Sexism in Higher Education

Margaret Gillett

"Sexism" is one of those words which have recently won wide currency and general acceptance; so has the adjective, "sexist." However, when I recently used "sexism" in connection with a course proposal on "Women in Higher Education" at McGill, assuming that its meaning was clear, I discovered that the Associate Dean who had to take the proposal to the Senate Academic Policies Committee was not acquainted with the word. This made me pause. Until then, I had not realized how the word has slipped into the language, that it has rarely been defined and that it does not yet seem to have made its way into the dictionary. For example, it is not included in Webster's 3rd International, the big one which includes "ain't" and other dubious words and neologisms. In view of all this, I think it wise to try to define "sexism" and explore some of its dimensions before considering its application in academe.

"Sexism" is discrimination--overt or covert, intended or unconscious--based primarily and irrelevantly on gender. There is a great difference between "sexism" and "sexuality." "Sexuality" is a biological construct, "sexism" is psychological and sociological. "Sexism" has virtually nothing to do with physiology and anatomy, but everything to do with attitudes and customs, values and traditions. It turns out to be a new word for an old habit--the evaluation of something or someone purely on the basis of sex in situations where there is no significant biological component. The behaviors that follow from a sexist perception of an individual or a situation are invariably discriminatory. In current usage, this nearly always means negative, unfair and irrational behavior with respect to women. This is not necessarily the case, of course. It is entirely possible to have sexist attitudes toward men. And the definition would still hold even if the attitudes were biased in favor of men. One might, for example, choose to promote someone not so much on the basis of his qualifications but simply because he was male and the other candidates for the job were not. This would be an instance of positive discrimination in favor of men; it is positive for the man concerned, negative for the women. This would be an instance of sexism because the decision was based primarily and irrelevantly on gender. It is also possible to have positive, or para-positive, discrimination with respect to women. In daily life, as in the academic, there are many minor concessions made to people simply because they are female--they are not expected to carry heavy things or pay for drinks, regardless of their physical or financial ability to do so. These advantages are only "para-positive" because, although they may be temporarily or superficially pleasing, they have a profoundly negative base that is extremely difficult for the individual to challenge and is actually an insidious manifesta-

tion of the negative aspect of sexism. These are planks of the old pedestal, but the pedestal has served its turn in social history. In any case, it was never a truly honest place to live and it was a very uncomfortable perch for active and intelligent women.

Much of the data on sexism is personal, anecdotal, subjective and possibly individual. However, more and more evidence is becoming available that is hard, objective and obviously universal. In what follows, I shall be generally dealing with sexism meaning negative discrimination toward women. I do not completely ignore the other forms, but both positive discrimination in favor of males and para-positive in favor of females are in reality subtle aspects of negative discrimination. I intend to rehearse some of the recently amassed data on academic sexism, much of it derived from studies of Canadian universities, and then to attempt to analyze the problem.

Discrimination in Canadian Universities

That discrimination against women exists in Canadian universities is surely no news. Nor is it a local, occasional or irregular phenomenon. It is rampant on a national scale, as nationwide studies have shown. CAUT has a standing Committee on the Status of Women and reports regularly in the Bulletin. The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) set up a committee in 1971 to examine the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women and one of the outcomes of this was a basic statistical survey by June Adam (Psychology, University of Calgary) entitled, "A Profile of Women in Canadian Universities." (An elaboration of this, "The Universities and the Status of Academic Women," is to be published in the Fall of 1975 as a CAUT Monograph.) And then, there is the Royal Commission itself, with its impact now fading because of the erosion of time but with only about fifty of its overall recommendations implemented, leaving about two-thirds unimplemented. These are all Canada-wide bodies that have produced national reports which, unhappily, show a consistent underprivileged position for women on the Canadian campus, as do the on-going statistics collected by Statistics Canada. In addition, there have been a number of investigations undertaken by individual universities, including McMaster, McGill, Toronto, UBC and York. I will draw on these national, and local sources for descriptive data, as well as on investigations made in the United States.

Female Faculty

Something less than one-fifth of full-time teaching positions in Canadian universities are held by women. These are not distributed evenly but tend to cluster in certain areas--the proportion of females relative to males is greatest in the Humanities and least in the

Physical Sciences, but varies according to rank. Of the women professors, roughly 34% are in Humanities, 36% in Social Sciences, 23% in Biological Sciences and 7% in Physical Sciences. Within these fields, there is considerable imbalance. For example, women tend to concentrate in English and French as far as Humanities are concerned, and for Social Sciences, they appear in Education, Household Science, Physical and Health Education. In other words, there are still "women's" areas of intellectual endeavour and "men's."

The percentage of female teachers is highest at the lowest ranks of the academic scale (i.e., lecturer and instructor) and declines progressively through the assistant and associate ranks to full professor. It seems that women have difficulty in being hired above the lowest ranks, regardless of their academic qualifications or abilities. This is true, too, in the United States, despite Civil Rights legislation and HEW regulations. A recent, extensive study in the US considered as typical the following comment from a language professor:

> Once I was being considered for an appointment as Chairman at another institution. During the interview the conversation turned again and again to the question of what I would do about my family, whether my husband would join me in the new location, what he would do, whether the children would live with me. These matters seemed to be of greater interest and importance to my interviewers than the question of my competence and qualifications. Such questions put the woman on the spot, because she cannot point out their irrelevance without seeming to be cold and heartless in regard to her family.1

But once they are hired, women discover other kinds of problems. Male/female salary discrepancies are commonplace in academia. This is borne out by each of the individual studies of Canadian universities. Thus, it is no great surprise that the most recent York Task Force found that for 1972-73, female full-time faculty members earned less money in every rank above that of instructor, despite the fact that at the professor, associate and lecturer levels, females had greater length of service to the university, greater number of years since their highest degree, and, at the lecturer level, had spent more years in rank. Only at the instructor level did women show a higher salary. There, nineteen women averaging 2.24 years of service made slightly less than $1,000 per annum more than fifteen male instructors with 1.57 years of service. The women earned more, but notice two things about those particular statistics. There were more women at this low rank (19:15) and they had longer

service than the men with whom they were compared. This is a small indication of the general trend for women to stay at the bottom while men get promoted.

The York Task Force recommended that the University set aside large sums of money to rectify salary discrepancies (some adjustments were also to be paid to males whose salaries needed raising in the name of equity). This kind of action has been recommended elsewhere and I believe has been acted upon at UBC and Toronto. The 1971 McGill Committee recommended an across-the-board salary increase for women, but the University has not favored this kind of rattrapage. Donald Hebb, who was Chancellor at the time, made a strong statement to Senate. He acknowledged that there was discrimination in the university, denied that it was widespread, dismissed the idea of raising all women's salaries by $1,000 as "absurd," and believed that women are "bound to get less promotion in a University that values research."

In the current issue of the McGill Journal of Education, Olga Favreau systematically analyzes Hebb's statement concerning male/female differences.2 However, it was not part of her mandate to tackle the question of male/female research performance. This is a study that needs to be done. It will be a lot more complicated than simply drawing up lists of who did what, who published what and where, who was awarded the most research grants. It will require a careful analysis of the academic ecology. The conditions and opportunities for female-led research are probably no where near as great as those for males and anyone who has been around the university for a while, or who has ever read The Double Helix, will recognize that it is not uncommon for women's ideas and efforts to be passed off as those of men--usually their bosses. Sir Fred Hyle, speaking recently at McGill, brought to light the case of student astronomer, Jocelyn Bell, who discovered pulsars, but Anthony Hewish, her professor at Cambridge received the Nobel Prize. In the US, Caroline Bird is currently calling for evidence from women who have had their ideas "borrowed" by men. This may seem to be bordering on the neurotic, but Bird considers that this is the stuff of a legitimate book, a serious questing for truth. I think she is right. In the past there have been too many Irene Murdock's of the intellectual scene.

Women as Administrators/Librarians/Non-Professional Staff

A few spectacular appointments--like those of Pauline Jewett as President of Simon Fraser, Jill Conway as Internal Vice-President, U of T and President Elect of Smith, Muriel Kovitz as Chancellor of Calgary, Paule Leduc as Vice-recteur exécutif de l'UQAM and so on--

may have created the impression that administration and its "big" jobs are opening up to women. These appointments must be welcomed individually in their own terms and hopefully they may also be considered as harbingers of things to come (or thin edges of the wedge); or they may merely be examples of tokenism. In any event, these kinds of appointments are still sufficiently rare to be headline news and the overall figures show that women do not hold ranking administrative positions--those of chairperson, dean or president --in anything like the proportion of their numbers in academe, much less their proportion in society as a whole.

The same is true for library administrators--about 80% of professional librarians are women, but they do not have 80% of the high administrative posts. It is true that McGill recently appointed a woman as Director of Libraries and that the University has three women and two men as Area Librarians. This helps adjust the balance, but the overall picture is still distorted. Figures for 1972 show that in university libraries in Ontario, 84% of the chief librarians were men, so were 74% of the associate and assistant librarians and 64% of the senior staff. Yet in the University of Toronto Library School, only one person in nine was male.3 He obviously was going to have a much better chance for promotion than the other eight. University libraries seem to have acquired some of the current characteristics of the elementary schools--both are places which were typically staffed by women and where relatively few men enter, but those who do seem assured of more rapid promotion and higher salaries than their female counterparts.

Given that women in the university generally receive less money than their male colleagues and that female librarians in general also receive less (there is about a 30% differential on the median salaries for professional librarians in Canada and the US), it cannot be surprising to find that women in university libraries earn less. An additional reason for this may be a particular tradition stemming from one of the founders of the modern library, Melvil Dewey, who was convinced that women should be paid less for the following reasons:

a) women have poorer health;
b) women lack business training because they have been playing with dolls;
c) they have a lack of permanence in their plans;
d) women receive other considerations from men because of their sex.4

These reasons may seem rather quaint and smack of an earlier age, but the ideas contained in them are basic to the sexism still prevalent in the universities. I suspect they apply particularly to non-professional women on campus--the secretaries, lab assistants, cleaners

and the rest. These women are especially vulnerable to exploitation since they often do not have formal qualifications to use in salary negotiations and rarely have unions or other organizations to back them up. The York Task Force found that 95% of the non-unionized support staff was female.

Within the support staff ranks--and sometimes in the academic--there is a sub-group of particularly exploited women. These are generally mature, competent, responsible women (a bonus for any organization) who work for unrealistic salaries in jobs that are blind alleys. These are faculty wives. Often they are people with PhDs who because of nepotism regulations or other factors which limit their opportunities, are given positions (usually on part-time or temporary bases) bearing little relationship to their qualifications and experience or to the contributions they make. They choose to accept such positions, it is true. They do so on grounds of convenience or interest rather than professional development, on "rewarding" work rather than rewarding salaries. Nevertheless, the universitites are guilty of exploiting them. In many cases, the universities are getting fine, concerned work at cheapest rates, in tasks that are essential but at salaries they would never offer a male, not even a graduate student. This is a sensitive issue, one which has received relatively little attention 5 and some of the people concerned may not thank me for bringing it up. It is a kind of academic extension of the "pay for housework" cause and some women may therefore think their private lives are being intruded upon. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the universities, in their genteel way, are ripping off these women.

In view of the temper of the times and the degree of discrimination it is not surprising to learn that women are beginning to resort to litigation in order to gain equity in matters of tenure and promotion.6 Yet, even with the support of "affirmative action" policies in the United States, an enormous reluctance to change the status quo remains.

Women as Students

Few are aware that it is exactly one hundred years since the first woman graduated from a Canadian college. In 1875, Grace Annie Lockhart earned her BSc from Mount Allison. She was not only the first woman bachelor in Canada, but the first in the British Empire. In the intervening century, the battles for women's admission have been fought and won (even the quota system is almost passé), co-education is accepted, the chaperones have vanished (I am not sure where they went, perhaps they are off taking courses in Sexology at the U of M). Yet, there is still sexism on the Canadian campus.

A study conducted during 1973-74 by the UBC Women's Research Collective found

that women students had many serious perceived complaints. They considered that they were surrounded by attitudes that depressed their full acceptance as students, researchers, professionals; specifically that:

> their parents still viewed higher education as a waiting period or an insurance policy--waiting for marriage or a safeguard against spinsterhood;
> counsellors tried to channel them into low-paying, service jobs;
> professors (male) did not treat them as inherently intelligent human beings (one professor insisted on calling a student "pussycat" in class);
> peers and professors criticized them if they exhibited characteristics such as aggression and ambition that are necessary for success in the world as we know it;
> there are relatively few women professors and thus there is a lack of visible alternatives to the traditional female roles.7

These are old complaints. I almost feel apologetic for rehearsing them here. But I have to, or someone has to, until the causes are removed. And still another old story was revived last year in a study on "Athletics in Canadian Universities" by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Canadian Inter-Collegiate Athletic Union. The conclusion was reached that intercollegiate sports for women "have some catching up to do." It noted that university-age women have a much lower rate of participation in athletics than university-age men (it is lower in the Atlantic provinces and Quebec than in the rest of the country) and that there are shortcomings in the attitude towards the sports program for women as well as in the degree of administrative cooperation, support and funds given it.8

In spite of all this bad news, the situation on enrolment for women undergraduates has improved in the last century. In 1973, instead of one Grace Annie Lockhart, about 30,000 women graduated with bachelor or first professional degrees. That was up from about 8,000 in 1963--a percentage change of 275%, which is a much faster rate of growth than that for men undergraduates during that decade (21,000 / '63 - 45,000 / '73 = 114%). From the beginning, the picture for undergraduate enrolment shows a fairly steady increase, enough to justify a dangerous touch of complacency. The graph for graduate enrolment is something else.

Perhaps the most dramatic piece of evidence in the Royal Commission Report was the graph on page 168 showing "Enrolment of Women at Undergraduate and Post-graduate Levels as a Percentage of Total Enrolment." It shows women undergraduates as about 16% in 1920-21, as 24% in 30-31, dipping to 22% in 1950-51, then rising strongly to about 34%

in 1967-68. It shows women graduate students as almost 25% in 1920-21, 26% in 1930-31, plummetting to 15% in 1950-51, and creeping up to 18% in 1967-68. The Commissioners drew the obvious but nevertheless astounding conclusion that, "At the graduate level, although there has been a gradual increase in female enrolment since 1955, the percentage of graduate students who are female has not yet reached the 1921 figure."9 According to figures released by Statistics Canada at the end of last year, we have still not broken the barrier. In 1973 the proportion of women in Canadian graduate schools, roughly 20%, was still less than it was in 1921. And according to projections, we will not do it in the immediately foreseeable future.

Tangibles and Intangibles

The problem is much more complicated than simple discrimination against women getting into graduate schools. Of particular concern is what happens to women when they do get into the university, a male-dominated institution with sexism imbedded into the structures and the curricula.

It is becoming increasingly acknowledged that women have not received full recognition of their potentials or achievements in any of the academic disciplines. True, there are "women's subjects" like English and History in distinction from "men's" subjects like Math and Physics--the subjects girls are discouraged from taking. Ironically, subjects like English and History have proved to be among the most sexist. For example, most history courses and history texts have ignored women--systematically or wilfully or ignorantly. Women simply have not happened in the history we teach. Surveys of school and college textbooks reveal an appallingly small proportion of the available space is devoted to half of the world's population. In the US, one study of twenty-seven important texts used in college history courses found that no book devoted more than 2% of its pages to women, and one had only 5/100th of 1% of its pages of women.10 This academic treatment of women has a lot to do with the way History itself has been conceived as essentially the recreation of the elite intellectual, military, economic and political powers that controlled other peoples' lives. The social revolutions of the '60s have brought a revisionism that questions history as a record of "man's progress" through an on-going series of diplomatic decisions, military manoeuvers and economic exchanges. The "new" history has opened the way for the study of working-class culture, blacks and other minority groups, the oppressed, the inarticulate and even women. However, while historians are beginning to resurrect women's past, many are still encumbered by their stereotypes, their ingrained notion of women's inferiority, and other deterministic ideas about "women's nature."

Thus, William O'Neill has written a book about feminism in America, but in the Introduction he makes the extraordinary statement:

> To begin with, I have avoided the question of whether or not women ought to have full parity with men. Such a state of affairs obtains nowhere in the modern world and so, since we cannot know what genuine equality would mean in practice, its desirability cannot fairly be assessed.11

Page Smith has also written a history of American women in which he feels constrained to pontificate about the nature of women in general. He declares, "A woman 'is;' a man is always in the process of becoming."12 And "A man wishes for an audience of millions; a woman will create for one man she loves."13 Even women historians are not immune from this deterministic danger. Mildred Adams, for one, writes about the difficulties women's organizers faced because of "the innate frivolity of feminine minds."14

Of course, it is naive to think that all writers of women's history should be, ipso facto, excellent historians. We have to expect our share of sloppy scholars. But what is distressing is the persistence of stale, unexamined assumptions in an enterprise where a fresh start is being made.

Concentrated efforts at curriculum reform can be seen in the current efforts to establish Women's Studies. Courses and programs are beginning to appear on campuses all over North America and elsewhere. These are significantly different from earlier attempts to have appropriate courses for women. In the 19th and 20th centuries--especially in the private colleges for women in the US--studies deemed quite suitable for young ladies were frequently offered. Again in 1953, Mirra Komarovsky in a book titled Women in the Modern World: Their Education and Their Dilemmas, which is considered something of a classic in the sociology of women, called for a "distinctively feminine curriculum." But what she wanted would not appeal in the slightest to Germaine Greer. Komarovsky, in asking "Why Not a Distinctively Feminine Curriculum?" demanded that "Women's colleges must improve education for family living, seeking a direction which avoids the shallowness of some of the practical courses;" she called for "studies which give prominence to the home" and for the "raising of the prestige of domesticity among educated women."15 Today, such a program would be condemned as the reinforcing of stereotypes; it would be considered outright sexism. Women do not want that kind of special treatment, different and unequal, they want "the real thing." But the problem is, as we have seen from the example of History, that the real thing turns out to be partly illusion since the scholarly disciplines in the masculine-oriented institutions of higher learning have obscured and distorted a good deal of the truth. Thus there is a need for

Women's Studies, courses and programs in the best scholarly tradition, that are devoted to the quest for truth, the fullest possible truth.

Women's Studies courses are based on the hypothesis that the full truth has not been told, that women have been hidden from History, that they have not been given their due or that they have been regarded from peculiar biases in any field you care to name. Women's Studies are not a passing fad; they are needed to provide relevant contemporary courses it is true, but more than that, they are needed for their own sakes, for the sake of knowledge. Just in testing the hypothesis that the full truth has not yet been told, they will help expose sexism in the curriculum and further new research.

But even if we introduced Women's Studies onto every campus, we would still find other sources of sexism. They could be found in a variety of ordinary structures and common practices that have curiously negative effects on women, especially those with children. Things that work against women include: requirements insisting on full--rather than part time study; the practice of holding classes during the day or during the dinner hour; the system of awarding loans, grants, and part time jobs (The Royal Commission showed that male students receive more money even though the numbers of scholarships are awarded about evenly, studies in the US show that males are greatly favored); the lack of day care facilities; the "old boys' network" which, inter alia, makes news of jobs, grants, etc. more freely available to males. Some of these same kinds of factors affect female staff who are automatically expected, by virtue of their sex rather than their talent, to be secretaries of committees or in charge of coffee, or to teach the largest classes at the most inconvenient hours. Those kinds of chores are, of course, not restricted exclusively to women. They tend always to be imposed by the powerful who are in positions to exploit the weak, whoever they may be. It just happens that in the university administrative structure, men are powerful and women are weak.

And if women show signs of getting uppity, the system has some subtle ways of putting them back in line--chairmen of meetings tend to overlook female speakers while giving men the floor; male professors and administrators, in ways that are patronizing and paternalistic rather than friendly, quickly get on a first name basis with female colleagues, while according males the full dignity of their honorable titles, "Dr.," "Professor," "Dean" or whatever. A common variant of this is for people to use professional titles for men ("Dr.," "Prof.," "Dean") and social titles for women ("Mrs.," "Miss," or "Ms."). It is not unheard of for men, who think they are liberated to address a female professor as "Ms." and sign themselves "Professor X." This

is such a little thing, small in every sense, and to protest it would be petty. What I do when someone does that to me is to assume that he really wants to be social, so I reply to his letter with a "Dear Mr. X." If there is a response after that it is almost invariably, "Dear Dr. Gillett"--though there are some die-hards who go the next step down and write, "Dear Margaret." All of this could easily be a slip of the pen, accidental except that it is done consistently in one direction, downward from the male. And on the other hand, there is a general tendency for people to address any male on campus as "Professor" or "Doctor" regardless of his rank and degree. But it is rare, indeed, that an unearned, high status title is gratuitously conferred on a female. Not important, you think? I think it is very important. It is an expression of the assumption that women are not "real" academics. The burden of proof is always on them to show otherwise. They are assumed guilty of being intellectual lightweights (featherbrains) until they have proved otherwise, and even then. . . .

Other examples of sexism may appear in the most unexpected places. In the Staff French course I took recently at McGill, the instructor asked the class to give the French for the verbs in the following sentence: "Mules kick, dogs bite, cats and women scratch." Even the library catalogue is not immune. There, white male is the norm, other human beings are deviant. Thus there is a classification "Physicians" then sub-sections "Negroes as Physicians" and "Women as Physicians"--and under "Women" who are not to be taken seriously, a cross reference to "Charm." Another small thing. One of the continual welter that constantly bombards women on and off campus. After many overt and subtle put-downs, aspirations are lowered, options are constrained, and it takes a lot of repetition to raise consciousness and keep it up, it takes an enormous amount of self-respect and drive to maintain confidence.

Analysis

It would be unfair to suggest that the university is actually a conspiracy against women, but it is clear that some fundamental changes are overdue. It may be conceded that women have greater academic participation than they had a hundred years ago but, even so, we are still at the point when excellent women have about the same degree of acceptance and success as mediocre men. It seems particularly unfortunate that prejudice should permeate the institution which is, ideally, dedicated to the quest for truth, the search for new knowledge. Unexamined custom and simple administrative convenience, rather than malice, may account for some of the sexism in higher education, but there are other complicated and interlocking explanations.

Part of the problem has to lie with society as a whole, with the stereotypical thinking, the role ascriptions. Society in general does not expect women to be intellects and young women continue to internalize this expectation. They learn this lesson well until, much as they want to find their own individual identities, to do well, to achieve, they have a fear of success. You may be familiar with a number of studies in this area, for example a well-known one conducted a few years ago at the University of Michigan where 90 women and 88 men were asked to write stories continuing from the following sentence: "After first term finals, John (Anne) finds himself (herself) at the top of his (her) medical school class." The women wrote about "Anne" and the men about "John." "John" was thoroughly successful and, after hard work, graduated at the top of his class. One "Anne" was "an acne faced bookworm;" another got smart and lowered her grades and finally dropped out of medical school so that she would not outshine her boyfriend; another graduated at the top of her class--in nursing school. In the experiment, scores relating to negative attitudes towards success showed that less than 10% men had any interest in avoiding success compared with 65% women.16 Similar negative attitudes towards women's competence and success appear in studies involving female professors evaluating academic papers differentially according to whether they believed the authors to be male or female 17 and in studies of female students adjudicating paintings.18 Work thought to have been done by men was consistently evaluated by women as higher than that thought to be done by women--except when a painting had been identified as a prize winner. The judgments had relatively little to do with the quality of the work, but with the sex of the author. This kind of data suggests that women, too, are victims of sexism and are prejudiced against each other.

Another part of the problem is that the issue is fraught with paradox and inconsistency. Thus, supporters of the theoretical idea that women are intelligent human beings can be self-contradictory and people who are generally supporters of liberal and reform causes can be rigid and antedeluvian in feminist matters. It may not be much of a surprise that Lewis Carroll (Prof. Dodgson), who wrote the very clever book about "Alice" for "Alice," also wrote a strong statement to the Congregation of Oxford against the admission to the ancient universities "of that social monster, the 'He-Woman;'"19 it is more curious (or, as "Alice" would say, "curiouser") that Herbert Marcuse in Counter-revolution and Revolt comes across as a "pedestal pedlar." He holds that women are less brutalized than men because economic discrimination has kept them out of the competitive world and confined them to the home where they exemplify bourgeois virtue. Curiouser and curiouser is the contradiction in John

Stuart Mill who wrote in his classic essay "On Liberty" that "woman was a man in petticoats" but later argued that there were basic differences in masculine and feminine natures and that women were an essential counterpart to the abstractness, narrowness and rigidity likely to beset men. The movement is fraught with this kind of inconsistency.

Another aspect of the problem lies in the fact that many women find rewards in being subjugated and subordinated. The fictitious medical student, "Anne," who dropped her grades to get her man has thousands of real life counterparts. They believe, at least temporarily, that they are rewarded by submitting to the stereotype of female intellectual inferiority. But there must be a better, more honest way to achieving those rewards.

Another, and closely related, part of the problem is that women have been prepared to settle for less. When senior administrative jobs are available, search committees report difficulties in even getting women to apply. Women seem so frequently content to sit back and let the men get the ulcers. Therefore, apparently, they have no one to blame but themselves. This is only the most superficial reading of the situation. Basic to it are the functioning of expectations and the lack of viable role models and the necessity for a great deal of extra determination to succeed if one is a woman.

Again, part of the problem is that many women do not support feminist movements on campus. Faculty wives are not always in favor of the appointment of female faculty--apparently for much the same reasons that policemen's wives object to co-ed patrol cars. Some female academics do not subscribe to feminist protests and consider them a) unnecessary, because <u>they</u> got where they are without social revolutionary movements, b) inappropriate, because the kind of radicalism associated with Women's Lib flies in the face of the dignity and gentility expected of university professors. It is all too obvious that the idea of gentility is tied to the notion of femininity and the pedestal and makes women extremely vulnerable to exploitation.

Yet another part of the problem is that women academics do not approve of Women's Studies. They consider them as special pleading, a kind of reverse sexism, or, like many men, they do not believe in their academic respectability. They appear to think that the truth about women can and will come out in the traditional disciplines. Such people overlook the significance of the Women's Studies hypothesis (that the full truth has not yet been told) and ignore the fact that throughout the history of higher education, women have just not appeared, have not been allowed to appear. There is no reason to

suspect they ever would unless a specifically directed program were advanced--in much the same way that relatively few works of Canadian literature would have been studied without the emergence in the 1950s of Canadian Literature courses. Canadian literature would not have a chance if English Departments had continued to teach only something called "English Lit."

The last, but not necessarily the final, aspect of the problem is that sexism is an ideology--a coherent, systematic body of concepts, assertions, theories and consequent behaviors that constitute a socio-political program. That this ideology is rarely articulated or even recognized does not lessen its force nor lessen the need for extremely strong counter-arguments. Theoreticians of women's liberation are still relatively rare, but feminists, whether socialist, radical or moderate, all agree that changes are due. It remains to be seen whether these theoretical positions will coalesce or whether one will emerge triumphant to combat the sexism so obviously rampant in higher education, or whether we will genteelly maintain the status quo.

FOOTNOTES

1. John A. Centra, Women, Men and the Doctorate (Princeton, N.J., 1974), p. 196.
2. Olga Eizner Favreau, "Research on Sex Differences in Behavior: Some Reinterpretations," McGill Journal of Education, Vol. X, No. 1 (Spring 1975), pp. 20-32.
3. Sherrill Cheda, "That Special Little Mechanism," Canadian Library Journal, Vol. 31, No. 5 (October 1974), pp. 425-426.
4. Cited by Cheda, Ibid., p. 422.
5. For an interesting anecdotal account with some sociological analysis, see Helen MacGill Hughes, "Maid of All Work or Departmental Sister-in-Law? The Faculty Wife Employed on Campus," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78, No. 4 (January 1973), pp. 767-772.
6. See, for example, Joan Abramson, The Invisible Woman; Discrimination in the Academic Profession (San Francisco, 1975).
7. UBC, Women's Research Collective, Voices of Women Students (Vancouver, 1974).
8. For a summary see, "Athletics in Canadian Universities," University Affairs, December 1974, pp. 2-4.
9. Report of The Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada (Ottawa, 1970), p. 169.
10. Bernice Sandler, "What Women Really Want on the Campuses," The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 24, 1972, p. 6.
11. William O'Neill, Everyone Was Brave: The Rise and Fall of Feminism in America (Chicago, 1969), p. viii.
12. Page Smith, Daughters of the Promised Land (Boston, 1970), p. 307.
13. Ibid., p. 318.
14. Mildred Adams, The Right to Be People (Philadelphia, 1966), p. 96.
15. Mirra Komarovsky, Women in the Modern World: Their Education and Their Dilemmas (Boston, 1953--Brown Reprints in Sociology, 1971), pp. 258-273 et passim.
16. Matina Horner, "Women's Will to Fail," Psychology Today, Vol. 3, No. 6 (1969).
17. Philip Goldberg, "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women?" Transaction 5 (April 1968), pp. 28-30.
18. G.J. Pheterson, S.B. Keisler, & P.A. Goldberg, "Evaluation of the Performance of Women as a Function of Their Sex, Achievement, and Personal History," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 19 (1971), pp. 114-118.
19. Charles L. Dodgson, "Resident Women Students" (March 7, 1896), The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll (London, 1939), p. 1070.