

Challenging Male Hegemony:
A Case History of Women's Experiences in British and US Higher
Education, 1970-2002

Lisa Alanna McGurk

A thesis submitted
To the University of Gloucestershire
In accordance with the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities

December 2002

PARK LEARNING CENTRE
UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE
PO Box 220, The Park, Cheltenham, GL50 2QF
Tel: (01242) 532721

ABSTRACT

This thesis is located within the discipline of history, and centres around the experiences of women in US and British universities. Higher education in both the US and the UK, as throughout the world, has historically been male-led and male-controlled. This male hegemony of higher education continues to the present, as evidenced by the low percentage of women in the upper echelons of academia (for example, professors). Women in the US and the UK have been challenging this male hegemony since their admittance to higher education institutions in the nineteenth century. They faced fierce opposition in their efforts to open higher education to women. This opposition was later echoed in the resistance to twentieth-century feminists' efforts to found women's studies programmes.

The male hegemony of higher education is evident in the case histories of the experiences of women at Appalachian State University (ASU) and the University of Gloucestershire (UG) in the latter part of the twentieth century. ASU and UG, although located in different countries, have similarities which make a comparison interesting. The male hegemony of the institutions, and women's challenges to it, is especially illustrated when analysing three areas: residence hall life (living), staff issues (working), and the women's studies programmes (teaching and learning).

Women students at both institutions experienced, and successfully challenged, strict residence rules through the 1960s. National influences, such as the change in the age of majority, and pressure from the students themselves brought a loosening of these rules in the 1970s and 1980s. The conservative nature of the institutions also influenced the experience of women academic staff. Institutional management was not proactive regarding women's issues, and there is strong evidence of a 'glass ceiling' at both institutions. The male hegemony of the institutions was also illustrated in the struggle to found and maintain women's studies programmes.

I declare that the work in this thesis was carried out in accordance with the regulations of the University of Gloucestershire and is original except where indicated by specific reference in the text. No part of the thesis has been submitted as part of any other academic award. The thesis has not been presented to any other education institution in the United Kingdom or overseas.

A section of the Women’s Studies Chapter was presented at the British Association for American Studies conference in April 2000. Part of the Staff Issues Chapter was presented at a Women’s History Network conference in September 2002.

Any views expressed in the thesis are those of the author and in no way represent those of the University.

Signed _____ Date. 25.10.4/03.....

To my family, without whose support this would not have been possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisors, Melanie Ilic and Diana Woodward, for giving me excellent support and critical feedback when I needed them the most. I would like to especially thank Diana for giving me the opportunity to pursue my PhD. She went above and beyond the supervisory requirements to make sure that I was welcome and comfortable in the foreign environs in which I found myself, and she greatly contributed to the enriching experience that was my doctoral study. Both Melanie and Diana gave me the opportunity to apply what I was learning through teaching assignments, which were also greatly appreciated.

The professors at Appalachian State University also helped me in my research. I would especially like to thank Dr. Michael Wade, Dr. Ruby Lanier, and Dr. Ruth Currie. Dr. Wade agreed to be my American advisor and provided me with office space while I was conducting my interviews in Boone. I first became interested in the history of women in higher education while in a research assistantship under Dr. Lanier's direction. Dr. Currie, former archivist at ASU, not only helped me with my research but also provided me with a much needed job in Boone.

I would like to thank the women students and staff who shared their experiences with me. Their recollections and insights added much to this research. I would also like to thank the participants of the European Union funded research and training network, *Women in European Universities*. I spent from November 2000 to November 2001 in the project conducting research on the position of women academic staff within the French university system. This experience not only provided needed financial support, but also gave me the opportunity of studying the wider European context of women's experiences within universities. It helped me to realise the 'universality' of the trends that I was finding in my research.

TIMELINE

ASU	DATE	UG
BB and DD Dougherty founded Watauga Academy, which would become ASU North Carolina legislature passed Newland Bill establishing Appalachian Training School headed by BB Dougherty Appalachian became a normal (teacher-training) college Appalachian's name changed to Appalachian State Teachers College (ASTC) Dr. William H. Plemmons became President of ASTC ASTC became Appalachian State University (ASU) Dr. Herbert Wey became President and then Chancellor (name change) of ASU	1847	The Cheltenham Training Colleges started as separate departments for male and female students in rented accommodation C.H. Bromby first Principal
	1850	St. Paul's College buildings opened on property donated by Miss Jane Cook. St. Mary's students studied and lived in St. Mary's Hall, an old hospital
	1899	
	1903	
	1921	Cheltenham Colleges split into two separate entities: St. Paul's and St. Mary's, with separate Principals - Wilfred Beck, St. Paul's and Anne Monk, St. Mary's
	1929	
	1938	Miss Jones became Principal of St. Mary's
	1947	Cheltenham Colleges became formally linked with Bristol University's Institute of Education, which meant a shift from examinations to continuous assessment
	1955	
	1958	St. Mary's Hall given over to St. Paul's and St. Mary's College moved entirely to Park Campus
	1961	Miss V.N Hall became Principal of St. Mary's. St. Mary's opened own chapel and had separate chaplain
	1967	
	1969	
	1970	Dr. G.M. Owen became Principal of St. Mary's
	1974	St. Paul's and St. Mary's student unions merged

Dr. John Thomas became Chancellor of ASU	1979	St. Paul's and St. Mary's Colleges merged and became College of St. Paul's and St. Mary's (CPM) with Guy Barnes as Principal
	1986	Janet Trotter became Principal of CPM, and remains so at the time of writing
	1990	CPM merged with other higher education institutions to become Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education (CGCHE)
Dr. Francis T. Borkowski became Chancellor of ASU, and remains so at time of writing	1993	
	2001	CGCHE became the University of Gloucestershire (UG)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract
Dedication
Acknowledgements
Timeline

Introduction..... 1

Chapter One: Setting the Stage..... 31

Chapter Two: Setting the Stage II..... 52

Chapter Three: Institutional Context..... 83

Chapter Four: Living..... 110

Chapter Five: Working..... 146

Chapter Six: Teaching and Learning..... 177

Conclusion..... 213

Appendices..... 230

Selected Bibliography..... 235

INTRODUCTION

The power that men have historically exercised in patriarchal societies, as discussed by Gerda Lerner and other feminist scholars,¹ has been reflected in their control over education. The ‘classical philosophers and teachers’ such as Aristotle and Socrates whose work has been studied throughout history were men. Male hegemony in universities has been evident from their founding in European cities in the twelfth century. Universities such as the University of Paris and the Oxford colleges in the UK were founded when men students demanded education that the church and monastery schools could not provide. Although the University of Paris and other early universities came into being outside the ambit of the all-powerful (and exclusively male-dominated) Catholic Church, they were strongly influenced by the Church until the sixteenth century.²

Many influential male scholars since Aristotle have argued that women’s supposed low mental capacities made them unfit for education. As Chapter One will also discuss, men in the nineteenth century even argued that education would damage women’s reproductive capacities.³ Despite the high hurdles that men have placed in women’s paths, women have struggled for and achieved high levels of learning throughout history. As Suzanne Stiver Lie and Virginia O’Leary point out, there were women scholars in India as far back as 1500 to 600 BC, and there were women practicing medicine in ancient Egypt. In Europe, convents were areas of intellectual activity in the first millennium, and there were even a small number of women professors in Bologna (Italy, one of the first universities) in the 1200s. The first PhD to a woman was granted in Padua (Italy) in 1687.⁴

¹ For example, see Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

² For a discussion of the early history of universities, see Emile Durkheim, *The Evolution of Educational Thought*, Translated by Peter Collins (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977, first published in 1938).

³ Joan N. Burstyn, *Victorian Education and the Ideal of Womanhood* (London: Croom Helm, 1980).

⁴ Suzanne Stiver Lie and Virginia O’Leary, *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World* (London: Kogan Page, 1990), p. 19.

However, despite the achievements of individual women scholars, male dominance of higher education continued well into the twentieth century, as will be illustrated by this thesis. In the early twentieth century, Virginia Woolf, in *A Room of One's Own* (1929), described male domination of higher education at that time.⁵ Nearly three quarters of a century later, there are many similarities between the situation described by Woolf and the situation that I have found in this thesis. This would suggest the fundamentals of male hegemony persist. While women have made great strides in scholarship and the integration of women into the disciplines, there is still substantial evidence of considerable gender inequality in higher education.

A Room of One's Own was written in response to a request for a lecture on women and fiction. Woolf asserted that women must have a room of their own if they are to write fiction, and described the deficiencies of women's education which helped explain the dearth of 'successful' women writers to that point. She begins by describing the male privileges of Oxbridge, illustrated by her being cautioned for walking on a college turf on which only Fellows and Scholars (exclusively male) were permitted to walk. Women were also barred from the library unless they were accompanied by a Fellow or had a letter of introduction.

In addition, Woolf reflected on the vast amounts of wealth that went into the building of the Oxbridge colleges. At their founding during the 'age of faith', royalty and nobles had 'poured' money into the colleges, and during the later 'age of reason', merchants and manufacturers likewise 'poured' their wealth into them. She comments: 'Hence the libraries and laboratories; the observatories; the splendid equipment of costly and delicate instruments which now stands on glass shelves.'⁶

Woolf contrasted this to the foundation of the women's colleges. She illustrated their poorer provisions by comparing an opulent lunch at a men's college to a plainer

⁵ Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own/Three Guineas* (London: Penguin, 1993, first published in 1929).

⁶ *Ibid*, p. 9.

supper at a women's college, stressing the importance of good food in supporting greater intellectual activity. In a fictional conversation with a friend who worked in the college, the relative poverty of the female sex was analysed. Discussing the friend's mother, Woolf stated:

if she had gone into business; had become a manufacturer of artificial silk or a magnate on the Stock Exchange; if she had left two or three hundred thousand pounds to Fernham, [fictional women's college] we could have been sitting at our ease to-night and the subject of our talk might have been archaeology, botany, anthropology, physics, the nature of the atom, mathematics, astronomy, relativity, geography.⁷

They then discussed the reasons why women did not have access to the amount of wealth that men had, chiefly their child-bearing and child-rearing responsibilities. Even if women had earned or inherited money, until the latter part of the nineteenth-century married women had no right to their property or money under British law.

Woolf also discusses a visit to the British Museum to research the topic of women and fiction, describing the nature of the scholarship on women that she found. She found that the only scholarship on women was written by men, and much of it reflected their anger toward women. Woolf's possible explanations of this anger, such as the nature and effects of men's power over women, still resonate today. She states that these books 'had been written in the red light of emotion and not in the white light of truth.'⁸ She notes that England was under patriarchal rule, with men dominating the positions of power in society. Reflecting on this, she questioned whether anger was an inherent part of power.

She went on to reflect on another possible reason for men's anger toward women; that men were afraid that women would usurp their power. Humans need self-confidence in life, and the easiest way to gain this is by denigrating other people. Woolf notes:

Hence the enormous importance to a patriarch who has to conquer, who has to rule, of feeling that great numbers of people, half the human race indeed, are

⁷ Ibid, p. 19.

⁸ Ibid, p. 30.

by nature inferior to himself. It must indeed be one of the chief sources of his power.⁹

Also, she argued, women act as a type of magical mirror that enlarges men's reflections of themselves, which is why men like Napoleon insist on the inferiority of women 'for if they were not inferior, they [women] would cease to enlarge.'¹⁰

Woolf also notes the absence of women from historical writing, both as authors and as subjects. The traditional areas studied by historians, for example war and politics, by their nature excluded the study of women except for the occasional 'de-feminised' queen or idealised saint. Woolf states: 'It would be ambitious beyond my daring, I thought, looking about the shelves for books that were not there, to suggest to the students of those famous colleges [Newnham and Girton, affiliated with Cambridge University] that they should rewrite history.'¹¹ And here is, at least, one area of great gains for women, as they have not only rewritten history but have influenced other disciplines and have pioneered the emergence of new sub-disciplines, as will be discussed in Chapter Six.

This research uses case studies of two universities (one in the US and one in the UK) to examine how far the situation of women in higher education has changed in the seven decades since Woolf wrote her treatise. Women have made great strides in scholarship (in the form of research publications), especially in the last thirty years. However, there is still substantial evidence of male hegemony in higher education. If Woolf could 'time travel' to the beginning of the twenty-first century, she would find that trawls through libraries now reveal extensive scholarship by women about women, and even about men.¹² She would also find, however, that men are still the gatekeepers of knowledge, and that they yet hold the majority of positions of power within universities (and control the purse strings).

⁹ Ibid, p. 32.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid, p.40.

¹² Woolf notes that women at that time had not written books on men, *A Room of One's Own*, p. 25.

Women have been challenging this male hegemony from the time they first entered higher education in the nineteenth century, but especially since the 1970s (see Chapter One). Feminists have provided alternative models of scholarship, of teaching, and even of university structures, most notably in the Feminist University founded in 1985 in Norway. According to Berit As, instrumental in the founding of the Feminist University: 'Predicated on the assumption that there now exists a new feminist knowledge-base that is of critical importance in solving the complex political and ecological problems of the planet, the Norwegian Feminist University's intellectual orientation is grounded in the rationality of care.'¹³ The Feminist University is guided by a women-only board of directors, and in its curriculum it rejects the prejudices of male philosophers such as Aristotle, which had become institutionalised within the educational system and society as a whole over the years. Interestingly, during its ten years of planning, the possibility of the government withdrawing funding support was provisioned for 'by combining the acquisition of knowledge with the production of goods, such as arts and crafts.'¹⁴ In other words, the founders' past experience with male hegemony of government and funding bodies influenced their decisions on how they were going to fund the University.

The male hegemony of education and women's struggles against it (see next chapter), is also evident when studying the experiences of women at Appalachian State University (ASU) in Boone, North Carolina, USA, and what is now the University of Gloucestershire (UG) in Cheltenham and Gloucester, UK, from 1970 through today. This research has centred around the extent to which women within these institutions challenged the male hegemony evident in the two institutions. The selection of the institutions proved to be fortuitous because of strong historical and cultural similarities between them. For example, both began as teacher-training institutions in the nineteenth century and were located in conservative communities (see Chapter Two). A comparison of these two

¹³ Berit As, 'A Feminist University in Norway,' in Lie and O'Leary, *Storming the Tower*, p. 224.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 225.

institutions reveals important trends and developments in women's higher education. It is especially important to look at the 1970s through the 1990s because these decades have historically been seen as periods of apparent gains for women in higher education and in the wider society. This thesis fills an existing gap in the literature of women in higher education by exploring the nature and extent of these changes for women in both the US and the UK. The concluding chapter will discuss more fully how this research adds to the existing scholarship of women in higher education.

I chose to concentrate on women in higher education because, like many other feminists, I believe in the importance of education in having the ability to either oppress or empower people. Throughout history, those in power have withheld education from those who they wished to keep 'in their place' (for example, slaves in the US South). If women are to improve their position in society, it is crucial that they analyse and improve females' educational experiences. As long as women continue to experience inequality in education, they will not achieve full equality in society.

Some may refer to the increase in female undergraduate numbers to a point where women currently comprise over half of the undergraduate student body as evidence that women have achieved equality in higher education. However, a closer look at the situation reveals that women are underrepresented in graduate education (which provides the seed-bed for the next generation of academics) and in certain disciplines such as engineering. In addition, there is evidence of a 'glass ceiling' for women in higher education employment.¹⁵ As illustrated in Table One in Appendix II, men held the majority of academic staff positions in higher education throughout the world into the 1990s. The highest percentage of women full professors in the late 1980s/early 1990s of the eight countries listed in the table is 14% (USA), and the lowest is 0% (Botswana). Even when considering the percentage of women academic staff (including all categories), the country

¹⁵ These are international problems, see: Suzanne Stiver Lie, Lynda Malik, and Duncan Harris (eds.) *The Gender Gap in Higher Education* (London: Kogan Page, 1994).

with the highest percentage is still far from reaching gender parity (USA with 26%).¹⁶

Like most feminist historians, I am concerned over the lack of significant progress in these figures. Hence, one of the 'driving forces' behind this thesis was the need to explore the connections between the apparently reassuring picture of the advances of women in higher education since the 1970s, and the less comforting reality behind the above statistics.

Definitions

Firstly, however, it is important to outline and explain some of the main definitions used in this thesis, and to look at how they apply in the specific context of this thesis. Feminist theory has played a central role in my research. The term 'feminism' has many interpretations and is often a very personal term. I will, therefore, briefly outline my interpretation of feminism, and how I 'became' a feminist. It is my conviction that the common denominator of feminism is the acknowledgement of women's unequal status and the attempt to do something about it. In this capacity, feminism is an inclusive term, which not only affects academic theory and teaching but also personal issues such as relationships. As Stevi Jackson and Jackie Jones assert, theory for feminists 'is not an abstract intellectual activity divorced from women's lives, but seeks to explain the conditions under which those lives are lived.'¹⁷ My 'discovery' of feminism occurred during my undergraduate career at the University of Georgia, where I earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in history. I noticed that I had an affinity for women's history, and even for my non-women's history courses I would concentrate my research papers around women's concerns.

This interest continued in my postgraduate career, where I first read books on feminist theory during the research for my master's thesis. For the first time I read about

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 226.

¹⁷ Stevi Jackson and Jackie Jones, 'Thinking for Ourselves: An Introduction to Feminist Theorising,' in Stevi Jackson and Jackie Jones (eds.) *Contemporary Feminist Theories* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), p. 1.

some of the debates in feminist theory, such as the debate over whether women were active or passive agents in history.¹⁸ I continued and expanded my feminist theory readings for my doctoral research, and much of these readings solidified many of the ideas and beliefs that I had long held on the position of women in society. Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* and Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* were especially influential works in this respect. De Beauvoir's discussion of women as 'other' opened my eyes to the wider societal forces affecting gender inequality.¹⁹ And as this thesis will purport, Woolf's discussion of the reasons behind gender inequality in higher education still resonates today.²⁰

The term feminism encompasses within it many different theories and understandings. As Valerie Bryson points out, 'feminists are profoundly and at times bitterly divided, not only over political priorities and methods, but also over goals.'²¹ By the 1980s, scholars identified three major 'strands' of feminism: liberal, socialist/Marxist, and radical. Other categories have since been added, including black, post-modern, lesbian, cultural, global, disability, and new feminism. It is important to keep in mind that feminism is not static, and feminists' positions evolve making it difficult to 'pin them down' to one position.²² Many feminists point to the dangers of categorisation, however it is a useful, if not necessary, analytical tool. I will further discuss liberal, socialist, radical, and post-modern feminisms; and I will analyse how they have influenced my research.

Liberal feminists stress equal rights and equal opportunities, and the importance of changes in governmental policy and law to try to achieve these. According to Judith Evans, liberal feminists 'claim... "adequate similarity", that is [there are] no differences

¹⁸ See, for example: Gerda Lerner, 'Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges,' *Feminist Studies* III (Fall 1975): pp. 5-14.

¹⁹ Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, translated and edited by H.M. Parshley (London: Vintage, 1997, first printed 1949 by Gallimard).

²⁰ Woolf, *A Room of One's Own*.

²¹ Valerie Bryson, *Feminist Debates: Issues of Theory and Practice* (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1999), p.5.

²² Jackson and Jones, 'Thinking for Ourselves', p. 2.

[between men and women] that could justify discrimination on the grounds of sex.’²³ Some feminists criticise liberal feminism because it ‘works within the system’, which means that it does not criticise or attempt to change dominant male values. As Bryson states, ‘critics argue, the whole tradition of liberal individualism is fundamentally flawed because it artificially abstracts people from both their physical bodies and their social relationships and treats them as autonomous, selfish and self-sufficient.’²⁴ Despite these flaws, I believe that liberal feminism has improved the position of women, and has the potential to continue to improve women’s position into the future. It has greatly impacted my research, partly because it has been the form of feminism that has had the largest influence on the institutions under study (see Chapter Three).

Socialist feminist scholarship has also influenced my research. In contrast to liberal feminists, socialists ‘tend to see collective class interests rather than individual rights as the primary focus of political concern.’²⁵ Critics have argued that this has meant that gender concerns have been subsumed under those of class. As Stevi Jackson points out, ‘Marxism was developed to explain capitalist class relations – the exploitation of the proletariat – and required considerable modification to accommodate gender relations.’²⁶ The works of the ‘socialist feminist’ Sheila Rowbotham have been very useful in contextualising the experiences of women higher education students both in the US and in Britain. I agree with her and other socialist feminists that class issues need to be analysed alongside gender issues. While socialist feminism has had an influence on my analysis of the data, it did not have a strong influence on the institutions under study, in part because of their inherent conservatism (see Chapter Three).

²³ Judith Evans, *Feminist Theory Today: An Introduction to Second-Wave Feminism* (London: SAGE, 1995), p. 13.

²⁴ Bryson, *Feminist Debates*, p. 12.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 16.

²⁶ Stevi Jackson, ‘Feminist Social Theory,’ in Jackson and Jones (eds.) *Contemporary Feminist Theories*, p. 12.

The third category of feminism that I will discuss is radical feminism. Radical feminists analyse 'the ways in which women's subordination extends beyond a lack of legal, political and economic rights and is rooted in family life and personal relationships.'²⁷ Critics argue that there is a danger in radical feminist thought that its emphasis on women's bad experiences with men mean that women end up being seen as helpless victims of male oppression. Radical feminism has had less of an influence on my research because, as with socialist feminism, it has not had as great an influence on the institutions under study (although feminists' radical vision to transform higher education has had a greater influence in the national and international contexts). However, radical feminist scholars' works influenced my research by reiterating the importance of contextualisation. For example, this is reflected in the analysis of how the inequalities that the women students experienced outside the institutions affected their experiences within them.

This is also true regarding the influence of post-modern feminism. According to Linda Nicholson, 'Postmodernists describe modern ideals of science, justice and art, *as* merely modern ideals carrying with them specific political agendas and ultimately unable to legitimize themselves as universals.'²⁸ Post-modernists see power not as centralised and controlled by one entity, but instead as fragmented and diffuse. Ann Brooks uses the term 'postfeminisms' to describe the intersection between feminism, post-modernism, post-colonialism, and post-structuralism. Brooks states: 'Postfeminism... is about the conceptual shift within feminism from debates around equality to a focus on debates around difference.'²⁹ Feminist critics of post-modernism assert that it uses inaccessible (to the 'lay' person) theory and language. Critics also charge that 'postmodernism could be seen to threaten the intellectual project of feminism since it undermines the attempt to

²⁷ Bryson, *Feminist Debates*, p. 25.

²⁸ Linda J. Nicholson, 'Introduction', in Linda J. Nicholson, (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism* (New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 4.

²⁹ Ann Brooks, *Postfeminisms: Feminism, Cultural Theory and Cultural Forms* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 4.

understand structural inequalities: instead, the world is seen as fluid and constantly shifting so that persistent inequalities of gender, class or “race” are erased.’³⁰ I do not dismiss post-modernist feminist theory out of hand, but as mentioned earlier I found the previous categories more conducive to the analysis of the institutions under study. Needless to say those categories will need to change to some extent through redefinition, but redefinition is not the immediate objective of this thesis, although its influence might underpin this thesis. For instance, the post-modernist feminist scholars that I have read, such as Denise Riley, have clearly impacted my conceptual horizon by stressing the importance of de-constructing the category ‘woman’. Previously the concept and category of ‘woman’ has been defined from within the male hegemonic discourse which for all the obvious reasons is unsatisfactory.

Male hegemony is another important concept that runs throughout this thesis. Before discussing this, I will define and discuss the term hegemony in general. Raymond Williams defines hegemony as a form of predominant consciousness which depends ‘for its hold not only on its expression of the interests of a ruling class but also on its acceptance as “normal reality” or “commonsense” by those in practice subordinated to it.’³¹ The traditional definition meant political dominance, but Marxists extended the concept to that of relations between social classes, thereby extending it past political issues. Hegemony ‘is a whole body of practices and expectations, over the whole of living: our senses and assignments of energy, our shaping perceptions of ourselves and our world.’³² The normative aspect of hegemony makes it very difficult for individuals to struggle against, let alone change.

Williams points out two dangers with the concept of hegemony. First, there is the danger that it may be seen as more static, uniform and abstract than it is in reality. Second,

³⁰ Jackson and Jones, ‘Thinking for Ourselves’, p. 9.

³¹ Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (London: Fontana, 1976), p. 145.

³² Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p.110.

its complex internal structures should not be simplified or over-generalised. Williams recommends that, in order to lessen these dangers, 'we develop modes of analysis which instead of reducing works to finished products, and activities to fixed positions, are capable of discerning, in good faith, the finite but significant openness of many actual initiatives and contributions.'³³ Because, as he states: 'The reality of any hegemony... is that, while by definition it is always dominant, it is never either total or exclusive.'³⁴ The hegemonic process is in other words affected by alternative views, therefore it is important to keep in mind its transformations.

Feminists have analysed male hegemony in the broader societal context as well as in educational institutions. As Stevi Jackson asserts: 'Feminist social theory has been concerned with understanding fundamental inequalities between women and men and with analyses of male power over women.'³⁵ Madeline Arnot describes male hegemony in education as: 'Women have become colonized within a male-defined world, through a wide variety of "educational moments" that seen separately may appear inconsequential, but which together comprise a pattern of female experience that is qualitatively different from that of man.'³⁶ This indicates that male hegemony is based on an ideology of gender difference and it has influenced the development of female education throughout history.

In a comparison between the two case studies, ASU's male hegemony is the more obvious one, as it has never had a woman President or woman Chancellor. Nevertheless, this thesis will show how UG, even while having a woman as head of the institution, is not a 'feminist-friendly', or even a particularly 'woman-friendly' institution. According to Cynthia Cockburn, women who reach positions of authority in organisations 'often disappoint their sisters below them' because they often incorporate masculine methods of

³³ Ibid, p. 114.

³⁴ Ibid, p. 113.

³⁵ Jackson, 'Feminist Social Theory', p. 12.

³⁶ Madeline Arnot, 'Male Hegemony, Social Class, and Women's Education', *Journal of Education* 164 (1982); reprinted in Lynda Stone, *The Education Feminism Reader* (New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 84.

management.³⁷ It is as if, in order to succeed, women are pressured to conform to male models. I follow the line of argument which believes that this male hegemony and control is mainly due to the historic nature of higher education and the wielding of internal institutional political power, and is not necessarily consciously instigated by institutional managers. Although the model belongs to and is maintained by the male hegemonic social discourse, constituting the norm where managerial practices are concerned, the one putting the norm into practice need not necessarily be male.

I chose to use the term male hegemony instead of patriarchy because I believe that patriarchy is too general a term to describe the specific phenomena which I found within the institutions. Patriarchy is a term used to describe male domination of society. As Eva Figes wrote at the beginning of the 1970s: 'We are born into a world where the great discoverers, philosophers, artists and scientists have almost all been male.'³⁸ Patriarchy has been much debated by feminists, some feeling that it is an ahistorical concept describing past societies based on the 'rule of fathers' but not applicable to modern society. Stevi Jackson points out that 'Among those who have used the term patriarchy... there is no consensus on how to define or theorise it.'³⁹ Ann Brooks asserts that before the influence of post-modernism, the universalistic assumptions of the concept of patriarchy were not questioned or analysed.⁴⁰ In addition, patriarchy (as with the male hegemonic discourse) has built its rhetoric as an opposition to change, stressing the institutionalisation and normalisation of its categories.

This leads me to conservatism, which is another important concept in this thesis. For the purposes of this thesis, the use of the term 'conservative' does not refer to a political party or ideology, but rather to the concept of opposition to change. Feminists have analysed the influence of conservatism on society. For example, Audre Lorde wrote

³⁷ Cynthia Cockburn, *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organisations* (London: Macmillan, 1991), p. 69.

³⁸ Eva Figes, *Patriarchal Attitudes: Women in Society* (London: Granada, 1972), p. 17.

³⁹ Jackson, 'Feminist Social Theory', p. 14.

⁴⁰ Brooks, *Postfeminisms*.

about the effects of conservatism in the US: 'Today, with the defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment, the tightening economy, and increased conservatism, it is easier once again for white women to believe the dangerous fantasy that if you are good enough, pretty enough, quiet enough, teach the children to behave, hate the right people, and marry the right men, then you will be allowed to co-exist with patriarchy in relative peace.'⁴¹

I characterise conservative environments as being very resistant to change. For example, Chapter Three will discuss the strong resistance a gay organisation was met with in its attempt to be recognised by ASU in the 1970s. This tendency toward 'homogeneity' means that conservative environments are often characterised as being 'safe' to the middle-class whites attracted to them. Another descriptor that I see as characterising conservative environments is 'cocoon-like'. Again, the 'sameness' of the environment can give the illusion that those within it are 'protected' from the outside world. ASU alumni characterised its environment as both safe and 'cocoon-like'.

In addition to definitions of the key terms of this thesis, a note on the terminology that I chose needs to be made. For the sake of simplicity, I will use the names Appalachian State University (ASU) and the University of Gloucestershire (UG) for the institutions under study. As illustrated in the timeline, both institutions have undergone several name changes throughout their histories. The term ASU was chosen for brevity in spite of those initials usually being better known as standing for Arizona State University. I chose to use ASU instead of Appalachian because of possible confusion with the mountain range of the same name.

British spelling and terminology will be used throughout this thesis, with some exceptions. The primary and secondary sources from the US use American terminology, so some explanation of these terms is needed. The term 'faculty' in the US is used to describe academic staff. 'Administration' refers to the management of institutions. There

⁴¹ Audre Lorde, 'Age, Race, Class, and Sex: Women Redefining Difference,' in Mary Evans (ed.) *The Woman Question* (London: Sage Publications, 1994), pp. 38-39.

are also differences in spelling, for example: center instead of centre, analyze instead of analyse. The British equivalent will be indicated in brackets next to the US term in direct quotes, where appropriate.

Approach to Study

As has already been indicated, women in the US and UK shared the experience of inequality in higher education with women throughout the world. I began my research wanting to explore this by concentrating on three basic research questions. The first question centred on the experiences of women students at ASU and UG since 1970, and the evidence of feminism's influence on these institutions. I chose to concentrate on this period because it seems to have been one of great changes for women students. The second question explored the similarities and differences between the experiences of women in these institutions, which spanned two continents. The third question asked how the women's movement affected the students' experiences; and how far they created their own kind of feminism. As is to be expected, these questions underwent modification as the research progressed.

At first, I concentrated on three main areas: residence hall life and extra-curricular activities, particularly the issue of students' rebellion against strict rules imposed by the administrations and how this rebellion contributed to the development of the women's movement at the institutions (for example, protest against residence hall rules); staff/student interaction, particularly whether greater democratisation occurred during this time period and whether earlier social barriers between staff and students were eroded (for example, student membership on committees); curriculum changes, particularly any impact of feminism on the curriculum and how these developments affected female students (for example, in the emergence of women's studies courses). These topics were chosen as areas of interest because of their potential to illustrate the male hegemony of the institutions, and the possible struggles of women against it, or simply for women to define

themselves within it. They are also important topics in considering the position of women within higher education.

As with the research questions, the topics selected for analysis evolved as the study progressed. First, 'feminism and conservatism' was added after early research revealed that these were important influences on women within the two institutions. Second, the topic 'staff/student interaction' was changed to 'staff issues', in a change of emphasis which emerged as the importance of the position of women staff on the experiences of students became apparent. For example, to have few women professors means few role models are available for women students who might want to pursue academic careers. Also, women staff and students are often influenced by the same phenomena, such as inadequate child care provision (see Chapter Five). The four topics: 'feminism and conservatism', 'residence hall life', 'staff issues', and 'women's studies' became the four core chapters of this thesis (see below).

My individual approach to my research, as I later came to understand, differed from the usual approach of historical research. The standard approach is to read around the subject, formulate a research objective, and then collect data. Instead, I began with a relatively open mind and 'dove head first' into the data, letting the story emerge from the data. This did create difficulties for me. For example, it meant several revisions of my chapters to make sure that I had provided sufficient context for the issues under review. However, it has had the important advantage (as I see it) of letting the story emerge from the data.

Triangulation, or the use of different sources and methods for validation purposes, was used in the collection of data, including the analysis of written primary sources and the use of semi-structured interviews to 'flesh out' the records. Triangulation has the advantage that the use of more than one method means that the study is less vulnerable to

the errors that are linked to one particular method.⁴² My main source of data was archival searches, supplemented by interviews with staff and past students. This was invaluable as it helped me understand issues ‘in the round’, rather than relying on the partial picture afforded by reliance on a single source of information.

I knew from my master’s thesis on female ASU students that there were very relevant materials in ASU’s archives.⁴³ The collection of past student newspapers were an especially rich source of material. The editorials were important in charting student opinion through the years under study. There were also rich sources at the UG archives. Especially helpful in charting student request for change and managerial reaction to these requests were the minutes from the Staff/Student Committee meetings in the 1970s. The ASU archives are more extensive and they have more detailed finding aids that made it easier to locate relevant material. While the UG archives do not have comparable finding aids, their smaller size meant that not too much time had to be expended on searching for relevant material (although I was almost side-tracked by interesting material from the early history of the institution).

One of the drawbacks of using archival materials is that they do not always contain accounts of staff and students’ feelings. Much of the material in both ASU’s and UG’s archives was in the form of official reports or memos, which meant that they were written for an ‘official’ audience and hence excluded any indication of concerned parties’ feelings or any treatment of ‘radical’ issues. This is why interviews were needed to identify the issues that were left out of the official accounts. I decided to conduct semi-structured interviews with ASU and UG staff and alumni. I had conducted interviews with ASU staff for my master’s thesis, which had elicited rich material for analysis, giving me confidence in the wisdom of doing so again.

⁴² For example, see Michael Quinn Patton, *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1990).

⁴³ Lisa McGurk, *Transition and Inequality: Female Students at Appalachian State University, 1939-1989* (M.A. Thesis), Boone: ASU, 1998.

I placed requests for potential interviewees in the alumni magazines of both institutions, which meant that those who were eventually interviewed were self-selected. I did not feel the need to attempt to collect a representative sample because the interviews were to be used as supplements to the archive material, and not as primary data sources. I also interviewed female staff members identified by former students and primary sources, especially those who were involved with feminist issues, and those who played important roles in improving the position of women on the campuses. The interviews allowed me to fulfil my objectives more fully by filling in gaps in the primary material, and they allowed me to explore more fully my selected comparative themes. I conducted approximately ten interviews with ASU staff, five interviews with UG staff, ten interviews with ASU alumni, and six interviews with UG alumni. Interviews consisted of both face-to-face interviews and email interviews. The average length of the face-to-face interviews was approximately one hour, and they took place either on the ASU or UG campuses. As will be discussed below, I asked open-ended questions and treated the interviews as conversations. Sample questions are included in Appendix III.

Methodology

Chapter One will more fully discuss the history of feminism's influence on British and US higher education. Feminist methodology arose from the research of the 1960s and 1970s that questioned and analysed the practices of the 'traditional' academic disciplines. As Dale Spender asserts: 'By asking questions in terms of *women* (and not in terms of a particular framework such as psychology or history, for example) feminists moved beyond some of the limitations which are imposed by "compartmentalisation"; they reconceptualised the existence of women and began to encode knowledge in a radically

new way'.⁴⁴ Feminist methodology in history and the social sciences moved from the debate over research methods to 'exploring a whole range of wider issues concerned with practical, political and ethical matters in undertaking research'.⁴⁵

Feminists have particularly critiqued the precepts of positivism in research theory, the notion that there are universal 'facts' or 'truths' that can be uncovered through the collection of evidence. An important debate regarding methodology is the relative merits of objectivity versus subjectivity. According to Spender, objectivity has been critiqued by women on two levels: men's appropriation of objectivity; and the validity of objectivity. Feminists who objected to men's alleged appropriation of objectivity did not question the polarisation of the two categories, but instead defended the importance of the personal. Feminists also critiqued the validity of objectivity. Spender believes that 'while objectivity persisted as a valid category... it worked to constrain feminist intellectual development for feminists tried to construct new knowledge about women in the old mould and there was considerable contradiction, and strain.'⁴⁶

They challenged the objectivity of objectivity; it was acknowledged that the legitimacy of research was associated with gender rather than with the merits of the explanation itself. When this was acknowledged, it was recognised that subjectivity 'plays a crucial role in the construction of knowledge.'⁴⁷ Liz Stanley and Sue Wise argue that the 'insistence of the crucial importance of the personal must also include an insistence on the importance, and also the presence, of the personal *within research experiences* as much as within any other experiences.'⁴⁸ Feminists must make sure that the presence of

⁴⁴ Dale Spender, (ed.) *Men's Studies Modified: The Impact of Feminism on the Academic Disciplines* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981), p. 2.

⁴⁵ Mary Maynard and June Purvis, 'Doing Feminist Research,' in Mary Maynard and June Purvis, (eds.), *Researching Women's Lives From a Feminist Perspective* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1994), p. 1.

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 5.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Liz Stanley and Sue Wise, *Breaking Out: Feminist Consciousness and Feminist Research*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983), p. 158.

the personal is not taken out of the presentations of their research, as it is in most other research.

Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook identified four themes as running through feminist methodology: 'reflexivity; an action orientation; attention to the affective components of the research; and use of the situation-at-hand.'⁴⁹ Reflexivity is the reflection on, and critical examination of, the research process. Consciousness-raising (a process of self-awareness) is one way that feminists use reflexivity, by analysing how research affects both the researcher and the researched. Another way that feminists use reflexivity is in their emphasis on collaborative research, which they believe has the possibility of improving intellectual analysis ('two heads are better than one'). Lastly, feminists use reflexivity in their examination of research stages which have previously been ignored, exposing their 'workings' in such areas as research funding and the necessarily selective presentation of research results.

The second theme running through feminist methodology is 'action orientation.' Feminists emphasise action as a desired outcome of their research, which 'is reflected in the statement of purpose, topic selection, theoretical orientation, choice of method, view of human nature, and definitions of the researcher's roles.'⁵⁰ Feminist researchers' aim is often political action, including the intent to change public policy. Some believe that in order to adhere to feminist methodology, one must be an active member in the struggle for women's liberation.

Feminists also emphasise 'attention to the affective components of the research act' in their research methodology. They pay attention especially to the emotional dimension of their research methods and methodology: 'this aspect of epistemology involves not only acknowledgement of the affective dimension of research, but also recognition that

⁴⁹ Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook, 'Back to the Future: A Look at the Second Wave of Feminist Epistemology and Methodology,' in Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook, (eds.), *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), p. 2.

⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 5.

emotions serve as a source of insight or a signal of rupture in social reality.’⁵¹

Interviews allow the researcher to gain insights about the feelings and emotions of the researched. As Liz Stanley and Sue Wise assert, ‘all research involves, as its basis, an interaction, a relationship, between researcher and researched.’⁵²

The fourth theme that Fonow and Cook find in feminist methodology is ‘use of the situation at hand.’ Feminists creatively use existing situations in their research, such as the ‘often taken for granted’ activities of everyday life. The use of existing situations can be a way to get around limited access to research material. For example, Fonow ‘found it necessary to arrange interviews with female Steelworkers’ Union convention delegates in the women’s restrooms when union officials barred her access to the convention floor.’⁵³

Feminists discuss and debate the benefits and drawbacks of various research methods. One of the important debates regarding feminist methodology is the debate around the relative merits of quantitative (for example statistical survey) versus qualitative (for example semi-structured interviewing) methods. Some argue that quantitative research silences women’s voices whereas qualitative research allows ‘women’s understandings, emotions, and actions’ to be understood in their own terms.⁵⁴ Others warn against the danger in qualitative research of few safeguards against alleged researcher bias; and that the rejection of traditional research methods carries scholarly costs. There is a range of feminist views on the relative value of the different data gathering methods. While many accept the utility of qualitative methods, there is a wider range of views on quantitative methods, from wholesale rejection to advocating a mix of both methods.⁵⁵

Toby Epstein Jayaratne and Abigail J. Stewart have argued that ‘much of the feminist debate about qualitative and quantitative research has been sterile and based on a

⁵¹ Ibid, p. 9.

⁵² Stanley and Wise, *Breaking Out*, p. 162.

⁵³ Fonow and Cook, ‘Back to the Future,’ p. 12.

⁵⁴ Toby Epstein Jayaratne and Abigail J. Stewart, ‘Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in the Social Sciences: Current Feminist Issues and Practical Strategies,’ in Fonow and Cook, *Beyond Methodology*, p. 85.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

false polarization.’⁵⁶ They believe that quantitative methods can be used as valuable tools in feminist research; and give several recommendations for conducting feminist research, one of which is to combine qualitative and quantitative methods. Other writers of the essays in *Researching Women’s Lives from a Feminist Perspective* agree that multiple research methods should be used to improve research. The editors state that the ‘challenge to feminists now lies less in the critique of a simplistic qualitative/quantitative polarization and more in how it might be possible to make all methods “feminist user-friendly”.’⁵⁷

One of the debates about feminist research methods is the debate over the merits of ethnography. According to Liz Stanley and Sue Wise: ‘Ethnography, living in a natural setting of some kind as a means of deriving data, seems quite different from the quantified, frequently statistical, approach usually associated with positivism.’⁵⁸ As such, it seems thoroughly appropriate for feminist research. However, the researcher hardly appears in the writing up of traditional ethnographic results; there is instead often only ‘objective’ description. Stanley and Wise assert that although the researcher is an integral part of the research process in ethnography, this is rarely reflected in the presentation of the results.

More specifically, feminism has affected historical research methodology.⁵⁹ Feminist historians have analysed, and attempted to rectify, the absence of women from historical accounts. Post-structural theory has influenced a shift in the emphasis in historical research to an analysis of language and ‘textuality’. Kathleen Canning states: ‘Together, if not always hand-in-hand, feminist and poststructuralist critiques of historical “master-narratives” interrogated, disassembled, and recast historical paradigms in light of new histories of women and gender and of race, ethnicity, and sexuality.’⁶⁰ As mentioned

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Maynard and Purvis, ‘Doing Feminist Research,’ p. 3-4.

⁵⁸ Stanley and Wise, *Breaking Out*, p. 159.

⁵⁹ For an overview of feminism’s impact on History, see: Jane Lewis, ‘Women, Lost and Found: The Impact of Feminism on History,’ in Spender, *Men’s Studies Modified*, pp. 55-72.

⁶⁰ Kathleen Canning, ‘Feminist History After the Linguistic Turn: Historicizing Discourse and Experience,’ in Sharlene Hesse-Biber, et al (eds.) *Feminist Approaches to Theory and Methodology: An Interdisciplinary Reader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 46.

earlier, post-structural feminist theory has especially influenced the analysis of the historical construction of the category 'woman'. Denise Riley asserts that "'women" is historically, discursively constructed, and always in relation to other categories which themselves change; "women" is a volatile collectivity in which female persons can be very differently positioned, so that the apparent continuity of the subject of "women" is not to be relied on.'

⁶¹

As stated above, this thesis is centred around comparative case histories. The case study, according to Robert E. Stake, 'is not a methodological choice, but a choice of object to be studied.'

⁶² I believe that the study of the two particular cases of ASU and UG can illustrate wider societal issues. However, I have kept in mind Stake's warning against over-generalisation: 'Damage occurs when the commitment to generalize or create theory runs so strong that the researcher's attention is drawn away from features important for understanding the case itself.'⁶³

Feminists have used women-centred case studies to redress the previous paucity of research on women. Shulamit Reinharz gives three major purposes for feminist case studies: 'to analyze the change in a phenomenon over time, to analyze the significance of a phenomenon for future events, and to analyze the relation among parts of a phenomenon.'

⁶⁴ Feminists' interest in case studies arises in part from their desire to document women's issues for future analysis. Reinharz asserts: 'Case studies of particular initiatives on behalf of women can illuminate why certain strategies succeed and others fail.'⁶⁵

⁶¹ Denise Riley, *'Am I That Name': Feminism and the Category of 'Women' in History*, (Houndmills: MacMillan Press, 1988), pp. 1-2.

⁶² Robert E. Stake, 'Case Studies,' in Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 1998), p. 86.

⁶³ Ibid, p. 91.

⁶⁴ Shulamit Reinharz, *Feminist Methods in Social Research* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 164.

⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 173.

Amitai Etzioni and Fredric L. Dubow define comparative analysis as that which ‘focus[es] attention on *similarities* and *differences* of at least two entities.’⁶⁶ I used a comparative method because I believe that by doing so, I could better understand the situation of women both within the institutions and within wider society. Etzioni and Dubow point out that comparative studies have the potential to illuminate different approaches to the same problem.⁶⁷ For example, a comparison of ASU’s and UG’s women’s studies programmes reveals the creative ways in which women’s studies staff have dealt with low levels of support for their programmes (see Chapter Six).

The comparative method also allowed me to ‘tease out’ cross-cultural differences (although there are many similarities between American and British cultures). As Reinharz asserts: ‘Feminist cross-cultural research explores how women’s lives in seemingly disparate societies actually have much in common.’⁶⁸ I also understood and tried to avoid some of the dangers of comparison, because as Stake warns: ‘Comparison is a powerful conceptual mechanism, fixing attention upon the few attributes being compared and obscuring other knowledge about the case.’⁶⁹ The nature of the comparative method means that descriptions of one case are not as ‘deeply’ analysed as they would be if it was the only one being looked at. I avoided the danger of glossing over uniqueness by also describing *differences*.

There are many sources and guides to conducting both archival and interview research. In the case of interviewing, there are guides on how to conduct feminist research by using oral history. I found Michael R. Hill’s *Archival Strategies and Techniques* (1993) especially helpful in planning and conducting my archival research. Hill points out the need to consider ‘the broad sedimentary processes via which materials come to rest on

⁶⁶ Amitai Etzioni and Frederic L. Dubow, ‘Introduction’, in Etzioni and Dubow, (eds.) *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970), p. 8.

⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 2.

⁶⁸ Reinharz, *Feminist Methods*, p. 112.

⁶⁹ Stake, ‘Case Studies’, p. 97.

archive shelves.’⁷⁰ He describes three main processes by which materials gather in archives: primary sedimentation, secondary sedimentation, and tertiary sedimentation. Primary sedimentation refers to the process by which people and organisations create, discard, and save materials of potential interest to archives. Secondary sedimentation refers to the process of evaluating and preserving papers that people leave behind when they die (for example, a famous writer’s partner sorting through her papers may throw away material which threatens to undermine the image which they wish to have preserved). Tertiary sedimentation refers to the sorting of materials once they arrive at the archive. The implications of this for my research were that I needed to keep in mind that the material in the college archives was chosen and processed by both the ‘depositors’ and archivists, which meant that there were inevitably gaps. This was an important reason for conducting interviews, to fill these gaps, and to elicit different perspectives on events described in the written records. Anderson et al. discuss the importance of interviewing as a research method: ‘When women speak for themselves, they reveal hidden realities: new experiences and new perspectives emerge that challenge the “truths” of official accounts and cast doubt upon established theories.’⁷¹ An extensive search through feminist scholarship revealed a dearth of guides on conducting feminist archival research.

As previously mentioned, this was not the case regarding feminist interviewing techniques. Ann Oakley, in her 1981 essay, ‘Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms,’ discusses the implications for feminist research of using interviews as a research method. She argues that the interviewing techniques in use at that time were based on a masculine model which did not work, especially in regard to feminists interviewing women. Methodology textbooks at that time described interviews as one-way processes whereby an ‘expert’ interviewer extracted information from a comparatively ‘ignorant’

⁷⁰ Michael R. Hill, *Archival Strategies and Techniques* (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993), pp. 8-9.

⁷¹ Kathryn Anderson et al, ‘Beginning Where We Are: Feminist Methodology in Oral History,’ in Joyce McCarl Nielsen, *Feminist Research Methods: Exemplary Reading in the Social Sciences* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1990), p. 95.

interviewee. Oakley protested this view of the interviewee as an 'object' of study.

Instead, she promoted a more equal relationship between interviewer and interviewee, with an element of reciprocity in exchanging information.⁷²

Oakley stated that when feminists interview women:

[the] use of prescribed interviewing practice is morally indefensible; general and irreconcilable contradictions at the heart of the textbook paradigm are exposed; and it becomes clear that, in most cases, the goal of finding out about people through interviewing is best achieved when the relationship of interviewer and interviewee is non-hierarchical and when the interviewer is prepared to invest his or her own personal identity in the relationship.⁷³

The implication of this for my research was that I strived to create a non-hierarchical atmosphere in my interviews. I answered interviewees' questions about my research and my feelings, and I treated the interviews as conversations rather than just 'data collection sessions'. I did this by including some general questions which gave the interviewees some control over the subjects that were discussed.

As a sociologist Oakley saw interviewing as a sociological research method. Several historians have also written about the use of interviewing in women's history. Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai, in the introduction to their 1991 edited work, *Women's Words*, recommend many of the same techniques that Oakley discussed. They state: 'In order to learn to listen, we need to attend more to the narrator than to our own agendas.'⁷⁴ They urge interviewers to allow women to talk about their feelings, not just facts. One of the ways to do this is to ask general questions, which allows women to reflect on their feelings. Also, it is important that the interviewer pays attention to what is missing in the interviewee's narrative, and try to understand the interviewee's story from her vantage point. Like Oakley, they recommend that interviewers treat the interviews as conversations rather than as formal public speaking occasions.

⁷² Ann Oakley, 'Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms,' in Helen Roberts (ed.) *Doing Feminist Research* (London: Routledge, 1995 first published 1981 by Routledge & Kegan Paul), p. 38.

⁷³ Ibid, p. 41.

⁷⁴ Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai, 'Introduction,' in Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai (eds.) *Women's Word: The Feminist Practice of Oral History* (New York: Routledge, 1991), p. 12.

Feminism also affected my interpretation of the data that I collected. I used content analyses, which Reinharz defines as: 'People who do content analyses study a set of objects... or events systematically by counting them or interpreting the themes contained in them.'⁷⁵ I used the latter, as previously discussed I organised and analysed my data around themes (such as women's students' resistance to residence hall rules). As with many feminist projects, I combined analysis of 'found' data (archives) with that which was 'produced' (interviews). I did not, however, use discourse analysis in my interpretation of the data. I felt that the large amount and richness of the data gave me more than enough material to support my thesis. Discourse analysis of the student newspapers of ASU alone would yield rich results for future research.

The Authorial Voice

My feminist approach has also had an influence on my authorial voice. As is the case with many feminists, I believe in the importance of acknowledging my influence as author on my research. My grounding as a feminist has not only influenced my analyses, but also the research methods and the voice that I chose to write in. Instead of relying on a more 'objective' scientific voice, I have emphasised the 'subjective' voice. In other words, I have not ignored the emotions and feelings that have come through in my research. Like many feminists, I believe that totally objective research is impossible. The researcher will always have an influence on the research conducted in terms of the choice of topic, its theoretical basis, the research questions, the approach adopted to the gathering and interpretation of information, and the writing of results. Hence my earlier discussion of how I came to feminism and how it has influenced my work.

⁷⁵ Reinharz, *Feminist Methods*, p. 146.

The Organisation of the Thesis

I organised this thesis in a manner which I feel best fits my main argument, that women at ASU and UG have challenged the male hegemony of both institutions. This challenge has proven especially difficult because of the conservative nature of both institutions, but progress has been made. However, this progress is currently under threat and may be reversed without the vigilance of women staff and students at both institutions. The chapter topics were chosen, in part, because they illustrate different aspects of this argument. The thesis is organised into six main chapters (not including the introduction, conclusion, two appendices, and bibliography). A timeline is given at the beginning of the thesis to help the reader place the events into context with the historical events of the institutions. Each chapter will cross-culturally compare the experiences of women within the two institutions.

Chapter One will give an overview of the history of women in higher education in both the US and the UK from their entry in the nineteenth century through the twentieth century. This chapter will provide a context for exploring in later chapters the developments at ASU and UG regarding the experiences of women. The history of the struggle of women to gain access to higher education will be discussed, along with the influence of feminism on higher education.

Chapter Two is also an important chapter regarding the context of the experiences of women within the institutions. It provides an overview of the history of ASU and UG, and will more specifically discuss the experiences of women students in the three decades leading up to the period under consideration (the 1940s through the 1960s). The influences of wider societal movements on the students will be discussed, for example how they were affected by World War II.

The influences of feminism and conservatism on women students at ASU and UG will be discussed in Chapter Three. As mentioned previously, both of these forces had an important influence on women within these institutions. Both institutions are relatively

conservative, yet despite their conservative ethos, feminists have been able to implement positive changes for women in both institutions. Societal negative reactions to feminism will also be explored.

The next chapter will analyse the experiences of women students in residence halls from the 1960s through the 1970s. This was a period of great change for students regarding their treatment, since the age of majority was lowered and the view of college authorities as *in loco parentis* was ended. There was a history of women students being subjected to stricter rules than men, and during this period the curfew hours and dating rules were especially resisted. Two other areas of rules will also be analysed: behavioural rules and dress rules.

Chapter Five will turn to the experiences of women staff in both institutions from the 1970s through the 1990s. Four main areas will be discussed: equal opportunity offices and policies; 'the glass ceiling'; barriers to career development for women academics; and women academic staff organisations. Appendices I and II contain the descriptions of important legislation in this area, and tables on the feminisation of higher education staffing throughout the world and in both institutions. Appendix III contains sample interview questions.

Chapter Six reviews the women's studies programmes at both institutions. After giving a summary of the history of the programmes, it will discuss programme needs and the issue of 'separation versus integration'. The low funding and support that the programmes received at both institutions have meant that women's studies staff have been especially important to the programmes' continued existence. Both programmes are going through periods of uncertainty at the time of writing.

The study of women's experiences within these two conservative institutions illustrates the wider experiences of women in higher education in both the US and the UK. While some progress has been made, there is still much more to be done before full equality of opportunity for women will be reached in higher education. Therefore, women

can-not afford to 'rest on their laurels'. The situation of women in higher education needs to continue to be analysed and women need to continue to agitate for change. This research contributes to the historiography of women in higher education through a case study of women's experiences in two universities in the US and the UK. Their struggles and triumphs illustrate the way women create change in conservative environments and how they challenge male hegemony.

More importantly, possible explanations for my findings will be explored. The change that occurred at ASU and UG was fuelled by both external factors (for example, governmental equality legislation) and internal pressure from women staff and students, who were themselves influenced by feminism (which is also an external factor). Analysis of the extent to which these influences affected change can illuminate the mechanisms of change, thereby providing potential guidance for those who wish to create change in conservative environments. Most importantly of all, this thesis seeks to provide a feminist account of recent historical change as a contribution to scholarship on women in higher education.

CHAPTER ONE: Setting the Stage

As described in the Introduction, universities were set up by men for men. The story of women's participation in higher education has historically been one of struggle.¹ In the US and the UK, women have been struggling to gain access to the universities since the mid-nineteenth century. Although a substantial measure of success has been achieved, aspects of male hegemony of higher education, as previously discussed, have continued into the twenty-first century. While women have reached parity in undergraduate numbers, inequality still exists in such areas as the proportion of women professors and university managers; gender differences between the disciplines; and research funding. It is important to study the history of the interactions of feminism and higher education to try to discern the possible reasons for these inequalities, and the possible solutions to them.

The Introduction briefly discussed the history of higher education; this chapter will discuss the history of the feminist movement and its effect on higher education. There is a plethora of scholarship available on the history of feminism in the US and the UK. It is important to emphasise the interrelatedness between US and British feminism. As William O'Neill states: 'While feminists in each country responded first of all to local conditions, neither movement grew up in isolation.'² From Aphra Behn in the seventeenth century to contemporary feminists such as Audre Lorde and Sheila Rowbotham, British and US feminists have been writing about the position of women in society.³ They have fought for such things as reproductive rights, political rights, property ownership, financial rights, educational reform, and employment reform. Women have gained important changes in

¹ For a history of education in the US see: Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988). For the UK see: S. J. Curtis, *History of Education in Great Britain* (London: University Tutorial Press, 1967).

² William L. O'Neill, *The Woman Movement: Feminism in the United States and England* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1969), p. 13.

³ See Dale Spender, (ed.), *Feminist Theorists: Three Centuries of Women's Intellectual Traditions* (London: The Women's Press, 1983).

these areas, which can be seen by comparing the situation of women at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and that of women at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

The terms 'woman's sphere' and 'cult of domesticity' have been used to describe the constraints on women in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The feminist historian Nancy Cott among others has used the concept of 'woman's sphere' in her description of the position of women in early US history. Woman's sphere of activity and influence was focussed on the private space of the home, while man's sphere was located in the public domain. She used the term 'cult of domesticity' to explain the importance of women's role within the home at that time: 'the "cult" both observed and prescribed specific behavior for women in the enactment of domestic life.'⁴ Cott also points to the advantages that separate spheres brought: mothers had an important role to play in the education and character formation of their children; and a 'sisterhood' was formed between women because of shared experiences. Domesticity paradoxically provided a foundation for the women's movement; the 'concomitant subtle changes in women's view of their domestic role established a substructure for their nondomestic pursuits and self-assertion.'⁵

Social norms as well as legislative controls restricted women's opportunities in various ways during the nineteenth century. Women experienced 'subordination to men in marriage and society, profound disadvantage in education and in the economy, denial of access to official power in the churches that they populated, and virtual impotence in politics.'⁶ Married women were especially disadvantaged in that their legal existence was subsumed under that of their husband. Upon marriage, men gained control of their wives' possessions, in addition to the control that they had over their bodies. This arose from the notion of the male head of the household exercising rights on behalf of every member of his household, including his wife, children, and servants.

⁴ Nancy F. Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood: 'Woman's Sphere' in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), p. 2.

⁵ Ibid, p. 9.

⁶ Ibid, p. 5.

Cott concentrated on the position of middle-class US women in *The Bonds of Womanhood*. While the middle-class domestic ideal affected women across class lines in the US and the UK, in practice there were immense social class differences regarding women's experiences. June Purvis, in her book *Hard Lessons*, describes the experiences of nineteenth-century working-class women in the UK. The middle-class ideal of a wife being financially dependent on her husband was especially incongruous for working-class women whose husbands did not earn an adequate 'family wage'. Purvis describes 'class-specific ideals of femininity', which were 'normative constructs against which women of different social classes could be judged.'⁷ While middle-class women were to be 'young ladies' and 'ladies', working-class women were to be 'good women'. The 'good women' ideal was related to the middle-class image of working-class lives. When young, working-class girls were to be trained to become 'good workers', then 'good wives and mothers'. They were expected to be honest, frugal, and self-sacrificing.⁸

Nineteenth-century feminists pushed for changes in women's societal position. Cott sees the 1830s as a turning point in US women's activism: more women were participating in the labour force (especially as textile workers and teachers), the first women-led industrial strikes occurred, middle-class women petitioned for the right of wives to retain property and earning rights, women's increasing literacy contributed to the growth of women writers and journalists, and women participated in a variety of reform movements.⁹ Purvis points to the influential writings of theorists such as Mary Wollstonecraft and John Stuart Mill, and the conflicts between the 'ideal woman' and reality as important influences on UK nineteenth-century feminists.¹⁰ Women's participation in the anti-slavery movement was especially important as a catalyst to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries' women's rights movements in both the US and

⁷ June Purvis, *Hard Lessons: The Lives and Education of Working-class Women in Nineteenth-century England* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), p. 59.

⁸ Ibid, pp. 63-70.

⁹ Cott, *The Bonds of Womanhood*, p. 7.

¹⁰ Purvis, *Hard Lessons*, pp. 56-57.

the UK, as women recognised the parallels between their own subordinate position and the slaves' position in society.¹¹

Wider political changes influenced the nineteenth-century women's movement. The French Revolution with its ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity; Marxism; and political ferment across Europe in the mid-nineteenth century made possible the idea of political emancipation for people other than the landed elites. These helped to create an environment where women could press for political rights, especially the right to vote. As William Chafe asserts, 'the success of feminist organizations depended ultimately on the response of the mass women, and the willingness of the society-at-large to tolerate a change in relationships between the sexes.'¹²

Early twentieth-century feminists in the US and the UK had as one of their main goals the gaining of woman's suffrage. Many of the early feminists believed that having the right to vote would enable them to press for improvements in other aspects of women's lives, that once women had political influence they could then improve such things as education and social welfare. There was debate in both countries about the best way to gain suffrage for women, whether through 'radical' agitation or political pressure. There was also division, as there would be throughout feminism's history, between those who emphasised women's 'equality' with men versus those who emphasised women's 'difference' from men. In relation to the vote, some women argued that women deserved the vote because they were equal to men, while others argued that women would bring special qualities to politics that men lacked. This debate was also important in the call for women's equal access to education (see next section).

Many feminists recognised that educational reform, and especially access to higher education, was required to improve the social and economic position of women. This

¹¹ Sarah Grimke is an example of a woman who agitated for both abolition and women's rights. An extract of her writings is in: Alice S. Rossi, (ed.), *The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir* (New York: Bantam Books, 1973), pp. 306-318.

¹² William H. Chafe, *The American Woman: Her Changing Social, Economic and Political Roles, 1920-70* (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. ix.

chapter will concentrate on the experiences of women in higher education in the US and UK, focusing on two main areas: women's struggle to gain access to universities; and second wave feminist influence on higher education. These topics were chosen because they provide important context for the rest of the thesis, which will be discussing the experiences of women in two universities in the latter part of the twentieth century. The 'Women's Struggle to Gain Access to Universities' section will review nineteenth-century feminists' efforts to open higher education to women. The 'Second Wave Feminist Influence on Higher Education' section will explore mid- to late- twentieth-century feminists' struggles to improve the position of women in academia.

Women's Struggle to Gain Access to Universities

Feminists throughout history have acknowledged the importance of education in both perpetuating and providing a basis for resistance to women's inequality. Nineteenth-century feminists in both the US and the UK were concerned with opening higher education to women, recognizing that 'knowledge is power'. In other words, that education opens doors to positions of power within society. This section will concentrate on the 'equality versus difference' debate between the nineteenth-century feminists who struggled to gain access for women to US and British higher education. As discussed below, this debate was centred on the question of whether women's equality with men, or their differences, should be emphasised.

Several arguments were used to exclude women from education. Ministers, academics, and government officials argued that women's brains were smaller and less developed than men's brains; therefore they were incapable of reaching the same educational level as men. Charles Darwin's theories of Evolution were used to argue that men were at a higher evolutionary level than women. As mentioned earlier there was concern over the possible negative effects of education on women's reproductive

capabilities.¹³ It was also argued that education would be wasted on women who would eventually marry and therefore would not have the opportunity to use their education in employment (ignoring the possibility that it might improve women in their domestic duties, see below). One male writer in the late nineteenth century conceded that women could attend higher education institutions, as long as there were precautions against ‘overpressure,’ and women did not try to compete with men.¹⁴

As previously discussed, there were protests against this societal attitude toward women. Two influential British writers during this time period who discussed the importance of education to women were Mary Wollstonecraft and John Stuart Mill. Wollstonecraft argued in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) that girls should be taught more than the traditional, domestic subjects. She also asserted that women’s lack of access to education left them in “slavish dependence” on men, that women would be better able to fulfil their domestic duties if they had a better education. For example, if they were taught anatomy and medical science, they could be better nurses to husbands, parents, and children.¹⁵ John Stuart Mill, writing almost a hundred years later in his *The Subjection of Women*, was also very influential in providing a theoretical basis for women’s education. Mill stated: ‘The masters of women wanted more than simple obedience, and they turned the whole force of education to effect their purpose.’¹⁶

Women in both the US and the UK used these theories in their push for improved educational opportunities. Higher education was closed to women in the US until the admittance in 1833 of the first woman student at Oberlin College in Ohio. Prior to this, elementary school teachers (a traditionally female occupation) had been trained at normal

¹³ Joan N. Burstyn *Victorian Education and the Ideal of Womanhood* (London: Croom Helm, 1980).

¹⁴ See George J. Romanes, ‘Mental Differences Between Men and Women,’ (1887), reprinted in Dale Spender, (ed.), *The Education Papers: Women’s Quest for Equality in Britain, 1850-1912*. (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).

¹⁵ Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967, first printed in 1792).

¹⁶ John Stuart Mill, *The Subjection of Women* (1869) reprinted in Alice S. Rossi, (ed.), *The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir*, (New York: Bantam Books, 1973), p. 202.

schools, which later became teachers' colleges. The first women's colleges in the US were established in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and some were affiliated to elite men's colleges, such as Harvard and Brown. The first exclusively women's colleges in the UK were also founded in the late nineteenth century. Girton College, founded in 1869, was the first university-affiliated women's college in the UK. As with some of the first US women's colleges, Girton College was associated with an elite male institution, Cambridge University.¹⁷ Although affiliated with Cambridge, women were not awarded Cambridge degrees until 1948.

As mentioned previously, there was a debate among the nineteenth-century feminists pressing for women's higher education about the nature of the education that women should receive. Some feminists emphasised equality in women's education, that women would only receive the same status as men if they received the same education.¹⁸ Emily Davies, who was instrumental in the founding of Girton College, belonged to this group. The nineteenth-century British feminist Frances Wright also believed in the importance of equal education. In an 1829 lecture entitled 'Of Free Enquiry', Wright decried the withholding of education from American women. She asserted that it was in the best interest of human advancement that women attain knowledge and break the binds of ignorance, that equal rights could not exist without equal educational opportunities.¹⁹

A nineteenth-century US feminist who played an important role in US higher education and who also emphasised equality in women's education was M. Carey Thomas. Thomas was influential in the founding of Bryn Mawr School for Girls (later Bryn Mawr College) and was president of the College for twenty-eight years (1894-1922). She was also influential, along with her friend Mary Garrett, in securing the admittance of women

¹⁷ For a discussion of women students' experiences at these early colleges see Maria Tamboukou, 'Of Other Spaces: Women's Colleges at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century in the UK,' *Gender, Place and Culture*, 7 (2000): pp. 247-263.

¹⁸ See Emily Davies cited in Dale Spender, (ed.), *The Education Papers: Women's Quest for Equality in Britain 1850-1912* (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987).

¹⁹ Frances Wright, *Course of Popular Lectures*, (New York: Free Enquirer, 1829), reprinted in Rossi, *The Feminist Papers*, pp. 108-117.

to the Johns Hopkins University Medical School.²⁰ In her 1901 article, 'Should the Higher Education of Women Differ from That of Men?', Thomas argued that women should have access to the 'broadest possible education'. In other words, women should have access to the traditional 'male' subjects of medicine and law, and should be taught the Classics (such as Latin), which formed the basis of the liberal education that males in higher education received at that time. She believed that both men and women would benefit from women being given the same 'intellectual training' and 'moral ideals' as men were given.²¹

Other feminists believed that women should have a different education from men. The founders of Newnham College, also affiliated to Cambridge University and founded soon after Girton, belonged to this group. They sought a new and more desirable form of education by bringing the benefits of women's insights into education. Josephine Butler was instrumental, with Anne Jemima Clough, in the founding of Newnham College. In her pamphlet, *The Education and Employment of Women* (1868), Butler argued that education would make a woman more, not less 'womanly,' and that it would increase her maternal instinct.²²

Elizabeth and Emily Blackwell, US doctors who did much to open the medical profession to women, agreed. They argued in *Medicine as a Profession for Women* (1860) that 'the thorough education of a class of women in medicine will exert an important influence upon the life and interests of women in general.'²³ Medical training would help women in their domestic pursuits in training them in such areas as sanitary science, and physical and mental development.

²⁰ Janet Farrar Worthington, 'The Other Feminist,' *Hopkins Medical News*, (Fall 1998), www.hopkinsmedicine.org/hmn/F98/feminist.html.

²¹ For more information on Thomas' life and beliefs, see Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, *The Power and Passion of M. Carey Thomas* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1999).

²² Josephine Butler, 'The Education and Employment of Women,' (1868), reprinted in Spender (ed.), *The Education Papers*, pp. 69-89.

²³ Elizabeth Blackwell and Emily Blackwell, *Medicine as a Profession for Women* (New York: New York Infirmary for Women, 1860), reprinted in Rossi, *The Feminist Papers*, p. 347.

In her essay, 'The Education of Women, and How It Would Be Affected by University Examinations' (1862), the British feminist Francis Power Cobbe contested the argument that higher education made a woman unfit for marriage or philanthropy. Cobbe believed that education was to draw out women's special abilities, that women and men were complementary but not the same. She did believe, however, that all masculine studies should be open to women, and that women should have the opportunity to earn degrees. 'It is not *in the truths to be acquired*, but in the *assimilation* of these truths in the mind which receives them, that the difference consists.'²⁴

Those who argued for 'difference' in women's education were influenced by the image of the ideal woman, as previously discussed. As Purvis points out, the importance of domesticity in the ideal image of women influenced their education. The ideologies 'constructed images of women as women and as students, and [...] they helped to shape what was considered an "appropriate" curriculum for women.'²⁵ A discrete branch of scholarship emerged in the UK in the early 1900s on the 'Home Arts,' or 'Home Economics' as it would later be called. In 1910, Wilena Hitching discussed the importance of home management as an academic subject. She asserted that: 'The cleverest *men* in the world may make good, wise laws, and strive with all their might to make the nation happy and prosperous; but unless *woman's* work is well done they cannot succeed, for mismanaged homes can never make a happy nation.'²⁶

A year later, Margaret A. Gilliland wrote about the movement to adapt females' education to their roles in the home. According to Gilliland, the 'old "blue-stockings" type, who prided herself on not knowing how to sew and mend, and who thought cooking menial, and beneath her, no longer appeals to anyone.'²⁷ She asserted that women in education should remember 'to be women first and scholars afterwards; dutiful daughters

²⁴ Francis Power Cobbe, 'The Education of Women, and How It Would Be Affected by University Examinations,' (1862), reprinted in Spender (ed.), *The Education Papers*, p. 42.

²⁵ Purvis, *Hard Lessons*, p. 48.

²⁶ Wilena Hitching, 'Home Management,' (1910), in Spender, *The Education Papers*, p. 312.

²⁷ Margaret A. Gilliland, 'Home Arts,' (1911), in Spender, *The Education Papers*, p. 316.

and wise, sympathetic mothers, not only college lecturers and high school mistresses.’²⁸

Again, the importance of women’s role in the home, the private sphere, was being emphasised.

Nineteenth-century US and British feminists debated the nature of the education that females should receive. One set of feminists believed women’s colleges should not only teach the same curriculum as men’s colleges, but also have the same rules and regulations. Other feminists believed that the different nature of women’s roles meant that they should be offered different curricula, and should also have different rules and regulations. For some women this emphasis on gender differences may have been a pragmatic decision as it was less threatening to male hegemony (in other words entailed the least amount of change).

These early feminist efforts to gain access for women to higher education did in time prove successful. Women went from total exclusion from higher education in the early- nineteenth century, to constituting over half of the undergraduate populations in the late- twentieth century. This has allowed present day feminists to concentrate on issues other than parity of student numbers, such as curriculum change, child care, equal pay for staff, and women students’ rights.

Second Wave Feminist Influence on Higher Education

Before examining the late twentieth-century feminists’ influence on education, it is important to review developments earlier in the century. The First and Second World Wars bought temporary improvements to women’s condition in things such as employment outside the home (see Chapter Two). The creation of a mass market after World War II in the US and the UK had far-reaching implications for the position of women. As in the nineteenth century, there was an emphasis on the importance of women’s role within the

²⁸ Ibid, pp. 317-18.

home. The consumer market emphasised the importance of women's domestic roles, and there was pressure on women to purchase the 'right' products and to emulate the glamour of the Hollywood film stars. Also as in Victorian times, women became aware of differences between the ideal and reality. There was a tension between the ideal image of a soft and yielding female, and strong female role models: 'amidst the pastel shades and thick-pile carpets of 1950s new prosperity, heroic aspirations, images of adventure, sacrifice for a noble cause, courage and daring somehow crept into the production of a feminine self.'²⁹ This tension was to provide 'fuel' for the later feminist movement.³⁰

Feminist historians have argued that one of the reasons behind the emphasis on "domesticity" during the post-war period in the US was that there was an effort to push women back into their homes, thereby freeing up jobs for returning World War II soldiers.³¹ It was expected that most women, even those who went through college or university, would eventually marry and become housewives. Once that happened they were expected to quit their jobs and care for their families full-time. Colleges and universities catered to this expectation by offering courses on subjects such as marriage and parenthood (see Chapter Two).

US Feminists continued to be active throughout this period, even in the post-World War II years, which has traditionally been seen as a fallow time for women's rights. Unlike the later women's liberation movement, the 1950s women's movement was not mass-based, but was instead 'elite-sustained.' Feminists 'active on behalf of women's rights were relatively few in number, mostly survivors of the suffrage struggle who maintained their commitment in a period inhospitable to feminism.'³² The much-reduced

²⁹ Rowbotham, *A Century of Women*, p. 281.

³⁰ For example, see Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: Norton, 1963).

³¹ Ruth Milkman, *Gender at Work: The Dynamics of Job Segregation by Sex During World War II*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987).

³² Leila J. Rupp and Verta Taylor, *Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 7.

National Woman's Party, which had been formed from the suffrage movements, continued to push for the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution.

In the UK, women MPs campaigned for such things as liberalised divorce laws. Improvements were made on equal pay issues, especially in the public sector. The 'equality versus difference' debate resurfaced during this period. There was a 'fierce row at the British Federation of University Women in July 1954 when the demand for protective legislation was raised, even though it was aimed at ensuring that the legislation applied equally to men and women.'³³

As mentioned previously, class has been an important analytical tool for UK feminists, especially in regard to the educational system. The British feminist Jane Thompson asserted that 'discussions about education since the last war [World War II] have queried increasingly the relationship between social class and achievement in the quest for equality of educational opportunity.'³⁴ Middle-class females (and their parents) sought an academic education like their brothers' or preparation for an appropriate job such as nursing, teaching, or secretarial work. Working-class females in general prepared for unskilled employment such as domestic service or factory work. Universities in the UK remained a mainly middle-class stronghold until the late twentieth century.

Despite the tensions created in the 1950s by the persecution of left groups in the US, British leftist groups were formed during this period. These groups, which would greatly expand in the 1960s, provided a forum for political action for academic and working-class women and men. One of the biggest British leftist groups that would have a great influence on the 1960s was the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), which was formed in 1958 and achieved mass support during the 1960s, most evidently in the form of an annual march from Aldermaston (a nuclear military research base) to London.

³³ Rowbotham, *A Century of Women*, p. 286.

³⁴ Jane Thompson, *Learning Liberation: Women's Response to Men's Education*, (London: Croom Helm, 1983), p. 29.

Women played an important role in the organisation from the beginning. Together with other leftist groups it 'contributed to a rediscovery of a libertarian radicalism which appealed to a new generation.'³⁵

The US and the UK experienced an upsurge in Left activism in the 1960s, with higher education students playing an important role within these movements. As Sheila Rowbotham points out in her memoir of the 1960s: 'My generation in the sixties was living through big social changes: the expansion of higher education, the opening of new employment opportunities, the increase in consumption and the growth of the media.'³⁶ These things contributed to the growth of the Left, as greater numbers of students who had more leisure time and money were exposed to a liberal education. Students agitated for greater democratic control over their education, challenging traditional curricula and forms of university management. As will be discussed in the next section and Chapter Six, feminists would build upon this tradition in their efforts to reform higher education.

As Rowbotham and other feminists have pointed out, the Left organisations and Civil Rights movements of the 1950s and 1960s acted as catalysts to the women's liberation movement. Women experienced sexism within movements such as the US Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which motivated them to organise for their own rights.³⁷ The women's liberation movement in Britain was also influenced by working-class women's activism. There were several major strikes led by and on behalf of women and they formed women's rights groups such as the National Joint Action Committee for Women's Equal Rights (NJACWER). Rowbotham points to these working-class women and the 'Vietnamese guerrilla fighters' as two important 'role models' for early women's liberationists.³⁸

³⁵ Rowbotham, *A Century of Women*, p. 290.

³⁶ Sheila Rowbotham, *Promise of A Dream: Remembering the Sixties* (London: Allen Lane, 2000), p. xii.

³⁷ Sara Evans, *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979).

³⁸ Rowbotham, *Promise of a Dream*, p. 203.

As a century earlier, the connections between US and UK feminists were important in the formation of the women's liberation movement. There had been a fruitful sharing of New Left ideas between the two countries, thanks to the media and international students, which was to continue for the women's movement. Ideas such as consciousness-raising and women's need for control over their own bodies flowed freely across the Atlantic. Rowbotham lists the contributions of North American feminism to the British Women's Liberation movement as: 'anti-authoritarianism and belief in participatory democracy,' and 'a belief in prefiguring a desired future in the way you organized.'³⁹

The Women's Liberation movement was to expand throughout the 1970s in the US and the UK. Women's Liberation groups worked to raise women's consciousnesses through self-knowledge and self-empowerment. They made the personal political by transforming their desires for personal change into political demands for equal pay, child care, reproductive rights, and educational reform. The 'equality versus difference' debate continued into the 1970s, along with the related debate between 'making a separate culture' or 'demanding access to the mainstream.'⁴⁰ The complexity of this debate contributed to the realisation by feminists towards the end of the 1970s 'of the immensity of what had been undertaken and a keen awareness of the snares.'⁴¹ According to Rowbotham this led to anger against men and other women.

Positive changes did occur for women in US and UK higher education in the 1970s, due in part to the activism of second wave feminists (those who came of age in the 1960s and 1970s). According to Kim Thomas, in the UK, 'the view of education which dominated feminist thought in the 1970s was heavily influenced by liberal explanations of working-class failure in education.'⁴² Feminists called for compensatory education to redress deficiencies in female socialisation, as Marxist and Socialist academics had called

³⁹ Ibid, p. 222.

⁴⁰ Rowbotham, *A Century of Women*, p. 399.

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 400.

⁴² Kim Thomas, *Gender and Subject in Higher Education* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1990), p. 11.

for the same for working-class socialisation deficiencies. For example, females should be encouraged to enter the sciences, to compensate for their low numbers in the past.

Feminists played an important role in lobbying for reform of the federal laws and regulations during the 1960s and 1970s that affected the status of women in US higher education, as will be discussed in Chapter Five. One of the first was the 1963 Equal Pay Act which 'intended to guarantee that for...work of exactly the same description (title, responsibilities, and working conditions)- men and women would be paid exactly the same amount.'⁴³

Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act forbade sex discrimination in employment. President Johnson's 1966 Executive Order 11246 required that companies doing business with the federal government use affirmative action to bring about racial equality in their hiring practices. Feminists lobbied Johnson to include sexual equality, which he did in 1967. During the Nixon administration, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the enforcing body, decided in favour of an officer of the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL) who had brought a suit against the universities and colleges to test whether affirmative action would apply to them. The ruling changed the way that higher education institutions handled their hiring and promotion. According to Tobias, the former system of the 'the old boys' network' was replaced, and 'today women and minority scholars can enjoy a more open process of application and employment, and universities have to monitor their hiring according to a long-term affirmative action plan.'⁴⁴

Title IX of the 1973 Civil Rights Act was very important in the struggle to gain equality for women on US higher education campuses. It prohibited sex discrimination in federally funded educational programmes or activities, and was a significant factor in the struggle to bring about gender equality in college and university sports programmes. It is enforced by the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and

⁴³ Tobias, *Faces of Feminism*, p. 98.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 105.

Welfare (HEW); if an institution was found to discriminate in one of its programs, its federal funding could be taken away. The male sports establishment, concerned over the Title's possible affects on varsity sports, lobbied to weaken the Title. In its 1984 decision, *Grove City College v. Bell*, the Supreme Court ruled that only the programmes that directly received federal funding had to provide sex equity. In 1987, the US Congress passed the Civil Rights Restoration Act, which restored full Title IX coverage. There were exemptions, however, for military academies and institutions which had historically and continually been single sex. The main air force, army, and navy academies admitted women in the 1970s, and private academies such as the Citadel became co-educational in the 1990s.

There was also important legislation passed in the UK in the 1970s that affected women university staff; in particular the Equal Pay Act 1970, and the Sex Discrimination Act 1975. The Equal Pay Act 1970 guaranteed equal pay for 'like work; or work rated as equivalent under an analytical job evaluation study; or work that is proved to be of equal value.'⁴⁵ The EPA covers both direct and indirect discrimination, for example practices that are applied to both sexes but that adversely affect one sex more than the other. A successful claimant is entitled to both equal pay in the future, and compensatory back-pay (subject to a time limit) with interest.

The Sex Discrimination Act (SDA) 1975, which incorporated the 1970 Equal Pay Act, was 'an act to render unlawful certain kinds of sex discrimination and discrimination on the ground of marriage, and establish a Commission with the function of working towards the elimination of such discrimination and promoting equality of opportunity between men and women generally; and for related purposes.'⁴⁶ In addition to employment, the act also covered educational opportunities (see Appendix I). Such

⁴⁵ 'What Does the Equal Pay Act Say,' www.eoc.org.uk/cseng/legislation.

⁴⁶ *The Sex Discrimination Act 1975*, reproduced by Press for Change on their website: www.pfc.org.uk/legal/sda2.htm.

matters as sexual harassment and the differential treatment of pregnant women are also covered by the SDA. As with the EPA, indirect discrimination is also addressed. For example, requiring employees to work full-time might adversely affect women more than men. The SDA prohibits positive action (affirmative action), except in training and encouragement to apply for positions where one sex is under-represented.

The Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC), set up by the 1975 Act, is a 'non-departmental public body' that is sponsored by the Women and Equality Unit at the Department for Trade and Industry. It gives advice and information to both individuals and employers; takes legal cases, runs campaigns and lobbies decision makers, and publishes research and statistics. There have been several EOC reports relevant to women academic staff. For example, the 2001 report 'Gender Equality in Pay Practices' discussed such issues as 'Current Equal Pay Practices' and 'The EOC's Code of Practice on Equal Pay'.⁴⁷

Rowbotham points out the limitations in these laws: the EPA applied only to 'work where no material difference existed between male and female employees'; so that 'making individual claims against discrimination was a cumbersome and lengthy process'; and 'the EOC itself was a cautious institution.'⁴⁸ Unlike in the US, where the National Organization for Women backed equality legislation, the British Women's Liberation movement did not similarly back equal opportunities. British women did, however, benefit from the expansion of social provisions such as day-care centres and domestic services during the 1970s.

Feminism has also brought changes in pedagogy and the curriculum in higher education, as will be discussed in Chapter Six. Dale Spender has written prolifically on the theory of knowledge and knowledge production, from a feminist perspective. In the

⁴⁷ Judy Morrell, Marcus Boyland, Gabriel Munns, and Louise Astbury, 'Gender Equality in Pay Practices,' report to the Equal Opportunities Commission, reproduced on website: www.eoc.org.uk.

⁴⁸ Rowbotham, *A Century of Women*, p. 405.

introduction to her 1981 edited work, *Men's Studies Modified*, Spender classifies the traditional curriculum as 'men's studies'; and asserts that men created and maintained this by keeping politics separate from knowledge production and dissemination, which meant that their activities were not closely scrutinised or questioned. As Spender states:

'Women have been excluded as the producers of knowledge and as the subjects of knowledge, for men have often made their own knowledge and their own sex, representative of humanity.'⁴⁹ In 'men's studies,' women have been either invisible or classified as deviant or the 'other'.⁵⁰ Feminists have been working to change this since the 1970s.

Feminist pedagogy is about empowerment as feminist instructors have introduced more 'student-centred' methods of teaching and learning, for example by giving students more say in their learning experience. As Gina Mercer asserts: 'Faced with, and very experienced in suffering, the model of masculinist power as dominating, alienating, punitive and disciplining, feminists critiqued this form of pedagogy with effective vehemence.'⁵¹ Mercer discussed the difficulty that feminist teachers have with power relations in the classroom. Even though teachers might say they are equal with the students, the institutions dictate the grader/gradee relationships that in reality exist. 'We are hip-deep in phallogentric waters, and to try to pretend that we are elsewhere, able to create a "truly maternal" nourishing space, is a lie...and a lie which it is dangerous to feed to ourselves, or to our students, most of whom will recognise it as falsehood.'⁵² They have, however, introduced less competitive methods of assessment.

Feminists have also effected curricular change in higher education. The explosive growth in the 1970s of research by, for, and/or about women in both the US and the UK

⁴⁹ Dale Spender, 'Introduction,' in Dale Spender, (ed.), *Men's Studies Modified: The Impact of Feminism on the Academic Disciplines* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981), p. 1-2.

⁵⁰ For a discussion of woman as 'other,' see Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (London: Vintage, 1997).

⁵¹ Gina Mercer, 'Feminist Pedagogy to the Letter: A Musing on Contradictions,' in Liz Stanley (ed.), *Knowing Feminisms: On Academic Borders, Territories and Tribes*, (London: Sage Publications, 1997), p. 39.

⁵² Ibid, p. 40.

contributed to the development of women's studies programmes in these countries.

Feminism has had a differing effect on scholarship in the traditional university disciplines, having more of an impact on the Humanities than in Business or Information Technology, for example.⁵³ As discussed in the Introduction, feminist researchers have not only placed women at the centre of their scholarship; they have also questioned the theoretical and methodological basis of the disciplines.

Increasingly after the 1970s, feminist scholarly writings recognised and analysed the differences between women. There has been feminist analysis of the implications of variables such as race, sexuality, disability, and class. As mentioned previously, feminists have debated 'equality versus difference' since at least the mid- nineteenth century; but this issue assumed added significance when the differences between feminists were recognized. Since the 1980s, there has been more recognition of the differences between feminists. According to Virginia Sapiro:

If, as many of us are inclined to believe, feminist studies is more than the sum of its parts, but not a completely separate discipline undefined by the existent disciplinary boundaries and differences, the interdisciplinary feminist community has considerable work left to do drawing connections and developing methods for this joint project.⁵⁴

Some feminists in the 1990s were concerned over the possible fragmenting of women's studies (and the women's movement in general), fearing that women's studies would splinter into countless numbers of sub-specialities. But there is also a need to recognize the differences between women because doing so 'helps illuminate more precisely the *dynamics* of discrimination and privilege.'⁵⁵ The recognition of the differences between women should not be allowed to overshadow the important commonalties that women share.

⁵³ For a comprehensive discussion of Women's Studies in the US see: Marilyn Jacoby Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions: Creating Women's Studies in America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998). For the UK see: Hilary Hinds, Ann Phoenix, and Jackie Stacey, (eds.), *Working Out: New Directions for Women's Studies*, (London: Falmer Press, 1992).

⁵⁴ Virginia Sapiro, "Feminist Studies and Political Science-and Vice Versa," in Stanton and Stewart, eds. *Feminisms in the Academy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995), p. 305.

⁵⁵ Mary Poovey, "The Differences of Women's Studies: The Example of Literary Criticism," in Stanton and Stewart, eds., *Feminisms in the Academy*, p. 138.

Felly Nkweto Simmonds asserts that feminist scholarship has ignored differences between women 'either through a basic reluctance to deal with the reality of difference or because difference has not been seen as adequately theorized by an Established Feminist Theorist (i.e. a white one).'⁵⁶ Difference should not be seen as divisive but as a tool for understanding the realities and experiences of all women. According to Simmonds: 'What must become important for us as feminists in creating an all inclusive feminist theory is the ability for such a theory to take for granted both our differences and our commonalities.'⁵⁷

Tamsin Wilton believes that by making gender the privileged category of signification, feminists run the risk of trivializing such considerations as race, sexuality, age and disability by making them appear to be 'tacked on' to the 'primary category' of sex. She argues for an analysis 'which, rather than confronting us with a simple linear hierarchy in which white, middle-class, heterosexual, able-bodied adult men are positioned at the apex of substrata of oppression, offers a way of understanding the complex web of often contradictory relations of power.'⁵⁸ While asserting the need to acknowledge difference, Louise Morley also warns about the possible consequences of this: 'Frustration, contradiction, and confusion are the inevitable results of women trying to relocate themselves on the powerless/powerful continuum.'⁵⁹

Staff issues that contemporary (post-1970) feminists in both the US and the UK have fought to improve have included: equal pay; equal opportunities offices and policies; discrimination in the hiring process; the 'glass ceiling' (dearth of women in the higher echelons of power in colleges and universities); and research acknowledgement and funding. These issues will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five. Student issues that modern feminists have fought to improve include: strict dormitory rules and

⁵⁶ Felly Nkweto Simmonds, "Black Women in Academia," in Hinds et al, eds., *Working Out*, p. 54.

⁵⁷ Ibid, p. 56.

⁵⁸ Tamsin Wilton, "Desire and the Politics of Representation: Issues for Lesbians and Heterosexual Women," in Hinds, et al, eds., *Working Out*, p. 74.

⁵⁹ Louise Morley, 'Women's Studies, Difference, and Internalised Oppression,' *Women's Studies International Forum* 15 (1992), p. 522.

regulations; financial aid disparity; inequality in the support and aid of women's sports; women's representation in student government; lack of support for women's centres; violence against women students; and hostile campus environments toward women and women's issues. Some of these issues will be discussed in more detail in the following chapters.

CHAPTER TWO: Setting the Stage II

The male hegemony of higher education, as discussed in the previous chapters, is also very evident in the history of Appalachian State University (ASU) and the University of Gloucestershire (UG). Whereas the previous chapter discussed the impact of feminism on higher education in the UK and the US, this chapter will concentrate on national societal changes and their effects on life and study in the two institutions, particularly in relation to the female students, from the late nineteenth century to 1970. The student regulations of the institutions will be discussed, which will give needed context to Chapter Four and will point to the ways in which wider social changes impact on life within higher education institutions.

Four major time periods in the institutions' histories will be analysed: the period up to the Second World War; during the Second World War; post-war to 1960; and the 1960s. These were time periods when macro-level societal forces were especially significant influences on female students at the institutions, and were chosen to provide a context for the later examination of female students' experiences. My master's thesis identified the major events during this time at ASU, which for this thesis have been reanalysed and compared with events at UG.¹

Foundation to 1940²

The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were times of expansion in education in both the US and the UK. In the US, the public perceived education as an important undertaking, especially necessary for the effective exercise of citizenship in a democracy.

¹ Lisa McGurk, *Transition and Inequality: Female Students at Appalachian State University*, MA Thesis, Appalachian State University, 1998.

² For a discussion of St. Mary's (predecessor college to UG) students' experiences, see: Ann Elizabeth Mathie, *Voices Raised in Cheltenham: Personal and Institutional Perspectives on St. Mary's College, 1930-1970*, Mphil Thesis, University of Gloucestershire, 2002.

According to educational historian Lawrence Cremin: 'The movement of education to the core of the American experience, already discernible during the nineteenth century, accelerated during the twentieth.'³ This expansion in education meant that new teachers needed to be trained, creating a demand for the expansion in the creation of teacher-training institutions.

The institution that would become ASU began as Watauga Academy in 1899. The brothers Blanford Barnard (BB) Dougherty and Dauphin Disco (DD) Dougherty founded the Academy in Boone, North Carolina (in the Appalachian mountains of the South), in part because of the lack of well-trained teachers in that part of the state. BB Dougherty discovered this deficiency while superintendent of Watauga County schools, and turned to the state legislature for help. In 1903, the North Carolina legislature passed the *Newland Bill* establishing the Appalachian Training School, which meant that the School would receive state recognition and financial support. Its emphasis on 'K-12'⁴ teacher training was evident from the start; students did not have to pay tuition fees if they promised to teach in North Carolina for two years.⁵ In 1921, the North Carolina legislature authorised Appalachian to become a normal school ('normal' was the term then used in the US to describe teacher-training institutions).

UG is older than ASU, since it began as the Cheltenham Training Colleges of St. Paul's (for men) and St. Mary's (for women) in 1847. It was founded by Reverend Francis Close (after having been suggested by 'influential folk all over the country')⁶ as an Evangelical-sponsored teacher-training institution in Cheltenham, a town already well-known as a centre for Evangelicalism. There was a demand in Cheltenham at the time for well-trained teachers due to rapid growth in pupil numbers in schools. There was

³ Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988), p. 12.

⁴ Kindergarten through twelfth grade, or students from the ages of five to eighteen.

⁵ Ruby J. Lanier, *Blanford Barnard Dougherty: Mountain Educator* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1974), p. 66.

⁶ W.E. Beck, *A History of the Cheltenham Colleges of St. Paul and St. Mary, 1847-1947* (Bath: Dawson & Goodall Limited, 1947), p. 8.

especially demand for teachers trained in religious-affiliated institutions, as ‘contemporaries were aware of a mass of people, especially in the towns and new industrial areas, whose ignorance and lack of access to religious teaching appeared to threaten the social order.’⁷

Close saw the institution as preparing ‘a class of instructors who, while they are enlightened and spiritually-minded men [sic], shall be furnished with a sound and not superficial knowledge of the subjects which they will be called upon to handle.’⁸ It is interesting to note that while both men and women attended the College, Close only mentions men. There are several possible explanations for this. He might have meant ‘men’ in the more generic ‘people’ sense, or he might have attached more importance to the men’s college, St. Paul’s. Close also asserted that the education was to equip the future teachers with the mental discipline that would give them ‘moral ascendancy’ over their students.⁹ This was to have an important influence on the regulations that students were to follow, as discussed below and in Chapter Four. Charles Bromby, the vicar of St. Paul’s Church, became the first Principal.

Unlike at universities, which offered their students a ‘liberal education’, the curricula at the Cheltenham Training Colleges centred around training for elementary (infant and primary) education.¹⁰ This vocational emphasis was generally less esteemed by society than university training. The focus on training teachers for infant and primary education meant that historically UG had more female than male students. The experiences of women within teacher-training institutions differed from that of women in universities. In addition to the lower esteem and higher numbers of women¹¹, which raises

⁷ Charles More, *The Training of Teachers 1847-1947: A History of the Church Colleges at Cheltenham* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1992), p. 1.

⁸ Francis Close quoted in More, *The Training of Teachers*, p. 15.

⁹ Ibid, p. 17.

¹⁰ More, *The Training of Teachers*, p. 143.

¹¹ For example, the 1942 McNair Report found that there were 7500 women students to 2500 men students in training colleges. Cited in Elizabeth Edwards, *Women in Teacher Training Colleges, 1900-1960: A Culture of Femininity* (London: Routledge, 2001), p. 13.

the question of whether one caused the other, there was a social class difference in the composition of students. Training colleges tended to contain more students from lower social classes than universities recruited from.

The affiliation of St. Mary's with St. Paul's offered some advantages. For example, the curricula of St. Paul's and St. Mary's were fairly similar. In 1852, Mr. Cook, one of Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI), commented that St. Mary's students were advantaged in the instruction that they received, and that they were well prepared for examinations because they had the 'same system of training' as St. Paul's students.¹² Some of their classes were taught by men staff from St. Paul's, particularly the 'traditional male subjects' such as the sciences. However, females were carefully segregated from male students (as will be discussed later). Cook stated in regard to examination results that St. Mary's students 'were not surpassed by any other Female Training School [teacher-training for women] in England.'¹³

The experiences of women students at ASU and UG in the nineteenth and early twentieth century were affected by societal expectations concerning women's roles. ASU's location in North Carolina, a southern state, meant that women students were influenced by the image of the southern ideal lady, which will also be discussed in Chapters Three and Four.¹⁴ Historians Anne Firor Scott and Amy Thompson McCandless have discussed the importance of the ideal of the 'southern lady' on the experiences of women in the South.¹⁵ A similar stereotype of the Victorian lady in Britain exerted a powerful influence over the lives of middle- and upper-class women in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Women were idealised as morally pure and they were expected

¹² Mr. Cook, in E.B. Challinor, *The Story of St. Mary's College Cheltenham* (Cheltenham: Taylor, Young Limited, 1978), p. 11.

¹³ Ibid, p. 16.

¹⁴ For a discussion of women students in other North Carolina universities, see Mary Jo Jackson Bratton, *East Carolina University: The Formative Years, 1907-1982* (Greenville: East Carolina University Alumni Association, 1986); and Carol Lorraine Bellamy, 'Student Life at Cullowhee: The Hunter Years, 1923-1947' (MA Thesis, Western Carolina University, 1979).

¹⁵ Anne Firor Scott, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995); and Amy Thompson McCandless, *The Past in the Present: Women's Higher Education in the Twentieth-Century American South* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999).

to be accomplished in the arts of domesticity. They were not, however, to be educated to a high intellectual level or to the standard required for entry to the professions.

Middle-class parents would not have sent their daughters to colleges and universities if they could not guarantee to protect their daughters' reputations. For women higher education students, this meant that even though there were strict rules for both male and female students, women faced the added dimension of the force of the institutions seeking to protect their reputations and their modesty.¹⁶ Women who had coeducational lectures were segregated in the classes, and the lectures 'were uncomfortable for everyone at first, with the women sitting apart in a gallery or in separate chairs at the front.'¹⁷

Certain characteristics of ASU and UG increased the importance of strict student regulations, for example the teacher-training aspect of both institutions. In both the US and the UK, teachers were expected to operate with higher moral standards than the rest of the population because of the nature of their work and their position as role models for their pupils. Their reputations affected their chances of being hired by a school, which might not employ them if they manifested less than high moral standards in their behaviour. The religious aspect of both institutions also influenced the strict rules and regulations. In keeping with the moral precepts of the local region from where most of its students came, there was a religious emphasis to life at Appalachian; weekly prayer meetings were conducted in the residence halls and students were required to attend church. BB Dougherty expected that everyone associated with Appalachian would observe high moral standards of behaviour. At a staff meeting, he stated that 'all were expected to cultivate a high moral tone and respect in all relations with each other,' and that 'all

¹⁶ The education of younger middle-class girls was similarly affected, see 'Education and Middle-class Girls' in June Purvis, *A History of Women's Education in England* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1991), pp. 64-95.

¹⁷ Perry Williams, 'Pioneer Women Students at Cambridge, 1869-81,' in Felicity Hunt (ed.), *Lessons for Life: The Schooling of Girls and Women 1850-1950* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1987), pp. 177-78.

swearing, black-guarding and gossiping of everyone on the campus' should be eliminated.¹⁸

When St. Mary's students in the nineteenth century finished college, they were given a book, *Book of Farewell and Guidance*, which emphasised the spiritual life of the students. The overwhelming impression that the book gives is that 'the woman teacher's role was to submit to God and to the school managers.'¹⁹ As Charles More points out in the most recently published history of UG, St. Mary's students 'were disinclined to question the existing state of affairs, within college or outside.'²⁰ This is a characteristic that would continue into the twentieth century (as the next chapter shows).

There were strict rules for both male and female US and UK students that regulated virtually every aspect of their lives, especially in regard to relations between the sexes.²¹ For example, early twentieth-century ASU students were fined if they were found talking to members of the opposite sex. The colleges acted as substitute families, which meant that 'Middle-class standards for the close supervision of daughters were upheld... by a timetable which was strictly enforced.'²² One St. Mary's student from 1879-80 described the austere life that students were to follow. The sixty students of the time were made to wear bonnets and attend church services on Sundays. For supper, they were given beer, milk, or water to drink, and bread for five nights, hard biscuits for one night, and seed cake for Sunday to eat. This was supplemented for some by food sent from home. Their exercise consisted of class walks between noon and 13.00 (or on Thursdays shopping with a colleague) in which they walked in pairs close behind each other, led by 'monitresses.' They also had Calisthenics one evening a week, where they wore their usual long and tight

¹⁸ BB Dougherty, quoted in Lanier, *Blanford Barnard Dougherty*, p. 98.

¹⁹ More, *The Training of Teachers*, p. 145.

²⁰ Ibid, p. 168.

²¹ For an analysis of UK student and staff experiences in women's colleges around the same time period see Maria Tamboukou, 'Of Other Spaces: Women's Colleges at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century in the UK,' *Gender, Place and Culture* 7 (2000): p. 247.

²² Edwards, *Women in Teacher Training College*, p. 34.

clothing (including corsets and petticoats), and were taught to walk ‘properly’ and curtsy.²³ Despite these strict regulations which were nothing out of the ordinary for the time, ‘young women applied in their hundreds to join the group at Cheltenham.’²⁴ This was most probably due to the excellent reputation that St. Mary’s had for training teachers.

A male student from St. Paul’s described the sex-segregated college life in 1887-88. He pointed out that St. Paul’s students were not allowed to cross High Street when the St. Mary’s students were ‘let out,’ and the only shared function was choir practice at St. Paul’s. The male and female students were separated by a row of empty desks and a guardian monitor.²⁵ A student from St. Mary’s (1907-09) described life there as being ‘strictly disciplined to high Christian principles.’²⁶ She described the ‘combined’ (with St. Paul’s) Sunday service as a highlight of the week, as it was ‘the nearest contact ever allowed with the students of the opposite sex.’²⁷

St. Mary’s students’ lives were regimented throughout the early 1900s, as it was for women students in teacher-training institutions throughout the UK.²⁸ In 1914, students were to attend roll call and morning prayers at 07.30, followed by breakfast, then beds were to be made and ‘dormitories’ dusted. At the end of the day, students were to be in their dormitories by 21.00, they were not to talk after 21.30, and at 21.45 the ‘monitress’ turned off the gas lights. Most of their classes were given in St. Mary’s buildings. However, as mentioned previously, the few St. Mary’s students who took physics, geology, or advanced mathematics had to go to St. Paul’s, where they were escorted during their time on campus, and made to sit in the front row. Women and men students had separate shopping days, and women were banned from Swindon Road (where the men’s

²³ Louisa Foskett, ‘Memories of 1879-80,’ *St. Mary’s College Magazine- Summer 1928*, reprinted in Sue Southern, (ed.), *The Way it Was: Memories of St. Paul’s and St. Mary’s* (Cheltenham: College of St. Paul and St. Mary Old Students’ Association, 1998), pp. 4-6.

²⁴ Challinor, *The Story of St. Mary’s College*, p. 24.

²⁵ R.A. Masters, ‘Extract From Centenary Chelt (1947),’ reprinted in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, pp. 6-8.

²⁶ Mrs. Flemons, ‘Ethel Johnson at St. Mary’s,’ in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 13.

²⁷ Ibid, p. 14.

²⁸ Frances Widdowson, *Going Up Into the Next Class: Women and Elementary Teacher Training, 1840-1914* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1980), p. 47.

sports ground was), as men were banned from the road near the women's hockey field.²⁹ During the 1915-16 academic year, many men students were drafted into the war effort and the 'few that were left were drafted to other colleges, but St. Paul's buildings were still used by us and some of the male staff still lectured there.'³⁰

There was a loosening of the rules in the early 1900s as the Victorian restraints on women in British society generally weakened. The changes at St. Mary's were due, in part, to the 'new generation of staff with different values.'³¹ The students themselves also influenced the changes in the rules; students in the last decades of the nineteenth century were more likely to have attended a secondary school or board school, whereas before they had not had 'sixth form equivalent' education. Their 'perception of the sphere of women's activities had been enlarged, both by liberalisation within the college and by the emergence of the "women question" nationally.'³² As mentioned in the previous chapter, this was a time of activism on the part of women wanting more political rights. There is evidence that the St. Mary's students were aware of outside debates about the role and position of women. In 1908, The Debating Society held a debate over the question: 'Is a woman's lot harder than a man's?' The argument for the motion included such things as: that females are handicapped from birth because of their sex; that a woman who marries 'has to give up all other ambitions she may have in life'; and that 'although they may do the same work as men, their time and energy are valued at a lower market price.'³³

The 1920s and 1930s were times of social change in the US and the UK. During this period, women achieved full suffrage, and the Depression brought changes in some women's work roles. In the US, 'educational institutions sought to design a pedagogy that would provide for the "new woman" who participated in the economic and political as well

²⁹ A.E. Gould, 'Recollections of Nell,' reprinted in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, pp. 18-20.

³⁰ Ibid, p. 20.

³¹ More, *The Training of Teachers*, p. 127.

³² Ibid, p. 165.

³³ UGA, p. 27: 'The Debating Society' in *Echoes of St. Mary's* (Winter Term 1908).

as the social life of the country.’³⁴ While there were rumblings of change, higher education students’ (particularly female) lives continued to be regulated until the end of colleges’ status as *in loco parentis* in the 1960s (see Chapter Four). Both male and female students at ASU were expected to observe strict rules and regulations throughout the 1920s and 1930s. However, female students were still subjected to stricter rules than their male counterparts: female teachers accompanied them when they left their residence halls; they were not allowed to ride in automobiles except when riding to and from home; and they could not stand next to cars for extended conversation.

There were student protests at ASU in the 1930s against these strict rules. In 1932, students held a mass protest meeting, asking for a joint discussion with the academic staff concerning their complaints. In 1935, male students sat with female students at a basketball game, in direct violation of the rules. Male students later clashed with police after they had visited the female residence halls. The next day, students went on strike to protest the students’ treatment; and BB Dougherty offered the following ‘concessions’: a student committee would be set up; all students would be able to attend classes the next day without the fear of punishment; and the students and academic staff were to build school spirit.³⁵ In other words, the students were not to see real changes in the system, they were instead still seen as errant children.

Life for St. Mary’s students in the 1920s and 1930s also continued to be strictly regulated. They were ‘counted in at least six times a day,’ during mealtimes, at 17.20 and 22.00. Rising bell was at 07.00, and they were to be back in their cubicles at 22.00 in the evenings. A St. Mary’s student from 1931-33 stated that the requirement of wearing the College hat during chapel was especially resented. Also, many students found the forced separation between men and women students ‘extremely Victorian’ since many had attended mixed schools. Students who wanted to date had to have parental permission,

³⁴ McCandless, *The Past in the Present*, p. 52.

³⁵ Lanier, *Blanford Barnard Dougherty*.

‘and one’s name went up on the “Menfriend’s List” which was displayed on a noticeboard in what we called the “Flower Corridor”.’³⁶

The College staff’s expectations for St. Mary’s students were revealed in a 1931 address to first years by the Principal, Miss Monk. She ‘told us how very privileged we were to have a place at College, and as this was for a vocation, she hoped we would spend some years teaching before getting married, because it would mean compulsory resignation.’³⁷ Students were told that they were to have ‘no contact’ with the men at St. Paul’s except if they had written consent from their parents. They risked being ‘sent down’ if they violated this rule. This raises the interesting question of whether the loosening of the dating rules that would come in subsequent years was due, in part, to the abolition of the marriage bar for teachers. A marriage bar was enforced for British women teachers from the early 1920s until its lifting in 1935. There were marriage bars in women’s occupations of similar status during that period. As Alison Oram asserts: ‘between the years 1921 and 1923 the vast majority of education committees (with the tacit agreement of the Board of Education) decided to dispense with the employment of married women as “the most obvious and natural way” of mitigating teacher unemployment and the effects of education cuts.’³⁸

There were a number of far-reaching changes in the rules and regulations during the latter part of the inter-war period. A.E. Monk, then Principal of St. Mary’s, stated in 1937 that she was ‘thankful that on the balance of the whole the widening opportunities for choice have meant a corresponding acceptance of responsibility and a consequent growth in our conception of the meaning of freedom.’³⁹ Compulsory Sunday morning chapel was replaced in 1936 with a ‘quiet hour,’ a quiet time for prayer or contemplation.⁴⁰ Also in

³⁶ Edwina M. Lindsay, ‘Memories of St. Mary’s Hall,’ in Southern (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 42-43.

³⁷ Eileen Brookes, ‘Priory Hostel,’ in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 48.

³⁸ Alison Oram, *Women Teachers and Feminist Politics, 1900-39* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), p. 26.

³⁹ UGA, 33/3/22, p. 3: A.E. Monk in *St. Mary’s College Magazine* (Summer 1937).

⁴⁰ More, *The Training of Teachers*, p. 39.

1936 (a year after the marriage bar for women teachers was lifted), the rules against mixing with students from St. Paul's were loosened when a 'mixed' inaugural dance was held. Rev. Beck, a former principal of St. Paul's who wrote a history of the institution, attributed this to 'the passing of the old order which frowned officially upon the association of the women students of St. Mary's with the men students of St. Paul's.'⁴¹ A St. Mary's student from 1935-37 stated: 'Life as you can imagine was never the same after that momentous event. Mixed friendships inevitably followed.'⁴² After the dance, St. Mary's were allowed to meet St. Paul's students if they signed in an exeat book with the name of the student they were to meet (but this was permitted only on the weekends and women students were to be in by 22.20). A student from the time period stated: 'The atmosphere was very much like a Girls' Boarding School and we were scared to be found doing wrong in case we had a bad reference - in which case no job!'⁴³ Dating was only later to become a more significant part of St. Mary's students' social lives.

Second World War

Historians in the US and the UK have asserted that although the Second World War brought major changes to many women's lives, most of them were transitory.⁴⁴ In Britain, the 1940 Extended Employment of Women Agreement stipulated that women were to be regarded as temporary workers who would fill men's jobs only until the end of the war.⁴⁵ Geoffrey Perrett made the point that in the US during the war there was advancement of conservative interests.⁴⁶ This would have made it harder for women to achieve permanent, radical change. As William Chafe points out, the absence of progress in such things as

⁴¹ Beck, *A History*, p. 21.

⁴² Alfreda Maurer, 'College Memories- 62 Years On In 1997,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 68.

⁴³ Lena Loades, 'Priory 1936-38,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 74.

⁴⁴ For a discussion of why the changes were not permanent see Margaret R. Higonnet and Patrice L. R. Higonnet, 'The Double Helix,' in Margaret R. Higonnet et al, (eds.), *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).

⁴⁵ Harold L. Smith, 'The Womanpower Problem in Britain During the Second World War,' *The Historical Journal* 27 (1984): p. 928.

⁴⁶ Geoffrey Perrett, *Days of Sadness, Years of Triumph: The American People, 1939-1945* (New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan Inc., 1973).

equal pay raised 'profound doubts about the war's permanent impact on underlying attitudes toward woman's place.'⁴⁷ This was true for women in higher education in both countries. The exit of men from higher education campuses as they enlisted created new opportunities for women. However, the end of hostilities and demobilisation enabled the men to return to campus, they filled the leadership positions once again and women found themselves back in their 'traditional' roles, irrespective of their wartime achievements and activities (see post-war section).

As throughout the US and the UK, the Second World War brought changes to women at both ASU and UG. At ASU, the departure of the majority of men from campus brought new opportunities for participation and leadership, whereas at UG the separation of St. Paul's and St. Mary's meant that this was not the case for women students. The position of women at ASU and UG was not fundamentally changed by the onset of wartime conditions. Instead, as was true at national level, the opportunities that opened for women were often only for the duration of the war.

Students at UG were affected somewhat differently from ASU students (reflecting the differing national situations). At the outbreak of Second World War, St. Paul's, along with all other men's training colleges, was closed down. After a few weeks, it was decided to re-open the colleges, but as the St. Paul's premises was being used by the government, the male students were sent to three other colleges - York, Culham, and Saltley. They returned to St. Paul's in September 1940. The students at St. Mary's were also required to move as the Government also used their college buildings. St. Mary's College continued to operate, but relocated to Llandrindrod Wells, Wales, with students and staff being housed in hotels. Students returned to the Cheltenham campus in 1941. This migration of St. Paul's and St. Mary's students was not unique to British citizens. In September 1939,

⁴⁷ William Henry Chafe, *The Paradox of Change: American Women in the 20th Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 152.

the government moved 1,473,000 people (mostly children) from the cities into the countryside to protect them from the effects of German bombing.⁴⁸

St. Mary's students' experiences were also different in that the Cheltenham students had to worry more about the war affecting their personal safety. For example, one student from 1942-44 remembers being kept awake one night in June by the drone of heavy-laden planes, and discovering the next morning from the radio that D-Day had arrived.⁴⁹ St. Mary's students also had to deal with food rationing, blackouts, and the influx of soldiers (many of them foreign) into the surrounding area (although this did create new social opportunities, see below).

Historians have pointed to the important role that women played in the war. Mary R. Beard, writing in 1946, pointed as evidence of this to women's agitation for the enactment of bills that supported the war effort, and their enlistment in military service.⁵⁰ There was evidence that some female ASU students realised the potential for change that the war brought. An editorial in the student newspaper lauded the potential for positive change that the war offered. After pointing out that the Nineteenth Amendment (granting US women suffrage) had been passed 'directly' after the First World War, it stated: 'Now with our college women stepping into every branch of the professions and business (almost entirely taking over the teaching profession) we can expect other great developments.'⁵¹

There were several different types of opportunities that opened for women, both at ASU and in US society as a whole. As mentioned above, women enlisted in the auxiliary forces of the military services. One of these forces, the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC), placed a recruitment advertisement in the 1943 edition of the ASU student newspaper. The advertisement attempted to appeal to the adventurous side of students, and ended by asserting that enlisting gave an 'opportunity to help your country by doing

⁴⁸ Richard M. Titmuss, *Problems of Social Policy* (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1950), p. 101.

⁴⁹ Norah S. Morrison, 'Wartime Memories,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 87.

⁵⁰ Mary Ritter Beard, *Women as Force in History* (New York: Macmillan, 1946), p. 12.

⁵¹ 'Where From Here?', *The Appalachian*, 17 April 1942, p. 2.

essential military work for the U.S. army that frees a soldier for combat duty.’⁵² The US government often drew on conventional stereotypes of women’s roles (in other words supporting men) in their appeals to women during the war.⁵³

In their discussions of their chances to help the war effort, ASU female students stayed within the boundaries of what was perceived at the time to be ‘the women’s sphere.’ In a 1942 meeting of the Women’s Dormitory Assembly, students discussed such things as conserving energy and saving time as things that they could do to help ‘national defense.’ In addition to working out a study plan to maximise their time for the war effort, female students did such things as participate in bond drives, give blood, and collect scrap metal.

Again, because of different national situations, the wartime activities of St. Mary’s students were slightly different. An article in a 1941 edition of St. Mary’s College Magazine describes the activities of staff and students to help the war effort: fire-watching; ration-book schemes; gas-mask testing; Red Cross work; and collecting for the Comforts Fund for the armed forces.⁵⁴ A ‘Wings for Victory Fete’ held in June 1944 to raise money towards the purchase of a plane for the war effort had such things as a fortune telling tent and refreshment stall. St. Mary’s students also volunteered to serve in the Forces’ Canteen, and some were trained to put out smoke bombs. They conserved energy by observing a fifty-mile travel limit, which meant for some not being able to go home for half-term.⁵⁵ Students also contributed to the war effort by planting potatoes in the grounds of St. Mary’s. A St. Mary’s student from 1943-45 stated that students at the end of the war ‘were virtually untouched by outside events - only those girls with men-folk in the battle zones were beset by anxiety.’ They were no longer under the threat of being bombed, and according to the student, rations were ‘small deprivations’ that ‘were of no consequence.’⁵⁶

⁵² ‘To College Women in Their Senior Year,’ *The Appalachian*, 15 January 1943, p. 3.

⁵³ Chafe, *The Paradox of Change*, p. 124.

⁵⁴ UGA, 33/3/28, p. 23: ‘War Work’ in *St. Mary’s College Magazine* (Summer 1941).

⁵⁵ Olive Pitman, ‘St. Mary’s 1942-44,’ in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 91.

⁵⁶ Mary Davidson, ‘Reminiscences of St. Mary’s 1943-45,’ in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 97.

Rationing of food had been in effect since 1940, although towards the end of the war the food shortages were eased with the arrival of lend-lease food shipments from the US.⁵⁷

The war gave ASU female students an opportunity to participate in more 'non-traditional' leadership roles; for example, a woman was elected student body president in the 1940-41 academic year (defeating a male opponent). Women held the post of president throughout the war years. There is a question, however, over how much power the president had at that time. *In loco parentis* was still in effect, and the male-led university management controlled many aspects of the students' lives. The new experience of women students in leadership roles due to the war was not the case at UG, since it was not co-educational.

The situation did improve slightly at ASU during these years regarding *in loco parentis*. The 'Constitution of the Student-Faculty Government Association' was passed in 1940, which helped give a voice to ASU students by providing them with formal input in shaping the rules that governed them. However, the students could only participate in the enforcement of the rules, not challenge them. The Constitution set up Men's and Women's Dormitory Assemblies that were to deal with problems with residence hall rules and regulations. Thus while giving students a voice in applying the rules, the Constitution did not change the power of the university management to govern the students.

As mentioned in the previous section, there were strict rules that governed every aspect of the students' lives, and which were especially important in protecting women students' reputations. The 1941-42 ASU student handbook stated that young men and young women were to 'retire to their part of the campus,' without escorting members of the opposite sex, after general meetings. All students were to go to their rooms when the whistle blew after supper; and they were forbidden to stop in town when going to and from the residence halls. Women students could only attend chapel-announced athletic games.

⁵⁷ Jane Waller and Michael Vaughan-Reese, *Women in Britain* (London: Optima, 1987), p. 46.

Furthermore, women could not spend the night outside of the residence halls and had to report to the 'matrons of the dormitories' before they left campus.⁵⁸

St. Mary's students were similarly subjected to rules that were intended to protect their reputations. They were to sign in and out in exact books, and were to return by 21.30 during the week and 22.00 at weekends. A student from 1942-44 remarked: 'I don't think we really appreciated the nightmares we must have given Miss Jones [Principal] who was responsible for all of us girls in a town full of American G.I.s and Polish forces!'⁵⁹

Another student from 1945-47 stated that after getting out of the cinema at 21.25, she would have to do her 'version of the four minute mile in order to "sign in" on time.'⁶⁰

Other rules that were meant to safeguard ASU students' reputations were the dating rules. The student council started a formal dating programme in 1938, which regulated the amount of dates women could have a week (except for fourth-years), the place of the dates (confined to the residence hall living rooms), and the time and length of the dates (20.00 to 22.00).⁶¹ There is a question of the extent to which the students obeyed these rules. Cratis Williams, a long-time staff and managerial member of ASU, described in his memoirs how he discovered several student couples on a walk that he took shortly after arriving to Boone in 1942. He stated that: "'Boys" over one entrance and "girls" the other, segregated seating in the auditorium, an eight o'clock curfew in the evening and other precautions did not prevent courting couples from coming together when they set their heads to do so.'⁶²

There was also evidence at UG that students 'got around' some of the social rules. A St. Mary's student from 1934-36 stated that 'Escapades were not infrequent - secret meetings with Pauls and windows discreetly left open for late adventurers.'⁶³ Another student from 1934-36 remembered 'two Seniors appearing through the trap door fire

⁵⁸ *ASTC Student Handbook* (Boone: Appalachian State Teachers College, 1941-42), pp. 44-46.

⁵⁹ Betty Drake, 'College Memories 1942-44,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, pp. 89-90.

⁶⁰ June Birch, 'College Days,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 105.

⁶¹ *ASTC Student Handbook* (Boone: Appalachian State Teachers College, 1941-42), p. 51.

⁶² David C. Williams and Patricia D. Beaver, (eds.), *The Memoirs of Cratis Williams: I Come to Boone* (Boone: Appalachian Consortium, 1999), p. 129.

⁶³ Olive Edwards, 'The Priory 1934-36,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 56.

escape in my cubicle in the dormitory' after lights out.⁶⁴ As previously mentioned, students had to be very careful because the punishment for breaking the rules was to be 'sent down.' A St. Mary's student from 1942-44 mentioned an incident where the Principal of St. Mary's shone 'a torch round the gates - couldn't see the St. Mary's students for the St. Paul's students they were with!'⁶⁵ Another from 1945-47 stated that 'those people with ground floor bedrooms were amongst the most popular of students.'⁶⁶

There were ASU student protests during the war years against the regulations that they were expected to follow. In 1943 a group of students presented a list of grievances (complaints) to the college management, which included: seeking the lifting of the ban against social activities such as dancing and playing bridge; a greater need for students to have a voice in residence hall regulations; later library opening hours; and the unpopularity of the 'human behavior system.'⁶⁷ The 'human behavior system' was a system whereby the students received grades for such behaviour as tardiness, and talking or sleeping in class. This had the possibility of decreasing their job opportunities, as prospective employers could make a judgement on students' 'moral characters' using these grades.

When an agreement was not reached with the college management, the students went on strike. This prompted the executive committee of the college management to meet to discuss the issues that the students raised. The findings did not address the students' concerns, but instead were more like a parent rebuking a rebellious child: the college would exercise leniency with the students who had absented themselves from classes; a chance would be given to students to 'stop and think about what it was doing'; any future grievances should go through 'proper channels'; the college would 'maintain the good name' of the students who returned to classes; and an appeal was made to students to

⁶⁴ Marjorie Duke, 'Jottings From 1934-36 At the Priory,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 58.

⁶⁵ Margaret J. Saxton, 'Wartime Memories of College,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 88.

⁶⁶ Birch, 'College Days,' p. 105.

⁶⁷ 'Details Concerning Controversy Revealed in the Following Story,' *The Appalachian*, 29 January 1943, p. 1.

return to their academic work.⁶⁸ As in 1935, institutional managers sought to defuse the crisis rather than address student concerns.

The 'human behavior system' was replaced by a demerit system in 1943. Instead of being graded on their behaviour, the students instead would receive demerits if they broke college rules. Their parents would be notified when they received 25 points, and they would be expelled if they reached 50 points. The student council established the system and was responsible for disciplining students under it.⁶⁹ The council also established residence hall regulation in 1943, the stated reason being to provide a better study environment. Women students were to have closed study sessions in their rooms for two hours, whereas men students were instead asked to refrain from making unnecessary noise.⁷⁰ These types of gender-differentiated rules were common in southern universities during this time period.⁷¹

The Post-War Years: 1945 to 1960

Women in the US and the UK experienced a measure of regression in the years following the end of the Second World War. As mentioned earlier, the return of men veterans meant that women forfeited some of the employment gains that they made during the war as men displaced them from jobs at which they had become proficient, although the number of women in employment grew throughout the 1950s (especially in 'pink collar' jobs, such as secretarial work). Women higher education students were also affected by the return to campus of men students, many of them veterans older than their pre-war counterparts. This decreased the women's leadership opportunities, for example presidencies of student unions returned to being male-dominated on coeducational campuses.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ 'What Do You Think of the Demerit System?', *The Appalachian*, 5 March 1943, p. 2.

⁷⁰ 'Council Sets Up Dorm Regulations,' *The Appalachian*, 19 March 1943, p. 1.

⁷¹ For rules at Vanderbilt University in the neighbouring state of Tennessee see, Paul K. Conkin, *Gone With the Ivy: A Biography of Vanderbilt University*, (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1985).

The post-war years were a time of increased emphasis on domesticity; educational leaders, along with political leaders and the media, stressed the need for women to 'return to their homes and take up domestic duties,' as if women who had been working outside the home had abandoned these duties. One of the reasons that historians have given for this increased domesticity was the perceived need to free up jobs for returning war veterans.⁷² Others pointed to the tensions brought about by the Cold War, which meant that the family and the home became safe havens against the stresses of possible nuclear annihilation.⁷³ There was evidence of this nuclear tension at ASU when a 1946 student newspaper article stated that the threat of nuclear weapons meant that college graduates were needed, and that they should have more children.⁷⁴ Also, the 1950s were a time of growing affluence in both countries. This meant that households could achieve a high living standard on one wage in both middle-class and working-class households.

ASU women students were more affected by the return to campus of men veterans since before the war they had not been as segregated from the men as were the St. Mary's students. A year after the war ended, male veterans comprised almost half of the 892 ASU students and approximately eighty percent of the 350 first-year students. An article in the student newspaper stated: 'The multitudes of veterans has almost balanced nature, or given the campus as many men as women for the first time since A.S.T.C. opened.'⁷⁵ Governmental subsidy for veteran higher education (the GI Bill) helped increase the number of men in universities and colleges nationally.

There was evidence at ASU of tensions between the returning veterans and the women students. In 1946, two female students wrote an article in the student newspaper stating that many of the veterans seemed to resent women students' leadership roles on

⁷² See Ruth Milkman, *Gender at Work: The Dynamics of Job Segregation by Sex During World War II*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987).

⁷³ Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*, (New York: Basic Books, 1988).

⁷⁴ '94% of Graduates Have Assumed the Matrimonial Yoke,' *The Appalachian*, 11 October 1946, p. 1.

⁷⁵ 'Males Outnumber the Weaker Sex,' *The Appalachian*, 20 September 1946, p. 1.

campus. The authors felt it necessary to state that: 'There are veterans here this year who, very capably, could fill those offices, but who, unfortunately were not here last year at election time.'⁷⁶ They pointed out that the main point of contention for the veterans appeared to be not the efficiency of the women leaders, but because 'members of the weaker sex' were in power that year.

Despite the tensions between male veterans and female students, reflected in the above-mentioned article, there was no evidence of an organised effort on the part of women to retain the political gains that they had made during the war. There are several possible explanations for this, one being the transitory nature of student bodies: while the members of one class might resent a certain issue, those in the next class might be less aware of it. Another possible explanation is that there was a perception that women benefited from the status quo. As mentioned earlier, the residence hall and curfew rules helped to guard women's reputations, which were important in attracting potential husbands because of the emphasis placed on 'virginal weddings' at that time. Also, the lack of access to reliable contraception and legal abortions meant that 'an extramarital pregnancy could be - and almost always was - disastrous.'⁷⁷ A pregnancy at that time left an unmarried woman with three hard choices: a forced marriage, adoption, or an illegal, unsafe abortion.

The return of the men veterans to ASU and UG might have played a part in the revision of rules that occurred after the war (discussed below). One St. Paul's student from 1947-49 made the point that most of the men of that year were ex-servicemen, 'recently demobbed, well disciplined, mature, and older than our "senior Year".'⁷⁸ Given their extensive life experience, these men were less likely to tolerate the strict rules against dating and other constraints. Another St. Paul's student from the same year stated that they

⁷⁶ Wilhelmena Ayers and Betty Cline, 'Inquiring Reporter,' *The Appalachian*, 15 November 1946, p. 2.

⁷⁷ Brett Harvey, *The Fifties: A Women's Oral History* (New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1993), p. xvi.

⁷⁸ Geoffrey Corlett, 'The Vintage Year,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 122.

‘found college traditions that had arisen from the lifestyles of much younger students difficult to accept and cope with.’⁷⁹ Another possible factor in the changing in rules was that during the period from the late 1940s through the 1960s, for students ‘contacts with the outside world had increased.’⁸⁰ This was probably due, in part, to the growth of mass media during this time.

Rules continued to be revised throughout the 1940s and 1950s. In 1946 female students at ASU gained the ‘privilege’ of riding in an automobile, with the requirements of parental permission and the approval of the Dean of Women. They also gained the right to attend a movie at 19.00 during the same year, again with the requirement of parental permission. Permission depended on their scholastic ranking and academic year, with fourth-years being allowed to attend movies most frequently, five nights a week, and first-years the least frequently, one night a week. In 1951, fourth-years gained the ‘privilege’ of attending Saturday night movies, and in 1952 they were allowed to receive ‘standing ride permission’ from their parents, which meant that they could use their own discretion when riding in an automobile. An editorial in the student newspaper commented in regard to the riding permission that ‘it gives the girls the feeling that the administration [institutional management] has faith in their abilities to assume such responsibilities without abusing them.’⁸¹ It was also most probably true for most students that they had these privileges at home.

The St. Mary’s College Magazines from the period reveal changes in the curfew and visiting rules throughout the 1950s. In the Spring Term 1951, the Saturday night curfew was extended to 23.00 for St. Mary’s students. During the 1954-55 academic year, St. Mary’s granted the right to students of having male visitors in the common rooms. In 1956, the curfew during the week was extended to 22.30. During the 1956-57 academic

⁷⁹ Peter Doole, ‘Priory Reminiscences 1947-1949,’ in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 121.

⁸⁰ Charles More, ‘*A Splendid College: An Illustrated History of Teacher Training in Cheltenham* (Cheltenham: Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Learning, 1992), p. 16.

⁸¹ Doris Haney, ‘An Accepted Responsibility,’ *The Appalachian*, 19 September 1952, p. 2.

year, the Principal granted students two free weekends a term, where they did not have to be in College.⁸²

Not all ASU women students were satisfied with the rules that applied to them and the minor changes that were made to them. In 1953, thirty-eight female students were called before the student council for having their lights on after hours. A newspaper article stated that the students 'considered the whole thing as a joke...and received demerits with mock tears.'⁸³ One female student complained that the rule was dictatorial and adolescent, and it was pointed out that that it had been enforced for the first time that academic year.

Several students openly complained in the student newspaper about gender inequalities in the rules. Student Billie Ann Roberts wrote in 1955: 'It's bad enough to have rules that seem to strangle you like chains but worse than that is not trying to do something to rid yourself completely of the rules or at least modernize them and make them more bearable as well as more understandable.'⁸⁴ Another student, in an anonymous letter to the student paper, argued for more liberal residence hall hours and asserted that this would not cause women students to fail or misbehave.⁸⁵

There is a question over the extent to which the rules were changed because of student protest, or in response to wider societal change after the war. Also, as will be discussed in Chapter Four, there is the question of whether the rules were changed in line with the changing pro-family ideologies in society. For example, the loosening of the riding and movie privileges rules made it easier for women students to date (thereby to find potential husbands). Marriage was a high priority for many women students, as evidenced by the low age of marriage in the 1950s and 1960s. Some women students viewed colleges and universities as providing important opportunities for women to find fiancées.

⁸² Change of rules were found in the various magazines: UGA, 33/3/39, 'Retrospection' in *St. Mary's College Magazines* (1951-57).

⁸³ 'Girls Admonished for "Burning Midnight Oil",' *The Appalachian*, 30 October 1953, p. 1.

⁸⁴ Billie Ann Roberts, 'The Gadabout,' *The Appalachian*, 15 April 1955, p. 2.

⁸⁵ 'Letter to Editor,' *The Appalachian*, 4 December 1958, p. 2.

As in the rest of the US, there was an increasing emphasis on domesticity at ASU during the post-war years and throughout the 1950s. Part of the increased emphasis on domesticity in the national psyche in both the US and the UK was the importance to women of the ability to attract husbands. There were several articles in the ASU student paper that discussed the appearance of female students. An editorial in a 1946 edition of the student newspaper stressed the importance of women's appearance, and complained that women students wore their gym sweat suits too much. Some even wore their sweat suits 'uptown,' which (it was asserted) not only reflected badly on them but on the whole college.⁸⁶ Another student editorial from the same year complained about the appearance of some female students, but this time the objection was to the wearing of blue jeans and slacks by women. The editorial implied that if the women students could not dress properly, they might as well dress in neckties and suits (in other words like men).⁸⁷

ASU offered a program, Home Economics, which would help prepare students for their future role in the home (and equip them to teach high school females the same). Home Economics courses had existed at ASU from its early history, and the major began in the 1930s. The offering of Home Economics courses in the early 1900s was part of a national trend. The courses 'were seen during the first quarter of the century as preparing young women for their proper vocation, namely, homemaking.'⁸⁸ The courses on offer at ASU in the 1959-60 academic year included: *Elementary Meal Preparation and Table Service; Children's Clothing; Home Furnishing; and Home Nursing and Health of the Family*.⁸⁹

Even courses not normally associated with domesticity had gender elements to them. New physical education courses were required for first year ASU women during the 1949-50 academic year. The course, *Fundamentals of Physical Education*, had two

⁸⁶ 'Girls, Look Your Best!' *The Appalachian*, 11 January 1946, p. 2.

⁸⁷ 'On Being a Girl,' *The Appalachian*, 4 October 1946, p. 2.

⁸⁸ Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), p. 232.

⁸⁹ ASU-A, p. 84: *ASTC Undergraduate Catalogue, 1959-60*.

purposes: to teach the fundamentals of 'moving, walking, sitting, climbing stairs,' and activities that would develop leisure time skills that are 'necessary to successful teaching.'⁹⁰ Dress and make-up would be discussed, but no mention was made of improving the students' health and strength as part of the course goals.

As previously mentioned, St. Mary's students had taken such 'physical education' courses from its early history. They also were offered 'Domestic Economy' courses, although according to More, there was less of an emphasis upon these than at other institutions.⁹¹ In 1889, St. Mary's students were offered cookery classes, and many early students had mentioned needlework classes in their memories of college life.⁹² Elizabeth Edwards discusses the importance of the 'professionalization' of these tasks 'in the construction of [British women's] college's culture of femininity.'⁹³ The needlework classes continued to be offered at St. Mary's for decades, being mentioned in the 1959-60 list of courses available.⁹⁴

As at ASU, the increased emphasis on domesticity at St. Mary's accompanied the growing importance in these post-war years of dating and 'finding a husband' in students' lives. St. Mary's and St. Paul's students now met through College dances, joint social events, and the joint Chapel services on Sundays. A student from 1945-47 stated: 'The highlight of my boyfriends came when, on returning from a visit home, I waved goodbye to my "home" boyfriend, met an ex-pupil from my old school and before waving goodbye to him at Gloucester, made a date. Then, as the train drew into Cheltenham, my College boyfriend was awaiting me on the platform...happy days!'⁹⁵ This is in stark contrast to the prohibitions against mixing with the opposite sex that characterised earlier students' social experiences.

⁹⁰ 'New Programs for Freshmen Inaugurated,' *The Appalachian*, 30 September 1949, p. 1.

⁹¹ More, *The Training of Teachers*, p. 81.

⁹² Various letters in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*.

⁹³ Edwards, *Women in Teacher Training*, p. 96.

⁹⁴ UGA, 27/1/35: 'Courses Available- Session 1959-60'.

⁹⁵ Birch, 'College Days,' p. 105.

In a 'mixed' debate of the St. Paul's Debating Society (where St. Mary's students would have been in attendance) in 1950, the motion 'A woman's place is not in the home' was 'defeated heavily.'⁹⁶ There is further evidence of the importance of domesticity and marriage to St. Mary's students in a College Magazine from 1963. Two students commented on the statement of a Conservative MP that the government funds spent on training women as teachers was wasted since a high percentage of them quit teaching because of marriage after only a short time working. They do not dispute that many St. Mary's students will be married within ten years after leaving College, but they do assert that those 'who are contemplating marriage plan to combine teaching with wedded bliss.'⁹⁷

The Sixties

As discussed in previous chapters, the 1960s were an important era in the formation of the 'modern' women's movement. There was an increase in 'Left' activism in both the US and the UK. Higher education students were integral to many of these movements, for example in the Civil Rights movement in the US. Many students and young people were concerned with advancing their rights and those of 'disadvantaged' groups. At ASU, this was reflected in the protests against the speaker ban law. In 1963, the North Carolina legislature passed a law that banned communist speakers from North Carolina college and university campuses. In an article in the student newspaper, student Ora Eads argued that the 'members of the General Assembly, adopting a paternalistic attitude, feel that they are better able than the college administrators [managers] to decide who should speak on the campuses of state-supported colleges and universities.'⁹⁸ Eads asserted that it was up to the students to prevent their rights being taken away by the legislators.

⁹⁶ UGA, 35/2/107, p. 16: 'Literary & Debating Society' in *The Chelt* (Christmas 1950).

⁹⁷ UGA, 33/4/3, p. 6: Jean Turner and Susan Trevor, 'Chalk or Chores?' in *St. Mary's College Magazine* (Whitsun 1963).

⁹⁸ Ora Eads, 'General Assembly Takes Paternal Role,' *The Appalachian*, 26 September 1963, p. 1.

St. Paul's students were also concerned with free speech issues. In the 1960s, two student magazines were started at St. Paul's: *Why?* and *Perspective*. *Why?* was described in a student magazine article as 'an independent periodical [that] has grown into a rather entertaining "sniping" organ of College opinion,' while *Perspective* was described as following 'a similar but more topical course.'⁹⁹ A 1965 article in *Why?* expressed concern that students did not want to write articles which risked offending the College authorities, as this might damage their assessments. The article asked that 'the College authorities should allay the fears of students, so that they may express their opinios [sic] without fear of reprisal.'¹⁰⁰

As was discussed in Chapter One, historians of the contemporary US women's rights movement have argued that it was strongly influenced by the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s.¹⁰¹ This was not the case so much at ASU, partly because of its historically low percentage of minority students (reflecting the low numbers of minorities in the surrounding community). The first Black student at ASU, Muriel Patricia Ferguson, enrolled in 1963. In an interview with the student newspaper, Ferguson asserted that everyone had been nice to her and that she had not had any trouble. However, the author of the article felt it necessary to state at the end that Ferguson 'entered ASTC under the same rules and regulations as any other student; no special requirements have been placed upon her.'¹⁰² However, two weeks after this article appeared, there was an incident that showed the extent of the prejudice that Ferguson faced in the local community. She and her fellow college band-members had gone to a restaurant in town to eat, when Ferguson was refused service because of her colour. Van Morrow, a fellow band-member, described what happened next, 'Pat smiled and, of course, left. Several of her friends left with her -

⁹⁹ UGA, 35/2/125, p. 4: A.D. Roberts, 'The Changing Scene' in *Chelt* (1966).

¹⁰⁰ UGA, 30/2/5: Martin Bartlett, 'Freedom of Speech?' in *Why?* 2 (1965).

¹⁰¹ Sara Evans, *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979), p. 23.

¹⁰² Louise Walker, 'Negro Co-ed Interviewed,' *The Appalachian*, 10 October 1963, p. 4.

many of us, who already had our meals, stayed.’¹⁰³ Although Morrow argued that students should demand respect for their fellow students regardless of colour, there was no call for a sit-in or boycott of the restaurant. Black students did not arrive at ASU in greater numbers until the latter part of the 1960s.

Feminist historians have also pointed to the New Left as another influence on the birth of the women’s movement during the late 1960s and early 1970s.¹⁰⁴ As with the Civil Rights movement, the New Left was not strong at ASU. As will be discussed in Chapter Three, this was largely due to the conservative nature of ASU’s ethos. For example, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) never became popular on the ASU campus. As will be discussed in the next chapter, when Vietnam War protesters tried to demonstrate on campus, they had eggs thrown at them and other students did not allow them to have a peaceful protest.

An influential ‘left’ movement during the 1960s in Britain was the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND). A college calendar from 1962 hints that the CND was not popular at St. Mary’s. In that year, a motion on CND was defeated by students, although a folk-singing event for CND held the same year was well supported.¹⁰⁵ There is evidence, however, of increasing outside influence on events within UG during the sixties. A 1967 editorial in the St. Paul’s student magazine discussed the increase in student activism. It stated: ‘the growth of the Radical Student Alliance has kindled some fires in the bellies of the most prosperous student population in the world, who are now realising that a ticket to a College or University does not preclude participation in the affairs of society.’¹⁰⁶ Higher education students in both the US and UK were also influenced by the ‘sexual revolution’ that occurred, in great part because of more reliable and available birth control (the birth

¹⁰³ Van Morrow, ‘Negro Co-ed Saluted,’ *The Appalachian*, 24 October 1963, p. 2.

¹⁰⁴ Evans, *Personal Politics*.

¹⁰⁵ UGA, 33/4/3, p. 12: ‘College Calendar’ in *St. Mary’s College Magazine* (Whitsun 1963).

¹⁰⁶ UGA, 32/2/126: A.D. Roberts, ‘Editorial’ in *Chelt* (1967).

control pill was influential in this).¹⁰⁷ In 1969, there was a survey at St. Paul's titled 'Sexual Freedom...Responsibility and Obligation.' The survey results showed that seventy percent of the respondents thought that pre-marital sex was permissible.¹⁰⁸

A St. Mary's student from 1961-64 stated that during those years 'there was much debate nationally on the freedom of students and the desirability of educating both sexes together.'¹⁰⁹ The student added, however, that the debate on student freedom was more 'strident' at other UK universities than at UG. She noted that the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963 'impacted greatly on this secure and rather comfortable existence that was College life and the concessions that we had achieved and that were so important to us were put into perspective.'¹¹⁰ One of the concessions that she was referring to was the freedom to wear trousers inside the College (only) that was granted in 1963. Also, visitors were allowed to visit the main residence hall of Fullwood for Sunday afternoon tea.

Another St. Mary's student stated that while the 1960s were known as a time when young people were free to express themselves in whatever manner they chose, this was far from being the case at St. Mary's. As a former student asserted: 'Compared to the rules that former students had operated under, our college lives must have seemed very liberal, but there were still rules, and penalties followed if you broke them.'¹¹¹ As will be discussed in Chapter Four, dress codes and curfew rules continued to constrain St. Mary's residents' lives.

One change that affected students at both St. Paul's and St. Mary's was that more students chose to live outside of the residence halls, making it more difficult for the Colleges to regulate their lives. Another change that occurred in the 1960s was that 'appointed student representatives...were replaced by elected student councils and student

¹⁰⁷ For a discussion of the effects of the sexual revolution in Britain see: Sheila Jeffries, *Anti-Climax: A Feminist Perspective on the Sexual Revolution* (London: The Women's Press, Ltd., 1990).

¹⁰⁸ UGA, 35/2/128, p. 19: 'Sexual Freedom...Responsibility and Obligation' in *Chelt* (1969).

¹⁰⁹ Marilynne Davies, 'Momentous Years at St. Mary's,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 173.

¹¹⁰ Ibid, p. 174.

¹¹¹ Nina E. Rogers, 'In the Pink,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 175.

unions affiliated to the National Union of Students.’¹¹² This exposed internal student politics much more to national issues and campaigns. The 1966 St. Paul’s student magazine stated that: ‘Student-Council, an innovation in terms of the history of College, progresses, albeit slowly, towards autonomy and democratic representation.’¹¹³

Conclusion

ASU and UG have a very similar history; both were founded in the nineteenth century as teacher- training institutions, by publicly-spirited men who believed in instilling high moral standards into future teachers. To this end, students at both institutions had strict rules and regulations placed upon them for much of the institutions’ early histories. As will also be discussed in subsequent chapters, the students at ASU and UG reacted to the conservative environments in similar ways.

One difference was that UG was less localised than ASU. UG’s Life Governors were appointed from all parts of the country. Another difference was that the male students outnumbered the female students by four to one when it began in 1847, whereas ASU has historically had more females. This ratio of St. Paul’s to St. Mary’s students was to change in the early 1900s when the number of places in St. Mary’s doubled, which reflected in part the growing popularity of teaching as a career for women.¹¹⁴

There is also a difference in how ASU and UG women students experienced Second World War (in keeping with the differing national situations). ASU women students were more affected by the departure of men from the campus to serve in the forces, whereas this did not affect St. Mary’s students as much because it was not co-educational. Another difference between the two was that St. Mary’s students experienced the war more personally because they were geographically closer to the battlefronts. At

¹¹² More, ‘A Splendid College’, p. 30.

¹¹³ Roberts, ‘The Changing Scene,’ p. 4.

¹¹⁴ More, *The Training of Teachers*, pp. 12-15, 33.

least one St. Mary's student was injured in the bombing of her hometown, and all St. Mary's students experienced evacuation, blackouts, and food rationing. A major similarity of the students' experiences was that the opportunities that opened for them during the war were temporary, mainly lasting only for the duration of the war. For example, at ASU women were student body presidents during the war, but men were elected to this post after their return to campus.

There were also similarities in ASU and UG women students' experiences during the post-war period. There were relaxations in the rules and regulations, especially in regard to curfews and dating. This fit in with the growing emphasis in both countries on domesticity. Again, ASU students were more affected by the return of men onto their campus, because St. Mary's was not co-educational.

The conservative nature of both institutions meant that the experiences of students within them during the 1960s were similar. An interesting question in regard to ASU and UG is where the impetus for change that occurred in the 1960s originated at these institutions. As will be discussed in Chapter Four, changes did occur for students in regard to a relaxation of the regulations that were applied to them. Students were influenced by what was happening on other US and British campuses and national events such as the lowering of the age of majority in their fight to be treated as adults. The doctrine of *in loco parentis* was being successfully overturned, and students were being accorded greater autonomy in relation to their own behaviour. While ASU and UG students might not have been directly influenced by national movements such as the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left, they were indubitably influenced by the broader social changes that were occurring throughout the western world in the 1960s.

The women at ASU and UG were influenced by outside events in their struggles against male hegemony from their founding to 1970. The women's movement as discussed in the previous chapter had an influence, as did political and legal matters such as the changing in the age of majority. While their experiences reflected national events,

the conservative nature of the institutions meant that the struggle of women within the institutions against male hegemony was especially difficult. The next chapter will discuss the conservative ethos of both institutions, and the influence of feminism and the negative reaction to feminism on women in the institutions.

CHAPTER THREE: Institutional Environment

Another dimension of the male hegemony of higher education will be addressed here: the interactions between conservatism and feminism. The previous chapters have discussed the conservative nature of Appalachian State University (ASU) and the University of Gloucestershire (UG). This chapter will further explore this. It will investigate the countervailing influence of feminism and also negative reactions to feminism for women staff and students in these institutions during the latter part of the last century. In the Introduction I discussed the terms feminism and conservatism, and the first two sections of this chapter will analyse their effects at ASU and UG.

The third section will discuss the negative reactions to feminism at ASU and UG. Some feminists have used the term 'backlash' to refer to the perceived negative reactions against feminism (especially in the Western World) that have occurred throughout history, but particularly since the 1970s.¹ The negative reaction was especially virulent in the 1980s, with radical feminism being attacked from elements of both the right and the left. Right-wing governments in both the US and UK promoted 'family values,' which were seen by them to be fundamentally different from radical feminists' values. Section 28 of the 1988 Local Government Act, which forbade the 'promotion' of homosexuality, typified the right-wing attack in Britain. However, it was not only those who held conservative views across a spectrum of political issues who were opposed to feminism. According to Sheila Jeffries, socialist gay males from the left who disagreed with feminist anti-pornography campaigns also attacked radical feminism.²

¹ See for example, Susan Faludi, *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women* (New York: Doubleday, 1991); and Sylvia Walby, "'Backlash' in Historical Context," in Mary Kennedy, Cathy Lubelska, and Val Walsh (eds.) *Making Connections: Women's Studies, Women's Movements, Women's Lives*, (London: Taylor & Francis, 1993).

² Sheila Jeffries, *Anti-climax: A Feminist Perspective on the Sexual Revolution* (London: The Women's Press, Ltd., 1990).

This chapter will explore how conservatism, feminism, and the negative reactions to feminism have affected the experiences of women students and staff at ASU and UG. The effects of these will be put into context through comparisons with the national and regional situations, and what was occurring at other higher education institutions during the same time period (namely the late twentieth-century). This chapter will illustrate the similar ways that feminists can (even across national boundaries) create change in conservative environments.

Conservatism

Both ASU and UG are located in conservative areas of their respective countries, and both are higher education institutions with conservative reputations. ASU is located in the southern region of the US, which has traditionally been seen as more conservative than the North. The historian Amy Thompson McCandless describes twentieth century southern higher education students as being more Protestant, rural, and conservative than the national student population. In addition, there are many fundamentalist Protestants in the South, who tend to be more conservative than other Protestants, and who disapprove of such activities as drinking alcohol, dancing and smoking.³ Many of the southern states (those which made up the Confederacy in the American Civil War) were among those states that did not ratify the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the Constitution. The ERA, which would have guaranteed women equal rights, passed through Congress but was not ratified by the required number of states by the deadline in the 1980s. Jane Sherron De Hart offers several possible reasons for this: there were more Protestant fundamentalists in the South; more southerners were traditionalists; and southerners generally tended to be more suspicious than northerners of federal intervention. She argues that 'court-enforced sexual equality, like racial equality, many Southerners believed, would further diminish the

³ Amy Thompson McCandless, *The Past in the Present: Women's Higher Education in the Twentieth-Century American South* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999), p. 1.

power of state and local governments and the right of individuals to live as they chose.’⁴ Southerners’ proclivity for conservatism meant that the student population from which the university recruited its students tended to be more conservative in relation to the US student population. It also meant that the staff members and managerial members that ASU recruited from the South were more likely to espouse conservative values than their northern counterparts.

As previously discussed, the conservative values of the South have affected women in particular ways. Historically, upper-class (and later, middle-class) white southern women were held to ideals typified by the concept of being a ‘lady.’ Anne Firor Scott contrasts the image of the ideal southern lady with the reality that women participated in political reform movements during the Progressive Era of the early to mid-nineteenth century. The ideal was that women were expected to be financially and emotionally dependent on fathers or husbands. Although they might hold jobs outside the home, they were not expected to have careers which might have the possibility of making them independent. According to Scott, the ideal ‘continued to shape the behavior of southern women for many years and has never entirely disappeared.’⁵

This image affected the education that women received: ‘many twentieth-century parents continued to view colleges for women as nineteenth-century finishing schools—places where adolescent women could be kept safe from the corruption of the outside world and where they could acquire the grace and bearing of a “lady”.’⁶ This was also the case for working-class women who were expected to help support their families. The normal and industrial colleges that they attended, which trained them for teaching and

⁴ Jane Sherron De Hart, ‘Second Wave Feminism(s) and the South: The Difference that Differences Make,’ in *Women of the American South: A Multicultural Reader*, Christie Anne Farnham, ed. (New York: New York University Press, 1997), p. 280.

⁵ Anne Firor Scott, *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), p. x.

⁶ McCandless, *The Past in the Present*, p. 12.

other 'female' jobs, also taught them how to behave as ladies. Chapter Four will discuss how this ideal image affected the rules and regulations that students were to follow.

As an ASU alumnus stated in an interview, ASU was 'by and large more toward the conservative side of things...compared with society as a whole [is] probably still on the conservative side...' which she attributed to the 'mountain culture, being isolated.'⁷

Another alumnus concurred: 'I feel that because ASU was nestled away in the mountains it often was protected from a lot of issues that are more prevalent in a bigger city and probably was more conservative in its rules and activities because of its location.'⁸ A third attributed the conservative atmosphere in part to the fact that ASU was a 'suitcase college,' meaning that students went home on the weekends. Many students were still tied to their 'hometowns,' which meant that they did not participate in extra-curricular activities as much as they might have if they had spent more time on ASU's campus.⁹ This meant that they were not as likely to be exposed to new ideologies and movements than if the college experience had been a larger part of their lives.

An ASU staff member described the institution as very conservative, and stated that changes occur slowly at ASU. When asked if she attributed this to the mountain culture, the staff member stated that she believed that the people in key positions migrated to ASU because they were attracted to the conservative atmosphere, which meant that they were not quick to change things. In other words, the conservative reputation influenced who applied for posts at ASU. Conservative senior managers did not want ASU to appear to be a radical institution; instead they wanted it to be seen as conservative and solid. She gave as one of the reasons for this the political nature of the managerial positions; they need to take into consideration public perception and the attitudes of financial donors to the

⁷ Nancy Schneeloch, interview with author, 20 June 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁸ Janice Howard, email interview with author, 5 July 2000.

⁹ Robbie Sharrett, interview with author, 10 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

institution.¹⁰ This was illustrated by the reaction to an effort to form a gay organisation on campus in the 1970s, which will be discussed below.

Several alumni mentioned the nurturing aspect of ASU's ethos. One used the following adjectives to describe ASU's environment: 'hominess, sense of security, tucked into mountains, protective and nurturing.'¹¹ She reported that as her secretary's son was interested in attending ASU, she had attended the open house and came away with a sense of security that her son 'would be okay' at ASU. Another interviewee described ASU's environment as being protective, providing the opportunity for her to 'grow up' in a protective environment.¹² One of the things that contributes to this feeling of cosiness and security is the conservative environment. As mentioned earlier, conservatism represents opposition to radical change, which means that things continue on a middle, 'secure' course. This raises an interesting question over what ASU is protecting its students from. There are several possible answers, including exposure to crime, drugs, 'radical' ideologies such as communism, and/or radical student movements.¹³

UG is also located in a conservative area of its country, one that has historically been conservative both politically and socially. In the nineteenth century Cheltenham was a spa town where well-off families of military officers who served in 'the empire' retired (particularly Anglo-Indians). It is also the location of two very prestigious public schools, Cheltenham Ladies College and Cheltenham Boys College. As mentioned in Chapter Two, Cheltenham was an evangelical Christian centre during the nineteenth century.¹⁴

A staff member at UG characterised the environment as being patriarchal when she arrived in the 1980s. Many members of staff and management appeared not to be open to

¹⁰ Thalia Coleman, Interview with author, 12 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

¹¹ Debbie Sexton, interview with author, 13 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

¹² Susan Johnson, email interview with author, 29 June 2000.

¹³ For a discussion of the fear of one of these 'radical' movements, see Lisa Maria Hogeland, 'Fear of Feminism: Why Young Women Get the Willies,' *Ms.* (November/December 1994), reprinted on website: www.rapiereliefshelter.bc.ca/volunteer/fearoffem.html.

¹⁴ For more information on Cheltenham's history, see: Gwen Hart, *A History of Cheltenham* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1965).

feminist ideas. She did, however, also state that the institutional environment has since improved, becoming more open.¹⁵ In an interview, another staff member stated that UG is a conservative institution, with a conservative student body. They also pointed out that UG 'has never had a radical history'.¹⁶

Both universities have a largely homogenous student body characterised as predominately white, Christian, and middle-class. ASU and UG historically have also had more female students than male students, due in part to their foundations as teacher training colleges, which in both countries have traditionally attracted more women students. A UG Academic Policy Committee meeting in 1983 discussed the imbalance of men and women students at Colleges of Higher Education, particularly at Cheltenham. It was pointed out that Cheltenham's image was 'strong' and that it appealed to the middle classes. The polytechnics appealed more to students who were vocationally-minded (excluding teaching) and those attracted to the independence of city-based larger institutions, many of whom were men. It was stated that Colleges of Higher Education not only had a rather paternalistic image, which tended to appeal more to women (or to the parents of female students), but also 'The nature of our major full-time courses pre-determines the balance across the sexes of 2:1, women to men.'¹⁷ The meeting discussed possible strategies to attract more men such as national advertisements in publications where men would be more likely to see them. This raises the interesting question of why they felt it was necessary to try to attract more men, and if they would have felt the same way if the ratio had been reversed. One possible reason for this is that institutions that have more men than women are regarded as more prestigious than those where the reverse is true.

¹⁵ 'Jo,' Interview with author, 20 February 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

¹⁶ 'Pat,' Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

¹⁷ UGA, 20/2/16, p.1: "Minutes of Academic Policy Committee Meeting" (11 May 1983).

As previously mentioned, both institutions were founded by highly religious, Christian men. UG has been cited as a Christian institution throughout its history. A 1980-81 Prospectus stated that the College's 'Christian foundation is reflected in its concern for family and community life and in the personal standards expected from all members, whether they are resident or day students.'¹⁸ In other words, staff and students were held to ideals of behaviour based upon Christian beliefs. One student protested these standards of behaviour in a letter to the editor of a student union newsletter in 1981. The student had been a post-graduate at a larger university before coming to Cheltenham, and made the harsh comparison of the institutional environment with a concentration camp:

Let me make myself clear, fellow students these are the best years of your life, believe it or not, so why do you allow yourself to be bound by petty rules? Why the hell can't you have visitors in your room all night if that's what you want? 'But this is a church college', I hear you scream- fair enough. But you're all adults, you all know what you're doing (even on a Saturday night).¹⁹

The next chapter will discuss in more detail the rules and regulations that students were to follow. The strong Christian atmospheres of both universities help to explain the stringency of these rules and regulations in relation to contemporary rules at other higher education institutions.

At ASU, this conservatism was evidenced by the controversy that was caused in the late 1970s and early 1980s when the Student Senate voted to recognise a gay organisation, the Gay Awareness Association. The Association submitted its application for recognition to the Student Government Association, which approved the request by a vote of nineteen to eleven.²⁰ The application was then to be approved by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and finally by the Chancellor of the University. According to the Constitution of the Gay Awareness Association, its purposes were:

1. To provide information, guidance and advice to the gay community.

¹⁸ UGA, 18/6/3, p. 8: *The College of St. Paul's and St. Mary's Prospectus* (1980-81).

¹⁹ UGA, 30/2/15: "Letters," *Student Union News* (November 1981).

²⁰ ASU/A, JET Papers: Herbert W. Wey, 'Memo to Rufus Edmisten' (23 April 1979).

2. To improve the stereotyped image of the gay person.
3. To sponsor service projects such as workshops, lectures and films relating to the special needs of gay students.
4. To inform the campus community of the needs of the gay population.
5. To provide a network for gays to communicate with each other.²¹

The listed purposes of the Association were not radical; it was to be a supportive network and not one that would 'promote homosexuality.'

Despite this, the Chancellor still received letters and phone calls of complaint from outraged members of the local community. In a letter to the Assistant to the President of the University of North Carolina System, he stated: 'I would like for you to know that this area of the state is very much opposed to the gays and I have had many letters and calls asking that the gay organization not be approved.'²² One call was from a reverend from a Baptist Church who told a manager that if the university allowed this to go on, it, along with the people in it, were going to hell.²³ There was also the possibility of financial recriminations; ASU's administration received a letter from at least one corporation threatening to withdraw contributions because of this matter.

The student body held a ballot in 1979 over whether they agreed with the Student Senate's approval of the Gay Awareness Association's constitution. Out of 760 votes, six were discounted, 198 favoured the Senate action and 556 opposed it. The 'head chairperson' of the Student Senate, in a memo to the Vice-Chancellor of Student Affairs, stated that the ballot 'serves as a further recommendation to the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs and the Chancellor.'²⁴ This raises the interesting question of why, if the majority of students were against it, did the Senate approve the organisation? One possibility was that the members of the Student Senate were more 'liberal' than the general student population. Another possible explanation was that they approved the organisation

²¹ ASU/A, JET Papers: 'Gay Awareness Association Proposed Constitution' (28 February 1979).

²² ASU/A, JET Papers: Herbert W. Wey, 'Memo to Richard Robinson' (15 May 1979).

²³ ASU/A, JET Papers: Rick Howe, 'Memo to Dr. Wey on Complaint Regarding the Proposed Gay Awareness Association' (6 April 1979).

²⁴ ASU/A, JET Papers: Steve Kotszycki, 'Memo to Barbara Daye' (7 May 1979).

because they knew what the reaction of the managers of the university would be. In other words, they wanted to create controversy.

The Chancellor of ASU also demonstrated his conservatism in his responses to the letters and telephone calls he received regarding the Gay Awareness Association. In a letter to the Attorney General for the state of NC, he wrote:

Although I realize that there are a couple of approved gay organizations on the campus of Chapel Hill [the main campus of the University of North Carolina] and probably some of the other campuses within the University system, I am concerned about the fact that North Carolina law is pretty specific about the activities of the gays. I also realize that federal court actions have given the gays more of what they call their rights. My question to you is if I approve the gay club on the campus of Appalachian State University, am I in violation of North Carolina statutes?²⁵

The Chancellor stated in a letter to people who complained about the Gay Awareness Association that he was personally opposed to the Association and would not approve it unless the Attorney General advised him to do so. He also pointed out that seventy-seven percent of the students balloted had voted against approving the Association.²⁶ In answer, the Attorney General wrote that if the Chancellor did not approve the Association, there was a possibility that the university could be sued as a consequence. The Chancellor asked the Student Senate to reconsider their approval of the Gay Awareness Association, but they refused. Despite all of this, the Association did not become active at that time because of lack of a staff sponsor, which every student government organisation was to have.²⁷

There was evidence of this type of conservatism state-wide in North Carolina (NC). In 1985, Michael Decker, a state legislator, sent a letter to the Chancellor of ASU asking for his support for a bill that he was introducing, House Bill (HB) 1186, which proposed to outlaw the recognition of gay organisations by universities. Decker stated that he was

²⁵ ASU/A, JET Papers: Herbert W. Wey, 'Memo to Rufus Edmisten' (23 April 1979).

²⁶ ASU/A, JET Papers: Herbert W. Wey, 'Memo regarding the Gay Awareness Association' (7 May 1979).

²⁷ ASU/A, JET Papers: John Thomas, 'Memo to Michael Decker of the NC House of Representatives' (4 June 1985).

concerned that gay groups were receiving official recognition by NC universities and colleges, because they engaged in illegal activities (a reference to old laws against sodomy that were still on the books). The Draft Bill, HB 1186, stated:

The Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina shall adopt rules to ensure that official university recognition is not given to any club or organization that is made up of avowed homosexuals or that advocates homosexuality. No constituent institution may give any aid, financial or otherwise, to such clubs or organizations, unless failure to do so would violate State or federal law.²⁸

According to McCandless, this attempted interference by a politician with the operation of state universities was common in the South. Many had opposed the integration of blacks into southern university systems in the 1960s.²⁹

There are similarly questions over how welcome homosexual staff and students were made to feel at UG, although a UG Student Union policy document issued in 1988 resolved to ‘counter homophobia wherever it exists both in our college and the wider community by means of positive action methods.’³⁰ According to a 1993 paper, *Lesbian Issues in the WS Curriculum*, ‘Cheltenham and Gloucester College, in our very relevant experience, does not always provide a safe and welcoming environment for non-heterosexuals.’³¹

As discussed in Chapter Two, the students at both institutions also showed their conservatism through their lack of support for ‘radical causes.’ One alumni interviewee who was a mature student who came to ASU in 1979 commented: ‘I found the students, in general, to be less politically aware than the folks I had known in NYC [New York City], where I lived before Boone.’³² The New Left, particularly Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), was not very active on ASU’s campus, unlike other American universities during the 1960s. When Vietnam War protestors tried to speak at ASU, they were forced

²⁸ ASU/A, JET Papers: Michael Decker, ‘Memo to John Thomas’ (30 May 1985).

²⁹ McCandless, *The Past in the Present*, p. 12.

³⁰ Papers of Melanie Ilic: Mark Ravenscroft, *Anti-homophobia Policy* (October 1988).

³¹ Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Lesbian Issues in the Curriculum* (1993).

³² Denise Grohs, Email interview with author, 05 July 2000.

off campus by counter-demonstrators. ASU was not the only southern university where this occurred; students at Clemson University in South Carolina held a counterdemonstration against a protest moratorium against the conflict in Vietnam.³³

Students at UG also were not politically active relative to national students; in 1971, they voted unanimously against holding a Day of Action in support of trade unions.³⁴ A 1983 news article on the history of the National Union of Students (NUS) and UG's Student Union acknowledged the political passivity of Cheltenham students. It stated that 'the daunting spectre of politics rarely reared its head in Cheltenham', and that the Student Union was detached from mainstream NUS politics.³⁵ Students did become active, however, when political change threatened to affect them more personally, as over the question of amalgamation of the Colleges of St. Paul's and St. Mary's in the 1980s (see timeline at beginning of this thesis).

Some UG students also held demonstrations over such issues as education cuts. In a 1976 Staff/Student meeting, St. Mary's students discussed taking action to protest education cuts (including occupying a college building and attracting press coverage). Students had attended a demonstration in London on the same issue that same year, and questioned the disciplinary action that the Principal had taken against those who participated. She had informed 'staff of her attitude about student absence from lectures to attend the demonstration.'³⁶

Another manifestation of this conservatism was the lack of amenities for female staff and students (for example women's centres and child care) at both institutions, which will also be discussed in Chapters Five and Six. An ASU staff member wrote in a 1992 memo that in a report that she had prepared in 1983 on ASU for the *Everywoman's Guide to Colleges and Universities*, ASU was ranked last-but-one in terms of women student

³³ McCandless, *The Past in the Present*, p. 240.

³⁴ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 109: 'Minutes of the Staff/Student Committee Meeting' (20 February 1971).

³⁵ UGA, 30/2/15, p. 6: "A History of the Student Union" *Student Union News* (October 1983).

³⁶ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 157: 'Minutes of Staff/Student Committee Meeting' (21 June 1976).

services and academic programs. The staff member noted that at the time of the memo, little progress had been made on Title IX services and the status of women's studies.³⁷ This reflects the conservativeness of the institution because improving Title IX services and the status of women's studies would mean making what could be seen as 'radical' changes to the management ethos of ASU.

There was also the issue of the attitude toward the Office of Women's Concerns (OWC), which is discussed more fully in Chapter Six. A 1992 memo from the head of the Office stated that 'women administrators [managers] such as myself -- whose office's explicit mission is to work to resolve all of the problems I have articulated -- are not included in the decision making process in areas specifically targeted toward women faculty [academic staff], students and [support] staff.'³⁸ Also, the academic staff and managers involved in female-related issues did not consult the OWC for networking, assistance, or advice on a routine basis. This attitude toward the OWC also reflects its low status in the eyes of some academic staff and managers.

The conservative ethos of ASU's managers was also reflected in their reaction to the effort to start a women's centre. One was opened during the Autumn term of 1998 after students complained of the deficiency. Some in the institution's managerial staff had been resistant to the establishment of a Women's Center because they were concerned that it would only be used by such groups as the National Organization for Women (NOW), which works for equal rights for women. Some managers were also concerned that the Women's Center would give feminists a forum from which they could launch their 'radical' agenda. The female staff member who was asked to oversee the project had a different understanding of what a Women's Center could offer; she saw it as being more inclusive. She had seen how Women's Centers on other US campuses were marginalised

³⁷ WRC, ASU WS Files, p. 2: Maggie McFadden, 'Memo to Chancellor's Search Committee' (19 November 1992).

³⁸ WRC, ASU WS Files, p. 2: Melissa Barth, 'Comment to Chancellor's Search' (not dated but circa 1992).

because they were seen as too exclusive.³⁹ Scholar Teri Ann Bengiveno is also concerned about the marginalisation of women's centres; she believed that they can 'play a significant role in promoting equity as long as they are viewed as central vehicles in the equity process and are able to avoid marginalization.'⁴⁰

Many other US Centers experienced debate between advocacy and activism. Bengiveno attributed the founding of many of the Centers to the hostile environment on US campuses and stated that the 'first campus Centers were service agencies.'⁴¹ This view of their role reflected the debate between advocacy and activism. When the Centers are seen as service agencies they fit in with the 'traditional sphere' of women. However, when they are seen 'as change agents, they threaten the traditional structure by demanding equal opportunity.'⁴² While many of the Centers started out being service agencies, many of them shifted to advocating institutional change, which seems to be what some ASU managers were protesting against.

The conservatism of some ASU managers was reflected in the concerns that they voiced about a Women's Center: that it would only be used by NOW members and that it would be used by feminists to launch their 'radical' agenda. It is especially ironic that the managers used NOW as an example of a radical organisation since many feminists do not see it as such. They instead see it as institutionalising the struggle for women's rights and some students feel that the organisation is 'too far removed from their daily experiences.'⁴³ The managers' concerns about the alleged dangers of feminism reflected in part the negative reaction that occurred against feminism (see Negative Reactions section).

ASU alumni interviews pointed to an interesting paradox in the campus environment, namely the seeming toleration of differences. One alumnus wrote:

³⁹ Lee Williams, Interview by Author, 8 April 1998, ASU, Boone, NC.

⁴⁰ Teri Ann Bengiveno, 'Feminist Consciousness and the Potential for Change in Campus Based Student Staffed Women's Centers,' *Journal of International Women's Studies* 07 March 2000, www.mcla.mass.edu/academics/sba-womenctr/bengiven.htm, p. 7.

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 2.

⁴² Ibid, p. 2.

⁴³ Ibid, p. 6.

‘Probably there was a more open mind to new ideas and more freedom for students to try on ideas and roles. There was an acceptance of ‘being different’ and looking at things from new ways.’⁴⁴ This was in comparison to what students had known before in their ‘hometowns’ and family life, and the acceptance referred to was by other staff and students. Another alumnus also believed that the ASU campus was more tolerant of differences than other places that she had known. She gave the example of one of her friends who pitched a tepee (Native American tent) on the commons. She stated that: ‘I don’t know any other college that would be as embracing of the ideals that sort of quintessential person stands for [hippies], peace, equality and that sort of thing.’⁴⁵ She went on to state that in her experience, ASU was welcoming of differences, but she acknowledged that there were conservative factions on campus who were not as welcoming. She also stated that any college campus is ‘more open to creative thinking and growth experiences,’ in relation to the wider society.⁴⁶ An alumnus from the 1970s also discussed the wide variety of types of students on ASU’s campus:

We would see the 60s and 70s dress, the hippie clothes and other extreme things, I remember one person wore a black cape all of the time. So we had a few very fringe people, then we had the hippie bunch, then the conservative bunch...⁴⁷

There is a difference, however, between tolerating differences and openly embracing them. In regard to feminism, one ASU staff member asserted the absence of an accepting attitude towards it, that it was tolerated but not accepted.⁴⁸ Also, as mentioned in the quote above, the proportions of students with radical versus conservative ideas was important; the vast majority of staff and students (and most of the leaders) on campus were not ‘fringe’ or ‘hippie’, but were instead conservative.

⁴⁴ Paula Stanley, email interview with author, 27 June 2000.

⁴⁵ Amy Funderburk, interview with author, 19 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Robbie Sharrett, interview with author, 10 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁴⁸ Coleman, 2000.

Feminism

The question arises of how, if the academic communities at ASU and UG were so conservative, were the female staff and students able to establish and maintain innovations such as women's studies, as discussed in Chapter Six? Even though ASU and UG are conservative institutions within higher education, higher education itself is often regarded as a relatively progressive force.⁴⁹ As discussed in Chapter One, feminism has had a significant impact on higher education in both the US and the UK, influencing not only what is taught, but also how it is taught (see also Chapter Six). As Louise Morley stated: 'Feminist academics can be knowledge agents, micropolitically making interventions, not only in course provision and organisational practices, but also about the discourses and regimes of truth that inform them.'⁵⁰ This feminist intervention has the possibility of profoundly affecting their students' ways of thinking.

Feminism did have an impact on staff and students at ASU and UG. Chapter Six will discuss how feminist staff influenced the foundation and maintenance of women's studies. There were also feminist groups, seminars, and organisations at both universities. At ASU, there was a 1986 Faculty Development Seminar on feminist theory. The purpose of the seminar was to give the members of ASU and the community of Boone an opportunity to debate and discuss the issues and themes of feminist theory. A brochure on the seminar stated that the seminar was especially important for ASU because the philosophies and structures of its departments inhibited the sharing of up-to-date information.⁵¹ In other words, feminism was to build links between otherwise disparate departments and disciplines. Victoria Robinson points to the importance of the interdisciplinary approach to WS: 'The crossing of theoretical boundaries –

⁴⁹ For a discussion of college students' role in the American New Left of the 1960s and 1970s, see James Miller, *'Democracy is in the Streets': From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987).

⁵⁰ Louise Morley, *Organising Feminisms: The Micropolitics of the Academy*, (London: Macmillan, 1999), pp. 6-7.

⁵¹ WRC, ASU WS Files, p. 1: 'Faculty Development Seminar on Feminist Theory - Proposal for Revitalization' (October 1986).

multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or transdisciplinary (going beyond the disciplines) – allows an issue or area to be examined from a variety of intellectual standpoints and has been seen as the most appropriate to Women's Studies.'⁵²

UG held a Women's Week in March 1989 with films, a debate on feminism, a talk on pornography, and an assertiveness training session. It was described at a Gender Committee meeting as receiving mixed support: the films were not well attended, but the debate on feminism and talk on pornography were well attended and produced 'lively debate.'⁵³ The meeting also discussed the possibility of organising a Gender Debating Society, which would be formed by students with the help of staff. This group ran for a short while in the early 1990s, which indicated that at that time there was an interest among some staff and students in feminist issues.

Chapter Five will discuss in some detail the feminist organisations that staff formed, but they and student organisations deserve brief mention here. In 1981, the Association for Women Students (AWS) was founded by five ASU female students: Dail Bridges, Susan Miller, Lee Beckham, Susan Cain, and Lisa Carswell. According to Bridges, the purpose of the group was 'to give students an opportunity to gain awareness and skills needed for full participation in a changing American society and to take action on issues that affect women students.'⁵⁴ The group provided education on laws which affected women, and exchanged information with the Boone chapter of NOW. Some thirty people attended AWS's first meeting and discussed women's health on campus. According to an article in the student newspaper, 'Through its outreach program, AWS seeks to heighten student awareness of women's issues and to encourage active student support of these concerns.'⁵⁵ Their activities during their first year of existence included: 'providing strong support for the ERA, working against the Human Life Amendment in its

⁵² Victoria Robinson, 'Introducing Women's Studies,' in Diane Richardson and Victoria Robinson (eds.) *Introducing Women's Studies* (London: Macmillan, 1993), p. 6.

⁵³ Papers of Melanie Ilic, p. 2: "Minutes of College Gender Committee Meeting" (27 April 1989).

⁵⁴ 'ASU Women's Group Formed,' *The Appalachian*, 20 January 1981, p. 5.

⁵⁵ 'AWS Brings New Ideas,' *The Appalachian*, 26 January 1982, p. 5.

present forms,⁵⁶ organizing a women's self-help health class, participating in local and state-wide political activities concerning women, writing letters, distributing educational information from contact tables, and sponsoring various social and cultural events.⁵⁷

There was also a feminist staff organisation that was active at the time, which will be discussed further in Chapter Five, the Organization on the Status of Women (OSW). The OSW was concerned with the position and status of both women staff and women students at ASU. Minutes from OSW meetings reveal that the members discussed and produced reports on such issues as sex discrimination, professional development, childcare, and Title IX. In addition to conducting and sharing the results of research, there were also guest speakers on women's issues.⁵⁸

Another feminist organisation that was active at ASU in the 1980s was the Feminist Collective. It consisted of both women and men and was committed to acting against discrimination in all of its forms. The Collective's constitution stated:

We take a feminist approach to these issues because it offers not just equality for women but for all people. We reject hierarchal structures for our organization. We will sponsor speakers, workshops, programs, support sessions, and research groups in keeping with and working toward the purpose of our organization.⁵⁹

In an interview, a staff member stated that during a demonstration against sexual harassment in the 1990s, someone spray-painted feminist slogans on some campus walls. There was some suspicion at the time that it might have been members of the Feminist Collective; and some members of campus blamed the women's studies programme.⁶⁰

There is also the question of the extent of the effect of outside influences on feminist activity within ASU and UG. This will also be discussed in Chapters Five and Six. Betty Friedan (author of the influential text *The Feminine Mystique*) spoke at ASU in

⁵⁶ The Human Life Amendment was a proposed amendment to the US Constitution, which would have negated the Roe versus Wade Supreme Court decision that legalised abortion.

⁵⁷ WRC, ASU WS Files, p. 1: 'Minutes from 1981-82 Organizational Meeting' (3 September 1981).

⁵⁸ WRC, ASU WS Files, p. 1: 'Minutes from OSW Meetings' (1984).

⁵⁹ WRC, ASU WS Files, p. 1: *Constitution for Appalachian Feminist Collective* (1989).

⁶⁰ Melissa Barth, Interview with author, 17 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

1970. In an editorial in the student newspaper, a male student acknowledged that her speech influenced him. He stated that 'after hearing her speech, I am further convinced that women have been unduly suppressed and dominated by males.'⁶¹ He agreed with her that men should become involved in the women's liberation movement and that they also had to overcome stereotypes of masculinity. In other words, men had a role to play in the challenge of patriarchal systems (for example the management systems that existed at ASU and UG).

At ASU in 1985, there was an on-campus debate between Phyllis Schlafly, president of the conservative Eagle Forum and a vocal opponent of the ERA, and Sarah Weddington, the lawyer who argued successfully for the legalisation of abortion in *Roe versus Wade*. They debated such issues as the ERA, nuclear weapons, Reaganomics, and abortion. According to a student newspaper article, the students received the speakers well and discussed the issues after the debate.⁶² This would seem to suggest that bringing in outside speakers is a very effective way to engage students in the debates concerning women's issues.

There was also evidence of the impact of outside influences at UG. In 1981 a UG student union newsletter drew attention to a Women's Aggregate Conference, which dealt with such issues as women in education and unemployment.⁶³ A 1987 UG student magazine article discussed the election of the female president of the student union, the first female president in nine years. Sexism and women's issues were to feature prominently in her year of office. The article ended by stating:

In a small Voluntary College, like ours, it is too easy for women to see there is no problem- especially as we have women in positions of power- for example our Principal, Vice-Principal, and Student Union President. One only has to consider however, the numbers of male members of staff or perhaps even the dominance of males at our College Bars in getting served, to realise we do not quite have equality at all.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Bob Williams, 'Women Should Have Equal Rights,' *The Appalachian*, 11 December 1970, p. 2.

⁶² 'Weddington and Schlafly Draw Reactions,' *The Appalachian*, 26 September 1985, p. 5.

⁶³ UGA, 30/1/11: Elaine Casey, *Student Union News* (November 1981).

⁶⁴ UGA, 30/2/17, p. 15: "National President Knows....," *S.P.A.M.A.G.* (January 1987).

There are the questions of the extent of the changes that feminists brought to both institutions, and the nature of the feminism that influenced them. As will be discussed in later chapters, the changes that occurred at both institutions were superficial changes, not enduring changes. An ASU staff member asserted that while many changes appeared to be happening at ASU regarding diversity, on paper it looked like the management were making an effort but the reality was that there was not really change.⁶⁵ This would suggest that the feminism that affected both institutions was not radical feminism. Radical feminists are more likely to call for a radical overhaul of the system, instead of working within the system for changes, as liberal feminists are more likely to do. Managers and staff reacted strongly against changes that were seen as being too radical. An example of this at ASU was the effort to start a Women's Center, as previously discussed.

The implication that liberal feminism seems to have affected the institutions more than radical feminism is not unique to these institutions. Louise Morley points out that it can be argued that 'the only identity permitted to feminists in organisations is that of liberal feminists, working within existing structures to reform, rather than revolutionise.'⁶⁶ Radical feminists may have had to adopt liberal feminists' methods as the most effective ways to affect change in the conservative environments in which they found themselves.

Negative Reactions to Feminism

The conservative values of both institutions has meant that there is strong evidence of negative reactions to feminism. This is typical behaviour for a group which perceives its values as being threatened by social change. This was illustrated recently in the US by a televangelist, Reverend Jerry Falwell, who blamed feminism, along with pagans, abortionists, gays, lesbians, the ACLU, and People For the American Way, for the

⁶⁵ Coleman, 2000.

⁶⁶ Morley, *Organising Feminisms*, p. 9.

September 11th terrorist attacks.⁶⁷ Some conservative and feminist commentators have used the term 'post-feminism' to describe the current era. This is the belief that either the women's movement had been so successful that it is no longer needed, or that it has failed and disintegrated. As Imelda Whelehan states: 'Feminism is popularly portrayed as outmoded- media announcements herald a "post-feminist" climate where young women are successful and independent, and less likely to espouse "dangerous" feminist ideals.'⁶⁸

The negative reactions to feminism in the US was manifested in the latter part of the twentieth century by a strong reaction against the reproductive rights that women had gained in the 1970s, particularly concerning access to legal abortion.⁶⁹ There was evidence of this at ASU, as several anti-abortion articles appeared in the student newspaper in the 1980s. In contrast, a search through the archives and interviews did not reveal evidence of such sentiments at UG. While there were also attempts in the UK to restrict abortion, the movement was much weaker and less successful than the one that occurred in the US.⁷⁰ This could be due, in part, to the higher number of religious fundamentalists in the US, who continue to campaign vehemently against abortion.

There was evidence of other negative reactions to feminism at both ASU and UG. At ASU, this was apparent in articles and editorials in the student newspaper throughout the 1980s. The title of a letter to the editor in 1981 stated that 'Women Already Have All the Rights They Need.'⁷¹ One student argued that the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) was not needed because the Constitution was not a sexist document. He stated: 'So, in response to those who want the ERA, I ask: If you've got equal rights nailed down already, what's all that you want around it?'⁷² Another student blamed the failure of the

⁶⁷ 'Falwell Apologizes to Gays, Feminists, Lesbians,' 14 September 2001, www.cnn.com/2001/US/09/14/Falwell.apology/index.html.

⁶⁸ Imelda Whelehan, *Modern Feminist Thought: From the Second Wave to 'Post-Feminism'* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995), p. 240.

⁶⁹ Faludi, *Backlash*, pp. 400-421.

⁷⁰ Walby, "'Backlash" in Historical Context,' p. 86.

⁷¹ 'Letters to the Editor,' *The Appalachian*, 10 November 1981, p. 3.

⁷² Al Haman, 'ERA: The Redundant Amendment,' *The Appalachian*, 22 October 1987, p. 14.

ERA on radical feminists, that they gave the ERA a bad name because of their irrational hatred of men.⁷³

Student Vennie Thompson went further, in an article in the student paper where he identified three categories of 'feminists':

1. Lesbian or celibate- Wishes to avoid men entirely. Reverse misogyny.
2. Domineering Witch- Likes to be in control. She pays lip service to equality, then demands to be the boss.
3. Pseudo-feminist- Espouses feminism and all that it entails but when encountered by a man who possesses all the qualities she as a feminist deems virtuous...finds him to be a disgusting weakling.⁷⁴

He also complained that the word 'sexist' was being used capriciously, and protested against leering and ogling being considered sexual harassment. Another article in the student paper expressed strong anger toward feminists and asserted that they degrade men in their battle for equal rights.⁷⁵ Virginia Woolf, who discusses men's anger towards women in *A Room of One's Own*, would recognise much of the same anger in the newspaper articles of the 1980s.⁷⁶ This raises the question of how much the position of women in society changed from when Woolf wrote her treatise in 1929 to the 1980s.

Several student articles acknowledged that there was a negative reaction to feminism. For example, a male student acknowledged in an article that the Association of Women Students was not well received.⁷⁷ Another student stated:

With the possible confirmation of Bork [Robert Bork, popular with the extreme right-wing, was nominated to the Supreme Court] and his notorious stand on women's rights (or lack thereof), rising discrimination, and the failure of equal pay legislation, there is evidence of a trend away from equality.⁷⁸

There was also evidence of negative reaction to the US legislative gains that had been made regarding equal rights in the 1970s (see Chapter One). In 1984, the US

⁷³ Steven Boyd, 'Feminists Dig Grave,' *The Appalachian*, 6 April 1982, p. 3.

⁷⁴ Vennie Thompson, 'Impossible to be a "Real Man" and a Feminist,' *The Appalachian*, 11 February 1986, p. 11.

⁷⁵ Billy Chandler, 'Feminists are as Bad as the Men They Hate,' *The Appalachian*, 13 February 1986, p. 4.

⁷⁶ Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own/Three Guineas* (London: Penguin, 1993, first published The Hogarth Press, 1929).

⁷⁷ Michael Questell, 'A Defense of the AWS,' *The Appalachian*, 26 February 1981, p. 3.

⁷⁸ Michael R. Cooke, 'Women: Back to the Kitchen?,' *The Appalachian*, 6 October 1987, p. 14.

Supreme Court limited the enforcement of Title IX (whereby organisations receiving federal aid should ensure equality) by ruling that Grove City College did not have to prove that all of its departments complied with Title IX just because some of its students received federal aid. An ASU student newspaper article stated that: 'Nationally, some observers worry the decision may leave some new women's programs vulnerable to administrators' apathy, and make it harder to overturn programs that continue to discriminate.'⁷⁹ This ruling was especially dangerous for women sports teams, who had benefited from the Title IX legislation by receiving more recognition and funding.

The attitude of some students at UG toward feminism and women's studies was summed up in a 1997 report by the Field Practitioner. Field Practitioners in the UK are the points of liaison between the Field and the outside world, particularly the areas where students might find employment after graduation. According to the then Field Practitioner, the report 'crystallized an angry outburst at the FP [Field Practitioner] meeting earlier that year; unexpectedly I'd found myself the conduit of students' worries which they didn't like to take to their personal tutors or other authorities.'⁸⁰ In the report, she noted that the women's studies field no longer placed placards (signs above notice boards for student matters) in the Central Corridor of UG because they had been stolen so often. women's studies notices were instead placed in the Education section where they were regularly defaced by graffiti, and 'any paper with "Women's Studies" on it had some kind of obscenity inscribed on it.'⁸¹ Because of these defacements, the Field Chairs posted women's studies notices only in Dunholme, the building where the history faculty (which contains women's studies) was located.

The Field Practitioner commented:

So far, no one interferes with them there. But this is obviously not a satisfactory solution. Some element in the College has been able to drive one of the College's Fields out of the information mainstream. The principle at stake goes far beyond the inconvenience to WS students,

⁷⁹ 'Supreme Court Limits Title IX Enforcement to Campus Officers,' *The Appalachian*, 22 March 1984, p. 1.

⁸⁰ Elizabeth Johnson, Email Interview with Author, 12 April 2002.

⁸¹ Papers of Melanie Ilic: Elizabeth Johnson, 'Harassment at C&GCHE' (22 May 1997) in the 1996/97 *Annual Review of Women's Studies*.

though that should be recognized and remedied: I am concerned, as Field Practitioner, for WS students, who have other disadvantages to face; but I am yet more concerned, as I am sure all colleagues will be, at the attack on equal rights and freedom of expression of any field of academic study which the College has established.⁸²

The Field Practitioner noted that the placard was first stolen in the 1993/94 academic year; and that the thefts continued into the 1995/96 academic year, when the women's studies notices were no longer placed in the Central Corridor. She questioned ironically whether it was possible that all the thefts occurred in a deserted corridor at midnight; or whether other students and members of staff had seen the thefts and done nothing about it. The Practitioner concludes that it was evident 'that an anti-WS climate of opinion prevails in the student body' but that the evidence that supported this 'is of necessity anecdotal and anonymous.'⁸³

The same report also discussed the treatment of women's studies students by non-women's studies students. Some women's studies students felt that they needed to hide their textbooks when entering the cafeteria or bar because they would be harassed otherwise. One women's studies student told the Practitioner that they did not like telling people what they studied 'because the immediate reply is that they must be lesbian, which is put as an accusation. The general assumption among other students seems to be that WS students are man-haters and that WS cannot be a genuine academic subject.'⁸⁴ Another student felt so harassed at the beginning of studying women's studies that she changed majors. In an interview, the former Practitioner stated that although members of the Field Practitioner meeting where this was brought up were sympathetic and it was suggested that a campaign be started to raise awareness of women's issues, she regretted that she was not able to follow this up because she had to step aside for pressing family reasons.⁸⁵

One UG alumni interviewee mentioned that there was a belief among some students that women's studies staff and students were anti-men. She discussed an incident where a

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Elizabeth Johnson, Email interview with author, 12 April 2002.

women's studies lecturer was heckled by a young male student, when she tried to discuss statistics for women's earnings, he accused her of being biased.⁸⁶ Another interviewee mentioned that people assume that women's studies students and staff are ardent feminists and lesbians, and that they think that women's studies is less of an academic degree.⁸⁷ One was asked by a male student, 'Why do you need a degree to know how to wash dishes?' She also mentioned that people were afraid of women's studies; that they believed that its staff and students would be 'raging feminists'.⁸⁸

The international negative reaction to feminism is typified by the statement, 'I believe in equal rights for women, but I am not a feminist.' Several female staff and student interviewees mentioned that this phrase was used by students at both institutions. An ASU staff member pointed to the interesting phenomenon of young women students using the term 'I'm not a feminist but...' because of the 'stigma' of being called a feminist. They choose to stay away from women's studies because they see it as supporting a political agenda that they do not support or do not wish to be perceived as supporting. The staff member stated that there has been a sort of backlash, a belief that feminism is just 'political correctness' and that there is no need for them to be involved with feminism.⁸⁹

Lisa Maria Hogeland, in a 1994 *Ms.* magazine article, discusses why young women in the US seem hesitant to use the word 'feminist' to describe themselves. Hogeland is a women's studies staff member, and she was prompted to write the article after several of her former students who had become teachers complained about young women's 'resistance to feminism'.⁹⁰ She attributes this to several things: the 'demonization of feminism' that occurred during the 1980s and early 1990s; the seeming opposition of critiques of marriage to family values; fear of the political aspect of feminism; fear of being labelled 'radical' or lesbian; the belief that women have already achieved equality;

⁸⁶ 'Tommi,' Interview with Author, 19 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁸⁷ 'Tina,' Interview with Author, 20 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁸⁸ 'Kim,' Interview with Author, 22 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁸⁹ Sandie Gravett, interview with author, 13 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁹⁰ Hogeland, p. 1.

and the 'anti-intellectualism' of US culture.⁹¹ There is evidence of this at ASU; one ASU staff member described female students as coming from homes where they were used to the finer things in life, and they had not experienced the 'glass ceiling' and inequality. Therefore, they did not want to become involved with the women's movement and they also questioned whether what the movement was saying was relevant to the 'average woman.'⁹²

Conclusion

As this chapter has shown, ASU and UG are both conservative institutions which were affected in somewhat similar ways by both feminism and subsequent negative reactions to feminism. They are located in conservative areas of their respective countries, and were founded by men who believed that their colleges should be run according to 'traditional' Christian values. This conservatism manifested itself in resistance to radical change at both institutions; the majority of students did not give support to what were seen as radical political movements. Gay organisations were not made to feel welcome at either institution.

A difference between the institutions is that ASU was more influenced by its regional character than UG. ASU's location in the US South meant that historically those staff and students recruited from the South (who constituted the majority at ASU) had a greater tendency to be conservative in outlook, compared to those recruited from other regions of the country. While UG is also seen as a conservative institution located in a conservative locality, it historically has been more national in its recruitment of students and staff (see Chapter Two).

Even with this conservative ethos, feminist staff and students were still able to introduce such changes as the founding of women's studies programmes. There was also

⁹¹ Ibid, pp.1-5.

⁹² Coleman, 2000.

other evidence of the feminist movement affecting both institutions. There were feminist staff and student organisations on both campuses, and also feminist conferences and 'women's weeks.' However, the changes that occurred at both institutions were typified by liberal feminism (working within the system), not the types of changes that radical feminists would call for (radical overhaul of the system). This is not to say that there were not radical feminists within the institutions, but rather that the strategies that affected changes in these institutions were not 'radical' strategies.

There is evidence of negative reactions to feminism at both institutions, as was the case nationally in the late twentieth-century in both countries. Some feminists have labelled this a 'backlash' that was specific to feminism, while others have asserted that this type of reaction is typical for movements that threaten social change. At ASU, there were anti-feminist editorials in the student newspaper which attacked abortion and the ERA. At UG, there were attacks on notices for the women's studies programme.

One of the major differences between the two institutions is that there was more evidence of negative reactions to feminism at ASU. This may be due, in part, to the larger amount of primary data available at ASU (ASU's student newspaper was very helpful in this regard). According to some feminists, this would fit in with national comparisons; they assert that the 'backlash' in the US was stronger than the one that occurred in the UK.⁹³ This was especially true in relation to the issue of abortion, and is due in part to the higher numbers of religious fundamentalists in the US, especially in the South.

Conservatism, feminism and negative reactions to feminism are interrelated: feminists often find themselves in conservative environments fighting for positive change, and when they do achieve this change, there are negative reactions to their gains. Both ASU and UG make interesting case studies of how these three forces affected higher education in the US and the UK. Feminists at both ASU and UG used the methods of

⁹³ Walby, 'Backlash,' p. 86.

liberal feminism (of working from within the system) to affect positive changes for women. There were strong negative reactions to any change that was seen to be too radical. The next chapter will further illustrate these issues in regard to the residence hall life of ASU's and UG's students.

CHAPTER FOUR: Living

There is evidence of male hegemony within higher education when looking at the experiences of women students living in higher education institutions. As discussed in Chapter Two, women students were held to stricter rules than men students from the time when women first entered higher education institutions through the 1960s. During this period, the staff of higher education institutions were regarded as *in loco parentis*, which meant that they were responsible for student welfare in its broadest sense, which was interpreted as including their moral welfare. There was a shift from this to student democracy and power in the 1960s and 1970s, due to both outside factors and student protest. The gender bias in the strictness of the rules meant that women had to struggle harder (had further to go) to gain full autonomy.

Residence hall provision had both benefits and drawbacks for women students in higher education. Carol Dyhouse describes the benefits of residence halls for university women in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They provided some university women with a ‘room of one’s own,’ which Virginia Woolf saw as very important for women’s education. Dyhouse lists as some of their other benefits that they provided space to work without disturbance and a respite from domestic obligations; they fostered the cultivation of corporate life and offered women students the opportunity to develop habits of study. She states: ‘the halls of residence for female students did constitute an important “women’s space” in universities, and [...] at their best they nourished a vigorous social and community life.’¹

In contrast, they also constituted a potential area of control over students. For much of women’s history of participation in higher education their lives have been strictly

¹ Carol Dyhouse, *No Distinction of Sex? Women in British Universities 1870-1939* (London: UCL Press, 1995), p. 123.

regulated and controlled, in both the US and the UK.² The abiding reason for this was the importance placed by society on protecting women students' virtue and reputation. Related to this was the perceived male need to control female sexuality.³ For women students resident in higher education institutions, this brought especially strict rules on such issues as dating and curfew. These rules remained into the 1960s, when societal changes, pressure from both men and women students, and changes in the age of majority brought the loosening or abolition of many of these rules.

Up until the lowering of the age of majority from twenty-one to eighteen in 1969 (UK) and 1970 (US), most higher education students were not legally adults and therefore the college took over the role of parents (*in loco parentis*). This meant that the authorities within higher education institutions had a legal responsibility to justify their close supervision and regulation of student activities. It also provided ideological justification for the actions of conservative institutional managers who treated students as if they were children, rather than as responsible adults.

The relative societal ferment in both the US and the UK of the 1960s influenced the change in residence hall rules which occurred during this period. In addition to the influence of the rise of modern feminism on women students, as discussed in Chapter One, students of the 1960s and 1970s were also influenced by the rise of 'New Left' politics. James Miller, in his book *Democracy is in the Streets*, chronicles US student activism from the 1962 *The Port Huron Statement* (the manifesto for Students for a Democratic Society) to the 1968 riots in Chicago. As Miller points out, 'Fueled by the hostility of many American students to the war in Vietnam, the New Left after 1965 quickly mushroomed into a mass movement that aggressively challenged the legitimacy of America's political

² As discussed in Elizabeth Edwards, *Women in Teacher Training Colleges, 1900-1960: A Culture of Femininity* (London: Routledge, 2001); and Amy Thompson McCandless, *The Past in the Present: Women's Higher Education in the Twentieth-Century American South* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999).

³ See, for example, the 'Sexuality' chapter in Sylvia Walby, *Theorizing Patriarchy* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), pp. 109-127.

institutions.’⁴ Similarly, Sheila Rowbotham describes the left activism of UK university students in her memoirs of the sixties in Britain, *Promise of a Dream*. She attributes the growing willingness of students in the sixties to protest against regulations to ‘structural changes’ in society (for example the relative affluence of society) that created ‘waves of dissident young people with some surplus cash for leisure and ideas about their destiny gleaned from growing access to the liberal education of the universities.’⁵ These helped to give students the confidence to demand that they be treated as adults.

This chapter will analyse how the residence hall experiences of women students at Appalachian State University (ASU) and the University of Gloucestershire (UG) reflected the male hegemony of these institutions. This can be illustrated by an analysis of the history of residence hall regulations in relation to four main areas: behavioural rules; visitation and dating; curfew hours and exeats; and dress rules. I chose these areas because they seemed from my analysis of documentary material such as student newspapers and minutes from committee meetings to be the ones that students resisted most strongly, and they illustrate especially well the institutions’ managers’ and staff’s then attitudes toward their students. I will explore the protests against, and changes in, each category of rules. Institutional managers’ reactions to the students’ requests for change will also be considered.

The analysis of the behavioural rules which follows will review such areas as the demerit system at ASU, which regulated female student behaviour by penalising them for, among other things, talking out of a window or taking a bath after a certain hour. The visitation and dating section will examine rules that attempted to regulate students’ romantic lives. The curfew hours and exeats section will analyse another way that the institutions’ managers and staff attempted to regulate students’ social lives by strict rules

⁴ James Miller, *‘Democracy is in the Streets’: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987), p. 15.

⁵ Sheila Rowbotham, *Promise of a Dream: Remembering the Sixties* (London: Allen Lane, 2000), p. 8.

on the hours in which they could come and go. The last section, dress rules, will examine a further aspect of the way in which the universities attempted to manage female students' images and reputations by regulating the type of clothing they wore. All of these issues reflect the differing ways that the institutional managers and staff attempted to control women students' sexuality, as discussed above.

Behavioural Rules

Rules that governed student behaviour in residence halls were common in higher education institutions in both the US and the UK, persisting into the 1970s. As discussed in Chapter Three, there was an added dimension to behavioural rules for women students in the US South. Women university students in the southern part of the US were metaphorically put on pedestals and were expected to act like ladies. McCandless notes that the Auburn University (Alabama) 1963 handbook stated that: 'An Auburn woman is expected to conduct herself as a lady at all times.'⁶ At Auburn University in 1964, women were to make their beds by 10.00, follow curfew and quiet hours, attend convocations, and follow dress codes. They would be referred to the judiciary council for any infractions.⁷ For middle-class women in the UK, there was a similar prescription on their behaviour, the belief in 'Ideal Womanhood' which originated in the Victorian era. Founders of the first women's colleges at Cambridge in the nineteenth century cautioned their students to dress tidily and to behave demurely in public.⁸ Many students in both the US and the UK may have faced similar regulations in their home lives, so were not as surprised by such rules as a late twentieth century student would be.

As in other southern higher education institutions, there was a perceived need for ASU women students to act as 'ladies'. The phrases 'lady-like' and 'unlady-like' conduct

⁶ Amy Thompson McCandless, *The Past in the Present: Women's Higher Education in the Twentieth-Century American South* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999), p. 132.

⁷ Ibid, pp. 223-24.

⁸ Perry Williams, 'Pioneer Women Students at Cambridge, 1869-81,' in Felicity Hunt (ed.) *Lessons for Life: The Schooling of Girls and Women 1850-1950* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1987), p. 184.

were used in several ASU student newspaper articles during the 1960s. For example, in 1967 one of the House Council Committee's suggestions for changes in women students' rules stated: 'Unlady like [sic] conduct should be defined by each individual house council.'⁹ House Councils oversaw the residence halls, and the House Council Committee was formed in Autumn 1966 to investigate the women's residence hall rules.

In 1963, the ASU Student Council and managerial staff organised a demerit point system that was to be the basis for the discipline applied to first year women students. It regulated such behaviour as telephone use and when students could listen to music. The reasons given for its initiation were that it was 'to foster self-discipline' and 'to simplify the work of the various House Councils.'¹⁰ Points would accumulate on a yearly basis and when the student reached a total of twenty points she would be referred to the Student Council for disciplinary action.

Not all students accepted the demerit system without protest. An editorial in a 1963 student newspaper complained that the first year students had little or no say on the implementation of the system. One reason given for its implementation was that it would make residence halls quieter, more 'lady-like' and more orderly. The editor, and other students, disagreed: 'On the other side of the fence stand those who declare the demerit system is unfair, and we are inclined to agree with them.'¹¹ The author particularly disagreed with those rules that she regarded as being unduly strict. For example, women were given demerits for cooking in their rooms or wearing shorts in 'forbidden areas.'

Another complaint against the demerit system was that women were being treated like children. According to the article, the majority of upper-class (third and fourth year) women did not get to discuss or vote on the demerit system. Instead, the students discovered that their House Councils had approved the system, and that they were expected

⁹ For example, see 'Women's Rules Revised,' *The Appalachian*, 12 January 1967, p. 4.

¹⁰ 'House Councils Approve New Demerit Point System,' *The Appalachian*, 26 September 1963, p. 1.

¹¹ 'Who Merits Demerits?', *The Appalachian*, 3 October 1963, p. 2.

to accept it without argument.¹² This would seem to suggest that only a few more senior students were able to vote on the system. It is also interesting that the system only applied to female students, raising a curious gender-related question: did the demerit system only apply to females because staff, students, and managers felt that the female students required more restrictions on their behaviour than the male students? A possible reason for this, as discussed earlier, was the belief in the importance of southern women behaving as ladies. Also, as discussed in previous chapters, ASU's foundation as a teacher-training institution also affected the expectations for student behaviour. Teachers were expected to model exemplary moral behaviour because of their potential influence on students.

An editorial on the demerit system in a 1966 ASU student newspaper hinted at outside influences on student protests against regulations. The author argued that the enforcement of petty rules was damaging the welfare of the female students, and that students were not used to such rules. The author stated:

Most of the women who are now coming to this campus are used to more liberal and adult rules. They, therefore, naturally rebel at the ridiculous rules which are forced upon them as co-eds at a college- an institution for young adults who are supposedly the most intelligent and the most mature of their high school classes.¹³

This signifies a shift in students' home life from having strict rules at home, as discussed previously, to more 'liberal' rules at home. This shift made the strict rules at ASU more incongruent to student expectations, hence their growing willingness to resist these rules. It was suggested that a committee made up of the Dean of Women, the Dean of Student Affairs, the residence hall counsellors, the presidents of the residence halls, and student leaders should meet and discuss revisions to the demerit system. It is interesting to note the use of the term 'women' instead of the term 'girls', which was used in previous

¹² Ibid, 2.

¹³ 'Revision of Women's Demerit System,' *The Appalachian*, 22 April 1966, p. 2.

articles. This would suggest a shift in attitude on the part of some students to thinking of themselves as adults (even before the change of the age of majority).

The ASU demerit system was replaced in 1970 with Men's and Women's Conduct Codes, which were compiled in the Men's and Women's Residence Councils. The demerit system raises an interesting question of the institutional managers', staff's, and students' possible motives behind the establishment of the system. It could have possibly been an attempt by the students to establish a measure of self- or peer-control over their own behaviour in a very controlling environment, since infractions were referred to the Student Council for disciplinary action. It could have also been an attempt by the more senior students to control younger students' behaviour, possibly in order to protect women students' reputations. Another possibility is that it might represent an effort by managerial staff to exert greater control over student behaviour through structures where students control other students.

In 1970, the closed study and quiet hours rule was changed for ASU women. The closed study rule required that women not take showers, use the telephone, and listen to radios or record players during the specified hours. They were also expected to be in their rooms unless they had permission to be elsewhere. First year women during the fall (first) quarter were to observe closed study from 20.00 to 22.00 Sunday through Thursday. During the winter (second) and spring (third) quarters, first year women were to observe quiet hours instead, which meant that they could take showers, use the telephone, and listen to the radio or record player but were not to make noise that was 'not conducive to study'.¹⁴ It is interesting to note the gender dimension to this rule, *first year women* were to observe closed study and no mention of men is made. It was as if the institutional managers believed that women had to be coerced into the habits of study, whereas men (for some reason) did not.

¹⁴ 'Women Acquire New Rights, Different Rules,' *The Appalachian*, 8 September 1970, p. 1.

Although there is no evidence of any similar demerit system being in place at UG, there is evidence of behavioural rules persisting as late as the 1978-79 academic year, when there were rules that were evidently intended to safeguard the reputation of students.

The Student Handbook from that year stated:

1. Students are not allowed to enter a Public House within a four-mile radius.
2. Smoking is not allowed in the town, and only on the outskirts where houses are on one side of the road only.
3. Students are not allowed to use the seats on the Promenade, or to walk arm and arm in the town.
4. Students must not enter the High Street on Tuesdays, Fridays and Sundays.

A student entering the corridor from the Dormitories, Baths, etc. must be properly dressed. No student is to wear slippers at Chapel or after 9 a.m. The singing of songs, choruses, etc., is allowed in the Recreation Room but not within the College, and not on Sunday.¹⁵

This raises the interesting question of why the institution had behavioural rules of this kind on the books at such a late date. They were rules meant to uphold students' respectability, and this most probably had to do with the character of the institution, where many of the students were training to be teachers. Also, as was explained in Chapter Three, as a church college the students were expected to uphold 'Christian values and morals,' hence the rule prohibiting singing on Sunday.

Visitation and Dating

University students also had to contend with visitation and dating rules enduring into the 1970s. Many of these rules would seem archaic to university students today, for example students were told on which nights and times they could date. As with behavioural rules, societal pressures and student protest eventually led to the gradual abolition or loosening of these rules. There was also a gender dimension to these rules, in that resident women students were subjected to stricter rules than resident men students.

As Rowbotham states in reference to her experiences at Oxford in the 1960s: 'The

¹⁵ UGA, 30/1/29: *St. Paul's and St. Mary's Student Handbook* (1978-79).

penalties we faced in the women's colleges were much more severe than those governing male sexuality.'¹⁶

Students in both the US and the UK in the 1960s and 1970s fought for, and achieved, changes in visitation and dating rules. For example, students at Florida State University in 1971 protested against the Florida Board of Regents banning visitors of the opposite sex in residence halls. University presidents across the state came to the students' defence and the Regents revised the visitation policy.¹⁷ An important area of resistance to the rules was the students' flouting of the rules by ignoring or finding ways of getting around them. They were influenced in this struggle, as with the behavioural rules, by societal changes such as the lowering of the age of majority. At the time of writing, there are no longer dating or visitation university rules in the US and the UK and many halls of residence are co-educational.

Students at ASU had the added dimension of the conservative ethos of the institution, as discussed in Chapter Three. An example of the rules at ASU in 1960 was that female students were to sign out on a 'Daily Sheet' whenever they wished to hike or ride outside the city limits of Boone, attend activities after 21.00 off campus, and/or date in the parlour. They were not allowed to sit in parked cars, or ride in a car after 20.00 except when returning from home or a movie date.¹⁸ As with the behavioural rules previously mentioned, these rules were meant to safeguard women students' reputations. Also, the 'signing out' was presented as a way to protect students by keeping track of them (for example if there was a fire or other emergency).

ASU students had specific times at which they were permitted to date. Parlour dating hours in 1966 were: 16.00 to 22.00 on the weekdays, 13.00 to midnight on Saturday, and 13.00 to 23.00 on Sunday. However, there was a conflict with the curfew

¹⁶ Rowbotham, *Promise of A Dream*, p. 49.

¹⁷ McCandless, *The Past in the Present*, p. 248.

¹⁸ Brenda Penley, 'Regulation Review for Girls in Dorm,' *The Appalachian*, 6 October 1960, p. 4.

hours, as female students were to be in their rooms by 23.00 every day. A Committee was established by the Student Council in 1966 to review these rules. An article in the student newspaper stated: 'It is hoped that this committee becomes efficient in its work and produces activity in the modernization of the women's rules.'¹⁹ The rules were revised, for example in 1967 ASU granted women students off-campus visiting privileges.²⁰

In February 1970 the ASU Student Senate (as the Council was known then) passed four bills concerning student regulations. One of the bills changed parlour dating hours in the women's residence halls. The hours were extended to: 10.00 to midnight from Monday to Thursday, 10 to 02.00 on Friday, and 09.30 to closing time (when the hall doors were locked, not specified) on the weekends. Interestingly, an article in the student paper stated that: 'The new proposal is aimed to make visiting more convenient for men, especially during the daytime.'²¹ This would suggest either that much of the pressure for change was coming from men students and reflected men students' wants, which were considered more important than women students' wants and needs.

Also in 1970, an article in the student newspaper pointed out that over eighty percent of ASU women voted in favour of open house weekends for the residence halls.²² During the open houses, members of the opposite sex were allowed to visit on the conditions that they were to sign in and out, that they were escorted at all times, and that the room doors were to remain open. There were six open houses for the women's residence halls in the winter quarter of the 1970-71 academic year, and three for the men's residence halls. Before the open houses could occur, the residents were to vote on whether or not they wished to hold the open house, and the results of the vote were to be taken to the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women a week in advance.

¹⁹ 'Parlour and Room Hours Problem for Women,' *The Appalachian*, 30 September 1966, p. 2.

²⁰ 'Now It's Our Turn,' *The Appalachian*, 11 May 1967, p. 2.

²¹ Bob Williams, 'Senate Passes Resolutions,' *The Appalachian*, 13 February 1970, p. 1.

²² Donna Bummic, 'Poll Indicates Women Favor Open House,' *The Appalachian*, 11 December 1970, p. 1.

There was resistance to this relaxation of visitation policies not only from university managers, staff, and parents, but also from North Carolina state legislators. In 1971, Senator Jyles Coggins introduced a bill in the state Senate that would have prohibited visitation at state-supported institutions. An editorial in the ASU student newspaper stated that: 'It should be evident to Sen. Coggins that he cannot dictate morals to anyone, let alone students, and that no act of the state Senate is going to affect the morals of any student in this state.'²³ This bill did not come into effect, and so students at North Carolina universities continued to have visitation privileges.

In fact, later in 1971 the ASU Student Senate unanimously approved weekly visitation. The policy would allow visitation on Friday and Saturday nights from 20.00 to 01.00; and it also left authorisation to amend the visiting schedule in the 'hands of the dormitory residents themselves.'²⁴ The proposal still had to be approved by university managers, but the VP of the Senate was confident in its chances of approval because the students had cooperated with them in the past on such issues. Two days after this article, the university managers, residence hall personnel, and officials from student government met to discuss problems with implementation of the policy. Some managers were concerned over the recruitment of people to oversee the visitation policy. There was to be further negotiation on the policy.²⁵ A visitation policy was eventually implemented in 1972.

Visitation and dating rules also evolved at UG from the 1960s. At a Staff/Student Committee meeting in November 1966, female UG students requested an extension of weekend visiting hours from 14.00- 18.00, to noon- 22.00. They gave the following reasons for this extension:

Boyfriends travelling from a distance would be arriving during the afternoon and therefore private entertaining would be cut short.

²³ 'Listening Senator Coggins?' *The Appalachian*, 7 May 1971, p. 2.

²⁴ David Wright, 'Student Senate Passes Policies on Visitation, SGA Committees,' *The Appalachian*, 14 September 1971, p. 1.

²⁵ David Wright, 'Barden, Officials Debate Visitation,' *The Appalachian*, 17 September 1971, p. 1.

The Common Rooms in Hostels are rather small and the lack of a common room in New Hall presents another problem. Now that meal tickets are in use for visitors, there is a short space of time, between 1.30 and 2 pm, before entertaining in rooms may take place.

Some students may not wish to go out in the evening, but may want to talk or discuss privately. There is also a time lag between 6 pm and 8 pm when most evening activities begin, particularly on Saturday.²⁶

The Chairman of the meeting (in other words the Principal) asked the student representative to which extension she would give the highest priority, and it was 'pointed out that the pleasure of all residents had to be remembered, but that these suggestions would be considered by the appropriate authorities [institutional managers].'²⁷ In other words, students would not receive their full demands.

The rules did become more lenient: in 1968-69, female students could receive visitors in the Common Rooms and TV Rooms until 22.30; on Saturdays visitors were allowed in rooms between 12.00 and 18.00, which was extended to 21.00 on Sundays. Relatives were allowed to visit 'at any reasonable time.'²⁸ However, there was a difference in the rules for male students. They could entertain visitors in personal study bedrooms on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday between 19.15 and 22.30, on Wednesday between 13.15 and 22.30, and on weekends between 11.00 and 22.30. Relatives could visit outside these hours on consultation with the Warden; and male students could have visitors in the Junior Common Rooms at any time in the day.²⁹ Unlike the female students, the male students could entertain in their personal study bedrooms during the weekdays. Again, this reflected the 'double standard' regarding sexual behaviour that existed for men and women at that time.

The rules continued to evolve at UG. In October 1968, female students requested that visiting hours be extended on the weekends to: Friday 19.00 to 22.30, Saturday and

²⁶ UGA, 30/1/9, pp. 25-27: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (29 November 1966).

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ UGA, 30/1/11: *St. Paul's and St. Mary's Student Handbook* (1968-69).

²⁹ Ibid.

Sunday 10.30 to 22.30.³⁰ They were unsuccessful in securing all the changes that they requested; visiting hours were extended in November 1968 to Friday 19.15 to 22.00, Saturday and Sunday 11.00 to 22.00. They were also told that the visitor was to be escorted by the student to her room so as 'to ensure security, privacy and consideration of other students.'³¹

At an October 1970 Staff/Student Committee meeting, female UG students requested an extension of visiting hours to: Weekdays 13.00 to 22.30, Weekends 11.00 to 22.30. They also made a request to have more responsibility for their visitors. The minutes from the meeting state: 'Students sharing rooms felt they could come to some arrangement between themselves with regard to visitors.'³² Their request for an extension for weekend hours was granted but not for weekday visiting. A staff member 'stated that the Wardens felt they could not accept the recommendation from the student body for weekday visiting from 1 p.m.-10.30 p.m. as there were students sharing rooms and it might be difficult for them to work.'³³ Therefore, the students' request for more responsibility was denied.

Male students at UG went further and asked for no limitations on visiting hours. During a St. Paul's Student Union meeting on 22 November 1972, students asked: 'That this Union instructs Council to enter into negotiations with the College Authorities regarding the instigation of 24 hour mixed visiting in College Halls of Residence (College and Rosehill) and to report back to the Union within a period not exceeding three weeks.'³⁴ This was a day after a ballot of the student body revealed that out of 131 voters, 111 were in favour of 24 hour visiting.³⁵ The following was a debate which occurred over this issue at a 1972 meeting:

³⁰ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 59: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (28 October 1968).

³¹ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 63: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (26 November 1968).

³² UGA, 30/1/9, pp. 93 & 95: 'Minutes of Staff Student Committee Meeting' (21 October 1970).

³³ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 101: 'Minutes of Staff/Student Committee Meeting' (7 November 1970).

³⁴ UGA, 30/1/13: 'St. Paul's Student Union Motions for Union Meeting' (22 November 1972).

³⁵ UGA, 30/1/13: 'St. Paul's Student Council Meeting on 21st November Agenda' (21 November 1972).

Speech Against: If 24 hour visiting was put into practice wouldn't this have a bad effect on individual privacy? Would there not be an increase in the comings and goings of students and hence more noise?

Speech For: It is up to us, as students, to respect each other's opinions within the bounds of community life, why should 'outsiders' impose their beliefs on people who are over the age of consent?

Speech Against: There are moral issues involved and should we not, as students training for teachers, set some examples?

Speech For: What would go on after 12.00 p.m. goes on before anyway!

Speech Against: The question regarding disturbance in the early hours was again raised.

Speech For: (In answer to above) Reference was made to proposed house regulations regarding disturbances.

The chairman put the motion to the vote.

For: 228 Against: 29 Abstentions: 28³⁶

The following poem, which appeared on the front page of a 1974 UG student magazine, gives an idea of how some male students viewed the regulations that female students had to follow.

St. Mary's

I saw a fortress,

White, with impervious walls of stone.

And, from the battlements high, a black flag flew.

This was the house of many maidens fair.

But alas! They were chained in this refined 'keep'

And shackled with heavy gold belts about the waist.

The black flag had an emblem, so I looked.

Upon it were some golden bars making an intricately

Fine cage, and imprisoned there within, writhed a fiery

Scarlet serpent.

And a single burning word in cold silver shone beneath.

It read "Morality".

Sweet singing came to me, wonderful in every note.

But the words "Plagiarised" from William B. seemed

Shreds of ice that broke my sword,

"Thou shalt not", they sang in perfect unison.

Oh! St. Mary, what have you done to your captives?

You had your child without the fire,

But now our swords are blunted on your testimonial.³⁷

The last sentence may have been a reference to the importance for students of getting a good reference from staff and managers for their teaching careers, which may have served to dampen student resistance to institutional managers over rules and regulations.

³⁶ UGA, 30/1/13, p. 2: "Minutes of Union Meeting" (22 November 1972).

³⁷ UGA, 30/2/11, p. 1: Raymond Hector, "St. Mary's" in *Impact* (21 February 1974).

Visitation and dating members of the opposite sex in US and UK residence halls became less of an issue after the introduction of 'co-ed dorms,' residence halls with both male and female students. A 1971 editorial in the ASU student newspaper discussed 'an experiment in coeducational housing' that was to occur in the Fall quarter.³⁸ Some third and fourth year women were to move across Kraut Creek (the traditional divide between male and female residence halls) into Gardner Hall. Coltrane, the adjoining residence hall, was to be filled with third and fourth year men. There was still not to be visiting in individual rooms, but there were areas where men and women could mingle with members of the opposite sex. In the Fall of 1971, 110 women students were brought across Kraut Creek where they stayed at Newland Hall.³⁹

In September 1972, ASU started Watauga College, an experimental residence hall for men and women first year students. Courses were given inside the same building where faculty members and students lived. The students took courses in Latin, Chemistry, Philosophy, History, Art, German, Literature, Speech, and other topics.⁴⁰ Watauga College was a successful experiment, as evidenced by it still being part of ASU today. Residence Halls for both men and women was not an issue at the same time at UG because St. Mary's did not join with St. Paul's, thereby becoming co-educational, until 1979.

As mentioned earlier, an important way that students resisted the rules was by flouting them. In 1966, an ASU editorial discussed the need for revision of the student rules. A committee of the student council had made some residence hall rules more lenient. The author agreed that the changes were a step in the right direction but disagreed with two rules that were not revised. The first rule prohibited women from visiting men's

³⁸ 'An End to Sex-segregation,' *The Appalachian*, 16 March 1971, p. 2.

³⁹ Connie Holt, 'Newland Dormitory Situation Well Liked BY ASU Co-eds,' *The Appalachian*, 14 September 1971, p. 15.

⁴⁰ Chilton Rogers, 'Coed Dorm Offers New Experience,' *The Appalachian*, 18 September 1973, p. 1.

apartments and the second prohibited the consumption of alcohol. The majority of students ignored these rules anyway, according to the author.⁴¹

There is also the question of whether the loosening of the rules actually represented a 'liberation' for the women students. The extending of visitation and curfew hours allowed women students to fulfil the domestic requirements that society expected of them. Sheila Jeffries argues against the idea that the sexual liberation of the 1960s benefited women. She saw it instead as helping 'to defuse the potential threat to male power' posed by the increasing opportunities open to women during that period. According to Jeffries, the sexual revolution 'was the freedom for women to take pleasure from their own eroticised subordination.'⁴²

Curfew Hours and Exeats

Higher education institutions' efforts to control student sexuality was also reflected in the rules regarding curfew hours and exeats (permission to leave campus). Students in both the US and the UK fought to liberalise these rules. In the US, the University of Tennessee abolished curfews for women over the age of twenty-one and for younger students who had parental permission in 1969, after women there had participated in a 'dormitory walkout'. Auburn University in Alabama extended curfew hours in 1970-71 for women, and seniors were given 'self-regulated hours'. There were protests against curfew, visitation, and dress rules at such universities as Texas Woman's University, the University of Tennessee, and Auburn University in Alabama throughout the 1960s and early 1970s.⁴³

As with the previous rule categories, there is a question of the extent to which these rules were obeyed. Rowbotham, in her memoir of her experiences at Oxford in the 1960s,

⁴¹ 'More Rule Revisions Needed at Appalachian,' *The Appalachian*, 18 November 1966, p. 2.

⁴² Sheila Jeffries, *Anti-Climax: A Feminist Perspective on the Sexual Revolution* (London: The Women's Press, Ltd., 1990), p. 1.

⁴³ McCandless, *The Past in the Present*, p. 24.

describes the way that women circumnavigated the curfew rules. Women students attempted acrobatic feats in their efforts to return to their rooms 'after hours', because the doors were locked and when open access was via porters' lodges. Rowbotham writes:

This involved dodging the porter's prodding torch and making your way over spiked railings, across a roof, through a window, out of the building, across the lawn, to scale up a fire-escape ladder flat on the wall for three storeys before clambering to safety.⁴⁴

In other words, women had to risk serious injury or risk being rusticated or 'sent down' if they returned after curfew. As previously mentioned, women students were more severely punished for infractions than were men students.

While many students were pushing for change, there is an interesting paradox that at the same time there was evidence of resistance to change. A possible reason for the resistance from some women is that they received benefits from the status quo. They might have enjoyed the protective environment in which they found themselves and feared that change jeopardised this comfortable environment. As McCandless points out: 'For many women, it seems, the benefits of an exclusive womanly culture and the ability to use traditional concepts of womanhood to effect change far outweighed the costs to individual self-determination.'⁴⁵ Also, some students may not have resisted curfew and exeat rules because heavy workloads meant they did not have the time and/or desire to stay out later than curfew. For teacher training students, 'teaching practice' was especially demanding on their time.

ASU and UG students also struggled for a relaxation of curfew rules (and exeat rules at UG) during the 1960s and 1970s. In 1961, ASU students held rallies to protest the curfew hours for women students. They started six petitions, one of which was titled: 'Later Curfew Hours for Girls'.⁴⁶ As with the protests against behavioural rules, there are

⁴⁴ Rowbotham, *Promise of A Dream*, p. 49.

⁴⁵ McCandless, *The Past in the Present*, p. 156.

⁴⁶ 'Students Hold Rallies to Protest Restrictions,' *The Appalachian*, 13 April 1961, p. 2.

indications that students were influenced by societal changes in their protests. An

editorial in the student paper stated:

It seems that these recent events are indicative of certain changes from past years in the composition of ASTC [as ASU was known] students. The same type of people will not endure without protest for years and then suddenly burst loose their feelings.⁴⁷

In March 1965 the ASU Student Council extended the female residence hall curfew hours. 'The dormitory hours for upperclass girls shall be changed as follows- Monday through Friday, 11:00 pm; Saturday 12:00 midnight; Sunday 11:00.'⁴⁸ The Council recommended that all females should be able to stay out until 1:00 a.m. for major dances on campus; however, the institutional managers extended the hours only to 12:30 a.m.⁴⁹

Proposals for new female curfew hours were also discussed at a 1969 ASU Student Government Association (SGA) meeting. There was a division according to year on what the new hours should be. Conservative members of the senior class (fourth year) proposed the most restrictive hours: Seniors with a 2.0 quality rating (based on their behaviour) would have self-limiting hours, and other female students would have three special late hours each quarter. The junior (third year) representatives proposed unlimited hours on Friday and Saturday nights and extended hours on Sunday nights. The sophomore (second year) representatives proposed the most liberal plan: Females over the age of 21 would have unlimited hours and third-quarter freshmen (first years) would be allowed late hours until 4:00 a.m. with parents' permission. A night watchman would be on patrol to let any late female students in.⁵⁰ A poll of the student body taken in February 1969 suggested that the students were overwhelmingly in favour of the most liberal proposal for women's hours.⁵¹ This suggests that students in the lower years were more open to change and that

⁴⁷ 'An Interpretation,' *The Appalachian*, 13 April 1961, p. 2.

⁴⁸ 'Co-eds Hours are Changed,' *The Appalachian*, 18 March 1965, p. 1.

⁴⁹ ASU/A, Plemmons Papers: W.H. Plemmons, 'Memo to Mr. H.R. Eggers' (February 23, 1965).

⁵⁰ Kitty Carson, 'SGA Hears Proposals for New Girls' Hours,' *The Appalachian*, (17 January 1969), p. 1.

⁵¹ 'Results of Poll Women's Hours,' *The Appalachian*, 21 February 1969, p. 1.

they had the majority of students agreeing with them. The younger students may have been more influenced by the societal changes discussed in the introduction.

There was a revision of curfew hours for ASU female students in 1970. Third and fourth year women no longer had a curfew; if they returned to the residence halls after they were locked, they had to find a security guard to let them in. First year female students were still required to sign in and out and were locked out if they returned after closing hours. This policy seems especially incongruent if the university was using the protection of students to justify curfew hours, as women would then be left wandering around campus late at night. They were also required to have signed permission forms from their parents and had to abide by the type of permission given regarding how late they could stay out. Residence Halls were locked on Monday through Saturday between midnight and 06.00, and Sunday between 00.30 and 06.00.⁵²

In May 1969 it was announced that an experiment would be tried at ASU in the 1969-70 school year whereby two residence halls would be reserved as 'no curfew' halls for upper-class women.⁵³ This experiment failed because of lack of interest of the female students; not enough students signed up for the halls. One possible explanation for this is that a vocal minority were pushing for change at that time, but the majority of female students did not support what was seen as change that was too radical. The female students might have also been concerned with their reputations, and might have seen danger in 'no curfew' halls. It had the possibility of damaging their reputations as 'ladies', which might hurt their possibilities of marriage and employment as teachers. A further possibility is that they feared that such halls would be difficult places to study in, and would therefore negatively impact on their studies.

A 1964 ASU student newspaper article discussed other reasons why women students might not have been interested in 'no curfew' halls. The article discussed an

⁵² 'Women Acquire New Rights, Different Rules,' *The Appalachian*, 8 September 1970, p. 1.

⁵³ 'New Policies for Coed's Halls Announced,' *The Appalachian*, 9 May 1969, p. 1.

interview with Polly Gerhardt, who was president of the Associated Women Students at the University of Colorado. She made the point that rules were helpful to female students; that they 'accept hours regulations, not because they are less responsible than men, but because the rules are helpful in arranging their daily routines.'⁵⁴ She went on to state that women were slowly taking more freedom and the responsibility that went along with it.

Later curfew hours were also an issue for female students at UG. At a St. Mary's College Committee Meeting in 1965, a student member requested on behalf of the student body that the 'week-day locking-up be extended from 22.30 to 23.00.' The voting was unanimously in favour of the proposal, with the Chairman abstaining. The extension to 23.00 began 12 January 1966, with the understanding that 'non-residents were to use the extra half-hour at the discretion of their landladies' and resident students were to follow the conditions of their wardens.⁵⁵

In a 1966 St. Mary's College Committee meeting a student brought up the subject of the procedure for the granting of late keys. Permission for late keys was granted by the Principal and Vice-Principal for special occasions 'but not for twenty first parties as there are so many in the 3rd year, both in and out of Cheltenham.'⁵⁶ After receiving permission, the students then received the keys from the Hostel Wardens. The students gave their suggestions for changing the procedure for late keys: that a certain number of late keys should be granted per term which would mean the students would have responsibility for being selective; and that one student could vouch for another and wake the warden if the student does not return. This issue was not resolved at this meeting, as the Principal 'suggested that it was improper and discourteous to proceed while those concerned were not present, that is Hostel Wardens.'⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Cited in Gail Sides, 'Odds and Ends,' *The Appalachian*, 23 January 1964, p. 2.

⁵⁵ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 7: 'Minutes of the College Committee Meeting' (7 December 1965).

⁵⁶ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 23: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (11 October 1966).

⁵⁷ Ibid.

Some staff members were concerned over the extension of curfew hours. In 1967, one female staff member 'asked that students be reminded of the fact that the 11 pm extension was a concession given to students finding it necessary to return to college late. It was also asked that students be more conscious of their responsibility to the community as they returned between 10.30 pm and 11.00 pm.'⁵⁸ Presumably this was a reference to the need of students to be quiet when returning to campus. The wording of this request is another example of staff using ambiguous terms in support of conservative rules (see Institutional Manager Section below).

At UG in 1968-69, the female students were to follow a certain numbers of exeats, or permissions to leave campus, per year. Exeats were signed by the student's personal tutor and then handed in to the Registrar and either their warden or landlady at least 48 hours before departure. Second and third level students had unlimited exeats for weekends except for the first and last weekends of term. First year students had six exeats in their first two terms at College and had unlimited exeats in the Summer Term.⁵⁹ In March 1968, female UG students requested an extension of exeat hours to 23.00 on Sundays. This was approved by the Principal and Wardens and came into effect in May 1968.⁶⁰

Extension of curfew hours to midnight each evening was discussed in a St. Mary's Staff/Student Committee meeting in November 1969. It was decided that 'mainly for security reasons, extension of hours on Friday and Saturday evenings is to be considered by resident members of staff, and present locking up times are to be retained.'⁶¹ Curfew hours were extended to midnight on Saturdays in January 1970. The same locking-up hours were retained throughout the week with the possibility of obtaining half hour exeats from the wardens.⁶²

⁵⁸ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 54: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (28 March 1968).

⁵⁹ UGA, 30/1/11: *St. Paul's and St. Mary's Student Handbook* (1968-69).

⁶⁰ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 54: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (28 March 1968).

⁶¹ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 79: 'Minutes for Staff Student Committee Meeting' (20 November 1969).

⁶² UGA, 30/1/9, p. 81: 'Minutes of Staff/Student Committee Meeting' (15 January 1970).

As previously mentioned, there was a gender dimension to curfew rules. There was a differing tone according to gender in regard to student rules in the 1976/77 St. Mary's and St. Paul's Handbooks. St. Mary's students who were in College residences who decided to go away on weekends were to sign out in residence exeat books. The Handbook stated that students were not to leave College 'until all College commitments have been fulfilled.'⁶³ The College was using an ambiguous term as a condition of a rule (for another example, see the Dress Rules section). First year students were still expected to remain on campus for the first weekend of the Autumn Term. The Handbook goes on to state that this rule was suggested by the Staff/Student Committee. The Vice Principal gave permission for special absences not due to illness. Residence Hall doors were locked at 23.30 at the latest, and it was stated that 'students should return by 2.00 a.m.'⁶⁴

In contrast, the St. Paul's handbook for male students from the same year reflects a different tone. The rules were more lenient, and visitors could be entertained in personal study-bedrooms between 08.00 and 01.00. The handbook states:

St. Paul's is a residential College, and to get full value from membership of such a College requires a general pattern of full-time attendance. On the other hand, students are legally adults and are being prepared for the responsibilities of the teaching profession. They should be left as free as possible to plan their own leisure time at College. At the same time they are encouraged to take responsible decisions about the many different claims on their time and money. The following arrangements have been worked out in the light of the general principles set out above, so as to give the minimum amount of control necessary to enable the College to fulfil its obligations to grant-awarding L.E.A.'s and to know, in the case of resident students (including out-residents) when they are going to be away for a night and where they can be reached in case of need, or emergency. If you are classed as 'resident' (out-resident or in-resident) and wish to be away for a night or a weekend, you must sign the appropriate Exeat Book.⁶⁵

⁶³ UGA, p. 5: *St. Mary's College of Education Student Handbook* (1976/77).

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, 14.

⁶⁵ UGA, p. 23: *St. Paul's College Guide for Members of the College* (1976-77).

It is interesting that in the St. Paul's handbook the tone was one of explaining the rules with the acknowledgement that students were adults, whereas in the St. Mary's handbook the rules were stated with no explanation given.

Gradually the rules were loosened. In 1977 the student handbook outlined the rules regarding the signing of registers. Resident students were to sign in a Fire Book in their Residence Halls for the nights they were in College, 'for security reasons.' Day students were to sign a register in the main College building when they arrived. The Vice-Principal was to be notified of any weekdays regularly spent away from College 'due to timetable arrangements.' The student was not considered absent on these days. The handbook states that: 'These records are kept to show attendance for the payment of grants.'⁶⁶ The rules were therefore justified through security and financial reasons, not for the reason that students were not considered adults and therefore had to be looked after.

A UG alumnus relates a story that illustrates the extent to which curfew rules were obeyed. She had attended the then St. Mary's from 1970 to 1973, living in residence halls for her first and third years. She related incidents of students getting around the late keys and curfew rules by having other students sign in for them and letting them in through locked doors. Also, a student who had signed out a key would leave it in a pre-arranged spot so that another resident would be able to use it to get in.⁶⁷ Another St. Mary's student from 1970-73 mentioned the ways that students evaded these rules. She related a story that showed the extent of staff flexibility on the rules. One student went with her boyfriend and the rest of an Athletic team on a trip, having arranged with a friend to sign her out and leave the student a key in a hole in the wall of the Residence Hall. She found out that she would be later than she thought because the team decided to go to a disco, and, failing to reach her friend, telephoned the member of staff on duty. The staff member arranged for

⁶⁶ UGA, p. 25: *St. Mary's College of Education Student Handbook* (September 1977).

⁶⁷ Jean Phillips, email interview with author, 27 November 2000.

the porter to let the student in, and did not call the student in for disciplinary action.⁶⁸

The evidence of student circumscription of the rules point to an individual form of resistance to the rules that was in addition to the group resistance evident through formal committees.

As at ASU, there is a question of the extent of the pressure for change at UG. St. Mary's Student Union requested in 1970 that, in view of the change in the age of majority, third year students be allowed to move into flats. However, only fourteen students requested to go into flats for the next academic year, and only four flats were involved.⁶⁹ This may be due in part to the perceived benefits of the rules to students. A St. Mary's student from the early 1960s stated: 'The positive side of all these rules was, however, that all students could feel that someone was watching out for them as they progressed through their studies and that people really cared.'⁷⁰ Despite the changes that occurred, this 'caring attitude' was still evident in the early 1970s. A St. Mary's student from 1970-73 asserted that students felt like they were looked after, 'whether we liked it or not.'⁷¹

Dress Rules

US and UK higher education students also resisted the dress rules imposed on them by their institutions, leading to their abolition during the 1960s and 1970s. As with the behavioural, visitation, and curfew rules there was a gender dimension to these rules, such as a ban on the wearing of trousers for women students in place at many institutions until the 1960s in both countries. Stricter rules for women were common for universities throughout the US South. As McCandless points out: 'Women were subject to more restrictive curfews, dormitory visiting privileges, and dress codes than were men.'⁷² As

⁶⁸ Diana Gordon, 'St. Mary's- Residential Life in the Early Seventies,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 183.

⁶⁹ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 89: 'Minutes of Staff Student Committee Meeting' (20 June 1970).

⁷⁰ Nina E. Rogers, 'In the Pink,' in Southern, (ed.), *The Way It Was*, p. 176.

⁷¹ Gordon, 'St. Mary's,' p. 182.

⁷² McCandless, *The Past in the Present*, p. 247.

mentioned previously, this was due in part to the ideal image of the 'southern lady.' In 1969, Texas Woman's University removed restrictions on casual dress from the student handbook. During the 1970-71 academic year at Auburn University in Alabama, the dress regulations were replaced with a request for appropriate dress and an appeal to the students' good judgement in choosing apparel.⁷³

Women students at ASU and UG likewise resisted dress rules. A letter to the editor of the ASU student paper in an October 1966 issue attacked the no-slacks rule, which stated that slacks could not be worn to classes, uptown, library, bookstore, cafeteria, and residence hall parlours. The author asked:

Why is this rule in existence? Why are girls made to feel like criminals, stealthily plotting complex paths where slacks are legal? Is it not the girl's own free decision to wear or not to wear slacks to a movie, the bookstore, cafeteria, or elsewhere?⁷⁴

She attacked the notion that slacks were indecent by pointing out that shorter skirts were more revealing than slacks.

In February 1967 there was a new SGA ruling at ASU on the wearing of slacks.

Slacks and bermudas are to be worn at the discretion of the girls except to classes, to the library, and to the cafeteria at the noon and evening meals on Sundays. On extremely cold days, slacks may be worn to classes and the library.⁷⁵

The students were not quite sure how to interpret this rule; who would determine what "extremely cold days" were? The female students always risked being told by a managerial or staff member that it was not cold enough and that they would have to change into a dress. The slacks rule would later be abolished; females freely wore slacks in the 1970s.

There were similar protests against dress rules for females at UG. A St. Mary's student from 1961-64 stated that trousers were only allowed for official College rambles,

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Faye Wilborn, "Letters to the Editor," *The Appalachian*, 14 October 1966, p. 2.

⁷⁵ "New Rule on Slacks," *The Appalachian*, 23 February 1967, p. 1.

and that 'skirts, jumpers and dresses were the order of the day.'⁷⁶ At a March 1967 College Committee meeting, a student brought up the request that students be allowed to wear slacks for Saturday Lunch. This was not decided at the meeting, it was deferred for further discussion.⁷⁷ At a April 1967 meeting, it was agreed that students could wear slacks to Saturday Lunch, 'providing that the students used their discretion, as visitors are often present at this lunch.'⁷⁸ In October 1967, the students requested permission to wear slacks for Saturday breakfast, which was agreed to by the Principal,⁷⁹ although as late as 1969 some staff members disagreed with the wearing of trousers. One complained in a Staff/Student Committee meeting that 'students were wearing trousers into lunch.' It was decided that Student Council would deal with the matter.⁸⁰ There were also questions from UG students about the wearing of mini-skirts. In June 1967, a student asked the College Committee for its opinion on the wearing of miniskirts in College. The Committee 'suggested that this problem should be dealt with individually.'⁸¹

Dress rules did gradually become more lenient at UG. In November 1969, a student proposed 'that trousers will be acceptable in college providing that the standard of dress is maintained.'⁸² The proposal was passed unanimously. As at ASU with the 'cold weather' rule, the use of the term 'standard of dress is maintained' raises the question of whether the use of ambiguous language was a device to permit the authorities to 'give way' without losing face, thereby retaining the right to claim back these concessions if deemed necessary.

As was discussed with the earlier rules, the strict dress rules were due in part to the character of ASU and UG as teacher training institutions. This meant that in order to get a position with some school systems, the students were expected to project a relatively

⁷⁶ Rogers, 'In the Pink,' p. 175.

⁷⁷ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 35: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (14 March 1967).

⁷⁸ UGA, 30/1/9, pp. 37-38: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (25 April 1967).

⁷⁹ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 46: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (20 October 1967).

⁸⁰ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 69: 'Minutes of Staff Student Committee' (26 March 1969).

⁸¹ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 42: 'Minutes of College Committee Meeting' (20 June 1967).

⁸² UGA, 30/1/9, p. 79: 'Minutes for Staff Student Committee Meeting' (20 November 1969).

conservative image. At UG, it also was partly attributed to its nature as a Church college, and therefore impropriety of dress was deprecated.

Institutional Manager Reaction to Requests for Rule Changes

UG Principals' and some staff's attitude toward students' requests for changes in institutional rules was illustrated in the 'back and forth' that occurred at St. Mary's Staff/Student Committee meetings (and at a St. Paul's meeting with the Principal) in the 1970s. As mentioned above, students were requesting a series of changes in residence hall regulations during this period. The staff demonstrated their resistance to change (in other words their conservative ethos) in their reactions to this. The nature of the institution's management was also revealed in the exchanges, which tended to be authoritarian rather than democratic. To the modern observer, the Principals of St. Mary's and St. Paul's behaved as parents, 'protecting' students' morality and upholding the perceived standards of respectable behaviour.

In October 1970 at a St. Mary's Staff/Student Committee meeting, a student stated that a subcommittee of the Student Council had been set up to consider coming in hours, after they had been discussed at an open meeting. It was recommended that 'every resident student should be given a front door key to her hostel which would enable her to come in at her own convenience.'⁸³ Staff raised several objections, the first being that landladies might not be willing to give front door keys and that they might object to their tenants coming in at late hours. The next objection was that if keys were lost, the locks would have to be changed and new keys issued. The third objection revolved around how to check on students in the case of a fire. The fourth objection was in regard to potential noise in the hostels and drives at late hours. As with other student efforts to effect change,

⁸³ UGA, 30/1/9, pp. 93 & 95: 'Minutes of Staff Student Committee Meeting' (21 October 1970).

the Principal and staff members deflected immediate change by deciding to set up a sub-committee to review residence hall regulations.

UG's Principal and staff reaction to student efforts to change curfew hours was also reflected in a 1970 Staff/Student Committee meeting. They stated that:

There is a great deal of academic work to do and consideration should be given to the students remaining in the hostel to work when others will be coming in late. The question of lodgings would have to be looked into very carefully. Although the age of majority is now 18 years, some of the community felt college still had a responsibility towards parents as to the welfare of their daughters. It was also stressed that there comes a time when students have to be responsible for themselves. If students' health was affected then the general standard of work would deteriorate.⁸⁴

Minutes from a St. Mary's Staff/Student Committee meeting in October 1971 illustrate the nature of resistance to changing the curfew and exeat rules which the students experienced. The students brought up the subject of the exeat arrangements, which they said were not always working well, suggesting the use of signing-in books instead. A staff member made the point that a student had been missing one night and suggested a more official form be used. A student answered that it should be necessary only to tell the landlady and not to sign a book. A staff member 'raised the point that some record must be kept from the courtesy point of view. He also said that by signing the exeats of first year students the personal tutor could see if the students were unhappy and going home too much in their first term.'⁸⁵ A student suggested that exeats be kept for first years in their first term.

The staff member raised the objection that students might ignore the signing-in books, and the students answered that such cases would be referred to the Disciplinary Committee. The Principal then mentioned the matter of courtesy, and a student answered that students in lodgings did feel courteous towards their landladies. The Principal asked a staff member how not having exeats would affect residence, and received the reply that

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ UGA, 30/1/9, pp. 117, 119, 121: 'Minutes of the Staff/Students Committee Meeting' (20 October 1971).

there would have to be a more detailed signing-in book. The students objected to the 08.45 signing in time on Monday mornings; that there was not enough time for lodging students to sign in, and that students whose first lecture was in the afternoon thought it unreasonable that they had to come in the morning just to sign in. They requested an extension to 13.00 on Mondays. Staff members raised several objections:

Miss Challinor [Vice Principal] felt that with the impending withdrawal of exeats, that signing in on a Monday by 1.00 p.m. would mean that the week could be getting shorter and shorter.

Dr. Owen [Principal] raised the point of heating in lodgings. She said that as landladies were not paid to supply heating during the day the students could not expect heating in their rooms in lodgings during the day.

Miss Gregory [staff] raised the point of Professional discipline- that students would one day be teaching at 9.00 a.m. every day.

Dr. Owen said that she was not prepared to see the [signing-in] books left until 1.00 p.m. and the suggestion was finally made to leave the books until Bunnery [11.00].⁸⁶

The students asked what was the reason for signing in. A staff member answered that it was a way of keeping check on students on their own in lodging. A student

asked the committee how far college responsibility went as she thought that many students found it difficult to accept the reasons for signing in as put forward by the Committee. Miss Holohan finally said that students felt that it was an encroachment upon their own responsibility. Dr. Owen ended this discussion saying that she would find out from Mrs. Rea the affect on her work would be [sic] if the books were left until 11.00 a.m.⁸⁷

UG Students brought up the nature of the rules that they were made to follow at a meeting in January 1972. A student 'raised the matter that first year students did not know what regulations they were agreeing to before they came into college.'⁸⁸ The point was also raised that second year students who did not like the rules of residence were not allowed to move into a flat. Finally, the students asked about extended visiting hours, using late keys after 02.00, and the possibility of students having front door keys. The staff reacted in the same manner as they had to the students' previous demands.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 127: 'Minutes for Meeting of Staff/Student Committee' (26 January 1972).

The point was made that students sometimes fail to realise that apart from college there is no place in normal life where people can live in a completely unrestricted way. While in college the corporate life must be considered, in lodgings problems are sorted out more easily between students and hostesses. It was agreed by the committee that the Principal and Vice-Principal would attend some open meetings [open to staff and students].⁸⁹

This type of managerial attitude was also evident at the men's college (St. Paul's). Students requested a meeting with Mr. Barnes, the Principal in 1972 to ask why their request for 24 hour visiting had been refused, particularly whether it was related to the foundation of the College. Barnes replied that the students 'had accepted conditions of membership on entry to the College, as the prospectus makes it clear that this is a Church foundation, and as such, can be expected to have different standards from other foundations.'⁹⁰ He went on to state that even if he had approved their request, the Governing Body would not have endorsed it because they would see 24 hour visiting as lowering the standards of the institution. Barnes stated that in universities where this had been granted 'multiple occupancy had resulted and they had fallen in danger of condemnation by the Health Authorities. The midnight restriction is a safeguard for College property, student study environment and College standards.'⁹¹

The students countered this by saying that societal attitudes have changed. The Principal reasserted that the foundation charter must not be lost sight of. The students asked if immorality was tolerated before midnight but not after, and the Principal answered that the only way to monitor this would be to patrol rooms, which would be an invasion of privacy. The students asked if this concern was connected to the public image of the institution, to which the Principal answered that students had benefited from the positive public image. The students then stated that having fewer rules would increase individual

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ UGA, 30/1/13, p. 2: "Minutes of St. Paul's Student Council Meeting" (4 December 1972).

⁹¹ Ibid.

responsibility. The Principal countered that 'In future students would be made fully aware of the regulations before residence is granted.'⁹²

A similar type of 'back and forth' occurred at a 1975 St. Mary's meeting. The Principal stated in response to student request for change that:

she believed that if one lived in a residential community one could never have complete freedom. It would be a poor training for a disciplined or organised life. If students who came into residence found the rules intolerable they should leave.⁹³

A staff member added that there were only 270 resident students, and that the committee was 'not considering the minority who voted against the motion for greater flexibility in the residence regulations.'⁹⁴ The students answered that the vast majority of students voted in favour of changing residence regulations at a Union meeting; and that it 'was a case now... of the minority ruling the majority.'⁹⁵ The Principal and staff member suggested that a secret ballot might have had a different result. The students replied that all committee members who talked with the Principal were in favour of changing the rules. The Principal answered that she had suggested that the committee represent all shades of opinion. A student 'emphasised that the members had all been democratically elected by the students and thus they were their chosen representatives.'⁹⁶ Again, the Principal and staff members were reflecting in their expressed attitudes towards the students, those found in mothers dealing with demanding children. In this exchange and the ones mentioned above there is no evidence that the Principals and staff considered the students as autonomous adults who could manage their own behaviour.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 145: 'Minutes of the Staff/Student Committee Meeting' (28 January 1975).

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

Discussion and Conclusion

There is a question of the external influences on ASU and UG students in their push for reform of the rules discussed above. The student protests against residence hall rules was not unique to these two institutions. There is evidence that students were aware of what was happening in society and at other higher education institutions and used this knowledge in their protests against the rules and regulations. In 1967, an ASU student newspaper article discussed the recent US court decisions which had undercut the concept of college authorities being *in loco parentis*. It stated: 'The courts have said that students are entitled to the same rights as any citizen who lives in our society.'⁹⁷ A year later, there was an article in the same student newspaper about the student revolt that was occurring on campuses across the US.⁹⁸ Clearly these students were well aware of what was happening outside on other campuses.

In 1972 ASU students received permission to have visitation in the residence halls.

A student newspaper article compared the policy to those at other institutions:

The policy [visitation] meant that while other major universities across the United States had co-ed dorms, or at least 24 hour open dorms, Appalachian State University students could on Friday and Saturday from 8 p.m. til 1 a.m. (six weeks out of eleven) have people of the opposite sex in their room- providing of course, their doors were open, and the lights were on, and there were enough people staying the weekend to supervise and participate in visitation.⁹⁹

Both female and male students at UG also used other institutions' rules and regulations as a basis for arguing for change. In a 1970 St. Mary's meeting, there were several suggestions regarding late keys and curfew hours, which 'were made with reference to systems as they exist in other colleges.'¹⁰⁰ At a meeting in 1975, a student stated that 'the present [residence hall] regulations were not up to date with the general life

⁹⁷ 'Students' Rights: What are They?,' *The Appalachian*, 20 October 1967, p. 2.

⁹⁸ 'Student Rebels Sweep U.S.' *The Appalachian*, 8 November 1968, p. 2.

⁹⁹ 'Visitation and the Sexes,' *The Appalachian*, 6 May 1973, p. 2.

¹⁰⁰ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 99: 'Report of the Coming-In Times Sub-committee Meeting' (28 October 1970).

style today and therefore there was a need to change them now.’¹⁰¹ Men students also referred to other higher education institutions when requesting changes to their rules. In a Student Council meeting in 1973, a student discussed a letter that he received from Whitelands College of Education (a church teacher-training college in South London) regarding their 24-Hour Visiting system. After discussing the letter, the Student Union discussed the possibility of boycotting the present visiting hours, offering to support anyone who was disciplined for this action.

It is interesting to analyse the nature and extent of the protests at both institutions. The changes that students sought could be characterised as relatively minor and superficial. They did not ask for radical overhauls of the system. As was discussed in Chapter Two, both of these institutions were conservative institutions, which meant that radical change was not likely to be well received by conservative managers, staff, and students. Instead, the students sought, and received, small, incremental changes. For example, the female students at UG kept asking for half hour extensions to their curfew rules.

As mentioned earlier, the regulations were stricter for female students than for male students at both institutions. This was demonstrated at ASU by the demerit system, which regulated only female students’ behaviour. A 1969 editorial in the student newspaper discussed the possible reason for this: ‘Apparently the logic behind this is yet another unwritten axiom: men don’t become pregnant.’¹⁰² At UG, women could not entertain visitors in their rooms, unlike the men students.

An interesting area for comparative analysis is the students’ perception of these protests and changes. A 1967 editorial discussed the progress that had been made at ASU in regard to student rules.

We asked that girls be allowed to wear slacks; we got it. We asked for a revision of the ancient drinking rules; we got it. We asked for later girls hours; we got it. We asked for off-campus visiting permission for the

¹⁰¹ UGA, 30/1/9, p. 145: ‘Minutes of the Staff/Student Committee Meeting’ (28 January 1975).

¹⁰² M.G. ‘Coeds Under Duress,’ *The Appalachian*, 7 November 1969, p. 2.

girls; we got it. These and many more smaller but no less important changes in the rules and regulations were passed, first by our 'do nothing' student government and then by our 'Puritanical' administration.¹⁰³

Almost ten years later, the students at St. Paul's and St. Mary's also lauded the changes that had occurred. In the 1976-77 Student Handbook, an article stated:

It took a long time for our Union to achieve significant improvements in the regulations which our resident students have to abide by. Last year a concentrated and carefully structured campaign led to the documents which you signed this year. So after nearly six years of negotiation and a definite danger of splitting our Union by emphasising our resident members, a real step forward was achieved- although we still fell short of our ultimate aim.

An overwhelming mandate from the student body meant that the Student Council was to pursue the ideal unrestricted visiting tempered by a genuine community atmosphere. Individual responsibility was sought. At St. Paul's the week-end visiting deadline was extended to 1 a.m. and it also became possible for students to accommodate guests in vacant study bedrooms, with the only charge being made for bed linen. This latter was certainly a radical change since it now meant that men and women could now sleep in the same corridor at any time provided that the hostel warden was aware of it.

At St. Mary's the situation had to be approached differently. Attitudes were different and so, too, were the regulations. Now, the girls can use record-players, tape-recorders, radios and hair driers off the sockets in their rooms- certainly an improvement on the standard table-lamp! But no adaptors may be used. The 2.a.m. returning deadline has been withdrawn and further facilities for guests are being provided.

Another U.G.M. overwhelmingly passed a resolution accepting the changes but saying that we must still work for individual responsibility for all students. We must also work to bring the attitudes of students and the attitudes of the colleges closer together. More realistically we must strive to bring the two sets of regulations more compatible, particularly when the two colleges may be faced with total merger.¹⁰⁴

Another similarity between the two institutions was that at a time of political protests about issues such as the Vietnam War on campuses across the world, students at ASU and UG were protesting instead for campus reforms. This was due, in large part, to the conservative ethos of both institutions (see Chapter Three). ASU was also influenced by its location in the US South. As McCandless states in reference to southern higher education students, 'Some white students seemed more interested in campus reforms than

¹⁰³ 'Now It's Our Turn,' *The Appalachian*, 11 May 1967, p. 2.

¹⁰⁴ UGA, 30/1/29, p. 29: Dave Barrs, "Individual Responsibility in Our Halls of Residence" in *Student Union Handbook* (1976-77).

in national social or political causes.’¹⁰⁵ For example, in 1960 at Queen’s College in North Carolina, students organised a ‘sit-in’ to support the abolition of compulsory chapel. While ASU students were pushing for more liberal dorm rules in the late 1960s, students on other campuses across the country were demonstrating for Civil Rights and against the war in Vietnam.

UG students also were pushing for more liberal rules while students on other campuses were demonstrating against such issues as the raising of tuition fees for international students. An example of this was when the men UG students went on strike in 1970 to protest the treatment of a male student by the Principal. The male student had requested to live in a flat with his child and partner, but the Principal had refused on the grounds that he would be living with a woman who was not his wife. The student had chosen to live in approved lodgings, but the Principal was reported as having refused the student’s request for a teaching reference, which precipitated the student strike.¹⁰⁶

One of the major differences between ASU and UG is that while ASU has been coeducational from its beginning, UG was divided into two single sex schools throughout much of its history: St. Paul’s for men students and St. Mary’s for women students (see Chapter Two). This, of course, influenced the students’ experiences of residence hall life. ASU students experienced coeducational residence halls before UG students. Some UG students did protest for coeducation, several articles in 1971 editions of the *Gloucestershire Echo*, a local paper, discussed the demonstration that students held on 23 February 1971 for coeducation. The students handed a petition with 1400 signatures to the College Council and demonstrated in the town.¹⁰⁷

This analysis of the history of residence hall rules at ASU and UG has illustrated one of the forms of the male hegemony of the institutions. Women students experienced

¹⁰⁵ McCandless, *The Past in the Present*, p. 245.

¹⁰⁶ UGA, press clipping of unidentified newspaper, p. 1: ‘Striking Students of St. Paul’s Say: “We Stay Out”’ (June-October 1970).

¹⁰⁷ ‘Co-education: Cheltenham Students’ Call,’ *Gloucestershire Echo*, 22 February 1971, p. 1.

rules that the men students did not have, such as closed study at ASU, which made their struggle for greater autonomy more difficult. Although St. Mary's had women principals, the women students were still expected to conform to patriarchal standards of behaviour. For example, like the ASU women students, they had stricter rules compared to the men students. The students were aided in their struggle for more autonomy by outside influences such as the change in the age of majority. The next two chapters will discuss two other forms that the male hegemony took at the institutions relating to the experiences of women staff and the women's studies staff and students.

CHAPTER FIVE: Working

An analysis of the position of women academic staff in both the past and the present lends strong support for the assertion that there is male hegemony in both US and UK higher education institutions. The experiences of women staff and students within higher education institutions are influenced in similar ways by the masculine culture of many of these institutions.¹ As mentioned in the Introduction and Chapter One, universities were originally established as all-male institutions. Perhaps it is not surprising then, that many of them continue to manifest a male-oriented culture and ethos. This manifests itself in several different ways, including men holding the majority of positions of power and male control of pedagogy and curricula (which women's studies have made significant inroads into, see next chapter). As Dale Spender asserts: 'Because of their dominant position men have often given substance to the maxim that "might is right" and have been able to appropriate *authority* - among other things - for themselves.'²

There have been changes in this male culture in the latter part of the twentieth century, although the changes have in many cases been more along the lines of 'dents in the armour' of patriarchy rather than radical changes. As mentioned in Chapters One and Two, the 1960s and 1970s were decades of change for both staff and students at US and UK higher education institutions. There were governmental and societal policy changes in both countries, which affected women staff especially. It is important to look at the experiences of women staff when studying women students because the two are connected, as will be shown in this chapter. As Diana Woodward states, when there are few women academic staff 'the prevailing style of higher education on offer is likely to remain

¹ Sue Ledwith and Simonetta Manfredi, 'Balancing Gender in Higher Education: A Study of the Experience of Senior Women in a "New" UK University,' *The European Journal of Women's Studies* 7 (2000): pp. 12-13.

² Dale Spender, *Men's Studies Modified: The Impact of Feminism on the Academic Disciplines* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981), pp. 3-4.

predominately traditional and implicitly male in terms of its curriculum, its modes of teaching and assessment, and in the students' experiences of formal teaching, pastoral support and institutional support services.'³

This chapter will explore the experiences of women staff at Appalachian State University (ASU) and the University of Gloucestershire (UG) around four main themes: equal opportunity offices and policies; the 'glass ceiling'; barriers to career development for women academics; and women academic staff organisations. These areas were chosen for analysis because they illustrate particularly well the 'secondary' status of women within these institutions. The 'Equal Opportunity Offices and Policies' section will explore governmental equal opportunities laws and regulations that were passed in the 1960s and 1970s, and the offices and managerial positions that were created to comply with them (in response also to pressure from staff and students). 'The Glass Ceiling' section will analyse the few numbers of women in the higher echelons of power at ASU and UG. The 'Barriers to Career Development for Women Academics' section will explore such issues as sexism in hiring processes, sexual harassment, and child care. The 'Women Staff Organisations' section will review the efforts of women academic staff to organise around women's issues. The experiences of women staff within the institutions will be put into the context of national events, and similarities and differences will be analysed.

Equal Opportunity Offices and Policies

The 'equality versus difference' debate that was discussed in Chapter Three in relation to the 'first wave feminism' of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries continued into the contemporary women's movement, but gained in complexity and

³ Diana Woodward, 'Gender: Students,' in Woodward and Ross, *Managing Equal Opportunities in Higher Education* (Buckingham: SRHE, 2000), p. 29.

nuance.⁴ This debate influenced the perceived implications and merits of the equal opportunity legislation that had been passed in the US beginning in the 1960s. As discussed in Chapter Three, the Equal Pay Bill 1963, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Executive Order 11246 of 1965 headed a wave of legislation and governmental initiatives that affected the position of women in US universities.⁵ The Equal Pay Bill of 1963 guaranteed equal pay for the same job, which meant that employers could evade it by giving the same job a slightly different title or description. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made it unlawful to discriminate in employment practices according to race, colour, religion, sex, or national origin.⁶ Executive Order 11246, signed in 1965 by President Lyndon Johnson, required that affirmative action regarding racial equality be taken by companies doing business with the government. It was later amended to include sex. Title IX, passed in 1972, prohibited sex discrimination in federally funded educational programmes or activities and has been used in the effort to bring about gender equality in college and university sports programmes (see Appendix I).

As discussed in Chapter One, there were two important governmental Acts which affected academic staff in the UK: the Equal Pay Act (EPA) 1970, and the Sex Discrimination Act (SDA) 1975. The EPA guaranteed equal pay for similar work; while the SDA outlawed sex discrimination and set up the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC).⁷ UK women also had recourse to Industrial Tribunals for redress concerning employment issues. While some feminists in both the US and the UK saw the legislation as necessary steps in the struggle for equality, others believed that as long as men

⁴ Barbara Ryan, *Feminism and the Women's Movement: Dynamics of Change in Social Movement, Ideology and Activism* (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 118.

⁵ For a discussion of feminists' influence on the passing of this legislation, see: Sheila Tobias, *Faces of Feminism: An Activist's Reflections on the Women's Movement* (Boulder, Co: Westview Press, 1997), pp. 105-128.

⁶ For a discussion of the effects of this legislation on working women, see: Nancy MacLean, 'The Hidden History of Affirmative Action: Working Women Struggles in the 1970s and the Gender of Class,' *Feminist Studies* 25 (Spring 1999): pp. 42-46.

⁷ For a discussion of the effects of this legislation, see: Sheila Rowbotham, *A Century of Women: The History of Women in Britain and the United States* (London: Penguin, 1997), p. 405.

continued to dominate positions of power in society these laws would not fundamentally change the position of women.

These national developments influenced the formation of ASU's and UG's equal opportunities policies. In 1972, William Friday, then president of the University of North Carolina system, wrote a letter to the chancellors of the institutions of the system (including ASU) asking them to appoint representatives to the University of North Carolina Equal Employment Opportunity Committee. This Committee was set up in part to make sure that the university's employment system complied with the federal regulatory programs.⁸ ASU's senior management established its own Equal Opportunity Office in the 1970s.

This office deals with such issues as Affirmative Action, 'arbitrary' pay discrepancies based on gender and race, and compliance with federal regulations. In a Conference for Governors and Trustees of the University of North Carolina held in 1975, the then Equal Opportunity Officer, Richard Howe, outlined relevant discrimination legislation and the efforts of ASU to comply with this legislation. He described Affirmative Action as requiring 'additional efforts to recruit, employ, and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded even if any exclusion we may have cannot be traced to a particular discriminatory action on our part.'⁹ In an effort to comply with federal legislation, in 1973 ASU implemented a three-year goals program that sought to fully utilise women and minorities in its work force by 1976. In order to attain these goals, university managers undertook a thorough analysis of the workforce to identify the under-representation of women and minorities. Howe stated that 'we were supposed to write our goals program based on what percentage of women and minority persons were "out there"

⁸ ASU/A, EEO Papers, p. 1: William Friday, 'Equal Employment Opportunity Memo' (28 September 1972).

⁹ ASU/A, EEO Papers, p. 3: Richard D. Howe, 'Remedying Discrimination Through Affirmative Action,' Speech at the conference for Governors and Trustees of the University of North Carolina (23 October 1975).

and from that arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not we were under-utilizing women and minority persons... [which] was and continues to be a very difficult thing to do.'¹⁰

Howe went on to describe Title IX issues, which, as mentioned above, prohibited sex discrimination in federally-funded educational institutions. ASU's Equal Opportunity Office addressed three areas in relation to Title IX: student admissions; employment; and the academic, social and extracurricular experience of students after admission. The Equal Opportunities Office staff at ASU consisted of, in addition to a Title IX Coordinator, a task force of ten people appointed by the Chancellor and twenty-four academic staff members who served as Equal Opportunity Associates. As head of the Office, Howe was 'directly responsible to the chief administrative officer' of ASU and formed 'part of the administrative decision-making machinery'.¹¹ Howe asserted that the efforts to comply with federal regulations had created heavy burdens on the administration (university managers) in terms of time and energy because they did 'not have the necessary funding to be cranked up for a full-blown effort'.¹² This begs the question of whether ASU would have had the EO Office if not for the federal legislation, since its implementation created such difficulties for managers and staff.

In 1975 university managers appointed Dr. Isabel Jones to coordinate the implementation of Title IX at ASU. In a memo to managers at the University of North Carolina System in 1976, she stated that she 'should like to state that lack of communication concerning the Title IX effort, its purposes and procedures, seems to me to be our major problem. It is not so much opposition to the program...that disturbs us; rather it is the apparent apathy and seeming indifference that concerns us most.'¹³ This

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 5.

¹¹ Ibid, p. 8.

¹² Ibid, p. 9.

¹³ ASU/A, Wey Papers, p. 4: Isabel F. Jones, 'Progress Report on Title IX Activities Memo' (29 January 1976).

points to the conservative nature of ASU's ethos, many managers and staff were not enthusiastic about change even if it meant potential improvements.

There is further evidence of ASU's struggle to comply with Title IX. In 1977, Jeffrey H. Orleans, a manager with the University of North Carolina System, stated in reference to ASU's athletic financial aid plan for the years 1978 to 1980 that it was 'substantially less' for women than for men. He added: 'In light of these differences, I do not think ASU yet projects offering women athletes reasonable opportunities to obtain athletic awards in proportion to their rate of participation.'¹⁴

The evidence above points to the tendency of ASU's university managers not to take a proactive stance regarding women's equality issues; they were instead concerned with complying with governmental regulations. Although UG university managers did not have to deal with so much governmental regulation, they shared this attitude toward women's rights on their campus. In addition to the above-mentioned Acts, there were governmental reports that affected UG women staff. The *Report of the Equal Opportunities Group* of the National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (NAB), published in 1988, had several recommendations for higher education institutions. It recommended:

that all institutions which have not already done so should develop an equal opportunities policy which is integrated into the corporate plan of the institution and agreed by the Governing Body. The policy should cover sex, race, disability and socio-economic background. The policy should address issues of access, student recruitment, harassment, academic affairs (including the organisation of academic life, curriculum content and development) and staffing. Further, the overall responsibility for the implementation of the policy should be assigned to a manager at the most senior level possible, and this manager should receive training in equal opportunities.¹⁵

It was also recommended that all higher education institutions monitor annually the composition of their staff and student populations.

¹⁴ ASU/A, Wey Papers, p. 1: Jeffrey H. Orleans, 'ASU Reports Concerning Future Athletic Opportunities Memo' (24 August 1977).

¹⁵ UGA, p. 2: *National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education Report of the Equal Opportunities Group* (1988).

These national developments helped to create a climate where proposals for equal opportunity committees were more likely to be accepted. Also, active trade unionists among higher education staff in the UK might have been encouraged to raise these issues by the climate in which many trade unions were pursuing equal opportunity issues nationally. A year after the NAB report, the UG Gender Committee sent a letter to the Secretary of the Academic Board asking it to consider the formation of a formal Equal Opportunities Group in the College. They believed that 'the ideal structure would be an Equal Opportunities Committee to oversee all areas of discrimination, with the College Multicultural Committee and the College Gender Committee acting as formally constituted sub-committees [of the Academic Board].'¹⁶ An Equal Opportunities Committee (EOC) was duly formed in July 1992, however it was not continued. The Committee met for a time, but lapsed after the submission of an EO Audit commissioned by the Principal in 1994. This would suggest that management was complying with the recommendations, but in absence of legislative requirements such as those in the US, there was not even an office to deal with EO issues.

In 1989, the same year that the EOC was proposed at UG, there was also a Joint Planning Forum on Equal Opportunities Policy. The report from the Forum stated:

The 'New College of Higher Education' is committed to the promotion of equal opportunities for all students and staff which should create an institution which is representative of the wider society. It is recognised that education is an important means through which equality of opportunity may be achieved. In order to provide equality of access to all courses positive action will be taken to encourage the participation of underrepresented groups.¹⁷

It also stated that UG would provide flexible course offerings and child care facilities in an effort to promote Equal Opportunities for women. The Management Information Section (MIS) was to monitor and analyse annually the composition of the staff and student

¹⁶ Papers of Melanie Ilic, p. 1: Clare Hanson, 'Minutes of the College Gender Committee' (7 February 1989).

¹⁷ Papers of Melanie Ilic, p. 1: *Joint Planning Forum: Staffing Task Group Equal Opportunities Policy* (30 May 1989).

populations, as was recommended in the national 1988 Equal Opportunities Group Report (see above). A MIS provides data, but does not draw conclusions in the absence of targets and benchmarks. However, as will be discussed later, it still remains difficult to collect information on staff by gender at UG.

There have been recent developments in the UK regarding equal opportunities, which UG management may have to respond to (for example making the equal opportunity policy more than a paper policy, which it seems to be at the time of writing). In the late 1990s there were two important UK governmental reports which raised equal opportunities issues in higher education: the 1997 Dearing Report, a report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education; and the 1999 Bett Report, which was a report of the Independent Review of Higher Education Pay and Conditions. Both reports 'drew attention to gender inequalities and the need for HEIs [higher education institutions] to ensure equality of employment opportunities for all staff, to take action to remove barriers which may inhibit recruitment and progression for particular groups, and to ensure the implementation of effective pay and career structures.'¹⁸

In Autumn 1999, higher education trade unions and the Universities and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA) agreed to set up both a joint working group involving higher education trade unions and a working group of the Joint Negotiating Committee for academic and related staff in the older universities (pre-1992) to discuss gender and ethnicity issues in UK higher education. The groups were to:

- Consider the relevant sections and recommendations of the Bett report;
- Consider present and proposed employment legislation in this area;
- Consider existing advice and good practice within HE.¹⁹

The national framework agreement that was reached encouraged localised partnership agreements between HEIs and trade unions for the promotion of equal opportunities. This

¹⁸ UCEA, 'Equal Opportunities in Employment in Higher Education: A Framework for partnership,' May 2000, www.ucea.ac.uk/equalopportunities123.html, p.3.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 2.

framework was largely based on the document 'Higher Education and Equality: A Guide,' produced by the EOC and other organisations, which recommended among other matters that higher education institutions have written equal opportunity policies.²⁰

The framework stated that the equal opportunity policies should be backed by the provision of sufficient resources to cover such matters as staff EO training and advice. It also recommended that institutions 'should start from their current situation, based on an audit, and set their own realistic and prioritised goals/outcomes.'²¹ UG's 1993/94 EO Audit for gender and race had done this, but very little action followed. The national framework recommended that in order for the policies to be successfully implemented, they needed to be fully integrated into the budgeting and strategic planning processes of the institutions. Also, it was recommended that the institutions publish action plans, which 'should include clear, objective and demonstrable methods of confirming and assessing progress in achieving desired outcomes.'²² A data bank was to be developed by national agencies such as the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) that would allow institutions to share comparative equal opportunities data, and that would also help in the monitoring of the equal opportunity policy status and its impact within institutions.

In the year 2000 the Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) was formed by Universities UK, a national consortium of all vice-chancellors and principals of universities. Up until that time, the Commission on University Career Opportunity (CUCO) had overseen most equal opportunities work in UK higher education. ECU's aims were to consult universities in 'integrating equal opportunities at a strategic level'; 'develop, share and disseminate good practice'; and offer women 'support for career and personal development'.²³ A Joint Equality Steering Group (JESG) meets three times a year and coordinates policies at the 'strategic level'. The question arises, however, of the ability of these rather piecemeal and

²⁰ Ibid, p. 5.

²¹ Ibid, p. 6.

²² Ibid, p. 7.

²³ 'Equality Challenge Unit,' accessed from the Universities UK website: www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/activities/ecu.asp.

under-resourced efforts to affect real change. They can also be seen as the attempts of heads of universities to be seen as doing something regarding EO, but not really wanting radical change. Without proactive management, and a desire/ recognition of the need for change, real progress on EO is not possible.

This may explain why despite the US and UK governments' efforts to promote equal opportunities, academic women still experience inequality. One of the signs of this inequality is the 'glass ceiling' that seems to persist for women in academia. Women academics throughout the world are poorly represented in the most prestigious, well-paid positions in higher education. International networks have been set up to analyse this situation. For example, the European Union funded project, 'Women in European Universities' is looking at the question of why women are underrepresented in positions of authority in European universities.²⁴ The next section will analyse the concept of the 'glass ceiling' at both national and institutional levels.

The Glass Ceiling

The concept of the 'glass ceiling', which has been used since the late 1980s in US business literature, is used to refer to the low representation of women in organisations' higher echelons of power.²⁵ Luba Chliwniak, in a 1997 US report, stated: 'The glass ceiling in higher education is seen as the result of a male-dominated organizational structure that places stumbling blocks in the career paths of many women faculty.'²⁶ She also pointed out that although women made up more than 52 percent of the US student population, higher education's leadership was still substantially male.

²⁴ For more information on this network, see their website: www.women-eu.de.

²⁵ For a more detailed discussion of the origins of the concept, see: Miriam David and Diana Woodward, 'Introduction', in Miriam David and Diana Woodward (eds.), *Negotiating the Glass Ceiling: Careers of Senior Women in the Academic World* (London: The Falmer Press, 1998), pp.14-16.

²⁶ Luba Chliwniak, 'Higher Education Leadership: Analyzing the Gender Gap,' *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports*, 1997, ERIC Digests, p. 2.

The 'glass ceiling' is a concept that has been extensively discussed in the UK regarding women in higher education. The Through the Glass Ceiling Network of women in higher education management posts was set up in 1990 by Christine King and Diana Green, 'to support the few women in posts of dean or above.'²⁷ The Network supports members in their progression up the career ladder, and helps to sustain members 'in handling the pressures and tensions of their present posts by this network of congenial peers.'²⁸ Miriam David and Diana Woodward, members of the Network, have pointed out that while members almost certainly share the experiences of sex discrimination in their careers, 'not all members... would necessarily endorse a feminist analysis of their experiences.'²⁹

The percentage of UK women professors differs by institution and discipline. The 'new' universities (post-1992) tend to have higher percentages of women academics. For example, in 1996, South Bank University (a 'new' university) had 32.6% women professors, while the University of St. Andrews (an 'old' university) had 2.9% women professors.³⁰ The engineering and technology fields have historically had the lowest proportions of women professors (in 1998/99, approximately 2.7% of engineering and technology professors were women). The subject with the highest percentage of women professors in 1998/99 was Education, with approximately 21.5%.³¹ Not surprisingly, it is also the case that there is a gender differentiation by subject areas for PhD students, from whom future generations of academics are recruited.³²

²⁷ 'Women Still Tapping on Glass Ceiling,' *The Times Higher Education Supplement* 21 January 2000, www.thes.co.uk.

²⁸ David and Woodward, 'Introduction', pp. 5-6.

²⁹ Ibid, p. 6.

³⁰ Sian Griffiths, 'Chipping Away at the Glass Ceiling,' *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 26 July 1996, www.thes.co.uk.

³¹ *HESA Individualised Staff Return*, 1998/99, cited in Susana Vazquez-Cupeiro, *The System of Higher Education in the UK* (Munster: Women in European Universities Training Paper, 2001), p. 21.

³² Margaret B. Sutherland, 'Two Steps Forward and One Step Back: Women in Higher Education in the United Kingdom,' in Suzanne Stiver Lie, Lynda Malik, and Duncan Harris, (eds.), *The Gender Gap in Higher Education*, (London: Kogan Page, 1994), p. 175.

As shown in the tables and figures in Appendix II, there is evidence of a 'glass ceiling' for women at both ASU and UG despite both institutions having a majority of women students. Indeed, women were poorly represented in the higher echelons of academic employment throughout the period under consideration. For the Autumn semester 1979 at ASU, women constituted approximately 28% of academic staff members, and males held a disproportionately large share of senior academic staff positions. Eleven percent of professors were women and as the positions went down in rank, the proportion of males dropped and that of females rose until the lecturer position where women constituted 50% of that position.³³ As Table Two in Appendix II shows, although the percentage of women professors grew steadily from 1970 (when it was 5.1%) to 2000 (when it was 24.1%), it never reached more than 25 percent.³⁴

There is also evidence at UG of a 'glass ceiling'. Analysis of the data in Table Three in Appendix II shows that, as at ASU, in moving up the career ladder at UG, the percentage of women decreases. The 'official' data from the 2000-2001 academic year shows that approximately 50% of researchers; 40.7% of lecturers; 36.4% of senior lecturers and researchers; and 28.6% of professors (an increase from naught the previous year) were women.³⁵ As mentioned in the Appendix, the data is not actual numbers because of the rounding system of the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), which has an especially important effect on the numbers for small institutions like UG. In actuality there were three women full professors from around the year 1994 until 2002, when the number decreased to one. A staff member in an interview in 2002 pointed to the low numbers of women in the higher echelons of power. They pointed out that at the time of the interview (February 2002), only two out of the seven heads of school were female.³⁶

³³ *Appalachian State University Annual Fact Book* (Boone, Appalachian State University, 1980), p. 70.

³⁴ *Appalachian State University Annual Fact Books* (Boone, Appalachian State University, 1971-2001).

³⁵ HESA, *HESA Individualised Staff Return 2000-2001*, Copyright Higher Education Statistics Agency Ltd., 2002.

³⁶ 'Jo,' Interview by author, 20 February 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

These low proportions of women in positions of authority affect both staff and students. For staff, the lower numbers of women adds extra time constraints for the women who do become professors. According to an ASU staff member, one of the problems arising from the lower proportions of female academic staff is that women students who want to seek out female professors to discuss problems (both university-related and personal) put more demands upon the time of the female professors. These extra demands can be very time-consuming and constitute invisible teaching duties that many male professors do not have. This can cause women to be passed over for tenure and promotion because they may not be able to do as much research and writing as they would otherwise. Many universities take research and writing into consideration when making tenure decisions.³⁷

As Helena Kennedy asserts in a *Times Higher Education Supplement* article, 'The difficulty in challenging the 'glass ceiling' which exists for women is that it is so difficult to see.'³⁸ The next section will attempt to illuminate the 'glass ceiling' by exploring the barriers to career development for women academics. These are indicative of male hegemony of higher education as previously discussed; and their identification can help identify strategies for women to 'break through the glass ceiling'.

Barriers to Career Development for Women Academics

The male culture of universities, as discussed earlier, has meant that many women academics have faced barriers in their careers that affect them differently from their male peers. These include inadequate child care provision; sexism in the hiring process; inequality of pay according to gender; sexual harassment; and the impact of recent changes in university ethos such as marketisation and casualisation. Many US and UK higher

³⁷ Thalia Coleman, Interview by Author, 16 April 1998, ASU, Boone, NC.

³⁸ Helena Kennedy, 'Prisoners of Gender,' *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 03 November 1995, www.thes.co.uk, p. 2.

education institutions have not provided sufficient child care for staff and student needs throughout their histories, and women academics and students today still list better child care provision as an unmet need. US feminist Ruth Rosen pointed out that: 'Hundreds of activists, like myself, sat for years on committees that never seemed to convince universities that women students, [support] staff, and faculty [academic staff] required child care.'³⁹ The continuing division of domestic labour (including child care) means that many women staff and students with young children find themselves either having to find and pay for private child care providers, or rearranging work and/or class schedules to accommodate care-giving duties. This also affects men, but to a lesser extent since it is still the case that women make up the majority of primary caregivers in the US and the UK.

In a 2000 journal article, Robert Drago and Joan Williams discuss the effect of having children on US women's academic careers, particularly regarding the tenure system. The authors point out that women's opportunities to secure tenure on an equal level with men has been hampered 'because of the *de facto* requirement that academics take *no time off for childbearing* [my emphasis] before achieving tenure.'⁴⁰ There have been, however, many higher education institutions that have new child-leave policies: parental leave; reduced workloads; and a pausing of the tenure clock (tenure assures academic freedom by making sure academics are not fired arbitrarily, although there is now uncertainty over its future). These policies, however, typically apply only for a short period of time (a half-year or full-year) and many pre-tenure academic staff still need to work many hours of 'overtime' in research productivity that is needed for tenure, which eats into their family and leisure time.

³⁹ Rosen, *The World Split Open*, p. 208.

⁴⁰ Robert Drago and Joan Williams, 'A Half-time Tenure Track Proposal,' *Change* 32 (November/December 2000), p. 48.

One solution to the problems posed by childrearing responsibilities in relation to securing tenure is what the authors called ‘part-time tenure track’. They suggest that ‘the solution is to redefine the ideal worker in academia, by offering proportional pay, benefits, and advancement for part-time work.’⁴¹ A tenure track staff member with care-giving responsibilities could request to be put on half-time status for one to twelve years. During this time period, the staff member’s workload, benefits, and advancement would be reduced; and the tenure clock would also run at half-time. The policy needed to be limited to those who could not do academic work because of other commitments. This would be necessary to help prevent some academic staff from unfairly accruing research time before tenure decisions. According to the authors, the half-tenure system would have ‘a neutral budgetary impact,’ it would not entail additional costs to universities.⁴² The authors assert that it would actually benefit universities by increasing the talent pool that universities choose from, and would improve their quality by changing the measure of academic success to the quality of the staff, not the previous requirement of how long they were willing to work. However, there is a danger that this would become a less prestigious career path that would act as a trap for women.

Child care provision has also been a concern of UK women academics. In a letter to the editor of *The Times Higher Education Supplement* in 1995, a female principal lecturer asserted that as long as university managers ‘view the cost of subsidised “child-parking” facilities, an inability to attend breakfast and evening meetings and the occasional days spent working at home while nursing sick dependants, as illegitimate costs and evidence of lack of professional commitment bordering on “scarpering”, the glass ceiling will remain intact.’⁴³ According to one British researcher, anecdotal evidence shows that

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ E. Stina Lyon, ‘Bottom Line on Chairs,’ *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 17 November 1995, www.thes.co.uk.

‘big families and academic success for women do not seem to mix.’⁴⁴ In other words, women who have made it to the position of professor are not likely to have had many children, if any. This points to the need for better child care within UK universities; or alternatively different attitudes to alternative academic career paths and a more equitable division of domestic responsibilities.

Some researchers, however, have downplayed the negative effect of family responsibilities on women’s academic career prospects. In a 1990 essay, Diane Davis and Helen Astin argued that their research (conducted in the US) ‘found that being married positively affects academic women’s research productivity, at least in terms of the mean number of publications;’ and that researchers were starting ‘to consider that gender differences in productivity might be explained by mediating factors other than family obligations.’⁴⁵

Inequality in pay according to gender is another barrier for women academics. As previously mentioned, equal pay legislation was passed in the 1960s and 1970s in the US and the UK. Despite this, inequalities in pay according to sex still existed at the time of writing. As Margaret Sutherland points out in a 1994 essay, even though the legislation was an official policy, ‘universities have discretion as to the scale-point at which appointments are made and as to merit awards.’⁴⁶ Sutherland cites 1991 Association of University Teachers’ (AUT) research that revealed that the average salary for women senior staff in universities was lower than that of men’s salaries. It also showed that the lower numbers of women in some subject areas affected the average salary. Salaries differed according to subject area, with the highest being the areas with the lowest percentages of women such as agriculture and engineering.

⁴⁴ Helen Hague, ‘9.2% of Professors are Women,’ *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 28 May 1999, www.thes.co.uk, p. 2.

⁴⁵ Diane E. Davis and Helen S. Astin, ‘Life Cycle, Career Patterns and Gender Stratification in Academe: Breaking Myths and Exposing Truths,’ in Lie and O’Leary (eds.), *Storming the Tower*, p. 92.

⁴⁶ Sutherland, ‘Two Steps Forward,’ p. 177.

Equal pay issues have been debated in newspapers and journals in the UK. A 1999 *The Times Higher Education Supplement* article pointed out that women academic staff earned an average of 4300 Pounds a year less than male academics. The article also pointed out that according to research conducted by the National Association for Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE), a university and college lecturers' union, 'to end sex discrimination in pay, as recommended in the Bett report, would cost just under Pounds 182 million.'⁴⁷ As previously mentioned, the 1999 Bett Report was a governmental report from the Independent Review of Higher Education Pay and Conditions, which pointed to gender inequalities.

Two years later, another article from the same paper stated that universities in the UK had done nothing to close this pay gap. It pointed out that the pay gap between men and women academics was larger for 'older' academics and those in higher positions. Furthermore, the gender pay gap even existed in disciplines that traditionally had a higher proportion of women, such as Education. According to NATFHE, universities 'have adopted an "out of sight, out of mind" attitude to the problem of unequal pay for women, despite agreeing to set up an equality challenge unit with national targets to improve the situation.'⁴⁸ The Union suggested that an incremental career scale with fewer steps be introduced, which would make it easier for those (particularly women) who take career breaks to 'catch up.'

Jocelyn Prudence, then chief executive of the Universities and Colleges Employers Association, in a 2002 article from the same paper attributed the gender pay discrepancy in significant part to higher education's forty-year old pay structure. She points out that considering the increase in women staff and the shift in their place within the hierarchy that has occurred over this period, the old structure of 'Ten different pay spines, long

⁴⁷ Harriet Swain, 'Natfhe Rails at "endemic discrimination" in Pay,' *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 12 November 1999, www.thes.co.uk, p. 1.

⁴⁸ Tony Tysome, '130m Needed to Bridge Pay Divide,' *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 05 October 2001, www.thes.co.uk, p. 1.

incremental scales and the absence of institution-wide systems for evaluating the worth of jobs, are not likely to deliver equal pay for work of equal value.’⁴⁹ In 2002, members of the Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff, which was made up of employers and trade unions, agreed that a single pay spine and new pay structures needed to be developed. According to Jocelyn Prudence, the ‘Universities and Colleges Employers Association’s vision is for a national framework [for pay systems] that recognises the diversity of the UK’s higher education institutions.’⁵⁰ As with EO policies, real changes are unlikely to occur in equality of pay in the absence of proactive university managers and a general recognition of the need for change.

The masculine culture of universities has also contributed to the prevalence of sexual harassment (defined here as unwanted sexual advances in the context of unequal power relations) within both the US and UK academic environments.⁵¹ Sexual harassment affects not only women employed in universities; higher education students also experience sexual harassment (for example when asked for sexual favours from professors in return for good or passing grades). Sexual harassment is evident in organisations throughout society, and there has been some suggestion that men may use sexual harassment to intimidate women out of desirable sectors of the labour market.⁵²

One of the early seminal texts on sexual harassment in the US was Catherine MacKinnon’s *Sexual Harassment of Working Women* (1979), which argues that sexual harassment is sex discrimination. MacKinnon states that ‘sexual harassment [is] neither incidental nor tangential to women’s inequality, but a crucial expression of it, a central

⁴⁹ Jocelyn Prudence, ‘Equal Pay is Responsibility of All,’ *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 17 May 2002, www.thes.co.uk, p. 1.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ For an overview of the history of the use of the term see: Alison M. Thomas and Celia Kitzinger, ‘Reviewing the Field,’ in Alison M. Thomas and Celia Kitzinger (eds.), *Sexual Harassment: Contemporary Feminist Perspectives* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1997), pp. 1-18.

⁵² For an analysis of possible reasons why men sexually harass women, see: Alison M. Thomas, ‘Men Behaving Badly? A Psychosocial Exploration of the Cultural Context of Sexual Harassment,’ in Thomas and Kitzinger, *Sexual Harassment*, pp. 131-153.

dynamic in it.’⁵³ After feminists’ ‘naming’ of sexual harassment, ‘public bodies and institutions in both Britain and North America began to see sexual harassment as a serious cause for concern, and to formulate specific codes of practice and grievance procedures to deal with it.’⁵⁴ Sexual harassment was added to the US Equal Opportunity Commission’s “Guidelines on Discrimination” in 1980. It was considered a violation of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (work environment) and also of Title IX (education environment). In the UK, it could be construed as sex discrimination under the 1975 Sex Discrimination Act or the Employment Protection Act. In 1991, the European Economic Community released a Recommendation and Code of Conduct on Sexual Harassment.⁵⁵

At the end of the twentieth century, there was a development in higher education that, according to some observers, threatened the position of women in academia: the marketisation and commodification of university education that has occurred in many countries. The globalisation of higher education and the expansion of participation have made it more difficult for governments to continue to fund mass higher education and maintain high quality. Therefore, HEIs in the Western World have been put on a more business-like footing, which has meant less public money (as a proportion of their income), greater autonomy, and pressures to become more efficient. The increasing preoccupation of universities with economic rationalism and income generation has meant that ‘The student is now the demanding “consumer” of the new knowledge services provided by the (new) academic.’⁵⁶ This has had differing effects on men and women academic staff. The new economic rationalism has meant that academic staff are expected to put in longer hours, travel more, network, have an extensive publishing record, and aggressively promote themselves in order to succeed, which puts added time constraints on staff

⁵³ Catharine MacKinnon, *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), p. xi.

⁵⁴ Thomas and Kitzinger, ‘Reviewing,’ p. 4.

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 5.

⁵⁶ Richard Collier, ‘The Macho World of Academia,’ *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 05 October 2001, www.thes.co.uk, p. 1.

members' personal lives. Furthermore, 'it is predominately women who are called on to negotiate the "double shift" of balancing academic commitments and "private lives"'. Men are seen as being accommodated by the new cultures of the business-like universities in ways that women are not.'⁵⁷ As mentioned in Chapter Six, UG staff interviewees expressed concern about the new business ethos in universities and its effects on the women's studies field, and more specifically, on women's studies staff.⁵⁸ While 'traditional' disciplines are also in danger of closing if they do not recruit students, the additional difficulties that women's studies programmes have encountered regarding funding have added special difficulties.

Another effect of this trend on higher education is that universities worldwide are making extensive use of staff in short-term and part-time positions for flexibility and cost reasons. This 'casualisation' affects women academic staff more than men academic staff because women are more likely to become 'trapped' in such low paid, insecure positions. A 1995 article in *The Times Higher Education Supplement* discussed the UK Hansard Society Report in 1990 that showed that women were a significant minority of full-time, tenured university academic staff, and also that they were 'concentrated in lower grade posts.'⁵⁹ Some attribute this trend in part to the short-sightedness of financial planners: 'When medium- to long-term funding and planning is reduced to a series of annual lurches as the basis of public financial support is changed, it is small wonder that universities are forced to take a cautious view and resort to increasing casualization as a "safety measure", if nothing else.'⁶⁰ In 1990, the Universities Funding Council introduced a bidding scheme for the funding of universities, whereby universities submitted bids for their projected student numbers for a four-year period from 1991. There was a maximum overall limit,

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ 'Pat,' 'Robin,' and 'Eliza,' Interview with author, 19 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁵⁹ Helena Kennedy, 'Prisoners of Gender,' *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 03 November 1995, www.thes.co.uk, p. 2.

⁶⁰ Adrienne Aziz, 'Women in UK Universities- The Road to Casualization?' in Suzanne Stiver Lie and Virginia E. O'Leary, eds., *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World*, (London: Nichols/GP Publishing, 1990), p. 38.

which meant that universities were bidding against each other for the limited funds available.

Research conducted by NATFHE in 1999 showed 'that women make up a higher proportion of the part-time than full-time workforce and that conditions of employment are usually poorer than for full-time staff.'⁶¹ The Union called for institutions to give all regular teaching staff full-time equivalent contracts. There is evidence of the efforts to improve this situation; in recent years there have been moves to restrict the proportion of staff on temporary contracts. In March 2002, employer representatives on the Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (see Equal Pay section) agreed 'to reduce the number of staff on fixed-term and casual contracts.'⁶²

This trend of 'casualisation' is also evident in US higher education. In 2000, the percentage of part-time teachers at all colleges and universities was 42.5 percent. Furthermore, women accounted for 36 percent of full-time academic staff, but nearly half of part-time academic staff.⁶³ The vast majority of these part-time positions are not tenure track; therefore they do not offer stable career advancement opportunities (and like other part-time jobs, offer low pay and no benefits).

The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), which will be discussed further in the next chapter, has been another influence on UK academic staff. The RAE ties funding into research performance, and has been an additional competitive pressure on departments to improve their performance in order to maintain their share of the Funding Councils' funding for research. In addition, the growing student numbers are currently major sources of the pressures on academic staff.

These national barriers were evident at local level at both ASU and UG. Child care was an issue that affected both staff and students at ASU and UG. ASU does have an on-

⁶¹ Swain, 'Natfhe Rails,' p. 1.

⁶² Phil Baty, 'Joint Bid to Cut Casualisation,' *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 29 March 2002, www.thes.co.uk, p. 1.

⁶³ Drago and Williams, 'A Half-Time,' p. 48.

site child care centre, although there is debate over the adequacy of this provision.

According to a woman staff interviewee (an ex-Assistant to the Provost for Women's Concerns), ASU has had a difficult time attracting qualified women due to two main deficiencies: a shortage of both child care facilities and suitable partner jobs in the region.⁶⁴ She attributes the difficulty in retaining female staff to the lack of qualified child care, especially for infants. The staff member called for more and better child care provision.

At UG in 1981, the Broadlands Playgroup Association was formed with three College representatives and three to four parent representatives. It was a non-profit organisation that provided care (during term time) for three to five year olds, and also provided Parent-Toddler groups for parents who wished to initiate their children into the playgroup environment. Its constitution included the provision that College staff and students had priority in allocation of places. According to a 1989 report, demand for places by College staff and students was minimal because the facility did not offer the hours of child care that they required.

It would appear from these results that there is an urgent need to at least treble the number of half-term Playscheme places available in order to meet the demand shown in the results of the survey, and make the facility available for a full working day. There is an immediate need for full day care for children from 0-5 years.⁶⁵

The report also discussed the result of a questionnaire on child care issued to staff and students that found that there was strong feeling that there was a need for full child care for children aged three to twelve years. It was concluded that 'People are obviously struggling with child care arrangements and it often affects their attitude to work or courses and reduces their effectiveness in their chosen studies or employment.'⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Thalia Coleman, Interview by author, 16 April 1998, ASU, Boone, NC.

⁶⁵ Catherine Dalley, *Child Care Report*, June 1989, Papers of Melanie Ilic, UG, Cheltenham, UK, p. 4.

⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 10.

In 1993, a UG female member of staff wrote a letter to the Assistant Director of Human Resources discussing the College's child care arrangements for staff and students. She stated that she was confused over the provisions of 'babycare' and that she was frustrated over its inaccessibility to her. A staff member in the Crèche told her that it did not offer places for staff or student children of less than two years of age. When the UG staff member queried this, she was told that there were only openings for the babies of College staff if the places and sessions were not requested by Midland Bank employees (partners with the College in the Crèche), and they were full for the foreseeable future. The UG staff member wrote:

Policies concerning Equal Opportunities look meaningless from my current position. Neither, I am afraid, do promises that the College will act given time soothe. I do not have time; my daughter needs care now for which I have to pay. More than six months have elapsed since I first complained and the only movement I can see is backwards.⁶⁷

Another barrier to female academic staff is sexism in the hiring process. At UG during the 1980s, there was particular concern by women academic staff over this; there were several letters from them to the Gender Committee (see next section) regarding this subject. A staff member on an interviewing panel related the following story:

I was on the interviewing panel for a position [in the] Geography/Geology Dep. One candidate was a "female divorcee" and I had to intervene in the post-interview discussion to object to discussion of her mental status and the impact she would have (potentially) on the marriages of men in the department! My objections were not seen as legitimate by 2 members of the interviewing committee. She did not get the full-time appointment despite her outstanding qualifications and unanimous view of the members of the Department. She has since gone on to much more prestigious ports.⁶⁸

It was not only women staff who raised objections to what they saw as the unacceptably different treatment of women and men applicants for university posts. A letter from a male

⁶⁷ Papers of Melanie Ilic: Barbara Hammond, 'Babycare Arrangements for Staff and Students' (1 March 1993).

⁶⁸ Papers of Melanie Ilic: Susan O'Brien, 'Memo to Gender Working Party' (not dated but most likely from early or middle 1980s).

staff member in 1986 objected to unacceptable interview questions to a female applicant about her child care intentions.⁶⁹

Inequality of pay according to gender was another barrier that feminists academics fought against. There is evidence of inequality of pay at both ASU and UG. Dr. Joyce Crouch, Chairperson of the ASU Psychology Department, prepared a report comparing male and female salaries at ASU in 1984. Crouch compared ASU's and similar North Carolina higher education institutions' academic staff salaries, and found that salary differences between the sexes at ASU increased more than at the other institutions between the years 1980 and 1983. Crouch offered the following tentative conclusions:

ASU has not made any systematic effort to determine possible sex bias. This failure to focus upon the possibility of sex bias in evaluation at the time of hiring as well as in recommending merit increases has led to a gradual erosion of the position of women faculty [academic staff].⁷⁰

The Equal Opportunity Officer Richard Howe had a different view of the issue. According to a study his office conducted in 1985-86, during that school year there were thirty-five unequal pay complaints and of these, eleven were from women and twenty-four were from men.

Overall, the data indicate that male faculty [academic staff], as a group, are paid substantially more than female faculty [academic staff], as a group. The reason(s) for the differences in salaries of male and female faculty [academic staff] can, in the large majority of cases, be accounted for by differences in overall experience, and/or some males may have received higher merit raises than some female faculty [academic staff].⁷¹

Howe ignores the gender dimensions of pay inequities in his explanation of differences. The last clause relates to the earlier discussion of the greater difficulty of women gaining merit raises because of greater constraints on their time such as child care responsibilities.

Equal Pay was also an issue at UG. A 1993 Equal Opportunities Report stated that women academic staff at UG were concentrated in the lower paying jobs, such as

⁶⁹ Papers of Melanie Ilic: Don Cartridge, 'Memo to Sue O'Brien' (September 1986).

⁷⁰ ASU/A, p. 2: Joyce Crouch, 'A Comparison of Male and Female Salaries at Appalachian State University' (13 February 1984).

⁷¹ ASU/A, Thomas Papers, p. 2: *ASU 1985-86 Equal Pay Study* (1985-86).

secretarial and administrative staff. In management and head of department areas, males outnumbered females by around 5 to 1.

The total male salary bill for the College is currently (August 1993) 5.8 million [pounds] and the total female salary bill is 4.9 million [pounds]. However since there are approximately 280 full time equivalent male employees and approximately 333 full time equivalent female employees, this works out to an average salary for a full-time male in the College of 20,425 [pounds]; but for a full-time female, of 14,690 [pounds]. This means that the average female salary in the College is 72% of the average male salary, which just about reflects the national average for male/female salary ratios, but which hardly indicates true equality of opportunity.⁷²

The persistence of inequality of pay at UG reflects the power of male hegemony at UG.

As discussed earlier, sexual harassment can be another barrier to women staff.

ASU released a study of sexual harassment in 1985. The staff of the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs prepared the report, *Analysis of Perceived Sexual Harassment of Faculty and Staff at Appalachian State University*, which listed recommendations such as: 'Line administrators, particularly deans, directors, and chairpersons should be reminded of their responsibility for implementing the policy and the EEOC's [Equal Employment Opportunity Commission] Guidelines and be held accountable for their implementation.'⁷³ The report also called for in-service anti-discrimination training for all employees. The same year as the report, ASU released a policy prohibiting sexual harassment. It stated: 'in compliance with Section 703 of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, the University will not tolerate any verbal, nonverbal, or physical behavior which constitutes sexual harassment.'⁷⁴ Proven violations of the policy could lead to the offender being suspended or dismissed.

These are some of the barriers that have been discovered through analysis of relevant literature and interview material, which help to explain why women have not reached equality within academia. However, women were not just passive recipients of

⁷² UGA, Paper EO7/94, p. 2: *Statistical Report on Equal Opportunities* (August 1993).

⁷³ ASU/A, Thomas Papers, p. 87: *Analysis of Perceived Sexual Harassment of Faculty and Staff at Appalachian State University* (undated, but circa 1985).

⁷⁴ ASU/A, Thomas Papers: 'Appalachian State University Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment' (1985).

these inequalities. The next section will discuss the staff organisations that women (and some men) founded to improve the conditions of women at ASU and UG.

Female Staff Organisations

As discussed in Chapter Three, there is ample evidence to show that academic women have analysed and struggled against these barriers. This was also the case at ASU and UG. A female academic staff organisation that was active on the ASU campus was the American Association of University Women (AAUW). The AAUW Corporate Program ‘provides a structure through which institutions form an alliance with the grass root membership to *mobilize support for higher education*.’⁷⁵ AAUW’s legislative programme during the 1970s supported such things as quality education at post-secondary institutions and lifelong general education. They also provided money for graduate fellowship programmes in an effort to correct the imbalance that existed in financial aid to females.

Another academic staff organisation that was concerned with women’s issues was ASU Faculty Women, which was formed in the 1970s. The organisation sponsored two speakers a month in an effort to explore the barriers and problems facing women. The president of ASU Faculty Women, Hubertien Williams, stated: ‘We want to sponsor a series of speakers from different areas to promote understanding and discussion.’⁷⁶

ASU Faculty Women soon changed its name to Faculty Concerned With the Status of Women because the former name could be seen as excluding male academic staff. In an interview in 1998, Maggie McFadden stated that the organisation was told to change its name by University Equal Opportunity Officer, Richard Howe, after the passage of Title IX because of the risk of being sued for the exclusion of males.⁷⁷ According to Patricia Beaver, president of the organisation during the late 1970s, Faculty Concerned With the

⁷⁵ ASU/A, Wey Papers, p. 1: Marjorie Bell Chambers, ‘Letter to Dr. Wey’ (undated).

⁷⁶ ‘Faculty Women Sponsor Colloquium,’ *The Appalachian*, 12 February 1974, p. 9.

⁷⁷ Maggie McFadden, Interview by author, 25 March 1998, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

Status of Women had three main goals: mentoring and personal reinforcement for academic staff; discussing and acting upon the inequities that existed at ASU; and bringing in outside speakers to help in the intellectual development of staff and students. There were members who kept up with the outside women's movements and feminist issues as they were addressed on other campuses.⁷⁸

During the 1980s, the Faculty Concerned With the Status of Women was known as the Organization on the Status of Women (OSW). The OSW was a voluntary academic staff organisation that was concerned with bettering the position of women at ASU.

Beaver made the point that the OSW was an independent organisation that worked in the absence of a proactive office working for women's rights. During the late 1980s and early 1990s, administrative offices took over some of the activities that OSW had previously been doing, reducing the need for such an organisation (see next chapter).⁷⁹ At the time of writing, there was an ASU's Women's Club; but it was a social club for women employees, retirees, and wives of ASU employees. It offered 'a variety of activity groups to include day and evening book clubs, daytrippers, gourmet club, and mom and tots.'⁸⁰

One of the institutional offices that took over some of the OSW activities was the Assistant to the Provost for Women's Concerns, which was created in the 1990s to act as an intermediary between the Provost and women staff and students. This post was created, in part, because of pressure by some women on campus who were worried about the institution's seeming lack of concern over women's issues. In a 1998 interview, the then Assistant listed her responsibilities as: to be available for women to come to her with their problems; to seek out women to see what issues are important to them; to report these issues to the Provost; to channel people who have problems to the people who can help them; and to work closely with the Equity Office.⁸¹

⁷⁸ Patricia Beaver, Interview by Author, 23 March 1998, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Barb Speir, 'From the President's Desk,' 29 March 2002, <http://www1.appstate.edu/~asuclub/>

⁸¹ Thalia Coleman, Interview by Author, 16 April 1998, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

The Equity Office was another institutional office that took over some of the tasks of the OSW. In the early 1990s, the Chancellor of ASU created a diversity committee which investigated ways of enhancing diversity. In 1996, the Provost formed the Equity Office, which differed from the compliance functions of the Equal Opportunities Office (see above). The Equity Office was to focus more on education, outreach, and such things as mediation and coordination of sexual harassment investigations. The Director's duties were to manage the unit, policy work, and complaint resolution. The Assistant Director's duties were community education. In an interview in 2000, the then Director saw one of the main purposes of the Office as helping staff and students become more comfortable with difference. In other words, to help staff and students be more comfortable with physical, cultural, and sexual diversity. She stated that two people in the Office were getting their doctorates in multicultural education; and that the Office was adding new things every year, such as 'modelling behavior' where 'successful' minorities share their experiences (for example Jean Driskell, a gold medallist wheelchair athlete, spoke on campus). The Office co-sponsored activities with other offices (such as the Multicultural Office), which the Director saw as helping to spread the budget by sharing costs.⁸²

An academic staff organisation active at UG during the 1980s was the Gender Committee. The Gender Committee began in the 1980s when a group of women interested in women's issues, and who knew that there was a multicultural policy but none on equal opportunities for women, met informally.⁸³ The Gender Committee discussed such issues as staffing, promotion, and child care. However, it was never a part of the official college structure. One former member asserted that the Gender Committee contributed in various ways to the profile of the institution without their work being fully acknowledged. 'We were acknowledged when the institution wanted to present itself as doing something...but

⁸² Melissa E. Barth, Interview with Author, 17 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁸³ 'Eliza,' Interview by Author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

easily silenced because actually we had no formal reporting procedure to any other committee.’⁸⁴ Again, UG’s management was not proactive when it came to women’s issues. As with the EO policy, there was no evidence of desire for real change.

The Gender Committee stopped meeting officially in part because of staff time constraints. Upon reflection, former Committee members regretted this decision because it was believed that after the formal EO Committee was established, the Gender Committee was needed even more. The point was made that without the Gender Committee ‘nipping at the ankles the formal arrangements for Equal Ops won’t function; and they don’t.’⁸⁵ The monitoring procedures were not implemented and the EO policy ended up being a paper policy. As previously mentioned, at the time of writing there was no formal Equal Opportunities Committee; and a staff member noted that the EO policy was ‘something to be ashamed of because I think that it would be better not to have one.’⁸⁶

While there were organisations that struggled to improve the conditions of women at ASU and UG that were active in the 1970s and 1980s, at the time of writing these organisations had ceased to exist and there were no such ‘politically active’ organisations on either campus. The only ‘women’s organisations’ that seemed to survive were the ones that were not seen as being political (for example, ASU’s Women’s Club). As mentioned in Chapter Three, this can be explained in part by the conservative nature of both institutions, where ‘radical’ changes and/or organisations are not welcomed.

Conclusion

As discussed in previous chapters, many feminists have recognised and analysed the male hegemony of universities, which has meant that women have struggled throughout history for influence and to make their voices heard within academia. As with

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

women students (see previous chapter), both external (governmental legislation) and internal (feminist academics) influences have brought changes for women academic staff within US and UK academia since the 1960s. Despite equal opportunity legislation that was passed in both countries, at the time of writing there is still strong evidence of a 'glass ceiling' for women academics (as there is for women in most professions). Women have not reached parity in senior management and academic positions. Several barriers to women academics' career advancement have been singled out for detailed analysis: inadequate child care provision; sexism in hiring practices; pay inequality; sexual harassment; and the increasing business ethos of universities. Women academics have not experienced these inequalities passively, but have actively organised to improve their conditions in the often hostile environments within which they found themselves.

While women at ASU and UG have experienced these national trends at local level, an added element affected their experiences. As mentioned in Chapter Three, the environment on both the ASU and UG campuses can be described as conservative, especially when it came to women's equity issues. Both institutions reacted in similar ways to both outside and inside pressure for change in women's position. The senior management of both institutions were reactive instead of proactive when it came to women's issues. An example of this at ASU is that the institution formed an EO Office only after they were forced to do so by federal legislation. At UG, senior management formed an EO Committee after the Gender Committee requested it, again being reactive instead of proactive, but it proved short-lived.

A difference is that while ASU still has an EO Office, UG no longer has an active office or committee on EO. This would suggest that legislative requirements are necessary to insure that organisations pay attention to EO issues. ASU is required by law to monitor its hiring processes by gender. In contrast, when I contacted UG's Personnel Office they were unable to provide me with a breakdown by gender of their academic staff because of

‘inadequacies in their system’. Conservative organisations need to have *requirements* regarding equity policies, not *recommendations*, in order for change to be achieved.

Furthermore, at the time of writing neither institution has a ‘politically active’ women’s organisation. It may or may not be a coincidence, then, that no improvements to women’s position have recently occurred on either campus. On the contrary, there are new, urgent concerns regarding women’s status within the institutions. Women within these conservative institutions, as in others, need to organise to promote improvements in women’s position, and push against managerial apathy. They need to collectively struggle to improve EO policies, break through the ‘glass ceiling’, and dismantle barriers in the paths of women. The next chapter will discuss another area in which women academics have struggled against male hegemony in higher education, women’s studies.

CHAPTER SIX: Teaching and Learning

I have discussed the evidence of male hegemony in higher education in relation to students' living experiences and staff experiences, and women's struggles to improve their status. Historically, male hegemony has also manifested itself in relation to male control over the curriculum, and this chapter will discuss women's efforts to challenge this through the introduction of women's studies programmes. women's studies are studies by, about and/or for women, and there is a plethora of research on this area in both the US and the UK.¹ This research will place the case histories of two programmes into this wider context of national events. In doing so, this chapter will illuminate the mechanics of male hegemony over higher education curricula, and women's struggle against it.

Analysis of the history of the women's studies programmes at Appalachian State University (ASU) and the University of Gloucestershire (UG) reveals the male hegemony of these institutions. Their conservative ethos, as previously discussed, meant that women promoting change met especially strong resistance from institutional management. After giving an overview of the history of women's studies in the US and the UK (and the programmes at ASU and UG), this chapter will discuss the programmes' needs in relation to better funding and staffing support (and how this reflects institutional support for the programmes). The issue of 'separation versus integration' as it relates to women's studies will be discussed around two main areas: student (women-only classes) and discipline-based (women's studies as a separate discipline) issues. These areas were chosen for closer analysis because they especially illustrate the difficulties that women have encountered while challenging the male hegemony of higher education's curriculum. While it will be shown that women's challenge of male hegemony over the curriculum has brought changes, vigilance is needed to ensure that these changes are consolidated and that achievements are not lost.

¹ See, for example, the writings of Marilyn Jacoby Boxer, Renate Klein, published works from the WSN network (UK), and edited works by June Purvis, Louise Morley and Val Walsh.

History of the Programmes

Studies about women have existed for a long time; there was even a prototype of women's studies in Paris at the turn of the twentieth century (a 'feminology' course offered at the *College libre des sciences sociales* in Paris around 1902).² However, formal women's studies programmes appeared much later. Women's studies' development in both the US and UK was influenced by the growth of the women's movement that occurred during the 1960s and 1970s, as discussed in Chapter Three.³ The first integrated women's studies programme in the US was founded at San Diego State University (SDSU) in the 1969-70 academic year. The programme began 'with the vision of a group of about twenty women- students, [support] staff, faculty [academic staff] and community feminists - active in the women's liberation movement in San Diego.'⁴ In 1969, they formed a Women's Studies Committee and worked to have the programme become part of the College of Arts and Letters. The importance of women academic staff and students in founding women's studies was common in the US. As Boxer asserts, women's studies 'grew out of the personal and political experiences of university-trained women.'⁵

According to one estimate published in 1970, fifty-five colleges and universities in the US were offering women's studies courses,⁶ and the number of formal women's studies programmes continued to show a steady increase in the US. There were 150 women's studies programmes in 1975, 300 by 1980, 450 by 1985, and the number exceeded 600 by the early 1990s. Boxer credits this early growth in part to the 'flow of pamphlets, manifestos, and newsletters from feminist communities to campuses, and the circulation of course outlines and

² Marilyn Jacoby Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions: Creating Women's Studies in America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), p. 45.

³ For a discussion of the modern American women's movement, see Ruth Rosen, *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America* (New York: Penguin, 2000). For the UK see Sheila Rowbotham, *The Past is Before Us: Feminism in Action Since the 1960s* (London: Penguin Group, 1989).

⁴ Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, p. 9.

⁵ Ibid, p. 167.

⁶ Philip W. Semas, "55 Campuses Now Offering Courses in Women's Studies," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 5 (November 30, 1970), p. 1.

reading lists from instructor to instructor.’⁷ The growth was also due to high student interest, which helped convince managers to provide resources to the new courses, and the demographic shifts that resulted in an explosive growth in university student numbers beginning in the 1960s. This meant that new programmes had more of a chance of attracting viable numbers of students and succeeding.

As in the US, women’s studies courses were offered before degrees in the UK, as one was taught at the Anti-University in London as early as the 1968-69 academic year. Also like the US, most of these courses took the form of interdisciplinary courses. This was due in part to women’s studies being seen as transcending traditional disciplines. There were Women’s Studies Diplomas in the UK before there were formal degrees (the Polytechnic of Central London started one in 1977). Unlike in the US, where it developed mainly within universities and colleges, women’s studies in the UK developed, in the early years, in adult education and community-based study.⁸ This was due in part to the less effort and resources required to start a course in adult education compared to universities and polytechnics.

There is a parallel between the effort to found women’s studies and the effort to gain women admittance to higher education in the nineteenth century. June Purvis describes the efforts of nineteenth-century women to gain access to education, particularly the mechanics’ institutes that were the main form of adult education during that period.⁹ Even when women gained admittance to the institutes, they were still only admitted as junior members. Nineteenth-century women were also instrumental in the call for part-time university extension courses. As Purvis points out: ‘It is significant that the first major attempt by women to enter the universities, through part time, university extension classes, was welcomed whereas the second major attempt, which would involve women becoming full time,

⁷ Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, p. 10.

⁸ Sue Jackson, ‘Networking Women: A History of Ideas, Issues and Developments in Women’s Studies in Britain,’ *Women’s Studies International Forum* 23 (2000), p. 1.

⁹ Mechanics institutes were founded in the 1820s to teach science to working-class men, and they admitted women from the 1830s.

university students, met with resistance.’¹⁰ A hundred years after they gained admittance to universities, women used a similar strategy to start women’s studies. This reflects the enduring nature of male hegemony in higher education.

The first MA degree in women’s studies in the UK was offered in 1980 (at the University of Kent-Canterbury), and an undergraduate degree in women’s studies was not offered until a decade later. According to Renate Klein, women’s studies degrees in the UK developed first in the less prestigious universities and polytechnics. Klein attributed this, in part, to ‘feminists at prestigious universities have to face the problems of “tradition” and the temptations of gaining acceptance within that tradition.’¹¹ The later development of women’s studies degrees in the UK compared to the US was ‘not to do with any lack of feminist commitment, but with the difficulties in getting such a course agreed by the university.’¹² In fact, as in the US, feminist networks in Britain helped the growth and spread of women’s studies. One of these networks was the Women’s Research and Resource Centre (WRRC), which was started in 1975 in London and which ‘acted as a clearing-house for WS with its newsletter.’¹³ The WRRC provided lists of women’s studies courses at all educational levels, maintained an index of feminist research in the UK, offered seminars and conferences, and had a lending library of women’s studies-related books. The WRRC was known as The Feminist Library at the time of writing and was still located in London.

There were several reasons why feminists called for the founding of women’s studies as a subject in its own right. Some scholars recognized that Western intellectual tradition had largely ignored women’s lives. Helen Crowley asserts: ‘In the main, and with a few notable albeit singular exceptions, the Western tradition had neither sympathy for, nor curiosity about,

¹⁰ June Purvis, ‘Towards a History of Women’s Education in Nineteenth-Century Britain: A Sociological Analysis,’ in June Purvis and Margaret Hales (eds.) *Achievement and Inequality in Education* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983), p. 167.

¹¹ Renate Duelli Klein, ‘A Brief Overview of the Development of Women’s Studies in the UK,’ *Women’s Studies International Forum* 6 (1983), p. 256.

¹² Jackson, ‘Networking Women,’ p. 2.

¹³ Klein, ‘A Brief Overview,’ p. 255.

the questions “represented” by women.’¹⁴ Feminists saw women’s studies as redressing the fact that women were ignored and marginalized in academia throughout history. This was a reflection not of their non-contributions, but instead of the place (status) of women within society. Boxer asserts that ‘in addition to providing new faces, alternative perspectives, and innovative approaches to scholarship as well as teaching, women’s studies has (re)introduced to higher education a type of moral inquiry long absent from most secular institutions.’¹⁵

Women’s studies teachers are also concerned with analysing the causes of women’s social subordination and the part played by various social institutions in perpetuating this subordination. Schuster and Van Dyne argue that staff need to make the curriculum more responsive to women’s experience and also to ‘imagine alternatives to the institutional structures that have excluded women and non-white cultures in the past.’¹⁶ As discussed in Chapter Two, feminists believe that one of the contributions to this exclusion of women was the emphasis on objectivity in research. Boxer asserts that ‘the notion of objectivity is rejected by many feminists, who see it... as a mask for bias.’¹⁷ By deconstructing objectivity, feminists can influence and change academic scholarship.

The issues of curriculum change in US higher education reflected in part a climate of fear brought about by a perceived threat to the US’s dominant position from students performing poorly compared to students in other industrialised nations. This brought about an interest in teaching method and curricular reform. According to Boxer, ‘By the 1990s much of higher education had revised its sense of mission to highlight teaching, and many pledged allegiance to pedagogical principles that put student learning in the center.’¹⁸ As previously

¹⁴Helen Crowley, “Women’s Studies: Between a Rock and a Hard Place or Just Another Cell in the Beehive,” *Feminist Review*, 61 (Spring 1999), p.132.

¹⁵ Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, p. 2.

¹⁶ Marilyn R. Schuster and Susan R. Van Dyne, eds. *Women’s Place in the Academy: Transforming the Liberal Arts Curriculum* (Totowa: Rowan & Allanhold, 1985), p.6.

¹⁷ Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, p. 73.

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 80.

mentioned, pedagogical change had been at the centre of feminist teaching methods from the beginning.

Many feminists see women's studies as the intellectual arm of the women's movement. This means that in addition to providing academic understanding and analysis, women's studies courses are also concerned with promoting social change and raising consciousness through enlightenment. The courses attempt to contradict the feelings of powerlessness that students might have. According to Louise Morley: 'Unlike other academic disciplines, Women's Studies does not aim to inform and educate "on top" of the individual's sense of self, but seeks to locate the self at the centre of the learning process.'¹⁹ Because of these values, feminist teachers are concerned with interacting with students in a non-hierarchical way. They want to develop pedagogical approaches that are democratic and that empower students by making them feel equal in the classroom. According to Ann Heilmann and Ingrid Sharp, there are several ways in which this can be accomplished. First of all, students need to be given a public voice, for example by being encouraged to present papers at conferences. They also need to be given more autonomy over the curriculum by allowing them input into what they are learning. A third way that instructors can promote equality in the classroom is by giving weight to students' ideas and responses.²⁰ All of these were issues when women's studies began, and they have spread to become an integral part of good higher education practice generally.

The nature of the development of women's studies courses has influenced their structure. In many US institutions, women's studies is located within interdisciplinary departments. According to Boxer, US women's studies mostly took the form of 'loosely coordinated interdisciplinary programs.'²¹ She attributed this in part to the way that the

¹⁹ Louise Morley, "Women's Studies, Difference, and Internalised Oppression," *Women's Studies International Forum*. 4 (1992), p. 517.

²⁰ Ann Heilmann and Ingrid Sharp, "Making a Space for Women: Student Conferences as an Example of Feminist Staff-Student Interaction in the University," *Women's Studies International Forum* 2 (1997) pp. 301-320.

²¹ Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, p. 38.

programmes developed by following the lines of least resistance. Boxer stated that with the low financial support that many received,

the best way to put together a program was to collect the scattering of courses developed in various departments, to label them women's studies through cross-listing (if possible), to establish a committee of faculty (often also students and staff and sometimes community representatives as well), and to seek recognition as an interdisciplinary program.²²

Another common feature of US women's studies programmes, especially early in their history, was that they were often involved with extra-curricular issues. Staff who helped found and develop the programmes brought links with community feminists, and organised such things as assertiveness training workshops, referrals to feminist health care providers, and sensitivity training on sexism for public employees. As women's studies programmes developed into 'full-fledged' units, staff 'deliberately withdrew from non-academic pursuits on campus, because of lack of time, and/or the desire to legitimize women's studies in the eyes of the academy.'²³

One extra-curricular activity that women staff helped initiate was the founding of women's centres and women's studies resource rooms. Teri Ann Bengiveno traced the history of the Women's Resource Center at San Jose State University (SJSU) in California; a student-run centre that was founded in the early 1970s and which was still running at the time of writing (making it one of the oldest in the country). The SJSU Women's Center was founded when women students, staff, and managers 'met informally to discuss the importance of having a place on campus to disseminate information and organize activities for women.'²⁴ Some of the women's centres that started in the 1970s developed out of the Continuing Education for Women (CEW) Centers, which were set up in the 1960s to 'help

²² Ibid, p. 40.

²³ Ibid, p. 170.

²⁴ Teri Ann Bengiveno, 'Feminist Consciousness and the Potential for Change in Campus Based Student Staffed Women's Centers,' *Journal of International Women's Studies* 07 March 2000, www.mcla.mass.edu/academics/sba-womenctr/bengiven.htm. Bengiveno, p. 3.

non-traditional women students (meaning over the age of twenty-five) adjust to campus life.'²⁵ Many of these CEW Centers expanded to also service other groups of women.

According to Bengiveno, the women who founded the SJSU Center 'had to carefully negotiate between the acceptable domestic sphere and the more threatening goal of equality.'²⁶ The Center's mission could not be viewed as political or else it would not have been able to receive funding from the Associated Students. The coordinators have struggled to remain politically active despite this limitation and the institutional managers have threatened to cut funding when the Center's mission was seen as too activist. The Center, like many US women's centres, has dealt with many of the issues that the larger women's movement has been involved with, such as child care, equal pay, violence against women, and sexual harassment.

Although women's studies has successfully spread throughout the US and UK curriculum, its programmes internationally at the time of writing are in a state of flux. Even though feminism has challenged and affected many disciplines, the 'traditional' disciplines' structure and curriculum nevertheless remain largely intact. These disciplines continue to shape women's studies as most of its research takes places within the 'traditional' disciplines such as history and sociology. Boxer points out that women's studies remains marginalized in spite of the successes of academic feminists in gaining acceptance for their research and their courses. This marginalization 'fuels continuing debates about its structure, future, and especially in the last decade, even its name.'²⁷ This last refers to the current debate over renaming 'women's studies,' instead calling it 'gender studies,' which is seen to be more inclusive. Some feminists argue changing the title to gender studies de-feminises and de-politicises the subject by removing the traditional commitment of women's studies to women's concerns and experiences. Also, some feel that is easier to keep women's studies

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, p. 76.

classes all-female than it is when they are called 'gender studies'. The 'separation' section below discusses the debate regarding the desirability of this. Others point to the positive aspects of the inclusive nature of the title gender studies. For example by incorporating the study of such areas as masculinity, it is argued that it can give a more complete picture of the nature of women's inequality.

There is evidence that women's studies programmes in the UK are struggling to survive. Beverly Skeggs, in a 1995 article, describes outside events that negatively affected women's studies in the UK. The growth in student numbers since the 1970s has not been matched by a growth in funding and staff numbers, which has meant larger groups and fewer resources. She attributed the growth, in part, to the 'credential inflation' that 'has placed many students in higher (and further) education by default.'²⁸ Higher education was increasingly needed for the types of jobs that were available in the economy. For example, factory jobs that did not require higher education were increasingly difficult to find. This also meant that there was a change in emphasis from 'elite' to 'mass' higher education.

In the UK, there has been increasing demand for higher education since the 1980s, which 'was enabled by a mixture of push and pull factors: the fear of unemployment and the concomitant ideological expansion of aspiration and ambition achieved through Thatcherism, which managed through careful short-term economic manipulation and a mainly acquiescent media to suggest that Britain could have the equivalent to an American Dream.'²⁹ This has meant that those entering education were more likely to be concerned not for 'education-for-itself,' but more for 'education-as-a-means-to-secure-employment,' in other words in the financial dimension of education. This 'vocationalism' damaged recruitment to women's studies because it is not as recognisable a career path as, for example, is business management. Because of universities' models for translating student numbers into course-based resources,

²⁸ Beverly Skeggs, 'Women's Studies in Britain in the 1990s: Entitlement Cultures and Institutional Constraints,' *Women's Studies International Forum* 18 (1995): p. 476.

²⁹ Ibid.

the increase in student numbers did not necessarily translate into an increase in government investment, which has particularly affected staffing (see next section).

Also, the emphasis on consumer ideology has spread to women's studies students, which has meant that the courses are 'assessed by the same criteria as the well established and well-funded subjects, even when they operate under very different institutional provisioning.'³⁰ The students have a well-defined idea of the field's courses and what they want to get out of them, which is not always influenced by an understanding of the institutional restraints that it works under. The interdisciplinary nature of women's studies has meant that: 'Dependence on interdepartmental support entails an enormous amount of daily effort and politicking.'³¹ The demands on its staff will be further discussed below.

During the 1980s and 1990s in Western Europe and America, higher education experienced a type of 'commodification'. According to Crowley:

The restructuring and resource stripping of the university sector that has developed with the ascendancy of economic rationalism as the credo of state managers increasingly seems to dictate the survival of disciplines, not by virtue of their intellectual integrity and coherence, but rather by virtue of their competitiveness in the growing market of educational products.³²

This means that disciplines must continue to recruit students or they will suffer financial cutbacks or even closure. At the time of writing, women's studies was continuing to recruit students in adequate numbers. However, if this was to change, 'no institutional sentiment will be on offer to alleviate waning fortunes, regardless of the rhetoric of mission statements.'³³

These and other recent developments have meant that 'at the end of the 1990s...many women's studies courses [find themselves] struggling to attract students and to keep running, with lecturers and course leaders engaged in political and pragmatic discussions about changes

³⁰ Ibid, p. 477.

³¹ Ibid, p. 479.

³² Crowley, 'Women's Studies,' p. 144.

³³ Ibid, p. 144.

in course structures, titles, etc.’³⁴ Skeggs asserts that feminist academics ‘seem to talk less of changing the power structures than of surviving them.’³⁵

The history of the women’s studies programmes at ASU and UG reflects these international trends. ASU was not the first US higher education institution to start women’s studies courses, although it was part of an early wave of institutions to do so. Its programme officially began in the late 1970s with the introduction of a minor in women’s studies, which enabled students to have it as their secondary subject of study. However, courses concerning the study of women were offered before then; in the 1973-74 academic year, four new courses were offered: ‘Women Orators in America’, ‘Psychology of Sex Differences’, ‘The Individual in Society’, and ‘Women in History’. These titles are typical of the early years of women’s studies nationally, indicating the fields and sub-disciplinary specialities where feminist theory first developed, and where feminist teachers’ expertise lay.

As at SDSU, a small group of mainly female staff influenced the founding of women’s studies at ASU (there was at least one man on the committees that worked to establish the field).³⁶ In an interview with the author, one of these founders maintained that they basically set up the programme with little or no administrative (institutional) help.³⁷ Perhaps surprisingly, ASU was one of the first universities in the state of North Carolina to have a women’s studies course, lagging only slightly behind more progressive universities in the North and West. This seems to be a paradox, since, as was explained in Chapter Three, ASU is a conservative university compared to others in the state (such as the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill). There are several possible explanations for this. One is that the staff members who pushed for and implemented women’s studies had studied and/or worked at larger universities and therefore were more likely to have been exposed to feminist ideas. Another possible reason is that the Chancellor of ASU at that time had already supported

³⁴ Jackson, ‘Networking Women,’ p. 8.

³⁵ Skeggs, ‘Women’s Studies,’ p. 482.

³⁶ Elizabeth Beaulieu, Email Interview with author, 20 July 2002.

³⁷ Maggie McFadden, Interview by Joanna Yount, 15 November 1996, Tape Recording, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

educational innovations such as interdisciplinary studies, thereby showing that he was receptive to new educational ideas at a time when other university managers were resisting change.³⁸

The managers and staff established an ad hoc committee on women's studies at ASU in 1975. Maggie McFadden (based in the Interdisciplinary Studies department) and Helena Lewis (based in the History department) co-chaired the committee, which convened interested staff to share resources and coordinate courses. This group formed the nucleus of the later Women's Studies Committee, composed of all of those who had taught related courses as well as others who expressed interest, including students.

In 1984, women's studies was allocated staff office space and administrative support from the General College. Also in 1984, one-quarter released time (time released from teaching and other duties) for Maggie McFadden, the Coordinator, was made available. A proposal for a half-time coordinator that would be funded university-wide through Academic Affairs was not accepted (and this is still an unmet need). The programme received a separate budget for the first time in the fall of 1987, whereas before it was part of the General College and Interdisciplinary Studies budget. In the late 1980s, Interdisciplinary Studies, which included women's studies, was moved to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS).³⁹ At the time of writing, it was the Provost's Office, also known as the Office of Academic Affairs, which supported women's studies by providing funding for the graduate assistant and for the money used to release staff from their home departments to teach the programme's courses. In addition, it received a budget supplement from the CAS. According to the then women's studies Director, 'this "homelessness" is indicative of... [the fact that] no one is really willing to absorb the costs of the program, and so we get a bit here and a bit there.'⁴⁰ She pointed out that this particularly causes problems in times of budget crisis such as they were currently

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ WRC, WS Papers, p. 1: Women's Studies Committee, 'Planning Document for Women's Studies at Appalachian State University' (April 1988).

⁴⁰ Elizabeth Beaulieu, Email interview with author, 20 July 2002.

experiencing (the state of North Carolina, like many states, had a large deficit). This 'homelessness' makes it too easy to overlook women's studies. In the Spring semester 2002, the provost cut all of the programme's funding thinking that the Dean of the CAS would cover it, while the Dean assumed that the Provost would fund the programme.⁴¹ As will be discussed in the next section, this low support of women's studies is indicative of the male hegemony of the institution.

Maggie McFadden led ASU's women's studies programme from its founding in the 1970s through May of 1990. One ASU alumni who minored in women's studies in the mid to late 1980s stated that McFadden 'really carried a lot on her shoulders.'⁴² When she resigned in 1990, there was no response to a call for applicants, due to the many responsibilities and little release time of the position (which remains a problem today, see next section). The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences appointed a Task Force to examine the responsibilities of the Office of Women's Concerns (which incorporated women's studies). The Task Force determined that coordinating the Office's many functions required much more time than the quarter-release time allotted.⁴³ They made several recommendations, one of which was to establish a 'Center for Women and Gender' whose mission would be both academic and service oriented. In fact, the Women's Center was not established until the late 1990s, as discussed below. They also proposed a model for an Office of Women's Development which would have a full-time coordinator and which would house Title IX (federal legislation that prohibited sex discrimination in federally-funded programmes) services; outreach services for students; the women's studies academic programme; and special events such as a Women's Week.⁴⁴ Some of these needs were met by the formation of the Equity Office in the late 1990s, as discussed in the previous chapter.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Crystena Lynde, Email interview with author, 08 July 2000.

⁴³ WRC, WS Papers, p. 1: 'Women's Studies Annual Report' (1990-91).

⁴⁴ WRC, WS Papers: Ellen Arnold, et al, 'Task Force on Office of Women's Concerns Memo' (6 September 1990).

In 1996, ASU's Equity Office assumed responsibility for the non-academic concerns with which the women's studies programme had been involved (such as sexual harassment and sexual discrimination). The Programme had become involved in those non-academic issues because if it had not, those concerns would not have been addressed. Also, as discussed earlier, it was not unusual for women's studies programmes in the US to participate in such activities. The Programme then focused on the academic and supplementary programmes, such as films and lectures. In February and March 1998, it co-sponsored a series of films to celebrate Women's History Month, which were seen by approximately 620 people over a five-week period.⁴⁵

An ASU women's studies' brochure from 1998 explained the purposes of the programme. It offered:

a new approach to traditional academic disciplines by incorporating the study and contributions of women; an interdisciplinary model of scholarship constructed around women's issues, gender and feminist/womanist theory; a variety of opportunities...for student, faculty and staff development in the study of women and gender; and an open atmosphere for the exchange of ideas and expression of concern over a wide range of women's issues on our campus and in our society.⁴⁶

At that time, ASU students could earn a BA in Interdisciplinary Studies with a concentration in women's studies; and an undergraduate minor in the subject was also offered. There were approximately fifty students who were either majors or minors in women's studies during the 1997-98 school year. The numbers of those enrolled in the programme's classes was considerably higher; approximately 250 students in the fall and 450 in the spring were enrolled altogether in women's studies courses (US higher education students can enrol in classes outside their major or minor). At that time ASU's student population was around 12,000.⁴⁷

⁴⁵Sandra Gravett, Interview with author, 25 March 1998, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁴⁶ 'Women's Studies at Appalachian State University,' Brochure from The Office of Women's Studies, ASU, Boone, NC, USA, 1998.

⁴⁷ Sandra Gravett, Interview with author, 25 March 1998, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

As was the case nationally, some women staff and students at ASU realised the importance of founding a women's centre in improving the climate for women on campus. During the 1996-97 school year, the Women's Center Planning Committee was formed from representatives of such diverse groups as the National Organization for Women (NOW), BE-GLAAD (a gay organisation), Women's Studies, and Christian groups. The motivation of the formation of the committee was partly a response to requests from students for such a centre. The committee submitted a proposal to the administration which listed as the mission of the Center: 'to enhance awareness of the challenges facing women on this campus and in this society.' One of the goals was to 'transform discriminatory institutional structures and practices.'⁴⁸ One institutional manager objected to the latter statement because he asserted that discriminatory institutional structures did not exist at ASU. The mission statement was omitted and the proposal was submitted to the Chancellor and approved. However, the planning committee included the mission statement in brochures on the proposed Women's Center.⁴⁹

An interview with the Women's Center's staff advisor in 2002 (its fifth year) revealed that the Center had held such activities as an Abigail Adams dinner to fund a non-traditional student; a video showing which raised money for a local organisation; outreach and education activities; brownbag lunches on such topics as breast cancer, alternative healing, and relationships; and a Men Against Rape group. The Center was staffed by around forty student volunteers; and its budget of around \$6500 plus \$7000 for a graduate assistant was funded through student activity fees.⁵⁰ Lee Williams was a paid staff advisor to the Center; and it was a part of the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership, which in turn was a part of the Division of Student Development.

⁴⁸ Lee Williams, Interview by Author, 8 April 1998, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Lee Williams, Email interview by Author, 21 May 2002.

As with women's studies programmes internationally, ASU's programme is currently in a state of flux and uncertainty. On 1 July 2000, ASU's Director of women's studies stepped down and, in a repeat of what had happened when McFadden resigned ten years earlier, a campus-wide search for a replacement failed. Sandra Gravett had been appointed to this post for three years in 1997 and had chosen not to reapply, in part, because she felt that she had achieved her goals as far as she was allowed to achieve them. In Spring 1999, she had met with the Provost and presented a petition asking that the programme be placed under Academic Affairs, which she believed would facilitate it becoming more of a university-wide programme. The Provost left the decision to the incoming Independent Studies Chair and Dean of Arts and Sciences and both declined to move the programme. Many of the staff were disappointed with this decision and felt that the programme was not being given the status and support that they believed it deserved.⁵¹

The Women's Studies Search Committee appointed Elizabeth Beaulieu as interim director for the 2000/2001 academic year. Her current status is that she is a full-time lecturer appointed annually (i.e. not on tenure track). A national search has been authorised for a tenured or tenure-track Director of women's studies based in Interdisciplinary Studies, and the post is being advertised at the time of writing. Current women's studies staff are concerned that the position would only be a quarter release-time position, which might make it difficult to fill.⁵² In other words, as with many women's studies programmes internationally, the Director would not be given sufficient time (or would have to sacrifice personal time) to ensure that the programme grew into the future.

UG's women's studies programme followed similar developments, although it began almost twenty years later than ASU's programme; the joint and minor routes began in September 1990. Like ASU, UG was among the first wave of higher education institutions to offer a women's studies degree in its respective country. Staff asserted that

⁵¹ Sandra Gravett, Interview with author, 13 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁵² Elizabeth Beaulieu, Email Interview with Author, 20 July 2002.

the programme would have been much more difficult or impossible to start without the introduction of the modular degree scheme at UG. It was modularity, and the enthusiasm for it, that allowed the interdisciplinary nature and working across faculties that was necessary for the degree. Staff added that the university's commitment to the interdisciplinary nature has changed over the past few years, making the running of the field more difficult.⁵³ This was influenced, in part, by national events such as the decrease in financial support for UK higher education which has made it more difficult to support interdisciplinary modules (along with the other modules).

As at ASU, women-oriented modules were taught within discrete discipline-based courses before the formal programme began, again in line with national events. The later start of a formal programme at UG compared to ASU was also in line with the national situations. As was previously mentioned, formal women's studies programmes were started earlier in the US. The later start for the field in the UK was attributed in part to the difficulty in getting courses approved by university managers.⁵⁴

Also as at ASU, certain female staff heavily influenced the founding of women's studies at UG. One of the first Field Chairs, Penny Richards, consulted with the College Gender Committee at all stages of the drafting of the programme (see previous chapter for a discussion of the Gender Committee). According to staff, the programme was founded when staff who were interested and committed to women's issues came together to write up the programme. Some of the women who were instrumental in its founding had attended or worked at larger universities where they might have been more likely to be exposed to feminist ideas. In an interview, one staff member stated that she had been involved in the women's movement before she came to UG, 'so external to my academic life I was already involved in women's issues...and I had a longstanding interest in

⁵³ 'Pat,' Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁵⁴ Jackson, 'Networking Women,' p. 2.

women's issues as far as my academic discipline as well.'⁵⁵ It was believed at the time of founding that funding would not be a problem, and that 'give and take would basically be the motif behind the borrowing of colleagues from other departments.'⁵⁶ In fact, the programme experienced difficulty in both of these areas, as will be discussed below.

When it began, women's studies was a joint and minor route and could be combined with cultural studies, educational studies, english studies, expressive arts, history, human geography, religious studies, visual studies, or sociological studies. It was (and still is) administratively situated in the Department of Humanities, which was (is) responsible for the provision of human and physical resources. Some staff members recognised fairly early on that in order to survive, it needed to become a major subject.⁵⁷

In September 1992, women's studies was upgraded from joint and minor routes to a major route in its own right, with reviews of the programme to take place in 1997 and 2002. The 1992 Upgrade Report⁵⁸ (written by women's studies staff and Gender Committee members) raised the issues of the aims and purposes of the women's studies field. The Field Team stated that one of the aims was to provide 'an experience which provided academic rigour but also prepared students for future employment.' The Programme 'was intended to give confidence and experience for movement across numerous areas of employment.'⁵⁹ The panel considering the upgrade warned about the possible unattractiveness of the field to employers, and that consideration should be given as to how it was to be marketed. This concern relates to the issue of the 'commodification' of higher education as previously discussed, in which universities are seen as business enterprises.

⁵⁵ 'Pat,' Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁵⁶ 'Robin,' Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁵⁷ 'Pat,' Interview with Author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁵⁸ A note on the reports at UG: The Upgrade Reports are usually written by the current field chair, and approved by the Women's Studies Field Board before submission. A Major Review takes place every five years; and when that is not taking place, the annual review report is presented (again, prepared by the Field Chair and approved by the Women's Studies Field Board). All of the Undergraduate Modular Schemes fields present annual reports at UG.

⁵⁹ Papers of Melanie Ilic: '1992 Upgrade Report: Proposal for upgrading from Joint and Minor to Major' (1992).

The 1992 report also discussed the development of the programme to that point.

Some of the proposed women's studies courses for that year were: HS105 Women in English History 1500-1800; WS103 Feminist Thinkers and Theory; EN103 Autobiography: the self in text; SO206 Gender and Social Policy; and RS312 Feminist Theology.⁶⁰ Like the initial courses offered at ASU, these courses reflect the fields that women's studies first made the most inroads into, the Humanities and Social Sciences. A 1997 Major Review stated that women's studies students had input into the development of the field, especially with regard to the integration of lesbian studies and feminist theory.⁶¹

The programme recruited well in its early years. In 1992-93, the first year that women's studies was available as a major, five students enrolled as major route students, twelve as joint, and twenty as minors. Ten students graduated in 1993 with women's studies joint qualifications.⁶² The next year, the women's studies field received 553 applications, of which 128 were for the joint programme, 109 for the major programme, and 316 for the minor programme. According to a Field Report, '[t]hese statistics reflect the continued health and growing attraction of Women's Studies.'⁶³ In 1997, a Major Review stated that recruitment remained at target, 'despite the fact that the Field is now faced with the challenge of competition from newly established WS courses in neighbouring institutions and nationally.'⁶⁴

In the 1993/94 academic year, Pauline Dooley and Melanie Ilic became joint women's studies field chairs. They remained joint chairs until 1998, after which Melanie Ilic became the sole field chair (and she had remained so at the time of writing). As at ASU, UG's women's studies staff had main teaching commitments in other disciplines and taught programme courses 'on the side.' There was no full-time member of staff with only women's studies responsibility. According to the 1997 Major Review, '[t]he devolution of staffing budgets to Departments and arrangements for servicing payments between Faculties have

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Women's Studies Major Review* (May 1997).

⁶² Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Field Report Women's Studies Field* (1992-93).

⁶³ Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Field Report Women's Studies Field* (1993-94).

⁶⁴ *Women's Studies Major Review* (May 1997).

limited the range of modules which can be offered by WS staff.’⁶⁵ In interviews, staff also mentioned that the system of staffing modules discriminates against interdisciplinary fields like women’s studies (see next section).⁶⁶

The 1997/98 Annual Review discussed the effects of the organisational restructuring that had recently occurred at UG. During this process, institutional managers considered the location of women’s studies within the modular scheme. The Field Chairs had several meetings with the Dean in which they were told ‘that the restructuring exercise would serve to ease the difficulties previously experienced by the Field... and [that] the new structures were designed to facilitate cross-faculty and multi-disciplinary approaches to study.’⁶⁷ The programme was placed in the School of History and Local Studies, which is in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities. The Field Chairs requested that the School be renamed because it did not offer ‘an easily identifiable profile to the WS Field.’⁶⁸ However, for whatever reason this advice was not followed at that time.

The number of applications and admissions to the programme decreased in 1998/99, ‘reflecting both a national trend and the introduction of a number of new fields to the UMS at C&GCHE [UG, see timeline], which are seen to compete directly with WS for students.’⁶⁹ There was concern that year over the effect of the introduction of fees for undergraduates on the field’s recruitment, particularly on the recruitment of mature students. The Annual Review also noted that students working toward a minor in women’s studies made up almost half of the programme’s recruitment.⁷⁰

Unlike ASU, at the time of writing UG did not have a women’s centre. This may be due to the smaller size (and therefore resources) of UG compared to ASU. As discussed below, there had been talk of a Women’s Resource Centre and a room had been designated for

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ ‘Pat,’ Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁶⁷ Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Annual Review of Women’s Studies* (1997/98).

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Annual Review for Women’s Studies* (1998/99).

⁷⁰ Ibid.

this purpose for a period of time. The Centre was used a meeting place for societies, and as ‘a student “retreat” from the otherwise rather hostile environment.’⁷¹

The women’s studies programme at UG is also experiencing a period of uncertainty. Melanie Ilic, then Field Chair, wrote a report in May 2000 responding to a request from the Dean of Arts and Humanities, made because of declining recruitment, to analyse the future options of women’s studies. The report stated that the decline in recruitment reflected a national trend, and that UG’s programme was in a more competitive market than when it was founded. The report cited the harm caused to recruitment of mature women by the national introduction of tuition fees, which was especially harmful to women’s studies because of the aforementioned fact that mature women have been an important contingent of its students. Other harmful affects included: the decline in recruitment to Humanities and Social Science programmes, which have traditionally been the fields that women’s studies has largely recruited from; the introduction of new fields such as American studies, which competed with women’s studies for students; the loss of part-time staffing, which affected the number and variety of modules that could be offered; and the recent restructuring exercise that caused further staffing problems because of its allocation of staff and modules into discrete Schools, which again affected the number and variety of modules that could be offered.⁷² All of these things detracted from the attractiveness of the women’s studies field to students.

On the positive side, the report pointed to the high enrolments on individual women’s studies modules. It also pointed to the good standing that the field had in the Undergraduate Modular Scheme; it was often cited as having good practice in teaching and learning. The report gave the results of a women’s studies survey that analysed the following options:

“Continue to offer modules under the heading of the WS Field, but make some changes to staffing.” Strong overall support.

“Continue to offer the modules, but devolve their ownership to base fields.” Also strong support - would result in more “patchwork” field map - have advantage of addressing “servicing” concerns of HoSs

⁷¹ Elizabeth Johnson, Email interview by author, 12 April 2002.

⁷² Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Women’s Studies: Looking Forward* (May 2000).

elsewhere. Have disadvantage of putting pressure on base field maps, also could make WS modules more vulnerable to deletion.

“Cease recruitment to WS major, but continue joint and minor routes.”

Little support. “could be seen...as the final ‘kiss of death’ for WS.”

“Recruit to WS type modules, but mainly under the umbrella of CA.”

Not highly ranked. “The profile of WS would be severely diminished.”

“Cease to recruit to WS altogether.” No support.⁷³

The survey results pointed to changes that could be made to improve the field, such as the inclusion of new modules and the possibility of a new title for the field. The report also stated that the UK Women’s Studies Network ‘may make recommendations for the selective closure of WS programmes on a regional basis in order to secure the survival of at least some courses in each area.’⁷⁴ A staff member questioned the possible affect of this on UG’s programme, whether it meant that staff should ‘sit tight’ or that they had ‘better change.’⁷⁵

UG staff interviewees identified several national trends that are influencing the place of Women’s Studies in higher education. Women’s studies programmes in the UK are negatively affected by the fact that the field is not (and has not) figured in the National Curriculum (national standards for curricula for schools). This means that their staff do not have access to the ‘fierce funding linked around the National Curriculum and curriculum benchmarking and so on.’⁷⁶ Also, because women’s studies is not separately represented in the periodic national Research Assessment Exercise (RAE)⁷⁷ and the Quality Assurance Guide, it is easier for institutions to drop ‘because it doesn’t fit into any convenient box that we can label...[and can not say] that it is going to be a money earner because the institute is going to apply for this body or that body for funding.’⁷⁸ Another staff member pointed out that because women’s studies is not included in these official indicators, staff achievements in research are not always credited to the field. She also mentioned other ways that it is made invisible to the institution: postgraduate students at UG who have women-related topics are

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ ‘Eliza,’ Interview with Author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁷⁶ ‘Robin,’ Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁷⁷ The RAE is a tool used to evaluate academic staff by assessing their research output.

⁷⁸ ‘Pat,’ Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

not registered with women's studies; and its graduates 'graduate at the end of the line and don't get acknowledgement in many ways at the graduation ceremony.'⁷⁹ Women's studies students are at the end of the line in the graduation ceremony because it is done by alphabetical listing by subject.

Programme Needs

As discussed earlier, the increase in student numbers has not necessarily translated into a concurrent increase in funding for higher education institutions. This has meant that all disciplines have experienced funding difficulties. However, the male hegemony of higher education has meant particular difficulties for women's studies because it has been especially vulnerable to managerial apathy. This can be seen in an analysis of ASU's and UG's programmes. An analysis of the archival material and interviews with staff revealed two main areas of women's studies programme needs at ASU and UG: better funding and staffing support.

As previously discussed, staffing issues for women's studies has been affected by the interdisciplinary nature of the field. According to Boxer, in the US: 'Joint appointments and/or split assignments appear to be the most common way of staffing women's studies programs; the average program has eighteen affiliated faculty [academic staff] who teach cross-listed courses.'⁸⁰ This has meant programmes rely on 'home departments' for staffing needs. In times of staffing 'crunch', this means that women's studies will be disproportionately affected. For example, a history instructor who is interested in teaching a related course might not be able to because of time constraints as their 'first loyalty' is to the history department.

⁷⁹ 'Eliza,' Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁸⁰ Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, p. 40.

In interviews in 1998, ASU female staff expressed a desire for better financial support, including both internal and external funding sources.⁸¹ The director of the women's studies programme only received a quarter release time, and there was only one graduate assistant and a work-study student to help the director. The position came with a high level of responsibility; the director had to coordinate with many different departments. In comparison, the director of a smaller North Carolina university's programme received more release time. Interviewees expressed a desire for funding and support for visiting professors on gender-related issues.⁸²

Follow-up interviews with the same staff in the summer of 2000 discovered that the need for better funding still existed. The fact that the director only received a quarter release time meant that it was difficult to recruit for the position, as previously discussed. There were, however, two recent outside events that helped with the funding of the programme. The first was that the *National Women's Studies Association Journal* was brought to ASU from 1997 to 2003. This brought money from the press to hire a managing editor, and the university released Maggie McFadden half time to work on the Journal. According to McFadden, the Journal brought energy and interest about women's studies to ASU; there were two graduate assistantships, and also a Staff Advisory Board who read prospective manuscripts and kept abreast of national developments.⁸³

The other positive development regarding funding was ASU's hosting of the Southeastern Women's Studies Association Conference in April 2000. There were generous contributions to the conference from the departments of Cultural Affairs and Interdisciplinary Studies among others, which contributed to the success of the conference ('profits' made from the event went into the Women's Studies Development Fund). According to the then women's studies Director, the university put up a lot of money for the conference and

⁸¹ Sandra Gravett, Interview with author, 25 March 1998, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC, USA.

⁸² Maggie McFadden, Interview with author, 25 March 1998, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁸³ Maggie McFadden, Interview with author, 11 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

supported it well.⁸⁴ Similarly, UG hosted the Women's Studies Network (UK) Conference in July 2001.

At UG, women's studies funding needs were affected by the cuts in higher education funding from the national government. A Field Report from 1992-93 stated that the decreased funding meant that an audit should be conducted to assess fields' investment in financial and academic areas. The report added: 'Large curriculum developments in terms of new modules were now unlikely.'⁸⁵ The report also expressed concern that the decreased state funding would affect the number of modules and part-time staffing levels. As previously discussed, the interdisciplinary nature of women's studies meant that part-time staff were especially important for the field to be able to offer a wide range of classes.

The 1997 Women's Studies Major Review discussed the financial needs of the programme. It pointed out that the allocation of teaching and learning resource funding depended on a formula that favoured larger fields over smaller fields such as women's studies (at the time of writing, the formula was still in use but under review). The lower amount of funding meant that the learning centre was missing some new and important journals. In response, women's studies tutors 'regularly [made] their own resources available to students.'⁸⁶ Further difficulty for tutors was caused by copyright restrictions, which inhibited the development of readers for classes. In addition, the field was unable to bid for additional 'investment funds' because it was not an identified area of strategic development. The 1997 report also commented that the External Examiner for women's studies noted that the field was under-resourced, for example there was no funding to support external speakers (mirroring a concern of ASU staff, see above).

Another funding and support need was in the area of a Women's Resource Centre. The 1992 *Proposal to Upgrade Women's Studies to a Major Field* called for a Women's

⁸⁴ Sandra Gravett, Interview with author, 13 July 2000, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

⁸⁵ Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Field Report Women's Studies Field* (1992-93).

⁸⁶ Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Women's Studies Major Review* (May 1997).

Resource Centre stocked with video and other electronic equipment, periodicals, cassettes, and files. The Proposal stated: 'Negotiations on this have been initiated and whether such a space was, in the first instance, permanent or borrowed, the women's studies team consider this an important physical provision which would achieve social and psychic space for women.'⁸⁷ This is especially important for women's studies students because of the hostility they often encounter regarding their choice of subject (see Chapter Three).

In 1997, the poor support for the Women's Resource Centre was still being mentioned. The Field Practitioner noted that there was poor accommodation for the teaching of some modules and also for the Women's Resource Centre, 'which has become less accessible every year' and that 'there is currently no identified space for the resource room.'⁸⁸ In an interview in 2002, the former Field Practitioner mentioned that one room was 'barely' designated for this purpose, and 'even in its bare state, was useful, as a student "retreat" from the otherwise hostile environment, and as a meetingplace [sic] for one or two societies.'⁸⁹ There was increasing competition for the room, and it 'drifted away' from women's studies' control and exclusive access.

Another area of programme needs is staffing. As mentioned earlier, neither ASU nor UG had full-time women's studies staff members. At ASU, a staff interviewee pointed out that more recently established programmes in North Carolina had faculty positions in women's studies, whereas ASU had faculty that were hired to teach their primary subjects and then teach the programme's courses on the side.⁹⁰ As mentioned previously, this method of staffing for the field was common throughout the US.

UG Reports in both 1991 and 1997 called for the hiring of a full-time staff member in women's studies. The 1991 Field Practitioner report stated: 'The upgrading to major route

⁸⁷ Papers of Melanie Ilic: 'Proposal for Upgrading Women's Studies Minor and Joint Field to a Major Field in Women's Studies' (January 1992).

⁸⁸ *Women's Studies Major Review* (May 1997).

⁸⁹ Elizabeth Johnson, Email interview with author, 12 April 2002.

⁹⁰ Maggie McFadden, Interview with author, 25 March 1998, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC, USA.

and to the M.A. will surely require the appointment of a full-time member of staff, trained and qualified and with research experience specifically in this field.’⁹¹ The 1997 Major Review also commented on the need for a full-time women’s studies’ staff position. It asserted that the ‘future development and profile of the WS Field would be enhanced by the appointment of an active senior researcher/reader’ and that the ‘appointee could be responsible for co-ordinating and encouraging further publications by the existing staff team.’⁹²

A manager responded to this perceived need by saying that the field was unlikely to have a senior level reader appointed to the staff team because there was not a Research Assessment Exercise Unit of Assessment in women’s studies. Some would argue to counter this that women’s studies has been an identified sub-panel area; and multidisciplinary teams often collaborate on certain research themes. The manager went on to suggest that the Field Chairs establish ‘a network by which research work and postgraduate work in Women’s Studies could be better co-ordinated, and in such a way that would benefit the undergraduate field.’⁹³

Women’s studies staffing problems continued at UG. The 1998/99 Annual Review stated: ‘The most problematic area for the WS Field remains the procedure for staffing WS modules, and this is felt to have been exacerbated rather than eased by the restructuring process.’⁹⁴ In the 1998/99 academic year, the administration decided that individual Heads of School would fund replacements for women’s studies instructors in their school who were on research leave. This meant that the School of History and Local Studies (where the field was located) was not the only faculty responsible for staffing women’s studies modules. According to current staff, this proved problematic in some areas. Also in the 1998/99 academic year, managers at Faculty level decided that money was not available for part-time

⁹¹ Papers of Melanie Ilic: Elizabeth Johnson, ‘Women’s Studies Field Board: Practitioner’s Report’ (10 December 1991).

⁹² *Women’s Studies Major Review* (May 1997).

⁹³ Papers of Melanie Ilic: Philip Martin, ‘Statement on staffing and resource issues’ in *Women’s Studies Major Review* (May 1997).

⁹⁴ Papers of Melanie Ilic: *Annual Review for Women’s Studies* (1998/99).

women's studies teaching in the next academic year, which resulted in the cancellation of modules and an increased workload for the field's tutors. The annual review stated that: 'The future staffing of WS modules remains an unresolved problem for the Field.'⁹⁵

The low levels of funding and staffing support reflect the attitudes of institutional managers to women's studies. It has been questioned as a 'valid' academic subject from both within and without academia from its beginning.⁹⁶ This has translated into little support for women's studies programmes from their academic institutions. Women's studies reports from both ASU and UG discussed the lack of institutional support that the programmes received. ASU reports from 1986, 1988, 1989, and 1990 specifically mention the lack of managerial support. The 1989-90 Annual Report from women's studies stated: 'There continues to be lack of faculty [staff] and administrative [managerial] support for Women's Studies at Appalachian State University.'⁹⁷

UG female staff in interviews also mentioned lack of institutional support. One staff member noted that the programme became 'a good programme despite somewhat surprising institutional infighting, disheartening infighting.'⁹⁸ Another staff member mentioned that she encountered jokes and negative comments about women's studies in committees that she served on; and that the field used to get those types of jokes and comments from very senior managers from both within and outside the institution. She also mentioned that they were encouraged at the founding of the programme, 'but since then it has been found rather inconvenient to the institution; partly because it is not a large field and we want to think big so just nipped a number of small fields, no matter how successful they were and inexpensive.'⁹⁹ The staff mentioned being disillusioned and exhausted from fighting the institution over the programme. They used the analogy of putting a lot of energy into banging their head into a

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ For a detailed analysis of this criticism see Marilyn Jacoby Boxer's 'Critics Inside and Outside the Academy' Chapter in her book *When Women Ask the Questions*, pp. 191-224.

⁹⁷ WRC, WS Papers, p. 4: *Office of Women's Studies Annual Report (1989-90)*.

⁹⁸ 'Robin,' Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

⁹⁹ 'Eliza,' Interview with author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

brick wall; that they were just moving from crisis situation to crisis situation. They made the point that there are strong differences between women's studies and other disciplines in such areas as facilities, administrative support, research funding, and time allocation. Like ASU staff, UG staff also mentioned that they have ideas for projects but do not have a chance to implement them, partly because so much energy has to be put into just keeping things going.¹⁰⁰

In contrast, the women's studies reports at UG did not explicitly mention the lack of managerial support. In fact, a 1992 report stated that the panel for the upgrade of women's studies to a major believed that 'the institution was being very supportive and there was a Gender Group which had kept in touch with the development, discussing the nature and content of all Modules.'¹⁰¹ The report went on to state that the early hostility to the field had diminished due to the Team's positive approach. It did not give details on the form that this hostility took.

However, the lack of formal institutional support at UG was illustrated by the lack of financial and staffing support. Also, the UG women's studies programme was asked to justify its existence several times (even beyond normal review procedures). In 1990, Melanie Ilic, then Chair of Gender Committee, wrote a memo requesting a contribution of 100 pounds from each Faculty's funds to finance the Gender Committee's activities. The Assistant Director and the Dean of the Faculty of Art's responses were positive. However, the responses from the Deans of the Faculty of Business, Finance and Management and the Faculty of Computing and Technology were not as positive. The Deans asked for more information on the work of the Gender Committee. In response, Ilic wrote a memo providing more information on the Gender Committee's activities. As discussed previously, the Gender Committee was instrumental in the founding of the women's studies programme.

¹⁰⁰ 'Pat,' 'Robin,' and 'Eliza,' Interview with Author, 18 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

¹⁰¹ Papers of Melanie Ilic: 'Minutes of Meeting Concerning Upgrade from Joint to Major Status' (24 March 1992).

As mentioned in the History of the Programme section, in May 2000, Melanie Ilic wrote a report on the future of the women's studies programme at UG. This report had been written in response to a request from the Dean of Arts and Humanities. At the end of the report, Melanie Ilic stated: 'To my knowledge, no other field in the UMS [Undergraduate Modular Scheme] is asked on such a regular basis to justify its own existence.'¹⁰² This raises the question of how much support the field really receives from institutional managers, and the nature of any support that it might receive. If women's studies was strongly supported by the institution, there would not be a 'perceived need' to explain and justify its continuing existence.

Separation versus Integration

The issue of separation versus integration (or mainstreaming as it is also known) is an important issue for women's studies programmes internationally, and it affected staff and students at both ASU and UG. It has been an issue that has been debated since the early years of the field. Linda Gordon, in an article from 1975, discussed the 'integrationist versus separatist debate' in Black studies and how this related to the debate in women's studies.¹⁰³ There are two main questions around this issue: should women's studies be integrated with the other disciplines, and should men be fully integrated into its programmes and courses?

As discussed in Chapter Two, there has been debate since the beginning of higher education for women in the nineteenth century in the US and the UK over the relative merits of separation of the sexes in education. This issue has also been debated in regard to whether (or how) men should be integrated into women's studies. Some feminists believe that there are many feminist 'paths', therefore feminism is flexible enough to meet the needs of diverse people, including men. Doris Ewing stated that: 'significant change will occur only by

¹⁰² Ilic, *Women's Studies*.

¹⁰³ Linda Gordon, 'A Socialist View of Women's Studies: A Reply to the Editorial, Volume 1, Number 1,' *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 2 (Winter 1975), pp. 559-566.

women and men working together toward a shared vision. Feminist “fundamentalism” and exclusivity prevents the formation of a critical mass that is necessary for wide-scale social change.’¹⁰⁴ Also, there is a practical element to this. With the increasing importance of recruiting students to programmes in the light of threat of closure, women’s studies needs to attract all of the students that it can (whether male or female). Also, it would violate equal opportunity policies (and law in the US) to exclude men from publicly-funded programmes.

Other feminists believe that the benefits of women-only courses outweigh any argument for male inclusion. The benefit of separation of the sexes in the classroom is that it is seen to produce a more conducive environment for female students’ learning. Renate D. Klein believes that ‘*there is no room for men in WS, none whatsoever* [her emphasis].’¹⁰⁵ She also points to the tendency of men to dominate in mixed-sex environments, thereby inhibiting the ability of women to express their views and feelings in an open manner. Some women’s studies staff and students see women-only courses as the only way to ensure that women have an opportunity to learn and explore in a free environment.

There are pressures from some women’s studies students to more fully integrate males into women’s studies classrooms. Phillips and Westland in a 1992 essay point to the tendency of young women to be more conservative, in part because they have not yet been ‘radicalised’ by life experiences. Their research found that a majority of undergraduate female students that they interviewed believed that male staff and students *did* have a useful place in women’s studies classrooms.¹⁰⁶ The field expanded in the 1990s and in the process admitted more men into the classroom, which some feminist scholars objected to. According to Phillips and Westland: ‘These new pressures mean that there is an urgent need for feminists responsible for developing and teaching Women’s Studies in all its varied forms to face the fact that men

¹⁰⁴ Steven P. Schacht and Doris Ewing, ‘The Many Paths of Feminism: Can Men Travel Any of Them?’ *Journal of Gender Studies* 6 (1997), p. 163.

¹⁰⁵ Renate D. Klein, ‘The “Men-Problem” in Women’s Studies: The Expert, the Ignoramus, and the Poor Dear,’ in Renate D. Klein and Deborah Lynn Steinberg, eds., *Radical Voices: A Decade of Feminist Resistance from Women’s Studies International Forum* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989), p. 106.

¹⁰⁶ Deborah Phillips and Ella Westland, ‘Men in Women’s Studies Classrooms,’ in Hinds, et al, eds. *Working Out*, London: Falmer Press, 1992.

are a fixture on many programmes, and to adopt some appropriate new strategies for dealing with them.’¹⁰⁷

The question of whether women’s studies should be a distinct field or integrated into the mainstream is also an important on-going debate. Some feminists question the necessity of separate women’s studies departments; there is a fear that separation could lead to trivialization. The departments would be vulnerable to attack from the ‘traditional’ disciplines, for example undermining the department by withholding resources. On the other hand, integration has the possibility of blunting the power of feminist analysis. In becoming part of the mainstream, feminist scholars might have to ‘de-radicalise’ some of their arguments.¹⁰⁸ They might have to make their arguments less ‘radical’ to ensure acceptance by peers in academic research, which is often necessary in the struggle for university resources. Perhaps more importantly, separate women’s studies gives staff and students a safer physical and intellectual environment in which to explore and apply feminist ideas. This safe environment has been especially important for previously excluded women who needed support to develop academic confidence and capabilities.

There was an effort to ‘gender-balance’ or mainstream gender issues into the US curriculum that began in the early 1980s and that was underwritten by government agencies, universities, and private foundations. Almost two hundred ‘curriculum transformation projects’ (efforts to integrate women into universities’ curricula) were reported by 1992. There is evidence that these projects do make a difference in changing previously male-centred courses. According to Boxer, ‘several “before and after” studies of course syllabi suggest that faculty participation in transformation does make a difference.’¹⁰⁹

There is evidence at ASU and UG of debate over these issues. In 1974 an ASU female History Professor proposed a ‘women’s only’ course. The course would have had the same

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, p. 36.

¹⁰⁸ Domna C. Stanton and Abigail J. Stewart, eds. *Feminisms in the Academy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995), pp. 1-6.

¹⁰⁹ Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, pp. 60-61.

material as other courses; the only difference would have been that the instructor and all of the students would have been female. The professor made the point that this course would 'eliminate the operation of sex-role stereotypes which are usually positive for men (brave, strong, aggressive, and worldly) and negative for women (weak, passive, and not too bright).'¹¹⁰ She also proposed a residential college (halls of residence where students also take classes) for first year women, which was not implemented. One may question the basis for the opposition to these plans. There are two areas from which opposition could have come. The male-biased hierarchy might have thought that these plans were too radical. Opposition could also have come from both men and women who disagreed with the segregation of the sexes.

There is no evidence of UG feminist instructors trying to introduce all-female women's studies classes, although a current staff member stated that this was discussed at one of the initial meetings. It was recognised that this would violate university policy and rules, and was never seriously considered. However, most of the students in women's studies classes were (and continue to be) female anyway. The 1997 Major Review stated that '[t]he WS Field recruits from a diverse range of almost exclusively female students.'¹¹¹

The question of separation versus integration also arises regarding discipline-based issues. A number of the ASU staff interviewed for this study expressed a belief that the women's studies programme should be available to more students. It should be more of a university-wide program; it was part of the College of Arts and Sciences and staff wanted to make inroads into other departments. There was a wish for better coordination of all services for women; some offices were working at cross-purposes and were not effectively pooling their resources. Staff wanted more women's studies courses and more workshops that taught instructors how to incorporate the subject into their own disciplines. Like other interdisciplinary studies programmes, there needed to be more comprehensiveness and

¹¹⁰ Sandra Horvath quoted in Paula Stanley, "'Women Only" Course Planned,' *The Appalachian*, 31 January 1974, p. 1.

¹¹¹ *Women's Studies Major Review*, May 1997.

integration between departments.¹¹² One of the interviewees stated that ASU should reach the position where a separate women's studies department would not be needed because it would already be fully incorporated into the rest of the curriculum. Many feminists do not foresee the incorporation of women's studies into the curriculum happening any time in the near future, and some do not see it as desirable. Those who would like to see the integration of the field acknowledge that there would need to be general understanding of the importance of the study of women before this could happen.¹¹³

The male hegemony of higher education, as previously discussed, has also influenced the separation versus integration debate. Some feminists have seen the separation of women's studies from 'traditional' disciplines as the way to make inroads against this hegemony. Other feminists believe that the integration of women's studies into the other disciplines is the goal to be worked toward, that this will bring about a total transformation of the curriculum without the perceived dangers of separation such as isolation and trivialisation. 'Separatists' counter that integration would mean that women's studies would lose some of its bluntness and power in the process, making it less able to make radical transformation on higher education institutions.

Conclusion

The ASU and UG women's studies programmes have striking similarities reflecting international trends in the study of women. Both programmes were begun in conservative institutions (see Chapter Three) through the determined efforts of female staff (and with little institutional support). It has also taken the determined efforts of female staff to keep the programmes going. Female staff's commitment to the programmes was illustrated by their willingness to spend extra (often uncompensated) time on the programme, their willingness to

¹¹² Sandra, Gravett, Interview with author, 25 March 1998, ASU, Boone, NC, USA.

¹¹³ Maggie McFadden, Interview with author, 25 March 1998, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC, USA.

share resources such as books with students, and the counselling and other services they have provided students.

Both have also experienced similar hurdles to their development. Women's studies staff consistently pointed to the need for more financial support. They also needed a full-time women's studies staff member; current staff were based in other disciplines and did field courses 'on the side.' As mentioned earlier, both received lacklustre institutional support, making it seem like the staff were fighting an uphill battle. Both also had to fight against perceptions of women's studies staff and students as 'man-haters,' and that women's studies is not a 'real academic subject'.

Many of these hurdles parallel the earlier struggle of women to gain entrance to higher education, and reflect the continuing male hegemony of higher education. While it is true that higher education is experiencing financial difficulties, which means less resources for all disciplines, women's studies experiences especial difficulties. As Virginia Woolf asserted in 1929, men's control over financial resources affects how higher education is funded. If women's studies is denigrated as 'not a real subject' (an attitude still evident today), then it will be less likely to receive strong institutional support. For women's studies staff, this means added struggle and sacrifice to ensure the programmes' continuing existence.

The male hegemony of higher education is also evident in the separation versus integration debate in women's studies. If women had sufficient autonomy in higher education, many of these debates would be superfluous. It would not be necessary to discuss the exclusion of men from women's studies classrooms if there was not evidence that men dominate discussion and attention in mixed settings. Also, the past exclusion of women from academia has made women's studies as a separate discipline necessary.

Despite the problems and concerns mentioned above, many feminists are optimistic about the future of women's studies. It has given voice to women in academia, and has influenced countless numbers of staff and students' lives. An UG staff member stated that women's studies is an essential part of students' lives, and that she 'wouldn't want to see that

disappear or go away, or even be diluted.’¹¹⁴ Boxer also mentions the great need for women’s studies to continue, and is optimistic about the future: ‘if we think back almost thirty years, survey the length of the roads traveled, and eschew the totalizing goals and millenarian attitudes that sometimes beset women’s studies, then I think that we can gain inspiration from its successes and anticipate a future in which women’s studies continues to flourish both in the United States and around the world.’¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ ‘Pat,’ Interview with author, 19 March 2002, UG, Cheltenham, UK.

¹¹⁵ Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, p. 248.

CONCLUSION

Men began universities in Europe in the twelfth century, and over 800 years later they still show evidence of male hegemony. This thesis has explored the extent of male hegemony in higher education and how it operates, taking two case histories of women's experiences, at Appalachian State University (ASU) and the University of Gloucestershire (UG) from 1970 to 2000. As discussed in the Introduction, I have structured this research around three research questions. First, what were the experiences of women students at ASU and UG since 1970? Second, what were the similarities and differences of women's experiences at these two institutions? And third, how did the late twentieth century women's movement affect the students at these institutions? The first part of this Conclusion will consider how these questions were answered by my research. I will then move on to the wider implications of this research, and will end by commenting on the overall boundaries and limits of my research, indicating future research directions in this area.

Before looking at the research questions, I will reflect on the research process itself. Feminist theory has influenced both the collection and interpretation of the data for this research. I used both the analysis of archival material and interviews in my attempt to answer my research questions. The selection of these methods was fortuitous, as they yielded rich material for my analysis. Especially interesting for me in the ASU archives were the collections of student newspapers and President's/Chancellor's Papers. The editorials in the student newspapers allowed me to gauge student opinion and the issues that they felt were important. The President's/Chancellor's Papers did the same, but for the managerial attitudes and issues. I found the St. Mary's Staff/Student Committee Minutes in the UG archives to be very helpful. They allowed me to gauge what changes in residence hall rules the students wanted during the 1970s, and the managers' reactions to

the requests for change (reflecting their attitudes toward the students). Like many other feminist researchers, I also realise the limitations to archival research. The documents in the archives were 'official', which meant that the nature of what they disclosed was limited. Feelings, emotions, and radical issues were often left out of these documents, although they were hinted at (for example, the feelings of the St. Mary's managers regarding changes).

The interviews allowed me to compensate for some of the deficiencies in the archival material. As mentioned in the Introduction, I interviewed both staff and former students, using both email and face-to-face interviews. The interviews with both staff and students allowed me to gauge both their feelings about their experiences at the institutions, and also incidents that were not mentioned in the official accounts. The interviews with women's studies staff especially helped me to understand the situation of the programmes at the institutions. Feminist theory influenced how I conducted the interviews. I empowered the interviewees by asking open-ended questions, treating the interviews as conversations, and sharing the results with the interviewees. Although the interviews allowed me to get a different perspective, this method of research carries its own limitations. One of these is the 'selective memory' of interviewees and the difficulty in remembering events from twenty years ago. However, interviews elicit rich material for analysis if these limitations are 'kept in mind', and if they are used in conjunction with other research methods, such as archival research.

Feminist theory also influenced my interpretation of the data collected. Like many feminists, I question whether a researcher can be 'objective' in their analysis of data. Hence my explanation in the Introduction of feminism's influence on me, which I believe is important in understanding my interpretations. Feminist theory helped me to better understand the events and trends that the data revealed. A 'non-feminist' looking at the same data would most probably have come to different conclusions. For example, I saw the difficulties that the women's studies programmes have encountered as reflecting the

male hegemony of the institutions. Others might interpret this as a reflection of national funding problems in higher education. However, within the individual institutions male hegemonic structures determine how the limited funds are distributed.

As with many things previously mentioned what happens within these institutions are often a direct reflection of wider societal forces. In this context, as discussed in Chapter Six, women's studies programmes are still seen as lacking in practical benefits regarding employment for its students. This might function as a deterrent for students who increasingly, for economic reasons, are forced to think about education in practical economic terms. This relates directly to Woolf's discussion (see below) of the purposes of education where she sets up a contrast between the ideal purpose of 'learning for itself' and the more 'mercenary' approach of education as training. Women's studies and feminist pedagogy emphasise the learning and growth aspect of education in an attempt to ensure greater awareness and understanding of otherwise neglected or sidelined issues in society. In this thesis this is reflected in the many different 'feminisms' that, as outlined and explained in the Introduction, have affected my analysis of the data. The different feminist theories I studied helped me to realise the importance of questioning issues and events which may otherwise be seen as 'normal'.

While the first research question centred on the institutions under study, I discovered during my research that women's experiences at these institutions reflected national and international events. It is important to understand the history of women in US and UK higher education in order to better understand the struggles of women at ASU and UG. The story of women's struggle to gain access to higher education illustrated first the importance of education for marginalized groups, and second the lengths to which those in control will go in excluding marginalized groups from access to education.

An important debate that has run throughout the history of women in higher education has been that of 'equality versus difference'. While some nineteenth-century reformers asserted that women would only achieve full equality with men if they were

given the same education, others believed that the differing roles and qualities of women meant that they should receive a different education. In the twentieth century, the 'equality versus difference' debate expanded to include that of differences *between* feminists.

The experiences of women at ASU and UG reflected the persisting male hegemony of higher education, and women's challenges to it. Women students in residence halls in the 1960s and 1970s challenged the strict rules which governed their campus lives. ASU and UG students resisted the rules both by not obeying them, and through the formal committee structure. They were influenced in their resistance to the rules by external events in both countries such as the change in the age of majority. The rules had a gender dimension to them, as women students had long been subjected to stricter rules than male students, exemplifying the sexual double standard which, by the end of the decade, students were no longer prepared to tolerate.

The experiences of women staff at both ASU and UG manifestly reflected the male hegemony of these institutions. There were important legislative gains for women workers in the 1960s and 1970s. However, institutional managers at both institutions demonstrated their reactive (rather than proactive) attitudes toward women's rights in this area. The persisting inequality of women staff at the institutions is reflected by the existence of a 'glass ceiling' for women: there is (and historically has been) a low proportion of women in the upper echelons of academic and managerial posts. In addition to the detrimental effect that this has on women staff, women students are also affected because they have fewer academic role models than if there were more women in positions of power. Female staff at ASU and UG, as with the female students, challenged the male hegemony of the institutions. They organised in the 1970s and 1980s (and at UG into the 1990s) to improve women's status in these institutions. Interestingly, these organisations are no longer active at either institution, although there appears to be an on-going need for such organisations

to continue pressure for positive changes for women into the future (in the absence of institutional managers that are proactive on women's issues).

One of the more successful challenges to the male hegemony of higher education has been the challenge to the curriculum in the form of women's studies. Women's studies have redressed the earlier absence of scholarship by, about, and for women that Virginia Woolf discussed (see below). Perhaps surprisingly, given their conservative ethos, ASU and UG were among the first wave of institutions in their respective countries to start Women's studies programmes (late 1970s for ASU, early 1990s for UG). Women staff at both institutions were instrumental in the founding and maintenance of the programmes, often spending extra time and offering their own resources to the programmes because of the shortage of formal resources allocated to them. Regrettably, this situation persists even today, despite the manifest success of these programmes.

The second question centred on the similarities and differences between the experiences of women at ASU and UG. As mentioned earlier, the selection of these two institutions proved fortuitous as there were strong similarities in their histories. Both institutions were founded in the nineteenth century as teacher-training institutions in conservative areas of their respective countries. Strict rules and moral expectations were evident from the institutions' beginnings. One main difference between the two institutions was that ASU was co-educational from its beginning, while UG had separate facilities for men and women for most of its history.

The conservative ethos of both institutions meant that there are striking similarities in the experiences of women within them. As previously discussed, women students at both institutions challenged the strict residence hall rules in similar ways, both formally through committees and informally by not obeying rules that they disagreed with. The coeducational nature of ASU meant that women students there worked more closely with men than their St. Mary's counterparts in these struggles. Similarly, the conservative ethos of management at both institutions meant that women staff experienced similar barriers to

their advancement. Management at both institutions was not proactive regarding women's issues, which meant that women staff had to organise to improve their situation. This was also the case regarding women's studies. Staff from both programmes listed funding for outside speakers as a major requirement. Also, neither programme has had a full-time staff member devoted solely to women's studies. Instead, staff are based in 'home disciplines' and teach women's studies 'on the side'. This has meant that women's studies staff have been integral to the continuing success of the programmes.

The third research question asked how the women's movement and feminism affected the institutions. Despite the conservative ethos of both institutions, women staff were able to successfully implement such changes as the founding of a women's studies programme. This provides some evidence of the impact of feminism on women at ASU and UG. Other examples include the visit of the influential feminist Betty Friedan who spoke at ASU in 1970, which influenced at least one male student to consider the role that men should have in the women's movement. There were also organisations at both institutions that were instrumental in working for improvements in women's status, for example the Gender Committee at UG.

In addition, there is also the question over the nature of the feminism which affected the institutions. While many of the feminist staff interviewed were influenced by 'radical feminism', the conservative ethos of the institutions meant that it was difficult, if not impossible, to make radical changes to the systems. Incremental changes were easier to achieve, for example in the residence hall rules. The conservative ethos of institutional managers increased the importance of outside pressures on improving the position of women within the institutions. Outside legislation was instrumental in the founding of equal opportunity policies and offices at ASU. This points to the continuing need of women at both institutions to organise and exert pressure on institutional management to improve the position of women.

Reflection on Research Process and Outcomes

The research process and outcomes reiterated for me the realisation that while women have ‘come a long way’, inequality still exists and women need to ‘continue the fight’. I knew from my master’s research that women at ASU had experienced, and continued to experience, inequality based on their sex. My PhD research helped me to realise how extensive and pervasive gender inequality still is in US and British higher education and how many of Woolf’s observations from the early twentieth century continue to be relevant today. I found the research process very rewarding since, as previously mentioned, both the archival research and interviews have elicited rich material for analysis that has brought me to this realisation and subsequent conclusion. Looking back now, one of the things that I might have done differently would have been to include contextual reading earlier in the research process. This would have ensured a firmer context not just for the events that occurred in the institutions but also for my own data collection and analysis. Also, if I had more time, money, and word space, I would have liked to conduct more interviews.

The research outcomes contribute to the history of higher education and women in higher education field by demonstrating the persistence of male hegemony in US and British higher education which calls for continuing efforts to tip the gender balance to an equitable position. In order to destroy the ‘glass ceiling’ evident in higher education, wider societal changes are still needed so that women may accomplish the goal of gender balance. At a local level, the research also has shown that there is potentially very rich material waiting for analysis in university archives in general pertaining to the issue of women in higher education. While there has been a significant amount of research into women in higher education, my thesis uniquely looks at two specific institutions, and cross-culturally analyses how they reflect national and international trends. As previously mentioned, the research outcomes show how women need to continue to organise and

‘fight’ for improved conditions, especially in conservative atmospheres such as the ones under study.

The Wider Implications of the Research

A central theme of this research has been how much (if any) the male hegemony of higher education has changed since Woolf described it in *A Room of One's Own* in 1929. Despite the improvements in women's positions that have occurred, there is still strong evidence of male hegemony in higher education. Woolf described the deficiencies of female education, and explored the reasons behind this deficiency. Contrasting the amount of wealth that went into the Oxbridge colleges with the relative pittance that went into women's colleges, she attributes this to the historic male control over financial resources both domestically and nationally. Woolf states:

Briefly, then, I told Miss Seton about the masons who had been all those years on the roof of the chapel, and about the kings and queens and nobles bearing sacks of gold and silver on their shoulders, which they shovelled into the earth; and then how the great financial magnates of our own time came and laid cheques and bonds, I suppose, where the others had laid ingots and rough lumps of gold. All that lies beneath the [Oxbridge] colleges down there, I said; but this college [fictional women's college], where we are now sitting, what lies beneath its gallant red brick and the wild unkempt grasses of the garden?¹

After conducting my research into the position of women in higher education both in the past and the present, I would answer that women's hard work and sacrifices lies beneath that college and beneath the improvements that have occurred in women's educational position. This continues into the present, women's studies staff continue to make sacrifices to ensure survival of the programmes (see below). The comparison of the women's colleges and Oxbridge colleges illustrates how much harder women have had to work to gain the right of having the ability to expand their minds.

¹ Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own/Three Guineas* (London: Penguin, 1993, originally published 1929), pp. 17-18.

Woolf also describes the attitude of male scholars toward women up to the early twentieth century. Describing a trip to the British Museum to research the question of women, she states in relation to what men had written about women:

Are they capable of education or incapable? Napoleon thought them incapable. Dr. Johnson thought the opposite. Have they souls or have they not souls? Some savages say they have none. Others, on the contrary, maintain that women are half divine and worship them on that account. Some sages hold that they are shallower in the brain; others that they are deeper in the consciousness. Goethe honoured them; Mussolini despises them. Wherever one looked men thought about women and thought differently.²

As mentioned in the Introduction, Woolf explores the possible reason behind the anger that was evident in men's writings on women. She points to the rule of patriarchy over society, which leads her to question whether anger and power are intimately connected. The misogynist undercurrents in scholarship that Woolf described are reflected in the anger shown by some men students toward women's studies (see below).

Woolf notes the historical portrayal of women in the early twentieth century. She contrasts this with the representation of women in fictional writing: 'Some of the most inspired words, some of the most profound thoughts in literature fall from her lips; in real life she could hardly read, could scarcely spell, and was the property of her husband.'³ Despite the success of some women fiction writers there was at that time a scarcity of information on the lives of 'ordinary' women in history. As discussed in the Introduction, Woolf points out that this was due in part to the concentration of historians on war, politics, and religious leadership, which women had been excluded from. Woolf notes that nothing is known about women before the eighteenth century:

Here I am asking why women did not write poetry in the Elizabethan age, and I am not sure how they were educated; whether they were taught to write; whether they had sitting-rooms to themselves; how many women had children before they were twenty-one; what, in short, they did from eight in the morning till eight at night.⁴

² Ibid, p. 27.

³ Ibid, p. 40.

⁴ Ibid, p. 42.

As mentioned previously, this is one area where women have made great strides, especially during the latter part of the twentieth century. This thesis has described some of the vast amounts of material now available on women in history. Social historians have ‘dug deep’ in archives and have used oral history to analyse such areas as marriage, childcare, food consumption, and domesticity. Feminist theory has influenced historians to analyse material in new and exciting ways. For example, recently post-modern feminists have questioned concepts such as patriarchy and ‘woman’ (see Introduction) which have previously been taken for granted. Feminist historians have closely analysed power within society, thereby better illuminating the structures of male hegemony that Woolf described and its implications for women.

However, this thesis has also revealed several parallel experiences between modern women’s experiences and those at Woolf’s time. While women currently have the legal right to control their own wealth, there is still evidence of a ‘glass ceiling’ and pay inequality based on gender in many organisations. The concern of women’s studies staff over the level of financial resources echoes the concern Woolf showed over the financing of the women’s colleges. This points to the enduring quality of men’s control over the financial resources of higher education.

Another parallel between the two times was the evident anger on the part of some men toward women, especially feminists. This was demonstrated at ASU by articles in the student newspaper in the 1980s that attacked feminists. At UG, this was demonstrated by the vandalising of women’s studies announcements and the harassment of women’s studies students. As Woolf points out, this anger originated, in part, from men’s fear that women would usurp some of their power. A frequent reaction of people who feel threatened is to lash out in anger. These parallels with women’s situation over seventy years ago would suggest that although women have made great strides in scholarship and in increasing their

undergraduate numbers, this has not been accompanied by any fundamental challenge to the male hegemony of higher education.

But will a researcher reading my thesis in seventy years time still find parallels between what my research revealed and the situation of women in higher education at that time? What lessons does my research reveal about what women in higher education today can do to make it more likely that someone reading Woolf in seventy years time will no longer find so many parallels with their time? First of all, it is very important that women continue to study their position in higher education both in the past and the present, so that they might better be able to map out where women should be in the future. If we know how women navigated obstacles in the past, we will be better prepared to navigate them in the present. For example, this research has revealed how women in conservative environments affect change in the face of institutional resistance (i.e. organise to push for incremental changes).

This research also points to the need of greater supports for women who want to advance in higher education. The mentoring of women first entering higher education, whether as a student or employee, is one very good way to support them and encourage their success. More networks, such as the 'Through the Glass Ceiling' network in the UK, need to be formed. These networks need to build international connections because, as this research has shown, male hegemony in higher education is an international phenomenon. They also need to make sure to support both women students and employees in higher education, as students provide the seedbed of future higher education employees. Women academic staff need to be supported in their research efforts, as this is currently the most important criteria for advancement in higher education. More studies need to be done on how best to do this. Both academic and societal barriers need to be addressed, for example, better support for women regarding childcare.

A related question is whether the relatively slow progress of women in breaking the male hegemony of higher education, illustrated by their continuing low numbers in the

upper echelons of higher education, points to a need for radical change instead of the incremental changes that have been gained in the past? Even if radical changes are made to higher education, will it make a difference if society does not also change radically?

While radical change might be the quickest way to improving women's position, it will be very difficult to achieve in conservative environments such as ASU and UG where it is likely to meet a strong reactionary response. As previously discussed, the 'normalising' nature of hegemony means that it is very difficult to challenge. Many students and employees within the institutions, both men and women, do not see a need for change, therefore incremental changes that do not seem to challenge the existing hegemony are easier to achieve. This may (hopefully will) change in future, making it easier to make more radical changes to the institutions.

Virginia Woolf, in her 1938 essay *Three Guineas*, describes what she sees as an ideal women's college, and the reality of what they had to be. She describes a place which would appeal to people who love 'learning for itself'. A place where artists

would come to the poor college and practice their arts there because it would be a place where society was free; not parcelled out into the miserable distinctions of rich and poor, of clever and stupid; but where all the different degrees and kinds of mind, body and soul merit co-operated. Let us then found this new college; this poor college; in which learning is sought for itself; where advertisement is abolished; and there are no degrees; and lectures are not given, and sermons are not preached, and the old poisoned vanities and parades which breed competition and jealousy...⁵

Although this represents Woolf's ideal vision for education, she nevertheless states that if women want to enter the professions, their colleges need to be equivalent to the men's colleges. The reality was that in order for degrees to enable women to obtain employment, which would give them the opportunity of economic independence, the ideal of 'learning for itself' was incongruent with the requirements of society. As the case of women's

⁵ Woolf, *A Room of One's Own/Three Guineas*, p. 156.

studies programmes illustrates, this conflict between ‘education for learning’ and ‘education for training’ still exists.

Again, there are parallels between what Woolf described in the early twentieth century, and the situation at the present time. Women academics need to work within the restraints that society holds them to. As long as society continues to treat higher education as solely for training students for positions (the commodification discussed in Chapter Five), radical changes to higher education will be difficult to achieve. This points to the importance for women academics to work for changes both within academia and in the wider society as a whole.

Another important theme emerging from this research has been the importance of the interconnectedness between international feminists in strengthening and maintaining the movement. As mentioned in Chapter One, there has been an important cross-fertilisation of ideas between US and UK feminists in the nineteenth century. Similar exchanges took place a century later between US and UK feminists in the 1960s and 1970s. As previously mentioned, they fought for the same improvements in women’s position, such as pay equality. They were also both influenced by New Left politics and the Civil Rights movements. The media and international students helped spread and share New Left and feminist ideas between the two countries. British activist Sheila Rowbotham, in her memoir of the 1960s, mentions several exchanges between British and North American feminists.⁶ Both saw similar improvements to their status. For example equal pay legislation was passed in both countries in the 1960s (US) and the 1970s (UK).

As a result of this, women in the US and the UK discovered that they were in the same situation regarding their position in society and access to higher education, and that they struggled against the same barriers and arguments against their education. For example, physical, mental and social arguments against women’s education were used in

⁶ Sheila Rowbotham, *Promise of a Dream: Remembering the Sixties* (London: Allen Lane, 2000).

both countries. They were also influenced by the same ideas in their struggle against this situation. The anti-slavery movements in both countries were important precursors to the women's movement, as they reinforced to women their inferior position and gave them the tools to organise politically to fight for their rights in society. Travelling and lecturing in both countries in the nineteenth century, women such as American abolitionist Lucretia Mott contributed to the transatlantic sharing of ideas.

Coincidentally, Maggie McFadden, who was instrumental in starting women's studies at ASU, has recently written a book on the trans-Atlantic connections of nineteenth-century feminists. McFadden describes the increasing international communications between women in the nineteenth century, which were made possible in part by increasing literacy and also by improvements in travel and the international post. McFadden concentrates on the period from the 1820s, when Europeans started to visit the US in increasing numbers, to the end of the 1880s when the first international women's organisation, the International Council of Women, was founded.⁷

McFadden's research highlights the cross-fertilisation of feminisms outside the institutional and national borders. At a local level, feminist staff at both ASU and UG were well aware of international developments, as were the students in their efforts to reform residence hall rules. This points to the importance of the knowledge that what happened at these institutions did not happen in isolation, but was affected by outside forces. This is one of the important lessons for me to have learned from my thesis research: the importance of finding links between seemingly separate and individual circumstances. No matter how isolated a place may appear (and the mountain environment of ASU certainly seems that), it is still heavily influenced by outside events. Universities are, by their nature, forums for the exchange of new ideas, both academic and political.

⁷ Margaret McFadden, *Golden Cables of Sympathy: The Transatlantic Sources of Nineteenth-Century Feminism* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1999).

Future Research Directions

Because of time and word constraints, this thesis has necessarily confined itself to a general overview of developments in the two universities. I was unable to explore the influence of social class on women's experiences at ASU and UG. There have been studies on the differing experiences of nineteenth-century British women in higher education according to social class. For example, as mentioned previously, June Purvis has written extensively on the experiences of both middle-class and working-class women in British higher education during this time period. It would be interesting to compare this with the situation in the US, and to assess the extent of change over the years. While the US has been described as a 'classless' society throughout its history, the reality is that someone born in poverty has always had a much more difficult road into higher education than a Rockefeller or Vanderbilt (especially in relation to entry to the elite 'Ivy League' institutions). And, of course, race has also played an important role in influencing access to higher education in the US.

Following this line of thought, another area for further research would be the experiences of minorities at ASU and UG. As explained earlier, students at both institutions historically have been majority white and Protestant. While this means that there might be a scarcity of archival 'written' sources, this could be more fully explored by interviewing minority former students. The 'restaurant experience' of the first black student at ASU, which was discussed in Chapter Two, points to the intriguing material that may be uncovered. Similarly, it would also be interesting to explore the experiences of gay students and staff at both institutions. As mentioned previously, both institutions have strong Christian influences which seems to have made it particularly difficult for gay students to organise on the campuses. Hence the strong negative reaction discussed in Chapter Three to the attempts of one gay organisation to receive recognition at ASU.

While there has been a plethora of scholarship on the experiences of women in higher education in the nineteenth century, the experiences of women in the twentieth century have been comparatively unexplored. I hope that my research will be used as a 'stepping stone' from which to further explore the experiences of women during this time period. This research is needed in order to explore ways of challenging the existing male hegemony of higher education in both countries, and around the world.

Conclusion

This research has explored the extent to which the position of women in higher education has changed since Virginia Woolf wrote *A Room of One's Own*. It did this through case histories of the experiences of women in two institutions, Appalachian State University and the University of Gloucestershire, in the latter part of the twentieth century. While keeping in mind the limitations of case histories and the comparative method, I found that the research illuminated the mechanisms of male hegemony in higher education. The comparison of the two institutions revealed several similarities which point to the pervasive and international character of male hegemony. Manifesting itself in institutional and educational terms, women at both institutions responded to the male hegemonic structure by challenging the strict residence rules, unequal work conditions, and exclusively male curriculum that they found at the institutions.

Feminist theory influenced my research methods and analysis of data. While an extensive search through feminist methodological literature revealed little resources on feminist archival research, there is a plethora of resources on feminist interviewing methods and analysis of interview data. My archival search and interviews yielded rich material for analysis. I was pleased with both the quantity and quality of the data found. I realise, and acknowledge, that my interpretation of the data would most probably differ from that of a non-feminist looking at the same data. Or even, it would differ from that of a feminist from another 'category' of feminism. For example, a 'post-structural feminist'

would have placed more emphasis on questioning the normalising categories of patriarchy and male hegemony.

That brings me to the effect that this research had on me as a researcher. A comparison of my MA thesis with my PhD thesis reveals the ways in which I have grown as a researcher. I not only have greatly extended my knowledge of feminist theory and methods, but have also learned the importance of contextualisation. My PhD research and my participation in the European Union funded project, 'Women in European Universities', revealed how 'universal' male hegemony in higher education is. In the project, I studied the status of women professors in French universities, and found that their numbers were also far from reaching parity with the number of men professors. One of the paramount conclusions to come out of this research is that women need to organise internationally in the effort to improve the position of women in higher education. Despite the claims of conservatives, women still 'have a long way to go' before reaching parity with men in higher education.

APPENDIX I

In the US:

Federal Laws regarding employment discrimination are enforced by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC), which was established by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and began operating on 2 July 1965.

The EEOC enforces the following laws:

- *Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin;
- *The Equal Pay Act of 1963 (EPA), which prohibits men and women who perform substantially equal work in the same establishment from sex-based wage discrimination;
- *The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA), which protects individuals who are 40 years of age or older;
- *Title I and Title V of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), which prohibit employment discrimination against qualified individuals with disabilities in the private sector, and in state and local governments;
- *Sections 501 and 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibit discrimination against qualified individuals with disabilities who work in the federal government; and
- *The Civil Rights Act of 1991, which, among other things, provides monetary damages in cases of intentional employment discrimination.⁸

Title VII's prohibitions against sex discrimination cover both sexual harassment and pregnancy based discrimination. It covers education institutions, private employers, and state and local governments that employ fifteen or more individuals. The EPA covers virtually all employers. Both the EPA and Title VII also cover federal government employees.

Executive Order 11246, which was signed in September 1965, stated in part:

⁸ 'Federal Laws Prohibiting Job Discrimination Questions and Answers,' www.eeoc.gov/facts/qanda.html, p. 1.

It is the policy of the Government of the United States to provide equal opportunity in Federal employment for all qualified persons, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program in each executive department and agency. The policy of equal opportunity applies to every aspect of Federal employment policy and practice.⁹

Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972 stated in part:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance...¹⁰

The Amendment went on to name exceptions such as military and religious institutions.

In the UK:

The Equal Opportunities Commission was set up by The Sex Discrimination Act 1975.

The Act stated in part:

It is unlawful [for an educational establishment] to discriminate against a woman -

- (a) in the terms on which it offers to admit her to the establishment as a pupil, or
- (b) by refusing or deliberately omitting to accept an application for her admission to the establishment as a pupil, or
- (c) where she is a pupil of the establishment-
 - (i) in the way it affords her access to any benefits, facilities or services, or by refusing or deliberately omitting to afford her access to them, or
 - (ii) by excluding her from the establishment or subjecting her to any other detriment.¹¹

⁹ *Executive Order 11246*, <http://hr.ucdavis.edu/saad/11246.htm>.

¹⁰ *Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972*, www.dol.gov/dol/oasam/public/regs/statutes/titleix.htm.

¹¹ *The Sex Discrimination Act 1975*, reproduced by Press for Change on their website: www.pfc.org.uk/legal/sda2.htm.

APPENDIX II

Table One: Percentage of Women Academic Staff in the Late 1980s/ Early 1990s

Country	Year	Instr./Lect.	Asst. Prof	Assoc. Prof	Full Prof	% W Acad. Staff
Australia	1992	38.5	17.8	10.9	7.4	18.6
Botswana	1991-2	23.6	0	4.2	0	13.9
China	1988	36.0	29.0	19.0	11.0	23.8
Iran	1988-9	19.3	12.3	6.4	5.9	11.0
Norway	1990	41.7	29.3	16.3	9.3	24.2
Russia	1986	37.0	25.0	NI	11.3	24.3
UK	1991	41.8	25.2	10.2	4.9	20.5 (1987-88)
USA	1989-90	NI	38.1	26.0	14.0	26.0

Adapted by Author from Unni Hagen, Statistical Appendix, Table 6 in Lie et al, The Gender Gap

Table Two: Percentage of women ASU academic staff from 1970 to 2000 by grade

Year	Professor			Asso. Prof.			Asst. Prof.			Instructor			All Faculty		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
1970	56	3	5.1	58	17	22.7	98	23	19	28	21	43	240	65	21.3
1975	111	10	8.3	96	31	24.4	94	34	26.6	25	22	47	326	97	22.9
1980	172	20	10	91	33	26.6	91	47	34.1	28	14	33	390	122	23.8
1985	201	38	16	90	32	26.2	54	20	27	9	2	18	368	95	20.5
1990	217	46	17	84	26	23.6	61	40	39.6	2	4	67	375	123	24.7
1995	205	45	18	86	39	31.2	70	70	50	5	3	38	378	161	29.9
2000	189	60	24	86	58	40.3	73	67	47.9	2	0	0	360	201	35.8

Sources: Adapted by Author from Statistical Abstracts of Higher Education in North Carolina, 1970-2000.

Table Three: Percentage of women UG academic staff from 1995 to 2001 by grade

Year	Professor			Sen. Lect.& Res.			Lecturers			Researchers			All Acad. Staff		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
1995				40	20	33.3	145	90	38.3	10	5	33.3	210	115	35.4
1996				40	20	33.3	135	90	40.0	10	5	33.3	195	115	37.1
1997				45	15	25.0	130	80	38.1	10	10	50.0	190	115	37.7
1998	15	0	0	25	10	28.6	130	90	41.9	20	15	50.0	200	125	38.5
1999	15	0	0	35	20	40.0	160	120	42.9	20	15	37.5	245	170	41.0
2000	25	10	28.6	35	20	36.4	175	120	40.7	20	15	50.0	265	170	39.1

Sources: Adapted by Author from HESA Individualised Staff Return (1995-2000).

Notes on Tables:

The percentages in both tables were rounded to the nearest tenth decimal place, and the years are the beginning of the academic year (for example 2000 is the 2000-01 academic year). The data in Table Two was found in the ASU archives and are actual figures; while the data in Table Three was obtained from the offices of the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) in Cheltenham and were rounded to the nearest five (e.g. 0, 1, and 2 are counted as 0); which means the figures in the total column do not always equal an addition of the previous columns. Because of the type of reporting during the years 1995-97, staff on the professor grade were indistinguishable with those on the senior lecturer grade at UG. According to HESA, 'This under-counting will have a consequential effect on the proportions of professors within particular subject areas, cost centres, and by gender... [the] Agency therefore advises caution in analysis of staff by grade.'¹²

¹² HESA, 'Staff Data Definitions – 20155_CH,' 2002, pp. 1-2.

APPENDIX III

Sample Interview Questions: ASU ALUMNI

1. Can you tell me a little about your family background and how you came to choose ASU?
2. What were the dates you attended and your major?
3. What were your career plans, and did they change, if so how?
4. How would you describe your professors' attitudes toward you and your fellow students?
5. What were the views of the women's movement on campus? Did it have an effect on the ASU campus?
6. What was the general attitude towards women's studies on campus?
7. Did you live on campus? If so, when and where?
8. What were your, and fellow students', views of the rules and regulations that governed dorm life? Which of the written rules were observed, and which were ignored?

Sample Interview Questions: UG STAFF

1. Could you describe your background briefly and how you came to Cheltenham?
2. How would you describe the environment here compared to other HEIs?
3. Could you tell me about how you became involved with women's issues and what you saw as some of the most important issues regarding women that you were concerned with when you first arrived?
4. What do you see as the current needs of the women's studies programme?
5. Do you believe the women's movement and feminism has affected UG? If so, how?

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Archival Material

University Archives, Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA. Including Dougherty Papers; Equal Employment Opportunity Papers; Plemmons Papers; Student Handbooks at Appalachian State Teacher's College, 1941-1953; Thomas Papers; Undergraduate Catalogues, 1939-1989; and Wey Papers.

University Archives, University of Gloucestershire. Cheltenham, UK. Including Academic Administration Papers (20); Academic Registrars' Papers (18); Annual Reports (04); Dean of Students' Papers (24); Histories of College (27); HMI Reports (25); Information and Appointments Officers' Papers (19); Prospectuses (05); St. Mary's Magazines (33); Student Union/Activities/Publications (30); and Vice Principal's Papers (11).

Personal Collections/Private Papers

Papers of Melanie Ilic, University of Gloucestershire. Cheltenham, UK. Including Equal Opportunities Committee Papers; Gender Committee Papers; and Women's Studies Field Chair Papers.

Women's Resource Centre, Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA. Including Women's Studies Papers.

Unpublished Theses

Bellamy, Carol Lorraine. *Student Life at Cullowhee: The Hunter Years, 1923-1947*. (MA Thesis). Cullowhee: Western Carolina University, 1979.

McGurk, Lisa. *Transition and Inequality: Female Students at Appalachian State University, 1939-1989*. (MA Thesis). Boone: ASU, 1998.

Newspapers

The Appalachian. (1939-1989).

The Times Higher Education Supplement, www.thes.co.uk.

Interviews

Beaulieu, Elizabeth. Email Interview with author, 20 July 2002.

Beaver, Patricia. Interview by author, 23 March 1998. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.

- Coleman, Thalia. Interview with author, 16 April 1998. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- Coleman, Thalia. Interview with author, 12 July 2000. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- Funderburk, Amy. Interview with author, 19 July 2000. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- Gravett, Sandra. Interview with author, 25 March 1998. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- Gravett, Sandra. Interview with author, 13 July 2000. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- Grohs, Denise. Email interview with author, 5 July 2000.
- Howard, Janice. Email interview with author, 5 July 2000.
- 'Jo.' Interview with author, 20 February 2002. University of Gloucestershire. Cheltenham, UK.
- Johnson, Susan. Email interview with author, 29 June 2000.
- Johnson, Elizabeth. Email interview with author, 15 April 2002.
- McFadden, Maggie. Interview by Joanna Yount, 15 November 1996, Tape Recording. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- McFadden, Maggie. Interview with author, 25 March 1998. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- McFadden, Maggie. Interview with author, 11 July 2000. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- 'Pat,' 'Robin,' and 'Eliza.' Interview with author, 19 March 2002. University of Gloucestershire. Cheltenham, UK.
- Phillips, Jean. Email interview with author, 27 November 2000.
- Schneeloch, Nancy. Interview with author, 20 June 2000. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- Sexton, Debbie. Interview with author, 13 July 2000. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- Sharrett, Robbie. Interview with author, 10 July 2000. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.
- Stanley, Paula. Email interview with author, 27 June 2000.
- Williams, Lee. Interview with author, 8 April 1998. Appalachian State University. Boone, NC, USA.

Published Sources and Reports

Appalachian State University Annual Fact Book. Boone: Appalachian State University, 1980.

Appalachian State University Annual Fact Book. Boone: Appalachian State University, 1998.

Chliwniak, Luba. 'Higher Education Leadership: Analyzing the Gender Gap.' *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports*. 1997, ERIC Digests.

Draft Planning Outline. Boone: ASU, 1974.

Editorial Research Reports on the Women's Movement. Washington: Congressional Quarterly, 1973.

'Equality Challenge Unit,' accessed from the Universities UK website: www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/activities/ecu.asp.

Executive Order 11246, <http://hr.ucdavis.edu/saad/11246.htm>.

'Federal Laws Prohibiting Job Discrimination Questions and Answers,' www.eeoc.gov/facts/qanda.html.

HESA. *HESA Individualised Staff Return 1995-2000*. Copyright Higher Education Statistics Agency Ltd., 2002.

Morrell, Judy, Marcus Boyland, Gabriel Munns, and Louise Astbury. 'Gender Equality in Pay Practices,' report to the Equal Opportunities Commission. Reproduced on website: www.eoc.org.uk.

Planning for the Eighties. Boone: ASU, 1981.

Sawyer, M. Faye. *Analysis of Perceived Sexual Harassment of Faculty and Students*. Boone: Office of Equal Opportunity Programs, 1985.

The Sex Discrimination Act 1975, reproduced by Press for Change on their website: www.pfc.org.uk/legal/sda2.htm.

Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina, 1971-2001.

Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972, www.dol.gov/dol/oasam/public/regs/statutes/titleix.htm.

UCEA. 'Equal Opportunities in Employment in Higher Education: A Framework for partnership.' May 2000, www.ucea.ac.uk/equalopportunities123.html.

Vazquez-Cupeiro, Susana. *The System of Higher Education in the UK*. Munster: Women in European Universities Training Paper, 2001.

Secondary Sources

Books and Journal articles

- Anderson, Mary et al. *Doing Feminism: Teaching and Research in the Academy*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1997.
- Astin, Helen S., ed. *Some Action of Her Own*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1976.
- Ballaster, Ros et al. *Women's Worlds: Ideology, Femininity and the Woman's Magazine*. London: Macmillan, 1991.
- Bannerji, Himani et al. *Unsettling Relations: The University as a Site of Feminist Struggles*. Boston: South End Press, 1992.
- Beard, Mary Ritter. *Women as Force in History*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1946.
- Beck, W.E. *A History of the Cheltenham Colleges of St. Paul and St. Mary, 1847-1947*. Bath: Dawson & Goodall Limited, 1947.
- Beddoe, Dierdre. *Discovering Women's History*. London: Pandora Press, 1983.
- Bengiveno, Teri Ann. 'Feminist Consciousness and the Potential for Change in Campus Based Student Staffed Women's Centers,' *Journal of International Women's Studies* 07 March 2000, www.mcla.mass.edu/academics/sba-womenctr/bengiven.htm.
- Blackmore, Jill and Jane Kenway, eds. *Gender Matters in Educational Administration and Policy: A Feminist Introduction*. London: Falmer Press, 1993.
- Boxer, Marilyn Jacoby. *When Women Ask the Questions: Creating Women's Studies in America* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Bratton, Mary Jo Jackson. *East Carolina University: The Formative Years, 1907-1982*. Greenville: East Carolina University Alumni Association, 1986.
- Brooks, Ann. *Postfeminisms: Feminism, Cultural Theory and Cultural Forms*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Brown, O. Lester. *Blanford Barnard Dougherty, A Man to Match His Mountains*. Publishing information not known, 1963.
- Bryson, Valerie. *Feminist Debates: Issues of Theory and Practice*. Houndmills: Macmillan, 1999.
- Bullough, Vern L. *The Subordinate Sex*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
- Burstyn, Joan N. *Victorian Education and the Ideal of Womanhood*. London: Croom Helm, 1980.
- Bynum, Victoria E. *Unruly Women: The Politics of Social and Sexual Control in the Old South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

- Byrne, Eileen M., ed. *Gender in Education*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1990.
- Chafe, William H. *The American Woman: Her Changing Social, Economic and Political Roles, 1920-70*. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Chafe, William H. *The Paradox of Change: American Women in the 20th Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Challinor, E.B. *The Story of St. Mary's College Cheltenham*. Cheltenham: Taylor, Young Limited, 1978.
- Chamberlain, Mariam K. and Alison Bernstein. "Philanthropy and the Emergence of Women's Studies." *Teachers College Record*. 93 (Spring 1992): 556-568.
- Cockburn, Cynthia. *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*. London: Macmillan, 1991.
- Conable, Charlotte Williams. *Women at Cornell*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Conkin, Paul K. *Gone With the Ivy: A Biography of Vanderbilt University*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980*. New York: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Crowley, Helen. "Women's Studies: Between a Rock and a Hard Place or Just Another Cell in the Beehive." *Feminist Review*. 61 (Spring 1999): 131-150.
- Curtis, S. J. *History of Education in Great Britain*. London: University Tutorial Press, 1967.
- David, Miriam and Diana Woodward, eds. *Negotiating the Glass Ceiling: Careers of Senior Women in the Academic World*. London: Falmer Press, 1998.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. Translated and edited by H.M. Parshley. London: Vintage, 1997, first printed 1949 by Gallimard.
- de Castell, Suzanne and Mary Bryson, eds. *Radical Interventions: Identity, Politics, and Differences in Educational Praxis*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Delamont, Sara. *Knowledgeable Women: Structuralism and the Reproduction of Elites*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- DeLyon, Hilary and Frances Widdowson Mignivolo. *Women Teachers: Issues and Experiences*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989.
- Douie, Vera. *Daughters of Britain*. Oxford: Vincent Baxter Press, 1949.
- Drago, Robert and Joan Williams. 'A Half-time Tenure Track Proposal.' *Change* 32 (November/December 2000): 46-51.

- Dubois, Ellen Carol et al. *Feminist Scholarship: Kindling in the Groves of Academe*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Evolution of Educational Thought*. Translated by Peter Collins. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977, first published in 1938.
- Dyhouse, Carol. *No Distinction of Sex? Women in British Universities 1870-1939*. London: UCL Press, 1995.
- Edwards, Elizabeth. *Women in Teacher Training Colleges, 1900-1960: A Culture of Femininity*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Etzioni, Amitai and Fredric L. Dubow, eds. *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970.
- Evans, Mary, ed. *The Woman Question*. London: Sage Publications, 1994.
- Evans, Sara. *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979.
- Faludi, Susan. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1991.
- Farnham, Christine Anne, ed. *Women of the American South: A Multicultural Reader*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Figes, Eva. *Patriarchal Attitudes: Women in Society*. London: Granada, 1972.
- Finkelstein, Barbara. "Conveying Messages to Women: Higher Education and the Teaching Profession in Historical Perspective." *American Behavioral Scientist*. 32 (July-August 1989): 680-699.
- Fonow, Mary Margaret and Judith A Cook, eds. *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Furniss, W. Todd and Patricia Albjerg Graham, eds. *Women in Higher Education*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1974.
- Gluck, Sherna Berger and Daphne Patai, eds. *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Hart, Gwen. *A History of Cheltenham*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1965.
- Hartmann, Susan M. *The Home Front and Beyond: American Women in the 1940s*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982.
- Harvey, Brett. *The Fifties: A Women's Oral History*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1993.
- Heilmann, Ann and Ingrid Sharp. "Making a Space for Women: Student Conferences as an Example of Feminist Staff-Student Interaction in the University." *Women's Studies International Forum*. 2 (1997): 301-320.

- Hesse-Biber, Sharlene, et al, eds. *Feminist Approaches to Theory and Methodology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Higgonnet, Margaret Randolph, et al, eds. *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.
- Hill, Michael R. *Archival Strategies and Techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993.
- Hinds, Hilary, Ann Phoenix, and Jackie Stacey, eds. *Working Out: New Directions for Women's Studies*. London: Falmer Press, 1992.
- Hirsch, Marianne and Evelyn Fox Keller, eds. *Conflicts in Feminism*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Hogeland, Lisa Maria. 'Fear of Feminism: Why Young Women Get the Willies.' *Ms*. November/December 1994, reprinted on website: www.rapereliefshelter.bc.ca/volunteer/fearoffem.html.
- Howe, Florence, ed. *Women and the Power to Change*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Howe, Richard D., ed. *Leaders of the Appalachian Alumni Family*. Boone: ASU, 1986.
- Hufton, Olwen et al. "What is Women's History?" *History Today*. 35 (June 1985): 38-48.
- Hunt, Felicity, ed. *Lessons for Life: The Schooling of Girls and Women 1850-1950*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Jackson, Stevi and Jackie Jones, eds. *Contemporary Feminist Theories*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.
- Jackson, Sue. 'Networking Women: A History of Ideas, Issues and Developments in Women's Studies in Britain.' *Women's Studies International Forum* 23 (2000): 1-11.
- Jeffries, Sheila. *Anti-climax: A Feminist Perspective on the Sexual Revolution*. London: Women's Press, Ltd., 1990.
- Kaufmann, Susan B. "Few Women Get Positions of Power in Academe, Survey Discloses." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. 5 (November 30, 1970): 1 & 4.
- Kennedy, Mary, Cathy Lubelska, and Val Walsh. *Making Connections: Women's Studies, Women's Movements, Women's Lives*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1993.
- Kerber, Linda K. "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History." *Journal of American History*. 75 (June 1988): 9-39.
- Klein, Renate D. and Deborah Lynn Steinberg, eds. *Radical Voices: A Decade of Feminist Resistance from Women's Studies International Forum*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989.

- Komarovsky, Mirra. *Women in College: Shaping New Feminine Identities*. New York: Basic Books, 1985.
- Lanier, Ruby J. *Blanford Barnard Dougherty: Mountain Educator*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1974.
- Ledwith, Sue and Simonetta Manfredi. 'Balancing Gender in Higher Education: A Study of the Experience of Senior Women in a "New" UK University.' *The European Journal of Women's Studies*. 7 (2000): 7-33.
- Leonardi, Susan J. *Dangerous by Degrees: Women at Oxford and the Sommerville College Novelists*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989.
- Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Patriarchy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Lerner, Gerda. "Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges." *Feminist Studies*. III (Fall 1975): 5-14.
- Levine, Arthur. *When Dreams and Heroes Died*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1989.
- Lewis, Jane. *Women in England 1870-1950: Sexual Division and Social Change*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf, 1984.
- Lie, Suzanne Stiver, Lynda Malik, and Duncan Harris, eds. *The Gender Gap in Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page, 1994.
- Lie, Suzanne Stiver and Virginia E. O'Leary, eds. *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World*. London: Nichols/GP Publishing, 1990.
- MacKinnon, Catharine. *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- MacLean, Nancy. 'The Hidden History of Affirmative Action: Working Women Struggles in the 1970s and the Gender of Class.' *Feminist Studies*. 25 (Spring 1999): 42-46.
- Maitland, Sara ed. *Very Heaven: Looking Back at the 1960s*. London: Virago Press, 1988.
- May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.
- Maynard, Mary and June Purvis, eds. *Researching Women's Lives From a Feminist Perspective*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1994.
- McCandless, Amy Thompson. *The Past in the Present: Women's Higher Education in the Twentieth-Century American South*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999.
- McFadden, Margaret. *Golden Cables of Sympathy: The Transatlantic Sources of Nineteenth-Century Feminism*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1999.

- McMillan, James F. "Writing Women's History." *History Today*. 31 (June 1981): 58-59.
- McWilliams-Tullberg, Rita. *Women at Cambridge: A Men's University- Though of a Mixed Type*. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1975.
- Milkman, Ruth. *Gender at Work: The Dynamics of Job Segregation by Sex During World War II*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987.
- Millen, D. 'Some Methodological and Epistemological Issues Raised by Doing Feminist Research on Non-Feminist Women.' *Sociological Research Online*. 2 (30 September 1997), www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/3/3.html.
- Miller, James. *'Democracy is in the Streets': From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987.
- Mingle, James Richard. *Degree Output in the South, Distribution by Sex, 1974-1975*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1977.
- More, Charles. *'A Splendid College': An Illustrated History of Teacher Training in Cheltenham*. Cheltenham: Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education, 1992.
- More, Charles. *The Training of Teachers 1847-1947: A History of the Church Colleges at Cheltenham*. London: Humbledon Press, 1992.
- Morley, Louise. *Organising Feminisms: The Micropolitics of the Academy*. London: Macmillan, 1999.
- Morley, Louise. "Women's Studies, Difference, and Internalised Oppression." *Women's Studies International Forum*. 4 (1992): 517-525.
- Newcomer, Mabel. *A Century of Higher Education for American Women*. New York: Harper, 1959.
- Nicholson, Linda J. *Feminism/Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Nielsen, Joyce McCarl, ed. *Feminist Research Methods: Exemplary Reading in the Social Sciences*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1990.
- O'Neill, William L. *Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.
- O'Neill, William L. *The Woman Movement: Feminism in the United States and England*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1969.
- Opportunities for Women in Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Oram, Alison. *Women Teachers and Feminist Politics, 1900-39*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Perrett, Geoffrey. *Days of Sadness, Years of Triumph: The American People 1939-1945*. New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan Inc., 1973.

- Purvis, June. *Hard Lessons: The Lives and Education of Working-class Women in Nineteenth-century England*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.
- Purvis, June. *A History of Women's Education in England*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1991.
- Purvis, June and Margaret Hales, eds. *Achievement and Inequality in Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.
- Richardson, Diane and Victoria Robinson, eds. *Introducing Women's Studies: Feminist Theory and Practice*. London: Macmillan, 1993.
- Riley, Denise. *'Am I That Name': Feminism and the Category of 'Women' in History*. Houndmills: MacMillan Press, 1988.
- Roberts, Helen, ed. *Doing Feminist Research*. London: Routledge, 1995 first published 1981 by Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Rosen, Ruth. *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America*. New York: Penguin, 2000.
- Rossi, Alice S. and Ann Calderwood, ed. *Academic Women on the Move*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.
- Rossi, Alice S. *The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir*. New York: Bantam Books, 1973.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. *A Century of Women: The History of Women in Britain and the United States*. London: Viking, 1997.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. *The Past is Before Us: Feminism in Action Since the 1960s*. London: Penguin Group, 1989.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. *Promise of a Dream: Remembering the Sixties*. London: Allen Lane, 2000.
- Rupp, Leila J. and Verta Taylor. *Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Ryan, Barbara. *Feminism and the Women's Movement: Dynamics of Change in Social Movement, Ideology and Activism*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Sanderson, Michael. *Educational Opportunity and Social Change in England*. London: Faber, 1987.
- Saywell, Shelly. *Women in War*. Ontario: Penguin Books, 1986.
- Schuster, Marilyn R. and Susan R. Van Dyne, eds. *Women's Place in the Academy: Transforming the Liberal Arts Curriculum*. Totowa: Rowan & Allanhold, 1985.
- Scott, Anne Firor. *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995.

- Semas, Philip W. "55 Campuses Now Offering Courses in Women's Studies," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 5 (November 30, 1970): 1 & 4.
- Sexton, Patricia. *Women in Education*. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976.
- Smith, Harold L. *British Feminism in the Twentieth Century*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 1990.
- Smith, Harold L. 'The Womanpower Problem in Britain During the Second World War.' *The Historical Journal* 27 (1984): 925-945.
- Solomon, Barbara M. *In the Company of Educated Women*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Sommers, Christina Hoff. *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.
- Spender, Dale, ed. *Men's Studies Modified: The Impact of Feminism on the Academic Disciplines*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981.
- Spender, Dale, ed. *The Education Paper: Women's Quest for Equality in Britain, 1850-1912*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Stanley, Liz, ed. *Knowing Feminisms: On Academic Borders, Territories and Tribes*. London: Sage Publications, 1997.
- Stanley, Liz and Sue Wise. *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Stanton, Domna C. and Abigail J. Stewart, eds. *Feminisms in the Academy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- Steffens, Heidi. "Women's Place is in the Curriculum." *NEA Today*. 3 (January-February 1985): 9.
- Stone, Lynda. *The Education Feminism Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Tamboukou, Maria. 'Of Other Spaces: Women's Colleges at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century in the UK.' *Gender, Place and Culture*. 7 (2000): 247-263.
- Thomas, Kim. *Gender and Subject in Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1990.
- Thompson, Jane L. *Learning Liberation: Women's Response to Men's Education*. London: Croom Helm, 1983.
- Titmuss, Richard M. *Problems of Social Policy*. London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1950.
- Tobias, Sheila. *Faces of Feminism: An Activist's Reflections on the Women's Movement*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1997.

- Tuchman, Gaye et al eds. *Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Walby, Sylvia. *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Waller, Jane and Michael Vaughan-Reese. *Women in Britain*. London: Optima, 1987.
- Weiler, Kathleen. "Women's History and the History of Women's Teachers." *Journal of Education*. 171 (Fall 1989): 9-30.
- Weiner, Gaby. *Feminisms in Education: An Introduction*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1994.
- Whelehan, Imelda. *Modern Feminist Thought: From the Second Wave to 'Post-Feminism'*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995.
- Widdowson, Frances. *Going Up Into the Next Class: Women and Elementary Teacher Training, 1840-1914*. London: Hutchinson, 1980.
- Williams, David C. and Patricia D. Beaver, eds. *The Memoirs of Cratis Williams: I Come to Boone*. Boone: Appalachian Consortium, 1999.
- Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London: Fontana, 1976.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Wilson, Elizabeth. *Only Halfway to Paradise: Women in Postwar Britain, 1945-1968*. London: Tavistock, 1980.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1967.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own/Three Guineas*. London: Penguin, 1993, first published The Hogarth Press, 1929.