

The Scholar and The Feminist XIX
Women as Change Makers:
Building and Using Political Power
Saturday, April 24, 1993

Afternoon Panel:

6. Women, Girls, Education and the State

Prof. Barbara Jackson, Fordham University: *** and the other, the final one... I'm going to talk a little bit about politics because if something is going to change we have to be knowledgeable about it as well as involved in it. But I think the comment near the end, the accusation almost that if you worry about girls that means you don't care about boys. Well, the study *** although there have been some negative comments about it, is that somehow by emphasizing the girls that means, therefore, whatever we're advocating for girls will be detrimental to boys and that's the farthest thing from our minds. Really being, if we improve things for girls all children will be bettered. But that's always a danger because your opponents always want to find something like that.

Okay, let me just tell you what I'm going to try to cover in the short time, and hopefully if you have more specific questions we can [discuss them]. I've already told you that this report...we'll prepare you with some ammunition if you want to then see what schools are doing in terms of girls, and education. As we all know, it is very important in how it's approached. So let me tell you how we went about this study. AAUW has done several reports before and if you're not a member I'm sure they would encourage you or even get their reports. I don't have a copy of their price list, but you could certainly get it. They did an earlier study -- this is the short version, *Searching for Girls, Searching for America*. This is a survey of some *** thousand girls that got at those issues of self-esteem and what not. They wanted then to follow up with another kind of report that would be different than this one, which is what they commissioned *** for Research on Women, which is very similar to the one here at Barnard in terms of it's overall purpose, to do another kind of a study which was to look at all of the research that had been done in schools related to girls pre-kindergarten through the twelfth grade. Now, you can imagine that's a rather gigantic kind of request. This would be done in a year and then we were to result in a report that was no more than a hundred pages long, all of which were really kind of difficult to do.

This is what the report ended up being. It was released in January of last year and I encourage you to get it and also get a summary that looks like this from either the Wellsey Center or -- and that's the order blank I have here -- or the AAUW. Your local branch will sell you one too.

Now in the process of doing that we had several issues we had to deal with. One was what was a topic that was the most important from our judgement. This was a core team of six people that tried to sort out what it is that's most important that schools are doing in relation to girls. And secondly, what's the research they're doing because [the] AAUW didn't want us to guess what's going on but wanted it to be rooted in fairly current research studies. So those are sort of two limitations. The other was, it was to be public schools and several people said, "Well, what about single-sex schools for girls?" Because there's certainly a lot of evidence in terms of single-sex colleges that do better and the few studies that have been done on high schools. But since we were to look at public schools, to my knowledge there are only two public schools in the country that are still all girls. One's in Philadelphia and one's in Baltimore. So that you don't have...we just didn't think that it was fair to look at those two. There is another group, I think it's a national coalition of girls' schools that are looking at those and it's certainly an area that we need to look at even though there may be a self-selective factor [of] who goes to those girls. But still, we need to see because the evidence is clear. In most schools and in other places where girls may do better where they're segregated -- I'll use that word that's also been through so many definitions. It's a hard to use it in another context and what not.

But we then reviewed 1300 different research reports. These are all listed in this bibliography by topics. So if anyone wants to just follow up, there's two that you can get in terms of the particular studies that we looked at. Most of them are fairly recent and, as I said, the core team was made of people of different backgrounds: ***, Katie MacIntosh who's done a lot in curriculum, and my particular responsibility since I'm not a full-time researcher at the center which the others were, one particular area. Because of the reform reports -- maybe you saw the thing last night on channel Thirteen. It's been 10 years since *** has been released, kind of a follow up, and there have been what we call several waves of reform since then. And some people say maybe we're in the fourth wave now, and I feel like we're going to get drowned before we make any changes in school because every wave comes up with something different.

When we went to look at those reports, of which I looked at 35 *** reports that we published between 1983 and 1991, that's the year we were doing the study. Since then I think I've discovered about another 10. So that we've got recommendations from all over the place on all sorts of topics. The question was were girls considered in any of these. Well, to nobody's surprise or chagrin, only, I think I found 4 that mentioned girls as a group or as a "problem" at all. Lots of the others mentioned not their problem, but the girls' problem which I'm sure you can guess which is getting pregnant. So they can get more money and then *** household group and a lot of girls drop out of school for that reason, but there are other reasons they drop out too. And then we took another look and this ties in with the overall topic of this, what about the leadership of these various commissions? Were women there at all? Because if we're

not in the deliberation of what it is that the group is going to study, you're not very likely to find recommendations if you haven't defined that as a problem, which is one of the drawbacks of defining the problem of pregnancy as only the reason to drop out and in effect it's the girl's fault. Then the schools don't have to do anything, which is one of the ways in which *** problems often lead to exclusion.

Well, we found a few, I don't think I found any, that -- I guess there were two or three -- that the co-chair was a woman, and usually when they publish a report the man's name was always listed first. Only one, would you believe, mentioned Title 9 specifically in their recommendations at all, and that was one of the better ones *** to excellent. So anyway, one of our tasks then was to meet as we did throughout the year to kind of, as we found all of these studies, how do we put this all together? What are the kind of topics that are major in terms of what research has been done and what it is that schools and other people can do something about? In terms of the part that I was doing, looking at leadership positions not only of the commissions but in terms of schools, because we keep hoping that if we have the right kind of leaders as we heard this morning we've got to get in those positions first and then you've got to keep on it to be honest and all. And despite some progress like in the political office, the number of women superintendents, which is the sort of highest position in public education, has increased quite a lot in the last 10 years. It still represents only about 5 percent of all superintendents, of which, in case you're not familiar, there are 15,000 school districts in the United States, Now some range, they may have one school with 200 kids all the way up to New York City which is obviously the largest in the country.

So they made some inroads unlike one of the comments this morning. For African Americans it's still much lower. What they don't do and the problem is throughout many of these research reports, they don't separate gender and race which makes it very difficult, again, to define your problem. And even within the race you will often find just minorities listed which doesn't help you, or... Let's see, is there one there? Or there will be "girls and boys" or "men and women." In fact, in all of the reports, I guess you can consider this progress, I don't think I found any that exclusively used the pronoun "he" a lot. So in terms of labeling maybe that's progress. But they did it to such a degree that they didn't even use "she" or "girl" when it would have been more helpful in terms of what, particularly in pre-adolescence where we all know there are big, big differences between the development of girls and boys at that pre-adolescent state. Those of you who are not familiar with Gilligan's studies, she's done a second one which is called *Meeting at the Crossroads* which was a study of the Laurel School near Cleveland, which is even more fascinating than the first one, if that's possible. Because of the interview technique, they found that while the women were schooled in knowing that there's a great value in relationships and connection, found that they were interviewing these women with the same distance and "objectivity" that was not getting the girls to respond to them. And you talk to one of the staff people who participated, one of the outcomes that's not reported in the book is what happened to the staff at the

Laurel School. They found their voice and they began to talk to others differently because they saw the value of their own position as women, kind of a breakthrough, kind of an interesting aside.

So that was our task, to kind of find out what it is, those couple of criteria. The report itself is divided into 4 parts and it ends with 40 some-odd recommendations grouped under 8 broad categories. I'm just going to tell you what's in those 4 parts and then encourage you to buy the study. There are some things that will be of more interest to some of you than others. We're very anxious to get some action as a result of this and that's always the gap between all the reform reports. We're still waiting for action in some of those areas. I've given talks on this as have the other members of the research team and particularly Susan Bailey who is the director, all over the country, who was out in Seattle just a month or so ago. (The salmon really is as good as they say it is. And you can to this market and I brought a whole salmon back with me which was really kind of nice.) But the follow up, because if we do these talks *** somehow you don't organize yourselves in some fashion or the groups you already belong to, it's like the political scene, you won't really make any kind of difference.

Now the first part of the report is what we call sort of framing the issues and it talks about our lack of place in the reform movement and a very brief sort of review of the development of stages of girls. We found that it had to be really short because there are a lot of other resources that people want more detail about, but we were interested in what happens to the girls reflecting their developmental stages. So the second part, *** in school, and that's where there's a little more concentration on achievement, the math and science, there's a long section on that. And one of the speakers this morning mentioned that while in many ways girls and boys are getting more equal in terms of science, they're not taking the advanced courses to the same degree. They still do not aspire to be scientists or engineers near to the degree that you might see even those who are in the advanced placement courses. It's one of the kinds of things if you're interested in what your school happens to be doing is to go and found out how many girls are in advanced physics. Then again, how many are taking Algebra, which seems to be the starting point for all other kinds of sciences. There is a section on vocational education which is under a new law now and there's supposed to be gender-free and non-traditional occupations. That needs to be watched too, because, as you know, you change the law and it takes much longer to change into action.

We separated the teen pregnancy issues from dropping out of school so that the dropping out of school became a broader kind of category. And that's one area where breakdown within race and ethnicity needs to be because in the few studies that have been done within Hispanics and Latinos there's quite a lot of difference and I would guess discrimination too. You can't lump them together. Us African Americans you can lump a little bit better, but even then it gets a little bit tricky. It's still ***. So the study, and there is one section where Lynn Bergridge who was on the *** as an

economist attempted to breakdown all three factors, gender, race, and class, but that's hard because most studies are not done that way, except the new 8th grade longitudinal study that's just gotten started, this huge one the federal government's doing, that is breaking it down that way. Because the solutions, again, depend on how you define the problem. The third section is on gender and test bias and that's another one. There are ways to make tests as bias-free as possible. Like so many things we know how to do it if we have the will to do it.

But the height of the report is in the fourth section which is about curriculum because here, very much like we heard this morning, it's not only the media that needs to change because that's how we get a view of ourselves, what we see in the curriculum, and I'm not only talking about technicals but everything that happened, are that the materials, what it is that's emphasized in classrooms, and if you never see yourself as a young woman, or a girl, or an old woman in the ***, you begin to think, "Well, I'm not very well-valued. Nothing that I'm reading has got anything to do with me." Ignoring pretty much all of the regular things that women have been doing over the centuries to really keep the generations going. Katie MacIntosh says that there is a kind of a five-stage way in which women may be getting included into the curriculum and we've sort of reached the last level which is really to re-do the whole approach to curriculum and teaching so that not only are women, but all the other groups that have been excluded, are incorporated very differently. We don't quite know how to do that yet and we're going to have [to make] some commitment to that. There's a high value. Because what happens in the materials that the young women and the young men, if they only see the heros, the heroines, they may think that unless you are Sojourner Truth -- and you'll notice I'm wearing my Sojourner Truth, I'm sure the person I bought it from would love it ***, but some of you remember her name -- but if that's the only person that you have one view of a Black person's slavery, that everybody had to be like that although there were thousands others who survived, along with the women who did all other things to keep the society alive and what not, if you only see Joan of Ark, whatever... So that's part of the need to change and there has been some progress in textbooks because this has been pushed. I mean, a lot of the push came initially from ethnic groups, particularly African Americans, to change what you see in textbooks. So there has been some progress along there, but obviously constant vigilance is required.

For each we separated -- Oh, three minutes, real quick -- two other parts of the curriculum and what we'll do with the recommendations is learn whichever *** when we talk about them because the curriculum, we had two other parts. One was, what I just talked about was the "Form of Curriculum." And then we had another section called "Classroom as Curriculum," and some of you may have seen *Dateline* about a year ago with Jane Pauley, where they actually photographed a *** classroom and to see the subtle ways in which boys got treated with the girls. If I had time I would have brought along, I finally got a copy of it. But that's something that you need to know,

see what happens. And this was a teacher who was not thinking that she was biased at all. I think some of it is subconscious, but it's very clear, boys got more of the teacher's attention which is a major kind of resource. So that, I think, makes a difference. When I did this same talk at the *** Ridge School of the Sacred Heart in Seattle, they had taken the fifth graders, taken this as an assignment, and gone back to visit their fourth grade and they actually stand in their teacher's classroom and reported how many times she called on the boys. ***

The last part of the curriculum, we coined the phrase "Evaded Curriculum," and again, it harkens back to what we heard this morning, we're not comfortable about talking about sexuality or about bodies and health, the obsession of being thin, and all of those kinds of things, and suicide, child abuse, and you name it, that kids live with not only in the ghettos of the world but every place now, the violence. It's sort of evaded and we don't know how much longer we can leave that out of being dealt with in a very direct way in schools. If kids come to schools with these things on their minds it's going to be hard for them to concentrate on anything else.

I mentioned the one thing, and I think I'm about finished, maybe we'll get a chance to look at some of the recommendations, there are a wide range of them. But one of the things I mentioned already, the research that is not helpful because it's not broken down. The other thing is we struggle a long time with labels. I mentioned the fact that girls weren't singled-out in the reports which is a plus/minus, but even more important, how do we come up with labels of the various ethnic groups to make sense. And that's getting to be more and more of a problem, of how...the studies we did review we used whatever terminology they were, but we all know that that continues to be a problem. To define it in a way that's helpful for each group but doesn't divide us and that's a constant kind of problem. Our group, I guess, has had the most trouble with labels, but I think the Hispanics and the Asians are beginning to have sort of the same confusion and it's almost unhelpful in a way if we define it in one way and not another.

Prof. Barbara Jackson: Thank you very much. And our next speaker will be Linda Peng.

Linda Peng, Director, Task Force on Asian-American Education for the New York City Board of Education: I only have 10 copies, but this is the data on Asian American enrollment from ***.

My discussion today is based on data that's gathered... Before talking about Asia American women or girls I'd like to put things on context. I would like to start with a general overview and demographics Asian American enrollment in the New York City public school system and then from that we can discuss in more detail the culture gaps

and what not. But just an overview: the data would include that in 1991 about 8.3 percent of the total student population are Asian American. I think the absolute number is about 80,000 ***. And it's increased actually so it's probably over that amount. We're just trying to interpret the data here given by the Board of Ed. And these are recent immigrants. We're talking about the period between 1990 to 1993, approximately 26,000 Asian Americans and they're coming from different nations. There are about 23 countries involved. So when we're talking about Asian Americans we're talking about East Asia, Southeast Asia, and the sub-continent of India, you know, Pakistan, Nepal, Thailand, ***, and so it's pretty extensive. That's the federal definition of Asian American. So it's very diverse, very, very diverse which is probably the source of a lot of problems or challenges for educators.

Now, as you are all aware, the great diversity of Asian Americans is not Chinese or Koreans, as I said, it's not just geographically. It's a whole span and not only by countries but by historical differences. We're talking about countries that have been in conflict with each other for centuries. We're talking about the conflict of the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and the experience of World War II at the expense of China, Taiwan, and the Phillipino experience and Asian experience, and of course India and Malaysia which are part of the British colonies. So they have a whole set of differences and linguistically it might be easier for them, but nevertheless there is a great culture gap. And you have such differences coming together here in the United States and it's very challenging.

Now I just wanted to tell you about the language and culture differences. For instance, like Asian Indians versus East Asians and Southeast Asians and experiences like the Asian Indians, [they] will have an easier time of getting ahead in school because of the relative lack of linguistic ***. Whereas when you're talking about Southeast Asians or Chinese, Koreans, ***, it's not only language but it's also socio-economic background. The New York City public schools are getting more refugees, which composes a big chunk of the new immigrants. And these are refugees from Kampuchea, Vietnam, and perhaps Laos and *** Thailand, but what you get with this group of kids are kids who are not even educated in their home countries very well. And even in parts of China the results of the cultural revolution or living in the countryside where there is no access to formal school training, they're having difficulty even with their own language. So you have kids who are coming into our...I think it's a lot easier if you're talking about K to 6th, but if you're talking about teenagers it's an even more difficult adjustment because they're not good at their own language and then they have to tackle a new language. And not only that, but cultural pressures from the home country and also the cultural pressures from this new mainstream culture. So it's actually a lot of pressure on especially the teenage era and I think that's probably why in areas especially school districts where there's a heavy concentration of Asians gang recruitment is pretty successful. And mainly it's because during that developmental stage in one's young life they really don't feel like belonging and that's why the

susceptibility to gang recruitment is pretty high. And in fact, talking with principles and all that, gang recruitment in Chinatown, especially in my community, is high and even in the 6th grade and junior high school, ***, and they're even reaching our best high schools like Bronx Science and ***. And they're getting bright gang members.

The new challenge is also the gap amongst Asian Americans, not just diversity in language, and all that, it's also the time period or how long one has stayed in this country. There's a big gap between new immigrants versus second or third generations. And, oh back to the socio-economic background, the differences between, let's say, new refugees versus new immigrants from Taiwan or Japan is totally different *** Taiwan or Japan *** relatively more developed, educational development is pretty high. So you have those people come in and most of the parents are either professionals or at least have some means of supporting the family relatively easily, in contrast to some refugees who have to struggle with the language and also displacement and everything. So the socio-economic difference is dramatic and I believe that would account for the success rate. So I think it's rather skewed. You see in the media the wiz kids and I think it's a more socio-economic basis, not necessarily as it appears.

Q: One of the guidance counselors at Stuyvesant High School -- I work in downtown Flushing, I'm a guidance counselor -- had remarked last year that the Asian children, the Taiwanese children, don't have to come to our meeting where we describe the different high schools because in Taiwan they have already learned they are to go to Stuyvesant High...

Peng: *** recruiting over there in Taiwan. I've heard of that.

Q: Would you please address the issue of how the girls are so ***.

Parikh: I think we should let her finish her prepared remarks and we'll bring up other questions in the discussion. Because we will have an entire hour.

Peng: I just want to give you the breadth of the diversity of Asian Americans, so it's not such an easy question. And actually, I could get into it a lot more but I just want to give you a general...

But just talking about, not focusing on women and girls, I would like to address some of the commonalties and a lot, if we're talking about the new *** and the role of the women with respect to the native country, historically and all that, obviously there are individual exceptions, I'm just making a generalization, and those traditional roles of women in their native countries carry over, at least in the first generation. You know,

this emphasis on the traditional family units. The women as defined as grandmothers, mothers, wives, daughters, or sisters. Daughters basically are chattel, in a way, a means to better the standing of the family unit basically by marriage or perhaps *** would be a great economic source for the family. And basically to assist in the economic well-being of the family unit, working and all that...we've heard stories where Asian women and girls go to another village -- this is the countryside -- go to another village sell themselves, you know, to bring some money for the family. These are *** examples of that. And also, you know, infanticide in China...but anyway... Part of the responsibility of women is to beget families in these Asian cultures, to carry on the lineage.

So these values are carried over in the first generation. So the girls in the school system, not only the school work and the difficulties, they bare responsibilities at home, especially the teenage girls, *** younger ones, for instance junior high and high school. If they have younger siblings part of their responsibility is to care for the younger siblings and not only that but since they've schooled a year or two in the public system, they're more fluent in English. They have to be sort of like the liaison with the outside world for the parents and the family. I conducted an interview recently with a 6th-grader and she said she had to answer phones for her parents and deal with Con Ed people when they call and answer letters. They're the only ones who could read them so they carry that responsibility at home. Those things that we take for granted, but these kids, you know, they do it because that's what they're supposed to do. And there have been studies where the kids have to help the parents take the subways, for instance. Some of these girls or kids have to help them get around and everything. And so there's a responsibility there that's a psychological and all that that will obviously effect performance in schools. So whatever the stereotype we hear, it's rather askew, I would say, and -- I'll talk about stereotypes later -- but the whole point is that with those stereotypes being so pervasive it hides and covers the underlying problem because most Asians are very respectful of authority. So in classrooms they don't speak up. So obviously teachers and administrators think if they don't speak out, nothing's wrong. Until you find out, suicide or something, they don't show up in classes anymore, then the teacher will find out what's going on. And plus, you have teachers who have 30 or 40 kids and they can't worry about everybody.

So the whole point is that these responsibilities and these values, basically, to the betterment of the family unit, you know, is the role of the girls, I would say, not just the women but girls. And it's more acute in refugees, I would say, in the lower economic strata, especially non-skilled workers who are refugees, or non-skilled immigrants. Most of the parents, at least in Chinatown...Flushing might be different, Flushing it's more Italians, you know, upper echelon kind of thing, we don't know. That's part of the problem, we don't have enough research. But in certain areas, for instance, the father's a cook and the mother's a garment work, seamstress, and all that. The point is that the economic survival of the family unit is the primary concern at the

early stages. So everybody chips in, basically. You know, you go and rent a four bedroom for 4 or 5 kids and stuff like that, but everybody chips in because the basic thing right now, the primary concern is to get everybody taken care of and that requires a lot of individual sacrifice from everybody concerned. So the individual needs and whatever is all sewn in to the unit surviving. So that's carried over, even more extremely in refugees as in blue collar.

And so it's understandable that, you know, there's parental pressure to do well in school and all that, that it's a means of social mobility and economic mobility. For parents who immigrate and sacrifice, working 15 or 20 hours, the only hope they have is their kids, and hopefully they do well in school and they get a steady job and be able to get a house and even get a two bedroom apartment, you know, something for the whole family. You know, that's a big deal. Or being able to go out together for a family dinner, or something. You know, that's a big deal, too.

You know, for girls though there are different pressures. In one interview of this one girl there was some pressure and tension between the family because -- this is one particular girl who is a little more out-going. She's worked and she's fluent in English and everything. And there's tension because her parents favor her brother more than she and this could be part of that thing about expectations on sons and daughters and that's the value that's carried over which is that while the daughter will contribute best she can, but eventually she's going to marry out, anyway. Whereas a son you want to make sure he does well because he's going to be the provider for you, you being the parent and that you are part of his family whereas the daughter will marry out. And therefore, the parent will not invest as much time, care, and effort on that particular daughter. But obviously there are exceptions, this is all a generalization because there are many Asian American women, despite ***.

But I think that would be an interesting study. You know, sons and daughters within the parent thing. And one of the things that I hope we have these research *** because there's *** research on this issue. Well, you know, as Asian Americans stay longer in this country, tensions build up. I think, mainly with girls and women, you know, because when you see more and you associate with more friends, different friends, and obviously social values and more the Western values of individual, and with the women's movement and all that, I think this awareness and consciousness reaches a certain level that conflicts with what you have to deal with at home. And that's where that thing comes and it happens...I don't know the exact scientific data of when it occurs, but that's when it starts happening: when the girls start going to school and learn different things and especially when they start working. That financial independence comes with certain personal independence and this perhaps, certain confidence. And because a lot of these girls they start early to have to handle stuff with family, that extra thing would force them to be a lot more outgoing. So that might be a factor.

I'm skipping a lot of stuff because there are stereotypes about, you know, science and math, and that stuff that we can deal with in our discussion period. But I just want to touch some points about the first and second generation Asian Americans. That's where that thing about high achievement ***, because, you know, higher ed, Ivy League's 15 to 20 percent Asian American. "Wow, be careful, you know. *** There goes your curve. Don't take any science or engineering class," and all that. But, if you see too many Asians then you don't take that course. But I think it's hiding some stuff because, you know, I think people concentrate on that. Asian Americans because of linguistic difficulties and also, I think, some studies say it's also the metric system. That's why Asians do better because Asian countries follow the metric system. Some studies say that. Therefore, it's a lot easier to go into math or science. Anyway, the whole point is that statistically, too, Asian Americans have been, and there's more in the professional level. But I've spoken recently with a counselor who has contact with young Asian Americans and especially women. Yes, they do well professionally, however, the disillusionment comes later. The disillusionment in terms of identity, because they've achieved and *** linguistic culture and all that in this society and now they don't really feel, for instance, they're not really Koreans, they're not really Americans. So what are they? And professionally, you know, they get to the point where they're in their late 20s early 30s and they've pursued careers or they have high hopes and what happens is that whole glass ceiling phenomena not just for women but for Asian Americans as well. ***

So I think demographically, I think, maybe the post-'65 *** big wave of Asian immigration that you're getting a big cycle of a number of college grads and beginning professionals. Again, studies *** the disillusionment ***. There's other stuff. Race relations in schools, there's a lot of physical harassment against Asians, especially Asian girls, you know, passivity and all that, from African Americans and Latinos and all that. However, there are good aspects to resolve those particular tensions through sports programs and everything. *** a lot more to where if you have more social contact between the different groups, that usually results in better relationships. And also stereotypes, wiz kids, model minority syndrome kind of a thing. Everyone knows that, right? That that's a myth? Okay. You know, and as far as Asian women and Asian girls that standard stereotype about Susan Wong, Miss Saigon, or in media Connie Chung, Katie Tong, ***, that that seems to be...it's the same thing with Black women, be more acceptable and not as threatening to mainstream culture. It's the same thing.

So, you know, as chair of the council, the ***, we're supposed to report, this is part of the report of what we've found, what I've personally found out is basically there have been very little studies, and I hope some of you will take on as a thesis, research ***, because there are very interesting issues and I think a lot more studies could be done on this thing. But I think overall there's a big influx *** transition as far as in cities like New York or out in California, where the Asian American population increased.

Previously, there hasn't been that....you know when we talk about America, I think, there's a penetration of a notion that the American identity has that Asian American aspect to it. It's just beginning, only perhaps *** critical mass, *** numbers, kind of thing, and it's probably because people have raised a lot more hell these days and you notice. But I think part of *** America, which is such a young country, it's beginning to seep in ***, and I think that's definitely a good sign.

Dr. Sunita Parikh, Columbia University: Well, I'm going to perhaps set my watch so that I can give myself the 3-minute warning. I'm going to switch gears a little bit now and try being the person who I guess was brought in as the political scientist in the group, to talk little bit about the background of what we've been hearing, and to put it in a kind of a context, and suggest what the state's interests may be, or the extent to which the state participates in the kinds of processes that Barbara and Linda have talked about so articulately.

One of the interesting things that you find when you look at gender issues in education, and discrimination issues more generally, is that women are almost always brought in through the back door, through something else. You know, the one that many people know who study Civil Rights is how women even got into the Civil Rights Act. Sex was added as a category during the Civil Rights debates to try to torpedo the Civil Rights Act by Southern Democrats. There was this idea that if sex was added like race, creed, etc., that somehow it wouldn't be able to pass, and in fact it caused a great deal of consternation because there weren't very many women in Congress and the men didn't know what to do with it, but they wound up keeping it in. And that is more or less how women got what has been their major weapon in fighting discrimination policy for the last 30 years. And that is Title 7 of the Civil Rights Acts, which prohibits discrimination. Now that prohibits discrimination in employment, so even there we didn't really see an understanding of women's and girls' positions in education, pre-collegiate or high education. Employment was addressed in a couple of different ways in discrimination in the Civil Rights Act and in the Equal Pay Act of '62 and '63 which actually pre-dated the Civil Rights Act.

For women, I mean, one of the reasons that, I think, the state has tended not to pay a lot of direct attention until this last generation is because women themselves have been a bit bifurcated or have had internal contradictions within their own community, which strategies to push. You can go back a hundred years and see these debates. You can certainly see them around the suffrage movement. And the same debates have carried through. When President Kennedy established his Committee on the Status of Women it was heavily staffed by women of one political persuasion rather than the other side. And the two sides of the debate that really run through a lot of theorizing and political activism about women's issues is: should women be incorporated...? I mean, it's not that different, really, from the African American debate: do we fight on their grounds or do we make them change the rules? And so what tends to happen is you will get

women who articulate living with the status quo until we can sort of get higher status. On the other side you have women who say, "No, we've got to change the rules of the game from the very beginning." That simply living with status quo or trying to get ourselves incorporated into the system is not really going to transform it and we're always going to be second-class citizens. And the activities, except for Title 7, the activities that we've seen, or the successes that we've seen, have tended to be along the status quo lines. By the late 1960s you start to see a real shift and that's partly because of the Civil Rights movement, in large part because of the success of the Civil Rights movement, and also because of the ability of the feminist movement to piggy-back onto the Civil Rights movement.

Now most of what I'm going to talk about is going to be about middle-class White women because most of the state directed activities that we've seen have been about middle-class White women, and they're the ones who have been to a great extent the most successful. I mean, I can't emphasize enough how important what the speakers before me have said, I can't emphasize it enough, because what you said is so true: women are always forced to chose. Are they White? Are they Black? Are they women? It should be a double benefit. Well, it's not. Usually it's a double whammy. Just as an example, in the Affirmative Action sort of rulings nowadays, or in the Affirmative Action schedules, there's Category I and Category II. Category I is African American, Latina, and Native Americans, and veterans, always veterans, and Category II is Asians and women. Now if you're Asian and a woman, you are not Category I, you are a double Category II. I mean, I have been told many, many times at Columbia that -- I mean, working in the Political Science department -- they're so sorry, but, you know, if only I were a different ethnicity, it would be so much easier. And I sort of feel like saying, "Well sorry, you know I was born with this. I've done the best I can."

But what this has meant is that generally people don't know exactly how to deal with women and it depends on what your race is and that's completely leaving aside class issues, which I'll get to in a minute. So we don't have a specific place within the state hierarchy. I mean, our group does not have a specific place. It depends on any given time who makes it up and how we chose to ally ourselves. And I think many of the problems and barriers that we've encountered have been trying to work within this system.

Now in women in education in particular access especially to higher education preceded non-discrimination provisions by quite a bit. Access to higher education really opened up after the Second World War with the GI Bill because the large influxes of veterans going into schools meant that there were lots more colleges. I mean, that's what helped developed the junior college system and it certainly developed the satellite campus systems that we see in New York and in California and in other places in the country. So what you had in the '50s was an explosion of universities and more

women starting to go to college. In the '60s not only did the number of campuses increase, but the volume at the campuses increased, and the prosperity of the '50s and the expanding economy pushed a lot of women into higher education. It was sort of a push-pull. Women were able to go into higher education that wanted to and there was also a greater demand because there were more jobs. So women started to come into the academy kind of without people really knowing what was going on. I mean, it wasn't like Blacks pushing to enter segregated universities. It was much more, I would describe it as much more subtle. At the same time, these processes meant that you saw a lot more middle-class women going into work in the '60s. Jobs became much more of a possibility and at this point we're still looking at "Assistant to..." kinds of jobs, but nonetheless many more of them were being seen than before. And many more women started entering, I mean, obviously working-class women and poor women always worked. Those numbers have really stayed constant from the '50s to now, they're, you know, 35 to 60 percent, depending on who you're looking at. But the number of middle-class and upper-class women started to go up. At the same time by the late '60s the feminist movement is really starting to push not only the fact of women in the job market and higher education, but starting to push the idea of the legitimacy of the idea of women being able to go in and the importance of access in upper-class, in professional areas. So initially you're seeing a lot more access in state schools and junior colleges and quasi-institutions, but by the late-60s then, mid to late-60s, then you're starting to see the big push for the elite schools and for the professional schools. And that's when you start to get the issues that fueled one part of the women's education debate, and that is the right of women to have access to the highest jobs.

The turning point for women in higher education in particular, to me, is really in 1972 and the Equal Opportunity Amendments and Title 9 of those. Now in 1972 the government expanded both their own Affirmative Action provisions and the non-discrimination laws more generally to higher education. Through employment it was in faculty representation and officer and staff representation, but Title 9 applied Equal Opportunity, gender Equal Opportunity and non-discrimination, to students. Now we tend to think, I mean, this was really the first explicit attempt to look at Equal Opportunity for women as women in education. And women again, African American girls and Latinas to some extent, became sort of included under the race and ethnicity of non-discrimination, but they weren't really thought of and it wasn't that they were women, it was that they were African American or Latina. Now it was women.

Now some of you certainly remember when Title 9 was passed, how it was going to be seen as the end of higher education as we knew it and, my god, we're going to have women's football teams. Well, we all see how many NCAA title football teams now. We know where that's gone. But Title 9 has been important in many ways. It has really been a double-edged sword because on the one hand schools have increased women's programs, they have also cut back women's programs as quickly as possible

when the money has gone down. And, the other thing that women's programs have done, [is they] have created wonderful opportunities for male coaches. I mean, you can sort of track how prestigious a women's athletic program is by how many men are coaching in it. And within the coaching ranks, I mean, within the same area, within the same athletic specialty, the men get paid much more than the women do. And any of you who are watching the NCAA women's play-offs, which are now on television [for the] second year in a row, they're actually on television, the final four, saw that there were women's coaches but there were also, not the winner, but the runner-up was coached by a man. And that's pretty common, and Donna McKenna has been working on this, who has been a big force for women's equality in athletics, has brought attention to this, but it's still very prevalent. Again, women have sort of been let in but it's still within the same structure.

Now Title 9 should, not theoretically, legally has the ability to provide for all kinds of, you know, push for Equal Opportunity for women. However, in practise it's not nearly effective as it's promise. I mean, it's promise has not been carried out. Primarily because the state doesn't fund it, the government does not adequately fund enforcement efforts. We see the same problem in enforcement of discrimination in education for women that we see in every other enforcement area and that is that when the government doesn't really want to pursue Civil Rights, it just doesn't. The Reagan Administration cut back just about everything in the '80s, caused most of the Justice Department lawyers who were for Civil Rights to leave or go nuts. I mean, they didn't go nuts, they left, but the morale was extremely down in the Justice Department. And since the way that our system is set up is a quasi-judicial system for Civil Rights, you have to bring a case and then it has to be investigated and then there has to be a finding and then it has to be implemented. It's very, very difficult. The contrast to that that I always find ironic and depressing is Affirmative Action by the government, by which I mean Affirmative Action programs, are set up differently. There the burden of proof like in contracting, for example, the burden of proof is on the contractor. Before you can get the contract you have to show an Affirmative Action plan, which means, these people are pretty good at it. They may not actually be carried out, but they're on paper everywhere, and to a great extent, I mean, you can enforce the contracts. In EEO enforcement it's all motivated by individual complaints, which means it's very hard to have systemic changes. And in the Reagan Administration things like *Grove City*, *Grove City v. ****, the *Grove City* decision was a crippling blow because the government spent 5 years arguing about whether discrimination would be in just one area of a university or whether if you found discrimination could you then penalize everything in the university. Well, this is even within the enforcement system we're arguing about how we're going to enforce. So it really slowed down our ability to counteract what we see.

Now, as far as Affirmative Action decisions themselves go, what we've found is that again, [in] employment we do much better, we do somewhat better in employment than

we do in education. There has never been, there's only been one Affirmative Action higher education case ever decided by the Supreme Court. There were two: one was mooted, one was decided, and that's Backy and there hasn't been one since then. I mean, I cite Grove City as a funding decision, but in terms of women's representation in higher education as students, there's only been one and I'm willing to bet dollars to donuts there will never be another one at least not in this Court's lifetime. What that means is that [what] the Affirmative Action women enjoy is determined almost entirely by the schools themselves. If a school wants to have a strong Affirmative Action program it will, but if it doesn't there's really not a whole lot you can do about it. And faculty hiring is the same thing. You've seen hiring and retention. I'm sure you've all seen figured and occasionally -- I obviously take a personal interest in this -- but, I've occasionally had people tell me, "Well, women are a third of the faculty now." Well, yes we are. Part-time, adjunct, non-tenured track, non-renewable contracts, we're there. You get to associate level and you're down to about 5 percent. You get to full professors and you're under 5. So, the glass ceiling that Linda was talking about for Asian Americans is just a strong for women. I've done work on a women in law firms. About 1979 you see enormous changes. You see all these women -- because we've all been told women are half the entering law school classes now. They are. They're not half of the people who make partners at the major law firms in the big cities in this country. They are something like a quarter. There's a lot more than there used to be, but you know, a lot more superintendents. We're up to 5 percent. A lot more Senators. What do we have, two now ? Four? Six, yeah. We got our own bathroom.

Q: ***

Parikh: I'm really not sure they have. All right. Hey, I have to give myself my three-minute warning.

Okay. What's the current situation? Well, I think what we see is we do see huge increases in women going to college. Women now constitute more than 50 percent of college enrollment, which is what we would expect given the relative ways that women and men perform in pre-collegiate education. The numbers are there, but we see the same kinds of concentrations that we were talking about earlier. And that is, they are disproportionately in education, in the humanities, in the softer social sciences. In graduate school, there are some fields where we're seeing 50 percent. I think medical school is up to 35 percent or something for women. As of 7 years ago it was still considered appropriate, I mean appropriate by the questioner, to ask a woman if she was planning to have a baby before she finished medical school. That was in the '80s, can you believe it? So what we're seeing is very few women in science and very few women in, I mean, dismally few women in the hard social sciences. And in graduate school you see more attrition because women generally tend to have more pressures that take them away from what's required to get through a graduate program. It does

not fall out according to intelligence or performance in classes or any of those things. A sociologist I know once did one of these little studies, you know, in terms of relative levels of happiness and the order is the happiest in graduate school, which is of course a relative phrase, but the happiest in graduate school are married men, then single men, then married women, and then single women. I actually would switch single and married women myself, but maybe I'm an out-lier here. But men simply have, usually are able to find support for the non-graduate school aspects of their lives to a greater degree than the women are. I mean, that's just almost always the case. And also, women often delay going into graduate school because they're financing their husbands or, you know, whoever, And those are perfectly acceptable decisions, I mean, I'm not saying they're sexist decisions within that unit. But what happens is that the result of that is that women are usually disadvantaged.

At the same time that we're still seeing these very sharp gender distinctions there's a real drop off in interest, I mean, at the sort of governmental level and at the administrative educational level on the role of women in the academy. You know, you'll see a lot *** about not enough women in science, but by in large women are not considered an Affirmative Action issue anymore. We're here, what's the big deal? We're getting a lot more interested in sexual harassment issues, but the actual laws and the actual sort of structures lag way behind the expressed interests. And I think here what's defeating us to a great extent is the fact that as a group women are so varied that people point to the success that middle-class and professional women, Asian, White, whoever, and now increasingly with people in their twenties, African Americans, and they say, "No, look, it's working." And they really don't see that there are real differences in whom it works for. If you ask a woman, if you profile like a man, you know, you're single or you put off child-bearing and you have a really supportive spouse, and you come from a middle-class [family] that's given you lots of support and an informal education, you will do very well in the American system, you can. You'll put up with a lot of crap. You'll put up with a lot of, you know, "What's a nice girl like you doing studying Macro Economics?" But you will make it. Everybody else still faces a lot of those same barriers and the problem is that because some people make it it takes the pressure off, because increasing numbers are making it. It takes the pressure off the system to change.

(Tape cuts off here.)