

# Market Segmentation and Shirley Jackson's Domestic Humor

*Benjamin Mangrum*

Shirley Jackson stood alone in the hospital foyer, minutes away from delivering her third child. A desk clerk in the foyer summons Jackson and asks for her name, leading Jackson to repeat, "Name," as though she were answering rather than restating the question. The clerk then continues:

"Age?" [the clerk] asked. "Sex? Occupation?"

"Writer," I said.

"Housewife," she said.

"Writer," I said.

"I'll just put down housewife," she said.

In this episode, the desk clerk denies both forms of Jackson's labor: her work as writer and her pains as a mother. Instead, she asks yet again about Jackson's husband—his name, address, and occupation. "Just put down housewife," Jackson says. "I don't remember *his* name, really" ("Third Baby" 61).

This scene from Jackson's 1949 essay titled "The Third Baby's the Easiest" filters the strictures placed on women outside domestic space through the satirical incongruity so common in the humorous essays of twentieth-century magazine writing. Yet unlike essays by *New Yorker* writers James Thurber and E. B. White, Jackson's is notable for using the derogating possibilities of satire to probe the normative gender relationships that prop up distinctions between public and domestic life. Rather than making the personal political, Jackson goes public with the supposedly private. Indeed,

\*Benjamin Mangrum is an assistant professor at the University of the South. He is the author of *Land of Tomorrow: Postwar Fiction and the Crisis of American Liberalism* (Oxford UP, 2019). His essays have appeared in *PMLA*, *New Literary History*, *Modern Fiction Studies*, *American Literature*, and elsewhere.

her magazine writing from the late 1940s to the early 1960s follows a regular pattern: upon leaving the ostensibly private arena of the home, the women in her essays find that same arena determining their experience of public life. It's as if an inescapable domesticity is the cost of admission to the public sphere.

While Jackson is better known as the author of gothic fiction, particularly "The Lottery" and *The Haunting of Hill House* (1959), she was also a major figure in what Nancy A. Walker describes as the "funny feminism" or "domestic humor" of the postwar decades. That body of nonfiction prose includes Betty MacDonald's *The Egg and I* (1945), Jean Kerr's *Please Don't Eat the Daisies* (1957), Phyllis McGinley's *Sixpence in Her Shoe* (1960), and Margaret Halsey's novel *This Demi-Paradise: A Westchester Diary* (1960), each of which variously takes up domestic life as the source material for comedic memoir.<sup>1</sup> Jackson published more than two dozen such essays, gaining a wider readership and earning more royalties than she did from any of her fiction. In fact, she compiled many of the essays into two popular memoirs: *Life Among the Savages* (1953) and *Raising Demons* (1957).

Not only did these articles turn into bestselling memoirs—an increasingly common pattern in the twentieth-century book trade—but they mostly appeared in such mass-market women's magazines as *Good Housekeeping*, *Ladies' Home Journal*, and *Woman's Day*. These magazines regularly commodified and circulated the very values of domesticity that Jackson depicted as ludicrous, seemingly inescapable, and cruel.<sup>2</sup> Critics have noted how the predominant image of women in these magazines shifted from the pro-business professional of the 1930s and early 1940s to the housewife of the 1950s, thus reimagining women readers through abstractions about "[t]he homemaker, the nurturer, the creator of childhood's environment" (Thompson 12).<sup>3</sup> In contrast to these shifting but consistently restrictive gendered norms, the women's lives Jackson portrays are shrouded by absurd, sometimes even uncanny oppression. When, for example, she describes moving to a new home in a 1952 essay published in *Woman's Day*, she recounts how she "awoke with nightmares of the house shaking over me, malevolent and cruel, and after that I frequently found myself awake after having walked in my sleep toward the front door" ("House" 116). Her mass-market essays narrate the desire to flee the home, to exit these magazines' constitutive scene.

I analyze how Jackson's essays in the postwar women's magazines negotiate the gendered tensions and commercial contradictions of postwar print culture. I show that her women are figures of the fraught convergence of women's public affiliation and the restrained politics of gender critique. Understanding their figural status also

enables us to explore broader issues in US print culture after the Second World War. In particular, the satirical work of domestic humor exemplifies but also challenges the patriarchal norms structuring the public sphere. These essays reveal how a certain strain of feminist writing was absorbed within the market forces of print capitalism. To explain this absorption, I draw on mid-century theories of “market segmentation.”<sup>4</sup>

The first section shows how women’s magazines relied on aggregative rhetoric when imagining a public of women readers during the first half of the twentieth century. This aesthetics of aggregation is important for its contrasts with the literary techniques of segmentation that I identify with the more satirical varieties of post-1945 domestic humor. I then consider, in two parts, how postwar domestic humor responds to a print culture where a constraining domesticity is the price for women’s admission to the public sphere. Jackson and her contemporaries represent the muddy convergence of such important historical developments as the satirical possibilities of the humorous essay in magazine writing; the contradictory relationship between print publicity and normative domesticity; and the newly wrought marketing strategy of market segmentation. These elements of mid-century print culture and gender politics converged in the development of domestic humor as a distinctive type of public writing, one that worked within but also against the public-private divide that supported postwar conceptions of domesticity. Analyzing domestic humor in terms of market segmentation helps us better understand some of the underlying tensions and contradictions of print publicity after the Second World War, particularly how comedic forms of gender critique fit within a print culture being restructured around the demands of market niches.

## 1

The mass-circulation women’s magazines proved especially important to this shifting mode of print publicity. Many of their writers defined their constitutive abstraction—a collective “woman” rather than the more general “We the People”—by reference to techniques of aggregation. These techniques differ in important ways from the mode of public-sphere discourse characteristic of the early republic. Scholars have often noted that self-abstraction was central to making publics imaginable from the American Revolution well into the nineteenth century.<sup>5</sup> For such scholars, the republican ideal of “the People” was collected into an abstract “We” that effaces the self of the writer. In turn, the circulation of “We” makes a public imaginable as a collective abstraction. Yet a changing marketplace

for print commodities—namely, the ascent of mass culture during the 1880s and 1890s—revised the rhetorical techniques of self-abstraction.<sup>6</sup>

One version of this newly aggregative mode of publicity appears in the pseudo-social-scientific polls that twentieth-century magazines conducted. According to Nick Moon, such polling originated in the straw polls taken by newspapers (7). After advances in print technology and less expensive paper revolutionized the newspaper and magazine industries during the 1890s, larger circulations expanded both the ambitions and capabilities of publishers. Mass circulation meant that more postal ballots could be sent to a larger number of subscribers and that new mass scales also made it plausible to implement sampling techniques when interpreting poll results. The first magazine to take advantage of the method of statistical sampling was the *Literary Digest*, which “produced a number of correct predictions” beginning with the 1916 election; at the same time, these surveys “also included questions to measure public opinion on topics of the day” (8).

These polls ostensibly uncovered the average or standard opinion among readers.<sup>7</sup> The statistical and survey techniques of the polls translated a data set, which in turn allowed the polled body to be represented as a public. For example, a February 1940 article in *Ladies' Home Journal* reports on readers' attitudes toward the war in Europe. In response to the question “Do you think the United States should go to war to help England and France?” 94 percent of respondents said, “No” (“What Do the Women” 12). As common as this isolationist view was until Pearl Harbor, the magazine glosses it as a distinctly feminine sensibility: “No flags flying, no bands playing, and no European crises—military or political—should stampede this nation into Europe's present conflict, according to the women of the United States,” or so the unnamed author concludes on the basis of poll data. This use of polling to represent a public assumes that publicness is measurable (rather than a discursive exchange), remaking publicity in the image of measurement.

Less evident but perhaps more important is that the magazine polling presents its implied readers as part of an undifferentiated totality, as though “the women of the United States” have voiced public opinion through poll results. This undifferentiated univocality elides the multilayered, even unseemly reasons for public opposition to US entry in the war. Indeed, in *Public Opinion* (1922), Walter Lippmann complains that an answer to polling questions has so often become “represented publicly by a number of symbolic phrases which carry the individual emotion after evacuating most of the intention” (231). This aggregation of opinion through polling converts a response into simple datum (“Yes” or “No”), when in fact

the forms of the answer are curtailed symbols. The symbols themselves are figural modes of representation, disguising the complexity of “emotion” and “intention” as well as their own status as symbol. Whatever polling reveals has already been filtered and mediated at several removes before a journalist or pollster interprets the data. Yet the representation of statistical aggregations (“94 percent of respondents”) is a rhetorical abstraction posing as objective measurement. The procedures through which those numbers circumscribe meaning are obscured by the process of converting responses into an aggregate form.

Such polling is both a symptom of and spur for the wider development of aggregative representational modes in US print culture. Republican-style print media tended to imagine publics through the ideas of simultaneity and circulation, which had distinctive forms of exclusion implicit within their discursive structure: women, racial minorities, and nonnormative bodies were excluded or effaced from the abstract “We.” Yet the assembling of public opinion by magazines like *Ladies’ Home Journal* produces a collective abstraction (“women of the United States”) that differs not just in quantity but in kind from the rhetorical techniques of its republican predecessors. This new form of abstraction does not present itself as performatively declared, as though the act of print circulation were an illocutionary speech act that instantiates the republic. Instead, the aggregative representational mode makes the public numerically available, as though it were produced through an ostensibly self-evident calculus. In effect, mass-circulation print media and their techniques of aggregation reconfigured the constitutive links of the public in terms taken from a homogeneous market.

Other articles in the mass-circulation magazines employ iterations of this aggregative mode in more explicitly consumeristic contexts. For instance, one advertisement depicts not only mass-produced goods but also massified models, as if the woman on the page were “The Girl From Anywhere, U.S.A.” (“All” 97). The article patterns its public of women readers after the aggregation of statistical data and consumer choices. This advertisement, in particular, depicts a woman who rearranges a “four-piece suit” for a date. The model woman stands in for a model of selfhood, which is fungible across locations: she is from “Anywhere, U.S.A.” Plus, this fungibility makes her exemplify one configuration of the national body. By being from anywhere in the nation, she represents the possibilities of everywhere. Notably, these possibilities derive from consumer choice: the model produces her identity by reformulating and mixing goods and commodities (“string gloves, ascot, and a white belt”).

This advertisement filters the production of identity through the normative language of statistical aggregation. At the bottom of

the page, we read, “Statistics show that her size range is likely to be 8 to 18” (“All” 97). So likely does the model fall within the statistical average that she comes to exemplify a public of readers. She is you, dear reader, the advertisement seems to suggest. Or, at least, she could be you, statistically speaking. This numerical rhetoric further invites readers to use their consumer choices to fashion their individuality—a rhetorical arrangement that envisions “womanhood” and “femininity” as the totality of predetermined but supposedly individual selections. Much like the reduction and symbolic translation of polling, this representation of consumer choices presupposes that the reader is fungible within an undifferentiated mass. The reader’s choices represent her position within the range of traits that come together to form an aggregate collectivity.

The aggregative mode also appears less visibly in many of the articles in these magazines. Readers of a 1950 issue of *Vogue* (1892–present) are asked, “Will you wear a star in your hair at night . . . or a little embroidered black veiling hat? A straight black linen sheath, to lunch . . . or an easy-skirted Shantung shirt dress? Dance in pointed shoes of spinach-coloured satin . . . or a pointy-heeled sole tied on with black violin strings?” (“Vogue’s Eye” 51). As the editor explains, “These are some of the little things you’ll be making up your mind about this spring; all of them a part of the looks that add up to *your* look.” The *Vogue* editors refer to spring fashion as a consolidated storehouse of “looks,” not unlike a generalized shop floor in which readers must select from a range of mass-produced goods. Readers thus constitute their selves by “add[ing] up” their own “look.”

The numerical connotations of this verbal construction are significant: the process of adding presupposes discrete integers (0, 1, 2, 3 . . .) that vary in value (“1” does not equal “2”) but nonetheless have a basis of equivalence within a system (“1” can be added to “2”). Imagining identity as a process in which one adds up a set of traits to create one’s look also imagines those traits (“the little things”) as aggregated qualities, bounded within a mass-produced cultural repository. Even as the *Ladies’ Home Journal* delimits the poll’s boundaries before measuring a very narrow type of public opinion, *Vogue*’s enumeration of spring fashion assembles its range of consumer choices from a meticulously curated catalogue, one that anticipates the issue’s subsequent articles and advertisements. Much like integers within a number set, *Vogue* presents an aggregation of commodities that assemble its readers en masse. The imagination of a plane of equivalence is the basis for aggregative representation.

The second-person pronouns of the *Vogue* article (“you’ll be making up your mind”) are also important because they appear to invoke a conventional technique of public address. The “you” creates

a public, but the address also positions readers within a marketplace of choice, as though they all stood before a buying rack and became a collective through the simultaneity of consumer selection. As readers, we are all consumers, sharing in the equivalent task of fashioning our identity before the arrival of spring. Yet this print public is mediated not only through consumption (which existed long before mass-market magazines) but also through the idea that the basis for publicness is mass-produced equivalencies. The universal abstractions of earlier bourgeois publicity imagine writers and readers transcending their particularities for the sake of (gendered) reason and (limited) public interest.<sup>8</sup> In the print publicity of the mass-market era, the assembled public gathers together, but this presentation works as what Sarah E. Igo describes as a “feedback technology” to “stimulate and control [the public’s] consumption behavior” (107). An aggregate public thus envisions its identity through aggregate consumption.

It’s also significant that the *Vogue* writers remain nameless; they are bodies without specificity, in keeping with the tradition of the anonymous editorial and much in the same way that the “you” imagines a public through the circulation of print. This aspect of the article is consistent with the earlier bourgeois technique of self-abstraction, but it redeploys the technique of a generalized voice to arbitrate over an arena of mass-produced goods. The commodities of mass culture join this public together, and the choices that “add up to *your* look” gather women together into an abstraction that mediates between—but also distinguishes or numerically positions—individual women readers. Such a configuration updates the revolutionary-era adaptation of the famous Roman dictum that the “voice of the people is the voice of God.” During the mass-market era, the voice of print is the voice of the commodity catalogue.

In another article from *Vogue*, titled “Model Models,” the editors present profiles of eight women who have modeled previously in the magazine. The profiles feature “some of the reasons for [the models’] fame,” even as the article also presents an ideal aesthetic sensibility for the culture of fashion and femininity made public on *Vogue*’s pages (34). This collage assembles reasons and images into a seemingly diverse composite of beauty, profiling the women upon what turns out to be a standardized backing or commercialized surface: it features different heights (including one model who is “too tiny for most full-length work”), clothing styles (“negligées,” “ball-gowns,” “bathing-suits”), and even regional origins (“a Southern girl” adds folksy élan). The collage assembles these disparate women, along with the details of their modeling credentials, as though they were exemplars: they “model” what it means to be in *Vogue*.

The collage trades on once-conventional ideas about which sorts of women may be counted as exemplary—there are no women of color, and the bodies are markedly normative—but less visibly, “Model Models” also expresses the aggregative social imaginary that developed across the mass-market era.<sup>9</sup> The article profiles the eight women through the tools and terms of measurements: one model “looks well in almost anything; but with her incredibly good figure (bust 34”, waist 23”, hips 34”), she’s most in demand for bathing-suits” (35). These numbers—along with the accompanying price of a Saks Fifth Avenue Original—substantiate the “reasons for [the models’] fame” (35). As Eileen Pollack explains in her anatomy of the collage, this genre uses an “aesthetic sense to come up with a pleasing order for the fragments” (317). For Pollack, this “aesthetic sense” emerges across what should only initially appear to be segmented fragments. Similarly, in “Model Models,” the profiles cohere into an aesthetic sense not just in the collated images of attractive women but through the numbers that quantify their status as exemplary. These “neighboring elements” of the collage “communicate with each other” to form coherence (Pollack 317).

The elements of *Vogue*’s collage become an aesthetics of convergence: they come together to bend consumer demand. This rhetorical mode is important for how it represents what postwar marketing analysts describe as “market convergence” or “market homogeneity,” in which corporations devise marketing strategies that direct “individual market demands for a variety of products” toward “a single or limited offering to the market” (Smith 4). Behind the seeming diversity, however, is a consolidated spectrum of goods.

The *Vogue* article’s aesthetic sense is likewise one of convergence. It presents a consolidated fashion image even as the details of each woman’s profile only feint toward differentiation. The particularities of the bodies and styles converge upon an “ideal woman,” which Miglena Sternadori and Mandy Hagseth describe as “thin, young, White, non-pregnant, and with sufficient resources to invest in beauty” (14). By presenting a limited offering as an aggregation of possibilities, “Model Models” reframes the modern adage that “men act and women appear” by glossing that appearance as commodity consumption (14). In turn, the profiles invite women readers to view the possibilities available for “the type of costume” in which they themselves might “look best” (“Model Models” 35). Indeed, as Anna Lebovic suggests, *Vogue* during the 1940s had a “dictatorial approach as a fashion ‘Bible,’” although it would later shift to a posture of “advis[ing] *without* dictating” fashion norms (180). Published during a heavy-handed editorial phase, the collage circulates an aggregative aesthetic sense that uses consumer choice to connect women readers as a public body.



This aggregative mode appears in reader polls, fashion commentaries, and collaged models as well as in the opinion articles of the women's magazines. For example, in 1940 the Nobel Prize-winning writer Pearl S. Buck dissuades readers of the *Ladies' Home Journal* from supporting the war in Europe. (Notably, Buck's essay appeared three months after the *Ladies' Home Journal* poll in which 94 percent of respondents opposed the war.) As part of this antiwar argument, Buck presents a view of the nation that repudiates the blood-and-soil sensibilities animating national socialism. For Buck, a nation "is nothing but a certain number of individuals, and the sum of their individual problems is the national problem, and the problems of the nations are the international problems" (94–96).

This claim denaturalizes the nation, which Buck presents as "nothing but" the individuals who add together to form it. For Buck, the nation is not a racial entity—an essentialized thing—but an aggregation of mere randomized individuals. However, much like the "little things" contemplated by *Vogue's* readers or the assemblage of models who signify the options available for those wishing to "look best," Buck rejects nationalist sentiment by construing collective identity as a numerical calculus. As a result, the US becomes an aggregation of otherwise discrete integers. The particular number of integers does not matter, because the *form* of aggregation is what holds them together: the "sum of their individual problems" constitutes—makes imaginable—the "national problem" itself. By adding together discrete "individual problems," one finds the public.

These ostensibly different representations of a public of readers in *Ladies' Home Journal* and *Vogue* signal an important shift in US print culture: the image of an undifferentiated market came to symbolize an assembled public. In this view, the public becomes intelligible through its aggregate demands, as though the sum of its parts could be added up to market wholeness because those parts were undifferentiated—which is to say, equivalent, convergent, and thus susceptible to being combined. As others have noted, significant disruptions in US print culture began much earlier, in the 1880s, and these changes had been sedimented in the magazine industry by 1940.<sup>10</sup> So, too, the literary techniques I've been describing. They represent the prevailing mode of print publicity at the time when Jackson and many others began writing for the women's magazines in the 1940s and 1950s.

## 2

A persistent line of inquiry in Jackson scholarship worries over the differences between the critical appraisals of gender normativity in her fiction and the seemingly breezy normativity of her nonfiction. One male contemporary called her domestic writing

“ephemeral fluff,” while praising the precision of her fiction’s prose (North 324), an appraisal rarely expressed so directly in subsequent criticism, though the worry never subsides.<sup>11</sup> Critics praise the subtleties of Jackson’s literary art, while the supposedly inferior, commercially tainted work of her magazine writing has been neglected, apparently for associating with the disreputable circle of masscult.<sup>12</sup>

Underlying this common suspicion regarding Jackson’s domestic humor are two critical judgments: first, these articles represent the widespread conflation of print culture with mass commodity culture; and, second, her domestic humor also appears to take for granted gender-normative social relationships. I am arguing that these articles identify and engage critically with these problems, as though Jackson were reflecting on the genre of domestic memoir itself. As a result, her essays do more than anticipate the “mommy blog,” as one critic suggests.<sup>13</sup> Instead, her domestic humor satirizes what Lauren Berlant describes as one of the primary modes of address in modern women’s culture: the female complaint. Regarding Dorothy Parker’s writing, for example, Berlant explains that the complaint is the means through which “women bound to femininity find a way of archiving experience and turning experience into evidence and evidence into argument and argument into convention and convention into cliché, clichés so powerful they can hold a person for her entire life” (227). The complaint is therefore a technique for “bargaining with what there is,” a mode of address that searches for belonging through sentimental attachments in the face of conventionality (31). The complaint constitutes a common world through a fear of the loss of what turns out to be a deeply “*melancholic position*” (212).

Jackson’s magazine articles differ from the melancholic mode of humor that Berlant examines in Parker’s writing insofar as her work recognizes the political problems of this mode of address and turns it inside out. Rather than melancholic consolation, Jackson offers readers absurdity and satirical defiance. Yet at the same time, Jackson’s shrewd satires of normativity are also bound up with broader shifts in the structures of print publicity in the postwar era. She satirizes a social world that imagines women passively accepting “a single or limited offering to the market.” This rivalling mode of publicity answers the normativity of a homogeneous market with what contemporaneous marketing analysts described as market segmentation. As I’ll show, framing Jackson’s domestic humor in this way reveals the imbrication of one kind of feminist critique with the market structures of print capitalism in the decades following the Second World War. Her essays satirize the “service articles” and domestic memoirs that constituted the bread and butter of the mass-circulation women’s magazines. Her representations of domesticity,

however, are also part of an emerging form of sociality that reimagined the publicness of print discourse in terms of the divergent demands of segmented publics of readers. Thus, before the American public could be “fractured,” as is so often argued about the 1970s, its public sphere of print commodities first had to be segmented.

Consider Wendell Smith’s original 1956 formulation of the marketing concept. For Smith, market segmentation “is *disaggregative* in its effects and tends to bring about recognition of several demand schedules where only one was recognized before” (5). The producers and marketers of commodities recognize the heterogeneity of demand and produce commodities to meet those divergences in taste and consumer behavior. Rather than produce one market offering (as though it were united by generalized and converging interests), those who make and sell goods create distinct products to meet the demands of discrete consumer groups. The satirical public invoked by Jackson’s domestic humor, I contend, follows a shift toward market divergence in US print culture. Her articles imagine publics of women readers after the image of divergent demand regimes, rather than as a homogeneous totality that converges on single market offerings. By describing domestic humor in terms of market segmentation, I account for certain conflicts internal to this mode of public writing, not the least of which are the connections between gender critique and broader changes in the structure for the production and consumption of US print media.

One excellent example of satire as a segmentation technique is Jackson’s essay titled “Karen’s Complaint,” published in the November 1959 issue of *Good Housekeeping*. First, Jackson announces that the social demands of being a housewife lead to loneliness, alienation, and even madness. The Karen of the essay’s title typifies this alienation: “a powerful young woman we used to know,” she has been laid low by several pregnancies (38). (There is no Karen mentioned in any of Jackson’s biographies, but Jackson herself was a mother of four children.) The essay begins by suggesting how the “half malady, half madness” experienced by Karen “affects mothers” indiscriminately. The “Complaint” is therefore generalized and “highly contagious; one mother suffering from this ailment is sure to infect her next-door neighbors, maybe her entire block” (38). This viral threat recalls many other postwar public health concerns, not to mention Cold War-era anxieties about containment.

Notable here is how Jackson adapts several streams of rhetorical tradition by inviting her readers into the abstraction of a representative figure. On the one hand, Karen is another iteration of the nineteenth-century “WOMAN,” to use an abstraction employed by

the radical women's magazine *The Lily* (1849–58) (Russo and Kramarae 17). As one editorial in this magazine puts it, "It is WOMAN that speaks through *The Lily*. It is upon an important subject, too, that she comes before the public to be heard" ("It is Woman" 1). *The Lily's* rhetorical figure of "WOMAN" was itself an adaptation of the ostensibly universal "We" of "We the People": the rhetorical abstractions of earlier women's periodicals included a (falsely universal) conception of womanhood to oppose the (falsely universal) male publicity that structured nineteenth-century print media.<sup>14</sup> Karen similarly stands in for a public, one marked by the particularities of motherhood. Much like earlier forms of abstraction, Jackson's rhetorical figure makes imaginable a more generalized audience while situating the essay's appeals on a public register.<sup>15</sup>

This aspect of "Karen's Complaint" also intersects with another rhetorical tradition, which Richard Ohmann describes as the "new art of reading" that developed during the mass-market era. Consumers' desires were "read" by marketing departments, and the magazines then sold "the eyes of the consuming reader" to advertising agencies ("Epochal" 351–52). Many of Jackson's figures share this identification of consumer desire through a representative figure, yet she often differentiates the desires of women in her essays from a wider public of consumers and implied readers. For instance, Jackson differentiates Karen from those in her community who attempt to "read" her: "To her family, she is made up of shopping lists and vegetable soup, button boxes and lullabies. To others, she may be the mother of that pretty girl in the blue dress or the mother of that boy who throws rocks. . . . Everyone knows her right away, of course, but *never as a separate human being*" (38). The humor of the passage—the idea that a woman may be "made up" of vegetable soup—suggests that Karen is not the person others understand her to be. She emerges as a synecdoche for the woman who lacks differentiation and thus has not been recognized "*as a separate human being.*" Karen's complaint, then, is that she has been fundamentally misread.

As both a public abstraction and a figure of consumer desire, Karen activates both sympathy and critical scrutiny of the norms that facilitate the misreading of the public for which she stands. In this way, such figures in Jackson's essays differentiate her mode of address from the one that Berlant associates with Parker's writing. Berlant finds that there is a persistent "other story" in Parker's work—a story "about the fear of losing the opportunity to enact conventionality" (225). Jackson's figures may suggest a fear of losing their public lives—which we may reasonably read as a fear of being trapped within domestic conventionality—but neither this critique nor its loss is the object of her characters' desire. If Parker's story

“Big Blonde” creates a generic woman who is “an example, the instance of a structure” (Berlant 217), Jackson’s representative figures exhibit the absurdity of such normative structures.

For instance, Jackson describes Karen’s Complaint as “a sudden, unnerving realization that no mother—especially herself—has a personality of her own. Somehow, over the years, she has merged into a composite of children and husband and home” (38). This description leverages two rhetorical abstractions (that is, both “Karen” and the idea of *all mothers*) in order to describe a third order of abstraction—namely, how mothers find their identity separated from their bodies and defined by their relation to domesticity. The readers of *Good Housekeeping* see how the identity of “all mothers” (a *rhetorical* abstraction) is constituted through the loss of personhood (a *patriarchal* abstraction). Karen isn’t even a “composite” of identities of her own making; the elements of this “merged” identity come instead from “children and husband and home.” She is an assemblage of the desires of others.

Not unlike some of the more biting humor in MacDonald’s *The Egg and I*, Jackson’s magazine essays treat domesticity as a dissociative institution, but she filters this criticism of an ostensibly private experience through a mode of satire that directs its diminishing force at marriage, home, and husband. In “G-U-I-L-T-Y Spells Mother,” published in *Redbook*, Jackson borrows from the form of the service articles common in the mass-circulation women’s magazines. According to Betty Friedan, the “service article takes over” for fiction in women’s magazines, replacing “the internal honesty and truth needed in fiction with a richness of honest, objective, concrete, realistic domestic detail—the color of walls or lipstick, the exact temperature of the oven” (107). This emphasis on “concrete details” implies that domesticity is “more interesting [to women] than their thoughts, their ideas, their dreams.” Jackson’s *Redbook* essay expresses a related criticism of this genre, yet her mode of writing is satirical rather than expository. As she writes in the essay’s first line, “It’s over. You can tie your shoes again. You can bend over to pick up a pin from the floor if you want to” (43). The “It” of the first sentence is polysemous: the pronoun refers to a new mother’s pregnancy, but “It” may also refer to her independence—or perhaps even her life and liberty. After all, the activities now available to mothers after the birth of “The Baby” are conspicuously limited—tying shoes, picking up around the home.

Even as the figure of Karen is a collective abstraction, “G-U-I-L-T-Y Spells Mother” employs a mode of address that situates the essay within the conventions of public-sphere discourse. The most obvious examples come when Jackson directly addresses her readers: “For the first time, you are alone at home with The Baby. All

alone—just you and the baby and an all-pervading panic” (43). Like earlier techniques for creating a bourgeois aura of publicity, the pronoun “you” invites mothers to understand themselves through the circulation of a discourse on matters of generalized or shared concern. Readers find themselves collected into a public through the combination of their shared interests, a rhetorical form of address (“you”), and the circulation of print itself. In a turn on these conditions for publicity, Jackson’s essay mediates between mother-readers by calling attention to their shared alienation: they are, collectively, “alone.”

Many of Jackson’s readers have remarked on the forms of alienation that arise in her fiction. According to Peter Kosenko, Jackson’s fiction adapts Marxist templates to explain how social norms shore up patriarchal power. The village of Jackson’s “The Lottery” exhibits “the same socio-economic stratification that most people take for granted in a modern, capitalist society” (28). Based on this observation, Kosenko argues that the lottery is “an ideological mechanism which serves to defuse the average villager’s deep, inarticulate dissatisfaction with the social order in which he lives by channeling it into anger directed at the *victims* of that social order.” The patriarchal structure of this social order likewise “keeps women powerless in their homes and [the administrator of the lottery] powerful in his coal company office” (30). The ritual of the lottery thus redirects the villagers’ anger away from the sources of inequality—class and patriarchy—toward the *victims* of the town’s power structures.

In keeping with Kosenko’s reading of Jackson’s fiction, women’s alienation in Jackson’s nonfiction similarly levies political critiques of patriarchal norms, even if her essays also modulate those critiques through satire. In contrast to the mass-market magazines’ images of united and happy homes, Jackson’s essays present the so-called head of the household as a particularly satirical figure, embodying a remote kind of incompetence. “Don’t bother to call your husband,” she advises readers worried about crying children. “He will only tell you that gosh, maybe there’s something wrong with the kid and you’d better call the doctor. When you say you’ve just *called* the doctor he will say well, maybe you’d better call the doctor again” (“G-U-I-L-T-Y” 43). The routine advice of the service article becomes the anti-advice of domestic humor. The only help to be found is the acceptance of isolation. Elsewhere, a husband appears only to make a casual remark “about living within our income,” but otherwise he is napping or taking a train to New York (“A Little Test” 58). And in an article on being a new parent, she writes that “anything [the new father] does is whimsy and not to be counted on for steady employment” (“How to Make” 25). In still another

essay—this one for *Woman's Day*—Jackson leads her son's Cub Scout den, declaring that she has influenced “the whole future course of American manhood” (“Alone” 42).

Wry and often hyperbolic, these comments deny that husbands and fathers are a stable source of domestic authority. Husbands are not even a source of idealized masculinity, as she explains in one 1949 essay on how “men are a little bit like women” (“Life Romantic” 165). After an account of her husband's failures to dispose of a bat that has invaded their home, she concludes that “husbands are all alike,” returning to their papers after they cannot manage even the most minor threats to domestic space (167). Across Jackson's magazine essays, husbands deflect matters related to their wives and children, displacing care onto other sources. Unreliable and uninformed, husbands and fathers are also largely irrelevant.<sup>16</sup>

These examples characterize how Jackson's essays take domesticity as a route for going public about the divergent, neglected demands of an imagined collective of women readers. As a result, she couches public criticism within a satirical turn on the postwar genre of domestic humor, interrogating the presuppositions that underwrite white male privilege. A *Redbook* essay thus replaces the “familiar and irresistibly comic figure” of the “new father” with a husband who “can no longer bear finding his dinner in the oven while the baby is being fussed over” (“How to Make” 24, 25). The humor surrounding this distinction between *father* (comically incompetent) and *husband* (petulantly chauvinistic) approaches the formulaic. It nods to tropes only to supplant them with other tropes. Yet the sexism of the home also submits readily to tropological patterns. In Jackson's essays, the life of a home is constituted through the play of tropes off one another. She situates these tropes alongside more direct criticism of the “division of labor between mother and father”: as she observes, “[W]hen it comes right down to hard facts, most fathers really believe that the baby is woman's work” (“How to Make” 25). This direct assessment again inverts the service article genre to remind her readers of the blunt truth that sexism is pervasive. But even as Jackson presents the domestic privileges of men within a frame of what “fathers really believe,” she implies that this “division of labor” is based merely in patriarchal structures of thought and feeling. The tropes are only tropes; they're set in type, not stone.

Jackson's representation of women in the domestic humor of the mass-market magazines indicates a nascent turn away from the aggregative representational techniques that formed the prevailing mode of publicity during the 1940s and 1950s. At a time when US producers began to capitalize on the possibilities of market differentiation, rather than homogenous aggregation, mainstream magazine

print culture—*Good Housekeeping*, *Redbook*, *Ladies' Home Journal*—also began to include figurations of readers who diverged (albeit not radically) from an otherwise homogeneous public. Nineteenth-century women's periodicals like *The Lily* and *Revolution*, edited by Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, had earlier elevated domesticity to a public register (Zuckerman 20). Jackson likewise transforms a realm of privacy into the route for publicity. In contrast to earlier modes of writing, Jackson's satire derogates the values and presuppositions of domesticity and the patriarchal authority underpinning it. This mode of satire inverts the logic for excluding women from the classic bourgeois model of the public sphere: while heterosexual white men have unmarked bodies and thus can speak universally—what Michael Warner calls “disincorporation”—the bodies of women are conventionally marked by particularity (*Publics* 165). Jackson's essays identify this logic of disembodiment as a principal source of domestic alienation.

Even as Jackson's essays send up the melancholic underpinnings of the female complaint, her rhetorical abstractions (for example, “Karen” and “all mothers”) are nevertheless imaginable because they are based on exclusions. Her white, middle-class women clearly don't represent *all* mothers or wives. Her figures of domestic women are as much a rhetorical technique of reduction as they are a literary strategy for imagining a public of readers. I explore the complexities of this form of publicity further in the next section, where I explain how market segmentation provided a new template for understanding the lived experience of alienation and collective disaffection.

### 3

For Smith, segmentation is a strategy for both marketing departments and the manufacturers or producers of goods. He explains that one reason for the emergence of market segmentation is the “decrease in the size of the minimum efficient producing or manufacturing unit required in some product areas” (6). In other words, manufacturers (or printers) no longer have to produce commodities at such large scales to turn a profit because technological advances have made it less costly to make certain goods.

This technical explanation maps onto the development of niche magazines and specialized advertising regimes in print culture during the 1950s. As one example, *Playboy* (1953–present) began as a special-interest magazine with a growing but segmented list of subscribers. The magazine's market niche appealed especially to advertisers of liquor and automobiles (Sumner 135). During the 1950s



and 1960s, the number of its subscriptions grew rapidly, and it enjoyed significant cultural influence. Its interviews with prominent cultural figures often informed political debate in the US, such as the one with presidential candidate Jimmy Carter in 1976.

The growth of so-called targeted publications like *Playboy* was possible, as David Abrahamson and Carol Polsgrove explain, because of technical and cultural shifts between 1955 and 1965:

Major advances in printing technology lowered costs [of magazine printing]. The computerization of type-setting and color-separation processes reduced per-copy manufacturing costs. Large print runs were no longer necessary to keep the cost per issue down; small print runs became economical, so small-circulation magazines for specialized audiences suddenly became more profitable. (111)

Thus, when Hugh Hefner printed nude photos of Marilyn Monroe in *Playboy's* first issue, the technologies of print production enabled these images to be produced and circulated through less expensive processes. What's more, because large print runs were no longer necessary for magazines' financial models, this shift in the relation between revenue and the scale of production also enabled targeted magazines to develop brands.<sup>17</sup> This relation between merchandising and decreased production costs became one of the driving forces behind the segmentation of the magazine industry throughout the second half of the twentieth century.

In response to these technical and economic changes, the print culture of the postwar era tended toward the niche. Rejecting mass culture in favor of segmentation became part of the logic of the market. Readers and advertisers began to identify themselves through segmented print commodities rather than the print discourse of mass culture.<sup>18</sup> Yet this pattern of segmentation, as we have seen, was more than a merchandising and production strategy: it was also a rhetorical technique and an aesthetic sensibility for figuring certain types of alienation. The satirical forms of domestic humor, in particular, developed a set of rhetorical strategies that transformed the self-abstraction techniques of earlier forms of critical publicity, moving away from unmarked abstractions ("We the People") and the homogenous aggregations of mass culture toward a rhetoric of segmentation. In these rhetorical strategies, alienation was recast as the denial of divergent demand and the imposition of homogeneous convergence. In turn, this rhetoric aimed to disarticulate a mass public and diminish or counter the forms of misrecognition that were part of the mass public's discursive norms. Satirical depictions of homogeneous or falsely universal norms segment the public in order

to exhibit the absurdity of an undifferentiated mass body and promote the recognition of the divergent demands of discrete groups instead.

This dynamic is vividly at play in Gloria Steinem's "If Men Could Menstruate." Steinem's essay was published in another magazine that exemplifies the ascent of segmented or targeted publications in US print culture, *Ms.* (1971–present), founded as a feminist alternative to magazines like *Good Housekeeping* and *Ladies' Home Journal*. By imagining a world in which men menstruate and women cannot, Steinem creates a scenario that opens up into criticism of two structures of thought shoring up traditional power arrangements: first, the idea promulgated by a "white minority of the world," which is that "a white skin makes people superior," and the related idea that "penis-envy is 'natural' to women" (110). As Steinem explains, these notions are not based on reason, nature, or empirical evidence; they are forms of representational misdirection.

By way of contrast, Steinem's thought experiment points out that "[l]ogic has nothing to do with [gendered power]," because in her scenario "menstruation would become an enviable, boast-worthy, masculine event: Men would brag about how long and how much" (110). By shifting the matrix of patriarchal ideas onto a different symbolic axis, Steinem shows the fatuity of masculine authority. Men would brag about bleeding, even as they brag about virility. This satirical situation foregrounds the arbitrary judgments of value about bodily markers (that is, white skin and penises are superior) that prop up a racist, patriarchal order.

Steinem's underlying assumptions about publicity differ from the aggregative representational mode of the mass-market era. Whereas the polling in *Ladies' Home Journal* imagines a homogeneous body of respondents, and the editorials of *Vogue* aggregate women in relation to a narrowly defined set of consumer choices, Steinem separates the public at its joints, portraying this homogeneous body's connecting ligaments to be (at best) mere whim and (at worst) absurd ideological justifications for oppression. As a way of disarticulating this mass public, Steinem's menstruating men conjure the disparate normative reactions of various groups: "[m]ilitary men, right-wing politicians, and religious fundamentalists" use menstruation to exclude women from the military and public office; "[m]ale radicals, left-wing politicians, and mystics" instead "insist that women are equal, just different, and that any woman could enter their ranks if only she were willing to self-inflict a major wound every month." Reactions cascade across hypothetical publics, changing as the essay's appraising eye falls on each collectivity: "[s]treet guys," "male intellectuals," "liberal males," "traditional women," "Reformers and Queen Bees," and feminists of several types,

including “[r]adical,” “[c]ultural,” and “[s]ocialist feminists” (110). Each represents a consolidated or collectively self-contained reaction. It’s as if the “voice of the people” has been disarticulated into the disparate opinions of focus groups.

In contrast to Buck’s view of a public comprised of integers on a plane of equivalence, Steinem’s discrete groups cohere around their contrasting appraisals of a symbolic object (*menses*). They separate themselves on the basis of judgments of value—what they desire, prize, and disdain. The arbitrary gendering of a biological process therefore creates not one converging social symbol but a variety of diverging judgments. For Steinem, patriarchal norms try to bend each group’s appraisal of *menses* toward a single ideological evaluation. Yet in the essay’s conception of the realities of collective life, such mass homogeneity is simply impossible; discrete groups instead coalesce only to express their divergent demands and contrary commitments. Therefore, Steinem presents each group as disparate segments (“liberal males,” “military men,” “cultural feminists”). Nor is there any basis for adding these responses together into a totality, because the groups’ basic demands and judgments diverge incommensurably. In this view, the public is a segmented marketplace, not a converging mass. Participants in public discourse speak from their segment of the market, not as self-abstracted voices aspiring to speak from a (dubious) universal position.

This vein of gender critique in US magazine culture takes the targeted focus group as the new image for the public, in contrast to the homogeneous market envisioned by the development of mass culture. Even as market segmentation was a strategy born in the postwar era, so too was the focus group, whose rationale and practice seem to derive from two sources: government studies on the effects of propaganda messaging and the meeting of clinical psychology and corporate management theory. Both began during the second half of the 1940s.<sup>19</sup> For instance, an academic study by Paul Cornyetz theorizes one early form of the focus group in an analysis of the relationship between “the group and the aggregate,” in which he raises doubts about the group psychology of aggregation (218–19). In this study of business techniques for segmenting market desire, Cornyetz presents the analysis of the targeted group in opposition to an impossible aggregation.<sup>20</sup>

Steinem’s disarticulation of a homogeneous public likewise rejects the aggregate in favor of the niche. She replaces a falsely universal or homogeneous abstraction with the divergent demands of smaller public segments. As I’ve argued, this segmented form of publicity also appears in the domestic humor of the immediate postwar decades. Much like Steinem’s work, this earlier writing

reconstitutes the public as a discursive space of differentiated desire and judgments of value. Jackson uses the segmentation of the public to highlight a domain of neglected needs and desires. In “A Little Test for Mothers,” she rejects nationalized ideas of domestic labor through a quiz about the experiences of “all us nonworking mothers” (54). Each quiz item suggests how “husbands,” “unmarried or childless” women, and “new brides” variously misunderstand domestic labor. Jackson’s questions suggest that domestic labor does not support a national public—an idea common once the War Advertising Council and the Office of War Information provided guidelines for popular magazines, advising that images of women as volunteers, laborers, and consumers would support the war effort.<sup>21</sup> According to Jackson’s quiz, domestic labor only supports the privileges of husbands and the social lives of children. Women, in short, are not part of the same collective body that enjoys the benefits of domesticity. Based on this differentiation, she poses the following question: “Who gets absolutely no sympathy or appreciation at all in spite of working eighteen hours a day to keep things nice around here and see that you all get good nourishing meals and baths and decent clothes and the least you could all do is show some consideration?” (58).

The pronoun usage in this question stands in contrast to the first-person plurals of the essay’s opening lines (“us nonworking mothers”). The discrepancy between first- and second-person plurals is part of how her satirical humor differentiates various publics: the “us” of the “nonworking mothers” is the essay’s principal audience, while the “you” of “husbands,” “maiden aunts,” and “friends without children” are altogether separate readerships who cannot share the same experiences or cohering interests as the primary audience. Only the first audience can supply answers to Jackson’s quiz and, as a result, her essay presents their wants and desires as a means of differentiation. Much as we saw in Steinem, Jackson segments a mass public by imagining collectivity through the image of smaller, self-contained markets with divergent demands. The differentiation of needs and wants is segmentation’s central imperative, and it is this imperative that enables certain forms of feminist critique to fit within a mass market for print commodities in the postwar era. Rather than describing the popular ascendancy of feminist critique as part of an “age of fracture,” as Daniel T. Rodgers describes the late 1970s and its legacy, the print culture of the 1970s is instead heir to the segmentation strategies that developed during the 1940s and 1950s.<sup>22</sup> Segmentation was first a print phenomenon that only later became what Rodgers calls a “solidarity” problem (155).

This reference to Rodgers’s important argument about the changing landscape of US intellectual and political culture suggests

*The differentiation of needs and wants is segmentation’s central imperative, and it is this imperative that enables certain forms of feminist critique to fit within a mass market for print commodities in the postwar era.*

why the framework of market segmentation is generative and significant. For segmentation is not only a *market reaction* to the rise of mass culture but also a *mode of publicity* within print media. Segmentation describes how publishers produced commodities and readers encountered print, but it also describes the techniques for making imaginable particular kinds of reading publics. This account also clarifies broader shifts in US print culture, allowing us to categorize contiguous modes of the production of print commodities and juxtapose their implicit public imaginaries. While mainstream magazines during the mass-market era often deployed aggregative techniques to call its public into existence, certain modes of publicity in the postwar magazine industry began to break with these techniques and looked instead to the targeted niche.

The idea of segmentation further clarifies how we might account for what is distinct about postwar writing in women's magazines while also retaining a way to position that body of writing within the structures of production and circulation common across print publics in the US. As a cultural and market imperative, the idea of market segmentation helps to detect and explain difference within similarity, for it allows us to think about women's culture as part of—but also a constitutive force within—the uneven, contradictory structures of US print culture.

The framework of market segmentation also helps us rethink critical suspicion of Jackson's memoirs on domestic life. Instead of "ephemeral fluff," her domestic humor retools the genres of mass-circulation women's media, adapting the genres of the humorous memoir and the service article. Jackson's work therefore seemed generically familiar to readers of *Good Housekeeping* or *Woman's Day*. At the same time, this familiarity finds itself inverted and satirized, as though the norms of a certain genre of public writing had become the source material for an absurd genre of lived experience.

### Endnotes

1. See Walker, "Humor and Gender Roles: The 'Funny' Feminism of the Post-World War II Suburbs," *American Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 1, 1985, pp. 98–113; and *A Very Serious Thing* (1988), pp. 139–68. See also Gloria Kaufman's introduction to *Pulling Our Own Strings* (1980).
2. For example, it has been widely noted that the magazines' advertisements simultaneously sexualized women and reimagined their labor after the image of white suburban affluence. See Gloria Steinem, "Sex, Lies, and Advertising," *Ms.*, July/Aug. 1990, pp. 18–28.
3. For an influential response to this set of tropes, see the chapter titled "The Happy Housewife Heroine" in Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963). More

recent scholarship also identifies a shift in the figural representation of women in these magazines during the mid-1940s. See Susan Ohmer, "Female Spectatorship and Women's Magazines: Hollywood, *Good Housekeeping*, and World War II," *Velvet Light Trap*, vol. 25, 1990, pp. 53–68.

4. Most business historians associate the term *market segmentation* with its formulation in Wendell R. Smith, "Product Differentiation and Market Segmentation as Alternative Marketing Strategies." For a history of the term, see John A. Quelch and Katherine E. Jocz, "Milestones in Marketing," *The Business History Review*, vol. 82, no. 4, 2008, pp. 828–30.

5. For example, see Michael Warner, *Letters of the Republic* (1990), pp. 48–49.

6. On the ascent of mass culture, see Richard Ohmann, *Selling Culture* (1996), pp. 11–30.

7. For another superb history of these methods, see Sarah E. Igo, *The Averaged American* (2007).

8. On the ways in which earlier techniques of publicity allow "the (male) particular . . . to posture behind the veil of the universal," see Joan B. Landes, "The Public and the Private Sphere: A Feminist Reconsideration," *Feminists Read Habermas: Gendering the Subject of Discourse* (1995), edited by Johanna Meehan, pp. 91–116, esp. pp. 96–98 (98).

9. For an overview of *Vogue's* history and relationship to mass-produced goods, see Alison Matthews David, "Vogue's New World: American Fashionability and the Politics of Style," *Fashion Theory*, vol. 10, no. 1–2, 2006, pp. 13–38.

10. For a synopsis of the changes in this period, see Carl F. Kaestle and Janice A. Radway, "A Framework for the History of Publishing and Reading in the United States, 1880–1940," *Print in Motion: The Expansion of Publishing and Reading in the United States* (2009), edited by Kaestle and Radway, pp. 7–21.

11. For example, see Lynette Carpenter, "Domestic Comedy, Black Comedy, and Real Life: Shirley Jackson, A Woman Writer," *Faith of a (Woman) Writer* (1988), edited by Alice Kessler-Harris and William McBrien, pp. 143–48.

12. See Dwight Macdonald, "Masscult and Midcult," *Partisan Review*, vol. 27, no. 4, 1960, pp. 203–33. For more on the cultural politics and genre distinctions surrounding Jackson's domestic essays, see James Egan, "Comic-Satiric-Fantastic-Gothic: Interactive Modes in Shirley Jackson's Narratives," *Shirley Jackson: Essays on the Literary Legacy* (2005), edited by Bernice A. Murphy, pp. 34–51.

13. In her important biography, Ruth Franklin advances this view of Jackson's essays, even iterating a version of Stanley Hyman's claim that the sole merit of the "household stories in women's magazines" was their lucrative payouts. As a result of this commercial logic, Jackson "essentially invented the form that has become the modern-day 'mommy blog': a humorous, chatty, intelligently observed household chronicle" (307).

14. See Mary Ellen Zuckerman, *A History of Popular Women's Magazines* (1998), pp. 3–18; Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (2002), p. 165; Ann Russo and

Cheris Kramarae, Introduction, *The Radical Women's Press of the 1850s* (1991), edited by Russo and Kramarae, pp. 1–11, esp. p. 9.

15. For an analysis of readers' responses to Jackson's domestic humor, see Jessamyn Neuhaus, "'Is It Ridiculous for Me to Say I Want to Write?': Domestic Humor and Redefining the 1950s Housewife Writer in Fan Mail to Shirley Jackson," *Journal of Women's History*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2009, pp. 115–37.

16. I've found one exception among Jackson's essays: "Lucky to Get Away," *Woman's Day*, Aug. 1953, pp. 26, 117–19. The husband in this essay is an object of affection, although this affection still places him in the margins of the story. Still, even the idea that a mother is "lucky to get away" presupposes a normative view of the husband sacrificing time away from public work in order to give his wife temporary reprieve from her attachment to domesticity.

17. For the earlier history of branding and magazine writing, see Ohmann, *Selling Culture*, p. 82.

18. There are notable exceptions, including *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. However, as Polsgrove says, most attempts to revive the models of earlier mass-circulation magazines and thus "match television numbers" (often by inflating circulation statistics) encountered "disastrous financial outcomes" (257). See "Magazines and the Making of Authors," *The Enduring Book* (2009), edited by Nord, Rubin, and Schudson, pp. 256–68.

19. See George Kamberelis and Greg Dimitriadis, *Focus Groups: From Structured Interviews to Collective Conversations* (2013), pp. 1–18; and Stephen P. Waring, *Taylorism Transformed: Scientific Management Theory Since 1945* (1991), pp. 113–18.

20. Cornyetz is not opposed to aggregation, much in the same way that market segmentation is not a wholesale break with its predecessor. He says, "The therapist may decide to aggregate patients with similar syndromes. An audience of alcoholics is readily approached with the theme of initial addition to drink, for example" (222). In this version of disarticulating mass homogeneity, segmentation is merely aggregation at smaller scales.

21. See Nancy A. Walker, "Introduction: Women's Magazines and Women's Roles," *Women's Magazines, 1940-1960: Gender Roles and the Popular Press* (1998), edited by Walker, pp. 1–20, esp. pp. 15–17; and *Shaping Our Mothers' World: American Women's Magazines* (2000), pp. 66–100.

22. See Rodgers, *Age of Fracture* (2003), pp. 144–79.

## Works Cited

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Abrahamson, David and Carol                                       | "All At Once—A Wardrobe." <i>Good Housekeeping</i> , vol. 132, no. 3, Mar. 1951, p. 97. |
| Polsgrove. "The Right Niche: Consumer Magazines and Advertisers." |   |
| Nord, Rubin, and Schudson, pp. 107–18.                            | Berlant, Lauren. <i>The Female Complaint: The Unfinished Business of</i>                |

*Sentimentality in American Culture*. Duke UP, 2008.

Buck, Pearl S. "Women and War." *Ladies' Home Journal*, vol. 57, no. 5, May 1940, pp. 18, 94, 96–97.

Cornyetz, Paul. "The Warming Up Process of an Audience." *Sociometry*, vol. 8, no. 3–4, 1945, pp. 218–25.

Franklin, Ruth. *Shirley Jackson: A Rather Haunted Life*. Norton, 2016.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. Norton, 1963.

Igo, Sarah E. *The Averaged American: Surveys, Citizens, and the Making of a Mass Public*. Harvard UP, 2007.

"It Is Woman Who Speaks Through *The Lily*." *The Lily*, vol. 1, no. 1, Jan. 1849, p. 1.

Jackson, Shirley.. "Alone in a Den of Cubs." *Woman's Day*, Dec. 1953, pp. 42–43, 107–8.

———. "G-U-I-L-T-Y Spells Mother." *Redbook*, vol. 113, no. 4, Aug. 1959, p. 43.

———. "The House." *Woman's Day*, May 1952, pp. 62–63, 115–16, 118–19.

———. "How to Make a Husband a Father." *Redbook*, vol. 115, no. 5, Sept. 1960, pp. 24–25.

———. "Karen's Complaint." *Good Housekeeping*, vol. 149, no. 5, Nov. 1959, pp. 38, 40, 42, 46.

———. "The Life Romantic." *Good Housekeeping*, vol. 129, no. 6, Dec. 1949, pp. 165–67.

———. "A Little Test for Mothers." *Good Housekeeping*, vol. 151, no. 4, Oct. 1960, pp. 54, 56, 58.

———. "The Third Baby's the Easiest." *Harper's Magazine*, vol. 198, May 1949, pp. 58–63.

Kaestle, Carl F. and Janice A. Radway, editors. *Print in Motion: The Expansion of Publishing and Reading in the United States, 1880–1940*. U of North Carolina P, 2009.

Kamberelis, George and Greg Dimitriadis. *Focus Groups: From Structured Interviews to Collective Conversations*. Routledge, 2013.

Kaufman, Gloria. Introduction. *Pulling Our Own Strings: Feminist Humor and Satire*, edited by Kaufman and Mary Kay Blakely. Indiana UP, 1980, pp. 13–20.

Kessler-Harris, Alice and William McBrien, editors. *Faith of a (Woman) Writer*. Hofstra UP, 1988.

Kosenko, Peter. "A Marxist/Feminist Reading of Shirley Jackson's 'The Lottery'." *The New Orleans Review*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1985, pp. 27–32.

Lebovic, Anna. "'How to Be in Fashion and Stay an Individual': American *Vogue*, the Origins of Second Wave Feminism and Mass Culture Criticism in 1950s America." *Gender & History*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2019, pp. 178–94.

Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion*. Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1922.

Meehan, Johanna, editor. *Feminists Read Habermas: Gendering the Subject of Discourse*. Routledge, 1995.

"Model Models." *Vogue*, vol. 97, no. 12, June 1941, pp. 34–35.

Moon, Nick. *Opinion Polls: History, Theory and Practice*. Manchester UP, 1999.



- Murphy, Bernice, editor. *Shirley Jackson: Essays on the Literary Legacy*. McFarland, 2005.
- Nord, David Paul, Joan Shelley Rubin, and Michael Schudson, editors. *The Enduring Book: Print Culture in Postwar America*. U of North Carolina P, 2009.
- North, Sterling. "Sterling North Reviews the Books." *New York World Telegram*, 21 June 1953, p. 324.
- Ohmann, Richard. "Epochal Change: Print Culture and Economics." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, vol. 110, no. 2, 2000, pp. 349–75.
- . *Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century*. Verso, 1996.
- Pollack, Eileen. *Creative Nonfiction: A Guide to Form, Content, and Style, with Readings*. Wadsworth Cengage, 2008.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. *Age of Fracture*. Harvard UP, 2003.
- Russo, Ann and Cheris Kramarae, editors. *The Radical Women's Press of the 1850s*. Routledge, 1991.
- Smith, Wendell R. "Product Differentiation and Market Segmentation as Alternative Marketing Strategies." *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1956, pp. 3–8.
- Steinem, Gloria. "If Men Could Menstruate: A Political Fantasy." *Ms.*, vol. 7, no. 4, Oct. 1978, p. 110.
- Sternadori, Miglena and Mandy Hagseth. "Fashionable Feminism or Feminist Fashion?" *Media Report to Women*, vol. 42, no. 4, 2014, pp. 12–21.
- Sumner, David E. *The Magazine Century: American Magazines Since 1900*. Peter Lang, 2010.
- Thompson, Dorothy. "Occupation—Housewife." *Ladies' Home Journal*, vol. 66, no. 3, Mar. 1949, pp. 11–12.
- "Vogue's Eye View." *Vogue*, vol. 115, no. 7, 15 Apr. 1950, p. 51.
- Walker, Nancy A. *A Very Serious Thing: Women's Humor and American Culture*. U of Minnesota P, 1988.
- . *Shaping Our Mothers' World: American Women's Magazines*. UP of Mississippi, 2000.
- . *Women's Magazines, 1940–1960: Gender Roles and the Popular Press*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.
- Waring, Stephen P. *Taylorism Transformed: Scientific Management Theory Since 1945*. U of North Carolina P, 1991.
- Warner, Michael. *Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America*. Harvard UP, 1990.
- . *Publics and Counterpublics*. Zone Books, 2002.
- "What Do the Women of America Think About War?" *Ladies' Home Journal*, vol. 57, no. 2, 1940, p. 12.
- Zuckerman, Mary Ellen. *A History of Popular Women's Magazines in the United States, 1792–1995*. Greenwood P, 1998.