Women in Academe

Patricia Albjerg Graham

American colleges and universities, struggling to accustom themselves to the state of siege mentality in which, it seems, their present and future work must be carried out, are in for another round of crisis—this one dealing with the "woman question." In colleges and universities throughout the country, high pressure has been applied by women intent on securing rights equal to those of men in academic position and preferment. In this atmosphere, many academic administrators must look wistfully back to the first two centuries of higher education in the United States, when women were simply excluded from collegiate precincts. From the founding of Harvard in 1636 to the opening of Oberlin in 1837, it was not possible for a young woman to attend college in this country. By the mid-19th century, some American colleges had begun to admit women to their classes, in response to pressures similar in some respects to those affecting higher education in the United States today. One source of the pressure was ideological—the conviction that women were entitled to the same educational opportunities as men. From this stimulus, which, significantly, was contemporaneous with the abolition movement, came the establishment of certain colleges designed specifically for women, and of others which admitted both men and women. But the major impetus for women's higher education came in the second half of the 19th century, a time of dire economic need for many colleges, caused chiefly by shrinking masculine enrollments. The sag in college attendance was attributed to the Civil War, to economic depressions, and to dissatisfaction with the college curriculum. College trustees and presidents saw women as potential sources of tuition revenues that would permit the colleges to remain open. The principal reason, then, for the 19th-century breakthrough in admitting women to colleges with men was economic rather than ideological, and these circumstances were not highly conducive to developing plans that would take particular account of the educational needs of women. Even such state institutions as the University of Wisconsin first admitted women during the Civil War when many men students had joined the army.

After the Civil War very few colleges were established solely for men, the major exception being Roman Catholic institutions. The most important women's colleges were still in the East, where traditional institutions of the Ivy League—as it would later be called—dominated the educational scene; these, on the whole, saw no need to include women. In the West, where endowments were small or nonexistent and the financial pressures were greater, resistance to the admission of women was much less. There the critical institutions were state universities, and by the turn of the century most were coeducational. There, too, the denominational colleges, limited as they were in endowments and dependent upon tuition, and now in competition with the less expensive public institutions, frequently became coeducational. The argument is sometimes made that the important role the women on the frontier played is substantially responsible for the greater degree of coeducation in the West. Although this may have been a factor, it seems not to have been as determining a one as the economic considerations, or as the nascent women's rights movement, which was heavily centered in the East. Well into the 20th century the single-sex colleges in the East remained the prestigious places for young women to be educated.

By 1920 women constituted 47 percent of the undergraduates in the country and were receiving roughly 15 percent of the Ph.D.'s. In 1930 the proportion remained about the same. Today women constitute only 40 percent of the undergraduate student body and receive about 10 percent of the doctorates. The total number of students, of course, has increased enormously during these years. Although the percentage of women receiving doctorates is rising gradually from a low in the late 1950's and early 1960's, it still has not reached the high attained in the late 1920's. Various studies have also shown that between 75 and 90 percent of the "well-qualified" students who do not go on to college are women.

In the present movement toward coeducation at some of the well-known single-sex colleges, particularly Princeton, Yale, Vassar, and Sarah Lawrence, economic considerations are again an important basis for the decision to admit members of the opposite sex. The current financial dilemmas of many colleges and universities are well known, but the cure is no longer simply a matter of enlarging the student body. Although these institutions are not short of applicants, some of them at least believe that the most outstanding high school graduates are choosing other, coeducational colleges because of a desire not to be isolated from young persons of the opposite sex. This is an economic argument of a rather more sophisticated type, based on considerations of human capital. In some cases the admission of women follows by several decades the abolition of quotas for Jews and, more recently, the initiation of efforts to admit blacks. Again, the parallel with the mid-19th century is striking: the women's rights advocates rode the coattails of the abolitionists much as the current feminists are trailing the black power movement.

The Current Situation

What, then, is the current situation for women in academe? Women constitute about 18 percent of the staffs of institutions of higher education, being distributed principally at small colleges and universities and in the lower ranks of other institutions. They tend to be concentrated in such fields as education, social service, home economics, and nursing. For example, 6 of the 11 women who were full professors at the University of Chicago in 1968–69 (there are 464 men full professors) were in social work. At present 2 percent of the full professors at the

The author is associate professor of history and education at Barnard College and Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. She spent the academic year 1969–70 at Princeton University, where she was an American Council on Education Fellow.

University of Chicago are women, in contrast to 8 percent at the turn of the century, when Chicago was (as it still is) one of the top half dozen universities in the nation. Alice Rossi reports (*1*) that 30 percent of the Ph.D.'s awarded in sociology go to women but that only 1 percent of the full professors in sociology in top graduate schools are women, 5 percent are associate professors, and 39 percent are subprofessorial appointees, such as "research associates."

The 2 percent figure for the proportion of full professors who are women also applies at Stanford University, where 15 percent of the graduate students are women. At Columbia University, which has probably granted more doctorates to women than any other institution and has for years enrolled a high proportion of women in its graduate departments (about 20 percent), just over 2 percent of the full professors are women. Barnard College, the women's undergraduate division of Columbia, which has its own faculty, for many years in the first third of the 20th century hired women primarily, as did most of the other women's colleges. Since World War II the proportion of men professors has risen steadily. Barnard still has a higher proportion of women on its faculty than any other of the "Seven Sister" colleges (only six of which have separate faculties), probably because there are more highly educated women in New York City than in South Hadley or Poughkeepsie. The representation of women at Barnard in 1968–69 in the professorial ranks is still weighted heavily at the bottom, with women constituting 82 percent of the nonprofessorial teaching staff, 64 percent of the assistant professors, 54 percent of the associate professors, and a mere 22 percent of the full professors. Nonetheless, Barnard still has a woman president, whereas only one of the other five faculties (Wellesley) is presided over by a woman. Mary I. Bunting heads Radcliffe, but it does not have a separate faculty. In the last 5 years men have replaced women presidents at Vassar, Bryn Mawr, and Sarah Lawrence. Both Smith and Mount Holyoke have men presidents. Kirkland, the newest bidder for prestige as a women's coordinate college, has a man president.

Recent studies, such as Helen S. Astin's (*2*), indicate that, contrary to the dire pronouncements of some graduate school officers, women who receive Ph.D.'s are likely to use them in a professional capacity. Ninety-one percent of the women who received doctorates in 1957–58 were employed in 1964, and 79 percent of them had not interrupted their careers during that time (*2*, p. 57). Even more startling to those of both sexes who assume that the reason women are not in better positions is that they do not publish enough is the research of Rita Simon, Shirley Merritt Clark, and Kathleen Galway (*3*), which showed that married women Ph.D.'s who were employed full time published slightly more than either men Ph.D.'s or unmarried women Ph.D.'s.

Other studies, such as one made by Lindsey R. Harmon and another by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), report, on the basis of various measures, that women doctorate holders have somewhat greater academic ability than their male counterparts (*4*). Further, women who were married at the time of receiving the Ph.D. were more capable academically than their unmarried female contemporaries. Nonetheless, the fate of married women Ph.D.'s is somewhat discouraging. The NAS report states:

> In general, the rate at which women achieve the status of full professor is slower than for men, the average lag varying from two to five years in the biosciences and up to as much as a decade in the social sciences. There is a marital status difference also. Considering data on women for all fields combined, the single women lead the married ones by five to ten years. At any given time, 10 to 20 per cent more of the single than married women have achieved full professor status.

Not surprisingly, the NAS also found that the salaries received by married women in general were 70 to 75 percent of those received by men at the same interval after receipt of the doctorate. Salaries of single women were more variable, but on the average they were somewhat higher than those of the married women, though still markedly lower than men's salaries.

Possible Explanations

Discrimination. One can think of various explanations for the considerable discrepancy between the ability and the professional position of women Ph.D.'s. One possibility is overt discrimination, but obvious disregard of women scholars is not as common today as it was in earlier years. The confident announcement of a senior professor in a leading history department less than 10 years ago that, as long as he was a member of the department, there would never be a woman professor in it was at the time accepted without a murmur. His view held sway until his retirement. Now, in that department of nearly 50 full-time members, one full professor and one assistant professor, both in esoteric specialties, are women. Explanations given by the department for the absence of women from the populous fields of European and American history are vague. For many years about 15 percent of the graduate students in that department have been women. The discrimination is now much more subtle and less easily countered.

Internal ambivalences. Preeminent among the reasons for the poor representation of women in the higher echelons of the professional world is a psychological-cultural one. Ellen and Kenneth Keniston of Yale University have written perceptively about the "internal ambivalences" that most American women feel about combining career and family (*5*). These ambivalences are especially acute in the years between 18 and 25, years which, in this society, men generally devote to intense preparation for a career. For women these years are likely to be a time in which they seek affirmation of their femininity, an activity likely to be at variance with serious vocational commitment. These activities are certainly not the only ones young people engage in, but they are likely to be the ones invested with the greatest psychic energy.

Some young women are able to do graduate work and to do it well in these years, but few pass through this period without severe qualms about the desirability of planning for a demanding professional life. Men, too, are beset by a variety of doubts during these years, but for the majority of them, at least, academic success does not bring substantial psychic problems as it does for women. Matina Horner has recently given unfinished stories, identical except for the name of the protagonist, to groups of young men and women for comment (*6*). In one set "Bill" is at the top of his medical school class; in the other set "Anne" is at the top. Both the young men and the young women believed that Bill was headed for a bright and happy future whereas many

believed that Anne would face many problems as a result of her academic achievement. Matina Horner concludes,

> For women, then, the desire to achieve is often contaminated by what I call the *motive to avoid success.* I define it as the fear that success in competitive achievement situations will lead to negative consequences, such as unpopularity and loss of femininity.

To expect young women to buck the cultural standards for females is to demand of them much more than is expected of any man attempting to succeed in his field, since men are supposed to be successful. The problem for young women is not eased by the fact that they see few women occupying positions of importance in the academic, professional, and business worlds. Some of those who are there are unmarried, and few young women deliberately choose the single life. Others are the rare individuals who manage to marry a brilliant and successful husband, have five children, write intelligently on a variety of topics, assume a major administrative position, and at the age of 40, be featured on the beauty pages of a woman's magazine. Most young women rightly recognize such an achievement as truly exceptional, and girls in this society do not think of themselves as conquerors of the world. "Models" of this sort sometimes lack effectiveness because undergraduates simply refuse to aspire to such heights.

Aspiration and expectation. The problem of aspiration is closely tied to the internal ambivalences. If one is uncertain about whether one should have a career, one cannot aspire, either publicly or privately, to be an art historian, a plasma physicist, or a professor of philosophy. Women's low expectations for themselves so infect the society that both men and women refuse to think of women as generally likely to occupy important posts. A riddle currently popular in the cocktail party circuit concerns a father and son driving down a highway. There is a terrible accident in which the father is killed, and the son, critically injured, is rushed to a hospital. There the surgeon approaches the patient and suddenly cries, "My God, that's my son!" The group is then asked how this story can be true. All sorts of replies requiring immense ingenuity are forthcoming: complicated stepfather relationships are suggested, sometimes even artificial insemination. Almost invariably the storyteller must supply the answer: "The surgeon is his mother."

The problem, then, of aspiration and of expectation is acute. The Kenistons have pointed to the absence of an aristocratic tradition in America as one factor depressing the level of women's aims. They point out that in Europe "women of the upper classes have had enough leisure and freedom from family needs to permit them, if they choose, to 'work' outside their homes." Except in the South and possibly in the Boston area—both places which have nurtured a number of unusual and talented women—the United States has lacked, not to say discouraged the growth of, such a leisured class. The South, which in this respect as in so many others does not fit the usual generalizations, has produced some of the best-known contemporary writers in America, such as Flannery O'Connor, Katherine Anne Porter, Eudora Welty, and Carson McCullers.

But Boston and the South cannot change the nation, much as both have sometimes wished to try. There are few hard data on the question, but the number of women Ph.D.'s in the United States today who have close ties to another cultural heritage is probably substantial. For example, both the first woman full professor at Princeton (who was appointed to the professorship in 1968) and the recently named special assistant to the president for coeducation, at Yale, the former a Ph.D. in sociology and the latter a Ph.D. in chemistry, came to the United States as young girls, one from Austria and the other from Germany. The author of the most recent major work on women Ph.D.'s herself grew up in Greece. A leader of the Columbia Women's Liberation Movement is English. All these women have direct experience with another culture and presumably recognize a greater variety of options for women than the stereotype of middle America currently exemplified by Mrs. Nixon and Mrs. Agnew.

Another substantial category of women Ph.D.'s is comprised of the daughters of professional women. Learned pediatricians and psychiatrists to the contrary, the daughters of working mothers seem more inclined to pursue definite career patterns than other women are. My own mother received her Ph.D. in 1925 and taught in Alabama State College for Women until her marriage and then only sporadically (she was a victim of the nepotism rule). When Princeton hired its first female assistant dean this year, the university selected a woman whose mother is director of the New Jersey State Council on Aging. Mary Bunting's mother was a leader in public education in New York City.

No doubt Princeton and other universities are completely unaware of the way in which their women fit into these three major categories, but the fit is striking. Incidentally, Princeton's second woman full professor, who will join the faculty in the fall of 1970, is a Virginian by birth.

The "internal ambivalences" remain for the girl of more or less ordinary ability. If she wants to marry, bear children, and also have a serious and responsible position, whom can she find to exemplify such a pattern? Unless she has gone to one of the women's colleges, which still have larger proportions of women faculty than coeducational institutions have, she is not likely to find many models, although probably more now than she would have found 5 or 10 years ago. If she is impolitic enough to suggest that something is wrong with a society in which it appears so difficult for a woman to achieve these kinds of goals, she is likely to be subjected to the harshest kind of argument—not anger but ridicule, as evidenced by the recent article in *Harper's* by a young Harvard graduate who had returned to the United States after several years in Europe and found to his consternation that a feminist movement was under way. In her formative state she may well opt out of a Ph.D. program or accept a "research associate" position instead of holding out for the degree or the assistant or associate professorship she deserves.

Publication. Another major reason usually given for the low proportion of women in top positions in universities is that they do not publish. This may well be true, despite the Simon-Clark-Galway study, which indicated that married women Ph.D.'s publish slightly more than men Ph.D.'s do. Simple numbers of items on bibliographies are not a guide to quality. Probably one of the most important reasons why most women Ph.D.'s do not publish as widely as men Ph.D.'s do, if this is indeed true, is that they are not put into positions in which they must. Research and writing for publication are not easy, and a great many people would

not publish unless it was necessary. For example, if a young man is appointed an assistant professor at a major university shortly after receiving his Ph.D., the chances are better than nine out of ten that he is married. Presumably he is supporting his wife and his growing family. He knows that if he expects to remain at the university beyond his 6 or so allotted years as an assistant professor, he must publish. Furthermore, as his family grows he needs more money, and his wife, whose status in a community is largely a reflection of her husband's position, is usually eager for him to be promoted and may even be willing to help him with his research. Most important, a man expects to be a success, at least in a modest way, and most men are willing to exert some effort to achieve this.

A woman's situation is very different. One of the cardinal social rules is that she should not be more successful than her husband, especially in his line of work. Nearly half of the recent women Ph.D.'s who are married have husbands who also have professional degrees. For example, all but one of the husbands of the married women Ph.D.'s holding professorial appointments at Princeton in 1970 have doctorates. The remaining one expects to receive his Ph.D. at Harvard soon. But people in some circles question whether a woman with an advanced degree should succeed at all. The chances are that, if she is married, her place of residence has been selected because it offers the best position for her husband, not for her. Often, if she is teaching, it is in an institution less prestigious than her husband's, and there she is under less pressure to publish. Sometimes she rationalizes her nonresearch on the basis that research would not be helpful to her professionally anyway, so why should she bother. Her chances of having secretarial help and graduate-student assistance are probably less than those of men professors. In short, incentives for her to do research are generally missing.

Single women, who theoretically have much greater geographic mobility than married women, can seek a position in an institution in which extensive publication is not expected. In fact, until very recently that was about the only place in which they were likely to be hired, since the faculties of the most prestigious institutions were almost entirely male. Unless she published, she would probably not be hired away from the small institution at a higher academic rank. Often she need not publish because departments frequently assign onerous committee duties to women, who accept them too willingly and then use them as excuses for not doing research.

The problem of time. Another serious obstacle to women's (particularly married women's) professional advancement is the simple one of time. There are just not enough hours in the day to do all she must. A recent UNESCO study (*7*) revealed that the average working mother had 2.8 hours of free time on a typical weekday, as compared with 4.1 for a working man.

Another way of viewing this question is to note that women Ph.D.'s in the United States spend about 28 hours per week, on the average, on household tasks (*2*, p. 95). Although we are fond of talking of the great advances made by technology in freeing women from domestic tasks, the working mother's concern for her children is not eased by possession of an automatic washer-dryer or dishwasher. What she needs, and what she finds increasingly difficult to find, is household help—persons who are competent and reliable and will assist her in caring for her children and running her house. Day care centers are certainly needed, but even they do not solve the problem of having to vacuum the living room and change the beds.

The suburban syndrome. Related to the problem of time and of inadequate household help is the suburban syndrome, in which both of these problems are accentuated. More and more Americans live in outlying urban areas, and it becomes harder and harder for wives to find jobs that do not take them away from their homes for long periods of the day. If one must spend 3 hours each day commuting and then come home to perform the customary domestic chores, the amount of energy left at the end of the day is small indeed. In suburban communities domestic help is notoriously difficult to find. Complicating the picture even further is the usual social custom of such towns, in which people generally entertain at dinner parties in their own homes. In a city it is still possible to entertain one's friends by taking them to restaurants or concerts, but in many suburban communities there are no public facilities where one can spend a pleasant evening. The home and the overtired woman are expected to provide the serene environment in which friends can enjoy themselves. An obvious solution is simply to reduce one's social life to the barest minimum, but this exceedingly common way of dealing with the problem works hardships on the professional woman's family and on the woman herself.

The nepotism rule. A final obstacle that a woman Ph.D. (or sometimes her husband) faces is the nepotism rule, written or unwritten, that still prevails on many campuses. Although more and more institutions are now willing to have two members of the same family teaching in one institution, few regard with enthusiasm the prospect of having a husband and wife in the same department, particularly if both are at the professorial level. Since many professional women met their husbands in graduate school (the proportion of women Ph.D.'s married to Ph.D.'s in the same field is very high in all fields except that of education, where women are less likely to be married), the question of husbands and wives being employed in the same department is very likely to occur. Rarely is the wife given the superior appointment. Typically she takes a job in another institution or works part-time as a "research associate" at her husband's institution.

Corrective Measures

If these are the problems that affect professional women on academic faculties, what are some of the steps institutions might take to alleviate them? Until very recently universities were, on the whole, not conscious of discrimination against women. Administrators were—and many still are—fond of making pious statements to the effect that all persons were treated equally, that none was discriminated against. To say this is to raise the question of what "equality" really is. Is it simply applying the same rule in all situations, or is it rather recognizing that the rules themselves may favor one group over another? For many years we gave standardized I.Q. and achievement tests to youngsters and assumed that we were treating them equally because we were giving all students identical tests. In recent years we have come to see the fallacy of this policy, and we recognize that these tests have a "cultural bias." Although they met the standard of abstract equality, they failed to meet the comparably important one of actual

equality. So it is with many of the policies in the university, which apply primarily to men. Women who wish to teach must meet these similarly "culturally biased" standards, and what is called equality in academe is only abstract equality and not actual equality.

Appointment to senior faculty and administrative posts. In order to achieve genuine or actual equality for women, colleges and universities need to make some adaptations. Preeminent among these is the need to recognize women's situations in their own academic communities and then to support them adequately. Probably the most important single factor in creating an environment that is as hospitable to the aspirations of women as to men is to appoint women in significant numbers to senior faculty and administrative posts in the university. Just as "tokenism" has been rejected for the blacks, so it must be rejected for the less militant feminine majority. The appointment of women to faculty posts will provide evidence for both male and female students, and for faculty colleagues, that teaching and scholarship of the highest standards can be attained by women as well as by men. The presence of women in senior administrative positions will also encourage the able young undergraduate and graduate women at the university to believe that a secretarial career, even a glorified one, need not be their vocational ambition, and it will remind the young men who will later be employers of women that women too can be expert executives. Male professors should see successful women of their own age among their colleagues, in order that the entire faculty can justifiably encourage women students to pursue additional studies or accept demanding positions that are in line with their talents.

No doubt it is also necessary, on most campuses, to increase the number of young women in the junior faculty and administrative positions at the university, but this is generally neither as crucial nor as difficult as the senior appointments. Many mature male professors find it much easier to appoint young women to junior and subordinate positions (where they have little power) than to appoint women of their own age to positions truly equivalent to their own. Sometimes it is possible to appoint women of mature years to junior administrative positions which might otherwise be filled by bright young men, but this kind of appointment may be more damaging than no female appointment at all. Few intelligent, alert coeds look forward to being rewarded in their middle years by promotion from departmental secretary to administrative associate when other administrative associates are 25-year-old men. At one leading university three assistant deans were men in their twenties or thirties; the fourth was a woman in her fifties. Many traditionally coeducational colleges are now replacing the separate dean of women and dean of men by a dean of students. Generally this reorganization, which is thought to be "progressive," means that a man is appointed. At one Midwestern state university where this was done the Dean of Women was nationally known and widely respected. The Dean of Students, who became her immediate superior, had no standing outside the community and not much locally, but he was of the same sex as the all-male administration of the university, which had been coeducational since its founding in 1869.

Ideally the women at the university should represent a variety of life styles, just as the male faculty members do. Some should be dedicated, and probably single, scholar-teachers, and others should be women who manage successfully to cope with the demands of academic life and of home and family. Some may be concerned with the particular educational needs of women students, but others may not. In appointing women professors the institution will look first for scholarliness and teaching ability, not militant feminism. As the number of women on the faculty grows, the responsibility of individual women for exemplifying female academic accomplishment will decline, and this is as it should be. When there are but a few women on a faculty, excessive demands are made upon them; not only must each fulfill the usual academic requirements but she must serve as the token woman on all kinds of committees.

Part-time professorial appointments. If the academic institutions do move vigorously to appoint more women to their faculties, they might well consider expanding the number of part-time professorial appointments with full perquisites. "Part-time" has a poor reputation among academic administrators, largely because it is assumed that the part-time person is one who is in effect "moonlighting" from a full-time job. With women scholars this is not quite the case. They have no prior institutional loyalty or obligation. Women scholars, particularly those who are married, might welcome the opportunity to teach on a part-time basis with full professional recognition. The demands on their time and energies at home are often considerable, as noted above, but at present, if they wish to be taken seriously in their fields, they must accept full-time positions. To do so frequently requires an unusual endowment of energy. If they do not wish to teach full-time, they are generally consigned to the ranks of lecturers and instructors, where they are not eligible for sabbatical leaves and other academic perquisites. Such circumstances tend to depress the status of women in the university and do not foster conditions in which they are likely to do research, which is the major means of getting out of the lower-ranking positions.

If universities permitted and even encouraged departments to appoint persons to assistant, associate, and full professorships on a part-time basis, they would be able to staff their institutions with persons of diverse interests and specialties whom they could perhaps not afford to employ on a full-time basis. In large departments these persons could supplement the traditional offerings, and in small departments which are not scheduled for substantial growth they could provide some of the necessary breadth. At senior levels, the university could select outstanding persons of proven accomplishment at salaries roughly comparable to, or less than, those now paid to lecturers and instructors. More imaginative research appointments for women might also be made along these lines.

Full provision needs to be made for opportunities for part-time faculty to shift to full-time status when the individual and the department agree that such a change would be desirable. Similarly, tenure should be available to part-time professors, just as it is to full-time professors, and the same standard should be used in determining qualifications for promotion. Anything less would create a category of second-class citizens. Committee obligations, student advising, and the other duties associated with professorial appointments would be apportioned to part-time faculty members roughly on the basis of the full-time equivalent position; thus, for example, a half-time associate professor would have half the number of student advisees that a full-time associate professor had.

Obviously men as well as women might be interested in these part-time appointments and should be eligible for them. Departments should be cautious, however, about permitting large numbers of their members to be on part-time appointments, and they should look with some skepticism upon persons who want continuing part-time appointments in order to devote more time to remunerative activities for other institutions or businesses. These difficulties should be construed not as insurmountable but merely as requiring some additional consideration before a part-time professorial appointment is made.

Maternity leave. The appointment of women in significant numbers to faculties must involve a policy concerning pregnancy and maternity leave. Most universities currently have no such policy, and many administrators, when queried, reply that none is necessary. The principal reason why none seems necessary is that women have never been on these faculties in substantial numbers. Typically, a woman faculty member either manages to have her baby in midsummer or simply loses her appointment when she takes time off to have the baby. Not all women have been as fortunate as Millicent McIntosh, who was debating whether to accept the position of headmistress of the Brearley School in New York City. Her aunt, M. Carey Thomas, the illustrious president of Bryn Mawr, is supposed to have advised her, "Take it, you can have your babies in the summer." Mrs. McIntosh accepted the advice and went on to have five children and to become president of Barnard College. In short, academic women who become pregnant must handle this part of their life as they do all other parts—they must pretend to be as much like men as possible and not permit this event to interfere with the regular performance of their duties.

No university should be exploited by women professors who keep having children and expecting the university to pay them while they are on maternity leave. A more rational policy than the present one ought to be developed, so that pregnancy, of itself, does not discriminate against a woman scholar. It would seem that guaranteeing a woman a maximum of two 16-week maternity leaves, with pay, during her academic career would not bankrupt most colleges or universities. This would in effect be a one-semester leave with pay, twice in a woman's life. Additional pregnancies would be the woman's own financial responsibility.

Tenure. In many institutions the hurdles that must be run in order to achieve tenure are considerable. It is now standard in many fields to receive a Ph.D. when one is in one's late twenties. If the new Ph.D. accepts a teaching appointment at the assistant professor level, then ordinarily within 6 or 7 years the tenure decision is made. In many universities this means that the dissertation must have been converted to a publishable manuscript, and that some other scholarly research, ideally another book, has been completed. This 6- or 7-year period coincides with a woman's childbearing years, and, if one assumes that the couple wants two children, both are ordinarily born before a woman is 35. Therefore, the greatest pressures both for scholarly publication and for domestic performance coalesce in these years between the ages of 28 and 35.

One way of handling this difficulty is to grant women assistant professors an automatic 1-year extension, before the tenure decision is made, for each pregnancy they have, up to a maximum of two, during their nontenure years. This addition of 1 or 2 years before they are subjected to the scrutiny of their colleagues for the tenure decision would give them some additional time to complete the scholarly work necessary to justify promotion. Should they prefer that the tenure decision be made earlier, this could be done.

Husbands and wives on the same faculty. Another policy that colleges and universities would do well to adopt is one that permits husband and wife to serve on the same faculty. Twenty percent of the wives of junior faculty members at one prestigious university have Ph.D.'s, yet none is a member of the faculty. At a large Midwestern university throughout the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's, one faculty wife published over two dozen articles and one book and coauthored two other books with her husband, yet was never permitted to become a member of the department, despite a research record superior to that of all but two members of the department. Obviously, having both husband and wife on the faculty can lead to some awkward circumstances, particularly if both are junior members of the same department and only one promotion can be made. The other frequently cited difficult case is that in which one spouse is a tenured member of the department and the other is up for promotion. The supporters of nepotism rules cite such cases with great alacrity, and they are absolutely right in pointing to the possibilities for hard feeling that can develop within a department. Nonetheless, the case is rarely made for the advantages of having two members of a family employed at the same institution. In this era of considerable faculty mobility and declining institutional loyalty, one way of insuring faculty support is to employ both husband and wife in positions commensurate with their ability and training. A husband and wife who both enjoy their work will be much less inclined than a single individual to heed the siren call of another university. In those fields in which collaboration is essential to research, husbands and wives are often much more effective as a team than either would be alone, hence the university is brought distinction by having both members on its faculty.

Although the problems should not be minimized and any department thinking of hiring such a husband-and-wife team should examine the situation carefully, any university rule which explicitly forbids such a practice should be abolished. Departments and senior faculty members should be strong enough to say starkly that only one spouse will be hired because only one is really wanted or needed, rather than dragging out a university regulation that officially prohibits the practice. The proportion of women Ph.D.'s who are married is increasing, and the nepotism question will become more acute.

Day care centers. A great boon to women faculty members with children would be the establishment of university day care centers. In these days of constricted university budgets this recommendation is perhaps the most expensive of all to implement, but it does deserve careful consideration. On those many campuses which now have nursery schools in connection with their School of Education programs for training nursery and primary school teachers, it would probably not be very difficult to convert these laboratory schools, which now function for the convenience of the School of Education, to all-day centers. For mothers to have a place where they can leave their children, confident that they will be well cared for, would be a tremendous help. Ideally these centers should be open to all employees and students of the university, with preference in admission given to children of

women attached to the university. Thus the women graduate students who have children would have a real chance to finish the work for their degrees despite their maternal responsibilities. Similarly, women employed by the university in food services and custodial capacities would have a much better place to leave their children than is frequently now the case.

A less ambitious aid than a day care center would be a placement service for domestic workers maintained by the university for the use of women faculty, administrators, students, and employees. Most universities have an extensive employment office in which they screen applicants for various jobs in the university. If this office would also supply names and references for persons willing to do cleaning, housekeeping, or babysitting, this would be a tremendous help to women working at the university. Astin found in her study of women receiving Ph.D.'s (*2*, p. 101) that the difficulty of finding adequate domestic help was their single greatest problem.

Curriculum changes. A recommendation less directly tied to insuring the full participation of scholarly women in the university life, but nonetheless related to it, concerns the curriculum. Departments within the university should be encouraged to review their departmental offerings to be sure that women's experience is given adequate treatment. English courses in biography, for example, might well cover women subjects as well as men. Anthropology courses might give considerable attention to male and female sex roles in various cultures. Courses in American social history could probably do better by the experience of American women in the 19th century than the usual hasty reference to the Seneca Falls convention and the suffragette movement. Much greater sophistication is needed to deal appropriately with women's historical experience; the particular psychological and cultural factors affecting women at a given time are poorly understood. In this connection the professional associations, such as the American Historical Association or the American Psychological Association, can be of genuine service by sponsoring sessions at their conventions on questions of this kind, so that historians and psychologists can become aware not only of the issues but also of what some of their colleagues are doing about them.

Continuous review. Finally, most colleges and universities would benefit from appointing a senior administrator, or establishing a committee, to keep under continuous review the status of women on their own campus. This would in effect be an individual or a group lobbying effort for the cause of women at that institution. The administrator or committee would be concerned with matters such as faculty salaries, making sure that women and men received equal compensation for equivalent services. On most campuses some change needs to be made if women are to have truly equal access to the opportunities of the institution, and change usually does not come, in a university or any other institution, simply on the basis of goodwill. Some steps need to be taken to assure that the needed alterations will take place, and these are not likely to be taken unless some person or group recognizes that the responsibility for change is theirs.

Generally a university does not create a lobby within itself in order to create change. In fact, too often administrations are forced to modify policies as a result of lobbies within the university that the administration did not foster. Unlike many other constituencies within the university community, women undergraduates (and to a lesser degree women graduate students) have not yet pushed for the cause of women on their own campus. Many women scholars on the faculty have not done so either, although such activity is now being initiated on some campuses, chiefly among the younger women faculty members and among women teaching assistants and graduate students.

The frequently drawn analogy between the status of blacks and of women in this society is perhaps least appropriate here. There is indeed much historic similarity between the two groups, particularly in regard to the way in which their respective heritages have been ignored, the patronizing manner in which both are treated, the economic discrimination both suffer, the inability of both to "pass" as members of the dominant race or sex, and, finally, the reluctance of some of the successful members of both groups to assist younger and more militant members to attain more satisfactory situations. In two critical areas, however, the analogy does not hold, and both of these are germane to the academic situation. One is the reluctance of young women, unlike young blacks, to band together to push for their own causes, and the other is the vastly more complicated relationship that women have with their so-called oppressors, males, than blacks have with whites. Unlike blacks, who can indeed develop a separatist mode of life, women as a group cannot. In the core of their lives they are deeply involved with men (whereas blacks are not inevitably tied to whites), and the nature of that bond is such that, for many women, an overt attack upon the male establishment is not possible. A major goal of the rapidly developing militant feminist groups is to increase women's sensitivity to their plight in this society. To do this many rely heavily upon informal conversations of women in small groups in which an effort is made to build a group solidarity. The hope is that these closer ties with other women will help "emancipate" women from their dependence—economic, social, and psychic—upon men.

A Rare Opportunity

So far the radical feminists have been most successful among women in their twenties and thirties, not yet among undergraduates. This laggardness in feminine militancy on the campuses gives university administrations an opportunity to act to improve the status of women on their campuses before being confronted with demands—an opportunity of a kind that is rare these days. Difficult as it is for an academic institution to gird for change when danger is not imminent, the present moment is a time when universities can assume the leadership they have so rarely exhibited in these years of confrontation politics.

References and Notes

1. Alice Rossi reported these figures and other related data to the general business meeting of the American Sociological Association on 3 September 1969. They were summarized in a mimeographed document, "Status of Women in Graduate Departments of Sociology: 1968–69," circulated by the Women's Caucus of the American Sociological Association; for excerpts, see *Science* **166**, 356 (1969).
2. H. S. Astin, *The Woman Doctorate in America: Origins, Career, and Family* (Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1969).
3. R. J. Simon, S. M. Clark, K. Galway, *Soc. Probl.* **13**, 221 (1967).
4. L. R. Harmon, "High School Ability Patterns, A Backward Look from the Doctorate," *Sci. Manpower Rep. No. 6* (Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1965); *Careers of PhD's, Academic v. Nonacademic, A Second Report on Follow-ups of Doctorate Cohorts, 1935–60* (National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1968).
5. E. Keniston and K. Keniston, *Amer. Scholar* **33**, 355 (1964).
6. M. Horner, *Psychol. Today* **3**, 36 (1969); *ibid.*, p. 62.
7. Reported in *New York Times*, 5 Mar. 1967.