fictional and publicistic works analyzed in their socio-political context. An introduction to Russian women’s studies.

WMST 209/ PHIL 209 FEMINIST THEORY — Staff
Seminar in recent developments in feminist philosophy. Topics include feminist critiques of and constructive approaches toward ethics, epistemology, aesthetics, and philosophy of science.

WMST 215/ ANTH 215 FEMINISM AND SOCIETY — Staff
Seminar in selected topics in feminist analysis of social life, with materials drawn from a global range of societies.

WMST 220/ HIST 220 EUROPEAN WOMEN’S HISTORY — Barbara Harris/Judith Bennett
Readings in European women’s history for graduate students.

WMST 221/ HIST 221 AMERICAN WOMEN’S HISTORY — Staff
Reading in American women’s history for graduate students.

WMST 222/ HIST 222 TOPICS IN WOMEN’S HISTORY — Staff
Directed readings on selected topics in the history of women in Western Europe and the United States.

WMST 223/ HIST 223 MEDIEVAL WOMEN’S HISTORY — Judith Bennett
This graduate-level reading course will cover selected topics in the history of European women, c. 500-1500. Topics will include: holy virginity and religious life; sexuality; work; courtly love; the different experiences of women of different social strata (i.e., aristocratic vs. urban vs. peasant); and analysis of changes in women’s status over time.

WMST 225/ FREN 225 FRENCH FEMINIST THEORY — Jane Burns
This graduate-level course will provide a rigorous introduction to feminist literary theory, focusing on feminist writings from France and their sources in psychoanalysis and post-structuralism. Anglo-American counterparts and adaptations of French theorists and the French tradition will also be treated.

WMST 228/ HIST 228 FEMINIST THEORY FOR HISTORIANS — Judith Bennett
Readings in contemporary feminist theory, focused especially on theories that address the construction, writing and general practice of history.

WMST 231/ SOCI 231 SOCIOLOGY OF GENDER — Lawrence Rosenfeld — Richard Udry
Reviews theory and research on variation in men’s and women’s gender roles, with emphasis on industrialized societies and women’s roles.

WMST 251/ ART 251 GENDER AND VISUAL CULTURE — Mary Sheriff
This course explores a range of feminist theory and investigates visual images (e.g., paintings, films, rock videos, advertisements) through issues of gender, race, class and sexual identity.

WMST 253/ ANTH 253 GENDER, SICKNESS AND SOCIETY — Kaja Finkler
This seminar will deal in depth with the nature of gender cross culturally and the ways social comprehension of gender, gender status, and gender relationships impinge upon the differential experience of health and sickness in men and women from both a contemporary and historical perspective.

WMST 265/ EDSP 266 GENDER, RACE AND CLASS — Staff
Insight and remedies on issues in education; curriculum, counseling and interaction patterns in the classroom; structures and leadership as well as fundamental assumptions can perpetuate racism, sexism and class divisions.
WMST 266/POLI 266 FEMINIST POLITICS — Pam Conover/Stephen Leonard
A survey of feminist approaches to politics and political inquiry.

WMST 267/EDSP 267 FEMINIST ANALYSIS OF POWER AND ETHICS — Staff
Feminist critiques of organizational and political power structures; readings and discussions leading to individual and group research projects.

WMST 387/HIST 387 RESEARCH SEMINAR ON WOMEN’S HISTORY

UNC-Charlotte

Undergraduate Courses

WMST 1101 Introduction to Women’s Studies
Introduction to values associated with gender and basic issues confronting women in society, from a variety of cultural and feminist perspectives. (Fall, Spring)

WMST 2050 Topics in Women’s Studies
(1-3) Credit hours vary with topics
Special topics in Women’s Studies. May be repeated for credit as topics vary. (On demand)

WMST 2050-C01 Women in Cross-Cultural Perspective
Cross listed with Anth 2123

WMST 2050-M01 Women and the Media
This course will examine messages about women as conveyed in contemporary media (advertising, magazines, music, videos, the internet, television, and movies). The role of gender in the power structures of the media producers and artists will also be analyzed. Students will do original research on images of women in several of the media.

WMST 2150-001 U.S. Women’s History 1877

WMST 3050 Topics in Women’s Studies
Special topics in Women’s Studies. May be repeated for credit as topics vary. (On demand)

WMST 3050-A01 Women’s Autobiographies
Through an examination of women’s autobiographical writings, art and other media, this course will explore select and distinct “voices” of various American women as they “tell their story.” The class will examine issues of identity, authority and authenticity, reading/publishing/viewing politics, memory and remembering, trauma, body and embodiment, agency and relationality.

WMST 3050-D01 Women’s Diaries and Women’s Experience
This course will examine why women keep diaries, how diaries provide an understanding of women’s experiences, and how diaries may be read as literature. The class will read from the diaries of famous and everyday women (such as Virginia Woolf, Alice James, Anne Frank, George Eliot, Carolina Maria de Jesus, etc.). Cross listed with Engl 3050-D01.

WMST 3050-U01 Women in Fiction

WMST 3050-V01 Women’s Know Young Adult Fict
WMST 3102 Changing Realities of Women’s Lives
Influence of gender, race and class stereotypes on women’s identities and choices. Examination of women’s individual circumstances through writing. (Fall, Spring, Summer)

WMST 3220 Feminist Thought
Cross-cultural and interdisciplinary survey of the main traditions of feminist theory in the context of their historical and philosophical roots. Required for Women’s Studies minor. (On demand)

WMST 3227 Feminist Philosophy
Views of contemporary feminist and female philosophers on traditional philosophical issues such as ethics, human nature, the construction of knowledge, modes of social and political organization, the relationship between the mind and the body, and the nature of God. (Same as PHIL 3227) (Alternate years)

WMST 3803 Independent Study
Prerequisite: permission of instructor and Women’s Studies Coordinator. Supervised individual study and/or field-based experience in a topic or area of Women’s Studies of particular interest to the student. May be repeated for credit. (Fall, Spring)

Undergraduate/Available for Graduate Credit Courses

WMST 4050 Topics in Women’s Studies.
Prerequisite and credit hours vary with topics. Special topics in Women’s Studies. May be repeated for credit as topics vary. (On demand)

WMST 4050-V01 Screen Violence and Women
Cross listed with Thea 3001

WMST 4101 Applied Research/Field Work
Prerequisite: permission of the Women’s Studies Coordinator. Research and in-service training in cooperative community organizations which provide services to women and their families. Specific content based on contract between student, supervising professor and community organization. (On demand)

WMST 4191 Women’s Health Issues
Prerequisite: permission of the instructor. Exploration of contemporary issues in women’s health from the feminist and women’s health movement perspectives. (Same as NURS 4191) (Fall)

WMST 4260 Women and Aging
Position of older women in society and the particular problems of and issues for women as they age. (The same as GRNT 4260.) (Yearly)

WMST 4601 Senior Colloquium
Prerequisites: completion of 15 hours in Women’s Studies, or permission of instructor. Critical examination of selected issues. Required for Women’s Studies minor. (On demand)

Graduate and Advanced Undergraduate Course

WMST 5050 Topics in Women’s Studies
Prerequisites and credit hours vary with topics. Special topics in Women’s Studies. May be repeated for credit as topics vary. (On demand)
Graduate Only Courses

WMST 6050 Topics in Women’s Studies
Prerequisites and credit hours vary with topics. Special topics in Women’s Studies. May be repeated for credit as topics vary. (On demand)

WMST 6800 Directed Reading/Research.
Prerequisites: prior written permission of instructor and Women’s Studies Coordinator. Independent investigation of a problem or a topic in Women’s Studies, culminating in a research paper or a final report. Student must provide a written plan of work before registering for the course. May be repeated for credit. (On demand)

UNC-Greensboro

WGS 250-01, WGS 250-02 Intro to Women’s & Gender Studies — Staff
This interdisciplinary course provides a brief introduction to the field of women and gender studies, addressing the topic “Engendering America: Past and Present.” By surveying the history and evolution of the role of women in society, masculinity, homosexuality, diversity, class, ethnicity, age, ability, and transgender issues in the United States, students will constantly rethink and reevaluate definitions. Course readings, audiovisual materials, and class discussions will allow students to encounter varying women and gender perspectives. What students theorize in this class will be linked to real-world practice. Several assignments in the course will take students out into the community to observe, talk, listen, and consider ways to take a small step toward improving the world.

WGS 350-01 Intro to Feminist Theories — Baumgartner, Karin
Explores and evaluates feminist theories in a socio-historical context. Raises questions about their implications for different methods of inquiry and about the nature of knowledge and rational thought.

WGS 400-01 Independent Study — Gibson, Mary Ellis
Intensive independent study of specialized topics.

WGS 460-01 Internship in WGS — Gibson, Mary Ellis
Practical experience in a variety of professional settings. Includes bi-weekly seminar with internship coordinator. Students will complete at least 7-10 hours a week at an internship site. The internship will encourage students to put theories to the test of practice, explore approaches and ideas, and consider vocations. The course builds research expertise and practical experience in addition to vocational preparation. Limited enrollment.

WGS 600-01 Independent Study — Gibson, Mary Ellis
Independent study of specialized topics. Requires written plan, permission of sponsoring instructor, and approval of the Women’s and Gender Studies Program director.

WGS 601-01 WGS Practicum — Gibson, Mary Ellis
Required of students taking the certificate who are not enrolled in a degree program at UNCG. Supervised experience related to women’s and gender studies; may include teaching internship, service learning opportunity, applied research experience, or internship in organizations and agencies that work on women’s concerns or serving women in the community.

WGS 803-01 Research Extension — Gibson, Mary Ellis

AFS 305-01 Spc. Topics: Race and Social Justice — Cauthen, Michael
A cornerstone of the American sense of fairplay or justice is the principle of “equality.” But the equality (or the
equal opportunity principle) is more complex than is commonly believed. It consists of equal or fair access to social goods, such as jobs, promotions, raises, or college scholarships; and equality in preparations to compete for social goods. Relying only on the former, perpetuates social inequality an injustice, as the wealthy and most power individuals, families, or groups would possess the best chances to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to successfully compete for valued social opportunities. We will explore, in great detail, concepts of justice, fairness, and equality, particularly as they apply, generally to American race relations, and more specifically to the experiences of Americans of African descent.

CED 574A-01 Contemporary Topics: Women’s Issues — Staff
This course is designed to explore women’s development, the roles society and culture play in women’s development, and the resulting issues women may bring to counseling.

ELC 688D-01 Contemporary Problems: Race and Education — Casey, Kathleen
The course will explore and map the multiple discourses in feminist theory and education as we engage politics, social and cultural analysis, lived experience, and pedagogical consciousness. Learning is understood through identity politics as it is evidenced in theory, practice (classroom and other sites for education), and media literacy. Of particular interest is the ways in which authority is negotiated in the “feminist classroom”.

ENG 531-01 Feminist Theory and Women Writers — Gibson, Mary Ellis
Examines gender and creativity, women’s place in literary tradition, and connections among art, gender, race, and class. Focuses on contemporary theory and on literary works from one historical period.

ENG 746-01 Studies in Contemporary Rhetorical Theory — Keith, Jennifer
Feminists have written experimentally about both their own cultures and those of others for many years, often with little notice afforded their textual constructions. The focus on this course will be on how selected feminists have written about past and current cultures, including popular culture. We’ll begin with theories of feminist rhetoric(s) and composing to analyze the difference that gender makes in both the researching and writing processes. We’ll look at feminist ethnographers who have written about past culture(s) — Margaret Mead, Zora Neale Hurston, Barbara Myherhoff — as well as those who are now writing about a wide range of contemporary cultures — Behar, Gordon, Narayan. Feminists who address the role that the female body plays in researching and writing about pop culture will make up a final segment of the course. Each participant will complete an in-depth research project for the course.

ENG 791-01 Studies in British Romanticism — Staff
We will study intensively a range of Romantic lyrics, focusing on their incorporation of a variety of forms and the public dimensions of representing “private” emotions. To begin we will review earlier versions of the lyric in early modern and eighteenth-century poetry. In our study of Romantic-era poets, including Charlotte Smith, William Blake, William Wordsworth, Felicia Hemans, and John Keats, we will consider their uses of form and gender in rendering emotion and the aesthetic and social dimensions of their lyric selves. Our close study of poetic passions will also attend to contexts in the visual arts and music. Requirements: Informed class discussion, two class presentations and one research paper.

HDF 212-01 Families and Close Relationships — Staff
HDF 212-02 Families and Close Relationships — Buehler, Cheryl
HDF 212-03 Families and Close Relationships — Staff
HDF 212-04 Families and Close Relationships — Staff
Intrapersonal and interpersonal process in development and maintenance of families and close relationships over time.
HDF 407-01 Current Issues: Women and Families — Morgan, Mary
Contemporary and changing issues affecting individuals and families and their environment. Multidisciplinary
approach to decision making and problem-solving.

HDF 409-01 Family Diversity — Morgan, Mary
Study of the variation within and between families through an exploration of the similarities and and differ-
ences according to culture, race, class, gender, family structure, and sexual orientation.

HEA 260-01 Human Sexuality — Pulliam, Regina
This course will introduce students to a variety of topics and issues related to human sexuality. Students will
learn and process ideas and information through reading, class discussion, lectures and guest lectures; topic
research, active participation in group and individual exercises, project work and other forms of assignments.
Topics to be addressed include: reproductive anatomy, birth control, conception, pregnancy and birth, sexually
transmitted diseases, gender, sexual communication, relationships and other related topics. An emphasis is
placed on students with recognizing and expressing personal aspects of their sexuality. Through structured
activities and discussions, students will examine their behaviors and address those factors that positively and
negatively influence their sexual and gender identity. Students will identify healthy, constructive methods for
dealing with sexual issues so that the students can begin to understand themselves and feel empowered to
change if they wish.

HIS 328-01 Women in American History, Part I — Levenstein, Lisa
A history of women in the U.S. from colonial times through the Civil War. Topics include roles, status, image,
family, work, and racial and class differences in experience.

HIS 524-01 20th Century US History: Selected Topics — Franz, Kathleen
This course will explore the origins and cultural meanings of American popular culture in the 20th century, and
in particular the rise of mass media as a form of communication and community formation between 1880 and
1990. Course readings will introduce students to the cultural history of circuses, commercial sports, film, radio,
and television as commodities but also as expressions of identity and community affiliation in a diverse nation.
We will pay close attention to how popular culture shapes ideas about gender, race, class and nation in the 20th
century and how American popular forms have been used and recreated by audiences. The course will require
intensive reading in history and cultural studies, active class participation, and several research and writing
assignments.

MGT 354 -01 Managing Diversity in Organizations — Buttner, Eleanor
Explores diversity in the workplace. Diversity is defined, examined, and discussed as opportunities for compa-
nies to discover and appreciate differences while developing more effective organizations.

PSY 346-01 Sex, Gender, and Behavior — White, Jacqueline
The first section of the course is aimed at placing the psychological study of gender in a larger historical and
cultural context. In order to do this, we will begin with a discussion of diversity in general, and the concepts of
stereotyping and prejudice in particular. This will be followed by an examination of various research approaches
and conceptual frameworks to understanding gender. In the second section of the course we will explore more
thoroughly issues of gender development. The question is: How does one go from being a biological girl or boy
at birth to a gendered adult? These discussions will include examination of the concept of gender identity and
how it differs from sexuality and sexual orientation. Biological and social aspects of development will be con-
sidered. The third section of the course examines in-depth a number of critical issues that affect the daily lives of
women and men, which can be studied from a gendered perspective. In particular, the development of relations-
ships, including a discussion of sex, love and romance, in heterosexual, bisexual and homosexual relationships,
is the focus. Implications for violence in relationships will also be discussed. The final section of the course
focuses on the workplace and mental health consequences of gendered expectations and experiences. A discussion of future possibilities concludes the course.