

#4
NOV 5 1971

*Unprocessed manuscript for circulation
to committee readers only. Not for
duplication or distribution in any form.*

WOMANPOWER:

THE VIEW FROM DOWN HERE

by

Roberta J. Moore, Ph. D.

Chairman, Journalism Department

Walla Walla College

CONTENTS

Introduction	i
Women: Fact and Fiction	1
Print Stereotypes	3
Stereotypes in <u>Insight</u>	9
Educate: How and for What?	22
Sex Roles in Academia	23
In the Beginning. . .	27
The Real Crunch	29
Women in Teaching	33
Methodology	33
Analysis of Data	35
It's Still a Man's World in Money Matters	45
The Last Word	53
Bibliography	54

INTRODUCTION

To evaluate the church's performance in any area is a task which, like marriage, no one would undertake lightly or inadvisedly. To evaluate the church's performance in an area so taut with emotion as its treatment of women is probably a task for which one should ask a guarantee of professional asylum.

If I am honest--and I try to be--what I say in this paper is bound to be critical. My words I hope are kind, but they bear the imprint of 24 years in the service of my church with the knowledge that the church has not always been kind to me.

At this point, however, I see reason for hope in the fact that a committee of the church has asked for this evaluation, and--more than that--it has asked it of me, a woman.

Roberta J. Moore
Walla Walla College
October, 1971

WOMEN--FACT AND FICTION

For the most part we do not first see, and then define; we define first and then see. In the great blooming, buzzing confusion of the outer world we pick out what our culture has already defined for us, and we tend to perceive that which we have picked out in the form stereotyped for us by our culture.¹

According to the United States Department of Labor, half of today's women marry by the time they are 21; they have their last child by the age of 30. When this youngster starts school, the mother still has 30 or more years of active life ahead of her.² Some choose to spend those years at home; others want to get at least part-time work, often to help meet family expenses; still others work because of the challenge they find in the job.

"I had my work done by 10:30 almost every morning," one woman told me. "Then I was free until the children came home from school at 3:30." She added, "With tuition running \$150 a month, can't you see why I wanted a job?"

Moreover, 23 per cent of the women now working in the United States are single and another 21 per cent widowed, divorced or separated.³ I have a friend whose husband died 12 years ago, leaving her with a son to raise; another friend, mother of two teenagers, not long ago gave her husband the divorce he wanted so that he could marry his secretary. Of necessity, both these women work.

¹Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion. The Macmillan Company, 1922, p. 81.

²Expanding Opportunities for Girls: Their Special Counseling Needs. U. S. Department of Labor, 1967.

³Ibid.

In the United States, as a matter of fact, about 2.5 million women workers, like my two friends, are heads of families; most of them must work to support themselves and children.¹ I have tried unsuccessfully to get comparable figures for denominational workers: apparently no one knows even how many women the church employs, let alone how many are single, married, or the heads of families.

Too often, however, those who speak for the church put all women into the same pigeonhole. This is a form of what we call stereotyping. It appears in books and papers which the church publishes. It surfaces in interviews with denominational leaders and with both men and women at every level of church work. It crops up in discussions with young people.

A secretary, fortyish and unmarried, says wryly, "I'm tired of hearing that a woman's place is in the home; we just don't all fit into that picture."

In its stereotyping, the church sometimes forgets its women members who have never married or those who married but are now widowed or divorced. It ignores the fact that there are many women who must work to feed and clothe their children or to keep them in church school. It shakes its head over those who cannot get inspired by a sinkful of dirty dishes or a stack of ironing, as though they are somehow unnatural.

Saying that a woman's place is in the home suggests that all of us are alike--that a woman exists solely to marry and to bear children and that having borne them, she must forever tend the nest in which she cradled them.

¹Ibid.

It is like saying that all men, because they are men, belong on the farm.

Print Stereotypes

Sex stereotyping runs through much of the output of Seventh-day Adventist publishing houses. In the summer and early fall of 1971, roused by articles such as "Women and the Church: Poor Psychology, Worse Theology," in The Christian Century,¹ Susan (Mrs. Daniel L.) Berger² and I did exhaustive reading in books her youngest children were reading in church school and in periodicals the Sabbath school gave them.

What did we find? Let's start with first-grade reading books.

BOOKS. Almost invariably stories in these books picture boys as doing things and girls who merely are. Boys not only are more active than girls; they come through as more alert and intelligent. Girls in the stories often need help and appeal to boys for it; boys give it.

A few examples will show the extent of this stereotyping.

Dick can stand on his hands; Jane can't. Sally says, "Oh, Dick! Help Jane. Go help Jane." Dick holds Jane's legs so that she can stand on her hands.³

Pam climbs on a stool and can't get down. Penny says, "Mike! Mike! Come here, Mike. Come help Pam. Help Pam get down."⁴

¹Sheila D. Collins, The Christian Century, December 30, 1970, pp. 1557-1559.

²An August, 1971 graduate of Walla Walla College with majors in journalism and sociology.

³Friends We Know. Pacific Press, 1966, pp. 7-10. Adapted from Now We Read, 1965. Scott-Foresman's

⁴Ibid., pp. 31-34.

Sally hides from Dick and Jane. Jane says, "Oh, Dick! I cannot find Sally. Where is Sally? Help me, Dick. Help me find Sally."¹

First-grade reading books usually show the boy as older, incidentally. This is so uniform as to appear to be a part of the stereotyping. One might reason, of course, that Dick helps Jane and Sally because he is older and bigger. When boys are consistently older and bigger, however, and when in story after story they must help girls in the games children play, one cannot fail to see a pattern emerging.

The picture first-grade reading books give of mothers and fathers is also a stereotype. Mother is getting a meal in the kitchen, or vacuuming the rug, or teaching Sally about Jesus.² She dusts, dries dishes, irons.³ In other words, she appears always in what psychologists call her role as "nurturer."

Father, on the other hand, comes home at the end of the day, carrying his briefcase. While Mother gets supper, Father and Dick play football.⁴ Father, as the stories show him, is in fact quite a playboy. He plays baseball with Dick, he pushes the children in a wagon, he puts a basket on Dick's bike.⁵ In one story, Called "Work to Do,"⁶ Daddy's "work" is putting together a barbecue grill.

¹New Fun With Dick and Jane. Scott, Foresman, 1956, pp. 32-35.

²Families We Know. Pacific Press, 1966. Adapted from Scott, Foresman, Fun With the Family, 1965.

³More Friends to Know. Pacific Press, 1967.

⁴Families We Know, pp. 15-18.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Fun With Our Friends. Scott, Foresman, 1962, pp. 15-18.

Illustrations with two stories in one book show a dark-skinned father planting a tree and mowing the lawn.¹ Most stories, however, consistently show fathers coming home from work and then playing with children, not helping mothers or working around the house.

Moreover, stories show Father as the decision-maker. Billy comes running home to tell Mother, for example, that he has seen a little black dog. Mother is in the kitchen, naturally, baking a pie.

Billy tells her, "I wish we could buy him."

Mother replies, "Ask your father. Ask him and see what he says."²

Says The Christian Century study already cited:³

Thus to limit roles on a sexual basis--female as homemaker, male as wage-earner--not only limits the life options and potential of countless females, but also has a deleterious effect on children whose parents do not happen to fit such stereotypic patterns.

CHILDREN'S PAPERS. The picture changes little if any when we move from first-grade reading books to weekly papers from denominational presses.⁴ Boys appear as dominant characters more than twice as often as girls. Interestingly enough, authors are usually women.

¹Families We Know, pp. 43-46 and 59-63.

²Collins, op. cit., p. 1557.

³The New Our New Friends. Pacific Press, p. 87.

⁴We analyzed three months, July through September, of each of three weekly papers: Our Little Friend, Primary Treasure, and Guide. We found little attempt at characterization; usually story interest lies in what happened, with a moral tacked on at the end in many cases. Along with appearing as dominant characters more than twice as often as girls, boys are pictured on the covers more often. Our attempts to decide whether stories showed boys in a more positive fashion than girls were not wholly successful, although generally speaking we felt that this was true.

In Our Little Friend stories, Mother is still the nurturer; children often find her in the kitchen preparing food. Stories in Primary Treasure and Guide include mothers less often than those in Our Little Friend; fathers seldom appear in any. Boys still dominate the scene, however, while as one writer commented about other stories, the image of girls in most cases ranges from dull to invisible.¹

One cover story in Guide deserves more than casual mention.² It begins:

Kristy wished with all her heart she had been born a boy. Why, oh, why did she have to be a girl? Girls never had any fun. They couldn't climb trees and explore caves and go hiking with the neighborhood boys. . . .when it came to real fun, Kristy had to be left out.

Then, as the story develops, Kristy remembered her Sabbath school teacher's saying that "if a person prayed earnestly, never wavering but firmly believing, all things were possible."

So Kristy prayed that she would become a boy.

The author's chief concern, of course, is not Kristy's wish that she could become a boy. Still, this deserves thought. How many little girls think they lead dull lives by comparison with their brothers and wish they were boys? On the other hand, how many boys think their lives are dull and pray to become girls?

¹Collins, op. cit., p. 1558, quoting Elizabeth Fuller's study of children's books for the New York Times Book Review.

²Dorothy Aitken, "Kristy's Impossible Prayer," Guide, July 15, 1970, pp. 2-3.

BOOK CLUBS. Children working for Missionary Volunteer book club certificates, either primary or junior, must read a book on missions and a biography.

We found a real dearth of books about women or girls, in either of these categories. Most missions stories deal with men doctors, preachers and teachers. Asked about biographies of women, one librarian replied that there were very few. Then she explained, "Famous people are usually men, you know."

Librarians and teachers sometimes say that stories must deal with boys in order to interest boys; girls, they say, will read stories about boys. This may be true. One might well ask, however, what girls would like to read; our libraries do not contain enough stories about girls to give them any choice.

BY WAY OF SUMMATION. Sex stereotyping raises a host of questions, not the least of which is why more parents and teachers do not protest the superficiality of children's reading. One teacher refuses to use in her classes some of the books intended for the grade she teaches; no one else with whom Mrs. Berger and I talked seemed concerned.

What value do stories have, which consistently portray girls as helpless creatures? Or their mothers as household drudges, eternally busy with food, laundry and housecleaning while boys and men romp outside?

Would anyone want to say that the stories children read and the pictures they see have no influence on what they think? If stories and pictures in any way shape a child's thinking, what about the psychological

damage of sex stereotyping on boys and girls whose parents do not match the roles in which books and Sabbath school papers cast them? Some children, for example, have fathers who are plumbers, taxi drivers and farmers. Storybook fathers, on the other hand, work in offices and schools; in illustrations they come home wearing dark business suits and ties. Some children, too, have mothers who work outside their homes, either from choice or necessity, instead of making cookies and gingerbread. Do these boys and girls think, perhaps, that their mothers and fathers are not proper parents? Do they feel cheated?

And what about the effect of stories about boys who are always doing things--usually, as we have seen, with a fair degree of success--and about girls who simply are? Since the stereotyping remains more or less constant from first grade on into academy, would it be any wonder if little girls besides Kristy wish they were boys?

"Every human being," Ellen White wrote, "is endowed with. . .power¹ to think and to do." Our stereotyping gives Dick the power to think and to do; Jane can only be. If she wants to do something, of course she can always appeal to Dick for help, but is this what Mrs. White had in mind?

"In these early years," says Bruno Bettelheim, "it is rare indeed for girls to hear the slightest suggestion that they might one day do the interesting work of this world quite as well as many men, or even better."² Children's literature included in this study does nothing to show girls that there is any place ^{for them} except on the sidelines, watching Dick and Mike.

¹Education. Pacific Press, 1942, p. 17.

²"Growing Up Female," Harper's, October, 1962, p. 121.

Stereotypes in Insight

Analysis of Insight, the church's controversial youth magazine, reveals some points which I think are significant enough to warrant more detailed treatment than that given children's papers and books in the preceding section. Because I know that the magazine is often the target of biting criticism, I hesitate to air my findings. What blame there is for sex stereotyping here rests with the writers; I think somehow those of us who write for publication need to take note of the pictures our work paints, taken collectively.

Because Insight publishes only one or two stories in most issues, my original plan, which called for analysis of magazines in two three-month periods, proved inadequate: it gave me too few stories of any one type, and I could not come up with what I considered valid conclusions. This being the case, I went back to the beginning and read all the stories in the first 15 months of the magazine, from May 5, 1970, to October 26, 1971.

The study was not without its problems. One was determining how many times an idea must appear before it becomes worth mentioning. That is, given a dozen personal experience stories, when should one rightfully begin to attach importance to the fact of the chief character's being a nurse? Is it significant the second time? Or perhaps not until the third or fourth time the idea occurs?

Generally speaking, I find significant those patterns of thinking which recur three or more times. As the magazine matures and the number of stories of a given type increases, one might naturally expect to find these patterns occurring more frequently.

A second problem lies in the subjectiveness of value judgments. Could I be sure that the picture an author sketches is either positive or negative--certainly a factor in a study of stereotypes--or is it my interpretation, my judgment that is positive or negative? I have solved this problem only to the extent that my illustrations prove their point.

Even so, the generalizations which follow are only tentative; I offer them as I might a basket of not-quite-ripe fruit. Analysis of a magazine on so broad a scale as this is usually the work of several months, not weeks, and I am aware that my ideas need more time to mellow. For what it is worth, however, I submit this analysis of how Insight handles the sex stereotypes discussed in the preceding section.

I find three types of narratives here, with, of course, some overlapping:

- 1) Stories in which personality or character is more important than what happens
- 2) Personal experiences, both first- and third-person narratives, including personal witness stories
- 3) Reports of team evangelism, such as ACT programs

In the more than a hundred stories I found some familiar patterns--stereotypes--but also a hint now and then that young people may be throwing off traditional sex roles.

In a sense, stereotyping is an economy move: instead of attempting to individualize character and personality, a writer plays up one trait, which becomes familiar to readers as somehow sex-linked. That is, if boys are rather consistently portrayed as active and resourceful, we come to think of action and resourcefulness as characteristics of males. This technique saves effort: it is obviously easier to show such patterns than it is to pick out individual traits, particularly when the size of a magazine limits the length of a story as does Insight's.

As examples of stories in which personality or character is more important than what happens, I would mention "Vision of Judy,"¹ the story of a blind teenager, a Braille proofreader, and "Mother Maria of Ravensbruck,"² which the author describes as "the true story of a very brave Christian." I could have selected any of a dozen others: this is a familiar type in Insight.

In these two, Judy and Mother Maria have positive character traits: that I think is beyond argument.

But here I would like to raise a question which has plagued me during the reading of such stories as these.

Several sketches deal with handicapped or sick girls and women. The chief characters suffer and in some stories--Mother Maria's is an example--die; their death, in fact, is the story's raison d'etre, because the women die with courage.³

¹Robert L. Sheldon, Insight, May 19, 1970, pp. 15-19.

²G. W. Target, October 19, 1971, pp. 13-16.

³For another example see Anne Hazelton, "When Death Comes By," September 8, 1970, pp. 18-19.

My point here is that while the characters are positive, even heroic, and the reader admires their positiveness and heroism, a normal, active teenager will have a problem of identification.

Take the story of Judy, the Braille proofreader, for example. The next to the last paragraph says:

A common question asked of blind people is whether they would like to have their sight. "No," Judy answers without hesitation. "I've adjusted to living without sight. I'm afraid too many things would frighten me if I could see."

A reader may sympathize with Judy and may admire the adjustment she has made to being blind, but identify with her? I think not.

Or take Anne Hazelton's "When Death Comes By":

She came off the plane last in a wheel chair, smiling and wearing a flower. But when my aunt came home to stay in my parents' room, she was starting to die once again after her last so-called recovery.

The writer goes on to describe death from cancer: "calm and cheerful. . . giving up one function after another."

I have watched death come like that, and I would not shield anyone from the picture simply because it is grim. I cannot help wondering, however, when so many girls and women in stories are pain-wracked, are the girls who a few years ago prayed to become boys going to feel any happier now with their lot? And should we be content with showing them how to suffer and die bravely instead of how to live splendidly?

This is not to say that Insight writers see most women as sufferers, feminine versions of Job. They too seldom, however, give girls a picture of women whose lives are full, happy, productive.

What about character stories of men?

Two sketches deal with handicapped young men. One who was studying to be an evangelist fractured his spine on a construction job and ended up in a wheel chair, paralyzed from the waist down.¹ The writer describes his life after his accident:

Some evenings Edwin borrowed a small projector and showed Bible pictures on the whitewashed wall; sometimes children from the mission compound sang and he preached a sermonet; at other times he just visited from bed to bed listening to patients' troubles, counseling, encouraging, and praying with patients.

In Vietnam another boy lost both legs below the knees. The writer² met him on a flight to Chicago; the young paraplegic was visiting the families of buddies who would not be coming home. After talking with the soldier the author says:

I craved a bull-horn big enough to command the attention of the whole nation. . . .I would yell in the ear of the nation, in anger and in pride:
"LOOK MA, NO LEGS!"

These two boys, handicapped though they are, still come through primarily as doers. And of course Author Gordon Hyde's reaction to the soldier--his craving a "bull-horn big enough to command the attention of the whole nation"--colors the reader's reaction to a large extent.

In other sketches of boys and young men, the chief characters lead busy lives, and they are obviously happy.

Several stories of this type crowd to the forefront. There is, for example, one called "Far Greater Glory," the experience of a former basketball

¹Edwin Matthews, as told to Goldie Brown, "Restructured Dreams," July 13, 1971, pp. 7-10.

²Gordon Hyde, "In Anger and In Pride," November 24, 1970, pp. 12-15.

player, John Rudomerkín, whom the author describes with frank admiration.¹ Then there is "Profile of a White House Fellow," the story of a young Black, who comes across as intelligent, articulate and energetic. He is worried, he says, by the church's tendency to be "other-world oriented": one of his responsibilities as a layman is to "emphasize how a Christian can live a better life here."²

By and large, I think, young men in these stories are very much alive; teen-age boys would find much in them to admire and little if any problem in identifying with them. In a sense these are stereotypes: we have come to expect boys in stories to be colorful characters, as we came to expect Dick of the first-grade readers to be older, bigger and stronger than Jane. The kind of girl who appears in stories here, however, is too often passive; she reminds one of Milton's sonnet "On His Blindness" and its famous last line: "They also serve who only stand and wait." Perhaps some girls are like this; all are not. Is virtue necessarily synonymous with dullness in girls?

What about personal experience stories, such as personal witness?

It is perhaps significant that stories of individual ministry involve young men less often than do stories of team evangelism. Are men more likely to work in groups than singly?

At least four stories show girls in the role of nurse: girls who are living happy, productive lives.

¹Harry Cummins, December 1, 1970, pp. 3-7.

²J. E. Dykes, December 29, 1970, pp. 3-9.

Ruthita Jensen, for example, is a student missionary in Saigon,¹ directing the immunization program of the Adventist hospital. Her story contains one obvious touch of stereotyping: she is not a career woman but a girl playing at being mother to Vietnamese babies. She writes home:

I'm a sucker for brown-eyed babies, so have made it a personal project to love each of the 24 babies under the age of one year. I go out twice a week and try to play with each one for a little while. They need love so badly.

Another girl, 15 years old, delivers a breech baby alone in her father's clinic in Honduras.² One spends the summer between academy graduation and college working with retarded children; she changes diapers and feeds, bathes and dresses the children, some of whom are human vegetables.³ Claire, the fourth girl, is a graduate nurse; she writes to a friend about her work at a mission hospital in Uganda.⁴

In other stories of personal witness, girls are teaching underprivileged children; in some cases they may be part of a team but the girls appear to be working alone, and, like the four nurses just mentioned, they work with children.

Personal experience stories other than those of personal service often describe girls with passive or negative qualities, and by comparison with most stories of boys and young men they are unappealing to say the least.

¹D. A. Roth, "She Shoots to Save," July 21, 1970, pp. 3-7.

²Sylvia Youngberg, "Guided Hands," October 13, 1970, pp. 12-15.

³Mindy Miller, "Via Holly Hall," October 6, 1970, pp. 16-18.

⁴Jane Allen, "Postmark Uganda," December 8, 1970, pp. 8-13.

If one story shows a girl as passive, the reader shrugs and says, "So what? So that girl is passive. What else is new?" When half a dozen stories within, say, three months, show girls as passive, the reader doesn't shrug them off. He may be well aware that this is an economy move on the part of writers--that even in their passivity, these girls have individual traits that distinguish them from each other, but that showing these traits takes time, effort and valuable magazine space. But gradually the reader comes to think of passivity as a characteristic of girls.

One girl goes to college, for example, drops out in two weeks to work as a waitress, and finally comes back. Of this second try she comments:¹

I was passing my classes, but don't ask me what I was learning. How to cut corners, maybe. Or how to pass a test without really trying. I was a history major, and history majors are supposed to be "intellectual." So I began to act very intellectual. I read the "right" books, talked with the "right" people, showed up at the "right" places.

At the end of the story she tells us that she is scheduled to graduate at the close of the year. Then she says, "I don't have plans for my future, but I have a feeling that He's planned it all."

Now, as a teacher I am well aware that some male students finish college without definite plans; indecision is hardly a feminine secondary sex characteristic. But this is not how we see college men; stereotyping rules out such a picture. Girls, however, often come through as indecisive; in some stories they are do-nothings, and there could be no

¹Carolyn Jones, "My Religious War," October 27, 1970, pp. 3-6.

story but for the fact that the do-nothings recognize that they should be doing something.

In one of the few two-parters which Insight has run,¹ the author describes her relationship with a young man she meets during a summer session at a state university. In the course of the story, incidentally, she describes women teachers:

The walks and corridors became the setting for leisurely strolling women, mature women in Pendleton jackets, double-knit dresses, sensible shoes, and black-framed eyeglasses. . . .As I observed the women, I felt that I might be seeing a portrait of myself in the years to come. Which type would I turn out to be like-- Mrs. Mohr with her pretty face, bright-blue eyes, and touch of bluing in her hair to keep the yellow tinge out of the gray? Miss Van Orpington in her smartly tailored clothes, who obviously believed the ad "Only you and your hairdresser know for sure"?

She feels strong attraction for the young man, as the summer wears on, but though personable, he is "worldly," and she does not bridge the gulf between them since she never quite brings herself to the point of telling him about her religion. The relationship ends with the summer, and she loses sight of him. As the years pass, she keeps going to art shows in hopes of seeing him again (does she wear a Pendleton jacket and sensible shoes?); the knowledge that she was laggard in sharing her faith with him always dogs her.

Other stories follow this same theme: a do-nothing attitude towards religion, followed, too late, by a remorseful awakening.

Among the personal experience stories which Insight has published I have found sexual stereotyping at its worst. Though in some stories girls

¹ Roselyn Edwards, "Maybe He'll Be There," September 14 and 21, 1971.

serve as nurses and teachers (this in itself, as I have noted, a form of stereotyping) in other stories they come through as passive characters, often given to a sense of failure, futility and frustration.

More frequent than stories in either of the other two classifications, reports of team evangelism are a staple in the diet of Insight readers. In many such stories, girls work in day-care centers, help in branch Sabbath schools, and tutor underprivileged children. And though girls share the responsibility for the success of these programs, young men serve as directors and generally speak for the group.

Here are a few examples, all of which follow this formula:

Morten Juberg, "They Pray Then Play," May 26, 1970, pp. 3-8.

Merikay, "Brotherhood on Spruce Street," December 22, 1970, pp. 3-7.

(Women's libbers would surely take exception to that title!)

"Beyond Entertainment," January 5, 1971, pp. 3-9.

Arthur R. Lickey and Ella Mae Rydzewski, "Day Camps Penetrate Inner City," January 19, 1971, pp. 9-11.

Opal Hoover Young, "Gymnics: Athletes with a Mission," March 16, 1971, pp. 12-16.

Walt Rydzewski as told to Ella Rydzewski, "Guatemala '70," March 30, 1971, pp. 8-11.

Merikay, "To Share Our Happiness," July 27, 1971, pp. 3-9.

Chuck Scriven, "New York City: The Summer of '71," October 12, 1971, pp. 3-10.

One should note, of course, that these are reports of team activities rather than imaginative literature (fiction, if you will), and basically

the stereotyping exists in the team activities, probably without much heightening of effect by the writer. Be that as it may, the sex stereotyping is obvious in the assignment of roles on the team and in some cases in the attitudes of the young people towards their work.

In stories of team evangelism, however, I find a hint of something else: a blurring of the lines that generally separate the men from the girls in team activities.

One example of this appears in the story of San Francisco's Vege-Hut.¹

As the author tells it, Ed Lang, 34, a junior in theology at Pacific Union College, has a dream of operating a vegetarian restaurant in the Haight-Ashbury district. His volunteer staff at Vege-Hut includes both men and girls; full-time workers include two men and one girl. Though Lang supplies most of the information about the venture (not at all strange, since it is his baby), I find little else in the story that indicates traditional role-playing. Lang, for example, cooks and serves food, as does Marilyn Grosboll and "a fellow named Bob." All workers "witness" to anyone who drops in.

One gets somewhat the same picture in Insight's report of the Georgetown Gate² and in the story of a community drop-in center in Bellevue, Washington.³ Here, a boy named Harris and a girl named Sue, teenagers who are part of a volunteer staff of young people, housewives and businessmen, see a girl back

¹Gene Jennings, "Taking Christ (and Vegetarian Food) to the Hippies," July 13, 1971, pp. 11-17.

²Jiggs Gallagher, "Open Door at the Gate," August 31, 1971, pp. 3-9.

³Merikay, "Heads Up," October 30, 1970, pp. 12-16.

from a bad trip on drugs. They take her home. Then, said Sue, "We kind of burst out of the door and ran down the road and started laughing." Harris added, "That was about three-thirty in the morning, and I felt like a whole new person."

In some team projects such as these three, girls and young men work together with little attention to traditional restrictions on the jobs they do, the hours they keep, and adult supervision of their activities.

I wondered if this is the beginning of a trend in youth evangelism. I talked with several Walla Walla College teachers who are in a position to see such a trend developing, if indeed this is what is happening.

One man, a sociology teacher who has worked with ACT teams for several years, thinks that the blurring of lines separating sex roles is more imaginary than real.

"Girls still provide food, operate day-care centers and teach branch Sabbath-schools," he says. "Writers may play up different angles, but that doesn't mean there's really much that's new and revolutionary going on."

A psychologist has a different view. "Sure, there's a lot less attention to sex roles and conventions," he says. "Young people are impatient of such restrictions." He looks for more developments along this line. "If the church doesn't accept this new view of things, I'm afraid we'll lose some of our most dynamic young people."

A dean of women recognizes that college girls in particular are demonstrating impatience with traditional views of their roles and conduct. "They want to come and go as they please," she says. "When a girl comes in at 2 in the morning after 'witnessing' at the coffeehouse, she sees no

EDUCATE: HOW AND FOR WHAT?

The juniors all but filled the stage for investiture that Sabbath afternoon, 18 boys and girls in Missionary Volunteer uniforms. As one part of the program, the children told what they planned to be: all intended to work for the church, apparently, the boys as doctors and ministers, the girls as nurses and teachers. Some specified that they wanted to be missionary doctors and nurses. Their leader smiled, obviously pleased. As I listened, I wondered how Paul would have fitted into that group: would the leader have smiled at a boy who wanted to be a tentmaker?

Before I reached home, I was feeling heartsick at what we parents, teachers and ministers are doing to boys and girls. What's wrong with tentmaking--or, for that matter, farming, plumbing or driving taxi--that we limit a boy's options to medicine and the ministry? Surely we can see that all boys are not fitted by ability or inclination for the professions.

Still thinking about tentmaking and similar careers, I suddenly realized that no boy planned to be a teacher and no girl a doctor. These boys and girls had accepted their sex roles without question. The girls' answers, however, suggested problems to come, because if no girl spoke of her wish to be a doctor, neither did one see herself as a housewife and mother. I'll come back to that. For the moment, what about her dream of a career?

Sex Roles in Academia

All the girls in that investiture group, remember, wanted to be teachers and nurses. As they grew older, and one voiced an interest in becoming a doctor, what encouragement would she get from her parents, her teachers, her guidance counselor?

A few days after the investiture service, a college girl came to see me. She was listless when I asked about her major. As we talked, I began to see why.

Back in academy, she had decided she wanted to study medicine.

Her parents were doubtful. "Why don't you take nursing?" they asked.

Her teachers said the same. "Medicine is a man's field," said the science teacher, "but you could be a nurse." The Bible teacher who doubled as guidance counselor pulled her folder from his files and looked at the scores she had made on college entrance tests just a few weeks earlier. "You've got the ability," he said, "but I would suggest you consider nursing. You want to get married, don't you?"

Too often we draw lines for reasons that are purely sexist. Boys can be doctors; girls should be nurses. The American Nurses' Association in 1969 reported a total of 909,131 registered nurses, of whom more than 99 per cent, or 900,325 were women.¹

This has not always been the situation. The National Commission for the Study of Nursing and Nursing Education points out that, in fact, through some periods of history nursing has been viewed as a male occupa-

¹American Nurses' Association, Facts About Nursing, 1969.

tion, as for example, the era in which military orders of hospital knights flourished.¹

Analysis of Walla Walla College nursing graduates over the last two decades shows that there have seldom been more than two or three male nurses even in classes with totals in the 40s and 50s. The 1971 nursing class had 72 women and one man; the 1972 class has 72 women and ten men, evidence, perhaps, of a new trend, thanks to recruitment programs for male nurses.

What about other professions, which are dominated by either sex?

Teachers in office administration say that so far, changing their department's name from secretarial science has not attracted men students.

"In national professional meetings we go on talking about how we can change our image," one teacher told me, "but apparently to men secretarial is still a woman's field."

The reason? As she sees it, men think of secretaries as people who take orders. "Men want to give orders," she explained.

A look at lists of alumni members from our colleges, incidentally, shows that before 1930 several men finished a "secretarial" course. For several years also men came to college to take nursing.

Elementary teaching, like nursing and office administration, has traditionally been a woman's field. In recent years, however, men have begun to show more interest in it. In 1959-60, for example, 13.7 per cent

¹ National Commission for the Study of Nursing and Nursing Education, An Abstract for Action. McGraw Hill, 1970, pp. 140-141.

of all elementary teachers were men; in 1969-70, the total had increased to 15.4.¹ In Seventh-day Adventist elementary schools, as I shall show in the next section of this report, 42 per cent of the teachers are men.

"I think you'll find men teaching the upper grades and serving as principals," says one of Walla Walla College's education faculty. "When a man shows an interest in the lower grades, people treat him like some kind of freak."

The same teacher adds, however, that some men students are now interested in kindergarten and nursery school teaching, "and we would like to see more. Men who like small children aren't necessarily womanish."

The fields of engineering, mathematics and the sciences are still predominantly male. In ten years, Walla Walla College has graduated four women engineers from a total of 216. Three of the four, incidentally, are still practicing.

Most science teachers are men, one reason perhaps that so few girls major in these fields.

"Some men try to discourage girls from taking biology," says a teacher in that department. "I don't know why--the few girls we have in our graduate and undergraduate degree programs are among our best students." He goes on to say that according to a recent study, contrary to the usual opinion women do superior research in science and a considerable amount of it.

In 1968 a national survey showed that 7 per cent of all physicians, 9 per cent of scientists and 1 per cent of engineers were women.² If

¹National Education Association, Research Bulletin. May, 1970, p. 35.

²Hearings Held in Washington, D. C., Part I. 1970, p. 11.

teachers in these fields know what they are talking about, percentages would certainly be no higher among graduates from Seventh-day Adventist colleges. Statistics are hard to obtain, however. For about two decades Loma Linda has accepted only eight women in a class of about 100 entering medical students, I learned from teachers who have served as advisers for premedical students.

The reasoning behind this admissions policy seems to be that even if women graduate, they will practice too little to be a good investment. A teacher who for 20 years was adviser to premedical students on the Walla Walla College campus scoffs at this. He has kept a list of all those who have gone into medicine, he says. His list from 1950 to 1965 includes 22 women. True, most of them have married and perhaps dropped out of professional life for two or three years, while they were having children, but 17 of the 22 are now practicing; the other five he has lost contact with.

Theology, like medicine, does not open its arms to women. Even women Bible instructors are becoming rare. Teachers in the Walla Walla College School of Theology note that the church discourages women preachers.

"It's too bad," says one, "because we've had some good ones." He chuckles. "I guess they work hard on a sermon because they know they've got to be good to survive. We always get good reports from churches where women students have preached."

Some teachers of theology recall Ellen White's writing to a woman, "Address the crowd whenever you can."¹ A year later Mrs. White wrote that two women were "doing just as efficient work as the ministers." One of

¹Review and Herald, May 9, 1899, in Evangelism. Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1946, p. 473.

them, she said, took the Bible and addressed the congregation.¹

The fact remains, however, that theology departments do little to attract women students and by holding out no hope for future work tend to discourage those who apply.

In the Beginning. . .

Pending the twig starts early; parents give their sons construction and chemistry sets and doctors' instruments and their daughters baby dolls, cooking and sewing sets and nurses' kits.

A widely-known psychologist, Paul Torrance, has for more than a decade studied young children's attitudes towards toys. First grade boys, he reports, often refuse to play with a nurse's kit; six-year-olds protest, "I'm a boy! I don't play with things like that."

Torrance says his experiments with older children and science toys show that girls are reluctant to play with this type of game; they often tell him, "I'm a girl; I'm not supposed to know things like that!" In one school Torrance reported his findings to parents and teachers and asked them to help change the girls' attitudes. A year later he retested, using similar science toys; the girls "participated willingly and even with apparent enjoyment. And they performed as well as the boys. But in one significant respect nothing had changed: The boys' contributions were more highly valued--both by other boys and by girls--than the girls' contributions,

¹Letter 169, 1900. Ibid., p. 473.

regardless of the fact that, in terms of sex, boys and girls had scored equally."¹

What happens when children begin to talk about what they want to do as grownups? I am of course particularly concerned with girls; that society defines the feminine role much more narrowly than the masculine I think few would deny.

To a child who says she wants to become a nurse, adults often say, "That's fine, dear, but of course you want to be a mommy too, don't you?" As she grows older, the matter becomes serious, particularly when the girl begins to express an interest in a predominantly male profession. If an adolescent says she wants to be a doctor, she often becomes the target for pressure from parents, teachers and her peer group.

Parents, for example, try to dissuade a girl from a career such as medicine, with the explanation that "Men don't like girls to be too brainy." (No one ever explains where to draw the line: what is brainy enough and what is too brainy?) Others dismiss the subject with an indulgent smile and "Why be in a hurry to decide?" If the interest persists, parents and school counselors may suggest that nursing is a better profession than medicine for a girl because she will probably get married anyway.

I myself went through a stage where I was going to be a secretary, so that--as various counselors advised me--I could earn my living while I waited for "Mr. Right" to find me. Then my family and a long-time friend who was a nurse convinced me that I should take up nursing; since there

¹Florence Howe, "Sexual Stereotypes Start Early." Saturday Review, October 16, 1971, pp. 80-81.

was always a dearth of nurses, they reasoned, I could surely find a job if I needed one. I was far more interested in veterinary medicine than in nursing, but I settled for two years of nursing as I had four years of secretarial science in high school.

Somewhere along the line I did a stint with two country newspapers. When the crisis had passed, my mother confessed that she had never known a good night's sleep during those months; I gathered that I had been a source of worry to her because I liked my job too much. I was 22 before I summoned the courage to announce to all concerned that I was going to finish college, even though this meant working my way--all my way. When I started a master's, my mother wept. "What man will ever want to marry you?" she asked. She died before I could disappoint her further; she would have been totally unable to understand my later urge to take a Ph. D. in journalism.

The Real Crunch

That the girl lives in a man's world from the time she enters ninth grade becomes evident when one realizes that 67 per cent of her teachers are men. The cards are stacked; most academy vocational and guidance counselors are men and many women teachers still feel obligated to uphold the idea that a woman's place is in the home, explaining that they themselves work only to "help out."

Through academy as well as church school, however, the girl must compete with boys for grades and extracurricular activities. Except for physical education and home economics courses, she takes the same classes, including mathematics and science.

But when she enrolls in college, she must put away childish things, including any ideas she may have had of competing with men.

Most girls have no question about why their parents send them to a Seventh-day Adventist college. One big object is to meet prospective husbands, and they know it.

What does this mean to a college girl?

"If you get an A on a test paper," several girls have said to me, "you mustn't let the guy next to you see it."

One dean of women says she knows college women see their A's as a threat to their boyfriends' ego. When we talked, she had in mind one couple for whom the girl's ability was a real problem. "I told her she could just listen in class," the dean said, "and pull C's. Then he wouldn't feel threatened. Otherwise she'll lose him, and he means too much to her for that."

Some girls say that insuring a steady lineup of dates is a full-time occupation. One day three girls told me they had not done an assignment because they had spent all of the preceding evening trying to decide whom to invite to their club banquet, "before all the nice guys are taken." But this wasn't the end of the matter. For the rest of that week the three lived in a dream world, trying to arrange a meeting that would look accidental and practicing the giving of their invitations in a casual fashion, as if they had just that moment happened to think of asking him to the banquet.

Before they are more than started in college most girls have created--or have had passed on to them--a romantic view of life, which includes school, marriage and a family, ~~and~~ living happily ever after. A far more accurate picture would be school, work and/or marriage, a family (sometimes continuing with a job by choice or necessity) and a¹ return to work when the youngest child starts school.

"I don't think most college girls really plan on getting a job," a senior told me recently. "The big push is towards marriage."

As they approach graduation, however, some girls can see that they are going to work whether they want to or not. Some are married and their husbands plan to go on to med or graduate school. Others have begun to face the realization that perhaps they will not marry. In either case, the adjustment is hard. It is obviously worse for the girl who took it for granted, along with everyone else in her group, that long before this she would pace up the aisle to join some nice young man at the altar. If she has always been told that woman's place is in the home and that marriage is every woman's goal in life, her sense of personal worth plummets.

For a time, both the married and the unmarried girl are likely to think in terms of a job, rather than a career. A few, it is true, look ahead to graduate school and life as professional women, with or without marriage. Whether a woman views her work as a career or simply as a job, however, she could find in it more satisfaction and fulfillment had

¹U. S. Department of Labor, Expanding Opportunities for Girls: Their Special Counseling Needs. April, 1967.

she looked ahead realistically to this day.

One might well ask, then--as I do--why we continue to ignore the situation that so many women face. When 23 per cent do not marry, when 21 per cent marry but find their marriage ending with death or divorce, why can we not bring ourselves to look squarely at the subject of working women?

The church acts sometimes as if it thinks that by shutting its eyes and plugging up its ears, it will get rid of the woman question. Such an attitude is beyond understanding in an organization that numbers among its founders a woman.

Many years ago that woman wrote to other women in the Seventh-day Adventist ranks:¹

We are inexcusable if we allow God-given talents to rust from inaction. Christ asks, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" Let us consecrate all that we have and are to Him, believing in His power to save, and having confidence that He will use us as instrumentalities to do His will and glorify His name.

¹Ellen G. White, The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, August 26, 1902, p. 7.

WOMEN IN TEACHING

Because so many women take up teaching, a look at their part in Seventh-day Adventist education may be profitable.

Methodology

While this is not primarily quantitative research, statistics were necessary to show male-female ratios at various teaching levels. I looked in vain for neat packages of figures which would show, for example, how many women are teaching in church schools, academies and colleges and finally concluded that the only way to obtain statistics was to count names on lists.

With the help again of Susan Berger, I tackled a massive job of counting and classifying, working from two sources: the 1971 Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook and current bulletins from Seventh-day Adventist colleges in the United States.

As problems arose, we decided on two simple ground rules: we omitted a few names when we could not be sure of sex and we tried to eliminate duplication when a name appeared more than once on a faculty list.

CHURCH SCHOOLS. In the Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook¹ each conference in the North American Division lists ordained and licensed ministers and

¹Pp. 27-95.

credentialed and licensed missionaries. These lists are subdivided into conference, academy and church school personnel. We counted the latter in each conference.

ACADEMIES. Because lists of credentialed and licensed missionaries for academies include non-teaching personnel (administrators, industrial and maintenance superintendents and office workers), we used the yearbook's section of educational institutions, which identifies persons by position.¹

Here our procedure was different from that for church schools, where we counted every church school teacher in each conference. We listed all academies in the United States--a total of 77. We then took every fifth school on the list, which gave us a sample of 15 academies. This seemed necessary because the duplication of names on academy faculty lists (some names appeared as many as four times) necessitated painstaking and time-consuming editing to be sure that we counted a name only once. Future studies would probably want to include the faculties of all 77 academies instead of a sample.

COLLEGES. Using current college bulletins for Seventh-day Adventist colleges in the United States, we tallied men and women teachers and then went on to classify teachers according to academic rank and degrees.

Because college staffs include many individuals involved in administration, office work and industrial and maintenance departments, we also counted men and women on the Walla Walla College payroll of full-time employees (that is, those working 30 hours or more per week). Since what

¹Pp. 303-389.

is true of one school is not necessarily true of all, future researchers should probably try to obtain other payrolls for determining sex ratios at levels other than the teaching faculty.

Not all college bulletins cover the same period; most are annual, but some are biennial. Colleges differ, furthermore, in the matter of who is a college teacher; some include, for example, teachers in campus elementary and secondary schools, classifying them as supervisory instructors. Because of these differences, it would be desirable in future studies to ask college administrations for classifications using standardized forms.

Analysis of Data

The statistics in Table 1 show that Seventh-day Adventist elementary and secondary schools have substantially fewer women teachers than do public schools.

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN TEACHERS
IN PUBLIC AND SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST
SCHOOLS

	SDA	Public
Elementary	58	85
Secondary	31	46
College	32	22

Sources: Seventh-day Adventist schools, 1971 Yearbook and current college bulletins; public schools, National Education Association Research Bulletin, May, 1970, and American Association of University Women, 1970.

Men teachers in public schools over the last ten years have increased by about 5 per cent. We did not attempt to establish any such trend for Seventh-day Adventist schools, but teachers in education think that while the trend is unmistakable in church-related schools, it began later and is developing more slowly. In any case, our figures show that even elementary teaching, traditionally a woman's field, is less the province of women than might be supposed. Specialists in education explain that in schools with two or more teachers, women would probably teach the lower grades and men the upper; in a multi-teacher school a man would probably be designated as principal.

Further reference to Table 1 shows a sharp drop in the Seventh-day Adventist teaching corps from 58 per cent women in elementary teaching to 31 per cent in secondary schools and 32 per cent in college teaching.

Over several decades the number of women in college teaching has decreased at what many writers see as an alarming rate. From 1910 through the 1930s women teachers in colleges and universities made a steady gain. They hit a peak of 28 per cent in 1940 and then began a downward trend. Early in the 1960s only 22 per cent of college teachers were women; a study by the American Association of University Women showed that in 1970 this ratio was unchanged.

Again, we did not try to establish the trend in Seventh-day Adventist colleges. The current figure of 32 per cent women teachers (See Table 1) is substantially higher than the national average.

What is the explanation?

I asked several long-time teachers and administrators. They suggest that church-related colleges demand less by way of degrees and experience.

"Too often," one veteran teacher says, "availability is the only factor the college considers. That is, somebody's wife has a bachelor's degree in a field where we need a teacher. She gets the job."

Interestingly enough, no one saw in this higher figure indication that the church places more value on women teachers than do non-church-related colleges and universities.

WOMEN IN COLLEGE TEACHING. Table 2 shows that in Seventh-day Adventist colleges the percentage of women teachers varies greatly, from lows of 27 and 28 per cent to a high of 43.

In the light of the explanation offered above--that is, the availability of women--perhaps we should ask if those colleges having the highest percentages are in areas where womanpower is plentiful. Are they in or near centers of denominational work? Do they hire organization wives where they are in generous supply? Analysis of our data shows no consistent pattern.

A number of writers decry the fact that in American higher education women find advance in academic rank difficult, in some schools virtually impossible. This means that more women teachers are to be found at the lower levels, as instructors and assistant professors, with significantly few as associate or full professors. One report¹ shows, in fact, that with women in 22 per cent of the jobs on faculties of higher education in the United States, "women hold fewer than three department chairmanships per institution and they hold only 9 per cent of all

¹ American Association of University Women (1970). See Janice Law Trecker, "Woman's Place Is in the Curriculum." Saturday Review, October 16, 1971, p. 86.

TABLE 2. NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN NINE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST SCHOOLS¹
1971

Colleges	Total Faculty		Per Cent Female
	Male	Female	
College A	59	35	37
College B	55	26	32
College C	31	18	37
College D	98	37	27
College E	31	12	28
College F	39	17	30
College G	50	37	43
College H	93	39	30
College I	129	55	30
TOTALS	585	276	32

Source: Faculty lists of the current bulletins of Seventh-day Adventist colleges

¹Includes Andrews University but not Loma Linda University

professorships. Furthermore, . . .the more prestigious the institution the fewer women are employed."

The picture is no different in Seventh-day Adventist schools, as reference to Table 3 shows. In nine colleges 223 teachers have the rank of instructor; nearly half of these instructors are women. As we move up the scale, however, the percentage of women drops sharply: 29 per cent at the assistant professors' level, 28 per cent at the associate professors', and only 20 per cent at the professors'. Of 178 teachers holding the rank of full professor, 142 are men and 36 are women. Here, it should be noted, is the one sharp break with the national figures.

TABLE 3

ACADEMIC RANK OF TEACHERS IN NINE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST COLLEGES

1971

Rank	Total	Men	Women	Percentage Women
Professors ¹	178	142	36	20
Associate professors ²	185	133	52	28
Assistant professors	275	196	79	29
Instructors ³	223	114	109	49

Source: Faculty lists in the current bulletins of nine Seventh-day Adventist colleges

¹Includes five visiting professors

²Includes two visiting associate professors

³Includes five supervisory instructors, one assistant instructor and one visiting instructor

Analysis of degrees offers further evidence that women do not advance professionally as far as do men (Table 4). Nine Seventh-day Adventist colleges have a total of 243 teachers with doctor's degrees; only 28 of these, or 12 per cent, are women. Looking at it another way, we find that these 28 women are 10 per cent of the total women teachers.

TABLE 4. NUMBER OF DOCTOR'S DEGREES IN NINE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST COLLEGES
1971

Colleges	Total doctor's degrees		Percentage
	Male	Female	Female
College A	21	3	12
College B	18	1	5
College C	15	2	12
College D	43	4	9
College E	12	1	8
College F	10	2	17
College G	13	4	24
College H	33	3	8
College I	50	8	14
TOTALS	215	28	

Source: Faculty lists in the current bulletins of nine Seventh-day Adventist colleges

I find no comparable figures on a national scale: that is, percentages of men and women teachers holding doctor's degrees. U. S. Department of Labor statistics show that the number of women earning doctor's degrees has followed an up-and-down course. Of the total number of doctor's degrees conferred, women earned 6 per cent in 1900, 15 per cent in 1920, 10 per cent in 1950, and 13 per cent in 1968.¹

What do the figures from Seventh-day Adventist colleges mean, in terms of sex discrimination? College teachers often take a leave of absence with college financial help to work on a doctoral program. Does the fact that so few women have doctor's degrees suggest that they have not been able to secure backing? That is, did they ask for a leave, or at least for a reduced teaching load in the case of those in an area where they could do part-time graduate study, and meet with a denial of their request? Or did they simply not ask--perhaps a logical explanation for married women to whom graduate study would generally mean separation from home and family.

Here as at several other points in the subject of women in education, we need to do much more research.

WOMEN IN ADMINISTRATION. Study of college bulletins shows but a token number of women board members--none at all in several colleges--and no women in top administrative posts. A few women become department heads. Here they stop. One college has a woman associate dean of students, but no woman has yet reached the position of dean of students; none is a vice president.

With no thought of nudging anyone from his pinnacle of success, I asked several administrators what they thought about working with a woman

¹Trends in Educational Attainment of Women. U. S. Department of Labor, 1967.

at the top--say a woman as dean of students, academic dean or vice president in charge of one of these areas of college life. The response to my question came so quickly it seemed almost reflex action: "Well, I would have no objection to a woman, but other women wouldn't work with her."

Is this true?

Trying to find out how women react to other women in authority, I interviewed rather widely in those departments headed by women and in administrative offices. I found a negligible amount of tension, no more than one would expect in any situation where one person must give orders and others take them.

In only one instance, in fact, did I find strong evidence of conflict between two women, and the woman who described her relationship with her superior finished her recital of grievances with the comment, "But this may be because she's a hard person to get along with, not because she's a woman."

Then I started probing the professional relationships of women with men: would men be able to work with a woman administrator, I wondered?

I asked about committees where men and women work together: do members function without being conscious of sex differences as a tension-producing factor? For example, in sharp disagreements between strong-minded teachers, to what extent are committee members aware that a difference of sex complicates their response to a problem under discussion?

Here I found that some men think other men ("I myself don't feel this way," they told me) smart over the loss of a point of argument to a woman.

When committee members referred to two women as being strong-minded, I probed the reactions of men to argument or discussion with either one of these. More than one man said, "Well, I suppose some men don't slug quite as hard when they're doing battle with So-and-So (one of the women) as they would if it were another man." The women, incidentally, are conscious of no kid-glove technique in the treatment they get.

Without exception, however, the women I interviewed think they have to battle harder with administrators than would a man in their position.

One woman tells about trying for years to get a change in procedures affecting her department. Another department head, a man, wanted the same change in his. He went into the administrative office which had blocked the change, banged his fist on the desk, and said, "I want. . ." "He got it, too," the woman department head says, "and I'm still working on it."

Women who say they have trouble getting additions to and improvements in their departments often think male administrators pass on word that they are "hard to get along with." One woman found that a college tried to withdraw a job offer when its president picked up a report like this. "I hear she's an empire builder," an academic dean said of another woman. "If she is, I don't think we want her."

A woman often has reason to think that if she is aggressive in promoting the growth of her department, she wears a label forever after. The irony of this situation is lost on few women. "If I didn't work hard to make my department grow, they wouldn't want me," says one, "but if I do work hard they don't like me."

Says one writer on this point, "The strength and substance of a man's attitudes about what a woman should do is often related to his education, to his socioeconomic background, and to his mother's example, among other things." The same writer goes on to point out that women sometimes feel they must hide their talents "so that a male may retain an image of his superiority."¹

Some teachers point out that men who resent a successful woman usually have non-professional wives. "If a man's wife is a successful teacher," one administrator comments, "he may not feel that a woman offers any threat to him."

I found also that the higher I went in my interviews with women, the less I heard that I could consider a denigration of other women. Some clerks and stenographers, for example, thought that by and large, successful women--say at the level of department heads or associate and assistant administrators--probably are not successful as wives.

One clerk offered the comment that women are more emotional than men--one reason, she said, that they would not make good administrators.

As with other ideas that I picked up in interviewing, I tried this one out with the next several women on my list. One laughed. "I don't think I'm so emotional," she said to me. "Are you?"

WOMEN AND THE GENERAL CONFERENCE. The women teachers with whom I have talked have rather strong feelings about their doing the work while men set policies. That this is the situation becomes apparent when one looks at policy-making at various levels.

¹Counseling Girls Toward New Perspectives. A report of the Middle Atlantic Regional Pilot Conference, Philadelphia, 1965, p. 62.

With 58 per cent of Seventh-day Adventist elementary teachers and 31 per cent of secondary teachers being women, the makeup of the General Conference Department of Education is baffling, to say the least.

The 1971 Yearbook lists six men as administrators.¹ The department includes also an advisory committee with one woman to 13 men and various "secretaries" of education from the world field, also men. Members of the Board of Regents include these secretaries of education and 37 elected persons, no more than a half dozen of them being women.

Membership of the new Board of Higher Education is equally disturbing: more than 40 men, one laywoman and two women teachers listed separately in the nominating committee's report as "others."

What this amounts to is that with 32 per cent of college teachers being women, the board which will direct the church's higher education includes one woman to 15 men--roughly 7 per cent.

Is this situation fair? Is it just? Is it wise?

Though written in a different context, a statement dealing indirectly with sex discrimination may have something of value for Seventh-day Adventist educators. It isn't that women are less capable than men, the writer says.²

In fact,

most work that men can do, women can also do, but they will do it differently. For example, men seem to believe that law piled upon law and appropriation added to appropriation will eventually solve all social problems from drug addiction to poverty, while women tend to stress the importance of personal relationships with and a sense of personal responsibility for the troubled and unfortunate--and it is easy to see which approach is in the ascendancy at present.

¹Page 16.

²From a report of a conference held in 1965 at the University of Chicago, by the Women's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor, the Office of Education, and the U. S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, p. 23.

IT'S STILL A MAN'S WORLD IN MONEY MATTERS

Many women workers are still trying to forget the long era of missionary wages and subsidies. They got substantially lower wages and half the amount of the subsidies their male colleagues did.

There was more resentment over the inequities in the subsidies than over salary differences: for example, \$35 a month on a house whose previous owner, a man, had collected \$70; \$10 towards heating bills when a man got \$20; and \$15 on car insurance and upkeep compared with a man's \$30. Even women's Christmas bonuses were halved, one worker remembers.

The problem still exists in some measure; there is still discrimination.

On the current denominational pay scale, basic salaries for men and women supposedly stay the same, but heads of household--male or female--get an allowance of roughly \$1,000 to \$1,200.

A typical explanation for this situation appeared a few months ago under Roland Hegstad's byline.¹ Mr. Hegstad quotes "a church administrator" who explains the practice of "allowing extra pay for heads of families."

His explanation:

These /heads of families/ get more than employees not responsible for a family. As a consequence many men then do draw more pay than single ladies doing the same job. But a woman who is the head of a family--a widow, for example--draws the same amount as a married man and more than a single man in the same job. Thus the discrimination is not based on sex.

¹Roland Hegstad, "It's a Man's World--2." Review, November 12, 1970, p. 12.

Is this true? Ask any woman.

As women see it, administrators and denominational leaders have a blind spot here. "Well," one administrator says, "a man with a family needs more, doesn't he?"

The answer is both yes and no. A man with a wife and four children (church leaders always picture him with four children) can certainly find good use for that extra hundred dollars a month. But, say women workers, he gets this allowance even when he has no children and his wife works.

Let me repeat: he gets a head-of-household allowance even when he has no children and his wife works. A woman, however, cannot claim head-of-household status and the allowance which goes with it if she has a husband. Since male heads of household get the allowance even though their wives work and make more than they do, this is in effect sex discrimination.

For some reason most administrators and church leaders do not see it this way. When they discuss the salary question in General Conference budget sessions, few women are present; women representatives from the Medical Department can hardly speak for their sex as a whole, since nurses' salaries follow an entirely different schedule.

What does the head-of-household allowance mean to teachers, for example? Take any of our Walla Walla College husband-and-wife teams. The husband's paycheck includes nearly \$100 a month allowance for the support of a family; in spite of the fact that her husband gets \$100 a month extra to support her, the wife's paycheck is the same as that of the unmarried woman who must support herself.

Or take a case where the husband works for the church and his wife teaches in a public school system or works in any other capacity outside of

the church. She makes as much as or more than her husband. Yet month after month his salary check includes a \$100 head-of-household allowance.

In other words, here are three possibilities. A man may have a stay-at-home wife and several small children. He may have a wife who like him draws a salary on the denominational pay scale. Or he may have a wife who works outside of the church system and makes as much as or more than he does. But in all three cases he gets the same head-of-household allowance, with the explanation that he needs it to support a family.

And what about women? Here there are no such options. A woman with dependents qualifies for head-of-household status. For income tax purposes she may conceivably claim a husband as a dependent when she is putting him through school and he earns less than a stated amount. The church is not so generous. Only in exceptional cases of ^{a husband's} disability can the married woman become head of household, even though she has minor children.

Then, too, while the law in some states permits unmarried women to adopt children--who thereupon become dependents--the church again is not so generous.

I know from experience. Two years ago I asked for head-of-household status because I wanted to adopt two children. Three times our college board discussed the matter and refused. "She doesn't need children," some members said. Demeaning though I found the experience, I kept going back, like the importunate widow in the Bible. The fourth time the board gave its consent if not its approval.

Erasing inequity in a salary structure is not easy, and it takes time. Women do not demand a miracle. As one middle-aged worker says, however,

"Apparently the church is going to wait for a trial on its violation of law before it moves." The Equal Opportunity Commission, incidentally, reports that complaints on sex discrimination comprise 45 per cent of the total and that they are increasing rapidly.¹

A teacher with a 29-year service record comments on steps the church has taken towards fair treatment of Blacks, then asks, "Did the church make these moves in all honesty or through fear?"

Like many other women whom I interviewed, she sees similarity in the conditions of Blacks and working women. She says, "Because we women continue to do our work with no threat of revolt, will the injustice towards us remain uncorrected?"

She remembers a church administrator's saying that to raise the salary of all single women to equal the men's would "break the denomination." Of this line of reasoning, she comments: "This is strange thinking from a church which says to the new convert, 'You think you'll lose your job if you keep the Sabbath? Step out in faith. The Lord will provide.'

"Perhaps," she goes on, "the church needs to step out in faith, do the right thing, and watch for God's blessing. Perhaps we ought to be the head and not the tail in meeting the saner objectives of the Women's Lib movement."

Most women find it hard to believe that denominational leaders do not see the injustice in the church's treatment of women. In any case, if discrimination on the basis of sex no longer exists, as these leaders insist,

¹One of several items in an invitation to a West Coast conference on industry and women, held October 21-22 in San Francisco.

some conference officials, hospital administrators and school principals have been slow to get the message. Last spring I had five telephone calls about former students. When I recommended either of two young men I knew would do a topnotch job, the reply in each case was, "Sorry. . .we've got to have a girl--the board says we can't afford a man's salary." The jobs, incidentally, called for journalistic training few secretaries would have had, but in such a job a girl would be called an editorial secretary, a title no one would offer a man capable of public relations and editing.

It may be well to consider three points in connection with sex discrimination in salary: what has this meant to women's attitudes towards the church, to the sense of security of women who must support themselves, and to women's self concept?

Some women have told me that their discovery of injustice in the church's salary structure meant loss of faith in the organization.

One woman says: "I had grown up with the idea that even heaven bowed to a decision of the General Conference. When I discovered by accident the difference between my salary and that of a man in the same department, I couldn't believe it. I thought, My church does this?

"Here was the beginning of a real spiritual crisis for me. I couldn't live in the turmoil into which the question threw me. I hoped I was wrong; I tried to get an appointment with the chairman of the board to talk about the situation, but he said he was too busy to see me.

"I finally asked my pastor for counsel; this thing really ate at me. He was as sympathetic as a man could be, I suppose; at least he was willing to listen. And since he really knew nothing about the problem, he persuaded

the board chairman to see me and a group of other women and then he sat in on the meeting with us: a kind of devil's advocate, I guess.

"Nothing came of the session. The board chairman said, in effect, 'God bless you, sisters. I want you to know how much we appreciate your sacrifices.' And that was that.

"It wasn't that money was so important to me; what bothered me was the discovery that the church could exploit women workers as it was doing, secure in its knowledge that we wouldn't do anything to rock the boat."

Experiences like these rankle. That many feel keenly the church's unfairness has surfaced in dozens of interviews I have conducted in recent months. Still, I do not know of one woman who would leave the church because she thinks it treats her unfairly in paying her less than a man. Whether any would enter a complaint on sex discrimination I do not know.

What about a woman's sense of security? We need to remember that 23 per cent of working women are single and another 21 per cent are widowed, divorced or separated and consequently responsible for their own support.

Insecurity plagues many of these, particularly as they pass middle age and approach retirement. One woman who has spent 25 years in the work of the church says: "Until three years ago I had to borrow money every January when heating bills got high or when I had medical or dental bills. I don't have to do that any more, but I don't have anything ahead, either." Understandably, she worries about retirement.

Older friends have told her that with careful management they can live on their denominational sustentation and Social Security checks. She sees one big difference in their circumstances and hers: instead of paying rent

on an apartment, they own homes.

"I'm still paying rent," she says, "because I couldn't take on a 20-year mortgage as long as I was working on a degree. After that, I still couldn't buy--inflation sent prices skyrocketing and my salary stayed pretty much the same."

Lastly, what about women's self concept?

When talk among women workers turns to money, one expression crops up with disturbing regularity. "Second-class citizens," these women call themselves. One of them remembers how she felt when her school board chairman said to her, "Why, we might just as well hire a man for the job if we're going to pay you a man's salary."

Another recalls her principal's saying, in response to questions about a new salary scale, "No, it isn't fair, but we know we can count on you women to stay with us: you're too dedicated to leave your jobs."

These conversations generally end with someone's commenting, "Well, the church has always treated us like second-class citizens, and it shows little sign of changing."

I once told a fellow teacher about such a conversation. He laughed. No woman teacher would laugh; being a second-class citizen is no joke, and dedication that keeps you working for the church or loyalty that stifles protest offers scant comfort when the electric company threatens to turn off your electricity in the coldest part of the winter because you haven't the money to pay last month's bill.

Two decades before the Nineteenth Amendment gave women equal rights with men in the voting booth, Ellen White wrote about paying them a fair salary:¹

The ways of the Lord are just and equal. The workers in the school should receive according to the hours they give to the school in honest, hard labor. Injustice must not be done to any worker. If one man or woman gives to the school full time, he is to receive from the school according to the time which the school receives from him. If one gives mind, toil, and strength in bearing the burdens, he is to receive according to the value he gives to the school. Justice and truth are to be maintained, not only for the present and future standing of the school, but for our own individual benefit in righteousness. The Lord will not be a party to the least injustice. (Underscoring is mine.)

¹Manuscript 69, 1898. In Selected Messages II. Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1958, pp. 181-182.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For quotations, statistics, and stories to which I referred in my analysis of sex stereotyping in denominational books and periodicals, I have supplied bibliographical information in footnotes. This bibliography represents only those sources which I found useful for background reading.

- "A Whole New Vision for the Educated Woman." AAUW Journal, January, 1970, pp. 50-76.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. "Growing Up Female." Harper's, October, 1962, pp. 120-123.
- Bock, E. Wilbur. "The Female Clergy: A Case of Professional Marginality." American Journal of Sociology, March, 1967, pp. 531-539.
- Bowen, Catherine Drinker. "We've Never Asked a Woman Before." The Atlantic, March, 1970, pp. 82-86.
- Calkins, Gladys Gilkey. Follow Those Women. National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., 1961.
- Collins, Sheila D. "Women and the Church: Poor Psychology, Worse Theology." The Christian Century, December 30, 1970, pp. 1557-1559.
- Counseling Girls Toward New Perspectives. A report of the Middle Atlantic Regional Pilot Conference held in Philadelphia, December 2-4, 1965.
- Covington, Ava M. They Also Served. Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1940.
- Deen, Edith. Great Women of the Christian Faith. Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1959.
- Discrimination Against Women: Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-First Congress, Second Session 805 of H. R. 16098.
- Diverman, Beatrice. "Sex Discrimination in Academia." The Journal of Higher Education, April, 1971, pp. 253-264.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. Woman's Place. University of California Press, 1971.
- Erikson, Erik H. Identify Youth and Crisis. W. W. Norton and Company, 1968.
- Expanding Opportunities for Girls: Their Special Counseling Needs. U. S. Department of Labor, April, 1967.

THE LAST WORD

I have studied four broad areas dealing with the position of women in the Seventh-day Adventist church: the picture the church gives of them, especially in print; their options in education; their work as teachers in the church's vast system of education; and their earning power on the denominational payroll.

That we need to take a closer look at each of these areas, and at some points within these areas, is evident; I have asked more questions than I have answered.

For obvious reasons I have not identified the scores of persons whom I interviewed in this study. In every case, however, I met a second-mile attitude even when I asked questions of a highly personal nature. The fact that so many women--and men--were interested in my subject and willing to contribute to it shows that much more could be done along the same lines, that, in fact, more could be done in other areas, where the lack of time if not inclination held me back.

Hundreds of years ago a Hebrew sage said what might well be the summation of the whole question:¹

Charm is deceitful, and beauty is vain,
but a woman who fears the Lord is to be praised.
Give her of the fruit of her hands,
and let her works praise her in the gates.

¹Proverbs 31:30-31, RSV.

Exploding the Myths. A Report of a Conference on Expanding Employment Opportunities for Career Women Held at the University of California Extension, Los Angeles, California, December 3, 1966. U. S. Department of Labor.

Facts About Women's Absenteeism and Labor Turnover. U. S. Department of Labor, August, 1969.

Feminists on Children's Literature. "A Feminist Looks at Children's Books." Library Journal, January, 1971, pp. 235-240.

Howe, Florence. "Sexual Stereotypes Start Early." Saturday Review, October 16, 1971, pp. 76-82.

Janeway, Elizabeth. "Happiness and the Right to Choose." The Atlantic, March, 1970, pp. 118-126.

_____. "The Subordinate Sex." Saturday Review, October 11, 1969, pp. 27-29.

La Sorte, Michael. "Academic Women's Salaries: Equal Pay for Equal Work?" The Journal of Higher Education, April, 1971, pp. 265-278.

Laws on Sex Discrimination in Employment: Federal Civil Rights Act, Title VII, State Fair Employment Practices, Laws, Executive Orders.
U. S. Department of Labor, 1970.

Lifton, Robert Jay (ed.). The Woman In America. Beacon Press, 1964.

Reeves, Nancy. Womankind Beyond the Stereotypes. Aldine-Atherton, 1971.

Rossi, Alice S. "Job Discrimination and What Women Can Do About It." The Atlantic, March, 1970, pp. 99-102.

Roszak, Betty, and Theodore Roszak. Masculine-Feminine: Readings in Sexual Mythology and the Liberation of Women. Harper and Row, 1969.

Stern, Paula. "The Womanly Image." The Atlantic, March, 1970, pp. 87-90.

Thornton, Maxine, and Cyrus R. Pangborn. "What of This New Woman, Mr. Jones?" AAUW Journal, January, 1969, pp. 63-65.

Tiger, Lionel. "Male Dominance? Yes, Alas. A Sexist Plot? No." New York Times Magazine, October 25, 1970, p. 35.

Trecker, Janice Law. "Woman's Place Is in the Curriculum." Saturday Review, October 16, 1971, pp. 83-86.

"Women Arise." Life, December 4, 1970, pp. 16B-24.

SUMMARY OF THE PAPER

WOMAN POWER: THE VIEW FROM DOWN HERE

BY

Roberta J. Moore

Introduction

The Church tends to place a stereotype upon women, failing to recognize that not all women can take their place in the home. Some have never married, others have lost their husbands, and others are divorced, yet the Church fails to recognize the differences and meet the needs of this large segment of its membership.

Chapter 1

Stereotypes in Seventh-day Adventist Educational Literature. In Seventh-day Adventist educational and Sabbath School materials for the lower grades the sex stereotypes run something like this: Boys are described as active, alert and intelligent, the ones who give help to the less-able girls. Papa is the decision maker in the home and the one who plays with the kids while Mama tends to the household drudgeries. The danger in this stereotyping is two-fold.

1. It automatically sets a role for each of the sexes.
2. Children may question the role and the ability of their parents when they do not conform to this stereotype.

Insight has to a small degree moved away from the traditional stereotyping sex roles only to fall into another trap. Male characters still take the active lead, living satisfying and productive lives while female characters range from merely so-so to downright dull, a good bit of physical suffering and death thrown in as apparently part of woman's lot. (p. 21)

Chapter 2

Educate: How and For What? Society defines the feminine role much more narrowly than the masculine. Women are generally excluded from sciences, medicine, and most of higher education and administrative roles. The role of the woman as Mother is well implanted by the time a girl gets to college. "Before they are more than started in college, most girls have created-- or have passed on to them--a romantic view of life, which includes school, marriage and a family, and living happily ever after. A far more accurate picture would be school, work and/or marriage, a family (sometimes continuing with a job by choice or necessity) and a return to work when the youngest child starts school." (p. 31)

When 23 per cent of women do not marry and 21 per cent marry but find their marriage ending in death or divorce and when many married women find it necessary or desirable to work, we should begin to help our girls to think in terms of a "career" rather than only in terms of marriage or a "job."

In emphasizing the responsibility of each woman to use her talents for God the chapter closes with this quotation from Mrs. White:

We are inexcusable if we allow God-given talents to rust from inaction. Christ asks, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" Let us consecrate all that we have and are to Him, believing in His power to save, and having confidence that He will use us as instrumentalities to do His will and glorify His name. (The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, August 26, 1902, p.7) (p. 32)

Chapter 3

Women in Teaching. Dr. Moore found that Seventh-day Adventists hire fewer women teachers than do public schools in the elementary and secondary levels whereas Seventh-day Adventist colleges hire a larger percentage of women teachers than do public schools. In general questioning she did

not find that this increase in the number of women teachers was due to a higher respect of Seventh-day Adventist schools for the ability of women. (p. 25).

The percentage of women teachers in Seventh-day Adventist colleges is 32 per cent. However, the academic rank of women teachers in Seventh-day Adventist colleges shows a different picture. Only 20 per cent of full professors are women. Twenty-eight per cent of the associate professors are women, 29 per cent of the assistant professors are women and 49 per cent of the instructors are women. Of those who hold PhD degrees in our colleges, only 12 per cent are women. (p. 38, 39)

Dr. Moore leaves the interpretation of these percentages open. She states that this could indicate either that women are not given an opportunity to go on for advanced degrees or that it was difficult for them to go on for advanced degrees since they are married.

Dr. Moore found few women on college boards and no women in top administrative posts in Seventh-day Adventist colleges. She states that women must work against tremendous odds in achieving such positions and when a woman does find herself in an administrative or departmental position she must work at tremendous odds to accomplish her task and must remain unaggressive in developing her department or line of work in order not to be labeled as an empire builder.

Dr. Moore finds it amazing that there is so little representation by women in the General Conference Department of Education and other educational committees, whose decisions affect a large number of women. In this connection she asks, Is this situation fair? Is it just? Is it wise?

Dr. Moore feels that women can be a tremendous asset to these committees and that they tend to view things in different ways. It isn't that women are less capable than men, the writer says. In fact,

most work that men can do, women can also do, but they will do it differently. For example, men seem to believe that law piled upon law and appropriation added to appropriation will eventually solve all social problems from drug addiction to poverty, while women tend to stress the importance of personal relationships with and a sense of personal responsibility for the troubled and unfortunate--and it is easy to see which approach is in the ascendancy at present. (From a report of a conference held in 1965 at the U. of Chicago, by the Women's Bureau of the U. S. Dept. of HEW, p. 23) (p. 44)

Chapter 4

It is Still a Man's World in Money Matters. Inequities still favor men over women in allowances; for example:

1. A man may have a "stays-at-home wife" and several small children or
2. He may have a wife who like him draws a salary on the denominational pay scale or
3. He may have a wife who works outside of the Church system and earns as much or more than he does.

In all three cases he gets the same head-of-household allowance, with the explanation that he needs it to support a family. With the woman there is no such option even if the husband is going through school with little salary she receives no head-of-the household status. This option is only received with a husband's disability or if she has minor children after the death of her husband. In the case of adoption of children there is also no provision for head-of-household status.

An example of an inequitable situation is given where a woman was asked to fill a job in public relations and journalism. The job was not filled by a man because the board said it couldn't "afford a man's salary." The title of editorial secretary was given to the girl, a title that no man would accept for the same job.

Dr. Moore states "it may be well to consider three points in connection with sex discrimination in salary: What has this meant to woman's attitude toward the Church, to the sense of security of women who must support themselves, and to women's self-concept?" (p. 49)

Two decades before the Nineteenth Amendment gave women equal rights with men in the voting booth, Ellen White wrote about paying them a fair salary:

The ways of the Lord are just and equal. The workers in the school should receive according to the hours they give to the school in honest, hard labor. Injustice must not be done to any worker. If one man or woman gives to the school full time, he is to receive from the school according to the time which the school receives from him. If one gives mind, toil, and strength in bearing the burdens, he is to receive according to the value he gives to the school. Justice and truth are to be maintained, not only for the present and future standing of the school, but for our own individual benefit in righteousness. The Lord will not be a party to the least injustice. (Underscoring by RJM) (MS 69, 1898. In Selected Messages II, R & H Pub. Assoc. pp. 181-132)