

5/3/73

The Education of Women Today and Tomorrow

K. Patricia Cross

The slogan, "You've come a long way, Baby," is at best a half-truth that applies more to cigarette smoking, I'm afraid, than to some of the more enduring values of life. If we wish to determine the real values of a society, let us look at the practices found in its institutions. The role of women in church, school, and state today might better be reflected by a slogan that sets forth its message in more guarded terms--for example, "You may be making progress, Baby, but you've a long long way to go."

On the eve of almost certain failure for the Equal Rights Amendment, which the country has had 50 years to think about since it was first proposed, I say women may be making progress because the direction of attaining equality for women in our social institutions is by no means clear. Churches are meeting brick walls of resistance when they attempt to discuss the question of whether women should have full equality with men in matters of the spirit. Educational institutions are making dubious progress toward granting women full equality in matters of the mind. As a matter of fact, the proportion of women on college and university faculties has dropped from one-third 100 years ago to one-fourth today (Sandler, 1970). Even in the female-dominated elementary schools, the proportion of women principals has dropped from 45 percent in 1928 to 22 percent today (McFarland, 1970).

As for female equality in the institution of government, we have had women senators--not many but a few--and we have had women cabinet members, but we have none today. Furthermore, although one-third of the white-collar workers in government are women, the proportion in policy-making positions is so low--between 2 and 4 percent--that women's progress over the years in federal employment has to be measured in tenths of a percentage point (Kator, in U.S. Congress, 1970, p 713).

If women are not making dramatic headway in attaining equality in church, school, and state, then perhaps we can use the common measure of value in American society--plain hard cash--to illustrate the progress of women. But alas, women seem to be making dubious headway on that measure as well. In 1960 the median salary of women was 64 percent that of men; by 1970 it had dropped to 58 percent (Green, in U.S. Congress, 1970, p 722); a figure that indicates that the average full-time woman worker makes a little more than half the salary of the average man.

Incredible as it seems, it is not at all clear that women have come a long way in attaining equality when measured by the institutions and values of society. But surely, we protest, all the hullabaloo of the last couple of years must have accomplished something. Indeed it probably has, but there are two reasons why progress is hard to document. First, statistics always lag behind reality. By the time the data are collected, analyzed, and published, they usually reflect the situation several years ago. Extremely rapid social change can sometimes be felt by individuals before it can be verified and generalized by research. Second, and perhaps more important, is the fact that social change is not likely to spring instantly into the full-blown reality envisioned by its most ardent and visible proponents. Change requires preparation. We are not likely to see

dramatic increases in the proportion of women in faculty and administrative positions on college campuses, for example, until we see increased numbers of women completing graduate study. We won't see substantial increases in the completion rate of graduate work until we see more women applying to graduate schools, more women accepted, more women retained, and more visible women on the faculty as living proof that graduate study is worthwhile for women. And so it goes, each slow step forward laying the foundation for the next one.

The same slow pace of change is evident in politics. Shirley Chisholm did not spring full-blown from the drive for minority and women's rights. She has been in politics for 20 years. If we want to understand the real progress of women, we have to take some measures at the lower rungs of the ladder while keeping our eye firmly on the goals represented by the middle and top rungs. To take a practical example, the change in the proportion of women elected to the national congress in 1972 is nothing to get excited about, but 425 women are now serving in state legislatures, and that represents a respectable 20 percent increase over the 350 women who were serving in 1971. These women are preparing to broaden their sphere of influence four to eight years from now. If, however, women relax as we did in the 1940's and 50's then those budding political leaders may never be counted in the halls of Congress; indeed, they may wither and die even at the local level.

All things considered, a more realistic slogan for women who seek self-actualization and the freedom to make their own choices would be, "Don't give up the fight, Baby; you've a long slow way to go." The foundation for that long slow road must be laid in the preparation of women for quite different roles in the society of the future. The women's movement did not

catch on because Betty Friedan wrote a book with the intriguing title, The Feminine Mystique, nor did the media's over-sensationalism of a few bra-burning incidents initiate the women's movement. Rather, these events stimulated widespread public reaction because they symbolized a social change taking place that a substantial number of people felt in their personal lives but could not yet articulate or generalize to the lives of others.

A brief glimpse at the roles of the women of yesterday will help to illustrate why women are caught today in a whirlpool of change reflecting both the cultural traditions of yesterday and the emerging needs of tomorrow.

In the 17th century, Queen Anne of England gave birth to 18 children, 17 of whom died at birth or shortly thereafter. The sole surviving child died at the age of 11. Queen Anne had all the medical attention that money and power could buy, and no effort was spared to insure a surviving heir. At that time, the population numbered about 500 million and it was growing at the slow rate of approximately .3 percent per year. Life expectancy was approximately 30 years, and it took 250 years for the world population to double (Meadows, et al, 1972). Obviously, producing children in the 17th century was essential for the survival of the human race. It would be hard to think of a job that was more important or more dangerous. No wonder it carried such high social reward.

The situation today is dramatically different. The world population has increased seven-fold, but even more alarming is the fact that we are growing seven times as fast as we were in Queen Anne's day. Instead of 250 years, it now takes less than 33 years for the world population to double and that time is steadily decreasing as population and longevity

increase (Meadows, et al, 1972). In the world of tomorrow, motherhood may still carry high personal reward, but it will no longer carry high social reward. This is not to say that caring for children will not be socially valued, nor is it to assert that society will no longer have a need for good mothers. It is to say that the reward for motherhood will be almost totally intrinsic. A woman will have to enjoy being a mother and she must take personal satisfaction in fulfilling that role. In the foreseeable future it is less and less likely that women will become mothers because it is destiny or because someone else thinks it is normal or the best role for women. Women of the future will have the opportunity and the obligation to make choices about how to spend their lives.

Most young women of today are choosing both family and career, but many women now in college are failing to recognize how rapidly change is occurring. They tend quite naturally to think of their lives as patterned after those of their mothers, but that is very unlikely to be the case. While women's work in the home has been steadily decreasing, her life expectancy has been increasing. My grandmothers, for example, had eight and ten children, and their days and their years of family responsibility were long and hard. It took nearly 30 years of their lives before the youngest child was off to school. By the next generation, my mother and her sisters spent an average of 15 years raising children to school age. Today's college graduate will spend closer to 8-10 years. She gets married at around age 22 or 23, and the youngest of her two children is in school by the time she is in her early thirties. The life expectancy of women today is 78. That raises the question of what today's woman is going to do with the nearly 50 years of her life that remain after the children are in school.

Most women are filling those years with work outside the home. Over half of all women between the ages of 18 and 64 are in the labor force today, and the more education a woman has the more likely she is to work. Over two-thirds of all women with five or more years of college education are at work today, and a study of women with doctor's degrees revealed that over 90 percent of them are working (Astin, 1969). Tomorrow it will be the highly unusual college graduate who will not spend most of her adult years in the labor force.

Today, many of the better educated women work because they find jobs outside the home that are more interesting than those inside the home, but the fact is that most women work because they must. Over 40 percent of the women workers work to support themselves and sometimes dependents; they are single, widowed, separated, or divorced. Another 30 percent are married to husbands earning less than \$7000 per year (U.S. Department of Labor, 1971). The quaint notion that a woman will be provided for by a husband is not true even today for the majority of women workers. The amount and kind of education a woman has will make a profound difference in her life. Thus we must begin to raise questions about the adequacy of education for women. The issue is not only an ideological one of equality of opportunity for all people, but it is an urgent practical problem for our society.

Let us approach the task with a factual review of some of the problems, followed by some constructive proposals for solutions. The educational problems of women differ so much with age, life circumstances, and type of education sought that I shall attempt to present my analysis separately for three groups of women--single undergraduates, graduate women, and mature women returning to college.

Undergraduates

It is commonly believed that men and women have equal access to undergraduate education, but it is widely acknowledged that hurdles for women become higher as the level of education increases. The number of women relative to men decreases as one proceeds from bachelor's, to master's, to doctor's and professional degrees. Roughly 42 percent of the bachelor's and first professional degrees are earned by women, while 37 percent of the master's degrees and 13 percent of the doctor's degrees go to women. As I noted earlier, the progress of women is slow enough that we need to build the lower levels of education in order to demonstrate improvement at the higher levels. Since as many women as men graduate from high school, the first educational inequity between men and women now occurs at entrance to college. And at that point, the discrepancy between men and women is greatest among bright students from the lower socioeconomic levels. While poorly educated parents are often willing to make the sacrifices necessary to send a son with academic promise to college, they are not equally dedicated to a college education for a high-achieving daughter. An analysis of Census data indicates that 73 percent of the mothers with a grade school education want college for their sons, but only 60 percent express the same desire for their daughters (Froomkin, 1970). Perhaps because of the attention given to the need for education for minority youth, black women seem to be making better use of the new college opportunities available than do white women of equal ability. One investigator (Knoell, 1970) concluded that, of all potential college students, able white women constitute the group most neglected by college recruitment personnel.

What can we do to attract more women from the lower socioeconomic levels to college? First, we can get the facts before the American public

and especially before high school students. No female high school graduate should be permitted to bank her entire economic future with someone else, however reliable, loveable, and promising he may seem at age 20. Colleges training high school teachers and counselors have a responsibility here. They should be certain that their education graduates are well-informed about the new role of women in the society of tomorrow. If such information is not provided as a part of the education curriculum, then male and female students preparing to work in secondary schools should be encouraged, and perhaps required, to gain exposure to these new trends through taking courses in women's studies. If educators are to help young people prepare for their futures, then surely an understanding of how the future of women will be profoundly different from that of the past is a basic part of that training.

Second, we must be certain that financial aid is available equally to male and female applicants. This is especially important for able women from working-class families. A study of the finances of college sophomores reported that on the average, women received smaller grants, took out larger loans, and earned less money from jobs than men (Haven & Horch, 1972). The problem seems to lie not so much in conscious out-and-out discrimination on the part of colleges as in the societal belief that it is more acceptable for women to remain financially dependent on their families. As a matter of research fact, the families of women do contribute more to college costs than those of men, but that is part of the problem, not part of the answer. If anything, financial assistance to lower strata women should be more generous in order to compensate for parental reluctance to send a daughter to college.

There are two further steps we can take to help women with financial limitations enter and remain in college. We can make certain that jobs on

campus are equally available and have equal pay rates for men and women, and we can work through placement and student employment offices to upgrade the salaries of women students and graduates. Finally, we can see to it that education for women is not more expensive than for men. The traditional protective stance of society toward women frequently costs money. College regulations that permit men to live off-campus and do their own cooking while women must pay room and board contracts on campus must be made non-discriminatory with respect to sex or they must be offset by additional financial considerations to needy women students.

The third action we can take to assure equal access to college for women is to make sure that discrimination against women does not exist in any educational institution in policy or practice. Several years ago, I was able to present some 1969 statistics from a national college guide for students and counselors showing blatant and public discrimination against women in college admissions (Cross, 1971a). Only two years ago, some researchers from the University of Wisconsin sent bogus application blanks for men and women to colleges throughout the country and reported that men with poor academic records were significantly more likely to be accepted than women with the same record (Walster, Cleary, & Clifford, 1971). Sadly enough, discrimination is not dead, and it operates most severely against those with moderate and low ability.

Vocational schools that appeal to many lower class women have been among the worst offenders. Although men may be considered prize students at secretarial or beauty colleges, women are rarely welcomed to electronics or auto mechanics. Since proprietary institutions are now eligible for certain kinds of federal aid, they must cease all discriminatory admissions policies if they wish to exercise these privileges. Thus decision-making

regarding appropriate vocational roles will be left to women and their counselors--subject to the various pressures of society. Personally, I doubt that we will see any great rush for women to enter "men's fields" despite their considerably more favorable pay scales. Most women entering vocational training are from the socioeconomic classes where sexual stereotyping is still quite prevalent. Nevertheless, it is the principle of free vocational choice that is at stake, and unhappily, we have learned that we cannot leave that to faith and good will.

After equality of access come the questions about the nature of the learning experience. What changes need to be made in a curriculum that remains fundamentally unchanged since it was designed hundreds of years ago for men? Actually, it may be a good thing that we never moved to accommodate the needs of women in the college curriculum. Much of the curriculum is career-oriented, and that suits the needs of the new woman quite well. By that relatively cheerful statement, I do not mean to imply that curricular innovation is not greatly needed to improve education for both men and women, nor do I wish to suggest that the present curriculum gives an accurate, or in any way adequate, picture of women. (I'll say more about the need for women's studies later.) The point I wish to make now is that had we made education relevant to the needs of the women of several generations ago, we would be in ever so much more trouble now--given the natural immunity of most curricula to change.

The latest report from the HEW task force on higher education--popularly known as Newman II--minces no words about what they consider appropriate education for women. They state that,

"The purpose of today's higher education must be to prepare women, as well as men, for meaningful work and to give both an education that is humane and practical in terms of today's needs. For women,

there must be a visible, vocational value to higher education to supersede the emphasis on delivery of cultural enrichment to home and family that has always been seen as its prime purpose (Cohen, Mesrop, Stoel, 1973, p 23)."

Our major problem will come, I believe, in getting women and men, faculty and students, to accept women as completely serious about career preparation. We must begin with women themselves. Until quite recently, women were enrolling in liberal arts or in a very limited number of career fields such as nursing, teaching, and home economics. These subjects were seen as practical since they would be useful in the home while providing modest insurance for those periods when work was necessary or desirable. Tomorrow's probable distribution of eight or ten years of emphasis on home-making and 30 years of emphasis on career puts a different light on the issue. It is one thing to major in elementary education because one enjoys the challenge of working with small children; it is quite another to prepare for a 30 year career by taking a subject that seems to be useful in the home and practical or simply tolerable as a career option. In the long run, the teacher surplus may be one of the better things that has happened to women. It has literally forced young women to think about other options. In the last five years, the major shift in the curricular choice of women has been out of teaching and into other areas--especially the newly emerging health fields (Panos, et al, 1967; ACE, 1972).

But women are still represented in only a very narrow range of careers. In 1970, two-thirds of all women workers were employed as clerical, service and sales workers, or as domestic servants (U.S. News and World Report, April 13, 1970). While new opportunities are opening rapidly as a result of affirmative action and aroused public conscience, women must be prepared to move into new fields and to accept new types of responsibilities.

Recent research indicates that women are getting the message. An analysis of Project Talent data in 1960 and 1970 showed that for eleventh grade girls the principal shifts of occupational preference were away from nurse, secretary, office worker, typist, beautician, and housewife and toward such occupations as biological scientist, lawyer, mathematician, political scientist or economist, social worker, psychologist, artist and writer (Guidepost, 1973). There is a hitch to this good news, however. According to the investigators, high school boys were making more realistic choices in 1970 than they made in 1960 when judged on the criteria of the relationship between their reading ability and their career choice. Girls, however, are making less realistic choices. Some girls planning to be biological scientists, for example, lack the academic ability to pursue training for that career successfully. Dr. Flanagan, the director of the research, noted that the interest shifts were apparently made without knowledge of occupational requirements as they related to personal abilities.

I don't find this especially surprising, but I do find it of grave concern. Why should young women who have never thought about biological science as a possible career and who have never seen a women biologist and who have taken vocational interest tests that didn't admit that women could have varied scientific interests know what the job requirements for biological scientist are? We have a great deal of work to do in improving our career education, our measuring instruments, and our counseling for women. We want to do all we can to encourage a broadening of aspirations, but we also want to maximize the potential for success and happiness with the choice. It is not an easy task. We need to expose women to a wider range of careers so that they do have a realistic understanding of the work; we need to provide successful female models; we need to break down stereotypic

thinking about the "appropriateness" of certain careers for women; we need to improve our understanding about the talents and interests of women when they are not artificially restricted by societal sanctions.

Some of these functions of helping women to understand themselves in relation to the changing society are being assumed through the curricular innovation of women's studies. A raft of course titles and functions make it difficult to evaluate the contribution of these courses. They run the gamut from self-defense to consciousness-raising to rigorous discipline-based study. Despite considerable opposition from those who view women's studies as not quite academically respectable, they have grown rapidly in numbers of courses offered and in student interest generated. It is estimated that there are over 1700 courses in existence now (Robinson, undated).

At their best, women's studies represent not a blot on the academic landscape, but a possible model for curricular reform. They have most of the qualities that students and educators are seeking. (1) They are interdisciplinary, calling on the student to integrate and synthesize knowledge across psychology, sociology, political science, humanities, art, etc. (2) They offer an opportunity to integrate cognitive and affective learning. Learning about women whether through history, literature, or discussion with other women helps a young woman to understand herself. Some new research in California indicates that higher education's failure to come to grips with the question of helping students to set personal goals and to understand themselves is viewed by students as one of the greatest shortcomings of their college education (Peterson, 1972). (3) Courses in women's studies are relevant to the needs of young people and the society. The changing roles of women will have a profound effect upon both men and

women. It is an issue that students have the motivation and the need to learn about. (4) Ideally, women's studies courses are excellent vehicles to teach problem solving and critical analysis. Fundamentally, they question the assumptions upon which society has operated with respect to women. If the courses are doing their job, they should require students to critically analyze the problems, document the evidence, and propose alternative solutions.

I would be the first to admit that many courses in women's studies do not represent these qualities of good education. But some do, and the potential for good teaching and rich learning is there. It may be that the need for women's studies per se will disappear when adequate information has worked its way into the traditional disciplines, but the danger is that the potential for lively, relevant, problem-based learning may then sink back into the dull information-giving that characterizes so much of traditional academic education.

Graduate Students

Assessing the opportunities for women in graduate and professional training is complex. In the first place, graduate education normally comes at a time in a woman's life when both internal and external pressures are strongest on her to assume the traditional role of wife and mother. Secondly, society has not yet accepted the strong career commitment for women that is implied by graduate study.

Thus if we would understand the obstacles for women at the graduate level, we must look at dispositional barriers, situational barriers, and institutional barriers. By dispositional barriers, I mean the attitudes, motivations, and cultural values that women bring with them as they make choices. Are intellectual achievement and femininity incompatible? How

can career and family obligations be balanced? Do women possess the aggressiveness and intellectual stamina to succeed in a career? By situational barriers, I refer to factors in the life situation that may prevent or impede graduate study--lack of finances, children at home, a husband who is antagonistic toward further education, lack of mobility or of a university in the community. Institutional barriers refer to those existing in colleges and universities--discrimination on the grounds of sex, age, or part-time study, the male-dominated environment of graduate schools, residency requirements and the like. Let's look briefly at the complex interweaving of these variables as they affect graduate education for women.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that although women make better grades than men from gradeschool through grad school, they consistently have more self-doubts about their academic ability (Cross, 1971b). The explanations for the inferiority feelings of women range from cultural indoctrination that women are the intellectual inferiors of men to the "fear of success" syndrome made famous by the studies of Horner (1968). According to Horner, success is punishing for a woman because it has the negative consequences of making her unattractive to men. Margaret Mead (1949) identified the same problem 25 years ago when she observed that "each step forward as a successful American, regardless of sex, means a step back as a woman." These social scientists have made explicit an ingrained cultural conflict; for most women in our society femininity and competitive achievement are mutually exclusive.

There is little doubt that graduate study is highly competitive and getting more so. There is also evidence that women in graduate school express feelings of considerable emotional strain. An extensive study of

some 33,000 graduate students revealed that out of seven possible situations that might prevent completion of graduate study, emotional strain ranked first among women. It ranked higher than lack of finances, lack of interest, or lack of academic ability (Creager, 1971). Although we can only speculate as to causes, the strain is probably a mixture of personal, situational, and institutional factors. One group of well-known women educators described it this way:

The problem of maintaining feminine identity while engaging in serious intellectual pursuits is real for most women and is aggravated for those who find themselves in a minority in a male-dominated institution. As a minority, women are easily branded as different, often as superior intellects but inferior females. Few girls remain unaffected by such attitudes. Women students need an unusual sense of self to persevere in a predominantly male setting (Bunting, Graham, & Wasserman, 1970).

What can we suggest? Only that the road to full equality of educational opportunity at the graduate level will be hard and slow. Remediation of the fear of success syndrome must begin at the elementary school level, but we can furnish the support and understanding for women presently pursuing graduate study by providing much greater access to successful women on the faculty, counseling, and administrative staff of the university. I wish I felt confident in saying that most graduate institutions are seriously trying to improve the balance of women on their faculty. Declining enrollments, decreasing federal support for graduate study, and local budgetary difficulties are frustrating even the best of intentions. But these temporal problems are also serving as excuses for the status quo. It was disillusioning to me to learn last week that of six new appointments made in the top 58 policy-making positions at the University of California, not one was a woman.

I have not said much yet about access to graduate school because retention seems to be the greater problem. It is estimated that in 1970, almost half (46-48 percent) of the women graduating from college entered graduate school, and that is almost as high as the proportion of men (50-54 percent) continuing their formal education (Haggstrom, 1971). These encouraging figures may be misleading, however. Roughly half of the women graduate students are enrolled in only two fields--education and English (Creager, 1971). Their low visibility in other subjects is a combination of lack of application on the part of women, but it is also a reflection of well-documented evidence that women are having a difficult time breaking the barriers of entry into male-dominated fields of study (University of Chicago, 1970; University of California, 1970). Expanding both the interests and the acceptability of women in a broader range of subjects is a matter that really needs work and constant attention. Neither one will go forward without vigilance and dogged determination.

Having noted that there are dispositional and institutional barriers to graduate study, we must also recognize that situational barriers are at their peak for potential women graduate students. Among women who plan to attend graduate school at some point, the most frequent reasons for not being enrolled are lack of financial resources and family responsibilities (HEW, 1968). These barriers have been widely recognized, and there is considerable agitation for financial aid for part-time students and for child care centers. There is every reason to believe that if we could provide money and child care for many young women who are eager and able students, we would go a long way toward equalizing educational opportunity for women.

Adult Students

Finally, I want to give some attention to the most rapidly burgeoning student population of all--adult women returning to college. I am going to approach this discussion a little differently. Rather than focusing on the barriers that exist and then posing possible solutions, I want to start with the solutions. There are two reasons for taking this approach. One is to end this symposium on an upbeat note of optimism. The other is to show some examples of what is being done and what can be done to make education more flexible and relevant for all kinds of learners--especially for women interested in lifelong learning.

It is hard to say what started the world-wide movement toward what, for lack of a better term, is known as non-traditional studies. It may have been England's dramatic new Open University, born of political warfare and championed by Jennie Lee, a woman of unquestioned courage and determination. Variouslly dubbed the University of the Air and the "university of the second chance," the goal of Open University was to open elite British education to the masses. With an initial enrollment of 25,000 students, Open University became overnight the second largest university in England. It is a university without a campus, and its primary distinction lies in its delivery systems consisting of radio, television, and correspondence courses. These opportunities for home study are then supplemented by more than 250 regional learning centers where students may consult the part-time staff of some 3000 tutors and counselors. Students are also expected to participate in short residential summer schools organized on the campuses of existing colleges and universities. Some of the learning

materials that have been developed for the Open University have received world-wide recognition. The kitchen science kit, worth \$250, but mass produced at minimal cost, is reported to give the student "at least as much equipment as someone at a conventional university would have under his personal control" (Maclure, 1971).

Think of the learning potential in this model for house-bound mothers of small children, for the elderly and the handicapped, indeed, for anyone who wishes to continue to learn regardless of his or her personal situation at a given time in life.

But we have similar models closer to home. The University Without Walls existing in more than 20 locations across the country promises a personalized educational program consisting of combinations of regular college courses, internships, field experiences, independent study and group projects, travel, and courses via new technologies. There is no prescribed curriculum, and graduation takes place when the student has achieved the learning objectives agreed upon with her faculty advisor. No one in the University Without Walls cares how old a woman is, how much time she has for study, how "old" or "transferable" her college credits are or whether she can pass a standard entrance examination. They are more interested in her motivation for learning and in helping her to create the type of program that will meet her situation and her needs.

The spread of non-traditional alternatives has been so rapid that campus-free colleges are established or under consideration in most states. As many of you know, the Illinois Board of Higher Education has proposed Lincoln State University which will utilize colleges, libraries, museums, and training programs offered by business and industry as learning resources and which will provide non-traditional alternatives throughout the state.

These flexible universities are more than a passing fad. Their fundamental purpose is to change the definition of education. The education of tomorrow will be measured in terms of the qualities of students instead of by the course offerings of institutions. The time will come when 128 credit hours will be meaningless, as students are permitted a wide variety of learning options. Where and how the student obtained learning will not be nearly as important as the fact that he or she did or did not utilize the opportunities available.

For women our task is two-fold. We must make certain that educational opportunities are fully and freely available in traditional as well as non-traditional forms. But our second task is even more formidable. We must make certain that rising as well as present generations comprehend the full implications of the social revolution that is taking place in the lives of women--for indeed it is revolutionary in the impact that it will have on the lives of individuals and on the readiness of society to cope with the new world of tomorrow.

Both men and women have a stake in that new world. While women may be more motivated and sensitive to changing sex roles, the education of women is a task that must be understood and shared by everyone. Let us be firm in our resolve to provide educational opportunity to all, but let us use strength wherever we find it--in men and women, old and young, rich and poor, black and white, those who question and hold back as well as those who are impatient and rush ahead. Women's rights is no more a woman's issue than civil rights is a minority issue. The future belongs to all of us, and if we don't make it better, who will?

REFERENCES

- American Council on Education, Staff of the Office of Research. The American freshmen: National norms for fall 1972. Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1972, Research Report 7(5).
- Astin, H. The woman doctorate in America. New York: Russell Sage, 1969.
- Berkeley, University of California at. Report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Academic Women on the Berkeley campus. Author, 1970.
- Bunting, M., Graham, P. A., & Wasserman, E. R. Academic freedom and incentive for women. Educational Record, 1970, 51.
- Chicago, University of. Women in the University of Chicago. Author, 1970.
- Cohen, A. C., Mesrop, A., & Stoel, C. Women and higher education: Creating the solutions. Prepared for inclusion in the forthcoming report of the Newman II Committee--Task Force on Higher Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Creager, J. A. The American graduate student: A normative description. Washington, D.C.: Office of Research, American Council on Education, 1971.
- Cross, K. P. Beyond the open door: New students to higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971. (a)
- Cross, K. P. The undergraduate woman. Research Report No. 5. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, March 1971. (b)
- Froomkin, J. Aspirations, enrollments, and resources. Prepared for the U.S. Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Guidepost. Project talent: Career goals. Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, March 1973, 15(13).
- Haggstrom, G. School and college entrance and graduation rates, 1900-2000. Unpublished paper prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Berkeley, California, 1971.
- Haven, E. W., & Horch, D. H. How college students finance their education. New York: College Scholarship Services, College Entrance Examination Board, 1972.

Horner, M. S. Sex differences in achievement motivation and performance in competitive and non-competitive situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

Knoell, D. M. People who need college. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

MacLure, S. England's Open University: Revolution at Milton Keynes. Change, March/April 1971, 3(2), 62-68.

McFarland, S. J. NOW ACTS, July 1970, 3(2).

Mead, M. Male and female: A study of sexes in a changing world. New York: Morrow, 1949.

Meadows, D., Meadows, D., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. The limits to Growth. New York: Signet, 1972.

Panos, R. J., Astin, A. W., & Creager, J. A. National norms for entering college freshmen--fall 1967. Washington, D.C.: Office of Research, American Council on Education, 1967, Research Report 2(7).

Peterson, R. E. Goals for California higher education: A survey of 116 academic communities. Prepared for the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California State Legislature. Berkeley: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

Robinson, L. The emergence of women's courses in higher education. Research Currents. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, undated.

Sandler, B. NOW ACTS, July 1970, 3(2).

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Special Subcommittee on Education. Discrimination against women. Hearings before the Subcommittee. Ninety-first Congress, second session, July 1 and 31, 1970. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971, Part 2.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institutes of Health. Special report on women and graduate study, Report No. 13. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June 1968.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. Underutilization of women workers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

U.S. News and World Report. Rebellious women: The reason. April 13, 1970.

Walster, E., Cleary, T. A., & Clifford, M. M. The effect of race and sex on college admission. Sociology of Education, 1971, 44.