WOMEN'S STUDIES AND THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT: A CASE STUDY OF THE IUP WOMEN'S STUDIES PROGRAM

1987

DIANA D. BRANDI

WOMEN'S STUDIES AND THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT:
A CASE STUDY OF THE IUP WOMEN'S STUDIES PROGRAM

A Thesis

Submitted to the

Graduate School in

Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for the

Degree Masters in Professional Growth

(Women's Studies Concentration).

Diana D. Brandi

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 1987

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
The Graduate School
The Professional Growth Program

We hereby approve the thesis of

Diana D. Brandi

Candidate for the degree of Master of Arts

November 5, 1987 — Irwin M. Marcus
Irwin M. Marcus
Professor of History, Chairperson

11/16/87 — Maureen C. McHugh
Maureen McHugh
Assistant Professor of Psychology

11/16/87 — Barbara M. Marquette
Barbara Marquette
Professor of Psychology

11/16/87 — Ginger Brown
Ginger Brown
Director for the Center of Community Affairs

11/25/87 — Gerald J. Stacy
Gerald J. Stacy
Associate Dean for Research
The Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Title: WOMEN'S STUDIES AND THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT: A Case Study of the IUP Women's Studies Program

Author: Diana D. Brandi

Thesis Committee Members: Irwin Marcus (Chair), Maureen McHugh, Ginger Brown, Barbara Marquette

Women's studies programs are at a crucial juncture between activism and cooptation. This thesis explains how and why women's studies programs arrived at this juncture, and what directions they could take.

My contention is that women's studies programs must be analyzed in their social context, namely their relationship to the women's movement, rather than as a traditional academic discipline or as a component in curriculum innovation. Much of the literature on women's studies suggests the emergence of three different kinds of women's studies programs. These programs can be categorized as three different generations of programs born out of three different phases of the women's movement.

This thesis incorporates an in-depth study of the women's studies program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) to illustrate this contention. The methodology includes a combination of participant observations and in-depth interviews and draws on the assumptions of research in feminist history.

The results of the study indicate that the IUP Women's

Studies program is faced with a variety of competing visions that reflect differing phases of the women's movement. The thesis concludes with recommendations for women's studies faculty and university administrators.

PREFACE

The process of writing this thesis has been much like my growing feminism -- it's been an evolution. It is part of an ongoing search to understand the changing role of women and our place in society. It is, therefore, a process that is by no means complete. What I have written has in fact been shaped by a number of currents in my life. It is deeply tied to my personal experience as a woman seeking to better society, reading a wide range of feminist literature, and dialoguing with many women in the women's movement.

This thesis does not, therefore, claim to be an objective empirical analysis of women's studies programming, nor a conclusive statement about the women's movement. It is rather an exploratory case study that attempts to interpret a women studies program from a fresh perspective -- a feminist perspective that sees women's studies as inextricably linked to the women's movement that gave it life. In the process, it illustrates how various stages of the women's movement have given rise to different generations of women's studies programs.

This kind of descriptive thesis has some obvious shortcomings. One case study is of course not sufficient to substantiate the assumptions underlying the thesis. It does not attempt to address all the nuances of

women's studies and the women's movement. It does not, for instance, discuss exceptional cases such as those women who moved from what I define as first generation to second generation women's studies programs, nor does it attempt to explain the organizations that do not fit the stages of the women's movement presented here. The thesis does, however, offer a spring board for future research on the nature and direction of women's studies programs.

The overall objective of this thesis goes beyond the description of women's studies programming. It is to further the understanding among women of different perspectives on women's studies, and to ultimately advance the women's studies program on the IUP campus. In my case, researching and writing this thesis has deepened my respect for the more "reformist" women of what I term "the second generation women's studies." These women confront with courage the problems of family and career and have brought a sense of professionalism to the movement. I have also become acutely aware of the need for coalition building with the diversity of community and minority women whose voices have been largely unheard in the past.

I have received tremendous encouragement, support and even prodding in the course of this effort, and I wish to acknowledge a few of the individuals who offered this help. I am deeply grateful to Irwin

Marcus who has understood and supported my undertaking this project in a way that allowed my own voice and ideas to emerge. He has been not only a mentor, but a friend and confidant. Another person who made this thesis possible has been my husband Ed Gondolf; he has been both a technical advisor and a most positive critic. I also thank the members of my thesis committee -- Irwin Marcus, Maureen McHugh, Ginger Brown, and Barbara Marquette -- for their encouragement in the writing and their important editing of previous drafts.

The most crucial contributors to any research are, of course, the participants in the events under study. Therefore, I wish to formally acknowledge and thank the IUP Women's Studies Director, the women's studies faculty, IUP administrators, students and staff for making history happen at IUP and for their willingness to discuss it so forthrightly with me. Lastly, my appreciation goes out to all my friends, near and far, who enlightened my vision of a better future for women.

Diana D. Brandi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Women's studies programs are at a crucial juncture. At first having grown out of the social activism of the women's movement, they were distinguished by their commitment to social change and community involvement. However, many of the newly founded programs have a different focus and are seen by some of their critics as being co-opted by academic institutions and increasingly isolated from the women's movement and the communities that fostered them. Many women's studies programs are, consequently, accused of being elitist and being dominated by white middle-class women. My thesis will not rebut or confirm these accusations, it will try to explain how and why women's studies programs arrived at this juncture, and what directions they could take. This then will reflect my contention that women's studies programs must be analyzed in their social context, namely their relationship to the women's movement, rather than as a traditional academic discipline or as a component in curriculum innovation.

Much of the literature on women's studies suggests the emergence of three different kinds of women's studies programs. These programs can be categorized as three different generations of programs born out of three different phases of the women's movement: the agitation phase, the accommodation phase, and the

revitalization phase. The relationship between program type and the phase of the women's movement appears to have influenced the development of program functions, directions, structures, ideology and focus. This probable linkage suggests that it is important to investigate women's studies programs in terms of their relationship to the women's movement.

The purpose of this thesis is to evaluate one newly founded women's studies program from this perspective, and in the process develop recommendations for it and similar programs. The thesis incorporates an in-depth study of the women's studies program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) in Indiana, Pennsylvania, utilizing a case study approach. IUP is a 14,000-student state school located in Western Pennsylvania. The methodology includes a combination of participant observation and in-depth interviews. This methodology is consistent with much of the current research in feminist history. Ultimately, the question addressed is: How might this program, and others like it, avoid cooptation while remaining viable academic programs at their respective institutions? The results of the study indicate that much of the problem is related to an identity crisis of sorts. The IUP Women's Studies program is faced with a variety of competing visions that reflect differing phases of the women's movement.

A number of issues appear to have divided women within and outside of the program even while they are united in their concern for women's equality and empowerment. For example, the evidence suggests the presence of a large division between those women who view the issues as "reformers," teachers of traditional disciplines who focus on women in an effort to bring their contributions more to light, and other women who perceive themselves as "transformers," women attempting to build a new discipline of women's studies that holds promise of a new and better society. The reformers seem to reflect more the orientation of the accommodation phase of the women's movement, and the transformers appear to be more in line with the initial agitation phase of the women's movement. One way to resolve the individual differences and the resultant program drift is to reidentify with the course of the women's movement. Particular energy should be directed toward a revitalization of activism, recruitment of a more diverse membership, and a global vision of sisterhood. However, this approach would most likely be more satisfactory to the transformers than to the accommodationists.

The case study of IUP's program offers a microcosm of the challenges facing women's studies programs in general. It is my hope that an analysis of this one program within the social context of the women's

movement will bring new insights into the course of women's studies programs. More specifically, an understanding of women's studies programs from the perspective of social context may not only serve to identify the gaps between the different generational programs but may also suggest ways to bridge these gaps.

The implications of this thesis are varied. It is intented to offer a useful assessment of the current IUP women's studies program and recommendations to improve and sustain it. The thesis could also serve as a guide to newly developing programs. In particular, the IUP example suggests how to negotiate with university bureaucracies and how to network with other existing women's studies programs. Furthermore, the thesis should provide university administrators with a better understanding of women's studies programs and how they differ from traditional academic programs. Moreover, the thesis could help bridge the gulf between first generation women's studies programs and second generation women's studies programs and the "reformers" and "transformers" who comprise them. Finally, the thesis suggests ways to further women's studies programs in general. It does so by identifying a third generation of programs that are drawing more minority and non-traditional women from local communities. These programs are recapturing their feminist roots, both philosophically and practically.

CHAPTER 2: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This thesis is premised on the assumption that there is an inextricable relationship between women's studies programs and the women's movement. Women's studies programs must, therefore, be interpreted in light of this relationship. This chapter provides further development of a conceptual framework, based on these assumptions, for the case study that is to follow. Initially, an overview of "generational" types of programs and their relationship to the respective phases of the women's movement is presented. The second section describes the evolution of the women's movement and its implications for program development, and the third section outlines the course of women's studies programs and consequent issues that have emerged.

The women's movement, in much of the literature analyzing it as a contemporary social movement, has evolved through at least three distinct phases, and a different generation of women's studies programs has emerged during each phase of the movement. Several authors (Schuster and VanDyne, 1985; Bunch, 1983; Boxer, 1982) identify differing women's studies programs within the framework of the three distinct phases of the women's movement.

The first type noted by these authors are the

activist programs which were established in the agitation and mobilization stage of the women's movement of the late 60s early 70s. These "first generation" programs were initiated by women simultaneously involved in political action and campus academics. As Charlotte Bunch (1983) suggests, in her overview of the inception of women's studies programs, this first generation of programs established a distinctive identity and relative autonomy through their political commitment to activism, new scholarship, and innovative teaching styles.

Next, there are "second generation" programs which are more reformist in nature. These second generation women's studies programs were conceived, according to Marilyn Boxer's (1982) history of contemporary programs, largely by a group of academic reformers who downplayed their activism and emphasized the development of their scholarship. They did so in order to enhance their legitimacy within the institutional framework of the universities and their respective disciplines. Second generation programs have their roots in the accommodation and legitimacy phase of the women's movement during the late 70s and early 80s which culminated in the nomination of Geraldine Ferraro as vice-presidential candidate.

Currently, there are signs of a "third generation" of women's studies programs. Emerging minority voices

and re- emerging first generation activists are attempting to broaden women's studies. The third generation may best be seen through the eyes of such feminist leaders as Bell Hooks (1984) from the Black community, Maxine Baca Zinn (1986) from the Hispanic community, and the Latin American and Caribbean Women's Collective from the Third World community of women. The third generation programs reflect a new phase in the women's movement bent on revitalization and diversity. Therefore, they are attempting to account for the diverse needs and interests of women of multi-cultural and racial backgrounds, women of different classes, women of various ages and abilities, and women of different sexual preferences.

The Evolution of the Women's Movement

The sociology of social movements has long examined the "lifecycle" of social movements (Blumer, 1974; Mauss, 1975; Spector and Kitsuse, 1977; Zald and Ash, 1969) and demonstrated that social movements -- the labor, civil rights, student, environmental movements and anti-nuclear movements alike -- proceed through distinct phases (Asch, 1972; Oberschall, 1973; Turner and Killian, 1974). Social movements typically begin with a stage of militant agitation and mobilization during which a core group of "idealists" expose society's ills, identify and confront an opposition,

and enlist sympathizers often through protest and conflict. This phase is followed by an effort to consolidate some of society's progress and gain legitimation as an organization. The outcome is often a wider general acceptance and recognition of the organizations goals. However, there may also be co-optation or institutionalization of the movement, as has been the case with the environmental movement and the resulting bureacracy of organizations like the Sierra Club. A social movement at this point may turn toward a third phase of revitalization in which the movement uses its new found legitimacy to broaden its base of support and reengage its grassroots, as the labor movement has attempted to do in recent years.

Feminist writers, such as Millett (1971), Evans (1980) Friedan (1963), and Freeman (1975), suggest that the women's movement has followed a similar lifecycle, moving from agitation in the late 60s early 70s to what Friedan (1981) has called a "second stage" of accommodation. For example, after an organizational split in 1968, the NOW leadership initiated demonstrations and marches and began to organize at the grassroots. In the late 70s and early 80s, the strategy for change was moderated as NOW moved away from demonstrations to focus more on lobbying for legislative change. The emphasis, at this point, was to work within the existing structures for reform. The

second half of the 80s shows signs of blending the two phases in order to build diversity among its membership and extend the movement's impact nationally (Smeal, 1986).

The First Phase:

Sara Evans, noted activist and author of Personal Politics (1980), a book about the roots of the Women's Liberation Movement, shows that the contemporary women's movement, at least in part, grew out of women's frustration with the Civil Rights, Black and Anti-war movements. A major motivation for the 1970s women's movement was, in fact, to address the sexual and economic inequality untouched and in some ways overlooked by the previous social movements. Many women felt betrayed by men who esposed equality yet denied women a leadership role.

According to writers and activists such as Evans (1980) and Freeman (1975), the activism of the 60s was a result of dramatic changes in women's reality since the fifties. Growing numbers of young women were attending college. House work was changed, many women worked at jobs outside the home. Moreover, there were dramatic changes in society itself that instigated questioning in general. There was the sexual revolution; there was the Black challenge to the mainstream; there was a resurgence of idealism. There were also the Welfare Rights and continuing education movements that emerged

to meet the demands of women's emerging dual role in the sixties of mother and provider. These changes occurred under the shadow of Betty Freidan's The Feminine Mystique (1963) which attacked the constraints of the family on women's potential and launched a wave of writings on women's liberation, including The Female Eunuch (Greer, 1971) and Sisterhood is Powerful (Morgan, 1970).

More importantly, Evans (1980) and Freeman (1973) suggest that an increase in women's public role accompanied the groundswell of social change. This increase in women's public role began in 1961 when John F. Kennedy established the "Commission on the Status of Women." The Kennedy Commission gave women's issues a national perspective and by 1963 there were commissions established in fifty states with the express purpose of examining the inequities in the state laws. The women and men appointed to these commissions were older than the grassroots activists and active in traditional political structures. However, as government employees, they were unable to lobby or pressure other branches of government, so they were forced to organize outside the existing structure.

The National Organization of Women (NOW) was one outgrowth of this process. Its structure was top-down and nationally focused with an agenda for economic and political equality for women. Most of NOW's original

members were from New York City and other East Coast cities. Simultaneously, according to Freeman (1973), a younger group of women emerged from the civil rights and grassroots New Left. This younger group organized horizontally and were opposed to formal structures. Its Chicago-based membership included such noted radicals as Shulamith Firestone, author of The Dialectic of Sex (1971).

Moreover, in Evans' (1980) view, this New Left offered a grassroots impetus:

> The women's liberation movement was initiated by women in the civil rights movement and the new left who dared to test the old assumptions and myths about female nature against their own experience and discovered that something was drastically wrong...they had learned to respect themselves and to know their own strength...They could do so because the new left provided an egalitarian ideology, which stressed the personal nature of political action, the importance of community and cooperation, and the necessity to struggle for freedom for the oppressed (pp. 212-213).

Consciousness raising (C-R) groups were a natural outgrowth of this cooperative and egalitarian atmosphere of the movement. The focus was on the personal experience of oppression. The groups provided an intimate and supportive informal environment to express personal concerns and innermost feelings. In her analysis, Evans (1980) presumes that the emergence of a collectivity of women, within such C-R groups, helped define "a universal woman's identity." This identity, with its roots in the feminist consciousness that developed in the late 60s, was in many ways analogous

to Marx's conception of "class for itself." Many women, especially white women, who were involved in these intense C-R experiences, truly believed in the "collective woman."

This collective identity, more than just an ideal, offered a reinforcement and structure for the eventual emergence of women's studies programs. It offered: 1) Social spaces provided by C-R groups to meet and develop ideas, 2) Role models breaking patterns of conventional behavior and thought, 3) An ideology that explains sources of oppression and justifies revolt, as well as presents a vision of the future, 4) Confrontation from mainstream society that fostered cohesion and determination among women, and 5) Organizational networks to spread and sustain the movement's consciousness.

These criteria for building and sustaining a "collective identity" continue to be an important tool for bringing women together to work on differences between women's studies members with different orientations and the different generations of women's studies programs themselves. In fact there is evidence that this sort of activity is reemerging in organizations such as the National Women's Studies Association, Battered Women's Movement, and Women's Peace Organizations.

The Second Phase:

The grassroots vitality of the first phase gradually gave way to a mobilized effort to obtain political goals for women as a whole. Perhaps nothing typifies this effort better than the ten-year nationwide campaign, coordinated by NOW, to establish the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). In the process, the movement became involved in coalition building with more than 450 national organizations. These organizations were a diversified lot and included the AFL- CIO, the YWCA, and the American Jewish Committee. In the ratification drive for approval by three-fourths of the states, many of the ERA proponents had to turn in their placards and armbands for the polished modes of lobbying in at least three target states: Illinois, Missouri, and Florida. By June 1982, the term allotted for passage of the ERA had lapsed, and NOW went down in defeat, even though polls showed a majority of popular support for ERA.

The post-ERA period focused on solidifying the changes that had occurred in the movement during the campaign. A new more moderate NOW president, Goldsmith, replaced the more radical Smeal. The movement turned out well orchastrated support for approved local, state, and national public office holders. The emerging women's leadership made their way into at least middle level management of the nation's major corporations and public

institutions. This effort to establish women in positions of leadership and authority was crowned by the appointment of Sandra O'Connor as the first woman Supreme Court Justice in 1983, and the designation of Geraldine Ferraro as the Vice-Presidential candidate of the Democratic Party in 1984.

The women's movement was somewhat neutralized in this new emphasis, however. For example, the movement met a fearsome backlash from reactionaries like Phyllis Schlafly, who launched the Eagle Forum to stop the ERA, and Jerry Falwell of the Moral Majority. The Reagan agenda as well undercut many of the laws that the movement had previously enacted. Day care support for instance went by the wayside, and abortion rights were seriously undermined. The movement fell, consequently, into a defensive posture and lost much of its foresight and vigor.

Perhaps sitting on the laurels of the first phase of the movement, many women seemed to move, with the more "success" oriented culture of the times, of getting ahead individually (C.DeLores Tucker, 1987). Self-help books, like The New Managerial Woman (Hennig and Jardim, 1978), typify what amounted to a new craze carried out in popular magazines like Professional Woman and even a "new, improved" Ms.. Scholarly treatises also began to examine the rise of women in the power structure (Epstein and Coser, 1981; Lenz and

Myerhoff, 1985; Pendergrass, 1979). Even the radical writers of the 60s adjusted their positions (see Friedan, 1982; Greer, 1982); Betty Friedan, for instance, in The Second Stage (1982), argued against the separatism she initially promoted and for women's accommodation to the family life she formerly denounced.

Eventually the hope of "feminizing" society through infiltration of the power structure (Bernard, 1981) has appeared to run its course. The women's movement had become increasingly fragmented in the process, and some women who gained status on the coattails of the movement, like Jean Kirkpatrick, the former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, could hardly be considered representative of feminism. Moreover, it became more apparent that the rise of a female elite, while desireable, had left behind a growing number of low-income and minority women, who were increasingly worse off. The so-called "feminization of poverty" was to become the new watchword for feminists in the late 80s (Ehrenreich and Fuentes, 1984).

The Third Phase:

There is increasing evidence (Morgan, 1984; Hooks, 1984; Hull, 1984) that the women's movement is now moving toward a third phase of revitalization, rather than cooptation through bureaucratization. This can be seen in the rise of global grassroots organizations. Prominent examples of this development include; the

organizations represented at the international women's meeting in Nairobi, Kenya; the organization of Argentine mothers of "disappeared" political dissidents; and SEWA in India which organized women in the market place. There is also the development of international networks of women's organizations, such as Global Sisterhood Institute in New York City, founded by activist feminist Robin Morgan (1984). This group brings together women from around the world to support the political activism of women in all countries in their struggles for equality. More mainstream professional and political organizations have also emerged. For example, the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., has initiated the Third World Women's Project designed to bring political women activists to the U.S. for networking tours. The Center for Women's Policy Studies and the Association of Women in Development are also acting on women's policy issues from a broad basis.

An influx of women activists from outside the U.S. and outside academe into such organizations is stimulating both the women's movement and women's studies programs. In addition, minority women within the United States are joining the ranks in larger numbers and speaking about issues of concern to them. Moveover, a wave of writings about and studies of Third World women has caught the attention of the women's

movement and is providing a fresh perspective and new possibilites (see for example, Barrios de Chungara, 1978; Bronstein, 1982; Charlton, 1984; Coles and Coles, 1978; Giddings, 1984; Hafkin and Bay, 1976; Kshwar and Vanita, 1984; Moraga and Anzaldua, 1981; Pescatello, 1976; Ramesh and Weiss, 1979; Saadawi, 1980). Robin Morgan's (1984) Sisterhood is Global is probably the most noted of these. It features first hand accounts of women from around the world who are struggling to end oppression.

This trend is forcing women to rethink their connections to the women's movement, and also the place of women's studies programs. The questions about global female oppression, multiple oppressions, white privilege, racial and ethnic diversity, and access to power, challenge all women in some way. Therefore, enthusiasm for international meetings and networks appears to be replacing the relative dormancy of the movement. Also, more frank discussion over the direction of the women's movement and society at large is also being undertaken in academia between activists and scholars.

Consequently, many women's studies programs are again working to join the larger women's movement. For example, the Center for Twentieth Century Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (de Lauretis, 1986), is making an effort to bring a wide

cross-section of diverse feminists together to understand their differences. At the center of its curriculum is a debate over the relationship of academic disciplines and political commitment, of multiple oppression and the need for diversity, of grassroots strategies and institutional power.

The Development of Women's Studies Programs

Women's studies are a recent phenomena within academia; the study and evaluation of the programs are also new. Even though the numbers of programs and courses have skyrocketed in a brief period to more than 500 programs and 5,000 courses taught in women's studies (National Women's Studies Association (NWSA), 1986), it is difficult to categorize the programs. However, there are some common features that appear to constitute a "women's studies program." The programs in general tend to be women-centered in that they are dedicated to understanding the role of women in society during the past, present, and future. Debate continues over the relationship between the theory and practice, as well as the structure of the studies as a field of inquiry. For example, should women's studies programs be involved in women's community activities such as "take back the night marches" or will that detract from the legitimacy of women's studies as an academic program?

Women's studies programs might be more readily characterized by sorting them into different types. Overviews of the field suggest, as previously outlined, that women's studies programs can be classified in at least three outstanding types. What has been termed the "first, second and third generation" of women's studies programs can be distinguished by their differing organizational structures, teaching methods, curriculum emphasis, and their relationship to the women's movement.

The First Generation Programs:

According to some feminists (Boxer, 1982; deLauretis, 1986; and Rich, 1983), the first generation of women's studies programs are unlike traditional disciplines, because they were directly tied to the women's liberation movement of the late 60s and early 70s. The first generation brought to the university a sense of shared responsibility to the social action of the women's movement. More specifically, these women's studies programs were committed to the promotion of social equality between the sexes, races, and cultures through every aspect of human life. This commitment was incorporated into a wholistic and inter-disciplinary search for equality using structures learned from the New Left (Evans, 1980), and reflected in cooperative teaching methods in which students were as likely as faculty to lead a

class. According to Boxer (1982) many women's studies programs in the first generation were distinct in their organizational structure. In other words, they were "centerless, leaderless, marked by a diversity of aims, content and style (Boxer, 1982: 667)."

According to feminists, such as Jane Thomas (1983), Charlotte Bunch and Sandra Pollack (1983), teaching techniques included consciouness raising exercises, biographical materials, and action projects organized by groups of students. Furthermore, the content for the women's studies courses tended to be established by the students, staff, and by community women.

The experimental nature of first generation programs allowed students to include their experience as a foundation for anlaysis of the materials. Students were encouraged to write journals of their feelings about the courses and instructors (Rich, 1985; Bunch, 1983; and Culley, 1985). As mentioned earlier, instructors in these programs sidestepped traditional disciplines, and were seen by most traditional academics as outsiders, as teachers of "soft" studies. These attitudes, however, did not retard their development. The women's studies participants of the time unearthed writings of and about forgotten women, raised new questions and research topics, and essentially invented new methodologies to aid in their studies.

Many of the first organizers of women's studies were social activists who had experienced difficulty bridging the gulf between the academic institutions' "ivory tower" view of the world and their own involvement in their communities and social change efforts (Bunch, 1983; Stimpson, 1980; Howe, 1978; and Minnick, 1985). They increasingly called into question the notion of "scientific objectivity," which appeared to underlie academia's detachment.

Charlotte Bunch (1983), longtime feminist scholar and activist, emphatically argued that no theory was totally objective, and to think so was a blindness to inevitable personal biases. In fact, most so-called "objective" theories were based on a male perspective of reality that failed to account for a female perspective or presence. Bunch (1983) goes on to suggest that the mission of women's studies is to bring the female perspective into the domain of knowledge building. Insights from the women's movement and individual female experiences should complement research and data gathering and broaden the academic outlook. These insights should also help to end female oppression. As Bunch (1983) explains:

> Feminist theory enables us to see immediate needs in terms of long range goals and an overall perspective of the world. Feminism is an entire world view...that effects the world politically, culturally, economically and spiritually...the idea that power is based on gender differences (p. 249).

Therefore, she maintains that women's studies must

integrate theory and praxis, become aware of our assumptions, and make choices for long range goals.

An important aim of the first generation programs was to challenge existing paradigms. Traditional research approaches were no longer valid as a means of evaluating society; relationships between personal subordination of women and broader political economic and social structures were examined (Schniedewind, 1983). Present throughout the new feminist scholarship and teaching was the goal of social transformation. Always there was a concern for "the personal as political," -- that is, that the lives of individual women together could and would produce a different social structure and ultimately a better world. As Bowles and Klein (1985) point out, the purpose of women's studies is to effect:

> the fundamental nature of all knowledge by shifting the focus from androcentricity to a frame of reference in which women's different and differing ideas, experiences, needs and interests are valid in their own right and form the basis for our teaching and learning (p. 3).

There was a confrontative aspect inherent in the first generation programs and the attendant goal of social transformation. The programs were developing a new and separate knowledge of women's issues, of individual disciplines, and of institutions where they were located. In the process, they began to expose shortcomings and contradictions in the knowledge and organizational structures of traditional academic

disciplines, and to make efforts to change them in some decisive way. For example, one of the first women's studies programs was established at San Diego State through a collective effort of staff, students and faculty from the women's movement. The program worked to develop not only courses about women from a feminist perspective, but also a supportive environment for women in the university community. This project included a teaching program for women's studies, day care for all women with children on campus, counseling services for women in need, and a research facility which contributed to the expansion of scholarly knowledge about and for women (see Howe, 1978).

The Second Generation Programs:

A split was to occur, however, among women's studies programs that would mark the inception of a second generation of programs. This split first emerged (Boxer ,1982) in the 1971 women's studies conference at the University of Pittsburgh and widened during the next decade. The 1971 conference was wrenched by a deep division between political activists and students, who were bent on making change within and without the university, and established academics concerned more with the intellectual integrity of their work and less with changing the university setting.

This schism reflected more widespread division. On the one hand, many activist academics (Robinson, 1985;

Howe, 1983; Bunch, 1983; Spender, 1981; Stimpson, 1980) were questioning the role of academics and the political goals of society in their classrooms. They affirmed a responsibility of women's studies to the women's movement, and furthering the impact of women's issues and scholarship on the structure and the governance of the university (Boxer, 1982: 668). These political activists considered themselves to be "social transformers" who were consciously engaged in a search for a new feminist paradigm and in the process working to reshape the world. Their militancy was fired by the civil rights movement, anti-war activities, and later the ERA campaign. Many of these women were also directly linked to local community and university activist organizations which gave their aims and activities additional support and direction.

On the other hand, there emerged a new breed of women academics who professed an alternative perspective. They were preoccupied with discussing theoretical issues related to the study of women and their disciplines and sought both respectability for their research and positions of power within academe for themselves and their successors. They applied the structures and methods of conventional disciplines and hierarchy to the study of women. They pressured the university to recognize women of ability by appointments to influential committees and election to

prominent offices.

Moreover, the increasing demand for women's studies courses and the growth in women's studies departments offered opportunities for moderate professional women to move into women's studies. This development heightened the divergence from the more radical leaders of the first generation who desired transformation and sustained autonomy within the institution. The newly involved women faculty had missed the civil rights and anti-war activism, and in some cases even the ERA campaigning, and opted for more moderate strategies for women's studies programs. They adopted, in fact, a reformist stance represented by their striving for institutional legitimacy and integration into the standard disciplines.

In part the strategies were adapting to the changing university climate, as well as a new phase of the women's movement. Until the mid 1970s, there was increased support for community-oriented university programs and open student activism. Also, the liberal arts curriculum maintained a prominent position in the university; funding and enrollments continued to increase; and innovative education was present in new Black Studies, Area Studies, and Women's Studies. All of these conditions contributed to the radical nature of those first generation women's studies programs.

By the late seventies, all of this was being

dramatically reversed. The "baby boom" students had completed college and college and unversities were faced with a shortage of students. A slumping economy brought drastic reductions in state and private donations. Increased maintenance and personnel costs drained the few financial reserves that did exist. Consequently, most universities were forced to cutback on innovative activities, including those sponsored by women's studies programs.

The student body was also experiencing a generational reorientation of its own. The so-called "me generation," in the face of a shrinking job market, was preoccupied with getting jobs rather than changing the world. They wanted job skills rather than new awareness. Even women students shifted their studies more and more to business and professional degrees that might grant them a place in the job market, and thus a more comfortable lifestyle. Consequently, the courses in new women's studies programs were geared toward student interest and produced courses about women in business and great women in history, rather than providing a feminist perspective and knowledge related to women's issues.

As the women's movement came under stronger attacks from the emerging Right, many programs even began to acquiesce somewhat to the charges so as not to "rock the boat" and maintain a modicum of acceptance. The women's

studies programs initiated during the late 70s early 80s period were especially reticent to cross disciplines or to embrace more radical social change. But women's studies programs within a social movement bent on social change have not been able to remain reclusive or out of controversy.

The Third Generation Programs:

The white middle-class women who have dominated the women's studies programs, and to a lesser degree the women's movement, have been increasingly challenged by minority women, or as I prefer to call them, "majority- minority" women. In 1975, at the first meeting of the United Nations Decade for Women convening in Mexico City, Third World women protested against the elitist attitudes of White North American and European women. The divisions that occurred over white elitism, colonial mentalities, and the insensitivity of educated feminists towards poverty, survival, and family issues of minority women continued to widen.

As mentioned in the discussion of the women's movement, there is a rising response to the minority challenge evident in the women's movement at large. More recently, the women's studies programs are also beginning to make adjustments that accommodate the concerns of minority women. These women are becoming students through increased minority student recruitment

and faculty and staff through affirmative action practices. The women's studies programs are expanding curricula to include the study of minority women, as well as the "great" women figures and are increasingly recruiting minority faculty and staff. Some of these women have joined forces with Black student groups, centers or study programs, as well.

The programs are also faced with a new constiuency of non-traditional students returning to the campus in increasing numbers. While most of these adult women are seeking job skills and credentialing, like the traditional students, they also bring with them experiences that have "awakened" their consciousness in many of the same ways that early feminists were awakened. They are disproportionately single parents who often confront special problems. They are faced with inadequate support for themselves and their children, an inability to get satisfactory work, and the difficulties raised by the issues of abortion, sexual harrassment, and discrimination. This trend is opening up women's studies program once again to the community and to the concerns of a broader group of women.

Lastly, the new women's studies programs are faced with an influx of international students who are now attending American universities in unprecedented numbers. Their increasing presence is in part as a

replacement for the "baby boomers" and in part as a result of the change in the value of the dollar. A larger number of exchange faculty, as international ties improve through advancing transportation and communication systems, are also making their way to American campuses.

As a result of these developments, women's studies programs are receiving new stimulus from women representing a variety of different circumstances and experiences. New ideas, new materials, and new methods are, therefore, gradually working their way into newer programs and to some degree the more established programs. Black women writers and poets (Giddings, 1984; Hooks, 1981; Hull, 1983; Lorde, 1984) are discussed in introductory courses within the humanities. International women anthropologists and sociologists (Hafkin and Bay, 1976; Kishwar, 1984; Moraga, 1981) are now part of the social sciences curriculum. If the women of women studies programs continue to respond to their inherent links as women with the minority, non- traditional, and international women coming to American campuses, something new will no doubt emerge. In sum, a third generation of women's studies programs is already in the works.

The National Women's Studies Association (NWSA), with over 3,000 members, appears to be an impetus for this new direction. Its 1987 annual conference was

devoted to the theme "Weaving Women's Color." The conference for over 2,000 participants deliberately convened at a small black women's college, Spellman College in Atlanta, GA. The major plenary sessions featured representatives from minority groups, including women from the Third World. Numerous sessions also addressed new research topics, research methods, and pedagogy, as well as reports from the women of color, lesbian, and Third world women's caucuses. The association's overt accommodation of these topics and inclusive format may set a standard for the third generation of programs, as well as some redirection for the persisting first and second generation programs.

CHAPTER 3: THE CASE STUDY

This chapter examines the women's study program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) using the conceptual framework previously outlined. That is, I attempt to interpret the development and future direction of the IUP women's studies program in terms of its relationship to the women's movement. The IUP program is of particular interest because it is a newly established program that has been adequately funded despite the numerous challenges that accompany program development in these fiscally austere times. Additionally, its inception occurred during a transitional period in what may be the evolution of the women's movement, and therefore, suffered identity problems. I attempt to illustrate how the challenges facing the newly formed women's studies programs, like the one at IUP, can be deciphered in light of the generational conception of women studies programs. In my opinion, programs like IUP's need ultimately to bridge the second and third generation programs. To accomplish this purpose, they may draw direction from the activities of the new third phase of the women's movement which is finding ways to address the women's issues of late 80s.

The University Setting

Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) is in the midst of an extensive transition that brings with it the promise for some concrete change as well as serious growing pains and resistance. It is currently experiencing a diversification of its student body, faculty, and administration. The curriculum is also being reevaluated and revised. This transition has enabled a women's studies program to gain at least a base of support and opportunities for growth and influence.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) is a medium sized state university with approximately 14,000 students. The campus is located in Indiana, PA, a small town of 25,000 inhabitants in rural western Pennsylvania. The university grew out of a normal school for teachers' training, but since the late sixties has become the largest in a state system of 14 universities, and the only one offering doctoral programs. Consequently, IUP is an institution that is attempting to approximate the status and facilities of the state's major institutions of higher learning, yet bears the legacy of a small town professionally oriented college.

Much of the IUP student population is from the neighboring rural areas, although in recent years there has been an active recruitment program which brings in

students, especially minority students, from Pittsburgh, Harrisburg and Philadelphia, and foreign students especially from Africa, India, China and Latin America. The relatively moderate tuition cost at IUP attracts better students who are unable to afford more prestigious private colleges and universities.

Despite the growing diversity of the student population, the majority of the students continue to be from Western Pennsylvania. Most are first generation college students from working class families. Most seek professional training. The largest major on the campus is business, and other professionally oriented majors such as teaching, nursing, nutrition, and computer sciences are also extremely popular. Moreover, women still predominate in the traditionally female oriented departments of education, nursing, and home economics.

As of 1983 the faculty at IUP was 690 full-time faculty, of which there were 195 female faculty (28% of the total faculty). Only 12% of the full professors were women. However, there is evidence of change in this regard. The current president of the university has publicly voiced his support of departmental efforts to hire qualified women and minorities. Moreover, he recently appointed a Black woman to the position of Provost, as well as authorizing the hiring of a substantial number of women (43%) to fill full-time tenure track faculty positions during for the 1986-87

calendar year. The president has also helped provide support for the increasing number of women faculty through the Women's Advisory Council, the new Women's Studies Program, and Advisory Board for Gender Balancing the Curriculum. The change in the status of women at IUP is also apparent in the fact that there are more women faculty chairing departments than ever before.

These developments coincide with the university-wide reevaluation of the general education curriculum. These recent events imply that a genuine soul-searching is in process within the institution. This attitude of openness has resulted in a greater emphasis on interdisciplinary programs such as women's studies. There is also a renewed focus on writing and furthering self-awareness that needs to accompany the writing process. The question of gender balance and minority awareness in the curriculum have therefore had an arena for discussion.

Clearly the university is in a transition that is likely to continue for several years. Over the next five years, one third of the current faculty will be retiring and new faculty will be hired. This development is likely to bring even more women faculty into the fields of science and mathematic where they can serve as role models in areas in which male students and faculty have traditionally dominated. Also, the student

body continues to include more non-traditional female students and minority women students. These students bring a diversity of experience and expectations to the university. Lastly, the implementation of several new graduate programs, including doctoral programs in psychology and criminology, is likely to draw more socially conscious adult students to the campus.

A History of the Women's Studies Program

Prior to the establishment of the IUP Women's Studies Program, programs for women on the IUP campus appeared disjointed and somewhat sporadic. In the mid-70s, a group of 15 women faculty and administrators met to discuss the possibility of organizing a women's center and a women's studies program on the campus. Subsequently, the Women's Center was established with university grant monies and housed in the Continuing Education Department. A women's studies program was not established because people could not agree on how the course offerings should be managed. Some members of the planning group thought there should be a core of women's studies faculty who would evaluate the method and content of the classes subsumed under women's studies. Others believed that such a practice would infringe on academic freedom.

There were, however, other efforts outside the administration and faculty to deal with women's issues.

In 1982, a small group of women undergraduate students formed "The Women's Alliance for Change" which got small amounts of money for women's programs. They later assisted the Student Development office in administering a campus wide women's needs assessment. The survey essentially demonstrated what many faculty and women's students were claiming -- that an alarmingly high rate of IUP women's students were subject to physical, sexual, or verbal abuse or harassment.

As a result of the study, the president asked an Administrator in Student Affairs to bring together a cross-section of students, staff and faculty women to find out more about the concerns of women on the campus. Thirty-five women attended the breakfast meeting with the president, and out of that meeting a group of approximately 20 women began to meet regularly. They eventually formed what was to become the IUP Women's Advisory Council (WAC). The advisory group divided into several committees, each dealing with a different issue (women's scholarship, health and wellness, mentoring, sexual harassment, and a women's center).

Later, in 1985, the president sent out letters asking administrators to recognize the efforts of the WAC members and its importance for the women on the IUP campus. The Council's activities ranged from work on health and wellness programs dealing with eating disorders to the issue of sexual harassment and the

formulation of a new campus policy. Most of the women did not know one another prior to the meetings and this new opportunity gave many of them a feeling of solidarity and support from other women, as well as recognition from the administration.

During this period, I was involved in developing my women's studies interests as a special studies graduate student. In 1983, I encouraged several other graduate women to join in a seminar on "Women and Power." We managed to have the seminar listed on the course register as a "special topics" course, and thus established the first graduate women's studies course at IUP. (A few undergraduate courses had been dealing with sex role issues, such as the "sex role" course in sociology taught since 1979.) The seminar was a self-directed study group that was multi-disciplinary, multi-cultural, and multi-racial. The women students were diverse in age and experience; some were single, some married with children, others married without children. Some took the seminar for credit while others did not. The course was so popular that many more women wanted to participate in the seminar, and enforcement of our 12 person limit led to a charge of elitism against us at one point (See Brandi and Draham, 1984).

Apart from this activity, there were a series of academic conferences that attempted to deal with crucial social issues. This conference series, initiated by a

professor in the history department, examined social problems from a wide range of perspectives from within and outside academe. The aim was to bring together noted scholars, activists and social critics to debate the issues on the IUP campus for three days each fall. The Global Economy and The History of the U.S. Working Class conferences included a women's perspective. Several of the women speakers (including Markusen and Nash in 1984, and Kessler Harris and Buhle in 1985) challenged the traditional ways of solving social problems by suggesting the importance of grassroots movements and women's power. Although the conferences were not focused primarily on women, the women participants had an impact on women students and faculty who attended them and strengthened the resolve of the women on campus to bring a greater awareness of women's scholarship to IUP.

With this new enthusiasm and encouragement from the administration, the members of the WAC Women's Studies Committee developed and submitted a proposal to the Provost requesting a women's studies minor in the Spring of 1985. The following September, the committee met with the provost to discuss the proposal. As a result of this meeting with the provost, the committee realized that because of IUP's faculty union and senate procedures, the establishment of a women's studies minor would probably take years to be formally approved and

adopted; therefore, alternative plans for establishing women's studies were considered.

In collaboration with the Acting Provost, the Executive Council for Women's Studies decided to press for an immediate women's studies program that would have a half-time director in women's studies, with a half-time appointment in an academic department. The administration agreed to fund such a position. At this point, the WAC Women's Studies Committee decided to bring in a consultant to advise them on the development of such a program. Dorothy Helley from Hunter College was selected. She visited the campus for two days, meeting with administrators, the president and provost, deans, and chairs, as well as the women's studies committee and recently established Advisory Board for Gender Balance in the Curriculum. Dr. Helley specifically recommended to the women's studies committee the following: to meet with all the college deans to discuss the possibility of a women's studies program and to meet with chairs of departments where women were doing women's studies work.

Several department chairpersons agreed to accept a half-time position with designated teaching responsibility for women's studies courses and program directorship. The half-time directorship in women's studies would be directly under the jurisdiction of the provost's office and would be evaluated jointly by the

women's studies faculty and the provost. There was discussion of establishing a women's studies evaluation committee which would work with the director's department on academic evaluation.

The hiring process was designed to honor the first preference of the women's studies executive committee although the committee would not hire a candidate that was unacceptable to the respective academic department. Applications for the half-time directorship were to be first reviewed by the women's studies committee and then referred to the appropriate departmental review committee. Each department had a women's studies liaison who worked with the departments to clarify either the needs of women's studies and the criteria for women's studies scholarship.

By late spring 1986, three candidates were selected and brought to the IUP campus for interviews with departments, deans, provost, president, and women's studies faculty. Members of the committee met frequently, first setting up schedules, then drafting outlines of important issues and questions that should be addressed by each candidate, and finally establishing an evaluation procedure. Issues considered important for a new director were breadth of knowledge in women's studies, quality and amount of scholarship in the area, administrative experience, and teaching philosophy. Members were in constant contact with one another,

either by telephone or in meetings.

Ironically, after the hiring process was completed, many members on the Women's Studies Committee withdrew as a direct result of burnout from the weekly meetings and the intensity of the discussions. Furthermore, numerous committee members left town for the summer vacation. Consequently, there was little done to prepare for the arrival of the new women's studies director.

In late August, a pot-luck social was held for the new director at the home of the then Chair of Women's Studies Executive Committee. This gathering is significant because it was the first group meeting without an agenda, where women could talk about their personal lives. There had been no time for consciousness raising or informal support outside the regular meeting schedule. The women present at the August social, in fact, remarked at the importance of getting to know one another. The recent developments had opened many personal issues but left no time to establish the kind of support needed to address them.

Some members of the Women's Studies Committee also felt a lack of closure and a disappointment with the Committee as a support group. There seemed to be no collective vision for the new Women's Studies Program. When the new director came in the fall, it was therefore difficult for her to have a sense of unified support.

There was no consensus of definition of women's studies or its direction, so the members of the women's studies executive council and the new director had to confer with individual members as they went along. For the most part, the impetus and direction of the program was thrown into the hands of the new director, but not without some resentments.

Members of the Women's Studies Committee frequently suggested that the new director should do this or that without offering practical support or necessary information. There was little formal cohesion among the previous committee members, except when it came to not allowing new faculty interested in women's studies to join the Women's Studies Executive Council.

The Women's Studies Director requested that a new structure be formed composed of task oriented sub-committees and a more open and flexible council organization. The executive committee was disbanded, and replaced by a less hierarchical coordinating council. These actions upset some faculty members on the executive council. The council was then open to faculty, staff and students of the university and used the criteria of concern for women's issues and work on women's scholarship as the basis for participation.

The presence of a half-time women's studies director, beginning in the fall of 1986, increased dramatically the activities of women's studies. In one

year's time, a process was established for library book acquisitions, a special colloquia series of research on women was initiated, a speaker series was organized, a women's film series was offered, an exhibit of campus wide women's faculty research was displayed in the library, a women's book section was established in the IUP bookstore, and six issues of a WAC/Women's Studies newsletter were published. Several social gatherings were also arranged in order for women to get acquainted. A sub-committee also campaigned to have women's and minority issues included in the new general education program. Several new women's studies courses were introduced; and the work for a women's studies minor advanced. Probably the most important activities to grow out of the new women's studies program was a faculty development seminar conducted in the spring semester and the approval for IUP's hosting the Mid-Atlantic National Women's Studies Association Annual Meeting (NWSA). The NWSA conference will be held in conjunction with the IUP Symposium on "Women in the Future" to convene in October 1987. The symposium features several nationally known figures.

The faculty development seminar was the most ambitious venture of the first year of the program. It was particularly important in that it attempted to address the unfinished business of the women's studies committee and establish a firm foundation for the new

program. The principal purpose of the seminar was to provide the women's studies faculty with the opportunity to educate themselves on the new feminist scholarship, to make contact with other women faculty with similar interests, and to meet in a supportive environment where they could openly discuss future directions of the program. In order for this to occur a proposal was submitted to the provost to fund a quarter release-time for 12 women faculty from different disciplines to participate in the seminar.

Initially 11 faculty and two graduate students attended the seminars which convened every Friday afternoons for three hours. This first faculty development seminar ended with many of the participants feeling frustrated, even angry. However, they lacked the confidence to voice their frustration, according to the interviews. Others felt comfortable with what they were learning but lacked the breadth of knowledge to contribute much. They were consequently apt to lose their train of thought and move the discussion off the track.

Nevertheless, the main consensus was that the seminar was vital to the women's studies program. It gave the women a place to discuss critical issues facing women in academia and to strategize what to do about them; it also let the individual women know that they are not alone. Lastly, the seminar, despite its initial

problems, was seen as an opportunity to read across disciplines and to gain reinforcement for one's own women's scholarship.

A Summary of the Interviews

In order to better understand the development of the IUP case, I conducted interviews with 12 key informants associated with the IUP woman's studies program. The interviewees were asked about a variety of subjects, including their family, their personal lives and their perception of the women's movement (See Appendix A). The topics of the questions were designed to solicit information relevant to the issues distinguishing the three generations of women's studies programs outlined in the conceptual framework. My interviews reveal a set of perceptions that suggest that the IUP program is a second generation program.

One outstanding issue facing several faculty women interviewed was the challenge of juggling of career and family. One woman very involved in women's issues spoke for many others when she summed up her priorities this way: "Personally my family is my first priority with my job as a close second." The women's families were their first priority, although they felt that their professional development was very important too. As another woman explained: "I am a professional interested in academics and social change -- but

basically a loner, a withdrawn person. I am a mother, teacher, a scientist, and middle aged -- but feeling young and would like to be more active."

They point out that marriage, family, and career choices for women are important topics in their courses. They in fact make an effort to disclose many of their personal experience in this regard and prompt students to do the same. Even a couple of faculty, who were formerly hesitant to emphasize "the personal" in teaching, have been moving in this direction. One woman explained: I have generally used a lecture style, although I do use small groups occasionally. I also maintain a distance from students mainly because I am a very private person." For many of these faculty, the woman's changing role in marriage, family, and career represents the heart of what they consider to be women's studies.

Several faculty were reluctant to use the word "feminist" to refer to themselves. As one woman said with reluctance: "Am I a feminist? Although I am reluctant to use the word, I feel as though I am an evolving ¶feminist'." They felt that the term put them in an awkward position for teaching a generally conservative student body. Several even confided that they would feel hostility from other "non-feminist" women faculty if they were seen as feminist.

Many faculty had or are having difficulty in

connecting with other women faculty on campus in a way that allows them time for personal sharing. As one faculty member noted of her own department: "Although there is some informal sharing in the department, I find that not all women in the department are empathetic...I share ideas mostly with other women outside IUP." Some women interviewees have been on committees with other women, yet admit to never talking about their research interests, family, or personal experiences. The faculty development seminar was the first time many of the women recognized the similarity of their experiences.

One interviewee perceived the lack of women's support as a major drawback to the retention of single women faculty at IUP. She felt like an outsider. It appears that many of the newer faculty are turning to each other, in part because they are coming to the university with a more positive conception of women's studies. They see women's studies as supporting women and women's ideas. Women's studies offers an egalitarian structure irrespective of the participants status at the university, and collaborative interdisciplinary research is possible and preferable.

There were several faculty who expressed their frustration with their chosen field of study and their ability to explore new directions. One well established researcher pointed out: "I am presently professionally frustrated with my career. It's not going where I

wanted it to go. My interests are too abstract and not understood by many; therefore, I feel too narrowly focused and would rather focus more broadly." One faculty member explained the intellectual tension she felt this way: "In the past I have separated the academic from social issues. Part of me still believes in the objectivity but I am moving away from it." They complained of the lack of support from other faculty, even women colleagues at times, and the sense of frustration that resulted. Most of the faculty interviewed felt support from groups of women outside the university, from old college classmates, or long-time friends who they connected with through telephone calls or meeting at professional conferences. As one faculty noted: "There is simply no department and research support for my interests. Most ideas have come from professional meetings and other women outside the university."

The desire to make a difference was strong in all the women interviewed, some specifically saw that difference directly related to being a woman. There was also a sense of powerlessness among many of the women. Some of that feeling is the result of too many "little things" to do that create ambivalence even about women's studies. As one faculty member active in the founding of women's studies at IUP lamented: "I have been feeling uneasy and confused about taking responsibility.

I feel overburdened. In women's studies I feel frustrated that so much is going on and I have other commitments. I feel guilty about participating; I would feel better if there was less going on." This sense of powerlessness was reinforced by the lack of networking skills and the lack of women's support groups. As one woman remarked: "Networking?! I guess I have that Yankee individualism...I still feel excluded even though I know all these things. I don't feel a team effort, I feel outside the department." Other women suggested that they had always felt a bit like "an outsider," because they were professional women who non-professional women sometimes perceived as threats.

None of the interviewed faculty were actively engaged in the women's movement, although a couple of women mentioned that they had had early experiences within support groups in the late 60s and early 70s. A typical posture was expressed in one woman's "evolving commitment": "Women's concerns permeate my life and I try to balance. I have a strong and growing commitment to the women's movement for the 80s." Even a person long affiliated with the movement noted her peripheral role: "In the 60s I was torn because the rhetoric used was too rigid. I felt a lot of the radicals were using the women's movement for their personal hang-ups...I see myself now as part of the rank and file supporters, I do what I can, but feel more comfortable to make telephone

calls and stuff envelopes than lead." However, despite the lack of involvement many felt it was important to their lives and the advancement of women's studies. The lack of involvement in the women's movement, or for that matter any form of social change organization, appeared to heighten the mistrust that some women felt for each other, even when they are working toward similar ends. One woman did not consider herself to be associated with the women's movement at all. She noted: "I am just trying to survive personally and am leery of being pushed toward activism." She believed that women should prove themselves as individuals within the system.

The interviewees' underlying perceptions of the women's movement were diverse. Some newer faculty felt their involvement in women's studies was their link to the women's movement. They noted that women's studies gave them courage to be more involved in activities that support women in general. Others kept their distance from the movement because they saw it as being dominated by radical lesbian feminists who were to be respected but feared. Other interviewees, although not involved personally in the movement, believe that the failure of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) essentially ended the movement as an organizational social force.

The majority of interviewed faculty believed the IUP program was on the right track. However there are

some emerging concerns about organizational style. As one woman noted with some frustration: "I feel we still have the problem of 'one-ups-emship' and unclear boundaries...I expected to know women better and then get disappointed when I feel women have adopted the male model." Nevertheless, there is a clear consensus about objectives: the development of a women's studies minor is considered to be an appropriate next step. A few were eager to increase the visibility of women's studies courses through the formation of a women's studies department; whereas other faculty felt women's studies should not become a department.

The administration openly supports bringing the new women's studies research onto the campus and introducing it into the university-wide curriculum. This integration is admittedly going to meet resistance, especially considering that there are some disciplines that consider themselves value neutral and complete as they are. The administrators who were interviewed, however, were generally hesitant about endorsing a women's studies department. They would rather work within the current departmental structure and not expand the bureaucracy. One faculty administrator did, nevertheless, think it important to establish a minor in women's studies and ultimately a department. According to this administrator, a bachelor's and master's degree in women's studies would add to IUP's status within the

state system.

The IUP Program as a Second Generation Program

Based on the criteria discussed in the preceding chapter, the Women's Studies Program at IUP could be considered a second generation program of the women's movement. The IUP program, as noted above, was founded largely with administrative support and encouragement, rather than community or movement advocacy. The university is in a transition period of increased concern about upgrading the school's status. This circumstance has contributed to the willingness of some of its leaders to support the program proposal.

There were of course a handful of individuals that had been active in furthering women's studies on the campus but they acted more as individuals than as part of a larger collectivity that was characteristic of the first generation programs. The WAC committee that developed the program was actually established as an advisory group to the university president. Most of the faculty involved in the inception of the program were at least initially drawn to the study of women from within their respective disciplines, rather than to women's studies as an interdisciplinary field of scholarship in its own right.

The most distinguishing characteristic of the IUP program are evident in the interviews with faculty who were associated with the program. The summary of the interviews

reveals the prevalence of reformist ideas, division and isolation among faculty, and detachment from the women's movement. These characteristics are representative of the second generation women's studies programs.

The case study also suggests that the IUP program may be moving toward a third generation program. Many of the tensions, conflicts, and organizational difficulties of the program may be explained in terms of this imminent transition. As previously mentioned, there are at least a few women who have been actively advocating women's issues on the campus for several years. In addition, an increasing number of the new women faculty have had experience in the women's movement and with women's studies as an emerging field.

The IUP program, moreover, has taken a very visible and even activist campus role in its first year. The faculty development seminar, despite its shortcomings, and the upcoming regional NWSA conference/symposium appear to be raising the consciousness of the women's studies faculty and developing a collective identification among the women. Some esprit d'corps does seem to be emerging that was not present prior to the program. This summer two women's studies faculty are participating in the international women's conference in Dublin, Ireland, and five members attended the NWSA conference in Atlanta. This increasing attachment to the field and linkage to the movement is likely to have an impact on the direction of the program.

As mentioned above, the university itself is experiencing changes, such as an increase in minority, international and adult students and new women faculty. These developments should also further stimulate the IUP program.

The university's transition, the developing personal connections, and the increased associations with the women's movement, now entering what might be called a third phase, appear to provide the basis for a new direction. With these elements present the IUP program could move toward becoming a third generation women's studies program.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS

The results of the case study of the IUP women's studies program suggests that the IUP program can be considered a second generation program. However, the IUP program also has the potential of developing into a third generation women's studies program. The question remains how do such programs make the transition to a third generation program, presuming that a third generation program is a desirable goal. There are obstacles that make such a transition difficult, yet there are also ways to address them that need to be more broadly considered. This chapter is divided into two separate sections. The first section outlines the major obstacles facing programs similar to IUP's. The second section recommends methods for movement toward ends consistent with third genderation programs.

As suggested in Chapter Two, the second generational programs are susceptible to cooptation by university institutions and the traditional academic disciplines of which they have become a part. They may be able to avoid the shortcomings of the second generation programs, and the second phase of the women's movement on which they are based, by following the revitalization of the third phase of the women's movement with its more diverse membership, increased grassroots involvement, and a renewed drive toward

social change.

In sum, the common aim of the original women's studies programs was to establish a women-centered perspective for the emancipation of all oppressed peoples. In the evolution of the women's movement and development of women's studies programs, some serious digressions from this fundamental aim have emerged. Several key questions, therefore, confront women in the 1980s: How do we communicate our differences and build on them? More specifically, how do we respond to the tensions between the transformers and reformers of different generations of the women's movement, between women from traditional disciplines and women's studies interdisciplinary approaches, between minority and ethnic women's issues and the mainstream of professional and organizational women? How do we negotiate these differences in ways that strengthen women's studies and inculcate its values within a widening societal framework? And in the process, how do we avoid being coopted by institutional inertia and compromise politics?

The Obstacles Facing Second Generation Programs

The second generation of women's studies programs, as outlined in the previous chapter, are comprised generally of women faculty who are largely self-taught in women's studies, but who are not actively involved in the women's support groups, consciousness raising

groups, or organizations of the women's movement. Furthermore, these women faculty tend to subscribe to traditional androcentric disciplines, and because of their training in these disciplines often find it difficult to challenge the accompanying academic assumptions. The lack of consciousness-raising in these faculty, as opposed to that in the first generation women, has also left many second generation women isolated and insecure about their abilities to question their respective disciplines let alone the academic institutions in general.

There are several practical reasons underlying the more conservative orientation of second generation programs. For example, hundreds of liberal arts colleges serving mainstream America cannot afford the luxury of more innovative programming. Women's studies programs in such schools are often doing the best they can by simply raising the topic of women's sex roles in traditional courses.

The educational responsibilities placed on most faculty and administrators today are high and limit the involvement of faculty in social activism. Faculty at IUP, for instance, teach 12 hours per term, hold office hours and engage in publishable research and community service. Furthermore, many women faculty are struggling to balance professional careers with families. They are striving for recognition in their disciplines and

tenure within their departments, as well as providing an income to feed their families.

Many of these faculty feel isolated and impotent in responding to collective action or women's issues outside their particular disciplines. Their lack of connection with other women faculty, in fact, helps to sustain their more narrowly defined discipline, even though they may feel a frustration with their current work. The absence of an immediate support network also appears to keep women faculty from understanding the espirit d'corps found in many of the first generation programs.

Second generational faculty generally do not identify or feel uncomfortable with the idea of women's studies as a discipline in its own right; they prefer to focus on mainstreaming the women studies curriculum. They may think that women's studies classes only attract females, and that men need to recognize gender equality as much as women. Another reason for their reticence may be their inability to give up their identification with "the familiar." Their actions may be rather like the wife of an alcoholic who has difficulty leaving her unbearable husband because he is less threatening than the unknown. Women's Studies is often perceived as a field that is pushing into new territory and forcing change -- sometimes on those who are not ready for it.

Finally, second generation women may also have more difficulty working on the kind of collaborative research projects that would move them outside their disciplines toward a broader women's studies perspective. Many of them are still embedded in their graduate dissertations which are generally narrowly defined research projects, unlike first generation women who have, for the most part, challenged their discipline's methodologies and have had feminist support and recognition for their achievements.

Moving Toward a Third Generation Program

The second generation women's studies programs do not begin with the same assumptions as the first generation programs. These programs are also less likely to incorporate professional connections among women. Women in second generation programs, therefore, rely on formalized structures to develop new material, refine their teaching styles, and follow their new research interests. They need a social support system that helps them deal with the emotional strains of addressing women's issues in predominately male institutions, and furthers their collective identification with other women.

Academic Supports:

One obvious option to move women deeper into the foundations of women's studies is to establish women's

studies programs that have some degree of autonomy and status among existing departments. Without some formal authority, women's studies can too easily be subsumed by existing departments, reduced by university cutbacks, or lose its influence and identity. The direct relationship of the IUP program to the provost office is a step in the right direction.

Another important aspect in the establisment of a new program is obtaining released time for faculty. It is necessary for faculty to have released time because of their busy teaching schedules and university committee work that often precludes developing other interests as well as limits maintaining some sort of social support. The released time is especially important for women's studies because of the nature of the field. Unlike many disciplines, women's studies scholarship exposes a variety of social ills that confront women in personal ways and often evoke personal wrestlings and emotional upheaval. The IUP faculty development seminar, despite its limitations, offered the released time and formal structure to help women's studies faculty in this regard.

Women's studies faculty also need some alternative evaluation of their work. First generation women's studies faculty have faced difficulties in obtaining tenure, because they have tended to use unconventional teaching methods and publish in interdisciplinary

journals. Some first generation instructors have discarded tests as a grading measure and instead use group projects and reports to evaluate students (Meyerowitz, 1987). Their preference for collective research and authorship is often judged by tenure evaluation committees as less scholarly and less valuable (Bright, 1987). The provision to evalute the IUP director with a women's studies evaluation committee, in conjunction with a departmental committee, ought therefore to be extended to other women's studies faculty.

Women's studies programs must work to further women's scholarship and its recognition on their own campuses. Many universities are now encouraging more collaborative research projects which can be beneficial for women's studies faculty. These projects could be used by women faculty advanced in women's scholarship to mentor faculty new to women's studies.

In the process, women studies programs should continue to press for the inclusion of women's studies within the general curriculum. Ideally, the general education requirements should include an introduction to women's studies which validates the importance of the research within women's studies in students' minds. According to scholar and activist Florence Howe (1978), women's studies is important to liberal education for five reasons: it is interdisciplinary and unifying, it

teaches skills in critical analysis, it assumes a problem-solving stance, it clarifies the issue of value judgments in education, and it promotes socially useful ends.

Moreover, the field of women's studies has accomplished much in its brief history. From its inception, women's studies has been responsible for innovations in teaching, establishing new methodology, and theorizing; some scholars suggest (Bowles and Klein, 1983) that women's studies has been responsible for developing a new paradigm. These contributions in and of themselves warrant more recognition and discussion among students and faculty alike.

Social Support:

Just as important is the development of social support for women's studies participants. Many of the IUP interviewees voiced their frustration over the difficulty of meeting and talking with other women. I personally know of two single parent faculty who left IUP because of the sense of isolation they experienced.

A women's center is an ideal place to provide social support and validation for women's concerns and interests. It not only provides a place for women to meet informally with a diversity of other women -- faculty, students, and community women alike, -- it also offers visibility and organization for women's activities. Proposals for a women's center at IUP have

been submitted to the Long-range Planning Committee and should be pursued in order to advance the women's studies in its transition toward a third generation program.

A means to assure dialogue and debate among women's studies persons is also an important part of building social support. There is now a rift between proponents of social transformation and proponents of social reform, even on the IUP campus. Discussion between them and the stimulus of new ideas from visiting scholars and activitists can do much to bring about the synthesis necessary for a third generation women's studies program. The faculty colloquia, film series, and visiting lecturers are therefore important activities to continue and even expand.

Women's studies programs, and women's centers, need to take a further step. They need to more actively recruit the minority, non-traditional and foreign women students now coming to their campuses in increasing numbers. A non- hierarchical structure that assures these women voice and responsibility is necessary. These students should be participants rather than tokens, lackeys, or research subjects. The structure must be accompanied by a genuine interest and respect for the potential contributions of these women. Similarly, new faculty and staff, regardless of position or rank, should be given responsibility and

encouragement.

A process for coordinating this diversity of women must be established with explicit guidelines and purpose, in order to offset the inertia of campus stratification. In particular, guidelines that assure collaborative ventures, consensus building, honest questioning, and personal sharing should be implemented. Without such guidelines, a women studies program is likely to lapse, or become a hierarchial organization that responds to the decisions of a director and maintains the status quo.

Lastly, support can be found through increased association with other women's studies programs. Several model programs offer examples of how to explore and conceive third generation programs. The women's studies program at SUNY-Buffalo, for instance, has established strong links with its community and conducted cooperative research with local women's groups. It has also managed to establish a doctoral program in international women's studies which is bringing a diversity of women to the campus. The program at Mankato State University in Minnesota requires its students to complete an internship in an activist organization and offers courses on community organizing and social change.

Ties with the NWSA can also provide stimulus and direction. As previously mentioned, the NWSA in and of

itself offers an example of how university-based women's studies programs might move toward third generation programs. The NWSA has instituted a number of caucuses that offer different kinds of women the opportunity to develop their own voice and identity and provides a forum for the diversity of interests to be discussed and synthesized. The organizations appeal to an increasingly broad base of women -- black, hispanic, Native American, Jewish, working class, lesbian activists and academics -- has brought its current membership to over 3,000.

A program's identification and involvement in the women's movement is ultimately what will revitalize it, as this thesis suggests. It is within the context of the women's movement that the field of women's studies was founded and its destiny now rests. The reality is that women's studies programs, regardless of their generational characteristics, confront the academic and institutional structures about them by focusing on women's issues and organizing women on campus.

The development of women's studies programs on campuses can, therefore, be thought of as a microcosm of the women's movement. It inevitably reveals a great deal about the current status of women, and women's ability to empower themselves to improve that status. Women's studies programs may have little choice but to build trust and cohesiveness among its participants in order

to transform their respective institutions and to assure the survival and advancement of women's studies. In this way, women's studies programs will also become a proving ground for the women's movement, and the impetus for social change they were originally intended to be.

APPENDIX: A FEMINIST HISTORY METHOD

The case study of the IUP women's studies program is based largely on a qualitaitve methodology that includes participant observation, document review, and in-depth interviews. This method, while common among social scientists involved in naturalistic field work, is drawn from the "new feminist history," which emphasizes documenting the personal experiences of women through an open involvement and relationship with them.

Unlike traditional history, which was pressumed to be totally objective and narrowly focused in its method, my approach attempts to incorporate my personal experience and participant observation with the perceptions of key informants, much in the vein of the qualitiative research methods endorsed by the new feminist history (Meyerowitz, 1987). I chose to use open-ended questions in interviews that allowed the respondents opportunity to define the terms and issues themselves. In this way, I was able to gain a clearer picture of the similarities and differences among members of the IUP women's studies program.

Assumptions:

The new feminist history (Kessler Harris, 1981;

Milkman, 1985; and Meyerowitz, 1985) is derived from the controversial "social history" or "new history" which has recently received much public as well as academic attention. According to a New York Times Magazine article (April, 19 1987), Princeton's history department exemplifies this "new history." It stresses the importance of viewing history from the perspective of "ordinary" individuals, that is, the daily activities and thoughts of the general population rather than from spectacular events or from views of people in power.

More specifically, the new social history attempts to assess what appears as micro-level epiphenomenon from the point of more macro-societal phenomenon or change. It does so by chronicling the personal experiences of individuals and groups that have not been formally recognized in the past. Personal and organizational documents from individuals are used along with individual interviews, where possible, with the "non-elite."

The new feminist history uses this approach but focuses on personal experiences of women especially. It is also more wholistic in its attempt to analyze political issues through an integration of the economic, social, and psychological conditions that have influence on power relationships and decision-making. In addition, feminist history

considers the intersection of the personal and public aspects of women's lives and is designed to contribute to social action.

This approach provided me with a vehicle to merge my personal commitment to feminism, personal involvement in women's studies, and involvement with other university and community women into some meaningful form of inquiry. In order to better understand the field of women's studies, I undertook to study it as a participant observer. My involvement in the development of the women's studies program at IUP offered me first hand observations of the women's studies program and access to important documents and correspondence. It also afforded me a relationship with faculty and staff involved in the program that enabled me to hold meaningful interviews and discussions.

I believe that the choice of this more personal qualitative method is no less valid as an evaluative tool than one that claims total objectivity. In fact, it has been argued by a long line of social scientists that qualitative research of this sort may move us closer to social reality. Certainly many feminist scholars (Bernard, 1981; Bunch, 1983; Carroll, 1976; Howe, 1982) insist that the more quantiative research currently dominating the academic disciplines may be responsible for the oversight of women's issues and

their personal experience. Fundamental to the advancement of women's studies has been the exploration and validation of women's personal experiences. This thesis attempts to similarly build on such experience -- my own and that of others associated with the IUP women's studies program.

Participant Observation:

In order to develop my conceptual framework about the generational development of women's studies programs, I reviewed a wide range of feminist literature. My interests led me to explore the literature on feminist education. There I discovered discussions of distinctive characteristics among women's studies programs developed during the 60s, 70s and 80s. The distinction between the generations of programs appeared to be in-part a result of the faculty's relationship to the women's movement, as discussed in Chapter Two.

My personal experience within the women's movement from the early 1970s to the present and my involvement in the establishment of a women's studies program at Indiana University Pennsylvania (IUP) from 1985-1987 is the foundation of the case study of the IUP program. In the 1970s I became involved in a number of local and regional women's groups and social action organizations. I became a member of NOW, I was active in the ERA campaign in Illinois, and I helped found a

battered women's shelter in Alton, Illinois. I also became involved in the peace activism of the American Friends Service Committee, Latin America Solidarity Committee, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. In the early eighties, as I returned to school, I became interested in women's studies and joined the National Women's Studies Association (NWSA). I have attended the NWSA's national and regional meetings and participated on several of its caucuses and coordinating council meetings.

In addition, I have worked on women's stuides activities since coming to IUP in 1982. I helped establish a "Women and Power" seminar, a writing workshop for women, a feminist speakers series, and a women's film series. I also participated in the Women's Advisory Council, Women's Studies Faculty Development Seminar and several other related committees.

In order to substantiate my personal experience in chronicling the history of the IUP program, I reviewed minutes of women's studies meetings, Women's Advisory Council memoranda, newsletters, and related proposals. I also had numerous informal conversations with administrators and faculty associated with the development of the program. Their frank comments and informative observations offered important background information.

Interviews:

I interviewed 12 individuals most associated with the women's studies program -- 9 faculty and staff participating in Women's Advisory Council and 3 administrators instrumental in establishing the program. Through open-ended interviews lasting from 1-2 hours, I collected the reflections of the women's studies participants about their committment to and involvement in the IUP women's studies program and the women's movement in general. As outlined in the interview summary in Chapter Three, the interviewees expressed the reformist ideas, division among faculty, sense of isolation, and conservatism with regard to the movement that characterize a second generation women's studies program.

My interview questions focused on four topics: 1) personal and family issues, 2) teaching experience and pedagogy, 3) definition and philosophy of women's studies, and 4) assessment and association with the women's movement (see Appendix A). The questions were ordered to move the interviewees from their personal reflections as women to their more professional and political involvements.

My personal relationships with the interviewees and my own knowledge of the development of the women' studies program aided in the interview process. All those who were interviewed appeared to take the

interviews seriously and use them as a time for personal reflection. During the interviews, my strong interest in social transformation as opposed to reform was difficult to contain at times. I did avoid interjecting my bias with regard to women's studies programs, but I often wanted an interview to be over so that I could have a frank discussion with the interviewee about the issues facing women in women's studies.

In sum, this approach enabled me to engage and address the larger political issues around me in a personal way, as so many feminists urge. At the same time, it served to check and balance my own biases and enthusiasm with reasoned objections and differing perspectives. All in all, I feel I have been able to gain a fuller picture of our connection as individual women to some larger whole.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ascher, Carol, et al. (eds.) 1984. Between Women. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Ash, Robert A. 1972. Social Movements in America. Chicago, IL: Markham.

Bazin, Nancy Topping. 1983. "Integrating Third World Women into the Women's Studies Curriculum." Frontiers 7:2:13-17.

Bernard, Jessie. 1981. The Female World. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Blumer, Herbert. 1974. "Social Movements." in R. Serge Denisoff (ed.), The Sociology of Dissent (2d ed.) New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Blumhagen, Kathleen O., and Walter D. Johnson. 1978. Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Collection. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Bowles, Gloria. 1983. Strategies for Women's Studies in the Eighties. New York City, NY: Pergamon.

Bowles, Gloria,and Renate Duelli-Klein, (eds.) 1983. Theories of Women's Studies. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan.

Boxer, Marilyn J. 1982. "For and About Women: The Theory and Practice of Women's Studies in the United States." Signs 7:3:661-695.

Brandi, Diana, and Annemarie Drahamn. 1982. Women and Power Seminar. (Unpublished Program Report) Indiana, PA: Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Bright, Clare. 1987. Personal conversation with past secretary of NWSA, May 18.

Bronstein, Audrey. 1982. The Triple Struggle: Latin American Peasant Women. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Bunch, Charolotte, and Sandra Pollack, (eds.) 1983. Learning Our Way: Essays in Feminist Education. Trumansburg, NY: Crossings Press.

Butler, Johnnella E. 1984. "Minority Studies and

Women's Studies: Do We Want to Kill a Dream?" Women's Studies International Forum 7:3:135-8.

Carroll, Berenice A. 1976. Liberating Women's History: Theoretical and Critical Essays. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Charlton, Sue Ellen M. 1984. Women in Third World Development. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Childers, Mary. 1984. "Women's Studies: Sinking and Swimming in the Mainstream." Women's Studies International Forum 7:3:161-6.

Clifford, Geraldine Jonich. 1983. "`Shaking Dangerous Questions from the Crease': Gender and American Higher Education." Feminist Issues 3 (Fall):3-62.

Coles, Robert, and Jane Hallowell Coles. 1978. Women of Crisis: Lives of Struggle and Hope. New York, NY: Dell Publishing.

Cotera, Martha P. 1982. Multi-cultural Women's Sourcebook: Materials Guide for Use in Women's Studies and Bilingual Multi-cultural Programs. Washington, DC: Information Systems.

Coughlin, Elen. 1984. "Women's Studies: Changing the Landscape of the Traditional Academic Disciplines." Chronicle of Higher Education 28 (August 1):5+.

Culley, Margo, and Catherine Portuges. 1985. Gendered Subjects: The Dynamics of Feminist Teaching. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan.

de Chungara, Domitila Barrios. 1978. Let Me Speak! New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

de Lauretis, Teresa. (ed.) 1986. Feminist Studies/Critical Studies. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Desia, Neera et al., 1984. "Women's Studies and the Social Sciences: A Report from India." Women's Studies International 3 (April):2-6.

DeSole, Gloria, and Leonore Hoffman. (eds.) 1981. Rocking the Boat: Academic Women and Academic Processes. New York, NY: MLA of America.

Dinnerstein, Myra, et al., 1982. "Transforming the Traditional Curriculum: Integrating Women's Studies into the Curriculum." Women's Studies

Quarterly 10 (Spring).

Du Bois, Ellen, et al., 1985. Feminist Scholarship: Kindling in the Groves of Academe. Champaign-Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

Duelli-Klein, Renate, and Shelley Minden. 1978. "Feminists in Science Peak Up: Alice Through the Microscope." Signs 14 (Autumn):1.

Ehrenreich, Barbara, and Annette Fuentes. 1984. "Life on the Global Assembly Line." in Jaggar and Rothenberg et al. (eds.) Feminist Frameworks New York, NY: McGraw- Hill.

Eisenstein, Hester. 1984. Contemporary Feminist Thought. Boston, MA: G.K. Hall.

Elliott, Joyce E., and Wilma Scott Heide. (eds.) 1984. "Feminism as a bona fide Occupational Qualification for Educators." NWSA Newsletter 2 (Sept.):8-11.

Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs, and Rose Laub Coser. 1981. Access to Power. London, ENGLAND: George Allen & Unwin.

Evans, Sara. 1980. Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Fieire, Paulo. 1974. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York, NY: The Seabury Press.

Firestone, Shulamith. 1971. The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution. New York, NY: Bantam.

Fowlkes, Diane, and Charlotte McClure. 1984. Feminist Visions: Toward a Transformation of the Liberal Arts Curriculum. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Franzosa, Susan Douglas, and Karen A. Mazza. 1984. Integrating Women's Studies into the Curriculum: An Annotated Bibliography. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Freeman, Jo. 1975. The Politics of Women. New York, NY: David McKay Co.

Freeman, Jo. 1973. "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement." American Journal of Sociology 78:4:803.

Friedan, Betty. 1982. The Second Stage. New York, NY: Summit.

Friedan, Betty. 1963. The Feminine Mystique. New York, NY: W.W. Norton Company.

Froines, Ann. 1980. "Integrating Women into Liberal Arts Curriculum: Some Results of a `Modest Survey'." Women's Studies Newsletter 8 (Fall-Winter):11.

Gates, Barbara. 1979. Changing Learning, Changing Lives. Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press.

Giddings, Paula. 1984. When and Where I Enter: The Imact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Gilligan, Carol. 1982. In a Different Voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greer, Germaine. 1985. Sex and Destiny: The Politics of Human Fertility. New York, NY: Harper-Row.

Greer, Germaine. 1971. The Female Eunuch. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Haecker, Dorothy A. 1984. "Thoughts on Feminist Teaching." Womens Studies Quarterly 2 (Spring):4-5.

Hafkin, Nancy J., and Edna G. Bay. 1976. Women in Africa: Studies in Social and Economic Change. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Henning, Margaret, and Anne Jardim. 1978. The Managerial Woman. New York, NY: Pocket Books.

Hersh, Blanche Glassman. 1985. "Making Connections with Feminism: An Oral History Project for the Senior Seminar." NWSA Newsletter 3 (Summer):16.

Hooks, Bell. 1984. Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Hooks, Bell. 1981. Ain`t I A Woman: Black Women and Feminism. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Howard, Suzanne. 1975. Liberating Our Children, Ourselves: A Handbook of Women's Studies Course Materials for Teacher Educators. Washington, DC: Washington Committee on Standard Higher Education, American Association of University Women.

Howe, Florence. 1983. "Feminist Scholarship: The Extent of the Revolution." in Bunch and Pollack (eds.) Learning Our Way. Trumsnsburg, NY: The Crossing Press.

Howe, Florence. 1982. "Liberal Education and the New Scholarship on Women." Women's Studies Quarterly. (Spring).

Howe, Florence. 1979. "Toward Women's Studies in the Eighties." Women's Studies Newsletter 8:4(Fall):2.

Howe, Florence. 1978. "Breaking the Disciplines." in The Structures of Knowledge: A Feminist Perspective. Ann Arbor, MI: The Great Lakes Colleges Assoc.

Hull, Jennifer. 1983. "Black Studies/Women's Studies: An Overdue Partnership." Off Our Backs 13 (June):5.

Hunter College Women's Studies Collective. 1983. Realities, Women's Choices: An Introduction to Women's Studies. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Jaggar, Allison, and Paula Rothenburg. 1984 Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the Relations Between Women and Men. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Johnson, Marilyn, (ed.) 1982. "Reassessments of `First Wave' Feminism." Women's Studies International Forum 7 (Fall):1.

Kerber, Linda K., and Jane DeHart Mathews. 1982. Women's America: Refocusing the Past. New York, NY: Oxford U. Press.

Kessler Harris, Alice. 1982. Out to Work: A History of Wage Earning Women in the United States. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kessler Harris, Alice. 1981. Women have Always Worked: A Historical Overview. Westbury, NY: The Feminist Press.

Kirschner, Susan, and Elizabeth C. Arch, (eds.) 1984. "Transformation of the Curriculum: Problems of Conception and Deception." Women's Studies International Forum 7:3:149-51.

Kishwar, Madhu, and Ruth Vanita. 1984. In Search of Answers: Indian Women's Voices from Manushi.

London, GB: Zed Books.

Komarovsky, Mirra. 1985. Women in College: Shaping New Feminine Identities. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Lenz, Elinor, and Barbara Myerhoff. 1985. The Feminization of America. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Leonard, V.W. 1981. "Integrating Women's History into the Secondary and College Curriculum." Social Studies 72 (Nov.-Dec.):265-70.

Lerner, Gerda. 1981. Teaching Women's History. New York, NY: American History Association.

Lougee, Carolyn C. 1981. "Women, History, and the Humanities: an Argument in Favor of the General Studies Curriculum." Women's Studies Quarterly 9 (Spring):4-7.

McIntosh, Peggy. Interactive Phases of Curriculum Revision. (Welseley Working Paper no. 12.) Welseley, MA: Welseley Center for Research on Women.

McIntosh, Peggy, and Elizabeth Kamarck Minnich, (eds.) 1984. "Varieties of Women's Studies." Women's Studies International Forum 7:3:139-48.

Martin, Elaine. 1984. "Power and Authority in the Classroom: Sexist Stereotypes in Teaching Evaluations." Signs 9 (September):482-92.

Mauss, Armand L. 1975. Social Problems as Social Movements. Philadephia, PA: Lippincott.

Meyerowitz, Ruth. 1987. Personal conversation with Director of SUNY Buffalo Women's Studies, Indiana, PA, April 23.

Milkman, Ruth, (ed.) 1985. Women, Work and Protest. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Millett, Kate. 1971. Sexual Politics. New York, NY: Bantam.

Minnich, Elizabeth Kamarck. 1985. "Friends and Critics: The Feminist Academy." in Culley and Portugese et al. (eds.) Gendered Subjects: The Dynamics of Feminist Teaching. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Moraga, Cherrie, et al., 1981. The Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color. Watertown, MA: Persephone Press.

Morgan, Robin. 1984. Sisterhood is Global. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Morgan, Robin. 1970. Sisterhood is Powerful. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Mullaney, Marie Marmo. 1983. Revolutionary Women: Gender and the Socialist Revolutionary Role. New York, NY: Praeger Special Studies.

NWSA Conference Proceeding. 1985. "NWSA: Creating Choices Through Feminist Education." NWSA Newsletter 3(Summer):11-14.

NWSA. 1983. "Feminist Education: Quality and Equality." Off Our Backs 13(Aug.-Sept.):8.

Novarra, Virginia. 1982. "Management Education: A Core for Women's Studies?" Women's Studies International Forum 5:1:69-74.

Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. Social Conflict and Social Movements. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pendergrass, Virginia E. (ed.) 1979. Women Winning: A Handbook for Action against Sex Discrimination. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Pescatello, Ann M. 1976. Power and Pawn: The Female in Iberian Families, Societies, and Culture. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Porter, Nancy. 1982. "Liberating Teaching." Women's Studies Quarterly 10 (Winter):19-24.

Radford-Hill, Sheila. 1986. "Considering Feminism as a Model for Social Change." in de Lauretis et al. (eds.) Feminist Studies/Critical Studies. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Ramesh, Jairam, and Charles Weiss, Jr. 1979. Mobilizing Technology for World Development. New York, NY: Praeger.

Reed, Beth (ed.) 1978. The Structure of Knowledge: A Feminist Perspective. (Proceedings of 4th Annual Women's Studies Conference.) Great Lakes College Assoc. Ann Arbor, MI: GLCA Women's Studies Program.

Rich, Adrienne. 1986. Disobedience and Women's Studies. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Rich, Sharon Lee, and Ariel Phillips. 1985. Women's Experience and Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review - Reprint Series no. 17.

Roberts, Helen, (ed.) 1981. Doing Feminist Research. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan.

Roberts, Joan I. 1984. "Assimilation or Integration: The Woman Student, Women's Studies and the Transmission of Women's World View." NWSA Newsletter 2 (Summer):6-13.

Robinson, Lillian. 1985. The Prism of Sex: Kindling in the Groves of Academe. Champaign-Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Rosaldo, Michelle Zimbalist and Louise Lamphere. 1974. Woman, Culture and Society. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rosenfelt, Deborah. 1984. "What Women's Studies Programs do that Mainstreaming Can't." Women's Studies International Forum 7:3:167-75.

Rowland, Robyn. 1982. "Women's Studies Courses: Pragmatic and Political Issues Concerning Their Establishment and Design." Women's Studies International Forum 5:5:487-95.

Saadawi, Nawal El. 1982. The Hidden Face of Eve: Women in the Arab World. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Sarah, Elizabeth. 1982. "Reassessments of 'first wave' Feminism." Women's Studies International Forum 5:6.

Schmitz, Betty. 1985. Integrating Women's Studies into the Curriculum: A Guide and Bibliography. Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press.

Schmitz, Betty. 1983. "Women's Studies and Project to Transform the Curriculum: a Current Status Report." Women's Studies Quarterly 11(Fall):17-19.

Schniedewind, Nancy. 1983. "Feminist Values: Guidelines for a Teaching Methodology in Women's Studies." In Bunch and Pollack (eds.) Lerning Our Way. Trumansburgh, NY: The Crossing Press.

Schuster, Marilyn R. and Susan R. Van Dyne. 1985. Women's Place in the Academy: Transforming Liberal

Arts Curriculum. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld Publishers.

Smeal, Eleanor. 1986. Personal conversation with President of NOW, Indiana PA, October 22.

Spanier, Bonnie, et al. 1980. Toward a Balanced Curriculum: A Sourcebook for Initiating Gender Integration Projects. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Co.

Spector, Malcolm and John I. Kitsuse. 1977. Constructing Social Problems. Menlo Park, CA: Cummings.

Spender, Dale. 1983. Women of Ideas: and What Men Have Done To Them. London, ENGLAND: Ark Paperbacks.

Spender, Dale. (ed.) 1981. Men's Studies Modified. New York City, NY: Pergamon Press, Athene Series.

Stimpson, Catharine. 1980. "Where Does Integration Fit: The Development of Women's Studies." In Spanier et al. (eds.) Toward a Balanced Curriculum. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Co.

Treichler, Paula A., et al. 1985. For Alma Mater: Theory and Practice in Feminist Scholarship. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

Tucker, C. DeLores. 1987. Personal conversation at NWSA Conference, Spellman College, Atlanta, GA: June 24.

Turner, Ralph H., and Lewis M. Killian. 1972. Collective Behavior, 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zald, Mayer N., and Roberta Ash. 1969. "Social Movement Organizations." In Barry McLaughlin (ed.) Studies in Social Movements. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Zinn, Maxine Baca, et al. 1986. "The Costs of Exclusionary Practices in Women's Studies." Signs 11:21:290-303.