

WOMEN IN POLITICAL SCIENCE:  
ISSUES, AREAS AND ALTERNATIVES

by

Gayl Angela Masson

---

A Thesis Presented to the  
FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

In Partial Fulfillment of The  
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

(Political Science)

August 1974

UMI Number: EP63835

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP63835

Published by ProQuest LLC (2014). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
UNIVERSITY PARK  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

eb

Po  
175  
M419

*This thesis, written by*

Gayl Angela Masson

*under the direction of her Thesis Committee,  
and approved by all its members, has been pre-  
sented to and accepted by the Dean of The  
Graduate School, in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of*

2310E  
m

Master of Arts



Dean

Date *January 7, 1975*

THESIS COMMITTEE

*Larry L. Berg*  
Chairman  
*James R. Lincoln*  
*W. A. Beebe*

## PREFACE

My career in graduate school has followed a path that began with a surefooted courage to say what I felt was right about almost anything, to a humbled posture where I carefully offer only what I feel can be adequately justified.

This paper, however, offers a stance somewhere between those two extremes. I have offered a view point that I have not run across in the writing of others, but one which seems to be a looming possibility for the explanation of certain phenomena.

I have purposely handled this possibility as a "notion," lest it be mistaken for a theory. Theory building is an arduous task. The motivation for theory-building is notably often sparked by the potentiality of a "notion." A notion, however, must first be conceptualized.

This thesis offers the framework and background for such a conceptualization.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE .....	ii
LIST OF CHARTS .....	v
FORWARD .....	vi
 CHAPTER	
I. THE CAREER WOMAN .....	1
Women in Political Science	
A Critical Review	
II. THE STUDY: QUESTIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS.....	17
The Problem	
Data Source: The Questionnaire	
III. WOMEN AND POLITICS .....	47
The Female vs. the Department of Political Science	
Women's Liberation and the Field of Political Science	
CONCLUSION .....	61
 APPENDIXES	
A. QUESTIONNAIRE .....	65
B. DRAFT REPORT TO THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT USC .....	71

FOOTNOTES .....	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	91

LIST OF CHARTS

CHART	Page
I. Change in Attitudes of Colleagues Due to Marriage .....	32
II. Difference Between Male and Female Cognition .....	37
III. Stereotypes: The Typical and Ideal Female Faculty Member .....	43

## FOREWARD

Women are discriminated against in the field of political science. They must assert themselves as more than competent in the field, must often accept lower than average paychecks, less than prestigious appointments, and hence fewer job offers. The explanation for these phenomena reaches across many boundaries, including societal pressures, psychological responses, and tradition. The scope of this paper outlines a few of the areas most pertinent in explaining why women are discriminated against in political science, how they are discriminated against, and what can be done about it.

The woman in political science has much in common with every professional woman, therefore women with professional careers are surveyed in chapter 1. Also, problems specific to the field of political science are outlined and a critical review of the Converse and Converse article - one of the more comprehensive papers thus far done on the subject of women in political science-is included.

To explore the feelings of the women in the field re-



garding perceived discrimination, a questionnaire was mailed, the details and organization of which appear in chapter II. The more interesting results are also treated with accompanying hypotheses in this chapter.

A historical overview of some of the problems encountered by women in other areas of political involvement broadens the perspective and helps explain some contemporary policies towards women, therefore chapter III includes a brief survey of women and their involvement in politics. The relationship between a female and the department of political science, what a woman can do about it, and some suggestions for substantive alternatives to the usual "warfare" methods of ending discrimination by legislation are issues that are dealt with in the remainder of chapter III.

The original intent of this paper was to provide a survey of the literature and the attitudes of women in political science about the status of women in political science. As my enquiry progressed, however, it became evident that the discriminatory process in academia may be based on more than just prejudice, but also on fundamental learning processes and procedures. Discrepancies here may make an alliance between male and female modes of thinking often uncomfortable, if not

truly incompatible. Indications of this dichotomy are pointed out in the context of this paper, and the reader is urged to consider their implications.

## CHAPTER I

### THE CAREER WOMAN

Sometimes in high-school, sometimes in college, and sometimes much later in life, a woman may decide she wants to embark on a career. She learns soon that this requires stamina, poise, and most often, a belief in what she is doing. Sometimes, though, this is not enough. She may find she is repeatedly overlooked at job placement time, in favor of a male.

Research studies have shown that the person whose pattern of interests agrees with those typical of people in a certain occupation is likely to find satisfaction in that occupation.<sup>1</sup> Thus an important criterion when a person applies for a particular job is personal choice - the person has first chosen that job field. However, hiring practices have shown that all fields do not hire both sexes. Men and women simply are not provided with an equal opportunity to choose career fields.

Restrictions on open-minded career choice is reflected not only by social norms and role expectancies, but by the law as well, in such forms as the so-called protective labor laws

which place restrictions on hours, rates and nighttime employment, thus "protecting" women from employment in certain fields.<sup>2</sup>

It is often argued that a field remains predominantly male because women simply do not choose to enter that career field. Mechanical engineering is the classic example here where graduate female enrollment in the United States in 1971 totaled one per cent.<sup>3</sup> Even if we draw the first important conclusion, that women are socialized throughout their lives to "choose" only certain professions, we still must contend with the fact that should a woman choose a male dominated field, not only are employment opportunities limited (if not non-existent) but once having secured a job, she must cope with the continuing barriers that arise purely because of sex.

Two high-pay job areas where women are still barred from employment in many cases are the airlines and radio. In June 1973 United Airlines and five affiliated unions were charged by the U.S. Department of Justice with discrimination against blacks and women in employment practices. The suit alleges that United traditionally assigns white males to jobs which offer good training and promotion opportunities and that the airline's transfer and promotion policies perpetuate these discriminatory assignments.<sup>4</sup> For example, of the approximately seven-hundred

women licensed to fly as airline transport pilots, only three are gainfully employed by airlines and each one is the token woman in her company.

The Washington D.C. affiliate of NBC (WRC-TV) is also faced with a suit, this one filed by a coalition of ten women's rights organizations and the Federal Communications Commission. Their brief charges WRC with sex discrimination and asks the FCC to deny the renewal of WRC's license on the grounds that it therefore does not operate in the public interest.<sup>5</sup> These are just isolated examples among many.

As Kirsten Amundsen<sup>6</sup> has pointed out "at least one half of American women have to and do work outside the home for the larger portion of their lives." And yet the two most often cited forms of work for a women are "domestic help" and "secretary." Why is it women work in these limited capacities, with very little chance for advancement, higher salaries, or personal achievement, while men outnumber women in almost every professional field?

Perhaps the dilemma begins before job considerations do -- in school, for instance. Do counselors bias their encouragement? Does the male advisor, for example, who (perhaps subconsciously) harbors the myth of the wife/mother/homemaker female recommend more men for scholarships than women? Or

is the close protege relationship that is often found between male professors and male students avoided with female students due to a fear of sexual involvement or allusions to it? These questions have yet to be answered.

People generally pursue the career (or "role") in which they feel there is a chance for success.<sup>7</sup> Not many fight against the acknowledged superior judgement or pressure of their school advisors, parents, or society's ingrained limitations. When, however, advice to a young person is biased and limits personal growth, a vicious cycle is sustained. Society continues a practice and form that is hard to break or change.

One third of all the women in the world are both home-makers and workers.<sup>8</sup> Why has it not been until recently that women have recognized their own ability to overcome the barriers of the working world? Fifty years ago there were no phones, mail was slow, and communication over distances difficult. Today rapid communication has enabled women to compare notes. It is not easy for a female to assert herself alone against a man's world, yet knowing that her compatriots stand behind her makes all the difference.

Simone De Beauvoir,<sup>9</sup> in describing the advancement of women workers in France, points out that according to a study

made in the 1890's, women received only one-half of the pay a man did for a day's work equal to that of a man. It was not until women recognized and had been integrated into the life of trade-unionism that they have been able to defend their own interests. Trade unions provided the French women with an organized, militant atmosphere for plea bargaining, but it was this strategy that provoked pay increases. Must women collaborate as sort of armies against men?

Some militant women feel they must. The "radical feminists," as described by Cellestine Ware in Woman Power,<sup>10</sup> feel that "women, as they exist in society are creatures of men." Their cause is a political issue and their means are marches, campaigns such as WRAP (Women's Radical Action Project) and "fighting the battle."

In contrast, some freedom leaders, such as Eleanor Roosevelt in the 1930's suggest men are as supportive as women in encouraging equal rights, status and opportunities.<sup>11</sup> In her essay, "Working in a Man's World," Roslyn S. Willett<sup>12</sup> states as her intention the suggestion of fruitful ways for men and women to work together. Her approach suggests: first, "mash the myths," then break the barriers. What are the myths? "That women cannot really do big jobs, that women are not crea-

tive, and that women in offices, government, and industry should hold jobs closest to housekeeping and a wife's duties."

Do these myths explain why women are offered and accept low pay? Why do capable, educated women accept dead-end office-wife types of jobs? And why do women who work full-time also often do virtually all the house-work and child care with little complaint in a family where a husband is also present? Only recently have alternative strategies been considered. Government employment agencies, day-care centers, women's groups (such as NOW, WEAL, and WLM),<sup>13</sup> and inspired young women have all been working to lay the foundation for a renaissance of today's professional woman.

The Spokeswoman, for example, is an independent monthly newsletter of women's news that reports on recent anti-discrimination suits, employment opportunities, women's business ventures (such as the proposed Woman's Banks), conferences, religion and media, as well as listing current books and publications on women. The Feminist Book Club offers hardbound and paperbacks, as well as prints and posters by women artists at discounts up to forty per cent. And recently a newsletter has been initiated by the National Women's Political Caucus called "Win With Women" which summerizes the progress of political



campaigns by women across the nation. The rising tide of communications among women indicate that the subjection that women have faced for so long will be challenged more and more by groups rather than just by women alone.

### Women in Political Science

Discrimination based on sex exists within the field of political science most markedly in initial placement of graduates,<sup>14</sup> annual income,<sup>15</sup> and the promotion progress of women. These facts have been well validated and documented by several sources which show that the greatest evidence of, as well as the most varied forms of, discrimination occur within the university.<sup>16</sup>

The most often cited, and perhaps the most obvious, form of discrimination occurs in job consideration. Women feel the pressure and men acknowledge its existence. The very fact that many universities have only one or two women on the faculty, and that many more have none, shows that somewhere there is a gap in the credible academic status of women.

Jessie Bernard lists several of the criteria used in academic job placement, and examines the subtleties of each aspect in which discrimination against women is evident. "Whatever the theory may be, there is in practice no question that academic competition discriminates against the best women candidates."<sup>17</sup>

Converse and Converse<sup>18</sup> found through their questionnaire that the most cases of discrimination reported (anticipated and actual) occurred in the area of job consideration, and the Distaff Papers<sup>19</sup> give a vindicating account of these practices.

Personal stories of outright discrimination are the vented wraths of women who have found that within "Affirmative Action Committees" their long suppressed encounters with injustice can be appealed to sympathetic ears. Many women within political science have taken advantage of these committees to organize and sort out the areas which prove to be hot-spots of academic equality.

In just what areas have women in political science been discriminated against? What are the causes? What are the solutions? These, and questions like these, have been asked before.

#### A Critical Review

Converse and Converse recognized the apparent discrepancies between men and women in the field of political science and attempted to study these problems.<sup>20</sup> Most often their study concerned itself with empirical evidence of discrimination, rather than hypothetical causes or cures, although they acknowledge that such solutions have been reviewed by Jewel

Prestige.<sup>21</sup>

The foundation of their article is the fact that "women show much more marked rates of attrition than men."<sup>22</sup> Their questionnaire contained a large battery of items concerning perceived discrimination based on the simple assumption that if sex-specific discouragement to women was concentrated in certain aspects of career development, it should come through clearly as a relative matter in such items.<sup>23</sup>

These eight items included: job consideration, teaching appointments, salary, promotion, tenure, initial rank, decision-making and fringe benefits.

Converse and Converse suggested that the best operational methods for this study would have been to trace cohorts longitudinally through the career ladder, but deemed this approach not feasible because of the long-term high cost and hence unpractical implications. Another alternative, studying those women who started out with good intentions to pursue the field but opted for other careers or lifestyles, was also deemed as unwieldy since no satisfactory sampling pool could be organized.

Ultimately, the only sampling frame that could be realistically assembled involved the set of post-graduate women interested enough in political science to maintain membership in

the Political Science Association.<sup>24</sup> The obvious problem with this cross-section is that it could be biased in the sense that these women may be more active than other women in the field, i. e., they may have more concerned attitudes, and perhaps only represent the more academic women in the field rather than a true sample of the population as a whole of women in political science.

The authors further state that if sex-specific discouragement (for instance, discouraging women from entering or staying in male dominated fields), is concentrated in certain aspects of careers development it should come through clearly as a relative matter to the question asked. With this in mind they reported academic appointment as the domain in which discrimination was most prevalent.

Converse and Converse also noted a "generation gap" in the responses made by their four samples (male professors, female professors, male and female graduate students) which indicated different degrees of perception of discrimination. Graduate students are more likely to perceive discrimination along sex lines than their post-graduate elders.

Converse and Converse describes the female graduate student's perception of anticipated discrimination as "overgeneral-

ized," suggesting that is is exaggerated;

...when a woman presents some intellectual 'fait accompli' such as a manuscript, it is likely that most males will examine it against universal criteria.<sup>25</sup>

But are these not universal male criteria? Standards and norms of excellence have been part of the academic experience and from Socrates and Plato on these criteria have been made, for the most part, by men. If men had been the traditional domesticated child guardian, as they were in the now largely extinct Amazon societies,<sup>26</sup> and universities had been initiated by women, would the ivy-covered walls imbibe more "feminine" criteria of excellence in the academic pursuit, such as the strength of poetic nuances, for example?<sup>27</sup> Or perhaps an emphasis on scholarly reconciliation rather than argument?<sup>28</sup>

Rather than confronting the substantive base of discrimination which may be rooted in rationality, Converse and Converse have measured the symptoms. They point out that although receiving more academic honors than men (twenty-one per cent of the women were Phi Beta Kappa compared with eight per cent of the men), fewer women (seventy-six per cent) were accepted to schools of their choice than men (eighty-one per cent). They also point out women receive lower salaries than their male counterparts - an annual gross of nearly \$17,000 for men com-

pared with \$10,500 for women, less than five-eighths as much. Discounting those men and women who work part time brings the averages closer (\$16,650 for men and \$11,820 for women) but the discrepancy is still clear. Other factors including lesser degree completion and slower research productivity account for a significant portion of the income differences. Even adjusting for these variables, however,

...there remains an income decrement for females relative to males who are comparable to them in a wide range of regards.<sup>29</sup>

One of the more provocative points resulting from this discussion is "the amount of published works." If this can be regarded as a standard for professionalism within the field, what does the fact that men publish twice as much reflect (other than marital status, which Converse and Converse point out)? They suggest that unmarried women without dependents do not have the economic motivation to compete while married women do not have the time.

Converse and Converse conclude another primary assumption is obvious; women are downgraded at initial placement, therefore have heavy teaching responsibilities and hence less research time.<sup>30</sup> This may reflect why women express lower levels of satisfaction with their first jobs. Indicative of this is

that a full third of the women with doctorates (compared to eight per cent of the men) had only part-time jobs at the onset. Converse and Converse suggest that limited contact with the field could contribute to the sparse research output by women in the earlier professional years. However, women do show a spurt of production in later years. Converse and Converse suggest two reasons for this increase in productivity: 1) both males and females receive a reduction in teaching load as they advance in rank and professional experience. While older males are drawn off into administrative activity (which may signify a further form of discrimination against women), women seem to profit in relative research productivity.<sup>31</sup> 2) The women who drop out of the profession early because of unfavorable early job placements, sense a lack of promise for career growth, or other factors, change the population. Older survivors tend to show higher rates of productivity partly because of "composition effects."<sup>32</sup>

Converse and Converse summarize this discussion and their article by noting that perceptions of discrimination seem largely indicative of the real thing, and that the transition from "student status to adult teaching roles is not a pleasant experience for most women."<sup>33</sup>

Their study seems to end rather abruptly on this dis-

couraging note, with no indication of where women graduate students are eventually placed, if at all. Also, there are no indications as to exactly what are "perceptions of discrimination," and on what grounds they might be based. The normative question of "perceptions of discrimination" and the primary sources of discrimination are addressed in this paper. The first issue, "where have graduate women been placed?", and the corollary questions of type of placement, title, length of commitment, and salary have been addressed in an empirically succinct article by Judith Stiehm and Ruth Scott.<sup>34</sup> In a study of ten political science departments for the years 1966-1971, they show that men are more likely to be placed after their preliminary exams than women. While thirteen per cent of the men were not placed at all, thirty per cent of the women were not placed. They also showed that men were more likely to receive three year contracts and women to receive one year contracts. They also show that only one woman received a tenure track appointment at an elite university and that that occurred immediately after HEW began its practice of holding up federal funds for the purpose of ending discrimination against women.

The authors suggest several factors which might contribute to de facto (as opposed to latent) discrimination against



women. One is that women's placement is affected by employment opportunities for their spouses, with the results that a woman's placement strategy is not one based on optimizing her own career but one based on maximizing two careers.<sup>35</sup> A second reason is based on the importance of sponsorship or patronage in the placement process. It may well be that senior professors (virtually all of whom are male) find it embarrassing or awkward to establish close relationships with female graduate students or to ardently promote them with others as colleagues. Women professors may also feel that to too enthusiastically sponsor women students is a reflection on their own objectivity. Other reasons may be that women are under-employed because they are not as serious about their work and hence more likely to drop out.<sup>36</sup> They are motivated "to avoid success,"<sup>37</sup> and the need of the employer to guess about the future, and therefore pursuing the goal of maintaining stability with the profession, assuming that a young man will be the safer choice since he is not subject to the probability of motherhood.<sup>38</sup>

In conclusion Stiehm and Scott reiterate that "equally qualified male and female political scientists do not now obtain equally desirable placements."<sup>39</sup> They indicate that quotas and goals may be the mechanisms necessary to force departments to

actively recruit and encourage women.

Could it be that drastic measures which "force" universities to accept, hire and place women are treating the symptoms of discrimination and not really the roots of the disease? Perhaps there are qualities inherently masculine within the hallowed walls of academia which need to be treated, rather than just the branches that hang on the sturdy trunk of tradition. If this is the case, then the cure may be reconciliation between male and female forms of thinking, perceiving, writing, and being.

## CHAPTER II

### THE STUDY:

#### QUESTIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

##### The Problem

If reconciliation between men and women, exhibited by a decrease in, and the eventual absence of, discrimination is to be pursued, a substantive data base must be formulated or outlined as a starting point for further inquiry. This data base, by its very nature, will include subjective recognition and observations of discrimination. The question of what accounts for this discrimination heretofore is largely a matter of speculation, and will be explored, for the most part, in terms of the uniqueness of feminine, in contrast to masculine, academic characteristics.

##### Questions and Assumptions

The following study and accompanying questionnaire were generated as a result of the lack of a substantive data base which might describe the perceived and actual foundations of discrimination against women in political science.

The primary assumption underlying the theme of the

questionnaire is that there are certain qualities peculiar to women which are singularly "female," and the tenacity of which no amount of male-oriented and dominated academic flogging will submerge in most cases.

"Femaleness," whether a result of socialization, genetics, both factors, or something else (such as "modeling"<sup>1</sup>) exists as a distinct set of characteristics apart from "maleness." More than just the difference between machismo and femininity this difference is evident in and reflected by academic orientations, thought processes and patterns. Other variables might include speech patterns, problem solving and conflict resolution. For example, that men and women are often characterized by speech patterns peculiar to their sex was demonstrated by a study of rhetoric in New Yorker magazine cartoons.

During the period between February 17 and May 12, 1973, one-hundred and fifty-two cartoons in the New Yorker (a general circulation magazine considered an innovator and leader in the field of cartooning) were analyzed. A questionnaire consisting of a list of captions from cartoons in the New Yorker was also distributed to fifty men and women in speech classes at the University of Illinois, with directions to indicate whether the statements were spoken by a male or female and why. To deter-

mine whether the treatment of women's rhetoric in the New Yorker cartoons was representative of mass circulation magazines, fifty-six syndicated cartoons from the Sunday Comics section of the Chicago Daily News were analyzed for the same three month period. Data resulting from the study of the cartoons suggested that:

...women use a more restricted, weaker language than men, women cartoon characters used fewer exclamations and curse words and did not converse about traditionally male topics such as finance or politics.<sup>2</sup>

Do women in our society that do discuss politics, do so from the same perspective as men? Do they do so with the same rational premises and according to the same thought processes as men? Do women in political science perceive any such differentiation? Do women in political science see themselves as exhibiting any innate differentiation along these lines, and if so, in what way(s)?

In short, the questionnaire seeks out substantive, if subjective, affirmation of the notion that men and women may think differently, and, therefore, ultimately perceive the scholarly pursuit differently.

Before posing a broad hypothesis of this nature, I felt it important to 1.) see if other women in political science perceived a dichotomy between male and female academic orienta-

tions, 2.) review the nature and character of women in the field of political science, 3.) have some indication of the nature of these differences, and 4.) have some idea of the self-image of women in political science.<sup>3</sup>

#### Methodology and Study Design

It has previously been noted that this study does not attempt to establish a theory, but rather, identify a "notion." Nonetheless, a theory-building format will be used in defining the assumptive base, conducting the research and delineating the casual structure of the questions at hand.<sup>4</sup>

From the onset it is evident that an ideal design which would explore and differentiate certain qualities peculiar to men and women lay far beyond financial or practical reach. The ideal study, for example, would span sociological, psychological and biological inputs striving for an interdisciplinary mix of supportive evidence. It would also include extensive personal interviewing to escape the low response rates that are inevitable in most types of mail surveys. However, such a design would have multiplied data-collection costs by a very significant factor, and could not be seriously considered.

### Data Source: The Questionnaire

A questionnaire format will be chosen as the most efficient means of surveying the attitudes and perceptions of women in Political Science.<sup>5</sup> The questionnaire will be mailed only to women in the field, and hence, will be most useful as a comparative measure between members of this group. Evaluation in relationship to other studies (notably those of Converse and Converse and the Political Science Association) will provide some supportive parallels as well as provoking discrepancies. The results would prompt further questions into specific areas and provide a starting point for such inquiries.

### The Sample

The only sampling frame that could be realistically assembled due to time and resource constraints involved a set of women compiled from two lists: Women in Political Science on the West Coast<sup>7</sup> and the USC list of Political Science Graduate Students of Fall 1971.<sup>8</sup> The first list includes both professional women, students, and those no longer working - with no means to distinguish these various groups. Question 2, 9, 19, 21, and 22 on the questionnaire helped resolve this problem and provided the women with an opportunity to give a general outline of their present and future goals - which, incidentally, seemed to affect

the amount of discrimination perceived by each woman, as well as her active participation in "liberation" movements in general.

Although the questionnaire distinguishes between the different levels of women within the profession (student, graduate student, professor, professional and retired professional) I have combined their answers to form a single category. I feel this is justifiable as Converse and Converse<sup>9</sup> have noted similar responses which are generally within the same range from all groups on the basic issues concerning perceived and actual discrimination (although students anticipated a bit more discrimination than was actually perceived by the professional women).

#### Format

The questionnaire was re-written several times, the final product taking into consideration the major hypothesis being tested, ease of collecting the information, length and clarity. It was tested on three female students before mailing. The questionnaire was mailed with a return envelope and an enclosed letter. See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire.

#### Return Rates

Two-hundred questionnaires were mailed in June 1972, just before summer vacation. Responses were received as late as February, 1973. Out of the two-hundred questionnaires mailed



thirty-eight per cent (seventy-three) were returned (fifteen questionnaires were returned; not forwardable, no such address, and addressee unknown).<sup>10</sup> Although not a high return, it appears to be an average response for one mailing, where stamped return envelopes were not included. No follow-up was conducted because of time and cost limitations.

The questionnaire responses were coded numerically, key-punched and processed at the USC computer lab under the SPSS program (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). All data analysis included in this paper is significant at the .05 level (chi-square). Not all respondents answered every question, therefore all percentages are based on the number that answered that question.

### The Questions

The majority of the questions were formulated with aspects of these hypotheses in mind:

Most women in political science believe that there are basic differences between academic approaches used by men and women, thought-processes and patterns as used by men and women, and judgemental and evaluation processes as used by men and women.

Marriage effects a significant, perceivable change in attitudes of co-workers towards women in political science, particularly precipitating a change in the attitudes of male co-workers.

The stereotype female faculty member is perceived by others as colder, more tense, and masculine, than the ideal female faculty member.

Women considering a career in political science are often discouraged by their educational counselors.

Women are more discriminated against in departments run by "elites" rather than those run "democratically."

Most women in the profession feel "women's lib" is a pertinent, important movement, and of great relevance to the field of political science.

Additionally, the questionnaire attempted to survey attitudes concerning women with both a career and a family by noting, for instance, reactions to stopping work to care for the family and not working during the summer.

The theme of these hypotheses is the generation of a primary normative data base of attitudes about discrimination in the field of political science, and a substantiation of the "notion" that feminine academic approaches may be different from those of men.

The more easily identifiable areas of discrimination were included in the questionnaire to provide a basis and control for other questions, as well as to verify that perceived discrimination actually exists.

The fact that there are women in the field of political science at all shows that there are a few brave souls who

weathered the first, and perhaps the toughest, years of female subjection; career-choosing time - those last years of undergraduate schooling when real decisions have to be made. For a young man the question is "What job?", whereas for a young woman, the question is "Job or Marriage?". Only recently have both even been considered compatible for a woman, possibly prompted in part by the fact that many women now start or return to careers after their child-raising years and the strong cross cultural influences from other countries.<sup>11</sup>

In Russia for example, women are ninety-five per cent of the pharmacists as compared to two per cent in the United States; eighty-three per cent of the dentists and two per cent in the United States; seventy-five per cent of the doctors and seven per cent in the United States; thirty-six per cent of the lawyers and three per cent in the United States; twenty-eight per cent of the engineers and one per cent in the United States.<sup>12</sup>

The Chinese, too, are way ahead in job equality. Women have sat on the Supreme Court since 1956. The law provides that in all legislative bodies not less than twenty per cent of the members must be women. If the United States followed this rule, there would be twenty lady senators and eighty-seven congresswomen. As it is, the high point was two lady senators

and eighteen congresswomen in 1962, before people even heard of women's lib.<sup>13</sup>

Women in professions, as dismal as the picture looks, is a reflection of the number of women in graduate school. In 1964 the percentage of master's degrees earned by women in the social sciences was only 22.4 out of 2,181 degrees awarded.<sup>14</sup> The proportion of women doctoral students is not increasing and has, in fact, dropped since 1930, when they obtained 15.4 per cent of the doctorates awarded in all subjects. In 1960 women only secured 10.5 per cent and in 1964 only 10.6 per cent.<sup>15</sup>

Let us assume that a female undergraduate has chosen the career path. How did she initially get interested enough that her motivation would lead her through the subsequent trials (Question 10)? Is there a pattern of interest or motivation that marks women with this perserverance?

And importantly, were her counselors sympathetic to her goals (Question 11)? How about those close to her (Question 12)? Certainly it is to some degree that the approval of your "leaders" and compatriots (guidance counselors, parents, and contemporaries) encourage or discourage a young person in career decisions. Women in political science have shown a tremendous amount of fortitude and self-conviction in regard to

this area (see Chapter VI).

Each of the considered hypotheses represent substantive beginnings for separate studies in themselves, but together provide an overview to the basic attitudes and confrontations encountered by women in the field of political science.

### Responses

The three issues which proved to be of most interest to the women answering the questionnaire were concerned with 1.) marriage and the career, 2.) academic approaches: male vs. female, and 3.) stereotypes. Since these were the questions that generated the most fervent and descriptive responses, I will discuss each separately.

#### On marriage

Hypothesis: Marriage effects a significant, perceivable change in the attitudes of co-workers towards women in political science, particularly precipitating a change in the attitudes of male co-workers.

The subject of marriage has long endured critical analysis from many points of view, but has recently been the object of a revised view of male/female relationships in a contemporary context. Germaine Greer<sup>16</sup> has described marriage as a self-imposed prison, love-killer, and as providing false security. She denounces the societal trick of believing a married woman to be more stable than an unmarried one, while being more generous

to men on insurance forms and business contracts.

Betty Friedan<sup>17</sup> also talks about women, marriage and security. To potential employers a married woman is more stable, (she knows her "identity") though psychological studies show that those women who married earliest, and were the most conventionally feminine, were those most troubling to the psychologist.<sup>18</sup> Friedan points out that while marriage is a sign of femininity, "being less 'feminine' is closely related to being more educated and more mature..."<sup>19</sup>

Discussing marriage and careers from another point of view, Caroline Bird charges, "Women are disqualified from many top jobs because they don't have wives."<sup>20</sup> She also points out that unmarried women are regarded warily in professional positions - she just might quit anytime to get married. A male, however, upon notice of his impending marriage, will likely as not be offered a pay raise.<sup>21</sup>

Another phenomenon associated with marriage and the job-seeking woman is the impending threat of the probability of an instant baby should the woman marry. Roslyn S. Willet points out that she worked as a top executive until the night before her baby was born and was back on the job two weeks later.<sup>22</sup>

Claire Walters, a United States Air Force Flight instruc-

tor, taught until two days before her child was born, and was also back on the job two weeks later.

When I was asked how could I continue to work with such a massive handicap, the answer was easy: a big belly only interferes with tying your shoelaces; it does not impair your intelligence. Ask any man with one.<sup>23</sup>

Nonetheless, Cynthia Fuchs Epstein<sup>24</sup> notes that "studies have shown that among those who rose to the top of their profession, the incidence of unmarried (to married) women was greater, than those who did not." Must a woman remain single to compete effectively with her married, male counterparts? Or can she combine a career with the role of a wife?

In Academic Women,<sup>25</sup> Jessie Bernard hits closest to home when she says, "Academic women ... are less likely to be married than are women in comparable professions."

She offers three hypotheses to explain this statistic; a monastic tradition in the academic world, and a shortage of suitable men in the world at large. She quotes and supports Margaret Mead with, "the academic world is fundamentally hostile, by tradition ... to those aspects of femininity which involve child bearing."<sup>26</sup> The monastic tradition, means, of course, in addition to asceticism, no marriage. She argues also that the woman with a preference for a celibate life is proved abundant in the academic world by including biographical sketches of several

women in academia who chose this path.

Her most convincing argument, however, is the lack of peers. She quotes Helene Deutsch who believes "Woman's intellectuality is to a large extent, paid for by the loss of valuable feminine qualities."<sup>27</sup> In other words, intellectual ability makes them less than women. Bernard counters this by suggesting that the deforming effect due to the intellectual gifts of the young woman is not concerned with feminity per se, but to the relative deficit of young men superior to her to perform the masculine role to her feminine. I would differ here with the assumption that the masculine role need be "superior," it should surely be "different," but her point is made. Ashly Montagu is one who argues that a woman is inherently "superior," in physical characteristics (such as chromozone formation) as well as mental capacity (women have higher I.Q.'s)<sup>28</sup> but again, it appears the more significant comparison emphasizes the differences between male and female. As the Kuder Occupational Interest Survey has shown time and time again, for example, fifty-seven per cent of men in general but only thirty-five per cent of women in general would rather go to see a fire if presented with an alternative choice of activities. This, and similar differences of preference and ability, does not make either sex "superior," merely different.



Of those responding to the questionnaire (seventy-three women) eight per cent (five women) are, or have been married. Of those who were married during their careers, all but two per cent (one woman) noted a significant change in the attitudes of co-workers, especially male (see Chart I). Some excerpts from the questionnaires identify just how marriage affects perceptual attitudes towards women in political science:

They treated me like a friend - a married woman, so that it was a different kind of relationship.

I noticed a change in the attitude on the part of my immediate supervisor (male) ... because I was no longer 'available.'

Co-workers were more relaxed, joked more frequently with less seriousness.

Marriage affected my social relationships.

Some couldn't believe I was serious about a career and kept treating me like 'temporary help' for years.

These responses refer to the perceived social change in status, and therefore interpersonal relationships. Another type of response referred more directly to the perceived professional change in status;

In terms of the 'job' market, I think my professors now somehow felt no great sense of urgency in finding me ... or promoting me ... for a job because I had to force them.

... I think student attitudes are much more favorable toward married, female teachers.

CHART I  
CHANGE IN ATTITUDE OF COLLEAGUES  
DUE TO MARRIAGE

	Married (N=58)	Not Married (N=15)
Noted or expected change	57 (98%)	12 (80%)
Did not note or expect change	1 (2%)	3 (20%)

I was presumed serious. ♦

The change in social status is understandable, from a behavioral standpoint, but the change in professional status is not. Why a woman should be considered more or less serious in respect to her work should not depend on her marital status, but purely on professional criteria. The need for and the nebulous state of a codified list or set of elements which make up "professional criteria" is questioned here.

This perceived change in attitude is acknowledged by unmarried women in "anticipated" responses. Seventy-eight per cent of the sample (fifty-seven women), felt marriage would affect their career, socially and/or professionally. The most often expressed concern relative to personal careers involved the anticipated added responsibilities, and many suggested they might work only part-time after marriage. Others insisted they would only marry with, "Career plans worked fully into a marriage - and only on those conditions."

The theme here is that a woman must struggle between marriage and career, whereas for a man, career and marriage are acknowledged as compatible, and even simbiotic. This dichotomous situation was expressed by one woman in these words,

(Marriage) would mean making sacrifices to advance

my husband's career at least half the time, or else not doing that - and feeling guilty.

Any alternatives to this situation apparently threatened deep-seated traditional social values, held by both men and women.

Academic approaches: male vs. female

Hypothesis: There are basic differences between academic approaches used by men and women, separate thought processes and patterns used by men and women, and different judgemental and evaluation processes used by men and women.

Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran have devoted a section of their book, "Woman in Sexist Society," to the behavioral aspects of women, and called it "Woman is Made, Not Born."<sup>29</sup> There are several essays to this effect. In "Psychology Constructs the Female," Naomi Weisstein<sup>30</sup> attacks the approach currently used by psychologists in the study of behavior. She points out:

Psychologists make the central assumption that human behaviour rests on an individual and inner dynamic ... Meanwhile, the evidence is accumulating that what a person does and who he believes himself to be will in general be a function of what people around him expect him to be, and what the overall situation in which he is acting implies what he is.<sup>31</sup>

She argues that men and women have equal potential and are equally endowed with brain-power. Women are shown to be as intelligent as men, and perhaps a little more so, until high-

school, when most finally "get the message" that women are supposed to be dumb, or at least "dumber" than men. There are a few women, however, she posits, that never "get the message," through high-school, college, or even graduate school. These women must be different, at least from other women.

In "Ambivalence: the Socialization of Women,"<sup>32</sup>

Judith M. Bardwick and Elizabeth Douvan describe the comparative socialization patterns of men and women. They point out that until puberty boys and girls are allowed to compete on equal terms in school, both in the classroom and on the playground. At the onset of puberty, however, boys are encouraged to stay competitive in both these areas, whereas girls are "socialized away from" this competitiveness - a female must begin to assert her "femininity." She becomes conspicuous competing with the boys at sports and she is encouraged to compete with other girls, instead, at "dating" games. Socialization tends to enhance initial sexual-biological tendencies.

Whether you are male or female, if you have the traditional masculine personality qualities - objectivity rather than subjectivity, aggression rather than passivity, the motive to achieve rather than a fear of success, courage rather than conformity, and professional commitment, ambition, and drive - you are more likely to succeed in masculine roles.<sup>33</sup>

Thus Bardwick and Douvan acknowledge ingrained

differences, motivations and tendencies between men and women, but account their substantial difference to the socialization process. They point out that "role freedom" for a woman will prove to be a frustrating experience until socialization standards have been more clearly defined, indicating that traits may be more likely generated by social values than any ingrained biological function.

But what do women in the field of political science believe in this area? Are there basic differences in academic approaches, thought-processes and judgemental standards between the sexes? The questionnaire posed this inquiry in the form of three questions (See Chart II):

Question 14: Do you think there are marked differences between the academic approaches used by men and women? If so, what are they?

There is an aura surrounding the academic world that suggests intellectual pursuits have a neuter quality about them. Often cold and pristine, they seem merely a matter of logical analysis, of systematic review, theoretically non-biased results. A computer, as well as a man or woman, might exemplify the average academic approach. Sixty per cent (forty-three women) of the seventy-three women questioned agreed that there is no difference between male and female academic approaches. The

**CHART II**  
**DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE**  
**COGNITION**

	In academic approaches	In thought- processes and patterns	In judgemental and evaluative processes
There is a difference	29 (40%)	35 (48%)	34 (46%)
There is no difference	44 (60%)	38 (52%)	39 (54%)

other forty per cent (thirty women) for the most part, did not know, or were not sure. Many said they had never had a female professor, or had never seen one at work, and hence could not answer the question; the women who answered "yes" apparently have worked with other women. More than one response suggested women in general are more behavior oriented than men.

Question 15: Do you think there are thought-processes and patterns peculiar to women? If so, please explain.

In response to this question, the women indicated that they see themselves as more conceptually verbal, and indicated that there might indeed be a quantifiable difference between men and women in this area. Although fifty-two per cent (thirty-eight women) answered a "no" opinion to the idea of these differences, the other forty-eight per cent (thirty-five women) of the responding women considered the idea possible, probable, or true, and offered reasons for their opinions:

Women are more means oriented than men - it shows in concern for details, and for people.

I consider it plausible, that differences in child socialization could produce differences in handling of information, in relating 'feelings' to 'thoughts' in differences in perceptions of what 'rational' or 'sane' priorities are.

Women are more inclined to notice fine detail...

Women's thought processes reflect a vital concern



for the less tangible things in life, e. g. happiness, peaceful co-existence, an international spirit of human-kind.

There appears to be a felt consensus that arose from these answers which becomes even more evident and concrete with the feedback from Question number 16.

Question 16: Do you think there are judgemental and evaluation processes peculiar to women? If so, please explain.

Although fifty-four per cent (thirty-nine women) of the responding women believed that there are not judgemental and evaluation processes peculiar to women, it is possible that these respondents may have been successfully socialized by "male academic criteria." It is in the contemplative answers of the other women that the possibility of a new academic realm is indicated.

Those who answered yes, or possibly, to this question replied with answers such as these:

I think that a woman's processes are more fully developed in that they incorporate feelings and thinking unabashedly and naturally. Men, on the other hand, must make a deliberate and determined effort to 'humanize' their evaluative processes.

Women appear to give greater attention to ultimate consequences - to people in general. Men to the pragmatic application of policy.

Women tend to be somewhat more concerned about the human dimensions of ... decisions and policies.

Women seem to recognize the importance of intuitive feeling....

Many suggested that there are differences due to feminine roles and experiences, while many who answered "no," indicated that there may be differences, though not inherent or biological.

It seems relevant to point out, that until scientific studies are conducted to disprove biological differences inherent in male/female thought processes, this should not be discounted. On the other hand, even if biological brain-functions are identical between the sexes, there is pressing evidence that socialization processes have played an important role in shaping fundamental thinking and theory-formulative process differences between men and women.

I have discovered in this last analysis a possible myth underlying academia. As long as men have run the higher schools of learning (women excluded for a variety of social and socio-political pressures), the principles, patterns, and methods of learning have been male dominated - and may I suggest, male-oriented. Perhaps if, first, there are qualitative differences between academic approaches, thought-patterns, and judgemental processes between men and women, and secondly, these are recognized as different, allowed to flourish in their own direction,

and accepted on their own merits and by their own criteria, a new body of literature might emerge sparkling with an insight bountiful as a new world yet undiscovered, while sagely wise, deep and ingenious as Woman has to offer.

### Stereotypes

Hypothesis: The stereotype female faculty member is perceived by others as colder, more tense and masculine, than the ideal female faculty member.

Stereotypes have often revealed how societies express evaluations, standards, and models. The very concept of "stereotype" gives an interesting insight into the nature of this phenomena:

STEREOTYPING is the method of making type-metal plates for use in printing. In the process, workmen set tye type and lock it into a steel frame.... It takes only about 15 minutes to make a stereotype....<sup>34</sup>

This explanation of the original "stereotype" is much akin to its semantic variation - a method of making type-humans for use in comparison.

The questionnaire offered the respondents an opportunity to express two stereotypes: the typical female political science faculty member and the ideal female political science faculty member.

Most of the women indicated a certain amount of uneasiness about drawing conclusions concerning the qualities and

attributes of a typical female faculty member. Their reasons coincided with the recurring comment of those who did not answer this section at all - they had never had a female instructor in the field of political science, and hence could draw no conclusions. Those who did answer often said that their responses were "conjured," having had no encounter with a female faculty member, as a professor or colleague.

The stereotype question<sup>35</sup> provided the respondent with an opportunity to scale her perceived models. (See Chart III). The resulting comparisons seem to indicate some real discrepancies and ambiguities felt by women in political science. They also indicate what this sample of women feels the ideal female faculty member should be like, and hence, those areas that merit investigation where a substantial gap between typical and ideal occurs.

The chart fascinatingly reveals that the typical political science female faculty member is significantly more tense than her "ideal type" counterpart. This tenseness of the female faculty member is understandable when compared with the stereotype that Cellestine Ware presents in Woman Power:

Feminists in both the early and contemporary stages of the movement for women's emancipation have been typified as unnatural. Their detractors have delighted

CHART III

STEREOTYPES

	TYPICAL FEMALE FACULTY MEMBER	IDEAL FEMALE FACULTY MEMBER	POINT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TYPICAL AND IDEAL
Tense-calm	2	4	2
Passive-aggressive	3	4	1
Dependent-independent	4	5	1
Emotional-unemotional	3	3	0
Feminine-masculine	2	2	0
Irrational-rational	4	5	1
Unproductive-productive	4	5	1
Open-closed	3	2	1
Demanding-accepting	3	3	0
Ambitious-unambitious	2	2	0
Cooperative-competitive	3	3	0

Scores range from (1) to (5). The numerical value (1) is closer to the first descriptive extreme, while (5) is closer to the second. Average scores are all returned questionnaires are used. N = 73.

to picture them as thin-lipped, man-hating, frustrated, neurotic malcontents.<sup>36</sup>

And from Sullerot's Women, Society and Change,<sup>37</sup>

A woman in a responsible job must be able to offer more qualifications and skills than a man, while at the same time remaining 'feminine.'

No wonder the typical female faculty member in political science is perceived as tense!

It also seems that the common epistemological understanding of the word "feminine" negates any qualities that allude to concepts of self-sufficiency. Those qualities that do, are regarded as "unfeminine," cold, and "masculine." This may explain why typical and ideal female faculty members are perceived as only one point away from "masculine."

It appears that the concepts of "feminine" and "independent" must be reconciled if women in academia wish to exemplify their heritage.

The beautiful and certainly feminine Zsa Zsa Gabor sums up the independence versus helplessness syndrome for women,

... the main thing to be smart about (for a woman), is what it's dumb to be smart about, and what it's smart to play dumb about ....<sup>38</sup>

In her book Fascinating Womanhood, Helen B. Andelin devotes a chapter to "feminine dependency," and says,

Feminine dependency is the feminine actions of a woman. It can best be described by saying 'It is her lack of masculine ability.' ... What happens when the average red-blooded man comes in contact with an obviously able, intellectual and competent woman manifestly independent of any help a mere man can give and capable of meeting him or defeating him upon his own ground? He simply doesn't feel like a man any longer.<sup>39</sup>

Perhaps this analysis explains why the typical female faculty member has tended to be less independent than her ideal counterpart, as well as less rational and productive. Certainly it would not be to her professional advantage to alienate all her male colleagues, especially if all her colleagues are male.

This is not to discredit or refute the concept of "feminine dependency," however. Unless we define the university as being inherently male, writing a paper, giving a speech, or reading a book could be placed in that previously defined category, "neuter-academia." If a woman out-does a man on any of these counts, it should possibly injure his intellectual pride - not necessarily his masculine pride.

A concept that closely parallels and overlaps "stereotype" is that of the "status quo." C. F. Epstein<sup>40</sup> speaks about birth order and wonders if this might be a determining factor in whether or not a woman chooses a career. "The woman who has had a special place in her family probably is better able to avoid

a stereotyped mold."

The "stereotype mold" Epstein speaks of is that of the wife/mother/homemaker. But given the opportunity to avoid this categorization, is the stereotyped woman not liable to fall under the heading of a more uncomplimentary stereotype, that of a pushy, cold, hard woman? Thus, a woman of great potential may find herself subjected to the status quo she is required to fulfill, but does not really understand. "The middle-class woman is required to operate at only minimum capacity."<sup>41</sup>

To do otherwise she must break rank, she must assert herself first as other than middle-class, and secondly, it seems, as other than "woman." No wonder those who conspicuously pursue a career, specifically in academia, are likely to be labeled and thought of in terms that include "cold," "unemotional" and perhaps most unfeminine of all, "rational."

What do these results from the questionnaire mean? What are the implications? To answer these questions the results must be placed in a broader context.

The following chapter is arranged according to a deductive process of analysis - from a consideration of woman in politics, to the role and status of a female in political science, and finally to the interface of political science with women's liberation.



## CHAPTER III

### WOMEN AND POLITICS

"Man is a political animal," said Aristotle, "For politicians neither love nor hate," continued John Dryden, while "A woman either loves or hates; she knows no medium," concluded Syrus. It seems politics has always been a never-never land for women. The suffragettes who fought so diligently for the right to vote were debased as the cause for the moral undoing of woman. Politics is secretly thought of as dirty, immoral, and masculine. Carrie Chapman Catt, one of the most influential women in obtaining women's rights, describes how men interpreted early earnest appeals by women in the political arena as capriciousness or mere feminine wiles.<sup>1</sup>

It has not been the American tradition to elect women to political positions, nor to appoint them.<sup>2</sup> Men and women are supposedly given equal opportunity to compete for civil service jobs in the United States, but

... the examining board, usually predominately if not completely male, often rates male candidates above females because they believe women are not well qualified.<sup>3</sup>

To most Americans, it would appear, the idea of a woman as President seems almost as outlandish as the idea of a woman as God. In Europe, despite the tradition of women monarchs, the situation for women in government appears much the same.

Bernadette Devlin, who wrote The Price of My Soul<sup>4</sup> after her first session as a twenty-two year old, female member of Parliament admitted, "Basically I have no right in organized politics," suggesting that she should perhaps be working as a secretary, "at the bottom." Does she say this as a woman or a revolutionary? Although this question is not specifically answered, she provides an interesting insight in the forward of her book,

The Price of My Soul refers not to the price for which I could be prepared to sell out, but rather to the price we all must pay in life to preserve our own integrity.

Political philosophers have long degraded a woman's interest in politics, or other intellectually inclined pursuits. Nietzsche,<sup>5</sup> for example, a flaming and ardent believer that women play a "secondary role," said, "When a woman is intellectually inclined there is usually something wrong with her sex."

Both Plato<sup>6</sup> and Aristotle<sup>7</sup> regarded women (as well as

children and slaves) as pliable objects in the hands of the government. And Aristotle, noting degrees of "goodness," affirmed Sophocles' observation, "A modest silence is a woman's crown." Machiavelli<sup>8</sup> in The Prince and Discourses, includes a special chapter (XXVI) entitled, "How States are Ruined on Account of Women." As late as the 18th century, the noble Baron de Montesquieu<sup>9</sup> noted, when speaking of the extremes of equality; i. e. . . , if all persons were equal,

... wives, children, slaves (would) shake off all subjection. No longer will there be any such thing as manners, order, or virtue.

One could easily conclude that chaos results from political equality.

Barely twenty years after Montesquieu's warning, David Hume,<sup>10</sup> clearly delineated men and women on moral grounds as inherently different. He attested (in political treatise) that virtue in a man is exemplified by "courage," whereas in a woman, it is by "chastity." More recently, Greenstein<sup>11</sup> accorded the most obvious political differences between male and female as evident in the issue positions and candidate choices,

Women are less willing to support policies they perceive as warlike or aggressive ... (they) have been shown to have greater 'moralistic orientation' than men....

In my own experience, however, the Viet Nam War

indicated that men have as much of an aversion to policies that are warlike as do women.

It might seem, therefore, that despite the advancements thus far made by women, those women in politics, or the field of political science, have a double wall which they must fell. Not only must they assert the standard that a woman can be a woman and maintain a career, but also that she can be interested in politics and remain feminine. The political struggle for women studying politics is almost as fierce as it is for women in politics.

In 1969 the American Political Science Association created a committee on the status of women in the profession to recommend ways of enhancing the professional position of women and of encouraging women to enter the field of political science. Several special studies undertaken by the committee from 1969 through 1971 reveal the disadvantage of women in recruitment, professional activities, and their prospects for advancement.<sup>12</sup> Many examples of these "disadvantages" were noted by women answering the questionnaires, as the following section illustrates.

#### The Female vs. the Department of Political Science

This tale begins for the female student often before career decision time (in the form of social antecedents such as

sex-role conditioning and compatible childhood aspirations),<sup>13</sup> but let us assume our heroine has successfully progressed in her education career to the college level, where she asks, "What now, Mr. Guidance Counselor?"

Those women now in political science have gotten there, often enough, by ignoring the discouraging advice from their counselors. Undoubtedly many more have taken the advice and hence have not graced the threshold of this still blossoming science. A study which sought to test the hypothesis that counselors are biased against women entering a "masculine" occupation indicated that such counselor bias does indeed exist, with female counselors displaying as much bias as the males.<sup>14</sup>

Results from the questionnaire included in this paper confirm these results.

"We don't take any women your age," was the reply one woman student, now a professor, received from an academic counselor. "What does your husband think? This will interfere with your social life."

One woman almost continued her studies in sociology rather than political science; "My advisor said his colleagues in political science are skeptical of women in the Ph.D. program."

Another advisor told a young woman, "For a woman in Political Science, a Ph.D. is an extra."

Many of these comments from the questionnaire speak for themselves:

A teaching advisor strongly discouraged me about teaching opportunities for women in political science.

The department chairman was the most discouraging.

My counselor said the profession does not welcome women.

Numerous male political scientists (have said to me), women social scientists aren't worth a damn, and while they had anything to say, one would never teach in their departments.

My counselor said political science is too tough for a woman.

One advisor said to me 'Women never finish anything.'

One counselor discouraged me and insisted that as a housewife/mother I'd be bound to be 'dilettante.'

It seems many departments of political science have hired chauvenistic counselors, or political science has a bad reputation as being unaccomodating to women, or else, and this is a possibility, women really cannot handle the university world of political science.

Yet, some women have managed to struggle through various university accredited political science programs, others are "being processed" and some are just embarking on the education adventure. How do these women feel about their own

capabilities, their chances, and the generally unfavorable atmosphere which they have claimed as their own?

The mailed questionnaire probed these delicate areas from several angles. First, to establish the environment of male/female encounters in political science departments, the question "what types of political science departments seem to be the most discriminatory" was posed.

Women are generally more discriminated against in departments run by elites, rather than in those run democratically. Question number 21 on the questionnaire ("Do you feel your department is run democratically or by an elite?") was correlated with those who answered question number 25 in such a way as to indicate a substantial amount of discrimination occurred within their department now.

"Elites" were variously described by those responding as "tenured members," "long-time department members," "higher-salaried males," "older, tradition," "old codgers," "older professors rather than younger professors or graduate students," "authoritarian," and "male chauvanists." Generally, "elites" seem to be old, tenured men.

Could it be that these old men tend to perpetuate the myth of the Second Sex? Simone de Beauvoir outlines this myth; women (emotional), are meant for the hearth and home, while

men (brains) bring home the bread; "... the myth of woman: it justifies all (male) privileges and even authorizes their abuse."<sup>15</sup>

Undoubtedly this time-honoured stance flavours the deeds and decisions of tenured old men. It follows, a creature bred to be an emotional housewife certainly could not satisfactorily operate within the confines of a brainy-bread-winners' domain.

Similarly, authoritarian political systems tend to be less liberal than democratic ones. However, even in the "democratically" organized departments, the majority is not inclined to vote the minority ticket. Women, therefore, must often turn to "affirmative action committees," generically referred to as "women's lib."

### Women's Liberation and the Field of Political Science

When a female student walks into a graduate class in political science, one thing is often startlingly clear. She is the only female to walk into the class. From there on she must silently bear being the example of feminism within the discipline - whether she has an inclination to do so or not. She is looked to if a question of male/female statistics should arise (how would she know?) and must solely bear the brunt of wife/secretary/



mother jokes that crop up in the course of instruction. Certainly a few sisters would strengthen her morale, if not give her the courage to offer a few jokes of her own.

Another illuminating facet of the struggle was pointed out by a male member of a political science faculty. It seems undergraduate men often single out a particular professor, and become something akin to an understudy, or protégé. For a male student to be able to work closely with a professor in this way is not only good for both the professor and student, but is considered somewhat a noblesse tradition.

However, would not a female student, working closely with a professor in such a manner, though be it purely academic, not raise a few eyebrows? The female, by sheer social stigma, department hearsay, and the way of man, is seldom allowed to cultivate this often extremely rewarding student-professor relationship. Unless, of course, she could work with a female professor - and here is the crux of the matter - there are fewer female professors in the field of political science than there are female students - much fewer. The University of Southern California, for example, has one. Many universities have only one female faculty member on the staff (perhaps a token gesture?), and more have none.

Why are there so few women faculty members? How

can the female assert herself in this masculine kingdom? Is the answer "women's liberation?"

A full ninety-three per cent of the women questioned (sixty-eight women) feel that "women's lib" is of great pertinence to the women in political science.<sup>16</sup>

"To help equalize opportunities and open up more jobs," was the most often cited relevance of women's lib to political science. "To get more women into political science and politics," came next as the viable spin-off from the movement, and finally, "... to get women to look at life differently," with "an increase in feminine 'consciousness'." "Recognizing women-power" was mentioned occasionally.

"Women's Liberation" has asserted itself in our society with a repercussion especially noticeable in literary output. New magazines have cropped up with "Woman Power" as their guiding principle. New Woman,<sup>17</sup> for example, proclaims, "new lifestyles for the involved woman," and offers such articles as "Know Your Rights" by Laura L. Barker, L.L.B., "Non-Sexist Child Rearing," and a "New Life Plan for the Frustrated Housewife," which tells the story of two women who changed their "status" from housewife to career woman.

Ms.<sup>18</sup> is a more "literate" magazine, published by the Ms. Magazine Corporation with Gloria Steinem as its president

(she is also one of the editors of the magazine). Ms. sports such articles as "The Radicalization of Simone de Beauvoir," "The Equal Rights Amendment: What's in it for You?" and "Kate Millett's Sculpture."

Cosmopolitan<sup>19</sup> proclaims a "new slant" to its literary coverage, taking a more light-hearted view to "the movement," and offers these possibilities in an article called "Liberation NOW!";

Tell him your new secretary is extremely sexy - and he's single!

Tell him, 'You're very clever - you think like a woman!'

McLuhan's observation that the medium is the message, coupled with the increasing output of "liberated woman" media messages, suggests there might be a "liberated" status also for women in political science. If "socialization" is the medium, the process has begun, at least on a societal level. Within the confines of the academic field of political science, the story is also beginning to unfold.

Forty-three per cent of the women (thirty-one women) reported via the questionnaire that their universities have "Affirmative Action Committees," and seventy per cent (twenty-two women) of the women aware of these committees belong to

or are active supporters of the committees. Many of the other women indicated that they would join if such committees were available, or that they are in the process of forming such committees. The need has been felt, and these women are organizing to meet the demands.

In Woman Power Cellestine Ware opens her book with these words,

GOALS ... Radical feminism is working for the eradication of domination and elitism in all human relationships. This would make self-determination the ultimate good and require the downfall of society as we know it today.<sup>20</sup>

The University of Southern California has a group of women working for equal rights within its academic bounds, and it seems they are calling for a downfall of this university-society as we know it. I had the privilege to attend several meetings about University Commission on the Status of Women, specifically the Subcommittee on Administration. At one of these meetings, as acting secretary, I had the opportunity to chronicle a political process, presented, represented, organized, and undertaken by women. The committees' endeavors were modeled after the "Affirmative Action Program" as outlined by the Defense Supply Agency, which emphasizes equality through employment, policy and administration.

Over the course of several meetings, the women on the committee (with Barbara Gardner as chairperson) first collected, then organized statistics, set policy, and outlined an immediate and five-year plan. The outcomes of their recommendations for program staffing could conceivably be applied to the department of political science, if such "forceful" measures need be effected.

The report submitted by the Subcommittee on Administration to the Commission on the Status of Women at USC was completed in May 1972 and submitted to President Hubbard on June 1, 1972. The report included a list of findings about the mix of the current administrative work force of the university which, in short, shows that although women represent slightly more than one third of the undergraduate and master's degrees awarded, the representation of women in administrative positions is not congruous. The top four administrative offices (president, vice-president, associate vice-president and associate dean) are occupied by men. Academic deans and department directors show only fifteen per cent and twelve per cent representation by women, respectively.

The committee put forth a recommended goal of one-third occupancy by women in these top administrative positions,

to be filled within five years. An affirmative action program, modeled after Chapter 60, Title 41, Part 60-2 of the U.S. Department of Labor's Federal Contract Compliance laws, was outlined and labeled "an action oriented program." A copy of the draft report submitted by the Subcommittee on Administration and their affirmative action program is included in Appendix B.

## CONCLUSION

It might seem that women actively involved in "liberation movements" antagonize men who would otherwise be sympathetic to the cause. But were it not for these fighting women, would not the same subjection of women continue? Must not there be a few to raise the issues and present the arguments? When Emma Goldman raised her fist in the 1920's and cried for birth control, legalized abortion, and rights for women, she was promptly labeled an anarchist - indeed, what other school would embrace her views and "outrageous" suggestions in those early days.<sup>1</sup> "Revolution must be re-invented," was her cry, and it was through the exaggerated reactionary tactics of Goldman and others like her that rights for workers, and later for women, were effected at all. Those women that did and now brandish liberation flags like guns, are those that helped shape the system that token bit - enough to cause a ripple to stir through society, political bureaucracy and academia, startling a few sleepers to their feet and eventually (if the Equal Rights Amendment is passed), changing the Constitution.

In the field of political science the problem is threefold; it encompasses the problem of the status of women in academia, the dilemma of women involved in politics, and the subjection of women at large. Perhaps these issues can be solved simultaneously. It seems there are two roads to changing things within the field of political science. One is through the field itself: hiring faculty and accepting students according to ability, training counselors to encourage rather than to quench or dampen female student's lust for a career, and perhaps even acknowledging differentiation in thought patterns, methods, and approaches between male and female academicians.

The other road, broader, slower, and tougher, is to work for equality of women within society: flood the media and minds of the populous with the "liberated woman" concept, and wait for its effects to seep through to academia.

Qualitative as well as quantitative research is needed to substantiate trends. Either method alone cannot adequately explain the dimensions inherent in the questions that have been raised. The important questions raised thus far include, first, the concept of a "neuter academia." Thus far subjectivity and normative positions have been largely at the inclination of the author. Conceivably academia might broaden its base to include



a feminist sort of subjectivity, possibly encompassing "intuition," "emotions" and other criteria offered by women in the field.

Secondly, there is an indication of an emerging phenomena which might be labeled "female politics." Currently it is only an ambiguously structured and vaguely synthesized construct of political/emotional voting patterns, an intuitive/deductive philosophy and a fundamentally non-war oriented political stance. If "female politics" is based on another premise, one of female rationality, it should be confronted more directly and explored more carefully.

Thirdly, there is a recurring theme raised in this paper that calls for further analysis of what it posits; male and female academic approaches are different and thought processes, patterns of reasoning and formative conceptualizations are sex-specific to a certain degree. If adequately verified this delineation should be acknowledged, allowed to flourish, and finally reconciled with traditional academia.

Fourthly, the implications of the foregoing issues indicate that they may best and most naturally be examined and evaluated not only by those in the field of political science, but also by those in sociology and psychology as well. Political science flourishes partly because of its integrated composition.

The reason that there are few women in the field of political science, and the accompanying discriminatory problems such as low-pay and inferior status, may stem from a fundamental discrepancy between approach, endeavor and output between male and female logic, standards and reasoning processes. It is the feeling of this author that these differences should not be subjugated or forced to conform to a single standard, but rather, each encouraged to flourish according to its temperament, and reconciled on the basis of individuality.

This "notion" may not be amenable to examination by purely statistical evidence or other empirical data to which many politically relevant questions are subject. On the other hand, it provides the social scientist with an opportunity to examine a question that is founded on a potentially paradigmatic underpinning.

APPENDIX A  
QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer those questions applicable to you (not all respondents will be able to answer all questions). Use additional sheets of paper if needed, or write on the back, and please attach materials wherever you can. Anonymity guaranteed.

1. Age: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Year of graduation (or expected graduation) and degree:  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Are you single, married, divorced, separated, or widowed? (circle one)
4. If married during your career, did you note a significant change in the attitudes of your co-workers, after your marriage (esp. male)? If so, please explain:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. If ever married, what was the date of your first marriage?  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. If not married, do you feel marriage would significantly affect your career? Why or why not?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. If you have children, please state their ages:
8. Have you ever stopped work to care for your family?  
(if so, for how long)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
9. Do you work within the profession during the summer for compensation? If so, in what capacity (full-time, part-time, teaching, research, etc)?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. How did you get interested in P.S.? \_\_\_\_\_
11. Were you ever encouraged, or discouraged (circle one) by a counselor or advisor to pursue P.S.? (please note male or female):  
\_\_\_\_\_
12. Were you ever encouraged, or discouraged (circle one), by anyone to pursue your profession? If so, by whom?  
\_\_\_\_\_
13. What do you think would get more women into P.S.?  
\_\_\_\_\_
14. Do you think there are marked differences between academic approaches used by men and women? If so, what are they? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
15. Do you think there are thought-processes and patterns peculiar to women? If so, please explain: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
16. Do you think there are judgemental and evaluation processes peculiar to women? If so, please explain:

- 
- 
17. How would you characterize "women's lib" generally?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
18. What do you see as the pertinence of the movement (if any) to P.S.? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
19. Does your University have an "Affirmative Action Committee"? If so, do you participate? \_\_\_\_\_
20. Would you, if it were available, participate on such a committee? Why or why not? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
21. Do you feel your department is run democratically or by an elite? \_\_\_\_\_
22. If given the opportunity, would you prefer an administrative position? \_\_\_\_\_
23. Stereotypes: Please indicate your immediate first impression of what a TYPICAL (or IDEAL) FEMALE FACULTY MEMBER is like by placing an X along each dimension in the appropriate area. If, for example, there were a "warm ... cold" dimension, and your immediate impression of a typical (or ideal) faculty member is of one who is fairly cold, then you would place an X in the area closer to the "cold" end of the continuum, depending on the degree desired:

warm    /    /    /    /    /    /cold

Please mark each of the following dimensions according to your first impressions:

TYPICAL FEMALE FACULTY MEMBER

tense	/ / / / / / / /	calm
passive	/ / / / / / / /	aggressive
dependent	/ / / / / / / /	independent
emotional	/ / / / / / / /	unemotional
feminine	/ / / / / / / /	masculine
irrational	/ / / / / / / /	rational
unproductive	/ / / / / / / /	productive
open	/ / / / / / / /	close
demanding	/ / / / / / / /	accepting
ambitious	/ / / / / / / /	unambitious
cooperative	/ / / / / / / /	competitive

IDEAL FEMALE FACULTY MEMBER

tense	/ / / / / / / /	calm
passive	/ / / / / / / /	aggressive
dependent	/ / / / / / / /	independent
emotional	/ / / / / / / /	unemotional
feminine	/ / / / / / / /	masculine
irrational	/ / / / / / / /	rational
unproductive	/ / / / / / / /	productive
open	/ / / / / / / /	close
demanding	/ / / / / / / /	accepting
ambitious	/ / / / / / / /	unambitious
cooperative	/ / / / / / / /	competitive

24. Have you ever written any books, articles, etc. concerning the role or status of women? If so, please list on back.
25. Have you ever felt you have been discriminated against on the basis of sex? (including any of these areas: job consideration, salary, teaching appointments, promotion, placement service, financial support, grant applications, initial rank, tenure, decision-making, later professional interests, department admissions, graduate admissions, exams, thesis, degree candidacy) If so, please explain:

---



---

---

---

Further comments or suggestions appreciated,

Thank you again,

Angela Masson



APPENDIX B  
DRAFT REPORT  
TO THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS  
OF WOMEN AT USC

APPENDIX A

DRAFT REPORT

TO THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT USC

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

Introduction

In accordance with the request of the Chairwoman of the Commission on the Status of Women at USC, the Subcommittee on Administration submits the Draft Report on Administration which follows herewith.

The Subcommittee on Administration requests that the Report, if and as approved by the Commission, be disseminated immediately to the university community, and that at the same time notice be given of an open meeting of the Commission to be held at 12:00 noon, Monday, May 22, room 201, Students' Activities Center.

The purpose of the planned open meeting will be to permit all interested persons in the university to express their approval or disapproval of the Draft Report and offer suggestions for improvements before it is put into final form.

The Subcommittee further requests that the Commission convene immediately after the open meeting of May 22 to make any changes in the Draft Report which appear appropriate in the light of the findings of the open meeting, and that the Report in its final form be voted on by the Commission.

The Report as approved may then be transmitted to President Hubbard before the final drafting of the university's Affirmative Action Program to be submitted to the government on June 1, 1972.

## I. Top Administrative Positions

### A. Findings

#### 1. The mix of the work force is as follows:

<u>Position</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
PRESIDENT/VICE PRESIDENT	9	9	0
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT	2	2	0
DEAN (ACADEMIC)	13	11	2
DEAN (NON-ACADEMIC)	3	2	1
ASSOCIATE DEAN	23	23	0
ASSISTANT DEAN	8	6	2
DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS	<u>102</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>12</u>
	160	143	17

#### 2. Recent developments

a. On December 1, 1971, President Hubbard issued a memorandum to all Vice Presidents, Academic Deans and Department Heads announcing that the university was beginning a program "to end sex discrimination at all levels voluntarily, rather than wait until we are forced to take action."

b. Since December 1, 1971, five appointments have been made to top level administration positions within the university. Of the two vice presidents and three deans appointed, none were women.

c. A Search Committee has been appointed for Vice President of Student Affairs. Three of the eight members

(two students and one faculty member) are women. The President has asked the Committee to consider qualified women as well as qualified men as they seek out potential candidates, and also indicated that "We will sincerely endeavor to see that women are fairly represented on all such university search committees." (Memo to Chairwoman Barbara Shell of April 18, 1972.)

3. Analysis of problem areas in respect of underutilization of women in major job classifications?

a. Of the seven categories in top administrative positions analyzed, we find that the following classifications do not underutilize women:

	<u>% Women of Total</u>
DEAN (NON-ACADEMIC)	33%
ASSISTANT DEAN	25%

b. The following classifications have underutilization of women:

DEAN (ACADEMIC)	15%
DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS	12%

c. The following job classifications are found to be completely void of women:

PRESIDENT/VICE PRESIDENT	0%
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT	0%
ASSOCIATE DEAN	0%

B. Goals and Timetables

1. It is required by federal regulation (US Department of Labor, Title 21, Chapter 60-2.12, December 4, 1971) that affirmative action goals should be significant, measurable, and attainable, and should be specific for planned results, with timetables for completion. Goals,

timetables, and affirmative action commitments must be designed to correct any identifiable deficiencies.

2. Recommended goals for women in top administrative positions within the university cannot be derived from any clearly defined labor pool, such as exists for many job categories.

a. There is no way to measure that portion of the educated female labor pool not currently available for administrative positions because of discouragement.

b. Current data on women professors or women in academic administrative positions cannot be used since there is clear evidence that across the country women have been discriminated against in all but the lowest academic positions.

c. Proportion of doctoral degrees awarded to women cannot be used as a basis for goals because doctoral degrees are not necessarily a requirement for top administrative positions. At USC, 37% of the Vice Presidents have no earned degrees above the B.A. Of a total of seven deans, associate deans and assistant deans in non-academic areas, two hold Ph.D. degrees and five hold master's degrees.

3. A recommended reasonable goal for top administrative positions within the university is that one-third of such positions at each level be filled by women within five years, i. e., by June of 1977, and that a significant measure of progress be made toward that goal by June of 1973. The rationale for this goal is:

a. Approximately one-third of the faculty and staff at USC are women and one-third of the students are women.

b. Nationwide, approximately 38% of bachelor's degrees awarded were earned by women and 37% of master's degrees awarded in 1969 were earned by women.

c. In view of the upgrading of women in lower and middle administration and in the faculty at USC which

can be expected under the university's Affirmative Action Program, it is anticipated that there will be an increased number of qualified women available to fill top level administrative positions over the next several years.

4. Therefore, it is recommended that the following goals and timetables be adopted as part of USC's Affirmative Action Program for top administrative positions:

<u>Current Underutilization</u>	<u>Change by June 1973</u>		<u>Change by June 1977</u>
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>To</u>
DEANS (ACADEMIC)	15%	20%	33%
DEPARTMENT HEADS	12%	20%	33%

Presently No Women

PRESIDENT /			
VICE PRESIDENTS	0%	20%	33%
ASSOCIATE VICE			
PRESIDENTS	0%	50%	50%
ASSOCIATE DEANS	0%	13%	33%

The above figures represent goals to be achieved through hiring as vacancies occur within existing positions or new positions are created at each level. Affirmative Action measures to help achieve these goals are recommended in Part IV of this report.

## II. Other Administrative Positions

### A. FINDINGS

1. Adequate data are not yet available to permit analysis of the administrative work force in other than top level positions in the university.

2. The Commission on the Status of Women has directed an inquiry to the President and all Vice Presidents of the university requesting from each an organization chart showing all administrative positions in his department and the departments that report to him, names of persons filling the positions and their dates of appointment. As of this date,

all information requested has been received from the Vice President of University Affairs and partial responses have come from other academic Vice Presidents. No response has been received from the non-academic offices.

B. GOALS AND TIMETABLES: As a first step toward bringing the university into conformance with federal requirements on Affirmative Action Programs, adequate data on the administrative work force, including data on salary levels, needs to be assembled. September 1, 1972, is suggested as a deadline for this task to be completed, so that the necessary analysis can be undertaken and goals and timetables established in respect of all administrative job categories.

### III. Policy Making Committees, Commissions and Task Forces

#### A. Findings

1. As of April 17, 1972, there were 48 university committees, commissions and task forces with a total membership of 599. Of these, 55 or 9.6% were women. 12 of the 55 women and no men were on the Commission on the Status of Women at USC.

2. 24 of the 48 committees and commissions did not have even one woman faculty or administration member.

3. Only one out of the 48 committees or commissions had a woman as chairperson, and she is the chairwoman of the Commission on the Status of Women at USC.

4. Since April 17, 4 men have been added to the membership of the Commission on the Status of Women at USC.

5. Many university committees are now in the process of reorganization for the new academic year and data aren't yet available on their membership or the number with women as chairpersons.

#### B. Goals and Timetables

1. It is recommended that the number of faculty and staff



women on decision making committees, commissions and task forces be brought into proportion to their representation on the total faculty and staff, i. e., one-third of total membership, by September 1, 1972.

2. For those committees for which chairpersons are appointed by the university President or Vice Presidents, or the University Senate, the number of women chairpersons should be brought into proportion to their representation on the total faculty and staff by June 1, 1972.

#### IV. Action-Oriented Programs

In order to implement the planned increase in the number of women in all levels of administrative positions at USC, the Committee on the Status of Women recommends that the following action measures be adopted as part of USC's affirmative action program.

##### A. Recruitment

1. When expansion or turnover allows an additional person to be added to the administrative staff, every effort should be made to recruit and hire a woman for the position.
2. Preference shall be given to women in hiring for all administrative positions until the goal of 1/3 representation is met.
3. Recruiting efforts should incorporate special efforts to reach women.
4. The following organizations, which are prepared to refer women with specific skills, will be added to recruiting sources:

- National Organization for Women
- Women's Equity Action League
- Talent Bank from Business and Professional Women
- Professional Women's Caucus
- Intercollegiate Association of University Women
- National Council of Negro Women
- American Association of University Women

5. Female employees will be actively encouraged to refer applicants.
6. Job descriptions and requisite qualifications will be openly announced, published in the Daily Trojan, sent to all offices of the University, and posted in an obvious place in those offices at least 3 weeks before application is considered closed.
7. At least 1/3 of the members of the Search Committees for future top administrative positions will be women.
8. Slates of candidates for top administrative positions will be constituted with at least 1/3 women.
9. All selection techniques--e.g., interviews, application forms--will be examined for possible discriminatory effects.
10. Considerations of marital status or dependency of minor children will be eliminated from selection procedures. Such information will not be requested or considered pertinent in any way.
11. All personnel involved in recruiting, screening and promotion should be carefully selected to ensure elimination of bias in all personnel activities.

B. Promotion

1. Women employees of USC will be given equal opportunity for promotion.
2. Women shall have access to and be encouraged to use career counseling services within the University, as well as programs in the School of Business and the School of Public Administration which will enable them to qualify for management positions.
3. Relief must be provided for women who have been dead-ended at lower staff levels. Therefore, present female employees occupying clerical or other non-academic positions and who possess equivalent or higher qualifications than those of male employees occupying higher

positions will be given priority for promotion.

4. Promotional opportunities as well as all job openings will be openly announced, posted and published at least 3 weeks before applications are considered closed.
5. If at any time in the future apparently qualified women are passed over for promotions, supervisory personnel will be required to submit justification for this action in writing to the E. E. O. office.

C. Measures to Repair Current Inequities

1. There will be an active effort to inform all supervisors, members of Search Committees, and persons in positions to affect recruitment, screening, and promotion of USC's affirmative action plan.
2. At all levels and in all departments regular open staff meetings will be held to discuss E. E. O. policy and to explain individual employee responsibility. At these meetings minority and women employees will be encouraged to participate in available educational and training activities. Supervisors will be informed that, among other criteria, their performance is being monitored on the basis of their success in meeting the stated goals.
3. Every Vice President will establish within his office an affirmative action committee to keep his staff informed about the plan, to provide information about how the actions in that office have progressed to date, and to keep the goals in obvious view.
4. By the end of the 5-year period, the university will provide child care facilities for children of all faculty, staff, and students. Parents using the facilities will contribute part of the cost of maintaining them in proportion to their salaries.

D. Committees, Commissions and Task Forces

1. Administrative women shall be considered for appointment to all decision making committees and task forces for which they are qualified.

2. The Commission will develop a roster of qualified women which will be available to assist in such appointments.
3. Already the few women in relatively high posts throughout the university are being overwhelmed with requests to serve conspicuous functions which have never before been open to women. When the goals of the five-year plan have been met, it will be possible to equalize the workload while still providing just representation of women. However, in the meantime, ways must be found to relieve the over-burdened women from other duties or to compensate them (financially) for the extra load of duties in the interim.

## NOTES

### FOREWARD

<sup>1</sup>See, for instance, Philip E. Converse and Jean M. Converse, "The Status of Women As Students and Professional in Political Science," P.S. (American Political Science Association: Summer, 1971; Vol. IV, No. III), p. 334, also Victoria Schuck, "Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations," Women in Political Science (APSA Report, 1969), and Judith Stiehm and Ruth Scott, "A Comparative Study of Male and Female Ph.D.s in Political Science" (prepared for the 1972 Annual Meeting of APSA: Washington, D.C., 1972), p. 20.

### CHAPTER I

<sup>1</sup>G. Frederic Kuder, "Kuder DD Occupational Interest Survey" (Illinois: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1974), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>For a discussion of New York's protective labor laws before 1969, see Mary Ann Krupsak, "Women and the New York Labor Laws," in Women's Role in Contemporary Society (New York: Discuss Books, 1972), pp. 328-337.

<sup>3</sup>Doris Sassower, "Women in the Professions," *ibid.*, pp. 350-358.

<sup>4</sup>"United Airlines Charged with Bias," in The Spokeswoman (Vol. 3; No. 12, June 15, 1973), p. 2.

<sup>5</sup>"Women Continue Fight Against WRC-TV," in The Spokeswoman (Vol. 3; No. 12, June 15, 1973), p. 2.

<sup>6</sup>Kirsten Amundsen, The Silenced Majority (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971).

<sup>7</sup>For a further discussion of the individual and role theory, see, Clifford H. Swensen, Jr., "Role Theory," in Intorduction to Interpersonal Relations, (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1973), pp. 373-415.

<sup>8</sup>G. Alison Raymond, Half the World's People, (New York: Meredith Publishing Co., 1965).

<sup>9</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, The Second Sex (New York: Bantam Books, 1961), pp. 100-125.

<sup>10</sup>Cellestine Ware, Woman Power (New York: Tower Publications, Inc., 1970), see chapter 1, "The Politics of Women's Liberation."

<sup>11</sup>See, for instance, Eleanor Roosevelt, It's Up to the Women, (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1933).

<sup>12</sup>Roslyn S. Willett, "Working in a Man's World," from Vivian Gornick and Barbara Moran (eds), Women in Sexist Society (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971), p. 512.

<sup>13</sup>National Organization of Women, Women's Equity Action League, and Women's Liberation Movement.

<sup>14</sup>Stiehm and Scott, "A Comparative Study."

<sup>15</sup>Converse and Converse, "The Status of Women."

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Jessie Bernard, Academic Women (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964).

<sup>18</sup>Converse and Converse, "The Status of Women."

<sup>19</sup>A. T. Feraru (ed.), The "Distaff" Papers, (1972).

<sup>20</sup>Converse and Converse, "The Status of Women," pp. 328-348.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 328.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 328.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 330.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 329.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 335.

<sup>26</sup> See Phillis Chesler, Woman and Madness (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & C., Inc., 1972), p. 286.

<sup>27</sup> Ashly Montagu points out that one of women's most notable strengths in academia has been in literature: poetry and the novel; Ashly Montagu, The Natural Superiority of Women (London: Collier MacMillan, 1974), 1st chapter and p. 169.

<sup>28</sup> Converse and Converse do not question the "maleness" of the rational base of academia, which may indeed account for, to a large degree, the exclusion of women from its upper ranks; The theme that men are argumentative ("warlike"), and women are more placid is often discussed. See, for example, Ashly Montagu, "The Genius of Woman as the Genius of Humanity," *ibid.*, p. 181-193.

<sup>29</sup> Converse and Converse, "The Status of Women," p. 345.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 346.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 348.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 348.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> Judith Stiehm and Ruth Scott, "A Comparative Study of Placement of Male and Female Ph.D.s in Political Science."

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

## CHAPTER II

<sup>1</sup>See, for instance, "Observational Learning" in Mussen, Conger and Kagen, Child Development and Personality (4th ed.), (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), pp. 55-56.

<sup>2</sup>Cheris Kramer, "Women's Rhetoric in New Yorker Cartoons: Patterns for a Mildred Milquetoast," (New York City: presented at 59th Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Nov. 8-11, 1973).

<sup>3</sup>Although a more extensive report might include parallel data for men in political science, time and money prohibited it in this case.

<sup>4</sup>The major reference to be used in this process is Arthur L. Stinchcombe's Constructing Social Theories (New York: Harcourt Brace & World, Inc., 1968) and the survey procedure and techniques for this study will be those outlined by Robert S. Weiss, Statistics in Social Research (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968).

<sup>5</sup>The stereotype question is taken from the American Studies Association, "Questionnaire on Women." Their results received on this question were unavailable.

<sup>6</sup>Converse and Converse, "The Status of Women."

<sup>7</sup>"Western Women in Political Science, 1972" prepared by the Committee on the Status of Women of the Western Political Science Association.

<sup>8</sup>This list was compiled from class rosters passed out in each political science class at the beginning of the semester (Fall, 1971) and from the secretary in charge of admissions (Luda)

<sup>9</sup>Converse and Converse, "The Status of Women."

<sup>10</sup>Seven more questionnaires were received after the data had already been computed (almost a year later!). These seven put the return rate at forty per cent.

Referring to a survey of Yale graduates, Darrell Huff points out, "With some kinds of mail questionnaires, a five or



ten per cent response is quite high. This one should have done better than that...." in How to Lie With Statistics (New York: Norton and Co., Inc., 1954), p. 14. Converse and Converse received a response rate of only 43.2 per cent from female professionals in the field (Converse and Converse, p. 329).

<sup>11</sup> Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Woman's Place (Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 1971), p. 199.

<sup>12</sup> Doris Sassower, "Women in the Professions," in Women's Role in Contemporary Society, p. 351.

<sup>13</sup> "Women's Lib - Free Chinese Style," L. A. TIMES (special insert on the Republic of China: April, 1974), p. 8.

<sup>14</sup> Sullerot, op. cit., p. 198.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>16</sup> Germaine Greer, "The Middle Class Myth of Love and Marriage," in The Female Eunuch (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1971), pp. 209-231.

<sup>17</sup> Betty Friedan, "The Happy Housewife Heroine," in The Feminine Mystique (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1970), pp. 28-61.

<sup>18</sup> See Clara Thompson, Psychoanalysis: Evolution and Development (New York, 1950).

<sup>19</sup> Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique, p. 166.

<sup>20</sup> Caroline Bird, "The Sex Map of the Work World," Born Female (New York: Pocket Books, 1968).

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Roslyn S. Willett, "Working in 'A Man's World': The Woman Executive," in Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran's, Woman in Sexist Society, pp. 511-532.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 521.

- <sup>24</sup> Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Woman's Place, p. 96.
- <sup>25</sup> Jessie Bernard, Academic Women.
- <sup>26</sup> Margaret Mead, "Gender in the Honors Program," The Newsletter of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student (May, 1961), pp. 4-5.
- <sup>27</sup> Helene Deutsch, The Psychology of Women: A Psychoanalytic Interpretation (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1944), p. 290.
- <sup>28</sup> Ashley Montagu, The Natural Superiority of Women.
- <sup>29</sup> Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran, Women in Sexist Society, Part II.
- <sup>30</sup> Naomi Wisstin, "Psychology Constructs the Female," in Gornick and Moran, *ibid.*, p. 207-222.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 210.
- <sup>32</sup> Judith M. Bardwick and Elizabeth Dowan, "Ambivalence: The Socialization of Women," in Gornick and Moran, Women in Sexist Society, pp. 225-241.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 233.
- <sup>34</sup> The World Book Encyclopedia (Illinois: Field Enterprises Corporation, 1962), Vol. 16.
- <sup>35</sup> See question number 23 of the Questionnaire, Appendix A.
- <sup>36</sup> Cellistine Ware, Woman Power, p. 165.
- <sup>37</sup> Evelyne Sullerot, Woman, Society and Change (New York: World University Library, 1971).
- <sup>38</sup> Zsa Zsa Gabor, How to Catch a Man (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1970), p. 53.
- <sup>39</sup> Helen B. Andelin, "Feminine Dependency," Fascinating Womanhood (Santa Barbara, California: Pacific Press, 1965), p. 163.

<sup>40</sup>Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Woman's Place, p. 78.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 131.

### CHAPTER III

<sup>1</sup>Carrie Chapman Catt and Nettie Rogers Schuler, Woman, Suffrage and Politics (Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 1923). T. A. Larson quotes from the American Political Science Review in the introduction of this book, "... a somewhat militant account..." which provided "an interesting summary and interpretation of the equal rights suffrage movement in America." August 1923, p. 509.

<sup>2</sup>See, for instance, Barbara A. Sizemore, "Will the Woman Administrator Make a Difference?" (Paper presented at the American Association of School Administrators Annual Convention: New Jersey, February, 1973).

<sup>3</sup>Ersa Poston, "Women in Government Employment," in Women's Role, p. 344.

<sup>4</sup>Bernadette Devlin, The Price of My Soul (New York: Vintage Books, 1969), p. viii.

<sup>5</sup>Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1955).

<sup>6</sup>Plato, The Republic (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968).

<sup>7</sup>Aristotle, Politics (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958).

<sup>8</sup>Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince and Discourses (New York: The Modern Library, 1950).

<sup>9</sup>Baron de Montesquieu, The Spirit of the Laws (New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1966).

<sup>10</sup>David Hume, An Inquiry (Illinois: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1966).

<sup>11</sup> Fred I. Greenstein, Personality and Politics (Illinois: Markham Publishing Co., 1969).

<sup>12</sup> Josephine P. Milburn (Chairman), Women in Political Science (Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association, 1969-71).

<sup>13</sup> Sandra and Derge Bem, Training The Woman to Know Her Place (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973).

<sup>14</sup> John J. Pietrofesa and Nancy K. Schlossberg, Counselor Bias and the Female Occupational Role (New York: Markham Publishing Co., 1970).

<sup>15</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, The Second Sex, p. 240.

<sup>16</sup> See question number 18, Appendix A.

<sup>17</sup> New Woman (Allied Publications, Inc: June/July issue, 1972), Vol. II, No. 1.

<sup>18</sup> MS. (Ms. Magazine Corporation, July 1972), Vol. 1, No. 1.

<sup>19</sup> Cosmopolitan, Helen Gurley Brown, ed. (Hearst Corporation, October, 1972), Vol. 173, No. 4.

<sup>20</sup> Celestine Ware, Woman Power, "Goals."

## CONCLUSION

<sup>1</sup> David E. Apter and James Joll, Anarchism Today (New York: Anchor Books, 1972).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Amundsen, Kirsten. The Silenced Majority. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Andelin, Helen B. Fascinating Womanhood. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1965.
- Apter, David E. and James Joll. Anarchism Today. New York: Anchor Books, 1972.
- Aristotle. Politics. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Bem, Sandra and Derge. Training the Woman to Know Her Place. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.
- Bernard, Jessie. Academic Women. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. The Second Sex. New York: Bantam Books, 1961.
- Catt, Carrie Chapman and Nettie Rogers Schujler. Woman, Suffrage and Politics. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Press, 1923.
- Chesler, Phillis. Woman and Madness. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1972.
- Devlin, Bernadette. The Price of My Soul. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.
- Feraru, A. T. (ed.). The "Distaff" Papers. 1972.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. Woman's Place. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1971.

- Gabor, Zsa Zsa. How to Catch a Man. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1970.
- Gornick, Vivian and Barbara Moran (eds.). Women in Sexist Society. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1971.
- Greenstein, Fred I. Personality and Politics. Illinois: Markham Publishing Co., 1969.
- Greer, Germaine. The Female Eunuch. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc. 1970.
- Huff, Darrell. How to Lie With Statistics. New York: Norton and Co., Inc., 1954.
- Hume, David. An Inquiry. Illinois: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1966.
- Machiavelli, Miccolo. The Prince and Discourses. New York: The Modern Library, 1950.
- Milburn, Josephine P. (Chairman). Women in Political Science. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association, 1969-71.
- Montagu, Ashly. The Natural Superiority of Women. London: Collier Mac Millan, 1974.
- Montesquieu, Baron de. The Spirit of the Laws. New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1966.
- Mussen, Conger and Kagen. Child Development and Personality. (4th ed.) New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. Beyond Good and Evil. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1955.
- Petrofesa, John J. and Nancy K. Schlossberg. Counselor Bias and Female Occupational Role. New York: Markham Publishing Co., 1970.
- Plato. The Republic. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.
- Raymond, G. Alison. Half the World's People. New York: Meredith Publishing Co., 1965.

- Roosevelt, Eleanor. It's Up to the Women. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1933.
- Stinchcombe, Arthur L. Constructing Social Theories. New York: Harcourt Brace & World, Inc., 1968.
- Sullerot, Evelyne. Woman, Society and Change. New York: World University Library, 1971.
- Swensen, Clifford H., Jr. Introduction to Interpersonal Relations. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1973.
- Thompson, Clara. Psychoanalysis: Evolution and Development. New York: 1950.
- Ware, Cellestine. Woman Power. New York: Tower Publications, Inc., 1970.
- Weiss, Robert S. Statistics in Social Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968.

#### ARTICLES AND PAPERS

- Converse, Philip E. and Jean M. Converse. "The Status of Women as Students and Professionals in Political Science." P.S. American Political Science Association: Summer, 1971, Vol. IV, No. iii.
- Kramer, Chervis. "Women's Rhetoric in New Yorker Cartoons: Patterns for a Mildred Milquetoast." New York City: presented at 59th Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Nov. 8-11, 1973.
- Kuder, G. Frederic. "Kuder DD Occupational Interest Survey." 1974. Part of test results.
- Schuck, Victoria. "Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations." Women in Political Science. APSA Report, 1969.
- Sizemore, Barbara A. "Will the Woman Administrator Make a Difference?" Presented at the American Association of School Administrators Annual Convention: New Jersey, February, 1973.

Stiehm, Judith and Ruth Scott. "A Comparative Study of Male and Female Ph.D.s in Political Science." Prepared for the 1972 Annual Meeting of APSA: Washington, D.C., 1972.