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CHAPTER I: EDUCATIONAL PURPOSE
"Let no one say, and say it to your shame
That there was meaning here before you came."

C. S. Lewis

It is clear that separate colleges for men and women no longer seem as useful as coeducational ones. Recently, a good many of the "Ivy League" men's and women's colleges have announced plans to admit students of the other sex. Directly opposed to this integrative trend in education, however, are sex-role differences between men and women. The well-documented, common-sense facts are that most of the working world is a man's world and that women have to spend a significant portion of their lives raising children. These facts certainly have an effect on college life, in one way or another. If they are not recognized by both men and women during college, then there is waste at both ends; if they are recognized, they can be put to some purposeful educational use. The virtue of separate colleges, of course, was that they provided for the latter. Their slow passing now is in no way solving the educational issue of how to deal with sex-role differences, but, instead, is making it more dramatic. Various colleges have realized this. Hampshire is one.
And Hampshire has commissioned this report to recommend some appropriate actions.

Now, this report has a certain character.

It is not at all original. It depends on The Making of a College for certifying bold change. It depends on other papers by the Hampshire staff for some of its special plans. Most of all, it depends on the work of many, many writers, researchers, and educators who have studied women's affairs for its matter. In places, it runs the risk of being a very thin covering indeed for the masses of research, ideas, and information underlying it. The references show that. There is almost no new data here, partly because there was not the time or resources to gather it, even more because others have gathered so much, and mostly because data is not the issue. There are almost no new arguments here, for the subject is as well traveled by now as a major turnpike. There are almost no new ideas here, for they could only come from new information and inference.

Instead, its virtue is thoroughness. It starts at the beginning with a general philosophy of coeducation, then organizes a mass of background material on the differences between men and women, and finally uses these to justify definite, practical recommendations for all aspects of Hampshire College.

Its vice is its length—for words, nowadays, should be treated as luxuries.
Its mood is militant. There is discretion and realism, too, but no one, after all, thinks that changing coeducation, like changing any other part of our educational system, is easy to do. If the recommendations go any farther than a conference table, they are bound to be controversial.

Of course, this report is only one part of all there is to do. The author has been gathering raw material to match her words here, and will continue to lend her support as usefully as possible.
Reasons come first.

A plan must have its goal, means an end, parts their whole . . .

It has always been harder to find reasons for women's education than for men's. Most of the reasons offered over the centuries are cramped, as some typical examples show.

--Women from fourteen years of age are flattered with the title of mistresses by men. Therefore, perceiving that they are regarded only as qualified to please the men, they begin to adorn themselves; and in that to place all their hopes. It is worth while, therefore, to fix our attention on making them sensible, that they are esteemed for nothing else, but the appearance of a decent, and modest, and discreet behavior.

Epictetus (55-135)

--Mary Wollstonecraft felt that women should study so that they would not have to marry for money or be regarded merely as sex objects by men. (1792) She quoted Rousseau's *Emile* disapprovingly:

--All the ideas of women, which have not the immediate tendency to points of duty, should be directed to the study of men, and to the attainment of those agreeable accomplishments which have taste for their object.

(1762)

--A woman ought to be educated . . . only so far as may enable her to sympathise with her husband's pleasures, and in those of his best friends.

John Ruskin (1864)

--In the young women of the nation we have a huge supply of talent for which our educational institutions have insufficiently provided, and which our country has imperfectly utilized.

Kingman Brewster (1962)
Over and above its general mission of developing women who combine such characteristics as competence and charm, culture and self-reliance, enthusiasm and poise, character and tolerance, the Texas Women's University recognizes its responsibility to prepare students to function effectively as citizens who appreciate the blessings and respect the obligations of a free society.

Texas Women's University Catalogue (1965-66)

Bryn Mawr College was founded by a group of men and women belonging to The Society of Friends who were convinced that intelligent women deserve an education as rigorous and stimulating as that offered to men.

Bryn Mawr Catalogue (1967-68)

The difficulty with statements like these about the purpose of women's education is that they are all the wrong size. Education is too big to squeeze into such a limited rationale. Think of education for individuals, not for women; for the mind, not the drawing room; for enlightenment, not advantage; and that is its proper scale. What follows is that the purpose of education for women, as for men, is to enable them to lead free and full lives. Education should lead women, like men, into ever new human circumstances, all the while helping their emotions, their intellects, and their wills to keep step and pace. It must show them greatness against which they can measure the growth of their personal wisdom. Through education, Beauty may appear to all as simple and rich as fire. Educated women, like educated men, should be good people, with their judgment of "good" depending on the quality of their education. Education should bring men
and without enough sight of the past and the future, enough self-knowledge for them to lead others. It must be ready to give, to both sexes, whatever they want as soon as they find it is also whatever they need.

If such statements of purpose seem arbitrary and personal, they are properly so, for the purpose of education is with individuals rather than sexes. There are many, many reasons to educate persons, but there is really no such thing as a reason to educate women.

There are, however, strategies to improve education for women, and these will be the subject of this report.
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CHAPTER II: COEDUCATION
Recently, as one separate college after another has announced the addition of either men or women students, there have been frequent rehearsals of the arguments for coeducation. The students want it. They can't really tell why except, "Well, it just feels more lively and natural." But nonetheless, the arguments are given, and rightly so, for, after all, coeducation is not inevitable; it is a matter of choice. Even Hampshire, born coeducational, should be self-conscious about its sex. If a college is coeducational either from a feeling, on the one hand, or, on the other a fancy, it has missed the main point: Sartre might call it a kind of existential blindness. The case for coeducation, then, is an important beginning for this report.

Coeducation is the general pattern for education in America. The public school system has always been for both men and women, and most students at Hampshire will come from it. Graduate and professional schools, not to mention working life, are for men and women together. Students who have been used to coeducation should not face a major readjustment to separate education and then another after their brief three or four years, particularly since the shifts would come during years when students most want to learn about themselves in relation to the other sex. Also, all the forms of education outside the classroom that Hampshire
supports, such as field-work, study abroad, work semesters, and the like, are coeducational. Although Hampshire will often want to work outside of given patterns, coeducation is one it should keep.

It makes particular sense for Hampshire to be coeducational in its Four-College setting, since it can stand as comparison to the three that are separate. Also, one of Hampshire's purposes is to be a meeting-ground for students in the surrounding area, and coeducation is the sensible environment for that.

The academic arguments for coeducation are complex. More detail on them will appear in another section of this report; here, a brief outline. There is a widespread opinion that women are temperamentally different from men in the way they learn. While some educators believe the supposed differences argue for separate education, where they can flourish, others think they argue for coeducation, where they can be shared. On the other hand, those who see no temperamental differences between men and women encourage coeducation so that men and women can more easily discover their similarities. In the aggregate, then, there is more support for coeducation than for separate.

The social arguments for coeducation go further than the obvious: that it allows convenient, casual dating and meeting between men and women. President Mary Bunting of Radcliffe has
noticed that men have more respect for feminine intelligence when they are with women academically, and that a husband who respects his wife in this way has more concern for her career or graduate-study plans than if he had known her before marriage in social situations only. Since a man's care for his wife's interest often determines what she will do more than any other factor, in this respect the cause of women's education is certainly served better at a coeducational institution than at a separate one. The Princeton report on coeducation adds emphasis: "Indeed, the recognition that intellectual activity is not sex-linked would seem to us an exceedingly important result of a liberal education." This is the same opinion as that of feminists Mary Wollstonecraft and John Stewart Mill.

Other feminists, though, have favored separate education in order to help women to their best advantage and also to accommodate large numbers of women. However, these reasons no longer apply. Current feminist opinion holds that women's colleges have "violated the public trust and forgotten or abdicated their purpose." It also finds that the women's college rated lower on scales of academic excellence than the men's, and therefore concludes on academic grounds that "coeducation is . . . the only viable or sensible plan."
Some educators feel that separate women's colleges can best resist the trends to professionalism and preserve liberal education. It is questionable, though, whether one should concentrate on preserving values in isolation. Surely professionalism should be cured right at the diseased sites.

Some who argue for separate women's education, though not men's, say that a separate college allows women to reach top positions in extracurricular campus activities more easily, giving them a sense of achievement and pride in their sex. Able women students usually scorn this, saying the achievement means little unless the competition is open, and show that they can succeed in coeducational colleges just as well. At any rate, if Hampshire follows the plan of letting its students participate in extracurricular activities at the neighboring colleges instead of maintaining a full program of its own, this issue would not even arise.

Hampshire seeks intellectually excellent and excitable students, and coeducation will help, since coeducational colleges do attract more and better students than separate ones. This is particularly important at a time when competition for top students is fierce. The Princeton study showed that those of its accepted group who did not choose to enroll listed the lack of coeducation as their chief complaint. Even more significantly, Princeton
surveyed secondary school students and found that more than three quarters of both the men and the women considered co-education more attractive than separate education, and that the percentage was even higher among the more able students. "Only 4 - 5% of present-day students from superior secondary schools have a positive preference for an all-male or all-female college."

Students who have gone to separate colleges often wish to change. Students at Vassar and Princeton voted overwhelmingly for coeducation: all students, not just the restless, or less able, or the ones who came from coeducational high schools. Two Vassar statistics point up the general vote. Although 78% of the students in all classes who responded said that they would have attended a coeducational college if they had not come to Vassar, the freshmen who replied to a similar questionnaire upon entering college eight months earlier answered differently. Of them, 50% said they would have preferred another women's college if they had not come to Vassar. These statistics indicate that even those students who went to Vassar strongly committed to separate education changed their view after some experience. Recently, a girl who transferred to Yale after two years at Wellesley said, "I don't know why I ever wanted to go to a woman's college."

The Vassar report on coeducation puts one part of the argument well. "Generally, students feel schizophrenic about education
at a separate college. They like a more integrated life whereby they can work and play in the same surroundings and with the same people. This, they feel, makes their experience of both work and play, certainly of personal relationships, more rich, communal, and satisfying to them. They feel that if education is to prepare them for life, it should provide an environment which is life in microcosm, something separate education does not do."

Faculty opinion must also count in the argument, for here, too, Hampshire seeks quality. There is some feeling among women that they might meet discrimination at a coeducational institution. While there does seem to be evidence that this is true, there is no evidence that it is unavoidable. This report will offer more details on this subject later. To cite the Princeton study again, very few faculty felt that teaching both men and women would be less satisfactory than one sex alone; and 69% of those who had had extensive experience with coeducational classes felt it would be more satisfactory. Also, younger faculty members believed coeducation helps in faculty recruitment. A survey of Wesleyan faculty generally agreed with these results.

In all, Hampshire has plenty of evidence to argue that its coeducational beginning is the right kind.

However, there are hazards in coeducation. All too often
coeducational colleges take the easy way: they assume stereotyped male interests and career patterns. Also, they suppose that educating men and women together is simply a practical matter and do not really grasp and exploit all its intellectual opportunities. For instance, they do not see coeducation as a ready-made forum for dealing with the issues of sexuality that are so important in our culture. Neither do they see its implications for reforming many poor or outmoded or discriminatory educational practices. Earlier, this report mentioned the practical reasons for Hampshire, in particular, to be coeducational. Now, another kind of reason is offered. Hampshire, eager to find a new vantage on many old premises, has a chance to do so in terms of an enlightened approach to coeducation. It could be as if, in trying to refocus, Hampshire were to use coeducation for a new lens.
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I have relied on a Vassar document, *A Report on Alternatives from the Committee on New Dimensions*, September 1, 1967, pp. 20-25, for the major part of the discussion in this chapter, twice, in relating Mrs. Bunting's view and in speaking about student attitudes, quoting directly. I have supplemented this with the extremely useful Princeton report called "The Education of Women at Princeton," which was published in the *Princeton Alumni Weekly*, LXIX, 1 (September 24, 1968). The first citation is from p. 15. The data from the student and faculty surveys comes on pp. 7, 8, 19, 17 in order of citation. The Vassar data on student preference is found in memos on the results of the "Student Questionnaire, April, 1967," unpublished. There is also an unpublished series of papers from Wesleyan, 1967, produced by the SEPP Committee, that provide data and opinion independently agreeing with those from Princeton and Vassar. Appendix 5 of the SEPP papers, "The Effects on Student Recruitment of Admitting Women Students," shows that incoming freshmen at two separate men's colleges felt as strongly as the Vassar freshmen about the advantages of separate education. I have mentioned the concurring faculty opinion; it is found in the survey called "Faculty Opinion on Women's Education at Wesleyan."
Interestingly, more students at Wesleyan voted for coordinate education, a women's college with separate classrooms and faculty but all other facilities and activities shared (32%), or some other facilities and activities shared (26%), than for coeducation (30%). This report does not discuss coordinate education because nearly all the same arguments apply against it as against separate education, with the addition of technical arguments, such as problems of faculty hiring, schedule planning, and administration that seem too particular and lengthy here. If, in the future, there needs to be more discussion of coordinate education, it could easily be supplied.

The argument for the preservation of women's colleges in order to save liberal education is made most particularly in an article by Mervin Freedman, "On the Future of the Women's College," (Journal of the American Association of University Women, IV, 3, March, 1963, p. 109).

The current feminist opinion is found in Token Learning: a Report on the Condition of Higher Education for Women in American Colleges, by the Education Committee of the National Organization for Women, New York Chapter (Kate Millett, chm.), pp. 3, 5, 57.
CHAPTER III: GENERAL SEX DIFFERENCES
"Though no man can draw a stroke between the confines of day and night yet darkness and light are upon the whole tolerably distinguishable."

Edmund Burke

There is a large body of data about the sex differences between men and women. They fall into several classes. None of them is a neutral difference: each puts women at a disadvantage.

**Physiological**

♀ ♂

**Political and Legal**

These differences, of course, caused the most controversy before this century. They have become less glaring now, although they still do exist. There is an active group of women on the UN's Commission on Human Rights that seeks, among other reforms, to secure political and legal rights for women in all countries, so, internationally, discrepancies still loom large. It was only recently that Swiss women obtained voting rights. In Thailand, women revert to the legal status of minors once they become wives. British women have the right to equal pay for equal work in only one plant in their country. Here, however, women are allowed to
vote, have some equal rights in marriage, some equal property rights, and are covered by the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in Title VII on employment, though the coverage is not complete. Of course, although American women have nearly equal rights with men, they do not yet have equal power. There are very few women in high Federal posts; women do not often run for or hold political office, women are not organized as an effective lobby for any cause, indeed, women do not vote as often as men.

Although this class of differences between sexes is still real and important, it is not the most controversial today, since it depends on even more fundamental discrepancies.

Economic

The economic positions of men and women differ enormously. This is true for all classes and independently of their level of education. In Male and Female, Margaret Mead points out that every society we know places a higher value on men's work than women's. Here, this fact turns in a vicious circle with the facts of rank and pay. As of 1966, women formed 36% of the national labor force and nearly half of all the white-collar workers. Most of them were at low rungs, in clerical jobs of all sorts. Only about one out of seven women were in professional and technical occupations in
1966; this is actually a smaller proportion than 25 years ago, despite the fact that the number of working women has nearly tripled. Less than one quarter of these work at other than traditional women's occupations: teaching, nursing, social work, and library work. Women are paid only about half as much as men. Average income for the white male is $6,704, for the white female, $3,991. Only 5% of the people who earn over $10,000 are women. The reasons for the large income disparities are partly that women are not in higher level jobs; partly because they work part-time, partly just because they are women. Discrimination against women in employment ranges from dual pay scales to pay ceilings for women, compulsory retirement ages, and refusal to let women work for overtime.

The set of differences between men and women in the working world is the main source of feminist concern today.

Social

Everyone knows that men and women have a separate social status in our culture. There is no documentation needed, but the tally of books that talk about it is long. Recently, there have been some popular accounts of the subject: Caroline Bird's Born Female and Mary Ellman's Thinking About Women. These are no more fascinating than eighteenth- and nineteenth-century tracts
by feminists, of which there were many excellent and pioneering ones, but they are easier to find in bookstores.

Our culture, more than any other in the world, has oriented the woman's role toward motherhood. Yet our accepted standards of achievement are wealth and prominence, which can only be pursued outside the home. The status result is simple: women are inferior to men.

A particularly valuable supplement to thoughts about women's status is in an essay by Diana Trilling on the image of women in contemporary literary culture.

What we have . . . is a literary culture . . . in which man lives in isolation from his society and in which his society reannounces itself in woman; in which, that is, woman is in essence either a predator or a husk, an uninhabited body supplied with the mechanical appurtenances for the satisfaction of sexual appetites and the continuation of the unhappy human kind.

This is originally a male writer's image, she says, but formed with "considerable cooperation from the opposite sex."

Psychological

In 1869, J. S. Mill wrote, "Standing on the ground of common sense and the constitution of the human mind, I deny that anyone knows, or can know, the nature of the two sexes, as long as they have only been seen in their present relation to one another."

Starting perhaps with Freud, psychoanalysts went to work to provide
a definitive view of women's nature, though not man's, for some reason. A century later than Mill, they have still not succeeded, but there have been many suggestions and, at least, a common thread, for as two commentators explain, "All orthodox psychoanalytic theorists believe that the awareness of anatomy plays a major role in differentiating" females from males. Behaviorists, too, have their theories, which also have an anatomical backdrop.

Of course, there have been signs that the psychoanalysts and behaviorists started with the wrong assumption. As one article points out: "With regard to the sex-role stereotypes, the Trait Psychologists in the 1930's investigating psycho-social sex differences . . . found that more differences existed within a single sex than were found to exist between the sexes."

It does not suit the purposes of this report to list all the imputed psychological sex differences here. Not all of them relate to education, and the ones that do will come up later. At any rate, a full description would be unreasonably lengthy. What is provided here is annotation to guide the way into the field, and which the next chapter continues.
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Political, Legal, Economic, Social


Carl Degler, "Revolution Without Ideology: The Changing Place of Women in America," The Woman in America, op. cit., p. 204, points out that women's lack of political activity in this country is "an American and not simply a sexual phenomenon." He notes the much greater political success of women in other countries.

The forms that discrimination takes are discussed in Born Female, Chapters 4 and 9; Esther Peterson's "Working Women," The Woman in America, op. cit.; and in American Women, op. cit.
"Labor Standards." The latter particularly points out that women have not done effective labor organization.

**Thinking About Women** (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1968) contains less information, more anecdote than **Born Female**. Its concern is more with sex-role stereotypes than social realities, with the images and adjectives conventionally used in thinking about women. It contains, therefore, a great many references from literature and advertising and pokes fun at all. Diana Trilling's comments come from **The Woman in America**, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

**Psychological**

An accessible text of Mill's essay, **The Subjection of Women**, is in an Everyman edition, along with **A Vindication of the Rights of Women** by Mary Wollstonecraft (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1929). The sentence quoted is on p. 238.


The dissenters are noted in Bettina Weary, "A New Focus on Counseling Girls, **Women's Education**, VII, 2 (June 1968), p. 2.

The psychology bibliography on sex differences is extremely lengthy, some of obviously good or bad, even to the layman, some
of it hard for the layman to judge. Summaries of research are Eleanor E. Maccoby, "Women's Intellect," The Potential of Women, eds. S. M. Farber and R. H. L. Wilson (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963); Jerome Kagan, "Acquisition and Significance of Sex Typing and Sex Role Identity," Review of Child Development Research, eds. L. W. Hoffman and M. L. Hoffman (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964); Wesley C. Becker, "Consequences of Different Kinds of Parental Discipline," ibid.; David C. McClelland, "Wanted: A New Self-Image for Women," The Woman in America, op. cit.; and Robert Oetzel, Selected Bibliography on Sex Differences, Social Science Research Council, Stanford University, 1962 (mimeograph). In order to know what to look for in these, and also for perspective on their bias, one should read Ellen and Kenneth Keniston, op. cit., a discussion of which is in the next chapter of this report. Their footnotes give a full range of valuable references. Also, at the end of their paper there is a chart of sex differences that is simple and direct, though misleading, since other psychologists might draw up completely different lists, and have.

Erik Erickson's research has gained a great deal of attention, although it is more limited than some others: he describes it in "Inner and Outer Space: Reflections on Womanhood," The Woman in America, op. cit. As his essay is first in the book, it becomes
CHAPTER IV: THEORIES ON THE CAUSES OF SEX DIFFERENCES

AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT THEM
"Culture is a caricature of biological differences."

Anonymous

"Sex is not an absolute, essential quality any more than age is; it is the sum of what happens."

Joanna Amateau

A. Two Causal Theories

Although there is much agreement on the description of sex differences, with some exceptions in the psychological area there is not much agreement on their cause. The disagreement is usually complicated; it is not always rational or polite. One paper that outlines it more clearly and thoroughly than any other is Ellen and Kenneth Keniston, "The Right to Be Equally Different." Since many at Hampshire have read this, there will only be a brief review here.

The central question is whether characteristic differences in male and female life styles are caused by Nature, through genes, chromosomes, and hormones, or by the Environment, through culture. As Kelly writes, "Sex difference research is essentially a part of the larger question of heredity versus environment—or nature-nurture research—which has proven to be one of the most complicated problems that scientists have yet undertaken." The Kenistons!
article gives an excellent description of both the "nature" and the "nurture" side of the question, citing their principal proponents. It then discusses whatever objective evidence might be used to judge between the two sides. The footnotes give a good record of that evidence, although additions should be made. One factor the authors omit, but others emphasize, is the sex bias of the researchers themselves. Also, the authors do not cover research done on animals, birds, and fish from which analogies are made to human sex differences, and they leave out cross-cultural studies, probably because there are still few of them. One could add, too, interesting points about the character of research into sex differences. It has its humor: women are discovered to have a better sense of smell than males, apparently, and there is an article called "Masculinity and Femininity of Musical Phenomena" that gives sex ratings to composers and musical instruments. It also has its fashions. Most psychologists are on the side of Nature: Caroline Bird called them the New Masculinists; most social scientists believe in Nurture: they are the New Feminists. The Nurture position has an old-fashioned flavor, whereas Nature is "now." Moreover, the research is often narrow: it seems suspicious that experiments into "natural" differences between women and men have never turned up any that are different from cultural ones.
All these emendations only add weight to the Kenistons’ conclusion:

The scientific evidence does not really permit us to choose between a bio-anatomical and a socio-cultural explanation of women's psychology. Indeed, it seems unlikely that empirical research will ever resolve the conflict between the two interpretations of women. For these two views do not differ over facts as much as they differ over the interpretation of facts; and the accumulation of new facts is not likely to provide any crucial test for either theory.

There is one further and final comment to make. At the very least, the result of psychological research into sex differences has been to show that there is some range of separation between individuality and sex. To put it another way: psychology allows us to say that, for each of us, there is something more than being a male human being or a female human being. Thus, among other inferences, Chapter I of this report is credible.

B. Three Theories of Action

The argument over the cause of sex differences leads to disagreement over what should be done about them. Since those who believe in natural causes think that sex differences are inevitable, they can only favor preserving them. Bruno Bettelheim gives a representative view:

What is needed, I believe, is not sex equality in work and home, as some advocate, not participation by women on an equal basis in activities which are considered masculine, but the creation of work and working conditions
which permit women at least as much self-realization in the social and work sphere of life as are presently available to men, and do so in line with women's natural inclinations, talents, physiological and psychological make-up which, after all, is different from that of men.

What is wrong is that today women are expected to enter man's working world . . .

In some cases, theorists even would exalt sex differences. They feel that the masculine abilities of "abstractness," "manipulation," "initiative," and the like have led our world almost to ruin, so that our only hope is to realign society around the feminine virtues of "concreteness," "nurturance," "acceptance," and such.

Erickson writes:

"Woman may, in new areas of activity, balance man's indiscriminate endeavor to perfect his dominion over the outer spaces of natural and technical expansion (at the cost of hazarding the annihilation of the species) with the determination to emphasize such varieties of caring and caretaking as would take responsibility for each individual child, born in a planned humanity.

Opposed to the "nature"school, the "nurture" group feels that since sex differences are only arbitrary creatures of culture, they should disappear for good. Alice Rossi is one spokeswoman for this view. In an essay called "Equality Between the Sexes" she writes:

It will be the major thesis of this essay that we need to reassert the claim to sex equality and to search for the means by which it can be achieved. By sex equality I mean a socially androgynous conception of the roles of men and women, in which they are equal and similar in such spheres as intellectual, artistic, political and occupational
interests and participation, complementary only in those spheres dictated by physiological differences between the sexes. This assumes the traditional conceptions of masculine and feminine are inappropriate to the kind of world we can live in in the second half of the 20th century.

The two principal justifications she discusses are that men lead unsatisfactory lives because their wives cannot find personal fulfillment, and that women no longer need to expect only marriage and parenthood. The bulk of the essay deals with the second of these, and provides a forceful argument against sacred motherhood.

Actually, there is no one who has ever written a more careful, thorough, and cogent brief on this position than J. S. Mill, in *The Subjection of Women* (1869) which Alice Rossi cites in her introduction to the paper above.

Against this all-pervasive counterpoint, there is yet a third point of view on what to do about sex differences, and it is neatly put by Margaret Mead. It falls, of course, between the other two.

Historically our own culture has relied for the creation of rich and contrasting values upon many artificial distinctions, the most striking of which is sex. It will not be by the mere abolition of these distinctions that society will develop patterns in which individual gifts are given place instead of being forced into an ill-fitting mould. If we are to achieve a richer culture, rich in contrasting values, we must recognize the whole gamut of human personalities, and so weave a less arbitrary social fabric, one in which each diverse human gift will find a fitting place.
C. Current Social Trends

While the intellectuals argue about how sex differences came to be and what to do, society is quietly starting to erase them. As Alice Rossi writes, "It is often the case that lively public debate about ideology takes place after rather than before the fact of social change." Just recently, signs of androgyny are abroad in the land. The "Pill" has brought an enormous change in both men's and women's sex habits. A random sample of newspaper clippings shows that women have tested "Men Only" bars and airplane flights and have entered ROTC. In athletics, women have become jockeys and, in some New York schools, have been given permission to play on the same teams with boys. Of course, men's and women's fashions have been merging, with women wearing pants and men ruffled shirts. There has also been an increase in "Unisex" wear. Even though some stores won't sell it and others use euphemisms to describe it, the fact is that Unisex is good apparel business. As a young customer said, "Both men and women are working for peace; men used to be warriors; now they're becoming as anti-violence as women. This closeness is bound to show up in what we wear." All these circumstances, not profound in themselves, nonetheless indicate a changing mood about sex traditions. Many young women are no longer selfconscious about working, marry men in their own fields, share child-raising responsibilities,
and forget about the discriminatory support laws. After all, women are getting married and having children earlier, and dying later, so that they can expect many years of life without children. They are more educated: in 1966, half of the white women in the U.S. older than 25 had over 12 years of schooling, almost a year more than in 1960. They are having a taste of employment; jobs are becoming desegregated; professional and special interest organizations such as local bar associations and the like are mixing the sexes. Research with children in 1960 shows that girls were more "masculine" in certain preferences than they had been thirty years earlier. Edna Rostow, in her essay "Conflict and Accommodation," pictures the contemporary scene as one in which sexual stereotypes have lagged behind reality. Women actually do have quite a bit of freedom, she suggests, although they still have trouble coping with it. She sees that "new mores have developed which require husbands and wives to share tasks and forms of social and recreational activity previously the province of either one alone." She is optimistic:

Young people live with novel conditions, ahead of experience and of the literature. But they have a singular advantage. For the young man accepts his wife's freedom as the order of nature, and both know that accommodation follows this fact. Moreover, the environment recognizes the magnitude of their task and is finding ways to favor their efforts.

However, despite omens of a changing society, most young women and men have not wandered very far from their traditional roles, as the next chapter shows.
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B. Three Theories of Action


is on p. 240. But Erickson's view would seem dangerous to almost anybody. Most people would feel safer if the fate of the world were up to all of us, not to one sex or another.


Margaret Mead, Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies (Apollo ed.; New York: William Morrow & Co., 1963), p. 322. As a necessary step in reaching her view, and as a healthy balance, Margaret Mead tells us that the problem of what to do about sex differences is in some ways more worrisome for males than for females.

The recurrent problem of civilization is to define the male role satisfactorily enough... so that the male may in the course of his life reach a solid sense of irreversible achievement.... In the case of women, it is only necessary that they be permitted by the given social arrangements to fulfill their biological role, to attain this sense of irreversible achievement.... If men are ever to be at peace, ever certain that their lives have been lived as they were meant to be, they must have, in addition to paternity, culturally elaborated forms of cross-expression that are lasting and sure. Each culture—in its own way—has developed forms that will make men satisfied in their constructive activities without distorting their sure sense of their masculinity.

C. Current Social Trends

For a full report on social trends, from which I have drawn most of my statements, see Born Female, op. cit., Chapter 8, "The Androgynous Life."


The research mentioned is from "Acquisition and Significance of Sex Typing and Sex Role Identity," op. cit., p. 142. Edna Rostow's essay is in The Woman in America, op. cit., pp. 212, 214. An even more radical opinion than Mrs. Rostow's is Ruth Hill Ureem's in "The College Woman in the Sixties," Women's Education, II, 3 (September, 1963), p. 1. "Indeed, it is becoming increasingly recognized that sex is not only irrelevant but downright dysfunction for most of the significant roles of modern society. As roles are becoming sexually desegregated, new formal and informal patterns are developing to strip them of their sex-linked connotations and to desex personal relationships between role holders."

Surprisingly, the information about changing trends in this country is offset by Bruno Bettelheim's observations of women on kibbutzim in Israel. There, although women are equal with men, may do their tasks, and can use complete day-care facilities, they choose to do the traditional women's duties of cooking, cleaning, child-tending, and the like. See his essay, "The Talented Woman
CHAPTER V: IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION AT HAMPShIRE
They all come marching up to Hampshire's front door. 

All the theories, the scholars, all the women and men and their differences, and Tradition and Change, and deep desires for sexuality and freedom; all arrive. 

Because the sexes are not alike, they want reasons; and because the reasons are at odds, they want action; and because the action concerns young lives, they want education to do it. "When a boy can say to a girl whom he wants to marry, 'I want you to do, with your life, what you want to do,' then he has had an education. And the opposite is equally true." 

Marya Mannes

**General Policy**

As this report has already suggested, Hampshire's position should be that it values individuality above all, and considers a student's sex to be secondary. Following this, the treatment of men and women in the college will have a certain rationale. 

--Generally, men and women should be educated in the same way. They should only be educated differently in cases where sex differences have hitherto been emphasized at the expense of individuality. 

--Both sexes should be made aware of the issues of sexuality as an important part of self-knowledge. They should discover the
ways in which sexuality has either limited or expanded men's and women's freedom to follow their own talents, and then apply their insights to their own lives.

Student and Faculty Attitudes

Although it may seem obvious to recommend that Hampshire should make its students aware of all the issues of sexuality, it is not. Many students and faculty would strongly dispute it. First, they are not sure what the issues are. They talk about sex as casually as cars: are potency and the Pill the "issues of sexuality"? Only partly. "Masculinity" and "femininity" are the terms of sexuality: the issues have to do with what these terms mean and how they affect us. They involve every discipline from microbiology to macroeconomics. For all our emancipation, we do not commonly speak of them. A Gallup Poll finds college students "a new breed" but considers only their opinions on premarital sex, not sexuality. The same college sophomore who shares his bed with a girlfriend probably would not talk over his masculinity with her. The same girl who goes to Hair with a date is afraid intellectuality is unfeminine. A young woman may wonder how to act at her wedding, but she would not question why her husband should support her.

College-age students may be too young for such topics. "The kids don't know enough about sexuality in college," one educator
Only when they are out, married with a family or single and working, do they have enough experience with sexual relations at all different levels to talk intelligently and come to any real decisions about sex-role. When you're in college, the problems just aren't real enough to you. You may talk a lot about them, but you won't learn much.

Countering this argument, however, is the fact that students in college do have close experience with sexual problems. They begin their sexual activity earlier than in the past, they marry while in college more often, they have more chances to talk intellectually with members of the other sex, and are more often employed, either with or under someone from the other sex, before college is out. College seniors are often quite articulate about their sex-role concerns; experience is filtering back down through the classes.

On the other hand, college students may be too old for such topics. Since cultural conditioning begins at infancy, one theory is that children will never change from their original attitudes about sexuality. There is evidence to the contrary, though. Secondary school teachers say that young teenagers often show a nice spark in talking over ideas about sex roles, which only blows out in the later-teen dating hurricane. But, even if it were true that college students are too old to change their minds about sexual stereotypes, it would be just as true for many other issues that a college education attempts to raise.
Pushed to its extreme, this argument is an argument against all education that tries to go beyond information.

Finally, many faculty and students do not like to think in terms of "sexuality": "individuality" is more important to them. They oppose any structured approach to the issues of sexuality in education; "laissez-faire" is enough. Typical groups of students say they don't think discrimination against women is a problem, that men and women can talk about anything at all completely freely, that their professional goals won't clash with marriage and parenthood, that there aren't any real differences between men and women. As one college president commented, "Women are not conscious of role differences in college." Neither are men. Why should they be? After all, the intellectual life is supposed to be above sexuality. Margaret Mead has written that

our academic tradition was initially designed by and for the celibate, the monk, the occasional nun, a kind of sexless life in which activities of the intellect were joined with a disavowal of the flesh and a denial of the body. The academic world is fundamentally hostile, by tradition, to those acts of femininity [and masculinity] which involve childrearing.

"Laissez-faire" would be fine if students started out as individuals in free situations. However, they do not. They start out as a cluster of stereotypes carried over from childhood, obtect and slow. In college, individuality is not a given, but
a goal. As Marya Mannes said, "I would like to see both the men and the women go through quite a long training in understanding one another. . . . At least to a point where each of them will think of the other as individuals first, and men and women afterwards . . . I still think the gap is immensely wide."

Students might want to talk about the issues of sexuality in a more organized way if they knew how powerfully their assumptions about sex roles were affecting each other. A large number of tests have been done since World War II on male and female students' sex-role attitudes. Data show that men are more conservative about women's role than women themselves are, yet the women accept the men's standards. Male students think that women are not career-oriented and would always prefer to have a family; they see a career vs. marriage choice as being exclusive. Women, on the other hand, generally do want to have families, but they also want careers; they pretend less interest in and ability for the latter in order to meet the men's expectations. Men expect women to have more passive control over situations, more social self-discipline, less gregariousness than women themselves feel, yet they comply. Although women want more equality, they accept less. Women hope for a 50/50 decision-making process in all family affairs, but men would allow this only until there was conflict, in which case they would make the
decision; it happens so. About one in two college women in one study said that they had once wished they belonged to the other sex, against only one in seven men. Both sexes feed the false images. Women, when asked to choose the most important quality in their husband, list first "Provider," second, "Husband," and third, "Man." Female achievement is suspect; said one high school senior, "I know I can't compete with men outwardly. I'll just have to get ahead by other means." Both men and women are naive about the amount of prejudice against women in the working world. Men do not think it exists; women go along with it, accepting, for instance, the custom that typing and shorthand are required skills for any woman to have, no matter what her job. It is an old story. Longitudinal tests have also been done on some of the attitudes described above. The result:

Striking similarities in three studies with similar college populations, done over a span of 20 years, suggest that attitudes toward women may not have shifted so much as to emancipate women from feelings of necessitated subordination to men, whatever the inherent capacities of either sex.

All this in itself may be fine and natural. Yet if men impose standards and women accept them either without self-awareness or without the will to talk to each other, whichever explains many students' reticence, then their lives are not fully their own. Particularly at the time when young people are most self-conscious about "being a woman" or "being a man" and are
preparing to make some of the most important choices in their lives about marriage and a career, they could use some help from their college education.

It is interesting to notice the student radicals' position. Kenneth Keniston, who has observed the radical movement extensively, says, "They worry constantly about issues of sexuality whatever else they may say. But they have not resolved much. They have a problem developing a marriage pattern based on the radical plan of complete equality. Where does the couple live? Who takes care of the children?" At least they have raised assumptions about sex role to the plane of awareness and begun to question them, as they have done with so many other assumptions. Answers, however, may be much harder to provide than for the others.

In the end, this report's recommendation stands. "Research scholars tend to agree on the need for more open discussion, among men and women, of the exigencies of male and female role assignments, with ample opportunity to explore the obstacles inherent in each," write two Stanford researchers. As for women in particular, Rossi says:

Every encouragement should be given to young girls and college-age women to air their real feelings about marriage and maternity and to chart the highly probable profile of cycling through which adult roles develop. And they must be able to stretch more than their minds. Their feelings must also be stretched. . . . The goal of more parents and educators should be for the cultivation of an "informed heart," to borrow Bettelheim's apt phrase.
Implementation

It is not simple, either, to carry out the recommendations above. What has not been said is that all the issues of sexuality are so intimate, and so general, that they are nearly impossible to discuss in the classroom sense of the word. Few advisers think a college can deal with them all directly. That does not mean, however, that a college cannot be quite practical about them. Somehow, the issues of sexuality must take protean shapes and spread themselves into all corners of campus life. Then communication, discussion, will follow, sometimes quite unawares. The next sections will describe how this can happen.
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A. CURRICULUM
"If I were asked to draw a cartoon of the state of our knowledge about women's education, I would picture a hoop, lopsided and with frequent breaks, being rolled through a brightening dawn by an educator holding a flaccid stick called research."

William Fels

1. Sex Differences in Learning

The first move toward recommendations on the curriculum is to scan sex differences specifically related to learning. Despite the quotation above, there is some basis for doing this. The known facts cover a number of areas.

INTELLIGENCE. There are no over-all differences between male and female IQs. There are some disparities in particular mental abilities, however, as follows.

Verbal Ability. There are few or no differences.

Mathematical Ability. Men have excelled females here because they have been able to perceive more abstract relationships between elements and are more facile with spatial associations.

These differences directly relate to men's greater interest in mathematics at school and college than women's.

Memory. Women are better at memorization than men. However, both sexes remember best whatever interests them most.

Memory is not an independent ability, but links with
Problem Solving. Men have a more analytical approach to problems than women, can pass more easily from problem to problem, are better at space and construction problems, are more self-motivated, and more dogged.

Problem solving has an evident and interesting dependence on the individual's concept of his own sex-role. Not only has it been shown that men who score highest on the pencil-and-paper test of masculine self-concept are better problem solvers than men who score lower, but women who score relatively high in masculinity are better problem solvers than other women; it has also been shown that the problem-solving ability of experimental women subjects rose following a group lecture and discussion in which the cultural artificiality of some popular conceptions of femininity was laid bare.

Learning Rates. Women earn better grades in elementary and secondary school than men but fall behind in college.

Here, again, motivation is the key. There are many women who keep up with the men; they are the ones who, for some reason, can share the men's motivation.

Emotional Expression. Women can express their emotions more comfortably and adroitly than men.

There is no research to offer proof of whether this is an innate characteristic or merely follows the cultural tendency to encourage emotional expression more among women than men.

Learning Habits. There is a common opinion that women are less aggressive than men in the way they learn. Their reserve shows
especially, so opinion goes, when sensitive issues, like sex, or sex-linked issues, come up.

Research on this subject has perhaps been the least satisfactory, since it is so largely a subjective matter. The opinion seems to belong more to faculty than to students, and it has not been correlated with faculty bias. Neither has it been correlated with class type and size, student motivation, or possible other factors. What is known, however, is that women do not fear classes with men and do not spoil their performance. Neither sex shys from talking about certain subjects in front of the other.

PERFORMANCE. Men's grades vary much more greatly than women's.

There is no convincing reason to explain this, but motivation is probably behind it.

PREPARATION. In the past, boys and girls received somewhat divergent preparation in elementary and secondary schools, particularly separate private ones. Girls often came to college with much less preparation in the sciences, but more in languages, for instance. Assumptions by school officials and teachers about the boys' and girls' future roles generally caused this imbalance.

Now, however, the variance has nearly gone. According to secondary school principals and college admissions officers,
boys and girls have much the same preparation, with individual option making for differences, rather than the school system. However, there are subtle differences in background due to cultural sex stereotypes. Women may not be as familiar with mechanical images and equipment as men because as teenagers they were setting their hair while the boys were stripping cars. Men may not have as much sense of artistic or literary style as women because they spent afternoons at football practice instead of reading. However, these fine disparities are hard to measure. Also, increasingly similar school and high school programs compensate for them. Boys take home economics and women take physics. TV, a common pursuit, gives equal time to razors and shampoo. The trend toward androgyny mentioned earlier stretches back before college too.

MOTIVATION. Men see their college career as preparation for a professional life; women do not. Women are tentative about their goals, and act without making long-term plans. As far as research can tell, this difference is entirely based on the cultural assumption that women will raise families and not pursue careers.

COURSE PREFERENCES. The conventional rubric is that men choose the sciences, women the humanities. Data from separate colleges
often seemed to follow this, for at men's colleges, cyclotrons and computers proliferated, while women's colleges built theaters and enlarged their music library collections. Even within disciplines, there were supposed to be divisions: for instance, in psychology, women would prefer the developmental rather than the experimental side; in philosophy, women would study metaphysics, men logical positivism; in the natural sciences, women would take botany, men zoology; in mathematics, women would like matrix algebra, men geometry.

Current data shows conflicting results. According to a recent Wesleyan study of several coeducational and coordinate liberal arts colleges, course elections do follow the rubric. However, there is a less divergent pattern for majors: well over one third of both men and women students major in English, history, or government. As for separate colleges: of the five most popular majors at Vassar and Yale, history, English, political science, and psychology are the same at both places. At the end of its section concerning the structure of a coeducational curriculum, the Princeton Report concludes:

The evidence we have, then, strongly suggests . . . that enrollments in a given discipline at a given university are affected far more by the quality of the faculty, by the particular courses offered and by the other options available, than they are by the sex composition of the student body.
Thus, in course preferences, as in other matters, motivation rather than innate sex differences seems to show. Other studies have confirmed this from a second point of view. Girls who make career plans take "masculine" courses; girls who are introduced to "masculine" courses make career plans. Finally, there is a general qualification of any statement about sex differences specifically related to learning. All of them become slighter and slighter the better educated and brighter the girls and boys are. It is as in Jerome Bruner's statement, "As societies get control over their environment, the differentiation between men and women becomes less marked."

Considering all the above points, the argument between the natural and environmental theories of sex differences outlined in Chapter IV seems to come out, at least with respect to direct learning differences, in favor of cultural causes.

2. Recommendations

Separation in the Curriculum

Theoretically, it might be possible to concoct a separate set of courses for women and men on the supposition that the two sexes learn differently. A few colleges have entertained the
notion. This report will recommend differently, however, since the evidence above indicates that there are fewer differences between the sexes' ways of learning than might be supposed and, furthermore, that where there are differences, cultural expectation, translated into the student's lives as differing motivations, is at work. Since this report's theme is that students need to gain some common vantage on this bifurcation, there should be no separate courses for men and women. It might be more efficient to have them, no doubt, but then, efficiency is not always education's worry.

---All courses should be for both men and women. Both men and women may need certain help, according to the differences noted above, but remedial work should be mixed with the course work for each individual, not provided for separate groups.

In the immediate future, many students will follow stereotyped course preferences. Women may do this more than men, since the stereotypes are more restrictive for them. And, unfortunately, they may do it more readily at Hampshire than at other colleges because of the flexible curriculum. Particularly alert advising during orientation's first stage should counter this.

---Women should be encouraged to diversify in their choice of courses.
It is perfectly possible to imagine that, one day, men and women may demand separate courses. Hampshire should allow this, depending, of course, on its staff and facilities, but should not institutionalize it, the college's aim constantly being to mend any such breaks harmful to individual option.

Additions to the Curriculum

Although the curriculum must not divide to serve men and women best, it must enlarge for them. However, like "Black Studies," "Sex Studies" are risky and vague. This section of the report makes a series of recommendations that would weave them almost entirely into the regular curriculum at Hampshire instead of segregating them.

Every possible course should include material relevant to the issues if sexuality. Men and women need to find these issues everywhere, not only in courses on "sexuality," not even only in the social sciences. The material would vary from course to course. In biology, it might be the variety of sexual adaptations for reproduction. In economics, it might be the manpower impact of volunteerism. In history, it might be feminist movements in whatever period: Hypatia, Mary Wollstonecraft, Mme. de Sévigné. In physics, it might be women's contributions: the Curies, Marie Goeppert-Mayer, Lise Meitner, Chien Shium Wu.
In English, it might be "male" and "female" sentences, as Virginia Woolf defined them. In philosophy, it might be Plato and Rousseau's differing metaphysic on the Nature of Man/Woman. In language, it might be the etymologies of household and hunting words. In music, it might be an ethnomusico-logical study of sex-linked performance habits. In film, it might be the visual formation of sex-role stereotypes. The list would depend on each instructor's wish. Hopefully, the examples here show that the material would not be segregated in the course, but, like every other particular topic a teacher submits, would lead into or come from broad issues appropriate to the over-all discipline. To make the point with two of the examples here: debate about "male" or "female" sentences in an English course brings up broad questions of style, contrasts between works in every century, and principles in criticism; study of Lise Meitner's work leads into the principles of nuclear fission, besides giving an exciting record of the human and political sides of scientific discovery. The sexual angles of these starting-points will enhance, not disguise, their academic meaning. And the students will gain much from thinking about sexual issues in a series of well-defined, limited, academic contexts.

In addition, there should be a handful of courses whose primary content has to do with sexuality. Traditionally, most
colleges offer one sociology course on "Marriage and the Family," which, even at excellent coeducational colleges, tried to teach students how to adjust to conventional roles. Such courses are not always successful; at any rate, their goal is askew. Adjustment is for the good of society; individuals care for Choice. Hampshire's courses should aim to help its students decide what their roles will be.

There are really three distinct bodies of investigation and information to cover. Students may learn about the economic and social position of women over the ages either through, or including, a study of feminist movements. They may learn about cultures in which sex roles differ from ours. And they may learn about the psychological investigation of sex differences. This triplex can be taught in pieces or as one. In the interests of integration, interdisciplinary work, and correlation, all of which are especially important to Hampshire, this report recommends that it be taught as one. Later, however, depending on the faculty at Hampshire or at the other Valley colleges, more detailed study on each piece might be offered.

There are two contexts especially suited for this material at Hampshire. One is Human Development. John Boetigger's report on Human Development lays the groundwork for this, so there will be no elaboration on it here.
--Each year, one of the seminars on Human Development in Division I should deal with the issues of sexuality.

The other context is that of Equality. Here, Hampshire's concern for communal and individual responsibilities provides the justification. The fact is that although women are not a numerical minority in America, they face nearly the same problems as a minority group. For instance, the number of similarities between women, considered as a group, and blacks astounds anyone who thinks about them carefully: there are the same legal and political barriers, the same low social status, the same economic discrimination, the same claims of incurable natural blocks or incredible natural advantages.

--There should be a three-unit course on Equal Rights that would stretch through two years, with any student in any division being free to take any or all the units. One unit would be on the black minority; the other would be on religious and a few special political minorities; and the other would be on women. This would have the scope to be a true course on Equal Rights. Of course, Hampshire has not arranged its curriculum yet, and the recommended course may not fit the pattern made next year. It seems, however, that the statement here is general enough to fit many patterns. Eventually, this course may even have its separate units on separate Valley campusus.
Any student should be able to build his or her "major" around the theme of sexuality.

One faculty member's time should be pliant enough to accommodate any student request for a special course in this area.

Sex Information

There is a continuum jump between the issues of sexuality discussed above and practical information about physical sex. While the first are most important in this report, the second belongs here too, for despite the fact that some schools now offer sex education in the third grade, many college freshmen know surprisingly sparse facts of life.

Hampshire should let students take the initiative in this area. There should be no separate sex education program, with the exception of one lecture a year by a visiting speaker who would be on hand afterwards for consultation. The lecture, as purely informative as possible, would be open to both sexes. Inevitably, some information about physical sex will come into the curriculum through the course material suggested above. Additional arrangements to provide information and services to students could be made on a contract basis with the local Planned Parenthood group. Of course, advisory faculty and the resident
psychotherapist should also help. The librarian should collect films, records, and books on the subject. Sex-educational events at the other four Valley colleges should be cross-scheduled.
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1. Sex Differences in Learning

A large part of my discussion of sex differences related to learning takes not only its content but also its form directly from a paper prepared for Vassar's deliberations on coeducation by a psychology professor there: Dwight Chapman, "Known Sex Differences and Their Implications For Higher Education," Vassar College, August, 1968. He himself relies on a basic source: J. E. Garai and A. Scheinfeld, "Sex Differences in Mental and Behavioral Traits," Genetic Psychology Monographs, LXXVII (May, 1968), pp. 169-299. I have supplemented his source with several of my own. His recommendations are quite different from mine, one important difference being that he emphasizes the need for more research. As I see it, Hampshire's classes will be so mixed and mobile that research would suffer from lack of controls and also would not be of much prescriptive use. Given the laboratory mood at Hampshire, however, possibilities for research could be explained further. Another report on sex differences in learning that is fascinating is called "Men and Women as Students: Comments from Swarthmore." This is a series of statements written by the department chairmen at Swarthmore about their students; often jumbled, inconclusive, hasty, impressionistic, it covers all the
angles on sex differences in a most personal, lively way. It is in Appendix 6 of the SEPP papers cited in Chapter II.

To discount even slight differences in male and female IQs, Kelly offers the thought that IQ tests are sex biased in the same way they are culturally biased. "Problems of Research: Design Difficulties," op. cit.


An article by Jean D. Grambs in Women's Education, VII, 1 (March, 1968), p. 2, also suggests that girls in elementary schools benefit from the favor of predominantly female teachers.

A number of studies have been done of whether or not students and faculty prefer discussion in mixed classes. Appendix 5 in the Wesleyan SEPP papers, op. cit., shows that students in separate colleges (Wesleyan and Amherst) are a bit hesitant about mixed classes but Swarthmore and Pembroke students are not. Faculty opinion at Wesleyan sees no hazards in mixed classes. Vassar's results are interesting. There, 80% - 90% would prefer mixed to separate classes in all types of discussion. They feel that they personally would not be cowed by men, but when it comes to considering women as a group, 45% are really not sure women will speak as often or as freely in classes with men.
(Student Questionnaire, op. cit.) I suppose this is a beautiful example of stereotype meeting individual, without the individual even knowing what's going on. The Princeton Report, op. cit., in Tables I-VII, VIII, and IX, pp. 11-12, shows that its undergraduates would not find it distracting to have women in classes (76%); that secondary school students find mixed classes more valuable (64% m., 73% f.); and that the faculty like them too. None of these studies, however, is the sort that could provide what we need: basic information about whether men and women differ in their classroom style.

In addition to other variances, the course-preference stereotype seems to change with time. Mabel Newcomer reported that in 1865-1869, 39.3% of the students at Vassar enrolled in science courses; in 1901-1905, 25.4% did; in 1953-1957, 16.5% did. A Century of Higher Education for American Women (New York: Harper's, 1959). Token Learning, op. cit., is particularly vicious in its description of the "female education" provided at some separate women's colleges that follow the stereotype. Data on course enrollments by sex appears in Wesleyan's SEPP papers, op. cit.; the Princeton Report, op. cit., pp. 13-14; and the Vassar-Yale Report from the Joint Study Committee, Vassar College, September, 1967. The "other studies" mentioned here were noted by E. Paul Torrance in Women's Education, IV, 1 (March, 1965).
2. Recommendations

Swarthmore's statement on separation in the curriculum is a good supplement here.

As far as the curriculum is concerned, the principle with which our discussion began implies that no special alteration of it for women would be justified unless there were strong evidence of a particular need. We have no such evidence. We have considered—and rejected in general—a proposal that has come to us from several sources and has been tried at various women's colleges: that the College establish topical courses for women on subjects assumed to be of special utility for them. We think our basic principle probably applies in two ways: if the conditions of intellectual development are the same for men and women, then curriculum concessions to special interests are unlikely to employ the College's resources most effectively or to promote the highest quality of education. (Critique of a College, Swarthmore College, November, 1967, p. 200.)

The statement on "Marriage and the Family" courses is based on a brief study I made of seventeen colleges and universities: separate, coordinate, and coeducational. The only courses that I found at all interesting from Hampshire's point of view were one offered at Bard in sociology called "The Role and Status of Women in Cross-Cultural Perspective," taught by a woman; a seminar at Swarthmore called "Human Resources," which does not deal with sexuality at all, but presumably could; a graduate course at the New School for Social Research on "Sex Role Differentiation," taught by a man; "Women in America: 1630-1890, 1890-today" in Barnard's history department and two other offerings (see Token Learning, op. cit., p. 44); and Social Relations 149, that
infamous Harvard course harboring radicals, which has one section on "Sex-Role Oppression in the United States," run by a Radcliffe junior.

Alice Rossi has also made a good statement of the need for a course on sexuality in the context of Human Development. It is recorded in "Minutes of Kirkland Advisory Council," Meeting of March 20-21, 1967, pp. 28-32.

Born Female, op. cit., has a devastating chapter called "The Negro Parallel."
B. LIBRARY
Too often, the library is taken for granted in reports on educational policy in one area or another. Some of the recommendations in this report assume a collection of books and other material on the issues of sexuality, yet these would not normally be in a "standard" college library collection. Basic psychology texts such as Freud, Erikson, and Horney are standard, as are anthropological works such as Margaret Mead's and sociology primers including J. S. Mill, Parsons, Riesman, Ginzberg, and the like. Yet a librarian would have to make a conscious decision to enlarge parts of his collection in order to feed concentrated study on the psychology, sociology, and other faces of sexuality. Literature about the early feminist movement in America would be particularly hard to acquire. However, in this, Hampshire is fortunate to have Smith and Mount Holyoke nearby, for these colleges each have special collections of feminist material. Indeed, they might welcome their greater use. Enleaged, Hampshire might be responsible for buying recent materials such as psychological studies, feminist periodicals, Women's Bureau reports, papers from other colleges on coeducation, Radcliffe Institute publications, and writings by selected contemporary women scholars; while Smith and Mount Holyoke might supply older texts, documents relating to UN efforts for human rights, and international feminist movement publications.
These are merely suggestions, of course. All the Valley librarians naturally have alliances much in their minds, and a partnership in the area mentioned here would have to fit in with several others.

--The Hampshire librarian should be aware of the needs for material dealing with the issues of sexuality. He should begin to enlarge his collection in this area with a definite budget allocation. He should learn about his neighbors' resources in this subject-area and should develop Hampshire's in coordination with theirs.
c. Sex Ratio
The common ratio at both coordinate and coeducational colleges is 60:40: men:women. This has happened more out of convenience than intention, and seems comfortable to many. Since Hampshire has the chance to make its own decision, however, it should recognize two principal issues.

There is no reason to accept more men than women. In fact, this practice is usually a detriment at coeducational colleges. All of them have more female applicants than male. They can be doubly selective with the females, therefore, with the result that their women are better qualified than their men, causing both sexes some malaise.

About the only argument actively made for the 60:40 ratio is that it is good for dating. This argument seems ridiculous for Hampshire to consider. It assumes just those stereotyped roles Hampshire wants to place at issue by taking coeducation seriously, and at the same time helps to perpetuate them. It does not take into account the students' sophistication. It does not apply to the Valley environment: there are two women's colleges nearby, certainly, but the Valley ratio includes the greater numbers of men at the University of Massachusetts.

Perhaps, though, the dating argument really disguises an opinion that it is somehow more worthwhile to educate men than women. This is a more serious argument, but it, too, is merely
a self-fulfilling prophecy that needs challenging, in fact, demands challenging if Hampshire is to be thorough in its approach to coeducation. Women have always had less access to liberal arts colleges than men. Although the men's colleges that are accepting women must honor tradition by preserving this particular inequity, Hampshire, as a new college, can start with no strings attached to its sex ratio.

-Hampshire should try to approximate equality in its sex ratio, 50:50. There will usually be an imbalance, of course, owing to the uncertainties of the admissions process; in the interests of evening its students' qualifications, then, and recognizing the fewer places for women in other colleges, Hampshire should err on the side of accepting more women.

Anything below a 75:25 ratio actually is worse than separate education. Many educators have testified to this, Mary Bunting, Radcliffe's president, perhaps most clamorously, since Radcliffe girls form only 20% of Harvard's undergraduates. Stanford, too, has a low ratio of women to men that is troublesome: 30:70. The difficulties would be the same, of course, with a low ratio of men to women, just as they are with the low ratio of blacks to whites. Having so few of one group over-all at a college means that there will be only one or two in many classes, and these will tend to leave the class to the majority. Also, the majority
does not have the chance to see and work with the others very much and so cannot form reasonable opinions about them. Social pressures seesaw, those in small numbers have no privacy, and ballasting maneuvers become unwieldy. Interestingly, Princeton, Vassar, and Yale, which now plan coeducation, have decided to avoid a final ratio lower than 66:33 but are all going through transitions with much lower ratios. Whether or not their transition periods offer them a fair test of coeducation, therefore, is questionable.
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The Princeton report, op. cit., pp. 21-23 has an excellent section on the sex-ratio problem, although it goes into many more factors than Hampshire needs to do.


Although the fact that a number of men's colleges are now going coeducational will mean more places for women in absolute numbers, the unequal proportion of men to women attending colleges will not change.

Right now, an interesting case is going on in a Richmond Federal court. The American Civil Liberties Union of Virginia has charged that the University of Virginia discriminates against women in its admissions program. The University planned to admit women to its all-male college of arts and sciences by September, 1970, but the ACLU feels that there has been unreasonable delay and, also, that there is no guarantee that discrimination would end in all phases of admissions without a court order. The decision in this case may affect sex ratios in many other State colleges.
D. CATALOGUE
Whether Hampshire presents itself in a talking catalogue, a videotape, or an old-fashioned piece of paper, it should mention the principles behind educating men and women together. Most catalogues for coeducational colleges do not do this. Instead, they mention only the principles behind educating individuals. While these, of course, are the most important principles, they should not be arrived at without mentioning others. Individuality is not so simple. Oberlin's catalogue, for instance, includes a model statement. It speaks of the college's "belief in the right of all qualified students, regardless of sex, color or circumstance, to those opportunities for personal growth which a liberal education provides."

Hampshire's catalogue might have, in addition, a sentence such as this: "Hampshire believes that all students, black and white, male and female, of whatever religious or political creed, can learn most about themselves in an environment where open and personal discussion helps them to look beyond group characteristics to personal identity."

--Hampshire should make some statement including the principles of equal rights to opportunity and free choice of roles in its regular publicity.
E. ADMISSIONS
Qualifications

There are many characteristics that Hampshire will look for in its applicants, all of which are important. Usually, eagerness, fancy, friendliness, lucidity, and the like all count toward admission, along with a student's grades. From the point of view of coeducation, however, there is one characteristic that ought to be as important as any of the others, and that is a student's ability to contribute to, and gain from, Hampshire's ongoing concern with the issues of sexuality. As Kenneth Keniston points out, an institution's interests must depend on its students: "image" comes more from the students than from the college catalogue, and only if the students create in their own culture the "image" that Hampshire takes coeducation seriously will it be so. However, it will be much harder to find students who will enter into Hampshire's coeducational aims than it will be to find ones who will participate in its innovational or developmental schemes. No one has set out particularly to find such students, and so there are no criteria. The following recommendations do not establish criteria, by any means, but they do take a few forward steps.

Wherever possible, the admissions interview should explore the applicant's reasons for attending a coeducational college. The more sensitive and articulate a student is about the wide
range of arguments for coeducation, and few students are, the more likely it will be that he or she can contribute to Hampshire's ongoing concern with the issues of sexuality.

   --Hampshire should aim for students whose ideas of sex roles vary. Students are almost never explicit about this. The only way of guessing their ideas is to know their parents' lives, their extracurricular activities, and their academic interests. For example, a girl whose mother is a doctor and whose father is an artist is liable to have a different view of femininity than a girl whose mother is a housewife and whose father is a banker. A boy whose mother studies geology is liable to have a different view of masculinity than a boy who spent a summer on a geology field trip. Girls who want more than preparation for family life should come to Hampshire along with future mothers and housewives. And Hampshire should have boys who want to prepare for family life too, knowing that men are as much fathers as women are mothers. Girls who want to concentrate in the sciences and boys who want to learn more about languages should be favored on the grounds that their unconventional interests might come to consciousness and stir critiques of stereotypes about sex-linked academic abilities. Over-all, the same reasons for having racial diversity among students apply in favor of sex-role diversity. A variety of
ideas and habits in sex roles hopefully may stimulate discussion and finally encourage diversity commensurate with individual talents.

-Hampshire should admit older men and women as regular students. Of course, accommodation at Hampshire will be useful to such people, but even more important will be their own usefulness to the younger undergraduates. Both men and women students particularly need to see older women who are having to juggle their academic talents with motherhood. The older men can show students that men, too, face readjustments as they go through life, and that for them, too, new choices are possible. Besides serving as models in this way, the older men and women will be helpful in open discussions of sexuality. For one thing, they have much more experience. Frank talk with someone of the opposite sex who is older can be a helpful, often necessary, transition to talking just as frankly with someone one's own age. The older men and women Hampshire admits would have to be full-time students, since their worth depends partly on their being on the campus. "Full-time," of course, is not a literal expression in an academic community, but even so, not many older men or women will be able to apply, so that Hampshire could not possibly over-accept. The college should publicize its search thoroughly and take as many older applicants as it can find.
"Then as far as the guardianship of a state is concerned, there is no difference between the natures of the man and of the woman, but only various degrees of weakness and strength. . . . Then we shall have to select duly qualified women also, to share in the life and official labours of the duly qualified men; since we find that they are competent to the work, and of kindred nature with the men."

Plato

The Hampshire faculty may be one of the single most important elements in helping men and women learn together most constructively. Not just any faculty will do. Hampshire needs people who are aware of coeducation's special opportunities and want to use them. They must be willing to talk with students about subjects that to others may seem embarrassing. They must be open-minded about an individual's choice of sex role, just as they must be open-minded about ideas. They must be self-conscious about their own way of incorporating individuality with sexuality in order to share a sense of care in such choices with their students. Faculty who normally apply to coeducational colleges do not necessarily have these qualities. In fact, they are less likely to have them than faculty applying to separate colleges.
F. FACULTY
1. General Policy and Organization

--In hiring faculty, Hampshire should consider their motivation and ability to deal with the issues of sexuality. This recommendation will be hard to effect, both because most applicants will not have the qualifications mentioned above and because there are few ways to measure them. Thus, Hampshire must constantly prompt its faculty on the significance it gives to coeducation.

--The Dean of the Faculty should meet annually with the faculty to talk with them about their attention to the issues of sexuality in their classes and their counseling. The Dean cannot intend to govern exactly how and what his faculty teach, but he can and should intend to instruct his faculty to include the dimension of value over and above the dimensions of logic and information in their teaching. No faculty member nowadays would disagree. Few, however, remember that sexuality falls into that value dimension along with the more familiar values of Truth, Integrity, Mortality, and others. This is the point needing emphasis from the Dean.

--There should be a Committee on Coeducation to support faculty responsibility in this area. This committee, with full representation from both sexes and all divisions, should monitor
Hampshire's educational policies with respect to coeducation, as discussed in major sections of this report. In this committee, the faculty could discuss exactly how to incorporate materials relevant to sexuality in their classes; they could also entertain student suggestions. To give one example: a professor in a respected coeducational college has taught a seminar in autobiography for several years that includes no female autobiographers. Any literary scholar will say that there are several books by female autobiographers which ought to have been included solely on literary grounds. The point here is, however, that the professor should have known that a comparison between autobiographical works by men and women would have been a valuable, self-revealing exercise for his students. If his colleagues or students had told him this, no doubt he would have agreed; as it was, he stayed unaware. A Committee on Coeducation might have helped him. Some faculty members are not only unaware but ignorant of women's contributions in their field, though this is more true in certain disciplines than others. A Committee on Coeducation would also help them. Some faculty simply need to discuss the appropriateness of certain student reflexes to the issues of sexuality. A Committee on Coeducation would also help them. In the Hampshire hierarchy, this committee would be a sub-committee to the Curriculum Committee or its equivalent, whatever Hampshire has. It
would contribute to, but not determine, larger issues of educational policy. Probably, it would parallel the Committee on Human Development, although it is not even clear yet where the latter fits. The Committee on Coeducation might advise certain new courses other than those outlined here; it might make recommendations on faculty hiring. It might write a "white paper" or a bibliography from time to time. It might imagine research projects. It might sponsor seminars once in a while for faculty or students or both. It would play a large part in orientation. Its chairman should consider it his or her job to be aggressive. It should be as conspicuous as any other faculty committee, and as clever, in improving education at Hampshire.

2. Women Faculty

--Hampshire should set out to hire a significant number of women faculty. This is more important than any other recommendation in this report. If Hampshire succeeds at this, then all the other changes will succeed beyond anything possible through mere rhetoric and good intentions.

All educators, researchers, students, men and women alike, all writings and people consulted for this report agree that women faculty serve as role models for young men and women in college. They do so in exactly the same way as men faculty serve
as role models for both sexes, and the students' need for both is equally great. However, the need has not been met. One psychologist has remarked, "Women are looking agonizingly hard for exemplars who can give them clues to their own lives. They search harder than men, and have a much harder time finding appropriate ones." Although men do not need female paradigms for their own lives, they, too, need to see instances of the needs and life styles of women who might become their friends, colleagues, or wives. As one sample shows, women faculty are simply not available in enough numbers at most colleges. In 1964, only 22% of the faculty and other professional staffs in colleges were women. The proportion was higher in 1940 (28%), in 1930 (27%), in 1920 (26%), and in 1890 (27%). The coeducational colleges have a particular duty to hire substantial numbers of women faculty, since they serve women. The table on the following page shows the percentages of women faculty at selected coeducational colleges and universities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Faculty (M)</th>
<th>Number of Faculty (F)</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bard</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown-Pembroke</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell*</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard-Radcliffe**</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford**</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swarthmore</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara*</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>526</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania**</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison*</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University*</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooster</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* College of Arts and Sciences  
** Total University

These summary statistics show that the coeducational liberal arts colleges are ahead of the universities in hiring women faculty, but that none of the institutions has an adequate number.

This table does not show data that is even more important than the percentage of women faculty: that is, their rank. Colleges, even independent coeducational ones, discriminate against the few women they do hire. They bring them in at the
lowest ranks, as instructors and teaching assistants, and keep them there. Fewer women than men get tenure, and minimal numbers are department heads. Nepotism rules often require that women accept semester-by-semester appointments, a low salary, no voting privileges, and no rank assignment. There is usually a dual pay scale for men and women faculty, justified on the basis that men are primary breadwinners. In 1963-64, the median nine-month salary at colleges and universities was $8,342 for men and $6,940 for women. While median figures have severe limitations, they do point out discrepancies.

All of this adds up to some skewed feelings on the part of students and faculty alike about women's careers, a failure to capitalize on a real educational opportunity, and perverted scholarly values. It adds up to attitudes such as the one discovered in a notorious study at Connecticut College for Women. Two groups of sophomores were given the same journal article to read and judge. One group's article was signed "John McKay," the other, "Joan McKay." The students thought very well of "John's" article, but poorly of "Joan's."

If challenged to hire more women, the colleges' reflex is to say there are not enough who are qualified.

First, this is only partly true. About 11% of the Ph.D. group each year is female. The number has stayed remarkably
static, fluctuating only between 9% and 11% during the last twenty years. It climbed to 20%, however, during the war years, and the women who earned degrees then are still available now. Reduce this number by a large factor for marriage, since most women Ph.D.'s are married; and by a small number for poor qualifications, since the women who can persevere tend to be well motivated and bright; and it is true that there are only modest numbers of women whom colleges can hire without making any allowances at all. Another minus, of course, is that they may cluster in fields where there are also large numbers of men. Still, in absolute numbers, there are more women available and qualified for the best faculty posts each year than are hired. One bit of evidence for this is that, each year, the Seven Sister Colleges turn down female faculty applicants, not for lack of qualifications but for lack of openings, who do not turn up at other colleges of the same rank. If a college, through especially enlightened hiring policies and good publicity, gets an "image" for hiring women, as several colleges have poor images, word of mouth can pass quickly and women applicants appear from a seemingly vacant field.

The barrier to employment and promotion for women comes at the department chairman's level. The chairmen, inevitably male and generally more conservative than administrators because of
loyalty to their discipline rather than to wider educational aims, do not recruit enterprisingly for women or watch for chances to advance them. After a while, this carelessness begets a fierce circle, as women do not apply or even train for faculty positions. Chairmen run tight fiefdoms. If an administrator wants to break into this cycle, he can only do it through bribery: approving a departmental budget on condition that the chairman give tenure to a woman, or, in some cases, hire a Negro, has occasionally worked.

The other answer to give those who say there are not enough qualified women is to suggest that their definition of "qualified" needs mending. Alice Rossi, who has written extensively on women in academia, feels this is the most important issue: it applies for both men and women alike; and it certainly is one of the sorest points among administrators nowadays. Their students have asked them to hire faculty who are good teachers, not researchers. They have looked for support in troubled days and found their faculty off at conferences. They have been told that if they want truly creative and committed faculty, they should hire the dropouts from Ph.D. programs. Most of this last group are women.

Over ten years ago, Radcliffe published a report called Graduate Education for Women: The Radcliffe Ph.D. Among other
points, it told the reasons why women publish less than men.

It found that women are under less financial pressure to publish; that they have no one to help with the publication chores, as men have their wives; that they have small incentive, since publication does not bring them promotion; that, having to spend more of their non-working hours at home, they gain fewer of the social contacts that so often lead to publication; and that they are assigned heavier teaching loads and more extra duties than men, for when a college has very few women, it uses them on every occasion, exactly as happens with any "token" person in a group; many academic women testify to this. In another important book, Academic Women, Jessie Bernard reports that men tend to write in journals for a public audience, interpreting or applying their academic specialties as "experts," while women tend to publish in journals for their fields, collecting and criticizing ideas to make them more easily presentable to students.

There is no real system of equivalency in academia whereby teaching and administrative work can be esteemed as well as publication; whereby part-time work can be summed in full-time units for tenure consideration; whereby a woman's reading and writing done at home can count as much as a man's time in the classroom or office. As Elga Wasserman, director of Yale's new coeducational program, suggests, a woman teaching part-time during the week and studying at home in her "off"-time does as
much in the long run as a man who works for two years and then takes a year's sabbatical. Also, there is no reason a college could not hire two part-time women for one full-time slot; or a woman could be hired to teach one semester and do research during the other. All these points suggest that if colleges were to accept a medley of qualifications and juggle schedules somewhat, they would find many more "qualified" women faculty. They would find more "qualified" male, and perhaps Negro, faculty, too, and this would be all to the good. Hampshire has helped its chances a good deal here, by deciding against tenure.

Women should form no less than one third of Hampshire's total faculty. They should be brought in at all levels. At least one dean always should be a woman.

It will be hard to find women. It will take more hours, energy, and cash than finding men. The figures in the table above show that one third is a sizable goal. Hampshire would be attempting the unprecedented. However, this section has tried to show that women are there. Not only are they there, but the departures Hampshire might have to make from accepted hiring procedures to get them, along with unusual male faculty, such as artists and excellent Negroes, go right in the direction of its own announced innovational aims. If Hampshire truly wishes to provide the best educational environment for its men and women
together, hiring and promoting women faculty is one of the most important efforts it can make.

--Hampshire should hire women faculty who have a variety of life styles. The reasons for this recommendation are exactly the same as those made for admitting students with a variety of ideas about sex roles and for admitting older students: Hampshire students deserve many more kinds of models than academia usually offers. For instance, most older women faculty are unmarried and professionally oriented, largely because it was even harder for women to finish graduate school twenty-five years ago than now, and they had to lead a man's life to do it. Younger women faculty, however, are married, usually to men who also teach, sometimes to professional men, sometimes to artists or writers who do not work away from home. Sometimes they have children, sometimes they do not. Women with all these types of life styles should be represented at Hampshire, just as men with different life styles should be. Students can only make real choices about their own lives if they first see all the possibilities.

Hampshire is in a much better position to hire married women faculty than an isolated college would be, since the whole faculty "pool" in the Valley is large. There are many good arguments for not having wife and husband at the same institution, but the husbands of Hampshire's women faculty can find positions nearby. The effort to hire married pairs in which both work may
be the most tightly wound in red tape of any of Hampshire's projects since it has to do with the other colleges, but, in the end, it may also be one of the most important ways of achieving a real sense of community in the Valley, a commitment to a true "regional university" with public and private units that now seems so distant.

Already, Hampshire has hired about eight planning faculty for next year. Out of these and the deans already on campus, only one is a woman. By the recommendations, at least one dean, one lower-ranked person, and two or three regular planning faculty should be women. Already, then, the college can improve.
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I am not alone in finding unanimity on the need to hire more women faculty.

Almost without exception research summaries and recommendations include proposals for increasing female role models in the course of undergraduate education, and in particular, suggest the necessity for colleges to provide women faculty members who exemplify the realities of assuming both the professional and homemaker roles. (Leland and Lozoff, College Influences on the Role Development of Female Undergraduates, op. cit., p. 5)

The last part of this quotation bears out the third recommendation in my section 2.


An interesting sidelight on present inattention to hiring women at coeducational colleges is the situation at Princeton and Yale. In its report on coeducation, Princeton did not even mention the need to hire more women faculty when it brings in women. Yale, with only three tenured women faculty in the university, has no plans to expand the number of women appointed.

I have not thoroughly documented the fact that women are everywhere at low levels because the data can only be gotten from an extensive catalogue survey. However, the fact is
parallel to women's low position in every other job category, as seen in Labor Department statistics. Any academic person's own experience or any random catalogue check can verify it. The figures I have on median salary come from Ray C. Maul, "More Women as College Teachers," *Women's Education*, III, 2 (June, 1964), pp. 2-7. A study on nepotism was done by Rita Simon, Shirley Clark, Laurence Tifft, "Of Nepotism, Marriage and the Pursual of an Academic Career," Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1965. One particularly interesting study is Alan E. Bayer and Helen S. Astin, "Sex Differences in Academic Rank and Salary Among Science Doctorates in Teaching," *Journal of Human Resources*, III, 2 (Spring, 1968), pp. 191-200. This shows women in a more favorable position than often recorded, although the small sample did not justify conclusions. The authors make a distinction, though, between the recognition women earn through academic title or position and through salary. Apparently, women in their group more often suffered salary discrimination than discrimination regarding tenure or promotion.

The study at Connecticut College is cited in *Token Learning*, op. cit., p. 24.

Data on the numbers of women doctorates are in *U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the U.S.* (89th edn.; Washington, D.C., 1968); the *Statistical Abstract* for earlier

The only case in which students have made the connection between the universities' need for more and better teaching faculty and women was in the Marlene Dixon case at Chicago last year.

Graduate Education for Women: The Radcliffe Ph.D., a Report by a Faculty-Trustee Committee (Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press, 1956).


An interesting case has just been decided in the Supreme Court. The Court ruled unanimously that the Montgomery, Alabama, school system should be required to fully correct racial segregation by assuring the same ratio of white to Negro teachers in each school, about 3:2, as exists in the school system as a whole (The New York Times, June 3, 1969, p. 18). While this has absolutely no legal relation to the question of male and female faculty in private colleges, it shows that a "quota" approach is sometimes justified. There are very few cases when quality and quantity depend on each other, but the case with women faculty, as with Negroes, is one of the few.
G. COUNSELING
"Heath suggests--from intensive study of a small sample of Princeton students--that college experience leads toward better integrated and more effective ego-functioning for all personality types. The Mellon Foundation studies, on the other hand, indicate that Vassar students progress from well-organized and well-adjusted freshman innocence to an unstable, confused, frustrated, anxious and unsettled state."

Martin Katz

Perhaps "counseling" should not have this exclusive section. It is separate too much of the time. A better perspective would be to see that this entire report is about counseling. However, there are some facts and ideas to set down here that have to do with career counseling, specifically. They are not quite appropriate for other pages of this report but they are plainly related.

1. Themes

Career counseling for women first must be familiar with the sociology of working life. In this country, women form about one third of the labor force; the same as in Britain, France, and Germany; more than in Belgium, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Italy; but less than Denmark. The pattern of employment here has the great majority of women at the lower
levels. Of our lawyers, only 3% are women, whereas in Denmark 50% of the law students are female, in the U.S.S.R. the number is 36%, and in Germany, almost 33%. In 1967, 7.5% of the graduates from medical school here were women, compared with 30% in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, 30% in Germany, 20% in the Netherlands, 25% in Britain, 22.5% in Israel. Countries that share a low percentage with us are the Moslem countries, where the tradition of purdah is still in force, Spain, where women are also traditionally cloistered, and Japan, whose universities did not admit women under the Imperial Government. This is embarrassing company. In other professional occupations here, women are only .6% of the engineers, 3.9% of the accountants, 8.4% of the pharmacists, and so on. This contrasts with too many foreign statistics to mention. Other facts about American working women were included in Chapter III. All in all, the picture is dismal.

What should be done? Perhaps the term "career counseling" seems to be in itself a recommendation that women should be up and out in the world, righting all the wrong percentages. Not at all. The idea of career counseling raises many questions, and this section will attempt to show what they are.

Women's careers usually meet "sexism." "Sex discrimination is a serious matter," Clifford Alexander, former chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, has stated. "Women are
seriously underutilized in many top management and professional jobs." And Caroline Bird records this ironic story.

A foreign visitor noticed that workers on electronic circuits in a factory were all women. "It's close work, and women have the finger dexterity for it," the visitor was told. Later on in her tour she visited a medical school class in brain surgery and remarked that the students were all men. "But they've got to be men," the answer came. "Brain surgery takes a steady hand!"

Many women do not want careers. As an article by Ellen and Kenneth Keniston argues, most American women have anachronistic views of themselves and work. They still think of work as it began for women in the early industrial period: a hard necessity that took them away from family life. Also, they learn about femininity from their mothers and fathers: the lesson is so strong that Victorian sex roles have been transmitted now for three generations. The schools reinforce the parents' teachings, so that adolescence, which usually allows people a second chance, is no help. And American women still think that it will be bad for their children if they work, despite much evidence to the contrary.

There are many reasons why women should not have careers. In her "Epilogue" to American Women: The Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, Margaret Mead took this point of view somewhat, sharply in conflict with most of the Commission members. She pointed out that women do not need to copy the role
and status of the successful male. Soon, not more but fewer workers will be wanted in the general labor market; however, the need for domestic workers will increase, and domestic work has its advantages, even on businesslike grounds.

American women have become the heritors of the American dream of "being one's own boss," once the prized possession of men. Within a well-equipped, independent house, in the management of which only her husband and children can help, advise, or interfere, the married homemaker is indeed her own boss. She determines the time and the order in which she will do her work and how well she will do it. The work itself has the diversity and the interest that are associated with running one's own business. . . . The home, as it is constituted for the millions of women who can afford to stay in it while their children are young, has areas of freedom that are almost wholly lacking in much American employment.

She reproached our cultural sense that fulfillment means work for money, but added that since this is the case, perhaps homemaking should be valued at more than a $600 tax deduction. She flouted the axiom that marriage and parenthood should never be sacrificed by making a strong case for women who wish to remain unmarried or childless. She concluded that the current trend toward pushing women into the triple roles of wife, mother, and worker may be only another "swing of the pendulum" in society's attitude toward sex roles.

Women may not listen to advice about careers. So much of a girl's attitude about her role comes from her home; studies show, that only if there have been divisions between her and
Career counseling for women at a college, then, must cope with "sexism," questions about its own goals, and gaps in its effectiveness.

Yet, against these qualms, there is a case in favor of career counseling. After all, educational institutions have a responsibility to at least dent the carapace of childhood conditioning so that students think of imagining other options. As two psychologists say, "The choice of family life" most women make can hardly be said to be 'free' in the psychological sense." Also, women's right to work must be ensured in our society, and only iron-minded women who go to work, organize, and goad employers can secure this right. Statistics say that the more education a woman has, the more likely she is to work. Top educational institutions, then, can capitalize on this and make their women the movers and changers. Most persuasive, perhaps, is the fact that technology and the pattern of child-raising in our society decree a long period of inactivity to women who would like to be homemakers. According to present life expectancy, women may spend twenty-five years or longer without their children. It is hard to think of any rearrangement in our society that would give them some activity during that surprisingly large piece of time other than a career.
Hampshire should plan career counseling for its women. The counsel should begin at the beginning, however, by examining its own assumptions about women's need for a career.

The most important stereotypes strait-jacketing men and women's relations with one another have to do with careers. This should be clear not only from personal experience, but also from the description of attitudes in Chapter V and other sections. So, it is most important that men and women talk about careers together. Separate attention to men and women in this crucial area would miss the main point, which is how to allow for the other sex. Although this report goes on to discuss career themes close to women's experience, they are shown to be important to men also.

Career counseling for women at Hampshire should always involve the men also.

There are three kinds of advice usually given to women about careers that this report will now cover in more detail. First, women are advised about jobs, not careers. Counselors do not urge women to plan far ahead, to see their first job as the fruition of their personal interest through college and one of a series of training exercises towards final qualification as a professional. A career, after all, is not just a way of making money; it is a commitment that one pursues for its own sake and can be considered a privilege. As Margaret Mead says,
"The failure to distinguish between job and career in the case of women is merely a special case of the more general failure to do so in our entire society." Thus, men can benefit from a changed emphasis in career counseling as well as women. If the type of planning suggested here sounds like narrow professionalism, it should not. Rather, the point is for an individual to take vocational goals seriously in his own personal development and to help him look at his actions in a long time-frame, a sight few college students today have.

—Hampshire's career counseling should emphasize long-term commitment and planning. It should begin in a student's first or second year.

Second, women are told that they can interrupt their work. This really is a corollary of the "job" rather than "career" approach to work. Women supposedly may work after college, leave the office for twenty years or so to marry and raise a family, then take a "Continuing Education" course and become a worker again. This may be a useful scheme in lower-level jobs and may even succeed in higher-level ones if the retraining is good, but, basically, it is impractical. No man would suppose he could leave his law practice for twenty years and return to it satisfactorily. Alice Rossi makes several important points in her essay "Barriers to the Career Choice of Engineering, Medicine,
or Science Among American Women" that apply to women in all professional careers.

Part-time employment is this generation's false panacea for avoiding a more basic change in the relations between men and women, a means whereby, with practically no change in the man's role and minimal change in the woman's, she can continue the same wife and mother she has been in the past, with a minor appendage to these roles as an intermittent part-time professional or clerical worker.

I think there is a danger that centers for continuing education institutionalize and lend further social pressure to the acceptance of the woman's withdrawal for a number of years, a pattern that should not be widely or uncritically accepted. . . . The most creative work women and men have done in science was completed during the very years contemporary women are urged to remain at home rearing their families.

Older women who return to the labor force are an important reservoir for assistants and technicians and the less demanding professions, but only rarely for creative and original contributors to the more demanding professional fields.

--Career counseling at Hampshire should further emphasize long-term commitment and planning by critically examining all types of work patterns. Women should not be misled into thinking that they may have both marriage and a career in simple alternation.

Third, women are often instructed to go into "women's work." The best debunking of the notion of "women's work" was done by J. S. Mill a very long time ago, but it still persists, an ideological weed. No less a notable than Bruno Bettelheim can write that the service occupations are more suitable for women
than men. Yet psychological studies show that women do not differ much from men in their reasons for choosing careers, one indication of their needs for similar ones. Actually, the career a woman chooses seems to depend less on her sex than on the strength of her sex-role conditioning. One study concludes:

Women who most accept stereotyped statements on the proper role of women express a preference for traditional careers and those who accept these statements least tend to prefer less traditional career patterns. Women who are most stereotyped in their beliefs and most traditional in their occupational preferences tend to share the opinion that a woman's place is only in the home.

In addition to being predictable, "women's work" often turns out to be wherever there are job shortages, either because the work is cheap or dull or a dead end.

--Career counseling at Hampshire should lead both women and men to consider whatever kinds of work fit their individual talents, without regard to their sex.

2. Mechanisms

Career counseling is not particularly effective at any college. Usually, it stands too far apart. As Bettelhim says, "One trouble with most outside counseling . . . is that it itself is not familiar with the subtleties of the sociology of intellectual life, within the institution." However, Hampshire is supposed to
be a college where the usual breakdowns between students' personal, academic, and vocational interests do not occur. Already, there are plans to mix varieties of counseling into the regular educational scheme. Career counseling presumably is only one of these, but since it has not yet been specifically mentioned, this report will suggest how it might fit.

--The over-all responsibility for career counseling for women at Hampshire should be with a woman faculty member, perhaps the chairman, of the Committee on Coeducation. As a faculty member, she would know more than an outsider about the place of counseling in academic life. She would make it part of the regular agenda for the Committee on Coeducation. That is, she would constantly plan ways for the faculty to attend to it in their classes, readings, and field assignments. She would consider places for career emphasis at orientation and all other evalulative times outside the regular academic program. She would coordinate other faculty members, principally members of the Committee on Human Development and the residential faculty, who may be one and the same, in their counseling for women. She would also work closely with the resident psychologist.

--One principal mechanism for career counseling for women should be a series of small, seminar-like sessions lasting for one or two days and with opportunities for private consultation
with professional women who are invited to the campus. These women should be well known in their fields, yet knowledgeable and sympathetic enough about college women's uncertainties to speak practically and personally about their professions. Women with these qualities are not easy to find; all too often those who succeed have no care for guiding younger women. The sessions should be arranged so as to have both younger and older students attending. They should be open to both men and women. Frequently, as a matter of fact, wife and husband teams should be invited to speak jointly.

An additional mechanism should be one or two conferences a year with a small group of professional men who are leading employers. The Hampshire women should be able to debate them on women's chances in their field, to ask them about any peculiar values that work in their field enforces, and to ask about changes in their field. These conferences would obviously be useful to both men and women students; they also would be useful to the professional men. They would give a much more stimulating exposure to any vocation than a student can get through a recruiter.

Perhaps there are other ways these professional men and women can be useful than the ones suggested here: it is only essential to have them at Hampshire, talking to and fro.
A third mechanism should be special arrangements for talks among the students themselves, both men and women. Nowadays, many students work during college, but they often do not talk much about it with other students. That is a loss to the others, and perhaps to them, too, for if they do not consciously connect their thoughts about work to others' career choices, they may miss the significance to themselves. The Student Committee on Coeducation might be the sponsor for several such talks.

There should be one or two workshops a year dealing with labor relations. The content would not be historical, but organizational. Students should know their working rights and how to assure them. The emphasis would be on organizing to obtain women's working rights, but the basic equal employment laws and techniques for organizing are often just as foreign to young men as they are to young women. Traditionally, of course, labor organization has occurred among blue-collar workers, but, increasingly, white-collar and professional workers find themselves in opposition to their employers, with no inkling of what to do about it. Even as an academic subject, this would be breaking new ground, but the women students, particularly, need to know it for practical reasons.
Physically, there should be some separate spot at Hampshire where brochures, catalogues, job lists, and all the other paraphernalia of employment would stay and where interviewers would come. Fundamentally, however, direct career counseling for women at Hampshire should be integrated as much as possible into the educational program as a faculty duty.

The indirect aspects of career counseling involve, of course, all the efforts to provide models that this report recommends throughout.
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H. ADMINISTRATION
1. Administrative Personnel

Hampshire will be as Hampshire does. No college can boast attention to women's needs unless it has women at all of its levels. Administrative women serve as role models and as spokeswomen for women's needs just as women faculty do, though perhaps less directly.

---Hampshire should have a significant number of women in high administrative posts. At the moment, the college has only one woman in such a post, and no openings for more. This is not adequate.

Dean's Office

Most coeducational liberal arts colleges have Dean's Offices for handling student affairs. They invariably have a male "Dean of Students," sometimes with a male "Dean of Men" and a female "Dean of Women" assisting him or one female "Assistant Dean" if the college is smaller. In coeducational university colleges, the male "Dean of Students" may have no "Dean of Men" and "Dean of Women" under him but three or four assistants, one of whom is a woman. Hampshire so far has no Dean's Office, and may not be planning one. It may want to handle all student affairs through the Dean of the Faculty's Office and in the houses. The recommendations that follow under this heading apply only if Hampshire does establish a Dean's Office.
--Hampshire should have a Dean of Students of either sex with assistants of either sex but no Dean of Men and Dean of Women. These latter titles only aggravate stereotypes. The jobs themselves are vestiges of the past, made for reasons that no longer apply. The only essential is to have both men and women with equal status for the students to consult.

--Hampshire should bring in a woman as its first Dean of Students. It should do this both to counter the stereotype of a male dean immediately and because it desperately needs women administrators. However, with time and other personnel changes, the job hopefully would change freely between men and women.

Admissions Office

Most coeducational colleges have all-male admissions staffs. In cases where there are females, they are never the directors, but assistants. There is no good reason for this, and none offered. It is a simple case of discrimination by stereotype. Yet it could not happen in a worse part of the administration, because admissions personnel are the first link between a college and its students. Hampshire should break away from stereotypes with its admissions staff as the first step in its treatment of sexuality on campus.

--Hampshire should have women in its Admissions Office. There is now one part-time female assistant. As the job grows,
a woman should be hired as a full-time assistant or, preferably, Co-Director of Admissions. Over time, the position of Admissions Director at Hampshire should change freely between the sexes if it is not held jointly by a man and a woman.

**Vocational Office**

It is hard to find data on the sex of vocational guidance personnel in coeducational colleges since catalogues frequently do not show it as a separate administrative position. Where it is shown, the sexes vary. This is gratuitous information here, however, since this report recommends in another section that Hampshire not have a separate vocational office. As with war and generals, careers are too important and complex to leave to one office's care alone. There is, however, one recommendation to make here about a vocational practice that will go on at Hampshire at separate, standardized times and places: job recruitment.

---Job recruiters who come to Hampshire should be required to interview women for whatever jobs they interview men for, and vice-versa. As a matter of fact, any other requirement probably would be judged discriminatory if if came before the EEOC: there is more discussion of non-discriminatory policies at Hampshire below. And it would be a novel way of keeping the ROTC recruiters away. Positively, however, requiring this will be another way
in which Hampshire can publicly commit itself to individual choice, free of external limitations on the basis of sex.

2. Other Personnel

--Hampshire should have significant numbers of women among its trustees and all other lesser advisory groups in separate areas. "Significant numbers" does not mean one or two women in each case, as the representation is now, but from about one third to one half of the total members.

3. Degree Requirements

--Hampshire should allow its women students who marry to satisfy requirements for its degree at another college. This would be helpful to those women who must follow their husbands to some other place but still want a Hampshire degree. Currently, not many colleges, even separate ones, permit this. Of course, the same might be done for men, but they seldom need help in this way, since they usually transfer in order to get another degree. Hampshire could show its good faith by allowing special flexibility in the degree requirements for women.
4. Employment Policies

**Equal Employment**

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the equal employment title, prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex. This title does not apply to colleges and universities; Hampshire, however, should act as if it does.

--Hampshire should not discriminate on the basis of sex in any of its employment policies. What does this mean? It means hiring men as secretaries and women as maintenance personnel if they apply with the necessary skills. Some employers have set sex as a qualification for certain jobs; furthermore, for females, they have sometimes set marital status as a qualification too. Airlines, for instance, required that flight attendants be unmarried females. The EEOC ruled that this was unwarranted. And some of the reasons for assigning jobs to only one sex or the other are a good deal more ridiculous than the airlines'. Non-discrimination means equal pay for equal work. Many employers have a dual pay scale; the reason, they explain, is that women take sick leave more often than men and quit more frequently. They do not. There have been thorough investigations of these claims and, as one report says, "The Bureau of Labor Statistics concludes that absenteeism and turnover rates depend much more
on the nature of the job than on the sex of the job-holder." Nondiscrimination means equal fringe benefits. Pension plans often slant against women; many institutional life insurance plans have larger pay-offs for men than women and smaller ones for widowers than widows. Nondiscrimination means a careful review of all employment policies so that they will mean the same when the word "female" is substituted for "male" and vice-versa.

... But there is no reason why nondiscrimination has to be worrisome and watchful when it could be free and bold. Think of the next recommendation as an instance.

Day Care Center

A working woman's largest cost is for child care. Often, the single reason a woman does not have a job is that it does not quite pay enough to cover baby-sitters' fees. Despite the fact that child care is a business expense for working women as legitimate as those that men write off on their tax sheets, they may not claim a deduction for it. As well as being costly, child care is hard to find. Many communities do not have anywhere near adequate facilities.

--Hampshire should provide a day care center for the children of all its female personnel: students, faculty, administrators,
secretaries, janitresses. This is by no means a discriminatory recommendation. It merely suggests that women should have the same facility at Hampshire as men have at home. Establishing a day care center would profit Hampshire in large ways that at first are not obvious. It would attract many well-qualified women at all levels, a recruitment device nonpareil. Since it could be set up in the house system, it would add greatly to the sense of community: children, like old and young people, men and women, workers and learners, belong to the natural communal group. Both men and women students would learn much about themselves and each other by caring for the children, which they could do as volunteers or for course work so that the cost to the college would be minimal. More practically, the center would give them a sense of alternative arrangements for their own working and child-rearing lives. Once more, Hampshire would be making a symbolic commitment to free attitudes on the issues of sexuality. The center would at once be innovational, practical, and moral.
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I. RESIDENTIAL PLAN
1. Residential Integration

The latest idea in campus housing is the bisexual dormitory. These happen to be cheap, since they use less space, but they are also politic, since they satisfy student demand for parietal freedom.

So far, experience with integrated housing has been limited. Stanford and the University of Rochester are among those that have tried it for a few years now. In both these cases, however, the actual integration is not thorough. At Stanford, men and women live in the same buildings but have separate entrances. The corridors are divided by swinging doors that can be locked. There are visitation rules. At Rochester, men and women live on separate floors of the same buildings. Visitation is open, but can be limited by a 75% vote of floor members. Both Stanford and Rochester have separate housing available also. At Rochester, only juniors and seniors may live in the integrated Towers. In Europe, many students live in groups in apartments near universities, or, in some cases, in university housing with men rooming next to women. The off-campus "communes" vary from sharing everything, including beds, to sharing only expenses. In university housing, the showers and toilets are segregated and there are rules against all-night visitation. However, in most cases, the universities still provide separate housing. The main difference between
Europe and America on this score is simply that European universities have never tried as much to act in loco parentis and so allow their students to live as they please.

The question of what effect integrated or separate housing has on women in particular is still open. There are various opinions. One psychiatrist, Dr. Ann Ulanov, believes that girls fear being "left out" more than boys do. They hurry into integrated situations as fast as possible, but then are never able to stand apart, and cannot develop as individuals. Women need help to grow independently, Dr. Ulanov thinks, and should be required to live in separate dormitories. Some women students agree with this, saying that they like, even depend on, chances for privacy, and perhaps this is why they have tolerated restrictions: most coeducational colleges have had stricter visitation rules for the women's houses than the men's, giving no better reason than conventional protectiveness, yet the women accepted it until only recently. David McClelland, another psychologist, also believes in separate housing, but from a different angle. He feels that women care more than men about "control of access" in their residences and should be given the chance to make formal visitation rules, a job they tend to like doing. He also believes women naturally like to make their living quarters hospitable, whereas men do not care, so that women should have nicer rooms, with
cooking facilities. Still another point of view supporting separate housing is that the younger students would not be able to cope with it. There would particularly be a problem in mixing freshmen boys with upperclass girls.

Against these points, some psychiatrists feel that integrated housing helps men and women to drop preconceptions about each other and develop real friendships. Women students say that this brings a healthier attitude toward sex. A girl who moved from the Yale graduate school to a Berlin university is quoted as saying, "It seems that people here are not so ready to possess you as a commodity . . . I find the New England situation quite dreadful . . . There, men view women as a weekend pleasure, an accessory. You meet men on weekends for a special, romantic time, not to live or work together." This woman would be interested to know that Yale's Kingman Brewster, speaking at a Radcliffe conference, said, "I think we have learned from Stanford, from the state universities, from the universities abroad, that at least the option of a greater degree of integration in residential arrangements is more normal, less frenetic, more conducive to a more moral relationship between the sexes than is this self-conscious segregation." This is the same argument used to justify coeducation, of course, carried to its next degree. Gardner Patterson, who chaired Princeton's committee on coeducation, makes a slightly
different kind of justification.

In terms of being a model of what an indulgently free society is, I think the university ought to lead. And I say "indulgently free" because I think that if our main business is in the discovery of knowledge, as well as in the training of students to be capable of having convictions that are really their own, we have to stick with the notion of taking in stride the risks of more freedom than would be tolerated in almost any other form of institution.

As to the "risks," there is some evidence, though not statistically significant, that colleges experimenting with integrated housing have found more problems with sex in the separate units than in the integrated ones.

Robert Birney's report on the House Plan at Hampshire describes the houses as small models of communal living. Surely, if this plan is to be followed it would demand integrated houses. Men's and women's shared responsibilities are an essential part of any living arrangement pretending community.

It is interesting to compare the debate over separate and integrated housing for men and women with that over housing for Negroes and whites. A college that establishes separate Negro dormitories may violate Federal law; yet colleges freely establish separate women's dormitories. The analogy works in many ways. There are the same issues of habit, fellow-feeling, privacy, dignity, and choice. In the main, officials have strongly urged integration between Negroes and whites, although allowing some separatism.
Some opinion leaders, trying to escape the choice between uni- or bi-sexual dormitories, have advised having apartments instead. This puts the emphasis on smaller communal groupings and at least solves tactical questions of toilet facilities, but it does not meet the basic dilemma. And Hampshire's dormitory designs rule out apartments, although they might be considered for future residences.

Finally, in questions where two opposing sides have equally strong arguments, and where individuals are involved intimately, the only resolution is to satisfy both. To quote Gardner Patterson again: "We found that the critical things in residential arrangements now seems to be to provide a wide range of choice."

--Hampshire should begin with one residential unit for men, one for women, and one for both sexes. Since the entire basis of this report is that Hampshire should prepare its students to make choices, this recommendation is the only one that will serve. Although full integration would mean men living next door to women, this will not fit with Hampshire's building plan, so that floor-by-floor integration will have to suffice. The designs for other buildings in future years, however, could be different. Within both the separate and the integrated units, students should be allowed to work out their own parietal rules. There should be no restriction on the age of students in the integrated unit.
Students should be given a choice, upon admission, between separate or integrated housing; since the choices probably will not match the number of places, reassignment can be arbitrary. After a year, students should be allowed to transfer as freely as possible within the space limitations. As the college grows and adds houses, there should be continued debate as to whether they will be integrated or separate.

2. Residential Organization

Mistresses

--Hampshire should place women as well as men in charge of residential units. This report has already discussed the importance of having women at all levels in the college structure. The House Plan is included, especially since it aims to create a model society. Single women and married women, the latter with husbands who teach, or work nearby, or work at home: these should be the Mistresses of the houses to match the Masters. In one case, perhaps, Hampshire might want to have a single man and a single woman as co-heads of a house. Naturally, Hampshire cannot plan on a large scale for only 300 students in 1970. However, if this report's recommendations apply, there will be three kinds of residential units. The head of at least one of these should be a woman.
Student Committee on Coeducation

--The students should form their own Committee on Coeducation. It should be composed of house representatives. Eventually, perhaps, each house would have its own sub-committee on coeducation. This is a logical scheme, since presumably all student activities will center around the houses, and the coeducational house will be an ideal forum for discussing the aims of coeducation. The student committee would not be a social committee, although it might want to affect the entertainment program at some points. Its job would be to aid the application of coeducational aims to all aspects of Hampshire life. Thus, it would parallel the faculty Committee on Coeducation, and would do many of the same things, including attend to career counseling. The two committees would have some joint meetings and might want to make a few joint decisions, but it is important for each one to have autonomy so as to act freely with their different constituencies and to pull or push the other out of its status quo.

Married Students

--Hampshire should provide some housing on campus for married students. This is a long-term recommendation. Hampshire has not designed housing for married students because it cannot afford that now. But in keeping with the recommendation for variety and
open discussion about sex roles, it should have its married
students on campus when it is possible. In the interim, married
students should belong to one residential unit and take full
part in its activities.
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J. EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES
Most of the subjects that might fall under this heading have been mentioned in the section on residential plans. There are just a few recommendations remaining.

**Campus Activities**

It would not add to the climate this report seeks to create if the men and women split into different groups on a college newspaper, radio or film club, chess team, or the like. Men dominate these activities on most coeducational campuses, and the exceptions are called "tokenist." Of course, there are two unknowns about the Hampshire situation: how much students will go to the other four campuses in the Valley for these activities; and how many of them will be established within the houses rather than campus-wide. However, if there are campus-wide activities at Hampshire, there should be free competition between men and women for the leading positions, and as much discussion encouraged about the competitive role here as about the intellectual role in the classroom. Men's and women's enclaves may spring up and settle again on students' whim, but these should not be structured as the normal pattern.

--Hampshire should encourage joint participation in all its campus activities.
Athletics

Hampshire's plans for athletics are not clear yet. Perhaps the college will have to go as far as building its own hockey rink; perhaps it can leave its athletic program altogether to the surrounding colleges.

--If Hampshire does establish an athletic program on its own campus, it should emphasize sports that men and women can play together.

Speakers

--Hampshire should try to make sure that a significant number of women speakers come to the campus each year, whatever the event or subject. In cases where men are invited who have wives with expertise in any field, the wives also should be used in some way. This is the kind of oversight the two Committees on Coeducation could exercise. Although it may seem picayune, it is just this sort of attention in day-to-day matters that may culminate in a new atmosphere for coeducation at Hampshire.

Special Events

There are a number of feminist groups that could bear hearing at Hampshire. Some are radical, such as the Women's Liberation Movement and the Women's International Terrorists Corps from Hell; some are more moderate, such as the National Organization for Women; and some have public sanction, such as each state's Commission on the Status of Women. They all welcome an audience.

--Hampshire should sponsor a program with presentations and debate among various feminist groups and perhaps academics
K. PRIZES, AWARDS, HONORS
The time when Hampshire can make special awards to students and friends seems only a day in a crystal ball. Yet even this now-fancied ceremony will necessitate some attention to sex. Will there be some separate awards for men and women or only ones for either? Existing coeducational colleges have both, since donors give both. For instance, there are Joseph Smith awards for the men with the greatest leadership qualities, Mary Jones awards for the women with the highest academic average, and XYZ awards for anyone who shows the most promise for a teaching career. Hampshire, however, is new, and could choose, if it wanted, to refuse donors on the basis of a particular policy. Perfect equity would suggest that all awards be available for either sex; yet women, particularly, could gain from special incentives in separate awards.

---Hampshire should have some separate and some joint prizes, awards, and honors. That is, the college should allow donors to establish three kinds of awards. It should discourage an imbalance among them. If donors should give only one kind, by chance, Hampshire should actively encourage gifts of the other kinds. The college also should discourage awards that tend to perpetuate sex-role stereotypes. For instance, there should not be awards for the most popular woman senior and the most brilliant male science student; rather, there should be awards for the
brightest woman and the brightest man, an award for any student who makes a unique proposal for Hampshire's educational policies, and so forth. All this is so uncertain, so dependent on outsiders, that no thorough advance scheme would make sense. However, some forewarning always makes the unpredictable feel more at home.
I. COOPERATION
Hampshire is fortunate to have Smith, Amherst, Mount Holyoke, and the University of Massachusetts for its sponsors, and they are lucky in their protégée. Hopefully, cooperation will turn into integration as the years run. There are many ways in which the five can help each other, even quite a few relating only to the issues of this report. Several of the latter stand out in particular. These have to do with faculty hiring, counseling, the curriculum, and the library. All of these deserve allied attention quite quickly.

—Hampshire should keep its neighbors informed about its actions related to this report's recommendations, and should cooperate with them particularly in the areas of faculty hiring, counseling, the curriculum, and the library.
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION
The recommendations in this report scatter among many parts of the Hampshire program. They are not supposed to be discrete, however. Some are more important than others, but they should not be set apart. Expense is no obstacle to any one of them alone, nor is effort, and, in the end, the ease of effecting them will be cumulative. All this follows from the report's concern with educational gestalt. When advice is meant for some material result, it can be sorted and divided, but when it aims to create an attitude, then it should be taken as a package.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
GENERAL POLICY

--Generally, men and women should be educated in the same way. They should only be educated differently in cases where sex differences have hitherto been emphasized at the expense of individuality.

--Both sexes should be made aware of the issues of sexuality as an important part of self-knowledge.

A. CURRICULUM

Separation in the Curriculum

--All courses should be for both men and women.

--Women should be encouraged to diversify in their choice of courses.

Additions to the Curriculum

--Every possible course should include material relevant to the issues of sexuality.

--There should be a handful of courses whose primary content has to do with sexuality.

--Each year, one of the seminars on Human Development in Division I should deal with the issues of sexuality.
--There should be a three-unit course on Equal Rights that
would include a unit on Women.

--Any student should be able to build his or her "major"
around the theme of sexuality.

--One faculty member's time should be pliant enough to accommodate
any student request for a special course in this area.

Sex Information

--Hampshire should let students take the initiative in this
area.

B. LIBRARY

--The Hampshire librarian should be aware of the needs for
material dealing with the issues of sexuality. He should
begin to enlarge his collection in this area with a definite
budget allocation. He should learn about his neighbors' re-
sources in this subject area and should develop Hampshire's
connection with theirs.

C. SEX RATIO

--Hampshire should try to approximate equality in its sex
ratio, 50:50::men:women.

--Hampshire should keep within the limits of 50:50-33:66:
::men:women.
D. CATALOGUE

--Hampshire should make some statement including the principles of equal rights to opportunity and free choice of roles in its regular publicity.

E. ADMISSIONS

Qualifications

--Whenever possible, the admissions interview should explore the applicant's reasons for attending a coeducational college.

--Hampshire should aim for students whose ideas of sex roles vary.

Special Students

--Hampshire should admit older men and women as regular students.

--Hampshire should accept married students.

F. FACULTY

--In hiring faculty, Hampshire should consider their motivation and ability to deal with the issues of sexuality.

--The Dean of the Faculty should meet annually with the faculty to talk with them about their attention to these issues in their classes and their counseling.
--There should be a Committee on Coeducation to support faculty responsibility in this area.

Women Faculty

--Hampshire should set out to hire a significant number of women faculty.

--Women should form no less than one third of Hampshire's total faculty. They should be brought in at all levels. At least one dean should always be a woman.

--Hampshire should hire women faculty who have a variety of life styles.

G. COUNSELING

Themes

--Hampshire should plan career counseling for its women. The counsel should begin at the beginning, however, by examining its own assumptions about women's need for a career.

--Career counseling for women at Hampshire should always involve men also.

--Counseling should emphasize long-term commitment and planning. It should begin in a student's first or second year.
Counseling should further emphasize the long-term by critically examining all types of work patterns.

Counseling should lead both women and men to consider whatever kinds of work fit their individual talents, without regard to their sex.

Mechanisms

The over-all responsibility for career counseling for women at Hampshire should be with a woman faculty member, perhaps the chairman, of the Committee on Coeducation.

One principal mechanism for counseling should be a series of small, seminar-like sessions with professional women.

Additionally, there should be one or two conferences a year with a small group of professional men who are leading employers.

A third mechanism should be special arrangements for talks among the students themselves.

There should be one or two workshops a year dealing with labor relations.
H. ADMINISTRATION

Administrative Personnel

--Hampshire should have a significant number of women in high administrative posts.

Dean's Office

--If Hampshire has a Dean's Office to handle student affairs, it should have a Dean of Students of either sex with assistants of either sex but no Dean of Men and Dean of Women.

--If Hampshire has a Dean's Office, it should bring in a woman as its first Dean of Students.

Admissions Office

--Hampshire should have women in its Admissions Office.

Vocational Office

--Job recruiters who come to Hampshire should be required to interview women for whatever jobs they interview men for, and vice-versa.

Other Personnel

--Hampshire should have significant numbers of women among its trustees and all other lesser advisory groups in separate areas.
Degree Requirements

--Hampshire should allow its women students who marry to satisfy requirements for its degree at another college.

Employment Policies

--Hampshire should not discriminate on the basis of sex in any of its employment policies.

--Hampshire should provide a day care center for the children of all its female personnel.

I. RESIDENTIAL PLAN

Residential Integration

--Hampshire should begin with one residential unit for men, one for women, and one for both sexes.

Residential Organization

--Hampshire should place women as well as men in charge of residential units.

Student Committee on Coeducation

--The students should form their own Committee on Coeducation to parallel the faculty committee.

Married Students

--Hampshire should eventually provide housing on campus for married students.
J. EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Campus Activities
--Hampshire should encourage joint participation in all its campus activities.

Athletics
--If Hampshire has an athletic program on its own campus, it should emphasize sports than men and women can play together.

Speakers
--Hampshire should try to make sure that a significant number of women speakers come to the campus each year.

Special Events
--Hampshire should sponsor a program with presentations and debate among various feminist groups and perhaps academics interested in women's affairs.

K. PRIZES, AWARDS, HONORS

--Hampshire should have some separate and some joint prizes, awards, and honors.
L. COOPERATION

Hampshire should keep its neighbors informed about its actions related to this report's recommendation, and should cooperate with them particularly in the areas of faculty hiring, counseling, the curriculum, and the library.
INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED
I have not always ascribed judgments cited in this report to individuals by name, since it was not always feasible or relevant. Generally, however, many ideas, opinions, and quotations are mixed and woven into the text that I gleaned from brief talks or longer interviews with the individuals listed below.

Helen S. Astin: Bureau of Social Science Research, Washington, D.C.

Caroline Bird: free-lance writer, author of Born Female, Poughkeepsie, New York

Rachel DuPlessis: preceptor, Department of English, Columbia College, Columbia University, New York, New York

Dora Evers: formerly editor of Women's Education, American Association of University Women, Washington, D.C.

Elizabeth Hall: President, Simon's Rock College, Great Barrington, Massachusetts

Carolyn Heilbrun: Associate Professor, Department of English, General Studies, Columbia University, New York, New York

Kenneth Keniston: Associate Professor, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

Elizabeth Koontz: Director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

David Lilliwer: formerly a recruiter for the Stanford Law School, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California

David C. McClelland: Professor, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Kate Millett: Chairman, Education Committee, National Organization for Women, New York, New York

Inez Nelbach: Dean, Kirkland College, Clinton, New York
Esther Peterson: formerly Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Alice S. Rossi: Associate Professor, Department of Social Relations, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland

Ann Ulanov: Assistant Professor, Department of Psychiatry and Religion, Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York

Elga Wasserman: Director, Coeducation Program, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

Sara K. Winter: member of the Department of Psychology and author of a report on the education of women at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut

Harriet Zellner: Ph.D. candidate, Department of Economics, Graduate Faculties, Columbia University, New York, New York

Student, faculty, and administration groups at:

- Columbia University, New York, New York
- Friends School, Washington, D.C.
- Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont
- St. Timothy's School, Stevenson, Maryland
- Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania
- Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

Other students

All of these generously gave their time with helpful, enthusiastic spirits. Since Hampshire is a venture that most of them knew very little about, they deserve all the more thanks for their receptivity.