University of Tennessee, Knoxville

TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

Masters Theses

Graduate School

5-2010

The Subject Representation of Core Works in Women's Studies: A Critical Analysis of the Library of Congress Subject Headings

Susan E. Wood
University of Tennessee - Knoxville, swood1@memphis.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons, and the Women's Studies Commons

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Susan E. Wood entitled "The Subject Representation of Core Works in Women's Studies: A Critical Analysis of the Library of Congress Subject Headings." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Information Sciences.

Bharat Mehra, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Kimberly Black, Suzie Allard

Accepted for the Council:
Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Susan Elaine Wood entitled "The Subject Representation of Core Works in Women's Studies: A Critical Analysis of the Library of Congress Subject Headings." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Information Sciences.

Bharat Mehra, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Suzie Allard

Kimberly Black

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges
Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

The Subject Representation of Core Works in Women's Studies:

A Critical Analysis of the Library of Congress Subject Headings

A Thesis Presented for
the Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Susan Elaine Wood
May 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee, Dr. Bharat Mehra, Dr. Kimberly Black, and Dr. Suzie Allard, for all the encouragement and assistance I received from them in preparing this thesis.   I would also like to thank all of the many authors who have inspired me with their feminist critiques of so many topics in Library and Information Sciences.

ABSTRACT

The system of Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) has been the subject of feminist, critical examinations since the 1970s. Subject headings pertaining both to feminist literature and to women in general have been analyzed to determine how LCSH represents these topics. In this study, I contribute to this body of scholarship by analyzing and reporting on the nature of the LCSH subject representation of 52 core works published from 1986-1998 in the areas of feminist theory and women's movements. These monographs were selected from the 3rd edition of *Women's Studies: A Recommended Bibliography* (Krikos & Ingold, 2004). The analysis of works of/on feminist theory and on women's movements is preceded by a pilot study of 24 core works on the topics of Communications, Film, Television, Media, and Journalism.

I utilize the abstracts of these works in Krikos & Ingold (2004), as well as the works themselves, to establish the nature of each monograph's perspective and scope. To this information I compare the LC subject headings employed in the bibliographic records representing these works in the Library of Congress Online Catalog in order to assess the headings' usefulness as surrogate representations of these monographs in terms of accuracy, relevance, specificity, and currency.

I present my findings as sets of problems and solutions illustrated with specific examples. Overall, LCSH is not able to represent adequately the 24 works in the pilot study sample or the 52 core works in the main study based on its current application. I conclude with a proposed set of subject headings as suggested by the abstracts of these works.

Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Problem Statement: Library of Congress Subject Headings as Cultural Authority

In order to make information accessible, librarians provide subject access points in bibliographic records utilizing controlled vocabularies. The purpose of subject access is attributed to Charles Cutter, as stated in his 1876 work *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue*: to enable a user to locate a known work by its subject and to locate all the works a collection has on a given subject. The purpose of a standardized, controlled subject vocabulary with uniform headings is to attempt to represent each subject in a collection by a single term, enabling a user to locate every work on that topic with one search term, thus preventing a user from being required to think of every possible term to describe a given topic.

The Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) is a very widely-used controlled vocabulary and is just under one hundred years old; the first edition of *Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogues of the Library of Congress* was published in 1914. LCSH is based on the principle of literary warrant in which headings are created for works that are cataloged by the Library of Congress (LC). It is not a universal vocabulary, one which would attempt to create headings for all subjects in anticipation of the need for them, though it has "becom[e] the de facto standard for subject cataloging and indexing in circumstances far beyond those for which it was originally designed" (Chan 2005,3).

LCSH exists within a specific cultural and societal context, therefore the headings constitute a reflection of the culturally-bound understandings of the works they seek to represent and acts necessarily as a form of cultural hegemony (Gramsci 1992). Headings are established based on "prevailing usage," meaning that terms attempt to reflect mainstream, common usage (Chan 2005, 22). Prevailing usage and naming systems are not value-neutral; they reflect the ideologies of social and

institutional systems of power and control based on race, ethnicity, sex, gender, and many other identity factors. It is not necessary to intend to reproduce discriminatory ideologies in a naming system for these ideologies to be nevertheless present; they are "in the water." Naming systems such as LCSH serve as normative cultural authorities, having the power to define knowledge and shape perceptions of a given body of literature.   For example, Moorcroft states that "any system of classification or naming reveals the values, the attitudes, and the world view of the person or people that design or employ the system" (1992, 41).   LCSH is an abstract entity that reflects a cumulative, mainstream, dominant worldview onto the materials it seeks to represent.

The flow of ideas within progressive social movements meant to resist and subvert the status quo of power relations have encouraged critiques of LCSH from within the Library and Information Sciences and Women's Studies communities, and LCSH has been largely responsive. These critiques are discussed in depth in Chapter 2 and include concerns about bias in naming, lack of adequate subject coverage for WS works, and problems with classification. New headings have been added and the forms and language choices of existing headings have been updated in response to the infusion of progressive discourses, such as feminism and anti-racism, into academic and mainstream thought.   It can be expected that subject headings, as subjective, human-produced tools used to describe information, will continue both to shape knowledge and to be shaped themselves by the interplay of dominant social forces and resistance to those forces.   With this research, my goal is to analyze how LCSH, an authoritative, generalized system of terms, has been used to describe and circumscribe the ideas represented in specific feminist monographs on the topics of feminist theories and women's movements.

1.2 Research Question: Subject Access to Women's Studies Literature

Grassroots movements of social and political activism, such as the women's movement and the civil rights movement have shaped knowledge production within academia. Women's and Gender Studies (WS) is an example of an institutionalized, academic field with its roots in the Second Wave of U.S. feminist activism, which began in the 1960s. Researchers in the field of WS have created and continue to create a huge body of knowledge reflected in a large, unique, and interdisciplinary literature. Previous research has shown LCSH to be inadequate in representing the early core works of the field as well as general information about women and topics of special concern to women (Gerhard, et al. 1998, Olson 1996, Mowery 1989). In this research, I would like to provide an update to these studies in an exploration of the Library of Congress Subject Headings' (LCSH) representation of feminist, monographic literature published between 1986 and 1998. I will focus on a rhetorical analysis of heading choices and forms of headings in the bibliographic records of 52 Library of Congress-cataloged core works within the field of WS; these works represent a variety of topics in the realm of feminist theories and women's activism. What is the fit between LCSH and the middle years of Women's Studies core works, and what kinds of ideologies regarding gender, sex, and feminism can be unearthed by examining subject representation?

1.3 Method

I will work from the example of Gerhard, et al. (1998) in analyzing the abstracts of WS core works, as represented in *Women's Studies: A Recommended Bibliography* (3rd edition, 2004). This topically-organized bibliography contains abstracts of monographs, anthologies, periodicals, reference works, and websites published between 1986 and 1998. My sample will be composed of 52 monographs from the bibliography's Chapter 2 "Feminist Theories and Women's Movements." I have excluded collections of essays and anthologies from my sample as these tend to be more wide-ranging and idiosyncratic in treatment of topic, and thus more difficult to represent completely in brief abstracts

and with a set number of headings. I have further limited the sample to works with bibliographic

records in the Library of Congress Online Catalog. I will evaluate the subject headings in the

bibliographic records of these works as they appear in the LC Online Catalog against the abstracts in the

bibliography in order to assess the nature of representation the headings provide. I will be attentive to

broad themes and patterns that emerge in the abstracts and in the headings, as well as to a one-to-one

comparison of abstract to record. I will present my findings both in narrative-form and with numeric

data.

I conducted a pilot study of 24 titles from the bibliography's Chapter 13 "Communications, Mass

Media, and Language," in preparation for the thesis proposal defense. Findings from this study include

an overall lack of available headings to describe feminist literature in these fields, as well as problems

with accuracy in applying existing headings. The pilot study and findings are discussed in depth in

Chapter 3.

1.4 Significance of the Research

With regard to any given topic, but in this case, Women's Studies, a controlled vocabulary can

distort meanings, minimize or inflate the importance of a concept, further normalize an unquestioned

ideal, reproduce discriminatory ideologies, or erase the existence of a critical discourse.   Identifying

particular instances of these occurrences and theorizing conceptual descriptions of the patterns in

naming and the ideologies underlying those patterns is necessary for suggesting specific ways to

produce change and improvement in subject access to WS materials. Previous research (discussed fully

in Chapter 2) has done much of this work and has provided a foundation for analysis. I seek to provide

an updated exploration of LCSH and WS to build upon this foundation, working with LC- cataloged titles

from a span of time within the middle years of the field of WS, 1986-1998. This particular period has not

been the subject of a large-scale, systematic examination. I hope to provide a glimpse into specific problems in representation and to suggest solutions to these problems.

1.5 Limitations of the Research

A limitation of my method of exploration plays out in an assessment of currency.   WS as an institutionalized academic field is only 39 years old, but its scholarship has evolved rapidly.   Feminist discourse has provoked enormous social change and has itself been shaped by criticism from the perspectives of race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class, internationalisms, post-colonialism, and more. As a result, feminist discourses and feminisms must be spoken of in the plural, and 39 years represent huge shifts in thought and vocabulary, both in the academy and in society as a whole.   The bibliography I will be using was published in 2004; therefore the terms used to describe the works in the abstracts are relatively up-to-date. The works which the bibliography describes were published between 1986 and 1998, while 1999 works are listed by citation only. These works represent a body of scholarship that is between nine and twenty-two years old.   I will work from the assumption that the bibliographic records I will be examining were created soon after the publication of each work. The age difference between the language in the abstracts and the language of the subject headings, as well as the rapid paradigm and theoretical shifts in the field, has the potential effects of the latest terminology not being represented in the records, and currency of the headings in the strictest sense may be difficult to assess. Via the syndetic structure of the records, older headings no longer in use will be linked to the new headings that have replaced them, but new, stand-alone headings created after the initial cataloging of the works will not necessarily have been added to the records.

The sample is made up of monographs and excludes reference books, websites, and periodicals. I have also left out volumes of collected essays and anthologies/readers because they tend to treat a

given topic from too many wide-ranging perspectives and contexts to be adequately represented in summarized forms, such as abstracts and subject headings.

The number of works in the sample is dictated by the practical concern of the time-constraints of this research context and is not a methodological choice. In order to create a manageable sample, I chose to work with books about feminist theories and women's movements/activism, which represent areas of personal familiarity and interest. I do not intend to suggest that this sample represents a full range of the subjects, perspectives, and methodological approaches addressed and utilized by WS scholars, but I do believe this area of scholarship is central to the field and "arguably the tapestry through which all other threads of feminism and women's studies are woven" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 22). In addition, this thesis represents only a portion of this project, and in the future, I hope to expand both the number of titles in the sample and its disciplinary range. Here I intend only to explore the representation of specific works, and though I will look for patterns in the representation, I make no claim that this sample is full or complete.

The abstracts in the bibliography were created by a team of librarians with special interest in the field of WS and a record of publications in the area of WS librarianship. WS scholars at several institutions served as consultants. The editor-authors, Krikos and Ingold, refer to themselves as "generalist librarians" and acknowledge that "scholars and specialists may take issue with our choices and comments" (Krikos and Ingold 2004, xxi). "Librarians with knowledge of various facets of Women's Studies" (xi) chose the works and wrote the abstracts, each of which "are based on thorough examinations of each title as well as consideration to its critical reception" (xxii). Chapter 2 "Feminist Theories and Women's Movements" was authored by Joan Ariel and Chapter 13 "Communications, Mass Media, and Language" by Ellen Broidy. (Chapter 13 is used for the pilot study sample only.) I will discuss these authors' professional backgrounds in Chapter 3.

The abstracts range from approximately 200-500 words each and in some cases may not be enough to determine whether the LC subject representation is accurate. When in doubt, I will consult other sources, such as the work itself, feminist thesauri, or feminist dictionaries. It should also be noted that the methodology in Gerhard, et al. (1998), which I have adopted for this study, has a fundamental flaw. It does not assess the accuracy of the subject headings in comparison to first-hand analyses of the works themselves, but to the abstracts representing the works. This means that the comparison for each title is of one surrogate (headings) to another (abstract), not directly to the text itself. Though this gives me pause, I believe that a comparison of subject headings to abstracts maintains validity due to the subject expertise of the authors who created the abstracts. This methodological flaw is not addressed by Gerhard, et al. (1998). Rather, they embrace the abstracts as authoritative sources of information which they feel establish literary warrant. "The literary warrant required by the library in order for a heading to be revised or established can be presented clearly by reference to the annotations in [the bibliography] and [the authors'] description of the core literature of Women's Studies" (137). Note that they are not advocating that bibliographic records should be created from anything other than the work itself, but rather that abstracts can be used as a source to update and establish the authoritativeness of controlled vocabularies.

Chapter 2: Context and Review of the Literature

In this chapter, I will describe the context of study, (the Library of Congress Subject Headings) in terms of principles and practices. Next, I will describe the field of Women's Studies, giving special attention to its literature. Last, I will discuss the problems and solutions identified in the Library and Information Sciences literature in applying LCSH and controlled vocabularies in general to Women's Studies resources.

2.1 The Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH)

The principles underlying the development of LCSH and the institutional guidelines behind the practices of applying headings to individual records that are relevant to this research include 1. the concept of literary warrant and the process for the creation of new headings, 2. the guidelines for terminology as based on the needs of the user, 3. the concepts of controlled vocabulary and specificity, 4. the rules regarding the structure and syntax of the headings and, 5. The syndetic structure of the headings' records. The following discussion is drawn primarily, but not entirely, from Chan as set forth in her work *Library of Congress Subject Headings: Principles of Structure and Policies for Application* (1990). Until this publication, the principles and practices had never before been codified in one place with attributions, though a number of separate documents published over the past century had provided the fundamentals of the purpose of the headings, listed the headings themselves, and/or discussed directions for creation, use, and interpretation. Chan was contracted by LC to derive the underlying principles and practices of LCSH from these previous works and to provide a code of practice in the form of a long statement: thus, this work represents an effort "to record the principles now [as of 1990] being followed in the construction and application of headings" (Chan 1990, iii). The works from which Chan has derived the code of practice are Haykin's *Subject Headings: A Practical Guide* (1951); LC's *Map Cataloging Manual* ; *Free-floating Subdivisions: An Alphabetical Index*; *LC Period Subdivisions*

Under Names of Places; Library of Congress Subject Headings; Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings; and *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*.

Literary warrant is the practice of establishing headings as suggested by the literature itself rather than attempting to fit all topics into a pre-defined, universal taxonomy that would presume to represent all possible subjects and knowledge. LCSH was established to describe the specific works held by the Library of Congress, but now also includes headings suggested by "libraries engaged in cooperative activities with the Library of Congress based on the needs of their collections" (Chan 1990, 3). The Library of Congress' policy is to "establish a subject heading for a topic that represents a discrete, identifiable concept when it is first encountered in a work being cataloged, rather than after several works on the topic have been published and cataloged" (Library of Congress 2008, H187).

The terminology chosen for the headings should be based on "current usage" (Chan 1990, 2) and should stem from research in *general* dictionaries, encyclopedias, indexes and thesauri, the work being cataloged, and authoritative references in the field (Library of Congress, Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings, H202-2b). When faced with synonyms, the specific terminology used in the heading should be determined by finding "the best possible balance among the criteria of being unbiased, familiar to users, and unambiguous in meaning" (Chan 1990, 7). LCSH is a general vocabulary meant to serve the needs of the broadest possible set of users, not a specialized group in a specific field, so there is a tension between the somewhat contradictory principles of following the usage in the field while simultaneously using terminology familiar to the most general, or simply the most, users: "In order to serve a multitude of users, popular terms are generally used, provided their meanings are precise and unambiguous" (Chan 1990, 8). However, Taylor notes that in LCSH, *myocardial infarction* is the preferred term over *heart attack*, indicating that LCSH does not always follow popular usage (2006).

The principle of controlled vocabulary via uniform headings and unique headings is also followed in formulating subject headings. A uniform heading, "one heading per subject" (Chan 1990, 3), is a term

which is chosen to represent all other forms of a given topic for the purpose of creating a single heading to which to link all the works on that topic. Uniform headings control for synonymy and plurality. For example, LCSH uses *chairs* instead of *seats* and *soils* instead of *soil*. A unique heading, "one subject per heading" (Chan 1990, 3) means that each heading represents only one subject. Unique headings are meant to control homographs, which are specified by adding parenthetical qualifiers to the main term, for example, *Difference (Musical group)* and *Difference (Philosophy).*

The principle of specificity is also followed in LCSH in that "the most precise term for naming the subject, rather than a broader or generic term which encompasses the subject, is used as the heading" (Chan 1990, 4). This is also called co-extensiveness, meaning that the subject heading is as broad, but nor broader, than the subject. In addition, consistency is sought by following patterns, both those "that exist in a particular field" and those that already exist in other LC headings (Chan 1990, 4).

There are many different syntactic structures of main headings, which themselves can be subdivided by other terms. The forms are: single nouns, single adjectives, gerunds, adjectival phrases, conjunctive phrases, prepositional phrases, and inverted phrases (Taylor 2004). Any of these might be modified with parenthetical qualifiers and/or subdivided with more words or phrases indicating subtopic, form/genre, geographic location, or chronological period (Chan 1990, 16). For example, *Guitars (2) with orchestra--Scores and parts (solo)* is a single noun heading, parenthetically qualified and subdivided by form/genre, the subdivision itself being parenthetically qualified.   In addition, there are also standard free-floating subdivisions and phrase headings "which may be combined with any existing heading or with any heading within designated categories to form new phrase headings" (Chan 1990, 13). An example is *Anecdote*, a free-floating subdivision that may be used under main headings representing people or corporations, geographic entities, topical headings, and others (e.g. *Acculturation – Middle west – Anecdotes*).

Syndetic structure refers to cross-references and the linked structure of the records for subject headings, called authority records. There are three types of relationships through which headings might be linked: associative, equivalence, and hierarchical (Taylor 2004). Equivalence relationships are indicated by directing users from non-preferred terms to the form being used as the heading, e.g., *Mankind,* see *Human beings.* Hierarchical relationships are lists of broader terms and narrower terms that the user might also search, e.g., *Circus*, narrower term: *Flea circus*. Associative relationships are represented in a list of related terms under which a user might search, e.g., *Computers*, see also *Calculators*.   Not all records of subject headings have a syndetic structure, nor do they all have scope notes, which indicate the scope of the subject heading so that a cataloger will know more specifically when and when not to use a given heading. Records for subject headings sometimes also contain a field indicating the bibliographic source of the term, but this, like scope notes, is not required.

The principles discussed above do not describe LCSH and authority records comprehensively, but recognize specific elements that affect this analysis of the subject representation of feminist monographs. In the following section, I will describe the field of Women's Studies, focusing on its historical and curricular development and its literature.

2.2 Defining Women's Studies

2.2.1 The Academic Field

Women's Studies (WS) is an interdisciplinary, academic field with many aims. Its literature, methods, theories, and scope are multiple and broad.   Its assorted names—Women's Studies, Women Studies, Feminist Studies, and Gender Studies—point to the changing conception of the field by its practitioners since the first "student-initiated" courses were taught on college campuses in 1970 (Boxer 1998, 11) to the current face of the field as an institutionalized academic specialty. The various names indicate shifting foci: a field created and claimed by women for women (*Women's* Studies), a field that

creates knowledge about women, (*Women* Studies), and a field that creates knowledge based on the belief that gender is political and matters both as a lens and as a subject (*Feminist* Studies and *Gender* Studies). Though it is now considered a mainstream academic pursuit, and there are nine universities in the United States that offer Ph.D. level degrees in Women's or Gender Studies (NWSA Guide to Graduate Work in Women's Studies), its core function can still be described as critical and transformative. It seeks, through feminist inquiry, to problematize the normative, prescriptive constructs of the sex/gender system in order to transform societies and the institutions and discourses, both concrete and abstract, through which they are constituted.

The institutionalization of WS in higher education stems from the second wave of U.S. feminist activism of the 1960s. San Diego State University became the first institution of higher education with an integrated program in 1970, brought about by the work of a group of feminist activists from the area who, beginning in 1969, formed a "Women's Studies Committee" in order to promote the development of a WS program in the College of Arts and Letters (Boxer 1998, 9). Cornell University followed suit in the 1970-71 academic year, and the number of programs and departments in colleges and universities across the country began to mushroom.

> The 150 programs counted in 1975 had doubled by 1980, reached 450 at mid-decade, and exceeded 600 by the early 1990s. Women's Studies courses…existed at a majority of four-year institutions of higher education. Often all it took was a faculty member willing to teach and an administrator willing to sanction the new venture—at times, not even money was required, for volunteers stepped forward…. (Boxer 1998, 10)

The current number of colleges or universities offering a Bachelor's level degree in WS is 314, with over 700 institutions offering undergraduate coursework (NWSA/Ms. Magazine Guide to Women's/Gender Studies).

2.2.2 The Curricular Development of Women's Studies

The curricular history of WS has been defined in a five-phase typology imagined by Peggy McIntosh (1985) in her essay "Interactive Phases of Curricular Re-Vision: A Feminist Perspective." She writes, "in naming the five phases, I will use history as the first example. I call Phase 1 Womanless History; Phase 2 Women in History; Phase 3 Women as a Problem, Anomaly, or Absence in History; Phase 4 Women *As* History; and Phase 5 History Redefined or Reconstructed to Include Us All" (5). Keeping in mind that WS is an interdisciplinary pursuit, this typology can be applied to any particular academic pursuit in which WS as a specialty is practiced, from Political Science to Biology. She creates a picture of the flow of knowledge creation within the field of WS and demonstrates the curricular impact on and transformation of the institution of education as a whole when gender is brought to the fore.

Phase 2 is popularly known as the "add women and stir" method of integrating a feminist perspective into the curriculum of various disciplines. It is considered a hurdle to a meaningful transformation in knowledge creation because it accepts the existing values, theories, and methods of the field in question merely by adding "important" women and their contributions to the mix, without challenging androcentric epistemologies. Contrast Phase 2 with Phase 5, in which the curriculum has been so transformed that Women's Studies is no longer necessary. "It is at this point that the very way we define subjects and departments should have evolved to take into account the critiques emerging from the earlier phases" (Pritchard 1994). Such a paradigm shift renders the continued existence of Women's Studies unnecessary because its transformative aim has been accomplished.

Conway, et al. (1995) gather together a list of definitions of the field from various scholars:

> Women's Studies: is a way of helping women to understand themselves…is a way of
> enabling women to develop a sense of self worth…illuminates women's
> experiences…explores the nature of the relationships between the sexes…is concerned
> with the patriarchal biases inherent in traditional disciplines…is feminist

education…exposes and redresses the oppression of women…provides a frame of reference in which to analyze contemporary and historical events and patterns in terms of the significance of gender roles, socio-economic class, ethnocultural identification, sexual preferences, and generational differences…is an alternate mode of thinking…a questioning of the nature of knowledge itself…. (70-71)

It is worth noting that this list was culled from sources in the '70s-'90s, and thus summarizes the early and middle years of the field. Titles analyzed within the context of my research were published in the middle years, 1986-1998.

2.2.3 The Literature of Women's Studies

The literature of Women's Studies is broad and includes primary and secondary sources of all types, gray literature, reference works, conferences papers, websites, journal articles, monographs, government documents, anthologies, zines, and more. While my research will examine feminist monographs in particular, I would like to outline the scope of feminist literature as a whole in order to contextualize the knowledge production within the field. Ulrich's Guide to Periodicals database (which, notably, does not contain any form of the word *Feminism* in its subject index), nevertheless lists 482 titles under the subject heading *Women's Studies.* Limiting this set of 482 records by keyword-in-title *feminist* and to indexed/abstracted journals returns 48 publications, of which 39 are active. A search of WorldCat under the subject heading *Feminism*, limited to books in English, returns 25,705 records, although it should be noted that this number reflects multiple editions of the same work. Using the same limits (books in English) in a subject heading search with the term *Women's Studies* returns 4,191 records.

In addition, there are many electronic databases specific to WS. The Association of College and Research Libraries, Women's Studies Section (ACRL WSS) has identified in the for-fee realm "nine core

databases that contain content primarily related to women, gender, sexuality, and/or feminist studies"

(Database Instruction Guide). Many general databases, such as Academic Search Premier and MLA

International also index feminist and Women's Studies-oriented information. For-free, authoritative,

digital resources with women's and feminist content are too numerous to count, and there exists no

comprehensive source for discovering all of them. Organizations such as ACRL WSS provide online

bibliographies of these types of digital resources, and many colleges and universities, notably the

University of Maryland and the University of Wisconsin, provide robust online research guides that

attempt to collocate many of these resources by topical area:

http://www.mith2.umd.edu/WomensStudies/ and http://womenst.library.wisc.edu/.

It is useful to break down types of information in the field into two sets because it illuminates

some of the problems of knowledge organization for WS resources. These two sets are *information

about women* and *feminist information*. The first set, *information about women*, is interdisciplinary and

includes any works that, intentionally or not, reflect the subjects of femininity or women, whether those

subjects are addressed head-on or are simply a by-product of the main topic. The perspective from

which this information has been created can exist anywhere on a continuum from misogynist to neutral

to laudatory, and may lack a critical view. The second set, *feminist information*, is a subset of the first,

deliberate in both subject and approach. It consists of information resources, published or unpublished,

primary or secondary, that address any given subject from a feminist perspective, i.e., a self-conscious

standpoint that, most simply, challenges the historical (and ongoing) trend of de-valuing women and

femininity (Lochhead 1985), that places questions of sex and gender at the forefront of the analysis, and

that avoids treating men, masculinity, and heterosexuality as normative, unproblematic constructs.

There are many hallmarks of feminist information that set it off from other types of information

and that should be considered when discussing the subject representation using LCSH. It is likely that

feminist information will include a nuanced understanding of gender and sex that deliberately takes into

account other identity factors and differences among women, such as age, level of physical ability, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, and geographic location (Rupp 2006). Feminist information tends to be both activist and highly interdisciplinary with subjects, methods, and theories crossing and re-crossing traditional disciplinary boundaries (Kushigian 1997). Qualitative, human-centered research in particular tends to be highly self-conscious in approach in that a feminist researcher will generally attempt to erase "artificial barriers between the researcher and those she researches" (Bolton 1989, 18). In other words, rather than viewing those s/he researches as passive objects of study, s/he will treat them as active research subjects, and the presentation of the data will reflect this orientation. Feminist information also very often challenges the idea that sex and gender exist as natural, rather than contrived, categories, or even takes a postmodern stance by questioning whether these categories are meaningful at all in the traditional fixed sense (Butler 1990). Lastly, feminist information often challenges the idea that knowledge can ever be objective or value-free, and posits that subjectivity is inherent in all endeavors and not to be stigmatized, but rather unearthed, acknowledged, and defined when encountered (Reinharz 1992).

Detlefsen (1984) describes the literature of WS in three sets: material about women, feminist material, and WS material. She describes the first, *material about women*, as "information simply about women or females [that] can be, and often is, totally reflective of male bias and traditional sex role socialization" (163). The second set, *feminist information*, she describes as "assert[ing] a point of view that has been lacking in traditional scholarship, one that affirms the equality of all human beings without regard to gender" (163). The third set, *Women's Studies materials,* she describes as "somewhere in the middle" (163). This three-set description stems from an analysis of WS information from the perspective of users of the information, while the two-set description above focuses more on how the information used in the field is created. Both are useful for discussing problems of organization and representation.

16

The use of primary sources in WS is also an important factor when discussing issues of access, though not the focus of my concern of this research. Primary sources in the broad grouping of *information about women*, such as, for example, etiquette guides of the early twentieth century, can provide information about historical conceptions of gender roles. Films, novels, diaries, letters, video games, household accounts, newsletters, church meeting minutes, census information, guerilla art, popular magazines, and more can also be mined for information on women, as well as the concepts of sex and gender in general. Some of these sources directly address these topics, often in intentionally prescriptive ways, though it is also of interest to researchers when these sources are not deliberate in their address of the subject, thus providing insight into the subterranean social and cultural conceptions of women and men, femininity and masculinity.

Primary sources of information about women, whether feminist or not, are especially important for social sciences- and humanities-oriented research on women and gender. "…[T]he field of women's studies depends on access to archival collections, pamphlet material, unpublished scholarship, and grassroots or small press publications" (Kushigian 1997, 20). This dependence has two main causes. First, women have been historically relegated to the private sphere and often not included in public documents and records, or, if they were included, tended to be listed under their husbands' names (e.g. Mrs. John Smith) until well into the 20th Century.   This trend greatly increases the importance of non-traditional forms of information, such as diaries and household documents, which give researchers information on women's daily lives. Second, women's historical lack of access to the public sphere and to positions of authority has resulted in a do-it-yourself ethos, perhaps common to all grassroots movements of resistance, in which zines, newsletters, posters, guerilla art, and other informally published sources of information proliferate.

2.3 Subject Access to Women's Studies Literature

Questions surrounding the organization of and access to this unique body of knowledge are many

and not limited to explorations of subject access.   The scope, interdisciplinarity, and anti-normative

perspective of feminist literature are all attributes that create unique challenges to its organization

when traditional organizational tools are utilized. No matter the nature of the specific discipline in

which feminist research takes place, the research tends to share some commonalities: a woman-

centered approach to theory and method, a re-visioning of epistemology, and a critique of the scope of

the discipline. Based on these attributes, practitioners and researchers have addressed a variety of

areas pertaining to the organization of and access to feminist, interdisciplinary, and women-centered

information, including classification (Kublik et al. 2003, Olson 2001, Olson & Ward 1998, Beghtol 2004,

Humphreys 1987), database coverage and periodical indexing (Mesplay & Loch 1993, Pritchard 1984,

Gerhard, et al. 1993), reference and user services (Westbrook 1999, Westbrook 2003, Searing 1986),

and collection assessment and development (Itner & Futas 1996). This review focuses on the critiques

of subject representation for feminist literature and general literature about women.

2.3.1 Systematic Examinations of LCSH Subject Representation of Women's Studies Literature

Gerhard, et al. (1998) (upon whose methodology my research is largely based) examined 826

bibliographic records of core WS works, comparing the abstracts of these works as found in *Women's*

Studies: a Recommended Core Bibliography, 1980-1985 to the subject headings found in their

bibliographic records in OCLC. They sought to answer the questions, "What subject concepts present in

the core women's studies literature are inadequately represented…? and, [w]hich of these subject

concepts could have been expressed adequately using LCSH" (133)? Taking an empirical approach in

their study, the authors assume that subject headings can be applied and assessed objectively. Their

findings indicate that there are two main problems: lack of cataloger knowledge in the realm of WS and

lack of existing headings in LCSH to describe this body of knowledge. 282 concepts were identified as

non-existent in LCSH, and "most of the time, the missing concepts were not exotic but, rather, were the

types of concepts a women's studies scholar would be looking for" (135). Examples of missing concepts

are depression in women, feminist nuns, lesbian authors, gender-free science, feminist approaches, and

sex role socialization (136). They do not suggest that the underlying principles of LCSH make it

impossible to accurately and completely catalog feminist materials, but rather, that the situation could

be improved by expanding cataloger knowledge of concepts in WS literature and diligent submission of

new headings based on literary warrant.

Olson, in her 1996 dissertation, took a much different approach in her evaluation of the

organization of feminist materials. Using the tool of feminist deconstruction, she first examines the

underlying principles of subject access based on assertions by Cutter, Dewey, and LC. In particular, she

argues that attempting to follow the principle of universality when organizing information makes it

impossible to represent diversity in terms of marginalized groups and ideas, such as women and feminist

thought. "…[T]he presumption of universality constructs systems that marginalize or exclude topics

outside of our cultural mainstreams" (289). She follows this critique with the examination of 11

bibliographic records representing works that "combine…a feminist perspective with attention to

particular groups of women identifying with one or more of the following: women of color, African

American women, Chicanas, lesbians, Asian American women, working class women, Jewish women,

[and] Native American/Canadian women" (290). Her findings include lack of correctly-applied headings

when they exist, and a lack of existing subject headings in LCSH to accurately describe these 11 works.

Missing concepts include: classism, the interrelatedness of class, gender, and race, perpetrators of sex

discrimination and harassment, women of color, Chicanas, lesbians of color, housework, Native

American feminist spirituality, feminist perspective, and voice and self-expression, among others.

Olson also identifies the problem of applying the heading of "literature" to works which consist of essays of creative nonfiction. Creative nonfiction, which she refers to as "personal narrative prose" (307) is a genre of writing utilized as a tool by feminists (and others) to make explicit the connections between the personal realm and the political realm, a basic tenet of the second wave women's movement. Olson argues that applying the subdivision "literature" to creative nonfiction places these collections with works of fiction, which has the effect of "construct[ing] a limit between literature and not-literature" (307) and de-emphasizes that these women are writing of lived experiences in order to use them as a means of feminist analysis.

A precursor to Olson's dissertation is her analysis of 100 Women's Studies titles acquired at the University of Alberta Humanities and Social Sciences Library (1992). Based on her cataloging knowledge in the realm of WS, she determined that there were 42 titles for which LCSH could not provide sufficient subject representation.   She attributes this lack to three causes: "LCSH has developed in the context of a society which does not treat women as equals to men; women's studies is an interdisciplinary field; and feminist research orientations do not fit into categories designed for traditional research" (159-160). She also observes that the problem of poor subject representation for WS materials may in part be due to LC catalogers not always making the best use of their subject lists nor following the principle of specificity.

Mowery studied the LCSH representation of "belles letters related to women's studies," (1989, 89) by examining 164 OCLC records of works found in the first (1979) and second (1986) editions of *Women's Studies: A Recommended Core Bibliography*.   The titles he examined are primarily works of literary criticism and biographies of women authors. He notes that *women in literature* appears in approximately half of the records, and *women and literature* appears in 7 records. *Women authors* appears as a main heading or subdivision in 47 records. *Feminist literary criticism* appears in 9 records, and *sex role in literature* appears in 7. This study is mostly descriptive, and he draws few conclusions.

Mowery makes the assumption that all works in the field of WS should have headings with some combination of the words "women," "feminism/ist," and "sex role" in order to show that they belong to the field of WS, which he does not define.   He concludes that the subject access via cataloging provides better access than does the subject access via classification for these materials, finding them to be too scattered across the P schedules of LCC (98). This indicates another assumption he has made: that all feminist literary criticism should be classed together rather than spread across the schedules by genre, language, geography, or chronology. The benefits of classing all feminist materials together based on approach and perspective, as opposed to scattering them across the schedules based on the subject of inquiry are debatable (Olson 1992, Searing 1986, Foskett 1971, Humphreys 1987, Lochhead 1985).

Rogers (1993) traces the changes made in LCSH regarding headings related to women by comparing four editions of *LCSH* spanning the years 1975-1991,and by a second comparison of 135 headings concerning women in the 14th edition (1991) to a variety of feminist thesauri and indexes of terms. Rogers finds that "the single most dramatic change in subject headings concerning women from [1975 to 1991] is in sheer numbers" (184). She also finds that the headings "from 1980 onwards show a turning away from the idealization of women…and from the assignment of stereotypical roles" (184). She notes that asymmetry in subdivisions relating to men and women decreases over time, that both men and women are recognized as objects of study in the field of WS, and that overly-simplistic headings such as *wife beating* have transformed to reflect a feminist understanding of the problem , as shown with the heading *wife abuse.* She does note the continuation of certain problems (which will be discussed explicitly in section 3.3) such as norming, in which, for example, the heading *engineers* has a narrower term *women engineers*, resulting in the assumption that all works with the heading *engineers* are about men or that all engineers are men unless otherwise noted, as well as that women are a subset of men in general (190).

Rogers raises questions such as the paradox of collocating works on women without contributing to the marginalization of women and without defining women strictly by our sex as opposed to more individual qualities, whether non-sexist headings should be applied to works that are clearly sexist in perspective, and whether a catalog can be too progressive at the expense of some of its users who are conservative. She concludes that "the library has a responsibility to be fair to the people referred to in its catalog, just as librarians have a responsibility to be fair to users they deal with. Although using headings that reflect various popular prejudices might give users easier access, it would also encourage those prejudices and instill them in young readers" (196).

Two broad categories of problems regarding subject access to women-centered and feminist information have been identified in the research discussed above: the inability of universal language structures, such as controlled vocabularies, to represent the inherent diversity of language, and especially to represent ideas that challenge the status quo, such as in feminist scholarship; and biased ideologies, which cause problems with representational terminologies.   Next, I will review the literature on these two broad problems.

2.3.2 Control, Diversity, Power, and Objectivity: The User and Common Usage

As discussed above, LCSH is a controlled vocabulary. In a controlled vocabulary system, one term is chosen to represent authoritatively a given topic in order that all works on that topic are grouped together rather than separated under various terms. The justification for this practice is that the user should have a way of being assured that s/he has located all the works on a given topic without having to guess under which other headings s/he might need to search in order to find more works on the topic. Terms are chosen through research and attempts are made to establish headings based on their appearance in the literature. However, LCSH is a generalist vocabulary, and a balance is sought

between representing terms that are used in a given field and constructing headings that are accessible to the average user.

Haykin states that "the heading chosen must represent common usage or, at any rate, the usage of the class of reader for whom the material on the subject within which the heading falls is intended" (1951, 8). This again points to the contradictory principles that headings should reflect common usage while also following the terminology as used in the field. In the case of a specialized academic field, the creators and readers of the literature are largely the same group of people, and the more specialized the literature, the fewer readers it is likely to have. This argues for a more specialized terminology to provide the basis for establishing headings in given domains. However, LCSH chooses popular terms over scientific ones (Chan 1990, 8).

Chan (2005), in discussing the concept of "the user," refers to Cutter (1897) and Haykin (1951) and their respective references to the "convenience of the public" and "the reader as a focus" for considerations in why subject access points are used at all, as well as for choosing the terminology for these access points (18).   In regard to terminology, the language of the headings should most closely match the way this hypothetical user thinks of the topic. The problem lies in determining who is the hypothetical user and how s/he would conceptualize a given idea. If the principle of a definable, general user is followed, then diversity in thought and experience among the many users of information must be disregarded. The hypothetical, singular user would have to be defined democratically in terms of the characteristics of the majority, and the usage of this group would have to represent what is considered to be mainstream or the norm in how topics and ideas are conceptualized in language. This approach disenfranchises those individuals who are not members of a demographic majority as well as those who, no matter what their demographic characteristics, do not view the world from a dominant/majority point of view.

Chan (2005) continues on to discuss two scholars who problematize the idea of "the user."

Prevost (1946) challenges the idea of a unified, singular public: "Children, young people, adults; the

expert, the inept, the illiterate, the savant; scientists, artists, authors, teachers and—librarians. Once

the diverse nature of the users of the catalog is recognized, it becomes a patent absurdity to speak of

cataloging according to the 'public' mind…" (140). Dunkin (1969) follows Prevost's line of thought while

(apparently) unknowingly perpetuating the idea a definable, singular public through his use of so-called

"generic" masculine terminology: "Suppose some study were to succeed; suppose it were to show that

there is only one user and to identify that user and his needs and habits….Habits and needs change; this

year's man will not be the same man next year" (Dunkin 142).

More recently, scholars have begun to critique the ideas of a singular, universal user and common

usage from the point of view that powerful groups in society have the privilege to define what is

considered mainstream, normal, or standard usage.   Olson poses the question, "Is authority control a

neutral process for creating order out of chaos?" (1996, 1). She determines that it is in fact not a neutral

process because "systems using authority control assume that a universal language is necessary to

overcome the chaos of information retrieval" (1), and due to the inherent diversity of people and ideas,

she concludes that universality cannot actually *be* universal. "A universal system… cannot cover all

topics from all perspectives even though we try to apply it as though it did" (1). The outcome is that

certain groups will always be marginalized by attempts at creating universal language structures to

represent information.   Olson calls for a more "permeable" (6) structure of references and a less rigid

authoritativeness and homogenization in language. For example, she suggests that within an online

catalog, a user could be sent directly from the non-preferred term with which s/he structured her search

to the bibliographic reference, rather than being directed to the preferred term first (6).

Marshall (1972) also addresses the problems in creating subject access points based on common

usage and the idea of a homogenous user. She refers to controlled vocabularies as "maintained,

updated lists" of headings and argues that "since the use of lists is the norm [in libraries], the list-makers must accept responsibility for viewing their reader as an aggregate who has varied social backgrounds and intellectual levels" (1).   Assumptions must therefore be made about the "probable psychological approach to a subject" (1), resulting in a list of headings tailored to a constructed group, not an existing one. Marshall continues, "the list's bias and illogic reflect the list-makers' identification with the 'majority reader' and the extrapolation from that identification that *that* reader is the norm" (2).   Here, it is the bias of those who construct headings and their identification with the politically and socially dominant groups within the greater population that creates problems within an authoritative system of terminology.

Olson & Schlegl point out that "what is commonly used terminology is often confused with what is objective" (2001, 76), raising the point that common usage is not necessarily desirable as a foundation for establishing headings free from bias. De La Tierra provides examples:

> Language is fluid and political. There was a time when we were all "Mankind." When immigrants were brave, as opposed to "Illegal" and "Alien." When African Americans were "Black" or "Colored." When the "N-word" was the actual word. When Latin@s were coined as "Hispanic" and Native Americans were "Indians." When terms such as "Homo," "Fag," "Queer" and "Dyke" were hurled like jagged rocks with the intent to cause injury. They still are, but now these terms have been proudly adopted by some. There was a time when "Male or Female" were the only recognized expressions of gender, "Homosexual or Heterosexual" were the only possible sexual identities, and "Black or White" referred to the entire racial and ethnic spectrum. (2008, 95)

With these examples, De La Tierra clearly shows that ideologies and terminologies go hand-in-hand, and common usage can be violent, exclusionary, and over-simplifying as opposed to neutral, universal, and inclusive.

2.3.3 Terminology: Bias in Naming

Critiques of terminology and heading structure in LCSH include the identification of a variety of specific biases. The four decades of research and observations of bias and discrimination in naming stem from the infusion of second wave (1960s-1970s) feminist discourse and activism into the professions. Berman (1971) and Marshall (1972) provide some of the earliest critiques. Many of these problems have been corrected in the years following the publication of these critiques, but problems persist. The categories of problems that have been identified can be described as: the *women as* syndrome, implied judgment, erasure, infantilization , norming/Othering, asymmetry, sex-specificity, and lack of indication of perspective.

Berman discusses a variety of problems in naming, beginning with *women as.* This problem is the use of the phrase *women as* to make headings such as *women as accountants, women as soldiers,* and *women as astronauts.* The objection is that "the 'as' strongly suggests that women are not ordinarily competent or otherwise equipped to work at accountancy, bear arms, or fly to the moon" (1971, 174). Marshall provides another example: "Women, despite the amount of wealth they supposedly control…have not yet achieved the status of actually *being* consumers. They act out a role. They are WOMEN AS CONSUMERS…" (1972, 2). The *women as* syndrome illuminates an underlying, sexist ideology at work in LCSH: when women are present anywhere in the public realm, they are interlopers who have strayed outside their established boundaries. *Women as* headings have been corrected and users are now directed from, for example, *women as spies* to the more straightforward *women spies*, a heading created in 1986.

The problem of implied judgment has also been noted by both Berman (1971) and Marshall (1972). This is the problem of value judgments attached to headings through the heading's references. For example, Berman notes that the references to *infanticide* and *offenses against the person* as related terms under the heading *abortion* imply a value judgment , labeling abortion-seekers as criminals (1971,

177). Though to be perfectly accurate, abortion was a largely illegal medical procedure at the time he made this observation. It is worth noting that the current LCSH authority record for the concept of abortion lists one term (*female feticide*) that links abortion to a criminal act, and the record also contains a SEE ALSO reference to *reproductive rights*.

Greenblatt also gives an example of the problem of implied judgment as it relates to headings for the concept of homosexuality. She notes that the terms *homosexual* and *homosexuality* appeared in mainstream publications by the 1920s, yet *homosexuality* did not appear in LCSH as a main heading until 1946. Prior to that, "the concept of homosexuality was subsumed under the heading *sexual perversion*" (1990, 78-79). Capek also supplies an example of implied judgment: "grouping lesbian issues and prostitution in categories of sexuality…skews complex social, political, and personal concerns" (1987, viii).

The problem of erasure occurs when groups of people, concepts, or ideas are not represented as headings, one of the primary problems indicated in the studies of representation of feminist works. Greenblatt shows that the terms *lesbianism* and *lesbians* appeared in the literature in the late nineteenth century, noting that they did not appear as headings until 1954 and 1976, respectively. Greenblatt also traces the history of the concept of gays and lesbians coming out, and finds that though the term is well-represented in the literature, no headings existed at the time of her writing to describe this concept. This omission has been corrected, and there is now a heading in LCSH to represent the idea: *coming out (sexual orientation)*.

Berman points out other examples of missing terminology, such as *Afro-American feminism*, *Anarcha-feminism*, *Christian feminism*, *Lesbian authors, and Women's resistance and revolts,* among many others (1984, 168). Again, some of these omissions have been more or less corrected, such as *Womanism* (African American feminism) as a narrower term under *Feminism*, and the addition of *Christian Feminism*, though only as a reference to the heading *Feminism – Religious aspects –*

Christianity, which is not only needlessly complicates the subject but doesn't quite manage to represent

the idea. *Lesbian authors* does exist as such, but *Women's resistance and revolts* is not to be found. The

problem with missing terminology is that a lack of representation has the effect of marginalizing to the

point of invisibility groups of people and ideas, requiring that works on these subjects be accessed

through less direct, inaccurate means. For example, a researcher prior to 1946 would have had to look

under a derogatory term (sexual perversion) to find information on homosexuality, and a researcher

who relies on subject headings to find information of the concept of women's resistance and revolts

might assume that no such information exists.

Infantilizing headings such as *Delinquent women*, as opposed to the more straightforward

possibility *Women criminals* was noted by Marshall (1972). In this heading, women are characterized as

children through the linguistic similarity of the heading to the term "juvenile delinquents." This example

also highlights the problems of asymmetry and norming. Currently in LCSH, adult, male criminals are

represented as *criminals* and adult, female criminals are represented as *female offenders*. The lack of

symmetrical terminology for men and women criminals indicates that there is apparently something

qualitatively different about the crimes women and men commit and/or the treatment they receive in

the criminal justice system, without specifying what these differences might be.   In addition, if a user

does not look at the narrower term under *criminals,* pointing to *female offenders*, then s/he must

assume that this subject heading covers works on female criminals, as well as male, which it does not.

Another example of the problem of norming is supplied by Lochhead, who points to two headings:

photographers and *women photographers* (1985). The assumptions to be made here are that women

are an exception to the norm of male photographers and that women are a sub-species of men.

Berman addresses sex-specific headings, such as *city councilmen*, *fishermen*, and *lumbermen,*

headings which have the effect of defining certain domains as male territory (1984). Detelfsen also

mentions sex-specific headings, such as using *wife* and *husband* instead of *spouse* (1984, 165). Detlefsen

does not explain why this is a problem, so I will provide an example and a purposefully problematized exploration. LCSH previously used the heading *Presidents—Wives*. In light of the recognized bias in this phrase (all presidents are men), the new heading is *Presidents—Spouses.* However much this corrects the stereotype that all presidents are or should be male, there is a tension between addressing the need for specificity in describing information while avoiding prescriptive headings based on stereotypes. For example, it is true in the context of the United States that presidents have all been men. Thus the previous heading *Presidents—United States – Wives* represents a specific topic which could accurately be applied to titles such as *First Ladies: Symbols for a Nation* (LCCN 96516112). On the other hand, this heading is prescriptive in that it seems to forecast a future in which only men *can or should be* presidents, not simply that only men *have been* presidents*.* In recognition of this effect, the new sex-neutral heading *Presidents – Spouses* is used instead.

However, the sex-specific version of the heading is accurate in that it clearly describes the context of presidential politics in the United States in which women have very rarely run for, and never been elected to, this office. In this light, the new heading *United States Presidents – Spouses* could be viewed as empty political correctness (as opposed to meaningful political correctness) in that it disguises and glosses the reality that due to patriarchal, sexist power relations, women have never served as presidents of the United States.   In addition, by naming 'wives' as such, the previous heading is sex-specific and allows a user to locate information on married women in the political realm, a probable research topic. Sex-specific headings are therefore problematic in that in one instance, they may promote stereotypes and in another, they may provide useful and relevant subject access points.

Detlefsen makes the point that "terminology is fluid" (165); therefore the shifting meanings and intentions that accompany various terms require constant navigation. This is particularly true for subjects in which a variety of value judgments exist, such as politicized issues, especially if those values are not openly acknowledged; in other words, where *unacknowledged* bias exists. An example given by

Detlefsen is the multitude of terms used by researchers to express the concept of female-dominated professions, (e.g. nursing, librarianship, and elementary education). Terms appearing in the literature to describe the concept of a female-dominated profession include *feminized professions, traditionally female professions*, *pink collar,* and *semi-profession.* These terms range from relatively value-neutral (*traditionally female professions*), to value-laden and negative (*semi-profession*), to those based on ironic word-play and knowledge of culturally-specific gender stereotypes (*pink collar)*. She asserts that to find material on these topics using LCSH, one must look very broadly, such as under the term *job segregation*.

Braidotti also addresses the problem and reality of fluidity in terminology and the inherently political nature of naming: "I think that one way of responding to the crisis of representation is by coming to terms with the power of naming. Issues of definition are no mere name-swapping. They…register the decline, or the inadequacy, of dominant analytic frameworks…" (2002, 174). In other words, shifting terminology provides a glimpse into ideologies and systems of power and control.

Lastly, the problem of lack of aspect and perspective is also mentioned by Detlefsen. She gives the example of the heading *abortion*, which is "almost never subdivided to indicate a difference in use or application as a gynecological issue on the one hand, and as a political issue on the other" (1984, 166). Lack of feminist perspective indicated in headings is also noted as a problem by Olson (1996, *Power)*. Weinberg (1988) argues, in the context of periodical indexing, that scholarly researchers search for more than simply topics, and tend to want to find information representing theories and ideas as applied to a given topic. She writes, "[t]he essence of the problem is that indexes focus on *aboutness* while neglecting *aspect*; the linguistic analogs of these notions are *topic* and *comment* respectively" (4). Though she is specifically discussing periodical indexing, this observation applies equally well to subject headings used in library catalogs. In WS, information is often sought about the feminist, gendered, or queered perspectives on a given subject.

2.3.4 Creating Change: Development of Thesauri and Actions of Professional Organizations

The critiques and studies of LCSH's representation of Women's Studies materials described above constitute one method of promoting change in LCSH. By describing the specific ways in which LCSH makes it difficult to access information on women and feminist information, the authors highlight the situation and call for redress. Another method of promoting progressive change in subject access is the creation of thesauri of terms for Women's Studies information.

Thesauri provide alternate models for subject representation that can be used as historical maps to the landscape of Women's Studies, as sources of new terms to be incorporated into LCSH or other controlled vocabularies, and as sources for organizing special collections of Women's Studies materials from the bottom up. Each thesauri discussed below is representative of a project with a broad scope with terms meant to represent the whole of Women's Studies literature, as opposed to narrower efforts, such as to provide terms for a single academic field or topical area, or to describe a particular special collection.

In 1977, Marshall's *On Equal Terms: A Thesaurus for Nonsexist Indexing and Cataloging* was published*.* This work is arranged in two parts, the second part encompassing the thesaurus. The first part has two chapters: "Sexism and Language" and "Principles for Establishing Subject Headings Relating to People and Peoples." In the first chapter, Marshall reports on instances of "the linguistic exclusion of the female" and explains that her thesaurus is meant "to provide an alternative to--and to change the vocabulary of—the most widely used source of subject descriptors, the *Library of Congress Subject Headings*" (4). In this short chapter, Marshall is calling for recognition of the impact on society of an authoritative vocabulary such as LCSH.

The 6 principles for establishing headings in the next chapter pertain to names for groups of people (use the authentic name or the name by which the group in question uses, and prefer the

literature of the group to outside "experts"); to subdivisions in pre-coordinated headings (avoid

connoting inferiority or peculiarity, and do not vary the structure of the main heading and its subdivision

for different groups of people); to structure and wording (avoid "as" and "in" to describe groups in

certain occupations or pursuits, and use the same structure for marginalized groups as for powerful

groups); to specificity (create new terms when needed); to classes of people (establish headings for all

classes of people, not some); and to the maintenance of cards in a card catalog (keep the number of

cards for each heading manageable by looking for ways to differentiate the titles represented).

The thesaurus in part 2 follows these principles and conforms to the recommendations of the

standard Z39. 19-1974: *Guidelines for Thesaurus Structure, Construction, and Use.* She includes broader

and narrower terms, as well as USE references, and provides information on the corresponding term in

LCSH.   Overall, the thesaurus provides "additions to the *LCSH* to cover areas of women's concerns that

are not presently covered…and revisions of biased terms" (12).

Dickstein, et al. (1988) created a different type of thesaurus in response to the needs of the

Women's Studies Program at the University of Arizona to identify works on women in their university

library. Because of the scattering of works on women throughout the physical collection, it was

determined that a list of subject headings would provide a better tool for analysis than surveying the

collection based on classification schedules. This project led the authors to compile a comprehensive

listing of all the LC subject headings pertaining to women from the 1983 edition of *LCSH*. The terms

within their listing are organized in multiple ways to provide access. The first chapter contains a full list

of the 3, 500 headings and subdivisions related to women displayed alphabetically. The following

chapters organize the headings into 11 topical areas: Communication and Information, Economics and

Employment, Education, History and Social Change, International Women, Language, Literature,

Religion, and Philosophy, Law, Government, and Public Policy, Health and Biological Sciences, Social

Science and Culture, and Visual and Performing Arts.

This thesaurus was meant to function solely as a list of access points to Women's Studies literature. The authors state in the preface that "the lack of critique of headings does not reflect the authors' acceptance of all terms assigned to women and women's issues by the Library of Congress" (vii). This work now serves the historical purpose of documenting terminologies used to describe the information about women at a given moment in time, though it does not assess how accurately the headings did so.

Just a year before the publication of *Women in LC's Terms*, a thesaurus with a more critical stance was published: *A Women's Thesaurus: An Index Used to Describe and Locate Information By and About Women*, edited by Mary Ellen Capek (1987). The purpose of this work is to provide current terms for the proliferation of information about women and girls in the 1970s and 1980s, as well as to represent the ways in which the production of this information changed the landscape of research, knowledge production, and social equality. Capek notes that "the language used to describe and synthesize this social phenomenon…has not kept up with the material and activities generated, [a]nd it is this absence, these silences, the words not present, that has shaped our work on this thesaurus" (1987, viii). Capek envisions the thesaurus as a source for generating a non-sexist set of terms for organizing Women's Studies information in a variety of contexts.

Her thesaurus is arranged in multiple ways. First, there is an alphabetical display with abundant related terms. Following this section, the terms are arranged in a "Rotated Display," or keyword-in-context display. Next there is a "Hierarchical Display" in which the main terms appear in bold with the broader terms listed above and indented according to their place in the hierarchy, and the narrower terms listed below, also in indented structure. Following this section, terms are displayed alphabetically by subject, utilizing the same 11 categories as Dickstein, et al (1988). Next, terms are displayed alphabetically in a right-side column (Use) with a corresponding left-side column (Do Not Use), then reversed with the Do Not Use terms appearing alphabetically in the right-side column and the Use terms

appearing in the left-side column. Finally, there is a "Delimiters Display," which lists terms for the

following categories, arranged hierarchically: Age Levels, Cultural and Political Movements, Education

Levels, Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Descriptors, Historical Periods, Laws and Regulations, National and

Regional Descriptors, and Types and Forms of Materials.   The variety of displays in this thesaurus make

it a very useful tool.

Broad-based thesauri in non-U.S. contexts include *The Dutch Women's Thesaurus,* which, over

several iterations from 1992-1998,has been translated and modified into *The European Women's*

Thesaurus. The mission of *The Dutch Women's Thesaurus* (*Vrouwenthesaurus*) was to map the

landscape of terms describing information on Dutch women, the Dutch women's movement, and the

field of Dutch Women's Studies. *The Dutch Women's Thesaurus* was adapted and translated into English

and published as *The European Women's Thesaurus* in 1998. It maps the field of European Women's

Studies and information on European women and European women's movements. *The Canadian*

Women's Thesaurus is similar in scope to the Dutch and European projects. It is "a standardized

vocabulary designed to help in finding or organizing written materials by, for, and about Canadian

women, the Canadian women's movement, and Canadian women's studies" (Canadian Women's

Indexing Group 1990, v). In French and English, it is arranged alphabetically by main heading with

broader, narrower, and related terms ordered hierarchically with each entry. It also includes a rotated

index in both languages.

Advocacy for change in subject representation also comes through the work of professional bodies

in the field of Library and Information Sciences and in Women's Studies. In 1976, an "[American Library

Association] Resolution on Racism and Sexism Awareness directed the [Resources and Technical Services

Division], among other ALA divisions, to assist in the process of eradicating racial and sexual

discrimination" (Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis Subcommittee 1980, 3). A committee was

formed to investigate these problems within the realms of classification and cataloging, and over the

next four years, the committee produced reports and recommendations based on their research

findings. Recommendations included specific changes in the terminology and structure of Dewey and LC

classification schedules, changes in terminology in LCSH, and the establishment of practices for

sustained analysis of sexism and racism in subject representation from within the Library of Congress.

The National Women's Studies Association approved a resolution in 1988 addressed to the Chief of

the Subject Cataloging Division at the Library of Congress to remove "exclusive sexist subject headings"

and replace them with inclusive terms, and to "create and assign new subject headings" based on the

literature (19). The Resolution includes a list of inappropriately sex-specific headings and suggested

inclusive terms to replace them (e.g. *fossil man*, replace with *prehistoric humans*; *freedmen*, replace with

freed slaves). A list of new headings is also included in the Resolution, including such topics as

acquaintance rape, *anti-pornography movement, feminist periodicals*, and *parental notification laws,*

among many others.   Some of these changes were made, though not necessarily exactly as suggested,

and some of the changes were not made at all. *Fossil man* now directs users to use *fossil hominids*.

Acquaintance rape was introduced as a new heading the year the Resolution was passed, and includes

the narrower term *date rape*, but *feminist periodicals* and *parental notification laws* have not yet been

created and *freedmen* remains. In the Resolution, NWSA explicitly addresses the principle of literary

warrant and the problem of sexist language and calls for "the cooperation of the Library of Congress" in

"enlarg[ing] the mind's boundaries and making knowledge readily accessible" (20), thus providing a

rationale for the changes requested.

Chapter 3: Theory and Method

3.1 Theoretical Approach

Hannigan (1994) explains that "feminist scholarship involves looking at the assumptions and biases, particularly androcentric biases, incorporated in theory and research, that directly affect the ways libraries collect, store, and disseminate materials and the choice of services offered to users" (302). I am adopting this approach here in order to analyze the construction and application of subject headings for WS materials. As mentioned in Chapter Two in the discussion of the defining characteristics of *feminist information,* I will also work from the approach that subjectivity is an inherent quality of information and its surrogate representations. A foundational approach to this research is to be aware of whether the headings serve as an accurate reflection of the works they are being used to describe or more as a reflection of the bias/sexism found in the "prevailing usage" and general understanding of concepts regarding women, gender, and feminism within contemporary society.

I will also be attentive to the multiplicity of feminist theories and open to interpretations stemming from the many perspectives offered by them; I will not attempt to take on a particular feminist theoretical approach from the onset but to allow the data itself to suggest fruitful and interesting lines of inquiry. Due to my subjective location as a researcher with a WS educational background and as a white woman from a middle class, suburban, middle U.S. context, I will attempt to be conscientious regarding my own bias and situation.

3.2 Method: Resources and Guiding Questions

Following the method of Gerhard, et al. (1998), I will assess the subject headings employed in the bibliographic records in the Library of Congress Online Catalog of 52 core WS works from *Women's Studies: A Recommended Bibliography*, (3rd edition, 2004) by comparing these headings to the content of the works as represented in the abstracts in the bibliography. If a record for a given work does not exist

in the LC catalog, I will eliminate that work from my sample. The purpose of this assessment is to evaluate the accuracy, relevance, specificity, and currency of the subject headings describing a particular work. I will also seek to determine whether better choices in subject headings exist but were not used or whether the LCSH Authorities lack headings to represent concepts in the WS literature. In particular, I will take a philosophical approach in assessment, paying attention to the rhetorical representation of these works, e.g. whether stereotypes and anti-feminist ideas play out in the subject representation. In addition to the abstract, I will at times consult the work itself in order to clarify the aboutness of the work and to look for appropriate terminology. I will also rely on my knowledge of the field, which I earned through my education in WS as an undergraduate and as a graduate student.

Guiding questions include: do the headings used in a given record match the description of the content of the work in question as provided in the abstract? From a feminist perspective, how do the headings rhetorically represent each work? Are given topics marginalized or reified? Are there headings which do exist that could have been used to better effect but were not? Are there concepts in the literature for which no established headings exist? Would a hypothetical feminist researcher be able to locate works relevant to his or her research needs via these subject headings (specificity) without the headings ghettoizing the works by describing them too narrowly (relevance)?

To illustrate the problem of specificity and relevance, a work about high school female athletes would be well represented with the heading *School sports for girls*, or *School sports – Girls,* yet the broader level heading *School sports* should arguably also be used in the record so that a researcher looking for information on high school sports in general would not miss the title and inadvertently find works only on boys. In other words, a work about *girls'* school sports is also a work about *school sports*. The rules set out in *LCSH* on "specific and direct entry" instruct catalogers to use the most precise heading as opposed to a broader or generic term. However, due to bias, many headings only exist in a general form. For example, the book *Measurement of the velocity factor and of athletic power in high*

school boys (LCCN: 39014219) has been assigned the heading *school sports*. A truly co-extensive,

specific, and direct heading would have been *school sports for boys*, but this heading has never been

created, demonstrating male bias and norming.   Male norming leaves catalogers with a problem—the

need to be specific about information on girls and women without ghettoizing.

      In addition to comparing the subject headings in individual records to the content of the

individual works, I will also observe the general fit of the headings with the overall patterns of

terminology used to describe the literature of the field. What is the state of LCSH's patterns of

terminology regarding WS topics in general, and is LCSH able to accurately represent the content of the

literature?

3.2.1 The Bibliography

      The annotated bibliography I will be using as a source of annotated, core works in the field of

WS has been written for an audience of "general academic readers" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, xxi). The

annotations were created by "librarians with knowledge of various facets of women's studies," and the

"bibliography faithfully reflects the shape that the literature of women's studies has assumed since the

1980-1985 installment…synthesizing a decade and a half of feminist scholarship" (xi-xii).

      Joan Ariel, compiler and author of Chapter 2 "Feminist Theories and Women's Movements,"

served at the University of California, Irvine for approximately 20 years as both the Women's Studies

Librarian and an instructor and academic coordinator in the Women's Studies program (Online Archive

of California 2009). Ellen Broidy, compiler and author of Chapter 13 "Communications, Mass Media, and

Language" (titles from which were used for the pilot study only), is the Library Director at the Santa

Barbara Graduate Institute. She was previously the Head of Collections, Research, and Instruction at

UCLA.   Her Master's and PhD are in history, and she was the recipient of Association of College and

Research Libraries Women's Studies Section Award for Career Achievement in Women's Studies

Librarianship (Santa Barbara Graduate Institute 2007).

The bibliography is organized both topically and by type of resource. Periodicals and general

reference works have been given their own chapters; more specific, topically-oriented reference works

and websites have been placed alongside monographs in the topical chapters. There are a total of

1,560 annotated entries which represent "the shape that the literature of women's studies has assumed

since the 1980-1985 [edition of the bibliography]" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, xi). The selections do not

represent the total number of works in the field, but rather the best, defined as including "not only well-

known works by prominent scholars, but also path-breaking and provocative titles that push the

boundaries of feminist theory and pedagogy" (xi). It includes an introduction to the landscape of

feminist thought and scholarship, and, as the third edition, has proved over time to be a useful,

respected, and authoritative tool for researchers and librarians.

3.2.2 Data Sample and Limitations

I have limited my analysis to the monographs in the specified chapters. This will ensure that

my comparisons of the descriptions in the bibliography with the subject headings in the records are

based on semantics and terminology more so than on cataloging practices specific to different types of

resources. Though I will be assessing the rhetorical applicability of the headings, I will also document a

count of headings per record in order to provide context.

The total number of entries in the bibliography is unwieldy in this research context, and

includes reference works, websites, periodicals, and monographs. Monographs include both single- and

multi-authored studies, collections of essays, and anthologies. I have narrowed the total number of

works to a more manageable scope but kept a large enough sample to provide rich data. The total

number of works included in this study (feminist monographs from selected chapters, not including

edited collections and those without records in the LC Online Catalog) is 52.

Table 1 (see Appendix) shows the topical arrangement of monographic titles across the

bibliography, as well as the total number of monographs per chapter and the sampled number from the

relevant chapters. Note that the *Communications, Mass Media, and Language* chapter titles are

included in the pilot study sample only (24 total) and not counted in the "Total in sample."

It is interesting as a side-note to observe the idiosyncratic topical and disciplinary arrangement

of the works in the bibliography. The arrangement is not based purely on method, subject matter, or

type of work produced, and this is characteristic of the interdisciplinarity of WS. For example, the

chapter *Feminist Theories and Women's Movements* is categorized outside of the disciplinary categories

applied to the other chapters and includes many histories, especially in the *Women's Movements and

Activism* subsection.   The *Feminist Thought and Theories* subsection contains works of poetry and

personal essays, as well as traditional scholarly works that address social issues, philosophy, and political

theories. Many of the works in the chapters given the *Science and Technology* disciplinary designation,

as well as many under the *Humanities* designation, such as those in the chapter *Art, Architecture, Music,

and Dance* are biographical and historical works. Works in the *Sociology, Social Lives, and Social Issues*

chapter are often journalistic accounts in addition to traditional qualitative studies. These observations

are not meant as criticisms of the arrangement of the bibliography, but are mentioned in support of the

idea that the traditional arrangement of knowledge domains into disciplines does not work well for

interdisciplinary topics and research orientations. Traditional knowledge domains and classification

structures, such as the Library of Congress Classification and the Dewey Decimal Classification are

inadequate for organizing WS and other interdisciplinary resources, resulting in a fragmentation of the

literature across a collection (Itner 1996, Humphreys 1987, Olson 1992).

In the process of defining a sample, I considered various strategies of selection, such as limiting by year of publication and limiting by resource type. Limiting by year has the advantage of providing more data on currency if I include only the most recent titles; limiting by type allows me to make sure that my comparison of subject heading to abstract does not inadvertently measure differences in cataloging practices of different types of materials. In addition, monographs, as opposed to edited collections, might well offer a more focused view of a given subject than anthologies with many contributors who each address the overall theme from a set of wide-ranging contexts and perspectives. The difficulty of summarizing each contributor's particular contextualization of the overall theme in the abstracts complicates the issue of evaluating the accuracy of the headings, which is the main thrust of this research.   Collections of essays by a single author also tend to range very widely across contextual areas and time periods, creating a similar problem for catalogers and abstractors in capturing all but the very broadest themes.

These limits do artificially reduce the diversity of information types considered to be core works, yet in exchange, provide a manageable scope in number. However, this analysis focuses on how the subject headings represent the specific works for which they were chosen in light of the possible choices in the controlled vocabulary, and on identifying concepts for which no headings exist, not on establishing a measurement of the representation of the entire body of WS literature. I am concerned with inadvertently marginalizing certain topics and non-traditional forms of scholarship within each chapter by not including collections of essays in the sample. In order to avoid this, I have at times, and sparingly, chosen to include in the sample works such as Gloria Anzaldúa's *Borderlands: The New Mestiza = La Frontera*, (Aunt Lute Books, 1987), which is described as a "hybrid text" that combines "essays, history, cultural criticism, autobiography, and poetry" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 27). My concern with including anthologies and collections of essays by a single author over a period of time is that it is difficult with these broad works to be specific about content in the abstracts, and this makes it difficult

to assess the applicability of the headings. However, works like Anzaldúa's *Borderlands* are not

"collections" in this sense.

3.3.3 Data Analysis and Presentation

I will examine the abstract and LC record of each work in the following manner:

1. Read each abstract and note topics and subtopics, approaches, perspectives, material

   types/sources, dates, people, and places.

2. Look up the bibliographic record for the work in the Library of Congress Online Catalog and

   make note of the subject headings in a word document under each title.

3. Note and record in the Word document:

   a. any concepts in the abstract not represented by the chosen headings (both specific

   terms and broader concepts not mentioned explicitly),

   b. existing LC Subject Headings that could have been used in the record. These headings

   will be found by searching the Library of Congress Authorities database, and the rules

   for the formation and structure will be analyzed with access to *Subject Cataloging*

   Manual: Subject Headings and *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations.*

   c. concepts in the abstracts for which no LC Subject Headings exist, and

   d. discussion of the rhetorical representation of the work via the subject headings applied.

My evaluation of the completeness and accuracy of the subject access to each work will be

supplemented at times by examination of the bibliographic records of similar works, by consulting

feminist thesauri, and by examination of the work itself, taking special note of its table of contents and

index.

3.3. Pilot Study

In order to test this methodology, I have completed a preliminary exploration of 24 titles from

Chapter 13 "Communications, Mass Media, and Language." I analyzed the first 8 monographs (not

including edited collections) with records in the LC Online Catalog within the three subsections of this

chapter: General Communications, Film and Television, and Media and Journalism. Table 2 lists the

titles in the pilot study, each record's Library of Congress Control Number, and the number of subject

headings per record. These titles are displayed in descending order of number of subject headings per

record.

3.3.1 Case Examples

Overall, I found that the subject access points applied to the records in the pilot study sample

were not able to represent accurately the contents of the works. Below are 8 examples of my analysis

(2 records each from the three subsections of the chapter). I am providing these case examples to

illustrate my analysis process for individual records. For each example, I have included the title analyzed

and a list of the LCSH descriptors in the record. I have bolded phrases in the abstracts pointing to

significant content and to content that represents ideas for which a feminist researcher would likely

look. Following each abstract is a short discussion of the LCSH representation of each work.

1. *Title:* Bate & Bowker, 1997. *Communication and the Sexes.*

Subject headings: Communications – Sex differences

Abstract: **"**A combination textbook and guide for improving **communications between women and**

men, *Communication and the Sexes* takes a proactive approach to the problem of understanding and

being understood. Careful to **distinguish between sex and gender**, Bate and Bowker argue that

individuals create and re-create gender in communication. The authors theoretically frame their work

with this idea, which they explain in detail in the first chapter. They outline **major arguments in the field**

of communications and compare basic approaches to the study of communication and the sexes in

chapters 2 through 4. In the remaining six chapters, Bate and Bowker discuss communication in specific

contexts, including **stages of relationship development; children's efforts to interpret interpersonal**

messages among family members, whether or not such messages meet children's expectations for

appropriate masculine or feminine behavior; public communication between teachers and students;

communication at the workplace; mass media; and the impact of the women's and men's movements

on changing personal communications styles. Each essay begins with a chapter overview and includes a

conclusion, discussion questions, and cases for analysis" (469).

     Discussion: Most prominent here is that the word "difference" is not used at all in this abstract

referring to differences in women's and men's communication, yet the heading suggests that is all this

work is about. I would argue that a preoccupation in the popular imagination with differences between

men and women has informed the use of this heading rather than content.

     Concepts not represented by headings include gender and its construction/creation, specific

contexts of communication between specific groups, and arguments and approaches to the study of

communication and the sexes. A feminist researcher would likely be interested in the idea of the social

construction of gender through communication and in the discussion of the difference between sex and

gender; in fact, it is these ideas that provide the foundation for this work and that are explored within it.

There is no authorized heading to represent the social construction of gender, or to represent gender

and communication. LC does offer the heading *gender differences*, but the authorized form of this is *sex*

differences, which blurs the distinction clearly discussed in this work.   This work largely examines social

aspects of communication between groups of people in various contexts in regards to the construction

of gender; the heading *Communication – Social aspects* could have enhanced subject access to this

work. Lastly, the work outlines the approaches and debates within the study of sex and communication,

but this meta-discussion is not mentioned. A heading to represent this field of study, subdivided by

"debates" or "approaches" would be desirable, yet no such heading exists.

2. *Title:* Cameron, 1992. *Feminism and Linguistic Theory.*

Subject headings: Language and languages – Sex differences, Sexism in language, Women – language, Feminism.

Abstract: "Cameron first published her **overview of feminist theories of language** in 1985. In less than a decade, significant changes occurred within the scholarly work of feminism and language, as well as feminist political theory, that warranted a second edition. In both editions, Cameron **elucidates highly intricate arguments about linguistics** without diluting their complexity or power. She organizes the work into eight substantive chapters, along with an introduction, "Language and Feminism," and a conclusion, "Problems and Practices." The author tackles issues such as **sexist language** and devotes two chapters to delineating the **various theoretical and empirical approaches to sex differences in language.** Although Cameron again devotes considerable space to **Dale Spender's arguments about language and gender**, she provides a **compelling theoretical alternative to these arguments** in the 1992 edition. In her second chapter on f**eminist models of language**, she introduces **postmodernism and the "debate on the gendered subject,"** clearly one of the most significant and contentious theoretical debates within feminism. In addition to footnotes and a bibliography, Cameron includes a **glossary of terms critical to an understanding of modern linguistic theory**" (469-470).

 Discussion: The subject access points in this record point clearly to sexism in language, but leave out the concepts of gender, and the fact that this work outlines debates and theoretical perspectives and approaches to studying sex differences in language. Again, a subdivision indicating the concept of 'feminist perspectives' or 'feminist theories' would be useful here, but no such subdivision exists. The heading *feminism* is not entirely misplaced for this work, but *feminist theories* would be more appropriate (LC uses *feminist theory).* Overall, the singular forms of these headings seem to suggest that 'feminism' and 'feminist theory' are monolithic categories rather than complex, fractured, and

often internally contentious ones.   A feminist researcher looking for works on the debates within the feminist study of language would not find this work if s/he relied on the subject headings.

---

3.   Brundson, 1997. *Screen Tastes: Soap Opera to Satellite Dishes*

Subject Headings: Feminism and motion pictures, Feminist film criticism, Women in motion pictures, Television and women.

Abstract: "In Screen Tastes, Brunsdon, an influential feminist cultural critic, analyzes **British soap operas**, **crime dramas created to attract a female audience**, and **1970s "independent woman" and "postfeminist" Hollywood films of the last two decades.** Written during the previous twenty years, the essays foreground Brunsdon's interest in **women's experience with popular or mass culture**. She introduces each section with a contextualization of the essays that follow, as well as some new insights. In part 1, "The Defense of **Soap Opera**," Brunsdon looks at popular **British productions**, particularly the show **Crossroads**, which became a veritable laboratory for critical media studies. In chapters 3 and 4, she explores the significance of soap operas in relation to the **development of critical feminist television studies**. In the final three parts of the book, Brunsdon considers the **changes in feminism and feminist media theory since 1970.** The essays in part 2, "Career Girls," address **feminist ideas that individuals have appropriated and re-presented in mainstream, mostly Hollywood, film**. In part 3, "Questions of Quality," Brunsdon looks at the **institutionalization of television studies in the Anglophone academy and the end of European public service broadcasting.** She describes the use of **satellite dishes to illuminate both the public and private aspects of the "taste wars"** that raged in Britain upon the introduction of satellite television in the essay "Satellite Dishes and the Landscapes of Taste." In the final part, "Feminist Identities," the author explores several of the most significant

arguments in the development of feminist film and television studies to demonstrate how they relate to the changing definitions of feminism" (475-476).

Discussion: The headings indicate the discussion of feminism and film, if not the more specific topic of how feminism is represented in film, and also capture the concept of feminist film criticism, as well as women *and* (not *in*) television (as in women as viewers of television), but they do no capture the concepts of the development of feminist television studies/criticism, feminism on television, the genres of soap opera and crime shows, social and cultural aspects of satellite dishes, feminist media theory, Britain, or historical era.

Soap opera is a genre frequently addressed in feminist television studies, and a heading exists for it (*Television soap operas)*, yet was not used. Another existing heading that could be applied to this record is *Feminist television criticism--Great Britain.* According to its authority record, it was created in the year 2000 based on the pattern *Feminist film criticism.* This indicates two problems in practice (lack of attention to literary warrant and lack of retrospective cataloging) more than it does a problem in representation, yet still affects subject access to this work.

---

4. *Title:* Press, 1991. *Women Watching Television: Gender, Class, and Generation in the American Television Experience.*

Subject headings: Television and women – United States, Women on television, Television viewers – United States.

Abstract: "Combining **feminist theory, class analysis, and empirical research, Andrea Press enters into a debate in television studies** between scholars who see **television as a preeminent exemplar of the tightening of hegemonic controls** and those who see a modicum of **resistance to hegemony among female viewers.** Press analyzes **interview responses** to learn where and how **television "reinforces patriarchal values in our culture"** and to examine the idea that **women use television to undermine**

this dominance. The author examines how **mass-media images, especially televised images**, affect

women's construction of their gender identities. Press also explores how different television programs,

composed of eclectic characters, resonate **across generational and class boundaries**. Press sampled

twenty working-class and twenty-one middle-class women, **ranging from seventeen to seventy-eight**

years old. The author became a participant-observer while also acknowledging her own exposure to

television, asserting that "television, more than any other medium, has been a pervasive presence in my

inner life" (p. 9). Press outlines her theoretical framework in the first section, then analyzes three stages

of the **televised representations of women: prefeminist, feminist, and postfeminist**. Section 2,

"Women Interpreting Television," is comprised of portions of Press's interviews, as well as the analysis

of her findings, including a **generational comparison of attitudes toward television that cuts across**

class lines. Press delineates her finding in the final section, "Conclusion: Television Reception as a

Window on Culture." She articulates how **class-specific differences and hegemony determine how**

television operates in American culture. The appendix contains useful information on methodology and

sampling techniques" (482-83).

     Discussion: Neither 'working class' nor 'middle class' nor age-ranges are represented by these

headings. The heading *Television viewers – United States* would be more helpful if it specifically

indicated the sex of the viewers, and might also be subdivided by *Interviews* and by *Attitudes*. *Women*

on television captures the "televised representation of women," fairly well. It does not denote whether

it is referring to the representation of specific real-world women on television, or to the general

category of 'woman,' but neither does the abstract. In feminist film theory, the representation of the

category of 'woman' is more often discussed than the representation of specific, real-world women.

Also lacking are headings that point to patriarchy, hegemony, or television as a mechanism of power and

control in culture. *Hegemony—Social aspects – United States*, might well have been applied to this

record. *Patriarchy in motion pictures* is an authorized heading, but there is no corollary *patriarchy on*

television, and in any case, the abstract suggests that the topic of patriarchy is not necessarily treated

from the perspective of the identification of images or instances of patriarchy on television, but rather

from the perspective of how television perpetuates patriarchy in the context of the United States.

---

5. *Title: Mothers and Work in Popular American Magazines*

Subject Headings: Working mothers – United States, Sexual division of labor – United States, Women's

periodicals, Sex role in mass media.

*Abstract: "*Keller critically examines how **women's magazines, particularly Ladies Home Journal,**

McCall's, Parents, and Good Housekeeping, reflect **women's changing roles in modern society**. Keller

posits that these magazines do more than simply mirror popular notions about women's place; they

serve as vehicles to either transmit or challenge dominant ideologies. She argues that the publication

of **eclectic items** such as recipes, letters to the editor, and articles by pediatricians, psychologists,

religious leaders, and other "specialists" both **determined and reinforced social norms**. Reviewing **forty**

years' worth of magazines and 450 articles, Keller selected magazines to analyze based on longevity,

circulation, and availability of citations in Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature. Yet, according to the

author, this method led to a **homogenous view of American womanhood, foregrounding the lives of**

white, middle-class women while almost completely silencing the voices of women of color. However,

Keller's acknowledgment of the limitations of her selection process highlights the types of images that

the publications printed. Keller **divides each section by decade, beginning with the 1950s**. She subtitles

the chapter on the 1950s "Hairline Cracks in the Traditional Mold" to indicate the first tentative stirrings

of a **new awareness among women of the possibility of change**. By contrast, she subtitles the chapter

on the 1980s "Ideological Retreat to the 1950s versus Facing Economic Realities." Keller concludes the

work with a section on how **women's magazines have reflected and somewhat contributed to the creation of changing family structures**" (492).

Discussion: The most glaring omission in LCSH representation has to do with the media as a transmitter of dominant ideologies and social norms regarding women's place(s) in society, and especially the ideas of power, resistance, and change. The heading *Sex role in mass media* somewhat captures this idea, but it is a vague: is it referring to women's *and* men's roles? The singular form of this heading (*role*) also disguises the complexity of sex-related social norms and expressions of gender, reinforcing a false dichotomy and simplistic binary opposition of women and men. Lacking altogether in this heading are the ideas of social change and dominant ideologies, family structures, specific differences among women such as race and class, a sense of chronology, and the specific magazines surveyed, all of which have existing headings.

Interestingly, the abstract does not mention anything specifically about mothers, paid labor, the public sphere of the economy, the sexual division of labor, or any other topics implied by the headings *Working mothers* and *Sexual division of labor*. I looked at the book itself to determine the representation of these topics and found textual evidence that they are indeed discussed.

---

6.   Title: Straight News: Gays, Lesbians, and the News Media.

Subject headings: Mass media and sex, Gays.

Abstract: A volume in Columbia University Press's groundbreaking series Between Men—Between Women: Lesbian and Gay Studies, Alwood's book is an examination of the **historical trajectory of news coverage of lesbian and gay issues from World War II to the mid-1990s**. Approaching the topic **chronologically**, Alwood begins his examination in 1943 in a section titled "The News Media Discover Homosexuality: **World War II to Stonewall, 1943–1969**." The subsequent sections cover the decade immediately following Stonewall, which he calls "**Progress and Backlash**, 1970–1980," and "Requiem for

the Media, 1981–1994," in which he discusses the **reporting on the AIDS epidemic** and the

consequences of outing in the media. Alwood uses the example of the **New York Times** as a bellwether

of change. Within three decades, the Times went from an outright (if unwritten) policy of exclusion of

any positive mention of lesbians and gay men to far more balanced and inclusive coverage of gay issues.

In addition to providing an eminently readable history of the often stormy **relationship between**

lesbians, gay men, and the popular press, Alwood raises significant questions about the **role of the**

media in reflecting and creating public opinion. In the epilogue to the book, he challenges **reporters to**

act truly as neutral observers and recorders of events. He demands a level of accuracy and fairness that

this book proves is elusive at best, in spite of journalists' statements to the contrary. Alwood sums up his

study thusly: "By looking at the **coverage of gays and lesbians from the 1940s to today**, it is striking how

often the double standard has been defended by the media, most often under the guise of protecting

the sensibilities of their audiences" (p. 328). "**Protecting sensibilities" is all too often a code for**

treatment of homosexuals, either to "render…invisible or paint them as a menace" (p. 329) (489).

Discussion: Though this title is about both gays and lesbians, only gays have been provided

subject access. The authority record for *Gays* lists *Lesbians* as a narrower term, and although "gay" has

historically been used to refer to both men and women (much like the pseudo-generic "mankind"), a

feminist researcher would most likely structure a search for material on lesbians with the term

Lesbian(s), not with the over-arching *Gay(s)*.   This is a case where an existing heading could have been

used to supply more specificity but was not. There is also no subject representation of chronology,

specific events (Stonewall Rebellion), specific publications (The *New York Times*), the idea of the media

as a transmitter and shaper of attitudes, or objectivity in news media.

The abstract does not mention anything about sex, therefore the heading *Mass media and sex* is

misplaced. I will argue that this represents the stereotypical over-association of gays and lesbians with

sexual acts: the whittling of distinct identities and a multiplicity of social issues down to sexual

behaviors.   I reviewed the book itself to determine if this is the case. The index has several terms related to sexual behavior: bathhouses, condoms, Institute for Sex Research, sadomasochism, Kinsey's studies, sodomy laws, and male prostitution. These references point to fewer than 12 total pages in this nearly 400 page work. Neither are there chapter titles or headings pointing to significant content on sex or sexual behaviors.   It appears that this heading is indeed misplaced.

3.3.2 Themes

In this section, I discuss the pilot study findings in terms of themes in representation for the three subsections in the "Communications, Mass Media, and Language" chapter, followed by a list of proposed headings as suggested by the abstracts.

The primary problem with the titles in the General Communications subsection can be summarized as an over-use of headings that point to "difference," e.g., *Language and languages – Sex differences* and *Communication – Sex differences.* These headings may be appropriate to works which discuss this topic, but when used alone to describe each of these works, have the effect of glossing the multitude and often competing approaches and theories within the feminist study of language and communication that these works discuss.

Similarly, the titles I analyzed within the Film and Television section tend to be represented by a singular and simplified concept of feminist thought: *Feminist film criticism* or simply *Feminism*. Despite the extremely heavy use and development of theories within this body of work (in particular, psychoanalytic feminist film theory, postfeminist theory, and postmodern theory) headings consistently represented the works very broadly, even when more specific headings exist and could have been used (e.g. *Psychoanalysis and feminism*).   The term "theory" or "theories" was not used at all in the headings for these 8 titles, even though 6 of the 8 abstracts utilized the words "theory," "theories," or "theoretical."

Specific and well-known concepts in feminist film and television criticism, such as the masculine (or male) gaze, spectatorship (or viewing position), woman's cinema, and woman as image do not have representation in LCSH at all. Another well-known concept in this field is *images of women,* and while there is an existing heading *Images of women* included in the LC Authorities Catalog, derived from "Women's Thesaurus," it has only been applied to one bibliographic record in the LC Online Catalog: *Framework gender: Images of gender and development in Peru, Nepal and Botswana* (LCCN: 97133183.) In WS, *images of women* tends to refer to the feminist analysis of images of women in mass media; here it seems to have been applied to this work because it is "a photographic report" (Publisher Description linked in the record: http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0834/97133183-d.html).

There is also a lack of consistency in use between the headings *Television **and** women* or *Motion pictures **and** women* versus *Women **on** television* or *Women **in** motion pictures.* Feminist film and television criticism tackles both concepts—i.e. the images of women/woman on TV and in film, as well as women as viewers and creators of TV and film. Each of the 8 works I analyzed takes on one or both of these topics, but the headings were not used consistently to represent which aspects the works embody.

The 4 titles in the Media and Journalism section with content about specific women and/or women as a group in the media industries are well-represented with headings that capture specificity (e.g. *Women journalists—United States –Biography*) and relevance (e. g. *Journalists – United States – Biography*). To represent these works *only* with headings specific to women would be to ghettoize them by separating them from works about the industries or professions in general. By using *both* sex-specific and general headings, these works are made accessible to researchers looking for biographies of journalists in the United States, as well as to researchers looking for biographies of women journalists in the United States. Had LC been sex-specific from the outset by creating headings for both men and women journalists and using them appropriately, the issue of ghettoization would not exist.

The other 4 titles in this sample of 8 have content on the media coverage of specific issues (sex crimes, gay and lesbian people and issues, and the social construction of gender). The 2 works which cover sex crimes are described by the abstracts as containing content on rape myths and/or attitudes and stereotypes about rape and rape victims that are both demonstrated in and perpetuated by news media coverage. However, neither work is represented with headings using these terms.   The terms *Social conditions*, *Public opinion*, and *Objectivity* are employed in these records, attached to the terms *United States* and *Press*.   While these headings capture, in a very broad sense, the notion of attitudes, beliefs, and stereotypes, they do not specifically link them to perceptions of rape and rape victims. *Sex crimes* and *Rape* are represented in the headings, but not subdivided by *Attitudes* or other term that would better express the content of these works. This is because the instructions for the heading *Attitude (Psychology)* indicates that "attitudes" may be used as a subheading only "under classes of persons and ethnic groups" (LC Control Number: sh 85009407). *Rape myths* does not exist as a heading; it is included as the non-preferred term to *Rape –Psychological aspects.* A search of keyword (all) of the words *rape myth* in the LC online catalog returns 21 titles, 4 of which explicitly name rape myths in the sense of stereotypes about women and men that serve as excuses for rape and/or place the blame on the victim. This is a well-established concept in Women's Studies literature and in the literature cataloged by LC and would be better represented as a heading itself instead of subsumed under *Rape – Psychological aspects*. The lack of a way to indicate directly the idea of *attitudes about rape* and the concept of *rape myths* is a problem.

3.3.3 Missing Concepts

Table 3 provides a list of concepts gleaned from the abstracts for these 24 titles for which there is no direct LCSH representation. These 16 terms show literary warrant and are common terms in feminist scholarship in this area.

3.4 Conclusion

For the full study, I anticipate displaying my findings in terms of discussions of patterns in representation with specific examples of records and evidence from the abstracts; a list of existing headings which could have been used for specific records but were not, and a list of suggested new headings for concepts found in the abstracts.   The pilot study has provided me with a glimpse of the type of data with which I will be working, but as my analysis unfolds across the larger sample, the findings and discussion may take a variety of different forms that I cannot at this moment describe.

The pilot study indicates that there are definable problems with the representation of core works in Women's Studies. Mainstream attitudes and beliefs about feminism and gender/sex-related issues play out in the way headings are applied to specific works, and specific concepts in certain areas of study lack direct representation.   In a future, full study across multiple disciplines and academic fields, I hope to gain further insight into the shape of LCSH representation for Women's Studies core works.

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion—Analysis of Monographs in "Feminist Theories and Women's Movements," Subsection: Feminist Thought and Theories

Chapter 4 represents my analysis of the subject headings employed in the bibliographic records of the 29 titles I have chosen from the second chapter of *Women's Studies: A Recommended Bibliography* (3rd edition, 2004). To reiterate, my sample titles come from the list of core monographs in the bibliography's Chapter 2 "Feminist Theories and Women's Movements," excluding any titles that are collections of essays or anthologies/readers and those lacking records in the LC Online Catalog. This chapter represents my analysis of the records for the titles chosen from the bibliography's Chapter 1, first subsection: Feminist Thought and Theories. Chapter 4 includes tables showing the titles and bibliographic record number (LCCNs) of the books included in the analysis (Table 4, see Appendix) a summarized description of the content of the titles as a whole, a table showing the distribution of subject headings across the records of these titles (Table 5, see Appendix), a discussion of key themes and observations regarding the use of subject headings for these titles, and a brief conclusion.

4.1 Description of Monographs and Subject Headings

Table 4 shows the titles, the Library of Congress Control Numbers for the titles' records in the LC Online Catalog, and the number of subject headings per record. The table is arranged in descending order of number of subject headings.

The portion of the total sample (52) represented in this subsection is 29 works. The average number of headings per record is 3.03, ranging from 6 headings to 1 per record. 25 of these 29 titles were published in the 1990s, and 4 were published in the late 1980s. All of these works have one author only and are in the English language, except for Anzaldúa (1987), which is in Spanish and English.

Feminist theory defies simple definitions and has come to be spoken of in the plural (theories).

At base, feminist theories represent a multi-voiced discourse that poses and answers questions about

the nature of human existence from the point of view that the categories of sex and/or gender

(contentious, multi-faceted subjects themselves) have had and continue to have impacts on people's

lives in terms of social relations and power/powerlessness. Wendell (1990) describes feminist theorizing

more simply as "the perspective of the observer/philosopher," which positions feminist theorists as

people "who seek to understand everything about how oppression works and how it affects women" in

order to end it (33).

The works in this subsection cover a wide range of theories, criticism, and issues. Taken as a

group, the abstracts describe the works as being about a variety of categories of analysis, theoretical

and philosophical stances and paradigms, and social issues.   Categories of analysis include geographical

location, sexual orientation, gender identity, race, ethnicity, biological sex, family status, and

socioeconomic class. A variety of philosophical positions and theories are mentioned, as well as

questions of power and social relations embedded in theory, the origins and development of specific

theories, dynamics between the multiple forms feminist theories take, and the epistemological

foundations available for theorizing. Issues include bodies and materiality, sexual and other forms of

difference, relationships between women, the nature/construction of sex and gender, racism, academia,

social relations and the state, community and individualism, whiteness, distinctions between public and

private realms, work and family, masculinity, abortion, lynching, pornography, identity politics,

pedagogy, activism, body image and eating disorders, education, violence against women, stereotypes

and images of women, AIDS activism, knowledge production and publishing, interpersonal relations, the

sexual division of labor, reproduction, ecology and environmentalism, distribution of wealth, human

rights, sexual freedom, motherhood, language, and popular culture.

Table 5 shows the subject headings applied to the 29 records in this portion of the sample and indicates in how many records each subject heading appears. As the table shows, there is very little repetition of subject headings across these records.

4.2 Themes in Subject Representation: Problems and Solutions

Following are 5 key themes of subject heading representation across this group of records.

4.2.1. Use of the heading *Feminist theory*

The authority record for the heading *Feminist theory* (LCCN sh 90002282) was created in 1990 and has been applied to a total of 1,386 records in the LC Online Catalog.   The fact that *Feminist theory* was not an authorized heading until 1990 shows a lack of attention to literary warrant on the part of LC. LC's policy is to create new headings "when [the new topic] is first encountered in a work being cataloged, rather than after several works on the topic have been published and cataloged" (Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings H187-1). A title search of Worldcat for the phrase "feminist theory" returns a record for a 1972 publication *Draftings in voices, costumes and mirrors: Feminist theory and new concepts of the self in the American novel* (OCLC number: 26782241). The phrase appears in the titles of 9 other Worldcat records with publication dates from 1972 to 1980, demonstrating that the phrase was in use at large almost two decades before an authority record was created. Within LC's holdings, there are several records with the phrase "feminist theory" in the books' titles published and cataloged in 1981, 1982, and 1984. At the latest, a heading for feminist theory should have been created when the 1981 book was cataloged.   Though I am not comparing the creation of subject headings for materials in the field of Women's Studies with the creation of subject headings for materials in other fields, still it should be noted that a comparative study might very well reveal that new entities and ideas are slow to be recognized and authorized as subject headings in many fields, whether the field is mainstream or critical.

Within my sample of 29 core works on feminist theory, the heading was applied to 23 records without subdivision, and used in 1 record as a main heading subdivided by *United States.* Of the 5 records in which *feminist theory* does not appear, 4 were published and cataloged in the 1980s and early in 1990 before an authority record existed, and the 5th was cataloged in 1994 and published in 1995.

The 5 works without the heading *Feminist theory* are hooks' 1989 *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black,* Anzaldúa's 1987 *Borderlands: The new Mestiza = la frontera,* Wiegman's 1995 *American anatomies: Theorizing race and gender,* Collins' 1990 *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*, and Fuss's 1989 *Essentially speaking: Feminism, nature, and difference.* Catalogers apparently did not extrapolate to the concept of feminist theory from phrases in the books' section headings, chapter titles, or subtitles, such as "Black feminist thought" and "Afrocentric feminist epistemology" in Collins (1990); from "Lesbian and Gay Theory" and "Poststructuralist Afro-American Literary Theory" in Fuss (1989); from "Feminist theory: A radical agenda" (hooks 1989), or from "Theorizing race and gender" (Wiegman 1995). Anzaldúa's (1987) *Borderlands* does not explicitly point to feminist theory. As an autoethnography, the work is an act of theorizing, and though Anzaldúa generates Chicana, lesbian, and feminist theory, nowhere does the work refer to itself as theoretical.

The absence of the subject heading *Feminist theory* in these records is not necessarily explained by their pre- or early-1990 cataloging dates; the heading is used in Spelman's 1988 *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought*, as well as 85 other LC bibliographic records of works cataloged before the authority record existed. It is not clear from the records of these works whether the heading was used non-authoritatively at the time the records were created, or if it was added in a retrospective cataloging process after the heading was authorized.

Why was this subject heading not used in these particular 5 records? It is notable that each of these works invoke race or ethnicity (African American women, Mexican-American women, the

interconnectedness of the categories race and gender, and the deconstruction of essentialist notions of race.) Four of them are primarily about women of color in the United States and have words alluding to race or ethnicity in their titles. The 5th takes on the topic of race and gender in a less obvious way, and has no words alluding to race or ethnicity in its title (Fuss 1989); its record is the only one in this group of 5 that includes a heading pointing to a type of feminist theory: *Feminist literary criticism.* hooks' (1989) and Collins' (1990) works are described with the heading *Feminism – United States*, but Wiegman's (1995)and Anzaldúa's (1987) have no headings pointing to any form of the word *feminism* or any form of theory/criticism. Six other works in this set of 29 that include elements of race and ethnicity in their abstracts *were* described with the heading *Feminist theory*, but only one (Caraway 1991) includes words pointing to race or ethnicity in its title, and the other 5 (King 1994, Butler 1993, Friedman 1998, Miles 1996, and Spelman 1988) are not primarily about race or ethnicity, taking on these subjects much more obliquely than the others.

It appears that works that are both easily identified as and primarily about feminism and race, women and race, feminism and racism, and feminism and ethnicity were not at the point in time in which they were cataloged seen as *also* being about feminist theory or seen as examples of feminist theorizing. The fact that the heading has not been added retrospectively indicates this view persists somewhat. This speaks to an ideological boundary between feminism/ists and women of color. Several of the works in this sample, in fact, make this very point. Caraway (1991) discusses the evidence of racism and white bias in the U.S. women's movement; Wiegman (1995) "is highly critical of white feminists who subordinate race to gender," and hooks (1989) argues for the "importance of words…in the often unwelcoming [to African American women] and challenging worlds of graduate school…and in the feminist movement" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 59, 42). Apparently, this disconnect was not limited to those within the feminist movement and stemmed from a broader societal notion that found its way into feminist activism and thinking as well as descriptions of feminist activism and thinking. Solutions to

this problem include a continued analysis of the intricacies of race and gender in academic discourse and more precise retrospective cataloging practices.

4.2.2. The concepts of sex and gender

"Sex" and "gender" are highly contested terms in feminist theory. "Sex" has most often been used for biological referents, such as male and female, and "gender" has most often been used for social and cultural referents, such as femininity and masculinity (Capek 1987). This is one of the early contributions of feminist theory to the general understanding of sex and gender—the idea that gender is not essential; i.e., that it does not stem from biological sexual differences between men and women, but rather is constructed through the pervasive processes involved in the socialization of females and males into feminine and masculine roles and behaviors within a patriarchal political economy (Oakley 1972, Rubin 1975, Keller 1987, Scott 1988). Behaviors and roles, i.e. gender roles, considered to be feminine or masculine are themselves historically-situated and fluid, changing over time and location. From this point of view, gender differences are not equivalent to sexual differences; gendered behaviors and gendered people are viewed as social constructs, socially and culturally related to but not stemming "naturally" from a biological sexual binary of male and female.

Theorists such as Judith Butler (1990, 1993) and E.A. Grosz (1994) have moved the conversation beyond the understanding of sex and gender as two related yet different categories, one constructed and fluid, the other natural and fixed. Butler presents the categories of *both* gender and sex as constructed rather than natural or essential and also challenges the primacy of the male/female sexual binary (1990, 1993). Grosz argues that the materiality of sexed bodies is indeed important for theorizing about social relations and power, but that sexed bodies are historically-situated, not biologically fixed (1994). Another element in the conversation about sex/gender is the idea that "woman" is a category intersected by so many other identity categories, such as race, socioeconomic class, and sexual

orientation, that it cannot be used effectively as a universal category of analysis on its own (Spelman 1988, Young 1994).

LCSH treats the concepts of gender and sex much too simply to capture the intricacies of these concepts as used by feminist theorists, treating them as equivalent to each other and preferring the term "sex" over "gender." For example, the heading *Sex* (LCCN: sh 85120549) lists both *Gender (Sex)* and *Sex (Gender)* as non-preferred, equivalent terms. *Sex differences* (LCCN: sh 85120580) is the preferred term to *Gender differences* and *Sexual dimorphism in humans. Sex role* (LCCN: sh 8512066) is the preferred term to *Gender role*, with *Sex (Psychology)*, *Sex differences (Psychology), Social role*, and *Sexism* given as broader and related terms. *Sex role (Philosophy)* and *Sex role – Psychological aspects* are listed in the Authority Catalog but lack authority records showing more detail.

Within the group of works I am examining, *Sex role*, *Sex role – Philosophy, Sex role – United States,* and *Sex differences (Psychology)* are used in two records: *Sex role – Philosophy* and *Sex differences (Psychology)* are used for Butler's two works (1990 and 1993), and *Sex role – United States* is employed in the record for Wiegman's 1995 *American anatomies: Theorizing race and gender.* In this work, Wiegman "provides a theoretical critique of contemporary debates about difference and multiculturalism…[and] demonstrates how race and gender are interlocked and mutually constitutive, their dynamics and meanings always historically contingent" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 59). Butler's two works (1990, 1993) discuss biological sex as well as gender, while Wiegman's (1995) focuses on gender and race, yet both are represented with the overly-simplistic and misleading heading *Sex role.*

Human body – Social aspects (LCCN: sh 85015232) is a heading which has been used to represent the idea of the constructed-ness of biological sex and the materiality of bodies in the record for Grosz (1994). This heading works much better than *Sex role* (which seems to be the LC solution to describing works about gender and sex as socially-constructed categories). In this work, Grosz, like Butler, "assert[s] the critical importance of bodies to understandings of sexual difference, gender, and

relations of power….[and] insists on the sexual specificity of bodies and the need to theorize bodies as

sexed in order to analyze sexual difference not as biologically fixed but as volatile…" (Krikos & Ingold

2004, 38). The heading *Human body – Social aspects* was created in 1986 and corresponds to the LC

Classification span GT495-GT498**,** Manners and customs (Anthropology). The subjects of works classified

in this span in the LC Online Catalog include body modification, costuming, the human body in art and

literature, body image and stature (height), orthopedics, sexuality, body size in juvenile folklore, ageing

bodies, birth customs, organ transfer, and more.   Grosz's title which has *Feminist theory* as the first

subject heading, is classified by LC in the HQ range with other works on feminist theory. Though the

heading *Human body – Social aspects* was not created to describe works such as Grosz (1994) and Butler

(1990, 1993), it nevertheless works well.

The heading *Gender identity – Philosophy* is employed in the record for Mann (1994). The

source for this heading is given as Campbell's (1984) *Psychiatric Dictionary* (see 670 field in LCCN: sh

91003756), and the definition included in the record is "gender identity: the inner conviction that one is

either male, female, ambivalent, or neutral." The narrower terms include *Intersex people, Queer theory,*

Transgender people – Identity, and *Transsexuals – Identity.* Mann (1994) "…provides a stimulating and

suggestive consideration of the failings of liberalism in the face of feminism's challenge to patriarchal

notions of sexual difference ('the most significant social phenomenon of our time,' …and its

transformation of contemporary gender relations" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 48). Mann uses the phrase

"gendered identities" and "gendered personal identities" (1994, 6, 52) to refer to gendered social

relations, stereotypical social roles based on the patriarchal norms of femininity and masculinity, and

the changing distribution of power, not to issues of gender identity. It appears this heading, though

incorrectly employed, was used to represent the idea of the social aspects of gender roles in the

absence of a heading better suited to the task.

Sex role is an especially troublesome heading because it disguises the nuances between sex and gender as feminists have used those terms over time by subordinating the term "gender" to the term "sex" as though they could be used interchangeably.   It is sometimes used in the LC Catalog alongside the heading *Women – Social conditions* for works about the "real-life" roles of women, such as *Changing roles of women in industrial societies: a Bellagio conference, March 1979* (LCCN: 77016792). It seems to be used simultaneously to represent works on gender as a social construction, on sex as a social construction, and on the socio-cultural life roles of that group of people identified as women within a patriarchal political economy.

Based on this heading's inaccurate use of the term "sex" from multiple feminist points of view, convincing arguments could be made for the use of *Sex role* in each of the records in the sample since all of them address to a high degree the nature and/or consequences of sex and gender in society. A better solution would be to throw the heading out altogether and replace it with more accurate terms. For example, establishing independent headings for *Sex* and *Gender* and using them in conjunction with existing headings, such as *Essentialism (Philosophy)*, *Constructivism (Philosophy), Subject (Philosophy), Subjectivity, Race, Sexual orientation, Sex differences, Social classes, Human body – Social aspects, Difference (Philosophy),* and *Identity politics* could much better represent the nuanced discussions in these particular works than does *Sex role*, even when it is combined with other headings for more specificity.

4.2.3. Intersections between schools of thought and types of feminism

How well do the headings in these records point to the varieties of feminist theories, the differences among them, and their relationships to other schools of thought, such as postmodernism? There are many schools of feminist thought, and they have been grouped in a variety of ways over time in order to point to their differences. A frequently-used set of categories employed to point out differences in feminist thought is Liberal, Radical, Cultural, Socialist, and Postmodernist (Evans 1995).

Tong groups them as Liberal, Radical, Marxist and Socialist, Psychoanalytic and Gender, Existentialist,

Postmodern, and Multicultural and Global (1998). Other types of feminist theories and feminisms are

lesbian feminism, Black feminism, (also sometimes called womanism), ecofeminism, Chicana feminism,

global feminism, and bisexual feminism (this is not an exhaustive list).   In addition, feminist theories

intersect, take from, and critique critical theory, postmodernism, postcolonialism, poststructuralism,

psychoanalysis, multiculturalism, essentialism, constructivism, and more. Feminist theories also

intersect disciplinary domains, such as geography, literary criticism, anthropology, cultural studies,

economics, and many others.

Within these 29 records, headings are used to represent the schools of thought or types of

feminism/feminist theory that are the topics of these works. These headings are *Psychoanalysis and*

feminism, Feminist geography, Feminist literary criticism, Second wave feminism, and *Ecofeminism.* In

some records, these are used in conjunction with the headings: *Postmodernism, Postmodernism – Social*

aspects, Psychoanalysis and philosophy, Philosophy, Modern – 20th *century, Philosophical anthropology,*

Multiculturalism, Essentialism (Philosophy), Constructivism (Philosophy), Critical theory, Social sciences –

Philosophy, Human ecology, and Poststructuralism.

On the whole, the records accurately represent the intersections between feminist theories and

these other bodies of knowledge and schools of philosophy/theory by combining or using several

headings. For example, the record for Ahmed (1998) uses separate headings *Feminist theory* and

Postmodernism to show that the Ahmed "takes up the question of how feminism and postmodernism

'speak to each other' (p. 1) and 'under what conditions is feminism included within, and excluded from,

postmodernism?'" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 26). Perhaps a better heading for this topic would be

Postmodernism and feminism because it shows the intersection of these two schools of thought as

opposed to positioning them in a compare/contrast dichotomy. At this time, there is no such heading.

The record for Flax (1990) also does a thorough job of showing the interconnectedness of a variety of

schools of thought, employing the headings *Psychoanalysis and feminism, Psychoanalysis and philosophy, Feminist theory, Postmodernism,* and *Philosophy, Modern – 20th century.* In this work, Flax "trenchantly examines and critiques 'three modes of contemporary Western thought': psychoanalysis, feminism, and postmodern philosophy. Using an engaging mode of 'conversation' among the three, she analyzes each in turn and uses the tools of each to scrutinize the others, revealing strengths and limitations" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 34). By combining two schools of thought into one heading (*Psychoanalysis and feminism*), the interconnectedness of these two strands of theory is made visible.

The most obviously lacking heading in this group is one for Black feminist thought/theory, which could have been used for Caraway (1991), Collins (1990), Fuss (1989), hooks (1987), Evans (1995), Evans (1997), King (1994), and Wiegman (1995).   These authors as a group include in their books discussions on aspects of racism and white bias within feminist movements and feminist theorizing, the interconnectedness and social/historical construction of race and gender, personal narratives on being African American and female, African American women's activism, African American writers, race and literature, and black feminism/epistemology.   There is no LC heading for African American or Black feminist thought or theory, but there is a heading *Womanism* (LCCN sh 2006001576), which was created in 2006 and has been employed in 4 records in the LC Online Catalog. The term is attributed to Alice Walker who defines womanist as a "black feminist or a feminist of color" (1983, xi). *Womanism* should not be used as a replacement for African American or Black feminist theory, as it represents a particular take on the subject as a whole.

Instead of a heading indicating that these works are about Black feminist thought/theory, the books are described as being about *African American women* (Collins 1990, hooks 1989, Wiegman 1995) *United States – Race relations* (Collins 1990, Wiegman 1995); *Racism – United States – Histor*y (Caraway 1991); *African American women – History* (Caraway 1991); and *United States – Race relations – History* (Caraway 1991). These headings provide some subject access points leading to the topic at hand, but

they are not specific enough. A feminist looking for information on Black feminism or Black feminist

theory is likely to use those terms rather than a racial category. At the least, *African American women*

might be subdivided by *feminist theory* or *feminism* or the reverse.

Chicana feminist theory/feminism is also lacking representation in LCSH and would have been

well-used in the record for Anzaldúa (1987). A search of LC's Online Catalog for "Chicana feminism" as a

phrase in titles returned 6 records with publication dates from 1980 to 2008. The phrase "Chicana

feminism" appears in main titles and chapter titles across these 6 works. Anzaldúa's work is described

with the following headings: *Mexican American women – Poetry, Mexican-American Border Region –*

Poetry, and *Mexican American Border Region – Civilization.* These headings are accurate but could have

been enhanced with headings pointing to Chicana feminism, lesbian feminism, Mestizas, and feminist

theory. A Mestiza is a woman of Spanish and indigenous descent, and the word is used by Anzaldúa

both literally to describe herself and other Chicana women, and metaphorically to frame the idea of

borderlands and divides. LC has a heading *Mestizos*, which is to be used for "works on Latin Americans

of mixed European and Indian descent" (LCCN: sh 93008230). This heading takes the masculine-plural

form, demonstrating the use of the troublesome pseudo-generic masculine, which suggests that women

are subsumed under men.

There is also a lack of description for works in this sample on lesbian feminism and lesbian

feminist theory. The heading *Lesbian feminism* (LCCN: sh 93000705) has existed since 1993, and the

heading *Lesbian feminist theory* (LCCN: sh 00002434) was created in 2000 and has been employed in 11

bibliographic records in the LC Online Catalog. *Lesbian feminist theory* replaced *Lesbian feminism –*

Philosophy, a heading established in 2000. 7 of these 11 records were created in the 1990s, so it

appears that the heading was added to these 7 records retrospectively. Within this sample, the heading

Lesbianism was used for Jagose (1994), *Lesbianism – Philosophy* was used for King (1994), and

Lesbianism – Political aspects was used for Phelan (1994). According to the abstracts, King's work, an

analysis of the production of feminist theory, includes discussion on "global gay formations and local homosexualities," as well as "sex radical approaches to lesbian and gay studies" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 46-47). Jagose "takes feminist and lesbian feminist scholars and theorists to task for failing to problematize 'lesbian' and for using the term (and the concept of the lesbian body) in universalizing…ways" (44). Phelan "wrestles with the potentials and pitfalls of lesbian identity and lesbian political theory, seeking a 'politics that might foster different, more resilient, and potentially coalitional identities'" (53). The headings chosen are not necessarily inappropriate to represent this content, but the heading *Lesbian feminist theory* should also have been used in each record.

Here again LC has demonstrated a lack of attention to literary warrant. A search of Worldcat for "Lesbian feminism" in titles returns records for works published as early as 1975 (Grevatt's *Lesbian/feminism: A response to oppression*) and 1979 (Baker's *Ideology and the structure of social movement organizations: A case study of lesbian-feminism*). These titles demonstrate that the phrase was in use at large much earlier than 2000. Within LC's catalog, records exist for works that include the phrase "lesbian feminism" in the titles with dates from 1980-1997.

The heading *Queer theory* (LCCN: sh2006001835) was established in 2006 based on references from a 1998 *New York Times* article and a 2001 entry in *The International Encyclopedia of The Social and Behavioral Sciences.* Queer theory is a term used to indicate a questioning of the essentialness of sexual orientation and biological sex categories, and a questioning of the relationship between sexual desire and gender, biological sex, and other forms of identity (Rudy 2001). This heading could have been used for Jagose (1994), Phelan (1994), Fuss (1989), and Butler (1990, 1993). Both *Queer theory* and *Lesbian feminist theory* would provide accurate and thus useful access points for a feminist researcher, as opposed to the more general *Lesbianism*, however it may have been subdivided. It should be noted however, that there is a difference between these two theories. Lesbian feminist theory may or may

68

not posit a more or less essential lesbian identity as a basis for producing theory, while Queer theory avoids essentialism.

4.2.4. Representation of specific issues and themes

The overall number of headings for each record appears to be rather low, but this is likely a function of the LC practice of applying subject headings only for concepts that are treated in at least 20% of the total work (Subject Cataloging Manual, H 1180.1). This practice is intended to prevent works that only tangentially treat a topic from being identified as highly relevant. However, when a complex work is indentified with only one subject heading, the potential for subject description to help researchers locate material on their topic from particular perspectives in limited. For example, in this group of works, there are no subject headings pointing to the specific concrete issues, events, ideas, and concepts discussed in relation to feminist theories and feminism.   A limitation of my method is that I am relying on abstracts rather than on the work itself, and it is beyond the scope of this research to examine each and every title in great enough depth to determine the exact percentage of coverage of all topics. However, in many cases, I have referred to the work itself to determine in how much of the total work and in how much detail these issues and concepts are treated.   In addition, I have paid close attention to words and phrases in the abstracts that suggest high relevance and high content. For example, the abstract for Miles (1996) claims that "the… first section of the book traces the history of Western feminist theory…[and]…the second half focuses on multiple examples of integrative feminisms in the 'Two-Thirds World'" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 50). The record for Miles employs two subject headings representing North American feminism and radicalism, but no headings pointing to the "multiple examples of integrative feminisms in the 'Two-Thirds World,'" which apparently make up the entire second half of the work.

20 of these 29 records were described with 3 or fewer headings each, and 4 records had only

one heading each; Grant (1993), Marshall (1994), Spelman (1988), and Evans (1997) were each

described solely with the heading *Feminist theory*.   None of these works discuss feminist theories in a

vacuum, but relate them to multiple themes and concepts in order to demonstrate the foundations and

applications of feminist theories, as well as the differences between them.

For example, Evans (1997) "…present[s] a broad sweep of feminist thinking focusing on central

themes such as distinctions between the public and the private and relationships between women and

the state, engendering knowledge, representation, and the body" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 33). The

number of pages in the topical chapters (excluding the introduction, notes, bibliography, and index) is

125. There are 7 topical chapters, 4 of which cover the topics described above. Chapter 2 "Public and

Private: Women and the State" is 20 pages in length, representing approximately 13% of the total

content. The other 3 topical chapters--"Engendering Knowledge," "Representation," and "The Body"--

are 21, 20, and 21 pages in length, respectively. The only heading for this work is *Feminist theory*,

indicating that none of the topics used to contextualize the discussion on feminist thinking make up, by

themselves, 20% or more of the total work. A potential result of the paucity of headings in this record is

that if a researcher were relying on subject headings to locate material on how various feminist theories

treat these "central" themes, this particular work would likely be overlooked.

Despite ample literary warrant, LC has no heading to represent directly the concept of the

relationship between, and gendered social construction of, the public and private realms, a theme that

has been central to feminist theorizing about social and political life, education, economics, sexual

difference, family and work, gender roles, and the sexual division of labor (Pateman 1983, Armstrong &

Squires 2002). This concept is not just a feminist staple but a basic principle of social philosophy and is

represented widely both within and outside of feminist theories and of this sample in particular. For

example, the bibliographic record for *Public and private in social life* (Benn & Graus 1983), which

includes Pateman's essay "Feminist critiques of the public/private dichotomy" (LCCN: 83009539) is

described with the headings *Social role, Individualism, Self-perception,* and *Personality and culture.*

Another example is the record for *Dividing public and private: Law, politics, and social theory* (Turkel

1992) (LCCN: 92012105), which has the subject access points of *Social institutions, Law – Political*

aspects, and *Sociology – Methodology – History.* None of these headings succinctly capture the larger

theme of the division of public and private realms.   In this particular group of works, a heading

representing the public/private division would be well used in the records for Marshall (1994), hooks

(1989), Miles (1996), and Evans (1997).

Continuing on with the example of the record for Evans (1997), there is no heading employed to

represent her discussion of "engendering knowledge." The heading *Knowledge, Theory of* (LCCN: sh

85072732) subdivided by *Gender* or *Sex* would be potentially helpful to a researcher looking for works

about engendering knowledge and other epistemological questions relating to feminism and to women.

Other works in this group that could be represented by this heading are King (1994), who looks at,

among other concepts, the "politics of oral and written knowledge production and distribution," and

Mellor (1997) who takes on "questions around women and nature and women and knowledge

and…feminist critiques of epistemology and science" (Krikos & Ingold 2004 46, 49).

The record for Grant (1993), like Evans, also employs only one heading: *Feminist theory*. Grant

"…seeks to disclose and discuss an underlying, 'fundamental feminism' manifested in three 'fetishized'

core concepts: 'woman,' experience, and personal politics. These concepts, developed by radical

feminists…provide the conceptual and, Grant argues, highly problematic basis for subsequent varieties

of feminism" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 37). Headings are needed to capture the idea presented in the title

of this work (*Fundamental feminism: Contesting the core concepts of feminist theory*). An existing

heading that might have been used here is *Essentialism (Philosophy).* There is no heading to represent

the idea of personal politics, though this concept has plenty of literary warrant, not only in Grant's work,

but also across the spectrum of feminist thinking. "The personal is political" is a widely-used feminist slogan and theoretical principle attributed to radical feminist Carol Hanisch from her 1970 essay by the same name. The phrase is included in the second edition of *The dictionary of feminist theory.* LCSH has no representation for this concept.

The record for Marshall (1994) also only employs one heading: *Feminist theory*. The abstract describes her work as one which "aims to offer 'a revised account of modernity'" and includes "several chapters that examine the legacies of modernist thought in current theories of the division of labor, reproduction, identity, and rights and the state" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 49). This book may have been better represented by utilizing other headings in addition to *Feminist theory,* such as *Civilization, Modern*, *Division of labor* or *Sexual division of labor, Reproduction – Social aspects*, *Identity (Philosophical concept),* and *Civil rights.*

Lastly, the record for Spelman (1988), which also only utilizes the single heading *Feminist theory* could have been augmented with several additional headings. This work "bring[s] to the fore issues of exclusion in the theories and writings of middle-class white feminists…[and] serves as both a cogent argument against this essentializing tendency and an excellent introduction to the ways in which Western philosophers, starting with Plato and Aristotle, treated women…" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 55). A heading for western philosophy (or for the specific works of western philosophy and feminist theory discussed by Spelman) subdivided by *Feminist criticism* would have been useful in this work, though LCSH lacks a specific heading for western philosophy and uses the general heading *Philosophy* instead. In addition, *Essentialism (Philosophy)* seems a perfect fit for this work entitled *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought.*

Other themes across these 29 works that receive no subject access points are social relations and the state, work and family, abortion, pornography, body image and eating disorders, violence against women, stereotypes and images of women, AIDS activism, interpersonal relations, ecology and

environmentalism, distribution of wealth, lynching, rights, sexual freedom, masculinity, whiteness, motherhood, socioeconomic class, and language.   In most of these cases, this is likely due to the 20% rule, in which subject headings are added to bibliographic records only if the content they represent makes up at least 20% of the total content in the work being described.

Headings for some of these issues exist in very direct form: *Work and family; Abortion – Social aspects; Abortion – Political aspects; Pornography; Body image; Eating disorders; Eating disorders in women; Images of women* (from *The Women's Thesaurus*, not used in any bibliographic records); *Stereotypes (Social Psychology) – Social aspects; Interpersonal relationships; Man-women relationships; Ecology; Environmentalism; Lynching; Human Rights; Sexual freedom; Masculinity; Motherhood;* and *Language.* For other issues, there is less direct access: *Government – Social aspects* (for social relations and the state); *Wealth* (for distribution of wealth); *Social classes* (for socioeconomic class); *Whites* (for whiteness); *AIDS activists* (for AIDS activism); and *Violence – Psychological aspects* or *Political aspects*, *Sexual violence,* or *Violence – Philosophy* (for violence against women). There is a heading *Violence against women – Lebanon* that lacks an authority record. Conceivably this heading could be used to structure a more general heading to represent the concept of violence against women. *Women – Violence against* is also used in a variety of records in LC in general, but this topic would be better represented in direct form: violence against women.

Again, it must be pointed out that it is likely that the reason so few headings were used in these particular records is that the topics and themes treated in them make up less than 20% of the total content. However, this rule minimizes the effectiveness of subject headings, disguising highly relevant content. Overall, a researcher relying on subject headings to locate material on feminist theory in tandem with the multiplicity of issues, themes, concepts, and historical modes of thinking addressed by feminist theory would miss many of the works in this sample.

4.2.5. Disguising privilege: whiteness and masculinity

It is interesting that whiteness and masculinity are not given subject access points for several of these works that include discussions of them because it follows an unconscious political and social pattern of avoidance in naming the power-holding or privileged element in the false dichotomies of people of color/white people and male/female upon which racism and sexism are built. These systems are routinely discussed only in terms of the less powerful elements of the dichotomies, i. e. people of color and women, while the benefits for whites and males in systems of racism and sexism are downplayed or ignored. "Denials that amount to taboos surround the subject of advantages that men gain from women's disadvantages. These denials protect male privilege from being fully acknowledged, lessened, or ended" (McIntosh 2008, 170).

McIntosh argues that this pattern also holds true for racism: "…I realized I had been taught about racism as something that puts others at a disadvantage, but had not been taught to see one of its corollary aspects, white privilege, which puts me at an advantage" (2008, 170). Not naming the advantages to some groups inherent in systems of discrimination reinforces the hegemonic view that women and people of color are solely responsible and to blame for negative outcomes and embody difference *from* a pre-existing, essential standard of maleness and whiteness (de Beauvoir 1971, Wiegman 1995). Maleness, masculinity, and whiteness then become categories immune to analysis, deconstruction, or problematizing and are able to maintain their existence as hegemonic entities. Wendell (1990) refers to this pattern as "the perspective of the oppressor," which "always assigns responsibility and blame to victims of oppression [and] involves mystification of the oppressor's responsibility and of the distribution of power" (23). The mystification process can be seen here in the lack of representation for the power-holding entities discussed in these works.

The abstract for Wiegman (1995) suggests she "makes a key contribution to feminist theory and cultural studies in her study of whiteness and masculinity that maps the 'categorical constructs of race

and gender'...and the entangled relationship between patriarchy and white supremacy in nineteenth- and twentieth-century America" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 59). hooks (1989) also takes on the topics of white supremacy and men in chapters titled "Overcoming white supremacy: A comment" and "Feminist focus on men: A comment." Caraway (1991) examines the "relations between white feminists and black women, both in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as well as in the contemporary period...[and argues for] a principled articulation of racism within white feminism, historically and in the present moment" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 30). None of these records include headings for white men, white women, white supremacy, patriarchy, masculinity, or men. Instead, they are represented by *Sex role – United States, United States – Race relations, African American women, Feminism – United States, Feminism – United States – History, Racism – United States – History, African American women – History, Feminist theory, and United States – Race relations – History.* These headings are accurate, but they only tell one side of the story, disguising the books' foci on the ways whiteness and/or masculinity/maleness play out culturally and socially.

There are multiple authorized headings pointing to whites, whiteness, and white supremacy. *Whites – Race identity* (LCCN: sh 98006796), *Whites* (LCCN: sh 85146547), *Caucasian race* (LCCN: sh 85021431), *Whites – United States* (LCCN: sh2001006027), and *White supremacy movements* (LCCN: sh 88004109). The scope note of *Whites* says it should be used for "...works of a sociological nature that discuss white people as an element in the population, especially in countries where they are a minority," and the scope note for *Caucasian race* says it should be used for "works of an anthropological nature focusing on the physical features that characterize Caucasians and distinguish them from other races of mankind." This leaves *Whites – United States*, which is to be used for "works on white people in the United States as a racial group" as perhaps the best choice of these headings for the records of Wiegman (1995), Caraway (1991), and hooks (1989). There are also headings *Women, White* (LCCN: sh 89006763) created in 1989 and *Men, White* (LCCN: sh 85083521) created in 1986. Both of these

headings may be subdivided by chronological and geographical subheadings. *Patriarchy* (LCCN sh

85098727) appears in the print editions of LCSH in 1975 as *Patriarchy*, see *Family.* In the 1980 edition, it

is listed as *Patriarchy* (indirect), and in the 10th edition in 1986, it appears in its current form: *Patriarchy.*

Masculinity (LCCN: sh 85081797) was created in 1986. A combination of these headings would have

been useful in Wiegman (1995), hooks (1989), and Caraway (1991). Overall, the subject headings in

these particular records limit the context of racism, white supremacy, patriarchy, and the construction

of race to one side of the coin: that of the target groups in systems of oppression and discrimination.

4.3 Conclusion

The themes uncovered in the subject representation of these particular works point to problems

such as an inconsistent representation of the varieties of feminist theory, an inability to represent issues

relevant to feminist theorizing, a disguising of white and male privilege, and the use of outdated and

unspecific terminology. These problems seem to stem from lack of attention to literary warrant, under-

cataloging, and an unconscious tendency toward maintaining the balance of power based on sex,

gender, race, and ethnicity. Solutions to these problems include paying better attention to literary

warrant and engaging in educational consciousness-raising practices regarding systems of

discrimination, power, and control.

Chapter 5: Findings and Discussion—Analysis of Monographs in "Feminist Theories and Women's Movements," Subsection: Women's Movements and Activism)

Chapter 5 represents my analysis of the subject headings employed in the bibliographic records of the 23 titles I have chosen from the second chapter of *Women's Studies: A recommended bibliography* (3rd edition, 2004). To reiterate, my sample titles come from the list of core monographs in the bibliography's Chapter 2 "Feminist Theories and Women's Movements," excluding any titles that are collections of essays or anthologies/readers and those lacking records in the LC Online Catalog. This chapter represents my analysis of the records for the titles chosen from the bibliography's Chapter 2, second subsection: Women's Movements and Activism. Chapter 5 includes a table showing the titles and bibliographic record number (LCCNs) of the books included in the analysis (see Appendix), a summarized description of the content of the titles as a whole, a table showing the distribution of subject headings across the records of these titles (see Appendix), a discussion of key themes and observations regarding the use of subject headings for these titles, and a brief conclusion.

5.1 Description of Monographs and Subject Headings

Table 6 shows the titles, the Library of Congress Control Numbers for the titles' records in the LC Online Catalog, and the number of subject headings per record. The table is arranged in descending order of number of subject headings.

The portion of the total sample of 52 represented in this subsection is 23 works. The average number of headings per record is 3.08, ranging from 6 to 1 per record. 19 of the 23 were published in the 1990s, and 4 were published in the late 1980s. 5 of these titles have two or more authors, and all of them are in the English language.

According to the abstracts, these titles take the form of histories and case studies of women's and feminist movements and activism utilizing primary documents from feminist organizations, as well as census statistics, legal statues and legislation, interviews, autobiographical accounts, and oral histories. A handful of the works include bilingual glossaries, bibliographies, and directories of feminist organizations.

Geographical coverage includes the United States, Canada, India, Japan, Africa, Morocco, Russia, Pacific Islands, Australia, China, Iran, Western Europe, El Salvador, Mexico, Brazil, and Chile. Chronological coverage is from the late 18th to late 20th centuries.   Specific organizations and people mentioned in the abstracts are Canada's National Action Committee on the Status of Women, Redstockings, Cell 16, The Feminists, New York Radical Feminists, Union of the Women of Russia, the Independent Women's Forum, the Women's League (Russia), International Council of Women (ICW), the International Alliance of Women, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the National Women's Party, the National Organization for Women, Gayatri Spivak, Chandra Mohanty, Allan Bloom, Betty Friedan, Carol Gilligan, and Alice Paul.

 Issues and themes present in these works include power, politics, the theory of feminist practice, anti-colonialism in French Morocco, Muslim women, nationalism, reproduction, marriage and family, the law, medicine, Western feminism, developing nations, trafficking of women, poor women, rural women, witchcraft, food riots, the New Right (U.S.), media, anti-feminist backlash, abortion, sexual and domestic violence, political participation, technology, Australian femocrats, Australian Aboriginal women, socioeconomic class, lesbians, immigrant women, economic independence and employment rights, legislation, suffrage, education, racism, anti-Semitism, anti-Communism, the Equal Rights Amendment, Women's Studies and academic feminism, radical feminism, gay rights, antimilitarism, and feminist publishing houses.

Table 7 shows the subject headings applied to the 23 records in this portion of the sample and indicates in how many records each subject heading appears. There is quite a lot of overlap in the main headings utilized. 18 of the 59 headings begin with *Feminism*, primarily subdivided by chronology and geographical location. *Feminist theory* is present in 4 records, and *Feminists* (variously subdivided by geographical location) is present in 4 records also. Headings beginning with *Women* and *Women's rights*, also subdivided by chronology and geographical location, are present in 16 records. 6 headings do not include words pointing to feminism, feminists, or women and have the effect of situating these titles more broadly: *Cultural pluralism, Morocco – History – Autonomy and independence movements, Power (Social sciences), Radicalism – United States, Social movements – Latin America – Case studies,* and *United States – Social conditions – 1945-*.

5.2 Themes in Subject Representation: Problems and Solutions

Following are 4 key themes of subject heading representation across this group of records.

5.2.1. Women's agency

How does LCSH handle the representation of books about women activists and organizers and about the political activities of feminists? Are the headings able to capture the agency and actions of women, or do they sometimes position women as passive recipients of a falsely-naturalized, inevitable civilizing process (Rosaldo 1993) or solely as victims of oppression? Gender stereotypes portray women and femininity as passive, as opposed to an active masculine principle. Does this stereotype play out in the subject representation of these books?

The concept of the agency of women in politics, activism, and social change is represented very directly with the main headings *Women social reformers, Women radicals, Women revolutionaries,* and *Women political activists.* The subdivision *Political activity* used with the main heading *Women* also

effectively captures the idea of women's political agency.   The activity of women activists is represented

less directly with the main heading *Feminists* subdivided by *Interviews.*

The works described with these headings are Rowbotham (1992), Miller (1991), Baker (1998),

Buckley (1997), Calman (1992), Racioppi & See (1997), and Stephen (1997). According to the abstract,

Rowbotham's work, *Women in Movement: Feminism and Social Action* is a "…comparative study of the

history of the feminist social movement" in the West, Russia, China, and India (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 77).

Three of the above headings are represented in this record: *Women radicals, Women political activists,*

and *Women social reformers.* Miller's book, *Latin American Women and the Search for Social Justice* is a

"comprehensive account of the mobilization of women in Latin America in the twentieth century" (74)

and has been assigned the heading *Women – Political activity.* Baker's work, *Voices of Resistance: Oral*

Histories of Moroccan Women is about "Muslim women who participated in the anticolonialist struggles

against the French in Morocco" (63), and its record includes the heading *Women revolutionaries.*

The headings *Feminists – Japan – Interviews* and *Feminists – Russia (Federation) – Interviews* are

used respectively in the records of Buckley's *Broken Silence: Voices of Japanese Feminism*, which is "a

unique and informative collection of first-person accounts [of Japanese feminists]," and in Racioppi &

See's *Women's Activism in Contemporary Russia*, which "focus[es] on Russian women activists and their

organizations in Moscow and St. Petersburg in the late 1980s and early 1990s…" (64, 76). Calman's

work *Toward Empowerment: Women and Movement Politics in India,* "us[es] personal interviews and

unpublished documents as well as secondary sources…[and] locates the Indian women's movement not

only within Indian state politics but also within the wider frames of international feminism" (66), and is

represented with the heading *Women – Political activity – India*. Stephen's book, *Women and social*

movements in Latin America: Power from below is "…based on collaborative research with grassroots

activists that Stephen conducted between 1989 and 1995…[and] presents six case studies of women's

activism in Latin American political movements" (80). The heading for Stephen's work is *Women – Latin America – Interviews*.

There are 14 other titles in this group that, according to the abstracts or titles, should also have headings pointing to the actions and demonstrating the agency of women: Chafetz & Dworkin (1986), Echols (1989), Kaplan (1992), Kumar (1993), Rupp (1997), Adamson, Briskin & McPhail (1988), Rupp & Taylor (1987), Ryan (1992), Simon & Danzinger (1991), Sommers (1994), Whittier (1995), Wolf (1993), Kaplan (1996), and Young (1997). Each of the titles or abstracts for these works point to the actions of women in direct ways.   Table 8 indicates phrases from the abstracts or titles of works that support the idea that these books should be described with headings pointing to the activities of women and/or feminists, rather than simply representing these books as about feminism in general or the social conditions of women.

Within this group of 23, only 2 works do not discuss women's direct political action or organizing: Faludi (1991) and Bulbeck (1998). Faludi primarily discusses the anti-feminist actions of a social institutions and societal trends against the ideas and strategies of previous feminist organizing without much discussion of the previous feminist organizing itself. For example, Faludi has divided her work into parts: "Introduction: Blame it on Feminism," "The Backlash in Popular Culture," "Origins of Reaction: Backlash Movers, Shakers, and Thinkers," "The Backlash Brain Trust: From Neocons to Neofems," and "Backlashings: The Effects on Women's Minds, Jobs, and Bodies" (v-vi). Bulbeck (1998) explores the perspectives of western and eastern feminisms and women about one another, as well as showing the competing views and stereotypes regarding social relations in eastern/western societies. Her focus is largely on trends, ideologies, attitudes, and cultural practices, as opposed to women's direct action and organizing. According to the abstract, Bulbeck provides an

investigation of similarities and differences… among women in a postcolonial

world…[and a] brief historical overview of Western feminisms, [in order] to offer critical

examinations of debates around colonialism, tradition, and modernity; law and human

rights; individual and community; motherhood and marriage; sexual identities; and

trade, labor, and the traffic in women. (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 65)

5.2.2. Feminist organizations

Specific feminist organizations mentioned in the annotations are lacking subject representation

across the board. These include: Canada's National Action Committee on the Status of Women,

Redstockings, Cell 16, The Feminists, New York Radical Feminists, Union of the Women of Russia, the

Independent Women's Forum, the Women's League (Russia), International Council of Women (ICW), the

International Alliance of Women, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the

National Women's Party, and the National Organization for Women.   Authorized subject headings exist

for about just over half of these, with no headings for The Feminists, Union of the Women of Russia, the

Women's League, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the National

Women's Party.

Echols (1989) *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975* "thoroughly

document[s] the history of radical feminism," with a focus on organizations as well as ideology, (Krikos &

Ingold 2004, 67). It is represented with two headings: *Feminism – United States – History – 20th century*

and *Women's rights – United States – History – 20th century.* Though headings exist for two of the four

organizations Echols documents (Redstockings and Cell 16), no subject coverage for these organizations

was provided in the record.   Chapter 4 (out of 6) entitled "Varieties of Radical Feminism – Redstockings,

Cell 16, The Feminists, New York Radical Feminists" covers 64 pages out of 295 of text (excluding notes

and appendices), for 21% of the total work. Though no single organization receives 20% or more of the

total content, the fact that 21% of the work is about four feminist organizations, and that there is a 4

page appendix "A Guide to Women's Liberations Groups," argues at the least for the use of a heading

for feminist political organizations in general, though none exists in the authorities. Instead, the subdivision *Societies and clubs* is used under the main heading *Women*. This pattern is used in the records for Rupp (1997) and Racioppi & See (1997) but not for Echols (1989), Ryan (1992), or Rupp & Taylor (1987) in which organizations receive no subject representation of any kind.

According to the abstracts, Racioppi & See (1997) focus on Russian feminist organizations: "…organizations provide the focal point of the body of the work, a multifaceted investigation of the movement through the work of the Union of the Women of Russia, the Independent Women's Forum, and the Women's League" (76); Rupp (1997), "frame[s] her investigation conceptually around 'social movement communities,' …compar[ing] three different women's organizations—the International Council of Women (ICW), the International Alliance of Women, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom" (77); Rupp & Taylor (1987) focus on the National Women's Party and the National Organization for Women; and in Ryan (1992), "The National Organization for Women (NOW) takes center stage…both as a focus in itself and as a marker of difference from other branches of the movement" (78).

There are many choices for headings and subheadings to describe organizations of a variety of types, and the distinctions in their use are not likely to be clear to most researchers. For example, the subheading *Societies and clubs* has been used for records in LC's Online Catalog for works on social clubs, political and activist organizations, and academic societies. *Organizations* is a non-preferred term and points to *Associations, institutions, etc. Associations, Institutions, etc.* is used in the LC Online catalog as a main heading in the records of works on political and government organizations, community movements and volunteer organizations, boards of directors, and other diverse organizational types, including the C.I.A. *Societies, etc.* is another subheading choice and has been used in records for works on a variety of organizational types, from Freemasonry to Bath's Natural History and Antiquarian Field Club.

A search of the LC catalog for the phrase "feminist organizations" in titles returns 6 records (one of which is for the book *Antifeminist organizations: Institutionalizing the backlash)*. The other five records are works on the roles, evolution, and history of feminist organizations. Headings pointing to organizations are employed in three records only and include: *Feminism – United States – Societies, etc. Women – United States – Societies and clubs; Organizational sociology; Organizational change; Bureaucracy; African American feminists --Societies, etc. --History --20th century;* and *African American women --Societies and clubs --History --20th century.*

While there is literary warrant to justify establishing a heading for feminist organizations, adding this choice to the many other existing headings and subheadings used to describe organizations, societies, and clubs could amplify confusion as opposed to lessening it. However, since there is literary warrant for the term *feminist organizations*, it ought to be used. Though the works in this particular sample point specifically to women's organizing and activism, men can also belong to feminist organizations, so the use of the heading *Women* subdivided by *Societies and clubs* or *Feminist organizations* or *Societies, etc.* to describe works about feminist organizations must be used judiciously. *Feminism – Societies and clubs* might be a solution for the records of books with content on general feminist organizations because it does not artificially exclude men's participation and utilizes an existing subheading as opposed to adding yet another option to the many that already exist for describing works on organizations. However, a heading for "feminist organizations" shows literary warrant and avoids the somewhat narrow social association implied with "clubs."

5.2.3. Contextualizing women's movements: Specificity and relevance

The problem of specificity and relevance appears again in this group of titles, i.e., to describe information about women and society as being *only* about women and society results in its ghettoization and isolation from its relevant context. It sets women and "women's issues" apart from

social problems, society, and social movements in general. Though LC purportedly follows the rule of

direct/specific entry, describing the subjects of work as specifically as possible, they are not always

consistent, as evidenced by works about boys and men that use non-gender-specific headings. For

example, the title *Living out of bounds: The male athlete's everyday life* is cataloged only with non-

gender-specific headings despite the fact that it's solely about male athletes: *Sports – Sociological

aspects, Athletes – Social life and customs,* and *Athletes* (LCCN: 2009041861).

Searing (1986) discusses this problem in terms of classification and the physical arrangement of

Women's Studies books, but her argument can be extrapolated to subject description, as well. In her

discussion of the pros and cons of the integration of Women's Studies materials throughout the general

collection, she refers to the "serendipitous consciousness-raising" and the "chance enlightenment" of

the general library user who, in a search of a book on a given topic, stumbles upon a feminist treatment

of the topic because the WS materials have been integrated into the collection rather than separated.

This follows the idea of Women's Studies as a mainstream pursuit in which the curriculum has been

transformed to include the study of women as a matter of course rather than as a special, separate

interest (McIntosh 1981). In this case, it is the idea of feminist social and political change that, through

the lack of use of general, contextualizing subject headings, is sometimes marginalized from social and

political change of which it is both an important part and a reaction to.

For example, Rowbotham (1992) contextualizes "the feminist social movement" by "…mark[ing]

its emergence in the French Revolution, then chart[ing] its development and impact through economic,

social, and political movements not only in the Western world but also in Russia, China, and India"

(Krikos & Ingold 2004, 77). The subject representation for this work does not give the broader context

of the French Revolution or of any other world-wide social movements of which feminist social

movements are part and parcel.   A researcher looking for information on social movements in general

would miss this title, one which can provide information on a very important thread within the larger context of social change.

Another example is Ryan (1992), who, "using a framework of social movement and resource mobilization theory…tracks the changes in feminist activism and thought from the mid-nineteenth century through the 1980s" (78). A heading for the concept of resource mobilization, an important idea for understand social movements, would have been useful here and could have revealed this work to a researcher searching for specific examples of the theory of resource mobilization. However, there is no authorized heading for this concept.

Similarly, Calman (1992) "contextualizes [the Indian's women's movement] within theories of new social movements…[and] locates the Indian women's movement not only within Indian state politics but also within the wider frames of international feminism" (65-66). In this record, headings such as *Social movements, Politics – India,* or *Political movements – India,* would make this work accessible to a variety of researchers, e.g., one who might be looking for works on social or political movements in India.

Echols (1989) "contexualizes [the history of radical feminism] within 1960s civil rights and other social struggles, then traces its contentious evolution until, by 1975, it was eclipsed by cultural feminism" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 68). However, the record for this work includes no headings for radical or cultural feminism, for the 1960s Civil Rights Movement, or for any other social movements of this period other than the very broad *Feminism – United States – History – 20th century* and *Women's rights – United States – History – 20th century*. This record could improve both its specificity *and* its relevance.

According to its abstract, Kaplan (1992) "describes the kaleidoscope of European women's movements explored within the political, social, economic, and cultural contexts in which they developed" (72), yet there are no headings for the European context in general. Only two headings are employed: *Feminism – Europe – History – 20th century* and *Women – Europe – History – 20th century*.

Miller (1991) also situates her history of Latin American feminist movements broadly: "detail[ing] the intersections between local, regional, national, and global events" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 75), yet the record only employs headings pointing to feminism and women's rights in Latin America.   Finally, Racioppi & See (1997) devote a full chapter to the broader societal context; Chapter 2 is entitled "Women's Activism in Historical Context" and covers both the Tsarist period and the Soviet Order (vii). It has been described with three headings: *Women – Russia (Federation) – Societies and Clubs*, *Feminism – Russia (Federation),* and *Feminists – Russia (Federation) – Interviews*. No headings are used to situate this work within these specific historical periods.

An example of a record which does contextualize women's activism into a broader, relevant context is that for Baker (1998). This record uses the headings *Feminism – Morocco – History* and *Morocco – History – Autonomy and independence movements* to represent this book as being about the connections between feminist activism, women's activism, and the anticolonialist movement. Another example of a use of headings which adds the element of relevance to that of specificity is the record for Stephen (1997), which employs the headings *Social movements – Latin America – Case studies* and *Feminism – Latin America – Case studies.* This works includes "…a comparative analysis of the case studies, focusing on recurrent themes of 'gender relations, economic development, political mobilization, identity, and power relations between researchers and the researched'" (Krikos & Ingold 2004, 80). Both of these records use specific headings for feminist activism combined with more general headings for social movements, with the result that the works are not artificially separated from the broader social and political contexts in which they arose, operated, and/or critiqued.

Lastly, the record for Whittier (1995) provides a relevant context, but no specificity, by employing a heading for radicalism in general, but not one for radical feminism. In fact, there is no authorized heading for radical feminism. Within this group of titles, a heading for radical feminism would be appropriate for Echols (1989) and Whittier (1995), both of which have radical feminism as the

main topic. The title of Echols' work, *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967- 1975*

unambiguously points to radical feminism as the main topic, as does Whittier's *Feminist Generations:*

The Persistence of the Radical Women's Movement. Echols' work is represented overly broadly with its

two headings: *Feminism – United States – History – 20th century* and *Women's rights – United States –*

History – 20th century; Whittier's is represented with *Feminism – United States* and *Radicalism – United*

States. Though the main heading *Radicalism* situates the content of Whittier's book in a broad context,

thus providing relevance for a researcher looking for material on the subject of radicalism in the United

States, the lack of a heading for radical feminism obscures the fact that both Echols and Whittier's main

focus is about radical feminism, a distinctive strand of feminist thinking, activism, and radicalism that

ought to be named.

5.2.4. Specific concepts, issues, and groups without representation

Specific issues of concern to women and feminists around which feminists have organized their

political activity and activism, as well as particular groups of women who have organized on their own

behalf or within general social movements, are at times substantially (though not necessarily at the 20%

level) covered in these works. These include the Equal Rights Amendment, Muslim women,

postcolonialism, feminist ideology, western feminisms, popular culture and media, Women's Studies,

feminist publishing houses, and suffrage.

Table 9 shows phrases from the abstracts and/or titles that point to how these topics are

covered in this group of books. Headings exist for all of these concepts in various forms, some direct

and some less so. Postcolonialism, suffrage, Women's Studies, and Muslim women have direct, specific

subject representation in LCSH though the headings were not employed in the records in this sample.

Equal rights amendments is the heading for what is more commonly known in the singular, or by

its initials (ERA). The ERA, a proposed federal constitutional amendment, was never ratified and is not,

therefore, an official amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The heading *Equal rights amendments –*

United States has been applied to 32 records in the LC Online Catalog. A survey of these 32 titles

indicates that the topic of all of these works is the specific ERA written by Alice Paul that reached its final

ratification deadline in 1982. However, there is not a heading in LC for this particular proposed

amendment.

A spectrum of representation exists for the remainder of the headings, though none of these

were employed in the records for works in this sample. The concept of feminist ideology does not exist

in LCSH in direct form, but the heading *Ideology – Political aspects* could have provided relevance for

the works indicated in Table 6 that address how ideologies structure women's activism in various

contexts. Feminist small press publishing is represented with the heading *Feminist literature –*

Publishing; Marriage and family is represented with *Marriage – Political aspects* and *Family – Social*

aspects; Media and popular culture can be represented with *Women in mass media,* whose scope note

indicates "Here are entered works discussing the portrayal of women in the mass media" (LCCN: sh

85147589), or with *Women in popular culture.* However, Faludi discusses the way feminist gains are

portrayed in the media and in popular culture, so a better choice would be a heading to represent the

idea of feminism in the media or in popular culture, for which no authorized headings exist. The

concept of western feminism has no direct representation, but *Feminism* variously subdivided by

specific regions can be used instead. However, because "western" is used as a synonym for "developed

and set in contrast to "the Third World" or "developing nations," in the case of Bulbeck (1998), a direct

heading for "western feminism" to capture this nuance would be appropriate.

5.3 Conclusion

The themes discovered in the subject representation of this group of 23 works indicates

problems in subject access for specific feminist issues and feminist organizations, as well as for situating

feminist activism and social movements in broader societal contexts. Rhetorically, these headings as a

group do not depict the political agency and direct action of women, but position the activists in these

works as recipients of social change. Like the records analyzed in Chapter 4, problems include lack of

attention to literary warrant and under-cataloging.   Solutions include decreasing the total amount of

content in a given work that is needed to justify the use of a heading representing that content and

engaging in consciousness-raising educational practices to help avoid perpetuating stereotypes.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and Implications

6.1. Proposed Subject Representation

Table 10 summarizes my proposals for subject representation for the 52 works in this sample, listing concepts and themes not covered in LCSH. These 22 concepts have literary warrant not only in this sample, but in many works in the LC Online Catalog. Utilization of these subject headings in the bibliographic records for these works would vastly improve subject access to them.

Table 11 lists existing headings that I have argued would improve subject access to the materials in this sample had they been utilized in the bibliographic records of these works. These 38 headings range from concepts to groups of people and include some useful subdivisions, such as *Political activity*. As noted by Gerhard, et al. (1998), lack of cataloger knowledge in the specialized realm of Women's Studies materials may be one of the reasons these existing headings were not employed.

6.2. Summary of themes

Previous research (reviewed in Chapter 2) has established a set of problems in Women's Studies subject representation with LCSH and controlled vocabularies in general related to the idea that a mainstream tool cannot accurately represent a critical discourse and will perpetuate stereotypes and the status quo of social relations and the distribution of power (Olson 1996). It is difficult for a mainstream tool to represent a discourse which purposefully complicates and problematizes common-sense notions, such as the seeming indisputability of binary biological sex categories, as evidenced by a lack of headings for descriptions of works about the historicism and fluidity of sex.

Problems with bias in terminology have been addressed again and again from the early 1970s to the present. These include missing terminology, implied judgment through syndetic structure, the "women as" syndrome, and inconsistent use of sex-specificity, i.e. some groups are named specifically, while others are treated non-specifically. Of these general types of problem with terminologies and

linking structures, I mainly noted problems with missing terminology, the normative use of the term

"sex," and the inconsistent use of specificity.   For example, in Chapter 4, I discussed the issue of lack of

terminology to adequately represent the concepts of sex and gender as they are used in feminist theory.

Gerhard, et al. (1998) also noted this problem, suggesting that the concept of "sex role socialization"

(136) lacks adequate LCSH coverage. Inappropriate sex-specificity was found in the use of the pseudo-

generic masculine heading *Mestizos*, and the problem of specificity and relevance was noted with the

works on feminist social movements.

On the whole, I found 4 broad instances of bias in the way these works were cataloged: 1. the

obscuring of women's agency in the works on women's movements with too few headings used to show

the actions of women, 2. the exclusion of works of Chicana and African American feminist theory from

the realm of feminist theory in general, 3. the representation of works analyzing white supremacy and

patriarchy without naming these entities, thus reinforcing Wendell's "perspective of the oppressor"

(1990), and 4. the ghettoization of women's movements from the broader historical and sociological

context.

Though I did not set out to analyze cataloging practices, I inadvertently did so, finding that LC's

cataloging practices (when they are followed) do not suffice for this body of literature. Gerhard, et al.

(1998) in their study of subject access to Women's Studies material conclude that some of the problems

in establishing accurate subject access to this literature are lack of cataloger knowledge about Women's

Studies , under-cataloging (i.e. providing too few subject access points) and lack of high quality

retrospective cataloging when new subject headings are established. In my study, I found that under-

cataloging, inaccurate retrospective cataloging, and lack of attention to literary warrant are still

problems, e,g., in the lack of representation of specific issues addressed in feminist theory and feminist

activism, in the use of too few headings per record, and in the inconsistent use of the heading *Feminist*

theory. The rule of direct/specific-entry also causes problems for this group of works, ghettoizing rather than contextualizing.

In particular, the 20% rule for content results in disguising works that discuss a variety of themes and issues, such as abortion and pornography, from the perspective of feminist theory and activism. Researchers often search for material that treats these topics from a feminist perspective yet would be unable to find them in books that take them on if the researcher relies on subject headings alone (Weinberg 1988). Perhaps LC should consider subject representation at the chapter-level to remedy this problem. Information currently exists in an environment of disaggregation. In the electronic environment, portions of works are removed from their containers. For example, on a top level, article databases represent articles, not journals. On a more granular level, tables and figures may be extracted from published articles and indexed as discrete, searchable entities (Sandusky & Tenopir 2008). I have observed that students and scholars routinely cite individual chapters in monographs, especially when using collections of essays and anthologies. Since this is currently the case and is likely indicative of further disaggregation of information in the future, subject representation at the chapter level may be warranted. As I have shown, subject headings alone, for this group of works, tend to obscure more than they illuminate. This lack is somewhat made up for by the fact that in the electronic environment, publishers' descriptions and tables of contents are often made available in bibliographic records, providing further representation once a user selects a record. However, subject headings for each individual chapter could provide much needed and helpful access points.

6.3 Implications and future research

This study has shown that there are both specific and general problems in LCSH coverage of feminist theory and women's/feminist social and political activism. Terminological problems as well as broad instances of bias result in a misrepresentation of many of the works in this sample.

A variety of future projects suggest themselves from this research. For example, I would like to extend this research to a larger and broader sample of feminist monographs in order to determine how LCSH handles the interdisciplinarity of Women's Studies. While feminist theory and women's political/social movements may be described as providing a foundation for the field, an analysis of the entire spectrum of feminist research would provide more comprehensive conclusions. Another future project of interest is to analyze how feminist scholars and how students of feminist topics make use of LCSH to find needed material. Are subject headings still relevant to researchers? A user-centered study could provide information leading to solutions to some of the problems noted in this study, as well as providing a possible glimpse into other issues. A study of cataloging practices regarding the creation of new subject headings and retrospective cataloging in this age of incredible information proliferation could also provide insight into the continued relevance of subject headings within a monolithic, generalized, controlled vocabulary such as LCSH. Lastly, as called for by Gerhard, et al. (1998), the creation of a tool to assist catalogers when handling Women's Studies materials, such as an updated Women's Studies thesaurus, could be invaluable for the creation and application of accurate, complete, and non-biased subject headings.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, Chris and Judith Squires. 2002. Beyond the public/private dichotomy: Relational and space

and sexual inequalities. *Contemporary Political Theory,* 1, no. 3 (October): 261-83.

Association of College and Research Libraries, Women's Studies Section. "Database instruction guide."

http://libr.org/wss/projects/guides.html (accessed September 12, 2009).

Beghtol, Claire. 2004. Exploring new approaches to the organization of knowledge: The subject

classification of James Duff Brown. *Library Trends* 52, no. 4 (Spring): 702-18.

Berman, Sanford. 1971. *Prejudices and antipathies: A tract on the LC subject heads concerning people*.

Scarecrow Press: Netuchen, NJ.

Berman, Sanford. 1984. Out of the kitchen—but not into the catalog. *Technical Services Quarterly* 2, no.

1-2 (Fall/Winter): 167-71.

Boere, Marianne and Gusta Drenthe, eds. 1998. *European women's thesaurus : A structured list of*

descriptors for indexing and retrieving information in the field of the position of women and

women's studies. Amsterdam : International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's

Movement.

Bolton, Sandra Lee. 1989. Libraries and liberation: A feminist view. In *Social responsibility in*

librarianship : Essays in equality, ed. Donnarae MacCann, 13-30. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Boxer, Marilyn. 1998. *When women ask the questions: Creating women's studies in America*.

Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2002. The power of naming. In *Information sources in women's studies and feminism*,

ed. Hope Olson, 169-177. Munich: K.G. Saur.

Butler, Judith P. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge.

Butler, Judith P. 1990. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Canadian Women's Indexing Group. 1990. *Canadian Feminist Thesaurus.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Capek, Mary Ellen S. 1987. *A Women's thesaurus: An index of language used to describe and locate information by and about women*. New York: Harper & Row.

Chan, Lois. 1990. *Library of Congress subject headings: Principles of structure and policies for application*. Annotated version. Washington, D. C.: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress.

Chan, Lois Mai. 2005. *Library of Congress subject headings: Principles and applications*. Westport, CT.: Libraries Unlimited.

Chetkovich, Carol. 2004. Women's agency in a context of oppression: Assessing strategies for personal action and public policy. *Hypatia* 19, no. 4 (Autumn 2004): 122-43.

Clack, Doris H. 1973. An investigation into the adequacy of Library of Congress subject headings for resources for black studies. PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh.

Conway, Meghan, Stephanie Gonder, and Michele Buti. 1995. Women's studies in academic library collections. *Current Studies in Librarianship* 19 (Spring/Fall): 70-84.

Cutter, Charles. 1876. *Rules for a printed dictionary catalog.* Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

De Beauvoir, Simone. 1971. *The second sex.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Detlefsen, Ellen Gay. 1984. Issues of access to information about women. *Special Collections* 3, no. 3-4: 163-171.

Dickinson, Elizabeth. 1981. *Report of the Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis Subcommittee to the RTSA/CCS Subject Analysis Committee.* Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Dickstein, Ruth, Victoria A. Mills, and Ellen J. Waite. 1988. *Women in LC's terms: A thesaurus of Library of Congress subject headings relating to women*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Drenthe, Gusta and Maria van der Sommer, eds. 1992. *Vrouwenthesaurus Lijst van gecontroleerde termen voor het ontsluiten van informatie over de positie van vrouwen en vrouwenstudies*. Amsterdam: Internationaal Informatiecentrum en Archief voor de Vrouwenbeweging.

Dunkin, Paul S. 1969. *Cataloging U.S.A.*.Chicago: American Library Association.

Faludi, Susan. 1991. *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women.* New York: Crown Publishers.

Foskett, A.C. Misogynists all: A study in critical classification. *Library Resources and Technical Services* 15, no. 2: 117-21.

Gerhard, Kristin, Trudi E. Jacobson, and Susan G. Williamson. 1993. Indexing adequacy and interdisciplinary journals: The case of women's studies. *College and Research Libraries* 54 (March): 125–135.

Gerhard, Kristin, Mila C. Su, and Charlotte C. Rubens. 1998. An empirical examination of subject headings for women's studies core materials. *College and Research Libraries* 59, no. 2: 130-138.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1992. *Prison notebooks.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Greenblatt, Ellen. 1990. Homosexuality: The evolution of a concept in the Library of Congress Subject Headings. In *Gay and lesbian library service,* eds. Cal Gough and Ellen Greenblatt, 75-101. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.

Grosz, E.A. 1994. *Volatile bodies: Toward a corporeal feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hanisch, Carol. 1970. The personal is political. In *Notes from the second year: Women's liberation: Major writings of the radical feminists*. New York: Radical Feminism

Hannigan, Jane. 1994. A feminist standpoint for library and information science education. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 35 (Fall): 297-319.

Humm, Maggie. 1995. *The dictionary of feminist theory.* 2nd edition. Columbus: Ohio State University

Press.

Humphreys, Nancy. 1987. Beyond standard forms of information organization: A woman's classification

system for libraries. *Feminist Collections* 9, no. 1 (Fall): 9-13.

Itner, Sheila and Elizabeth Futas. 1996. The role and impact of Library of Congress Classification on the

assessment of Women's Studies collections. *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory* 20 (Fall):

267-279.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. 1987. The Gender/Sience System: or, Is Sex To Gender As Nature Is To Science?

Hypatia 2, no. 3: 37-49**.**

Krikos, Linda A. and Cindy Ingold. 2004. *Women's studies: A recommended bibliography*. 3rd edition.

Westport, CT.: Libraries Unlimited.

Kublik, Angela and Virginia Clevette, Dennis Ward, Hope Olson. 2003. Adapting dominant classifications

to particular contexts. *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* 37, no. 1-2: 13-31.

Kushigian, Nancy. 1997. Researching women's lives and issues: Contemporary Women's Issues and

Women 'R'. *Database Magazine* 20, no. 6 (December): 18-26.

Library of Congress. Cataloging Policy and Support Office. 2008. *Subject headings manual.* Washington,

D.C.: Library of Congress, Cataloging Policy and Support Office.

Lochhead, Ishbel. 1985. Bibliographic control of feminist literature. *Catalogue and Index* 76/77: 10-

15.

Mann, Patricia. 1994. Micro-politics: Agency in a postfeminist era. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota

Press.

Marshall, Joan K. 1972. LC labeling: an indictment. In *Revolting librarians,*eds. Celeste West and

Elizabeth Katz, 45-49. San Francisco: Booklegger Press.

Marshall, Joan K. 1977. *On equal terms: A thesaurus for nonsexist indexing and cataloging.* New York:

    Neal-Schuman Publishers.

McIntosh, Peggy. 1983. *Interactive phases of curricular re-vision: A feminist perspective, working*

    paper no. 124. Wellesley, MA: Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College.

McIntosh, Peggy. 2008. White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In *Classroom conversations: A*

    collection of classics for parents and teachers, eds. Alexandra Miletta and Maureen Miletta, 169-

    177. New York: The New Press.

Mesplay, Deborah and Loretta Koch. 1993. An evaluation of indexing services for women's studies

    periodical literature. *RQ* 32, no. 3 (Spring): 404-410.

Mowery, Robert L. 1989. Women in literature: A study of Library of Congress subject cataloging.

    Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 9, no. 4: 89-99.

National Women's Studies Association. "NWSA guide to graduate work in women's studies."

    http://www.nwsa.org/students/gradguide/index.php (accessed September 3, 2009).

National Women's Studies Association. "NWSA/Ms. Magazine Guide to Women's/Gender Studies."

    http://www.nwsa.org/research/theguide/undergrad.php (accessed August 30, 2009).

National Women's Association. 1988. NWSA Resolution. *WLW Journal* 12, no. 3 (Fall): 19-20.

Oakley, Ann. 1972. *Sex, gender and society.* London: Temple Smith.

Olson, Hope. 1996. Between control and chaos: an ethical perspective on authority control. In *Authority*

    Control in the 21st Century: an Invitational Conference. Online at

    http://www.worldcat.org/arcviewer/1/OCC/2003/06/20/0000003520/viewer/file97.html

    (accessed September 20, 2009).

Olson, Hope. 2007. How we construct subjects: A feminist analysis. *Library Trends* 56, no. 2 (September):

    509-541.

Olson, Hope. 2001. Patriarchal structures of subject access and subversive techniques for change. *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science* 26, no. 2-3: 1-29.

Olson, Hope. 1996. The power to name: Marginalization and exclusions of subject representation in library catalogues. PhD diss., University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Olson, Hope. 2001. Sameness and difference: a cultural foundation of classification. *Library Resources and Technical Services* 45, no. 3 (July): 115-122.

Olson, Hope and Dennis Ward. 1998. A shelf browsing system for marginalized user groups. In *Information access in the global information economy: Proceedings of the 61st annual meeting of the American Society for Information Science*, ed. American Society for Information Science, 342-47. Medford, NJ: Information Today.

Olson, Hope. 1992. Subject access to Women's Studies materials. In *Cataloging heresy: Challenging the standard bibliographic product, proceedings of the Congress for Librarians, February 18, 1991*. Ed. Bella Hass Weinberg, 159-168. Medford, NJ: Learned Information, Inc.

Online Archive of California. 2009. "Guide to the Joan Ariel files on Women's Studies at the University of California, Irvine, AS. 105."

http://www.oac.cdlib.org/view?docId=kt9p3038pr;query=;style=oac4;view=admin (accessed January 31, 2009).

Pateman, Carol. 1983. Feminist critiques of the public/private dichotomy. In *Public and private in social life,* eds. S. I. Benn and G. F. Gaus, 281-303. London: Croom Helm.

Prevost, Marie Louise. 1946. An approach to theory and method in general subject heading. *Library Quarterly* 16, no. 2 (April): 140-151.

Pritchard, Sarah M. 1984. Developing criteria for database evaluation: The example of women's studies. In *Evaluation of reference services*, ed. Bill Katz and Ruth A. Fraley, 247-261. New York: Haworth Press.

Pritchard, Sarah M. 1994. Women's studies scholarship: Its impact on the information world. Feminist

    research in librarianship. http://libr.org/ftf/wsscholar.htm (accessed September 24, 2009).

Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. The principles of feminist research: A matter of debate. In *The knowledge*

    explosion: Generations of feminist scholarship, ed. Cheris Kramarae and Dale Spender, 423-437.

    New York: Teachers College Press.

Rogers, Margaret. 1993. Are we on equal terms yet? Subject headings concerning women in *LCSH*, 1975-

    1991. *LRTS* 37, no 2: 181-196.

Rosaldo, Renato. 1993. Culture & truth: The remaking of social analysis: With a new introduction.

    Boston: Beacon Press.

Rubin, Gayle. 1975. The traffic in women: Notes on the 'political economy' of sex," in *Toward an*

    anthropology of women, ed*.* Rayna R. Reiter, 157-210. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Rudy, Kathy. 2001. Radical feminism, lesbian separatism, and queer theory. *Feminist Studies* 21, no. 1

    (Spring): 191-221.

Rupp, Leila J. 2006. When women's studies isn't about women: Writing about drag queens. In

    Exploring women's studies: Looking forward, looking back, eds. Carole Berkin, Judith L. Pinch,

    and Carole S. Appel, 57-67. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Sandusky, Robert J., and Carol Tenopir. 2008. Finding and using journal-article components: Impacts of

    disaggregation on teaching and research practice. *Journal of the American Society for*

    Information Science and Technology 59, no. 6 (April): 970-82.

Santa Barbara Graduate Center. 2007. *News Center.* "Interview with Ellen Broidy, PhD."

    http://www.sbgi.edu/news/broidy.html (accessed February 22, 2010).

Scott, Joan Wallach. 1988. *Gender and the politics of history*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Searing, Susan. 1986. Feminist library services: The Women's Studies Librarian-at-Large, University of

Wisconsin System. In *Women's collections: Libraries, archives, and consciousness*, ed*.* Suzanne

Hildenbrand, 149-162. New York: Haworth Press.

Spelman, Elizabeth V. 1988. *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought.* Boston:

Beacon Press.

Taylor, Arlene G. 2006. *Introduction to cataloging and classification.* 10th edition. Westport, CT.:

Libraries Unlimited, 2006.

Taylor, Arlene G. 2004. *The organization of information*. 2nd edition. Westport, CT.: Libraries Unlimited.

Tong, Rosemarie. 1998. *Feminist thought: A more comprehensive introduction.* 2nd ed. Boulder:

Westview Press.

Walker, Alice. 1983. *In search of our mother's gardens.* San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Wendell, Susan. 1990. Oppression and victimization; Choice and responsibility. *Hypatia* 5, no. 3

(Autumn) : 15-46.

Westbrook, Lynn. 2003. Informational needs and experiences of scholars in women's studies: Problems

and solutions. *College and research libraries* 64, no. 3 (May): 192-209.

Westbrook, Lynn. 1999. *Interdisciplinary information seeking in women's studies*. Jefferson, NC:

McFarland.

Wienberg, Bella Hass. 1988. Why indexing fails the researcher. *The Indexer* 16, no. 1 (April): 3-6.

Wiegman, Robyn. 1995. American *Anatomies: Theorizing Race and Gender.* Durham, NC: Duke

University Press.

Young, Iris Marion. 1994. Gender as seriality: Thinking about women as a social collective. S*igns* 19, no.

3: 713-38.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Topical and disciplinary organization of chapters in *Women's Studies: A Recommended Bibliography*, 3rd ed.

Discipline and chapter title	Chapter subdivisions	Number of monographs	Number in sample
(No disciplinary designation) Feminist Theories and Women's Movements	Feminist Thought and Theories	81	29
	Women's Movements and Activism	50	23
(Social Sciences) Anthropology, Cross-Cultural Studies, and International Studies	Anthropology and Social Conditions of Women	58	
	Archaeology and Prehistory	9	
	Geography	7	
(Social Sciences) Business, Economics, and Labor	Economics, Development, and Globalization	20	
	Business, Entrepreneurship, and Labor	27	
	Workplace Issues, Unions, and Activism	20	
(Social Sciences) Education and Pedagogy	Pedagogy, Teaching, and Curriculum Transformation in the Academy	21	
	Women Faculty, Students, and Academic Climates	15	
	K-12 Education in the United States	13	
	Global Perspectives on the Education of Women and Girls	8	
(Social Sciences) Law	No subdivisions	32	
(Social Sciences) Politics and Political Theory	Political Theory	18	
	Women and Politics Worldwide	19	
	Women in the Third World	10	
	Women in Europe	6	
	Women in North America	15	
(Social Sciences) Psychology	No subdivisions	89	
(Social Sciences) Sociology, Social Lives, and Social Issues	Sociology: Issues, Methods, and Diversities	80	
	Social Work, Welfare, and Poverty	10	
	Criminal Justice and Crimes Against Women	16	
(Social Sciences) Sports	No subdivisions	33	
(Humanities) Art, Architecture, Music, and Dance	Visual Arts, Design, and Architecture	52	
	Music, Dance, and Performance	22	
(Humanities) Autobiography, Biography, Diaries, Memoirs, and Letters	No subdivisions	83	
(Humanities) Communications, Mass Media, and Language	General Communications	17	8 (pilot only)
	Film and Television	28	8 (pilot only)
	Media and Journalism	17	8 (pilot only)

(Table 1, continued)

Discipline and chapter title	Chapter subdivisions	Number of monographs	Number in sample
(Humanities) History	General Theory and Historiography	8	
	Ancient, Medieval, and Renaissance History	9	
	Africa and the Middle East	6	
	Asia and Oceania (Including Australia)	6	
	Central America, South America, and the Caribbean	4	
	Europe	28	
	North America	36	
(Humanities) Literature	General Theory and Criticism	19	
	Biography and Autobiography	12	
	Europe	10	
	Great Britain	15	
	North America	17	
	Women's Literature from Other Countries	11	
	Theater	23	
(Humanities) Religion and Philosophy	Religion, Theology, Spirituality, and Mythology	39	
	Philosophy, Philosophers, and Philosophical Subjects	21	
(Science and Technology) Medicine and Health	Medicine, Healers, and Health Care Issues, Policies, and Treatments	42	
	Reproductive Issues	17	
	Self-Help and Consumer Titles	15	
(Science and Technology) Science, Technology, and Mathematics	Science, Nature Studies, and Mathematics	22	
	Technologies	13	

Total: 1170   Total in sample: 52

Table 2. Pilot study titles from chapter 13: "Communications, Mass Media, and Language"

Author(s)/Year Published	Title	LCCN	Number of Subject Headings in Record
Cuklanz/1996	*Rape on Trial: How the Mass Media Construct Legal Reform and Social Change*	95024840	6
Okker/1995	*Our Sister Editors : Sarah J. Hale and the Tradition of Nineteenth-Century American Women Editors*	94015269	6
Glenn/1997	*Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity though the Renaissance*	97007051	4
Brundson/1997	*Screen Tastes: Soap Opera to Satellite Dishes*	96035327	4
Joyrich/1996	*Re-viewing Reception: Television, Gender, and Postmodern Culture*	96006931	4
Mayne/1990	*The Woman at the Keyhole: Feminism and Women's Cinema*	90034125	4
Alpern/1987	*Freda Kirchwey: A Woman of The Nation*	86025826	4
Benedict/1992	*Virgin or Vamp: How the Press Covers Sex Crimes*	92003821	4
Keller/1994	*Mothers and Work in Popular American Magazines*	93037508	4
Lacey/1996	*Feminine Frequencies: Gender, German Radio, and the Public Sphere, 1923-1945*	96025344	4
Braden/1993	*She Said What? Interviews With Women Newspaper Columnists*	92036460	3
Cameron/1992	*Feminism and Linguistic Theory*	92008906	3
Crawford/1995	*Talking Difference: On Gender and Language*	95069396	3
Tannen/1994	*Gender and Discourse*	93038839	3
Wood/1997	*Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender, and Culture*	95048774	3
Cowie/1997	*Representing the Woman: Cinema and Psychoanalysis*	96020752	3
Dow/1996	*Prime-Time Feminism: Television, Media Culture, and the Women's Movement Since 1970*	96005604	3
Mellencamp/1995	*A Fine Romance: Five Ages of Film Feminism*	95033540	3
Press/1991	*Women Watching Television: Gender, Class, and Generation in the American Television Experience*	90021274	3
Alwood/1996	*Straight News: Gays, Lesbians, and the News Media*	96000526	2
Hershfield/1996	*Mexican Cinema/Mexican Woman, 1940-1950*	96010110	2
Talbot/1998	*Language and Gender: An Introduction*	98031710	1
Graddol & Swann/1989	*Gender Voices*	89032368	1
Bate & Bowker/1997	*Communication and the Sexes*	97205063	1

Table 3. Concepts lacking in LCSH for pilot study titles

Concept with no direct LCSH representation	Number of works with content on these concepts
Debate on the 'gendered subject'	1
Differences among women	4
Feminism and popular culture	3
Feminist linguistics	4
Feminist media theory	1
Feminist television studies/criticism	3
Masculine (or male) gaze	1
Multitude of perspectives/debates within feminisms and feminist theories	8
Postfeminist theory	2
Rape myths	2
Resistance to dominance/power	4
Sex difference theories	4
Social construction of gender	5
Spectatorship	3
Women and popular culture	3
Women's cinema	2

Table 4. Titles in sample from "Feminist Theories and Women's Movements," subsection: Feminist Thought and Theories

Author(s)/Year Published	Title	LCCN	Number of Subject Headings in Record
Friedman/1998	*Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter*	98011525	6
Butler/1993	*Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*	93007667	5
Caraway/1991	*Segregated Sisterhood: Racism and the Politics of American Feminism*	91002528	5
Flax/1990	*Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*	89004797	5
Butler/1990	*Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*	89006438	4
Walters/1995	*Material Girls: Making Sense of Feminist Cultural Theory*	94029007	4
Fuss/1989	*Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature, and Difference*	89010279	4
Jagose/1994	*Lesbian Utopics*	94027402	4
Mann/1994	*Micro-politics: Agency in a Postfeminist Era*	93028965	4
Ahmed/1998	*Differences That Matter: Feminist Theory and Postmodernism*	98020051	3
Collins/1990	*Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*	90031998	3
Grosz/1994	*Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*	94201519	3
King/1994	*Theory in Its Feminist Travels: Conversations in U.S. Women's Movements*	94005612	3
hooks/1989	*Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*	88042874	3
Mellor/1997	*Feminism and Ecology*	97034294	3
Miles/1996	*Integrative Feminisms: Building Global Visions*	92033164	3
Phelan/1994	*Getting Specific: Postmodern Lesbian Politics*	94017529	3
Weeks/1998	*Constituting Feminist Subjects*	97052190	3
Wiegman/1995	*American Anatomies: Theorizing Race and Gender*	94036882	3
Anzaldúa/1987	*Borderlands: The New Mestiza = La Frontera*	87060780	3
Curthoys/1997	*Feminist Amnesia: The Wake of Women's Liberation*.	96020529	2
Sawicki/1991	*Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power, and the Body*.	91000142	2

(Table 4, continued)

Author(s)/Year Published	Title	LCCN	Number of Subject Headings in Record
Fox-Genovese/1991	*Feminism without Illusions: A Critique of Individualism*	90041044	2
Weedon/1997	*Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*	95045081	2
Evans/1995	*Feminist Theory Today: An Introduction to Second-Wave Feminism*	95068523	2
Marshall/1994	*Engendering Modernity: Feminism, Social Theory, and Social Change*	94013416	1
Grant/1993	*Fundamental Feminism: Contesting the Core Concepts of Feminist Theory.*	93017451	1
Evans/1997	*Introducing Contemporary Feminist Thought*	97000559	1
Spelman/1988	*Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*	87047878	1

Table 5. LC Subject headings: distribution across 29 records

LC Subject Heading	Number of Records
Feminist theory	23
African American women	3
Femininity	2
Feminist criticism	2
Postmodernism	2
Sex differences (Psychology)	2
United States – Race relations	2
African American women – History	1
Constructivism (Philosophy)	1
Critical theory	1
Culture	1
Ecofeminism	1
Essentialism (Philosophy)	1
Feminism	1
Feminism – North America	1
Feminism – United States	1
Feminism – United States – History	1
Feminism and education	1
Feminist geography	1
Feminist literary criticism	1
Feminist theory – United States	1
Foucault, Michel, 1926-1984	1
Gender identity	1
Gender identity – Philosophy	1
Hooks, Bell	1
Human body – Social aspects	1
Human ecology	1
Identity (Psychology)	1
Individualism	1
Lesbianism	1
Lesbianism – Philosophy	1
Lesbianism – Political aspects	1
Mexican-American Border Region -- Civilization	1
Mexican-American Border Region -- Poetry	1
Mexican-American women – Poetry	1
Multiculturalism	1

(Table 5, continued)

LC Subject Heading	Number of Records
Philosophical anthropology	1
Philosophy, Modern – 20th century	1
Political correctness	1
Postmodernism – Social aspects	1
Poststructuralism	1
Psychoanalysis and feminism	1
Psychoanalysis and philosophy	1
Racism – United States – History	1
Radicalism – North America	1
Second wave feminism	1
Sex role	1
Sex role -- Philosophy	1
Sex role – United States	1
Sexual orientation – Philosophy	1
Social sciences – Philosophy	1
Subject (Philosophy)	1
Subjectivity	1
United States – Race relations – History	1
Women in popular culture	1
Women's Studies	1

Table 6. Titles in sample from "Feminist Theories and Women's Movements," subsection: Women's Movements and Activism

Author(s)/Year Published	Title	LCCN	Number of Subject Headings in Record
Bulbeck/1998	*Re-orienting Western Feminisms: Women's Diversity in a Postcolonial World*	97025836	6
Baker/1998	*Voices of Resistance: Oral Histories of Moroccan Women*	97002649	5
Stephen/1997	*and Social Movements in Latin America: Power from Below*	96045788	5
Faludi/1991	*Backlash: The Undeclared War against American Women*	90029172	4
Miller/1991	*Latin American Women and the Search for Social Justice*	91050371	4
Rowbotham/1992	*Women in Movement: Feminism and Social Action*	92012239	4
Rupp/1997	*Worlds of Women: The Making of an International Women's Movement*	97014449	4
Rupp & Taylor/1987	*Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s*	86023486	4
Buckley/1997	*Broken Silence: Voices of Japanese Feminism*	95051306	3
Calman/1992	*Toward Empowerment: Women and Movement Politics in India*	92006420	3
Kumar/1993	*The History of Doing: An Illustrated Account of Movements for Women's Rights and Feminism in India, 1800–1990*	93036715	3
Racioppi & See/1997	*Women's Activism in Contemporary Russia.*	96036093	3
Chafetz, Dworkin, & Swanson/1986	*Female Revolt: Women's Movements in World and Historical Perspective*	85022141	3
Simon & Danzinger/1991	*Women's Movements in America: Their Successes, Disappointments, and Aspirations*	91008619	3
Wolf/1993	*Fire with Fire: The New Female Power and How It Will Change the 21st Century*	93025975	3
Kaplan/1992	*Contemporary Western European Feminism*	91031639	2

(Table 6, continued)

Author(s)/Year Published	Title	LCCN	Number of Subject Headings in Record
Ryan/1992	*Feminism and the Women's Movement: Dynamics of Change in Social Movement Ideology and Activism*	92000091	2
Sommers/1994	*Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*	94004734	2
Whittier/1995	*Feminist Generations: The Persistence of the Radical Women's Movement*	94026260	2
Young/1997	*Changing the Wor(l)d: Discourse, Politics, and the Feminist Movement*	96022564	2
Echols/1989	*Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975*	89005058	2
Kaplan/1996	*The Meagre Harvest: The Australian Women's Movement, 1950s–1990s*	96218295	1
Adamson, Briskin, & McPhail/1988	*Feminist Organizing for Change: The Contemporary Women's Movement in Canada*	89136669	1

Table 7. LC Subject headings: distribution across 23 records

LC Subject Heading	Number of Records
Feminism – United States	3
Feminism – United States – History – 20th century	3
Feminist theory	3
Feminism	2
Feminism -- United States – History	2
Feminists – History	2
Women – India – Social conditions	2
Women – United States – Social conditions	2
Women's rights – United States – History – 20th century	2
Anti-feminism -- United States	1
Cultural pluralism	1
Feminism – Australia – History	1
Feminism – Canada	1
Feminism – Cross-cultural studies	1
Feminism – Developing countries	1
Feminism – Europe – History – 20th century	1
Feminism – India	1
Feminism – India – History	1
Feminism – International cooperation – History	1
Feminism – Japan	1
Feminism – Latin America – Case studies	1
Feminism -- Latin America – History	1
Feminism – Morocco – History	1
Feminism --Russia (Federation)	1
Feminism – United States – History – 19th century	1
Feminist theory – Japan	1
Feminists – Japan – Interviews	1
Feminists --Russia (Federation) --Interviews	1
Minority women – Social conditions	1
Morocco –History – Autonomy and independence movements	1
Power (Social sciences)	1
Radicalism – United States	1
Social movements – Latin America – Case studies	1
United States – Social conditions – 1945-	1
Women – Europe – History – 20th century	1
Women – Developing Countries – Social conditions	1
Women --Latin America –History	1
Women – Latin America – Interviews	1

(Table 7, continued)

LC Subject Heading	Number of Records
Women – Morocco – Interviews	1
Women – Morocco – Social conditions	1
Women political activists – History	1
Women – Political activity – History	1
Women – Political activity – India	1
Women -- Political activity -- Latin America – History	1
Women – Psychology	1
Women --Russia (Federation) --Societies and clubs	1
Women – Social conditions	1
Women – Societies and clubs – History	1
Women – United States – History – 20th century	1
Women in development – Latin America – Case studies	1
Women radicals – History	1
Women revolutionaries – Morocco	1
Women social reformers – History	1
Women's rights – History	1
Women's rights – India – History	1
Women's rights – International cooperation – History	1
Women's rights – Latin America – Case studies	1
Women's rights -- Latin America – History	1
Women's rights --United States -- History	1

Table 8. Book titles and phrases from abstracts pointing to women's actions and organizing

Author/Year Published	Title or phrase
Young/1997	"In her concern with the 'discursive aspects of direct-action activism'… [Young] sets a unique focus of her study: feminist small press publishing, their networks, and the ways in which they redefine political activity, reflect new economic and ideological models, and effect social change" (p. 84)
Adamson, Briskin, & McPhail/1988	"…the book provides… analyses of the women's movement focusing on feminist practice, ideology, and organizations" (p. 61)
Whittier/1995	"…primary documents from feminist organizations and interviews with thirty-four feminists who entered the movement before 1977 and were active during its early heyday…" (p. 83)
Sommers/1994	[title] *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*
Simon & Danzinger/1991	"Divided into three sections reflecting women's efforts to achieve equality in these areas, the book contextualizes each historically and provides data and documentation…" (p. 79)
Ryan/1992	"Based on research grounded in primary documents, oral histories with longtime activists, documentation from organizations, and participant observation…" (p. 78)
Rupp & Taylor/1987	"…the intersections of the members' political and personal lives also give added dimension to the story of how a small group of privileged women could have a significant impact…" (p. 78)
Rupp/1997	"…compares three different women's organizations…in terms of their origins and development, their membership (primarily Anglophone, white, bourgeois, and Christian), their political issues, tactics, and strategies of representation and activism." (p. 77)
Kaplan/1996	"Framing her survey within a wide-ranging historical and social context (1950s–1990s), she measures achievements and political gains such as the notable emergence of "femocrats," women working within government and bureaucracy to advance a feminist agenda." (p.73)
Kumar/1993	"Drawing upon speeches, memoirs, and autobiographies, the first part highlights individual women who were important in the nationalist movement against the British as well as women's use of their status as wives and mothers to mobilize…" (p. 74)
Echols/1989	"Drawing extensively from interviews and early feminist publications, she describes the formative thinkers and organizations… and charts internal dynamics, shifting ideologies, and political strategies in enormous and dramatic detail." (p. 68)
Chafetz & Dworkin/1986	[title] *Female Revolt: Women's Movements in World and Historical Perspective*
Wolf/1993	"…this book alternates between impassioned pleas for women to take and assert power and an equally strong denunciation of women as the major obstacle to this assertion of power." (p. 84)
Kaplan/1992	"Employing a wide variety of historical and statistical sources, she surveys social conditions, chronologies and events, and political strategies and accomplishments…" (p. 72)

Table 9. Concepts, issues, and groups covered substantially without subject representation

Concept	Author/Year published	Phrase/Title
Equal Rights Amendment	Rupp & Taylor (1987)	"They describe the NWP's continuing struggle for the Equal Rights Amendment, including their early infiltration of the nascent National Organization for Women in an attempt to assure the primacy of efforts to pass the Equal Rights Amendment." (p. 78)
Equal Rights Amendment	Ryan (1992)	"…showcases the campaign for the Equal Rights Amendment, claiming it as a "unifying issue" that prompted a convergence of feminist purpose and mobilization between 1975 and 1982…. subsequent divisiveness around race, pornography, and sexuality, for example, can be traced to the defeat of the ERA and consequent disarray in the movement." (p. 78)
Feminist ideologies	Adamson, Briskin & McPhail (1988)	"…analyses of the women's movement focusing on feminist practice, ideology, and organizations." (p. 61)
Feminist ideologies	Chafetz & Dworkin (1986)	"…combines comparative historical investigation and quantitative analysis in an effort to develop a theory for the emergence and ideology of women's movements." (p. 66)
Feminist ideologies	Miller (1991)	"She traces the development of hard-won recognition and legitimacy of organizations as well as the inevitable divisions and ideological differences between and within Latin American women's movements…. she reviews the emergence of feminist ideologies through scholarship in feminist journals and forums." (p. 74-75)
Feminist small press publishing	Young (1997)	"…she sets a unique focus of her study: feminist small press publishing, their networks, and the ways in which they redefine political activity, reflect new economic and ideological models, and effect social change." (p. 84)
Marriage and family	Simon & Danzinger (1991)	"…advances of women in the realms of suffrage and politics, education and the workplace, and marriage and family." (p. 79)
Muslim women	Baker (1998)	"Baker presents the compelling stories of remarkable Muslim women who participated in the anticolonialist struggles against the French in Morocco." (p. 63)
Popular culture and media	Faludi (1991)	"…examines the multiple sites in society and popular culture complicit in promoting the message that feminism is women's worst enemy… targets books, movies, television, and newspapers… forcefully attacks media claims" (p. 68-69)
Postcolonialism	Bulbeck (1998)	…" substantive investigation of similarities and differences, tensions and connections among women in a postcolonial world… offer[s] critical examinations of debates around colonialism" (p. 65)
Suffrage	Simon & Danzinger (1991)	"…advances of women in the realms of suffrage and politics, education and the workplace, and marriage and family." (p. 79)

(Table 9, continued)

Concept	Author/Year published	Phrase/Title
Western feminisms	Bulbeck (1998)	[title] *Re-orienting Western Feminisms: Women's Diversity in a Postcolonial World*
Women's Studies	Sommers (1994)	"…salvo against women's liberation and, most especially, academic feminism… attacks on the intellectual weaknesses of women's studies programs…" (p. 80)

Table 10. Proposed headings

Subjects without authority	Records in which to employ heading
Academic feminism	Curthoys (1997), Evans (1997), Friedman (1998), Sommers (1994)
Black/African American feminism/feminist theory	Collins (1990), hooks (1989), Caraway (1991), Fuss (1989), Evans (1995), Evans (1997), King (1994), Wiegman (1995)
Chicana feminist theory	Anzaldúa (1987)
Equal Rights Amendment	Rupp & Taylor (1987), Ryan (1992)
Feminism in popular culture/media	Faludi (1991)
Feminist ideologies	Adamson, Briskin & McPhail (1988), Chafetz & Dworkin (1986), Miller (1991)
Feminist organizations	Echols (1989), Racioppi & See (1997), Rupp (1997), Adamson, Briskin & McPhail (1997), Ryan (1992), Rupp & Taylor (1987)
Global feminism/ feminist theory	Miles (1996)
Mestizas	Anzaldúa (1987)
National Women's Party	Rupp & Taylor (1987)
Personal is political	Grant (1993), Miles (1996), Mann (1994)
Postfeminism	Walters (1995)
Postmodernism and feminism	Ahmed (1998), Caraway (1991), Flax (1990), Mann (1994), Sawicki (1991), Weedon (1997)
Poststructuralism and feminism	Weedon (1997), Friedman (1998)
Public/private dichotomy	Evans (1997), Marshall (1994), hooks (1989), Miles (1996)
Radical feminism/feminist theory	Echols (1989), Whittier (1995), Miles (1996)
Resource mobilization	Ryan (1992)
Social construction of gender	Butler (1990), Butler (1993), Collins (1990), Grant (1993), Grosz (1994), Wiegman (1995)
Social construction of the body	Butler (1990), Butler (1993), Collins (1990), Grant (1993), Grosz (1994), Wiegman (1995)
Violence against women	hooks (1989)
Western feminisms	Bulbeck (1998), Miles (1996), Spelman (1988), Flax (1990), Grant (1993)
White feminists/ism	Caraway (1991), Spelman (1988), hooks (1989)

Table 11. Existing headings not employed

Existing headings not used consistently	Records in which to employ heading
African American feminists	Collins (1990)
Authorship	hooks (1989), Anzaldúa (1987)
Civil rights	Ahmed (1991), Fox-Genovese (1991), Marshall (1994), Miles (1996)
Difference (Philosophy)	Ahmed (1998), Evans (1997), Friedman (1998), Fuss (1989), Evans (1995), Wiegman (1995)
Essentialism (Philosophy)	Grant (1993), Grosz (1994), Jagose (1994), Mellor (1997), Spelman (1998),
Family – Social aspects	Simon & Danzinger (1991)
(Subdivision) *Feminist criticism*	Spelman (1988), Butler (1990), Flax (1990), Grosz (1994), Jagose (1994), King (1994), Marshall (1994), Weeks (1998), Wiegman (1995)
Feminist literature – Publishing	Young (1997)
Feminist theory	hooks (1987), Anzaldúa (1987), Wiegman (1995), Collins (1990), Fuss (1989)
Feminists – Political activity	Young (1997), Whittier (1995), Sommers (1994), Simon & Danzinger (1991), Ryan (1992), Rupp & Taylor (1987),
Human body – Social aspects	Butler (1990), Butler (1993), Collins (1990), Grant (1993), Grosz (1994), Wiegman (1995)
Identity (Philosophical concept)	Marshall (1994)
Identity politics	Butler (1990), Friedman (1998), King (1994), Phelan (1994), Wiegman (1995), Grant (1993)
Interpersonal relationships	Mann (1994)
Knowledge, Theory of	Evans (1997), King (1994), Mellor (1997)
Lesbian feminist theory	Jagose (1994), King (1994), Phelan (1994)
Marriage – Political aspects	Simon & Danzinger (1991)
Masculinity	Wiegman (1995), hooks (1989)
Men, White	Wiegman (1995)
Multiculturalism	Caraway (1991), Wiegman (1995)
Muslim women – Political activity	Baker (1998)
Patriarchy	Wiegman (1995),
Pornography	Fox-Genovese (1991)
Postcolonialism	Bulbeck (1998), Friedman (1998), King (1994),
Power (Philosophy)	Butler (1993), Collins (1990)
Queer theory	Butler (1993), Butler (1990), Jagose (1994), Phelan (1994), Fuss (1989)
Representation (Philosophy)	Evans (1997), Walters (1995), Wiegman (1995), hooks (1989)
Reproduction – Social aspects	Marshall (1994), Sawicki (1991)
Reproductive rights	Marshall (1994), Sawicki (1991),
Russia (Federation) – History – 20th century	Racioppi & See (1997)
Sexual division of labor	Marshall (1994), Weeks (1998)
Social movements	Rowbotham (1992), Calman (1992), Echols (1989), Kaplan (1992), Miller (1991)
Stereotypes (Social Psychology) – Social aspects	Collins (1990)

(Table 11, continued)

Existing headings not used consistently	Records in which to employ heading
Subjectivity	Ahmed (1998), Butler (1990), Grosz (1994), Jagose (1994), Weedon (1997),
Suffrage	Simon & Danzinger (1991)
White supremacy	Wiegman (1995), hooks (1989)
Women – Political activity	Adamson, Briskin & McPhail (1997), Ryan (1992), Kumar (1993), Wolf (1993)
Women, white	Caraway (1991)

VITA

In addition to the M.S. in Information Sciences, I also hold an M.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies with two concentrations: Women's Studies and English Rhetoric & Composition. I have earned these two degrees in order to prepare for a career in academic/research librarianship. In particular, I would like to serve as a Women's Studies subject specialist at a research institution.