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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction to the Research

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the educational conditions existing for women students during the initial years of coeducation in a previously all-male institution of higher education. The research involved a case study of the University of Virginia between the years 1970-1974. The study was, in addition, a "prosopography" - a collective biography of a small sample of the first-female undergraduates to attend the University of Virginia. The selection of the University of Virginia was based on its significance as a southern, state university with a strong, recognized tradition as a predominantly all-male institution. Moreover, the historical issues and events, as well as the legal ramifications, which shaped the University of Virginia's move towards coeducation in its undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences were felt to be significant in that the University of Virginia claims national visibility along with its state identity.

A 1971 study conducted at the University of Virginia
by the Student Affairs Office was to determine the general attitudes of fifty women students following their first year of resident living in a predominantly male environment. The research conducted by doctoral candidate Evelyn A. Mayer was devised to investigate the reasons a first-year woman chose to attend the University of Virginia and the extent to which a predominantly all-male institution served its initial class of first-year women. The information provided by the sample of first-year women was analyzed to identify goals for meeting the needs of female students and to establish guidelines for attaining the identified goals. One result of the study revealed that these fifty first-year women were generally satisfied with their acceptance and assimilation into the University of Virginia community and perceived no discrimination towards women students.

The intent of my research was to question the same sample group of fifty women to determine, in retrospect, their general perceptions and evaluation of their college experience. The information provided by these women was analyzed and compared with the findings of the earlier study to determine if the general attitudes of these women toward their college experience at the University of Virginia had changed fourteen years later. To this purpose, the investigation was to: (1) identify to what
extent the University of Virginia served its initial class of female undergraduate students; (2) identify, in light of the historical significance of the University of Virginia's transition to coeducation, what effect this particular environment may have had on the women's overall college experience; and (3) identify what effect attending a predominantly all-male institution may have had on the long-range goals and ambitions of the first-female students.

Important to note is what this investigation was not. While the data were collected through a questionnaire administered to a sample group of first-female students, the research was not a strict comprehensive or massive attitudinal survey. The study, instead, focused on the attitudes and opinions of a small group of women toward their college experience in the context of an historical event. The findings from the questionnaire were used to generate insights, revelations, and suggested patterns as to the University of Virginia's ability to serve its undergraduate women during the beginning years of its conversion to coeducation. Moreover, the research, presented as a collective biography and case study, had implications for institutional behavior and organizational change.
Background of the Problem

In the history of American higher education, coeducation has played a relatively recent role in the development and advancement of the modern American college and university. In the beginning college education was predominantly for men and, with few exceptions in the colleges, remained almost exclusively so until after the Civil War. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, private institutions, particularly those in the Midwest and Far West, had begun to admit women as students; and almost all public universities had gone coeducational. But among the older, more established colleges in the South and Northeast, coeducation was not a consideration until much later.

Over the past twenty years the transition from single-sex to coeducation had been more apparent among the private colleges and remaining single-sex public universities. By the late 1960's, coeducation was not only popular among the colleges but had become the "wave of the future."\(^3\) The reason for a move in this direction was both predictable and in line with the changing social values, which preceded governmental emphasis, toward greater equity for women and minorities.

A primary reason for coeducational considerations
among the private colleges was economics. Private institutions were now competing with a growing public sector that offered similar if not equal educational opportunities for students. Moreover, the traditional men's colleges in the Northeast as Colgate, Williams, Amherst, and Dartmouth, "suddenly self-conscious about sexual discrimination in academe, blushingly opened their doors to women" beginning in the early seventies. A few years earlier both Princeton and Yale Universities began to admit women in their undergraduate colleges. For Princeton the decision favoring coeducation was "taken at a time when there was beginning to be general recognition that the opportunities for the female half of the nation's population were less than equal and that this inequity meant both human denial and the loss of needed talents and skills." Among women's colleges the debate over coeducation met with much uncertainty; Vassar College, for example, was the only member of the prestigious seven sister colleges in the Northeast to admit men.

In the few remaining public single-sex institutions, the adoption of coeducation was related more to governmental pressures than to either trend, popularity, or social consciousness. Evidence of equal educational access for women began with Public Law 92-496 passed in 1972 which extended the Commission on Civil Rights' jurisdiction over
discrimination on the basis of sex. Title IX of the Education Act Amendment of 1972 and the Women’s Educational Equity Act of the Education Amendments of 1974 led to still more opportunities for women in public higher education. Further, the entrance of women into the service academies became a Congressional mandate in 1975 with Public Law 94-106 which authorized the admission of women to the United States Naval Academy, the United States Military Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy by June 1976. As such, the persistence of congressional and federal pressures toward equalizing opportunities for women steered the remaining public colleges and universities towards coeducation considerations.

In September 1970 the University of Virginia began a two-year plan to implement complete coeducation at its undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences. The plan – to admit 450 freshman women in 1970, 550 more women in September 1971, and equal admissions of all qualified students, male and female, thereafter – would end a ninety-year discussion of the University’s “responsibility to provide women a liberal education on par with that provided for men.” Moreover, the implementation of coeducation at Virginia had legal significance. On February 6, 1970 a U.S. District Court sanctioned the conversion to coeducation after it had ruled the University of Virginia’s
policies on admission of women unconstitutional on the basis of the Fourteenth Amendment.7

The entry of women to the University of Virginia on the same basis as men was a major shift in the traditional thinking of Thomas Jefferson's University. The final total enrollment of 350 first-year women in September 1970 was a part of the University's environment that had already approximately 10,000 men. Such a shift in institutional posture raises questions as to the overall educational conditions existing during the initial years of coeducation, as well as the extent to which the predominantly all-male institution served its initial class of women. Moreover, a determination of the overall effect of the coeducational experience on the first undergraduate women, and the problems they may have confronted in a predominantly all-male institution, is the basis for study.

Conceptual Framework

The research was based on the premise that female students attending coeducational institutions confront institutional or structural barriers which interfere with the quality of their undergraduate life. According to Schwartz and Lever, a woman entering college "typically brings with her a history of self doubt, conflicting
motivations, and anxieties about her social success, and these factors constitute psychological barriers to achievement. In addition, she will confront structural barriers that interfere with the quality of her undergraduate education and influence her ambitions for long-term goals."8

According to Roby, "institutional barriers" are those policies and practices found in higher education which often underrepresent female students and later hinder women's efforts to obtain advanced degrees. Such barriers include practices pertaining to student services, admissions, financial aid, student counseling, student activities, degree requirements and curriculum.9 For an example, Roby explains in the practice of student counseling, college advisors will often be known to counsel women students away from "rigorous, traditionally male courses of study, or away from advanced work of any kind."10 In the instance of the college curriculum, again women students face a set of obstacles in that course material which are often "formulated and filtered through an exclusively male perspective" virtually ignore the female perspective except when women are described in their traditional roles.11

This study examined if institutional barriers, (which
may be either strengthened or created during an institution's transition from being single-sex to coeducation) adversely affected the quality of undergraduate life for the University of Virginia's first class of female students. As such, this study was to examine the retrospective perceptions of a sample group of the first class of female students as to their college experiences eleven years after graduation and compare these perceptions with those surveyed during their first year of resident living. Aspects of college life examined included the following: academic offerings, social activities, coeducational resident hall living, advisory and counseling services provided, safety and security, food services, community acceptance and institutional tradition.

Definition of Terms

**Transitional period:** The time period immediately preceding the initiation of coeducation at a college or university, as well as the years which immediately follow the conversion.

**Institutional Barriers:** The practices, arrangements, and policies of a college or university which hinder the quality of undergraduate life for women students. These barriers include practices pertaining to student
admissions, student counseling and advisory services, degree requirements, and academic offering and curriculum. In each of these cases, women students are often misrepresented or underrepresented with regards to their initiative, abilities, needs, and potential achievements.

Coeducation: The education of students of both sexes at the same environment.12

First-female Class: The first female students to gain admission as a class member of a traditionally all-male student body.

Undergraduate Life: The institutional environment as depicted by the academic instruction as well as the community's social program. Aspects of undergraduate life include the presence of academic offerings, social activities, resident living, advisory and counseling programs, food and health services, community acceptance, and institutional tradition.

Objectives of the Instrument for the Study

The objectives of the instrument for the study were constructed from the original objectives established in the 1971 study.13 These were:

1. To determine the reason a first-female student chose
to attend the University of Virginia.

2. To determine the personal and professional ambitions of the first-female students and whether these ambitions were changed or enhanced after exposure to the University of Virginia's environment.

3. To discover the impressions of the first-female students regarding the academic offerings and effectiveness of instruction that was available to them.

4. To determine the reactions of the first-female students experiences regarding the general social atmosphere and University-sponsored activities that were available to them.

5. To discover the reactions of the first-female students regarding resident hall living during their college years. Emphasis was on the following factors:
   a. combined residence hall living
   b. residence hall counseling and advising
   c. security and general safety
   d. physical facilities
   e. food services

6. To find which counseling and advisory services were used by first-female students and determine what were their perceptions of the effectiveness of these services.

7. To discover the most difficult adjustments to
University life experienced by the first-female students.

8. To determine whether being a "minority group" at the University fostered feelings of "discrimination" or was in any way considered disadvantageous to the women students.

9. To determine the reactions of the first-female students regarding the effects coeducation may have had upon traditions at the University of Virginia.

10. To determine if the first-female students had suggestions or comments for improving the conditions that affect the life of women students in the University's community.

Limitations of the Study

The subjects of the study were limited to forty-one women from the original group of fifty first-year female students who participated in a 1971 study conducted by the Student Affairs Office at the University of Virginia. This research encompassed the years 1970 through 1985. The inclusion of fourteen years focused on four years of undergraduate studies (1970-1974) and the perceptions and evaluation of the sample population towards their college experience fourteen years later. Direct application of the data was limited to the University of Virginia's
Other limitations of the study are as follow:

* The sample group of forty-one students were participants in the original 1971 study. Random sampling was not involved in the original selection process. Selection involved name drawing from a receptacle containing the names of the 350 first-year women admitted to resident living at the University of Virginia in 1970. A total of ninety women students were sent letters asking their participation in the study before a test group of fifty subjects was achieved. Thus, any generalizations from the findings in the present research applied only to the responses for the sample group. No generalization can extend to the total population of first-female students who attended the University of Virginia beginning in 1970.

* The perceptions and evaluation of the sample population toward their college experience were made eleven years after graduation. A time lapse of this extent subjects all responses in the questionnaire to elements such as nostalgia or hindsight and must be a consideration in the findings of the research.

* The objectives of the research were investigated
through a questionnaire developed from the original set of interview questions used in the 1971 study. A preliminary study was conducted in 1971 to experiment with the interview questions and to analyze their overall effectiveness to the stated objectives of the study. No additional study was completed in the present research before the questionnaire was mailed to the same subjects.

The intent of the present research was to question a sample group of women to determine, retrospectively, their general perceptions and evaluation of their college experience. The information provided by these women was compared to the findings of the 1971 study to determine if the general attitudes of these women toward their college experience at the University of Virginia had changed fourteen years later.

An examination of the information revealed that a direct comparison of the two studies could not be valid for a number of reasons: (1) **Sample Size:** The 1971 study was conducted using 50 first-year undergraduates. While the present research intended to question the original group, only 41 names and current addresses were secured and from this number, 31 women responded to the study; (2) **Collection of Data:** The findings in the 1971 study were
collected by interviewing each subject. The present research relied on the responses of the questionnaire; (3) **Timing of the Study:** The 1971 study was conducted during the first year of coeducation at Virginia and relied on the opinions of a sample of freshmen women. The present investigation was a retrospective analysis of opinions from students about their college experience eleven years after graduation; (4) **The Questions:** The questionnaire was constructed from the original set of interview questions used in the 1971 study. In several instances, alterations to the questions, necessary to the present investigation, changed the original intent of the questions.

Because of these peculiarities in methodologies, a general comparison of related questions in each study, appearing in the aggregate, were highlighted and appear in Appendix E.

**Process of the Study**

The objectives of this study were primarily investigated through a questionnaire. Forty-one first-female students who attended the University of Virginia beginning in 1970 were mailed a copy of the questionnaire. The sample of women students was derived from the original group of fifty women students selected to participate in
the 1971 study conducted by the Student Affairs Office at the University of Virginia. Forty-one current names and addresses from the earlier sample were obtained through the University of Virginia Alumni Office and through the Office of the Dean of Students. A letter requesting possible knowledge of current addresses of the remaining nine women accompanied the questionnaire (personal data and addresses of the sample group appear in Appendix A).

The questionnaire (totaling twenty-three questions) was constructed from the original set of interview questions asked in the 1971 study. The questions focused on aspects of the students’ college life during the initial years of coeducation at the University of Virginia. Questions regarding personal reactions and evaluation of conditions affecting women students in the University community included aspects of academic offerings, social activities, coeducational resident hall living, advisory and counseling services provided for women, safety and security, food services, and the University community acceptance of coeducation and the effect coeducation may have had on the institutional tradition. In addition, questions were asked of the sample regarding (a) the type of factors which influenced their decision to attend the University of Virginia, (b) their personal and professional ambitions and whether these ambitions were affected after
attending the University of Virginia, and (c) suggestions for improving conditions that affect the life of women students in the University community (the questionnaire appears in Appendix B).

The questions, with a cover letter of explanation, were mailed to the test group on May 17, 1985. A completion date of June 25, 1985 was requested. A follow-up letter was sent to those women who had not yet responded by the completion date. A thank you letter was mailed to each participant who responded to the questionnaire (copies of these letters appear in Appendix C).

Thirty-one questionnaires were returned from the initial forty-one mailed. Two respondents were found not to have been a part of the original sample group (common names appeared in the Alumni listing). One response appeared as a hand-written letter stating the reasons for not completing the questionnaire. A total of twenty-eight questionnaires were used to compile survey data.

Three participants from the test group were chosen to be interviewed. The participants were selected based on their responses to the questions. Geographically, the women interviewed lived in Virginia (2), and Arizona (1). The interviews were open but followed the same objectives of the study. Each interview lasted approximately 30
minutes. Comments made in the interviews were incorporated into the findings of the study (Chapter Four). In addition, selected statements were included in Chapter Three.

Because the investigation was multi-faceted and only in part relied on the findings of the questionnaire, the following areas of research provided additional information: (1) an historical review of coeducation in American colleges and universities; (2) literature pertaining to selective, residential single-sex institutions and their conversion to coeducation in the 1960's and 1970's; (3) the historical development of coeducation at the University of Virginia; and (4) archival materials, including oral histories, written documents, manuscripts, involving the first years of coeducation in the undergraduate college at the University of Virginia, (5) articles reacting to coeducation at the University of Virginia appearing in student and community newspapers during the years 1970 through 1974, (6) materials collected from personal interviews with selected members of the University's administrative staff and former graduate and undergraduate students who were in attendance at the University of Virginia during the initial years of coeducation.
Summary of the Succeeding Chapters

Aspects of the study discussed in Chapter One included the purpose of the study; the background to the problem; the conceptual framework; the objectives for research; and the process of the study. The succeeding chapters include a review of the related literature in Chapter Two. The review is primarily concerned with determining the factors which are involved with an institution's transition from a single-sex status to coeducation. The examination searches the literature for possible evidence relating to the effects these factors may have had on an institution and its students during the transition towards coeducation.

Chapter Three involves an historical account of the University of Virginia's decision to admit women to its undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences and a description of the transitional years of coeducation. A summary of the data and discussion are found in Chapter Four. Chapter Five is an analysis of the research. Policy implications and conclusions are drawn, as well as possible recommendations for future study.
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The original objectives established in the 1971 study
PART ONE: The Early Years

Education for men and women together in the American colleges and universities was not a practice until the mid 1800's. In 1837, Oberlin College in Ohio became the first college to admit female students and, thus, to inaugurate coeducation. Prior to this time, and for many years after the Oberlin experiment, the formal education of men was seen as essentially different and separate from that of women. The literature on this early period in higher education explains that essentially any opportunities for women to become educated were largely through the coordinate or woman's colleges. By the end of the nineteenth century, conditions on the admissions of women in the state universities and land grant colleges around the country had improved. State universities of Iowa, Utah, and Washington had followed Oberlin College in the admission of women. By 1870, state universities of Wisconsin (1867), Kansas, Indiana, Minnesota (1869), and finally California and Michigan (1870) had gone
In these public institutions, the argument for coeducation rested with a broad philosophical notion: since men and women must live together, they should be educated together. Further, education must approximate the conditions of life. Such conditions could be obtained under a system of coeducation.

The conditions shaping the extension of coeducation in the 19th Century American college and university were strongly economical in nature. In addition, these early values favoring coeducation were based on the responsibility of the schools to provide opportunity for both sexes and to provide an environment of equalness and shared behavior. Further, "the fact that young people educated under such conditions are kept in harmony with society at large, and are prepared to appreciate the responsibilities of life" were added guarantees to the value of coeducation. Woody, in explanation of this attitude, cites the West as having a freer and more progressive attitude to the early admission of women to the colleges (than the older, more established institutions in the Northeast and South) with both the faculty and students strongly in favor of coeducation.

Cornell University provides an example of how both old and new ideals towards the education of women were represented in one institution. As the "People's College"
in central New York State, Cornell was originally intended to provide for both male and female students. Yet in 1865, the University’s Charter had no mention of women. Seeking to reside over a research institution with agricultural and industrial pursuits, Cornell’s first president, Andrew D. White, stalled on the admission of women until in 1870 a young woman, Jenny Spencer, arrived at the college doors with a state scholarship in her hands. Like many of the public universities, Cornell University was not only privately funded but received financial support from both its state and the Morrill Land Grant Act. Because of these particularities in the school’s funding Miss Spencer could not be denied entrance as Cornell’s first-female undergraduate nor could the University avoid the admission of any qualified woman thereafter.

Rudolph explains the advent of coeducation as being tied closely to the conditions of American life namely, in a climate of democracy, higher education for women drew on a tradition of educational emancipation. The growth of women’s education, Rudolph cites, was the function of two agencies: the land-grant college and, where coeducation really sprang from, the state University. Additionally, several factors were crucial to the strength and popularity of coeducation. First, a lower enrollment in men’s colleges of single denomination caused by a growing
popularity to attend state universities. Thus agreeing with Woody, Rudolph sees the support for coeducation tied closely to its economic benefits. Secondly, there was an increase in the number of women graduating from high school and wanting entrance into the colleges. Rudolph explains that as the proportion of women on the college campuses were approaching a level equal to that of men, there were growing new ideas regarding what a liberal arts education meant to them and how it may differ from a liberal education strictly for men. Coeducation, namely: "helped to divide the subjects of the curriculum and the courses of study into those which were useful, full-blooded, and manly, and those which were ornamental, dilettantish, and feminine." 9

In many of the established, all-male institutions in the Northeast and South, opposition towards coeducation remained strong. As late as 1865, "the faculty at the University of Virginia announced in its considered opinion that women were often physically unsexed by the strain of study." 10 Whitney in her study of coeducation at the University of Virginia explains that the blockage of women students at Virginia was not through the opposition of the faculty and students but grew largely from the feelings of the alumni and Board. "These men were not necessarily opposed to higher education for women; rather, they were
opposed to women receiving higher education at or near the University for fear its traditions and masculine atmosphere would be destroyed.\textsuperscript{11}

Chambliss Light’s account of the 1912 discussion on coeducation at the University of Virginia reveals that, again, opposition was largely due to the response from alumni and Board members.\textsuperscript{12} Similarly, at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire, the early attempts to admit women to the undergraduate college were blocked by the College’s governing board and by the informal recommendations of a committee created to study coeducation at the school.\textsuperscript{13} Included in the committee’s recommendation was the establishment of a women’s coordinate college as an alternative to coeducation -- a direction other established men’s colleges in the Northeast were taking. In a student newspaper at Dartmouth a writer notes: “most people of sense appear to be well satisfied that there is a propriety in not herding young men and women together in our great public institutions of learning.”\textsuperscript{14}

At Harvard opposition to women students came from the College’s President. Charles William Eliot, in his inauguration speech in October, 1869, declared himself opposed to coeducation. “The difficulties involved in a common residence of hundreds of young men and women of
immature character and marriageable age are very grave. The necessary police regulations are exceedingly burdensome."\textsuperscript{15}

Thus, while coeducation was seen as both beneficial and economical by many educators, the admission of women to the American college and university remained incomplete. McAffer's research on segregation and the women's college suggests that the early attempts of coeducation were more a toleration than an encouragement. Further, it was expected that the "established strongholds of masculinity in the East and South" would hold out against coeducation.\textsuperscript{16}

Thus, for McAfee, conditions were ripe in these regions of the country for the establishment of the women's college and coordinate college as a way of providing educational opportunities for women. "The woman's college came into being essentially because women were not welcomed in men's institutions -- a fact most women accepted with no question."\textsuperscript{17} By the end of the nineteenth century, all of the northeastern women's colleges, known as the Seven Sisters, were in operation.\textsuperscript{18}

The literature on the conditions which preceded the conversion to coeducation in many institutions of this early period in higher education supports economics and the American conscience as important contributors. In opposition to coeducation, the literature suggests the
masculine tradition, so firmly established in the colleges of the Northeast and South, as the primary obstacle against the admission of women on equal terms with men.
PART TWO: The 1960's and 1970's

New coeducational activities in the 1960's and 1970's were confined to a small number of private and public institutions. Moreover, the decisions made by these colleges and universities to convert to coeducation were complex in nature. The literature surrounding this era in higher education suggests several important factors related to the overall decision-making process: (1) Financing. Private institutions were faced with an economic future less bright than in previous decades. Public education was becoming easily accessible and was showing improved quality of education. Public education was, in addition, cheaper for the consumer; (2) With the shift from private to public education, there was an increased strain on state budgets and, eventually an added strain on the taxpayers. Private institutions were finding it increasingly difficult to raise needed money; (3) Coeducation had become advantageous for admissions offices by increasing the applicant pool of students; (4) The public, as well as colleges and universities, were becoming conscious in matters of sex and minority discrimination; and (5) There was increased governmental pressure toward providing greater equality for women and minorities.

Baker in her study on the coeducational efforts among
the prestigious "Seven Sister" colleges in the Northeast, explains that there was conflict surrounding the coeducational decisions for these institutions. In the mid-sixties, coeducation for many private institutions, had become more economically feasible than remaining single-sexed. "Vassar went coeducational not because the social conditions were finally right, but because finances dictated it. Economic determination, which too often sacrifices intellectual to housekeeping concerns, had become a persistent theme in academic administration throughout the nation."19 But selective women's colleges, as well as the all-male Ivy League schools, did not seek conversion to coeducation without considering other options first to retain their single-sex status. Vassar's decision to admit men was decided after a long drawn out and unsuccessful affair to link herself with Yale University. Similarly, the other six "sisters" went through a period of soul-searching with with regards to becoming coeducational. Barnard and Radcliffe, coordinate colleges to Columbia and Harvard, contemplated "rewriting their marriage contracts" in light of the new social factors and economic conditions that threatened their union with the main universities. To reduce duplication of educational facilities, such as faculty and curriculum, was the major consideration for merger.20
Accounts of the selective, all male colleges move toward coeducation happened after a series of cooperative experiments with surrounding women's colleges had failed.21 Dartmouth in 1968 accepted seven women as special students on an experimental plan. "For the three years previous to the ultimate coeducational decision by the Trustees, women exchange students were at the college, but under stipulation that they were not awarded a Dartmouth baccalaureate degree."22 Similarly, the decision for coeducation at Yale came after admitting women on an experimental basis.23 The interest, however, to admit Yale women on a full-time basis was first a faculty recommendation before becoming a popular student issue. In 1969, Yale admitted 500 women, equally divided among freshmen and transfer students, without reducing the number of men students.24

Coeducational considerations were not confined to the private colleges and universities. During the 1960's and 1970's, the few remaining single-sex public institutions were forced to recognize coeducation as an educational option. Decisions for conversion to coeducation, for the public college or university, were perhaps more legislative in nature than those decisions of the private sector.

In September 1970 the University of Virginia began
the first phase of a two-year plan to implement complete coeducation and thus end a ninety year period of discussion of the University's responsibility to provide education to women. In previous years discussion of coeducation in the undergraduate college of arts and sciences, was opposed to by both University trustees and alumni. Whitney's examination of the University's final move to coeducation reveals the legislative nature of the decision. On February 6, 1970, a U.S. District Court sanctioned the conversion to coeducation after it had ruled the University's policy on the admission of women unconstitutional on the basis of the Fourteenth Amendment.25

Circumstances and conditions surrounding the University of Virginia decision to go coeducational had similar overtones to those of the private sector. First, the opposition by the Board and alumni were not shared by the faculty and students. Secondly, a series of alternatives to coeducation was first considered by the University. Thirdly, a committee of both faculty and college administration organized to make final recommendations to the President and Board on the needs for the admission of women to the Undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences. Lastly, female students admitted to the undergraduate college would be in addition to the normal
enrollment of men. Women were not to replace male students.26
PART THREE: The Effects of Coeducation on Student and Institution During the Initial Transition Period

The literature on the effects of coeducation on both the institution and student is unpredictable and limited. While studies are centered around the advantages of coeducation versus single-sex education, there is little information regarding the immediate effects of coeducation on either the college or the college student during the transitional period. What evidence there is focuses on aspects of: (1) comparative academic performance between men and women in a coeducational environment; (2) short-range barriers female students may face in a coeducational arrangement; (3) institution's ability to provide for the special needs of women students; and (5) the effects of coeducation on female students and their future career decisions.

Female students are the central focus of attention in the studies regarding coeducation. The overall changes to the institutions, as a result of converting to coeducation, are rarely discussed and only with mentions to the physical changes to the institution's grounds or buildings. In these instances, it is, again, the impact of female students to the institution, particularly in the area of housing, food services, and student health services. For an example, Texas A & M, a landgrant
institution, adopted coeducation in 1969. In the following
first years of coeducation enrollment figures showed a
considerable gain in the numbers of female students.
Female representation on the Texas "Aggie" campus had
increased from 8.17% in 1969 to 25.33% in 1974. "In seven
years the formally all-male institution had acquired a
student body of 21,463 that was one-fourth female."27 Such
a noteworthy increase in student enrollment (particularly
female students) was felt in the university housing
facilities. Additionally, new attention was needed in
developing better safety conditions and adequate counseling
and student health services for women students.28

One important work on the immediate effects of
coeducation on both the institution and the first-female
students is Women at Yale29, a study of the first year of
undergraduate coeducation at Yale University during the
academic year 1969-1970. The research involved a case
study of female-male interaction and their relationship on
campus. The investigation was to determine the
difficulties a woman confronts in developing a positive
self-image as a scholar. The study was based on the
authors' belief that women entering college confront
structural barriers and these obstacles interfere with the
quality of undergraduate life and influence their ambitions
for long-range goals.30
The Yale study pointed out that while women vocalized doubts about their identity, competitive instincts, relationships between future careers and marriage, and their capabilities as scholars, the first-year women continued to praise the Yale academic experience. Further, in spite of the Yale dominant "male ethos," the women's GPA scores were slightly higher than the men's after the first academic year; and 46% of the first female class stated they planned immediate postgraduate or professional studies - a figure identical to that of their male Yale classmates.31

Women at Yale is similar to this study in its focus and objectives. Because the authors were concerned primarily with the campus and social life and not the academic experience at Yale, it is felt the research fell short of being a thorough investigation of the coeducational experience at the University. Further, the authors limited their study to the first year of coeducation at Yale with no long-range study anticipated.

Wasserman disagrees that the effects of coeducation can be accurately determined during the initial phases of conversion. In her examination of the first year of coeducation at Yale, Wasserman found that the true effects of coeducation could not be measured until the ratio of men
to women became more nearly equal. "As long as substantially fewer women than men are admitted, the women will be highly selected, causing the superwoman image to prevail. This image in itself is damaging to women students and is a source of friction between the sexes."32 Similarly, because of the small ratio of women to men, there is little opportunity for women to form friendships among themselves or with men. Thus, Wasserman would suggest that the success of coeducation, during the first year at Yale, could not be determined. This point is crucial to the present research as it cites the importance of a longitudinal study to accurately determine the effects of coeducation on the first class of female students.

In comparison, El-Khawas found in the study of academic development during college that even though men and women entering college similarly aspire to go on to graduate school and into professional careers, women lose much of this ambition during the undergraduate years. Further, the investigation, based on data collected during the initial years of the merger between Brown University and its coordinate college, Pembroke, found more women than men experiencing a drop in grades from high school to college especially in courses in biological and physical sciences. Male students, in addition, were better prepared for graduate school than the female students.33 What is
important in this research is the suggestion that women may be at a disadvantage in a coeducational setting because they tend to underestimate their overall abilities.

But while an institution must provide the necessary academic provisions for its first-female students, the social climate it creates may pose difficulties and barriers for adequate relationships to develop between students. A study conducted at Dartmouth College on the initial feelings of the first-female class toward coeducation revealed the Dartmouth women were generally content with the academic side of the college. The majority of the students ranked the quality of teaching, course and program offerings, and academic facilities as "good" or "excellent." Negative comments revolved around the campus life. Many voiced disapproval protesting "immature Dartmouth males," "no female friends," and "an outdated dating system," as some of the difficulties they encountered. Overall, complaints fell under the categories of: (1) lack of women friends; (2) the uneven ratio of men to women students; (3) a distaste for fraternities and the social life that function around them.34

By comparison, "Women at the University of Virginia," a study of first year undergraduate coeducation at Virginia, was to determine the extent to which the
predominantly all-male institution was fulfilling the needs of its initial class of first year women. Findings suggested that the women, in the first year, were satisfied with their acceptance in the Virginia's community and they perceived no discrimination towards women students. The study, however, was conducted only on fifty of the first women residents and completed within the narrow period of the first year of residence. Emphasis was strong on aspects of campus life rather than the curricular and academic facilities. Further, because the study was done early in the conversion to coeducation the significance of the responses may be in question.

An aspect of considerable importance in the conversion to coeducation is how the entrance of women into a predominantly all-male environment alters the mission or posture of an institution. Moreover, how significant are the differences between male and female expectations of an institutional environment and how do these differences affect the acceptance of policies and the openness towards the initial enrollment of female students.

On October 8, 1975, President Gerald Ford signed Public Law 94-106 which authorized female enrollment into the United States Naval Academy, the United States Military Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy. A study conducted during the initial years of coeducation comparing
the expectations of the Class of 1980 female and male midshipmen entering the United States Naval Academy's intellectual-social-cultural environment as elicited through the College and University Environment Scales (CUE II) found no differences in expectations between female and male students. Findings of the study strongly suggested both female and male plebes expected the same predominant characteristics in the academy's environment with regards to both high academic achievement and cultural emphasis. Evidence from the study further indicated that the United States Naval Academy is a unique institution with a salient and distinctive image. The entrance of women into its environment showed that the environment rather than the females' expectations had a greater impact on the initial assimilation of coeducation. Neuberger's study is contradictory to past findings. CUE II Scale scores have consistently shown differences to distinguish male from female expectations across various American colleges and universities. The significance of this study is its suggestion that a strong and distinctive mission of an established all-male institution may not be changed by the admission of women students. Women students may rather be assimilated into the existing environment without evidence of alteration to the institution. The evidence is important to this study because the University of Virginia,
prior to 1970, had been recognized as having a strong, conservative tradition as a men's college and university.

An important consideration facing an institution during its transition to coeducation is whether it is able to meet the needs of its new students and it is able to provide for the equal treatment of both sexes. In traditional coeducational institutions, studies have found an inability to provide women equal educational opportunities on par with that provided for men. Conway, in her examination of coeducation and institutional treatment of the sexes, writes: "The problem is that the mechanism of coeducation, though it appears on the surface the simplest road to equitable treatment of the sexes, conceals within itself many difficulties and obstacles in the way of achieving this goal, though few educational theorists or educational historians have paid serious attention to them." These obstacles appear in the content of the curriculum; the opportunity for women scholars to participate in research activities of the universities; and in providing similar patterns of career development for men and women into the "professional elites of society." Further, Conway points out that the decade 1964-1974 was one in which coeducation, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, failed to bring women into positions of authority in the definition and transfer
of learning. While it remains difficult to measure an institution's success or failure in providing equitable educational opportunity in the treatment of the sexes during the transitional period of coeducational conversion, there is little suggestion in the literature that attempts to determine this dimension was considered.

Supporting Conway's claims are the authors of "The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One For Women," a comprehensive survey of the policies and practices in today's colleges towards women students. Written in conjunction with the Project on the Status and Education of Women, the paper was intended to help faculty, students, and administrators become aware of the subtle - "and not-so-subtle" - ways in which women students are often treated differently than their male counterparts. It summarizes: "Despite women's gains in access to higher education - especially since the passage of Title IX - women undergraduates and graduate students may not enjoy full equality of educational opportunity on campus. Indeed, women's educational experiences may differ considerably from those of men, even when they attend the same institutions, share the same classrooms, and work with the same graduate advisors."40

In studies centering on single-sex institutions one important focus has been the aspect of adequate role models for female students. In her study on achievement output of
women, Tiball found that when graduates from women's colleges were compared to women who attended coeducational institutions, there was greater achievement among those who attended single-sex institutions. Tiball felt the difference was in role models citing a correlation between the number of women faculty and women students to that of increased output of career-successful women graduates. Moreover, and what is significant to the present research, is Tiball's statement that traditionally all-male institutions such as Princeton or Dartmouth, who claimed to provide equal educational opportunities for its female undergraduates, anticipated a target size for women enrollment greater than 1,000 while their status of women faculty (and these figures would relate to the transitional period of coeducation) would provide a ratio of barely 31/1,000.41

Research on the status of women students in traditional coeducational or single-sex institutions provide a comparison to colleges and universities which have in recent years become coeducational. The findings suggest that while the decision to admit women is seen to be in the best interest of both students and institution, the degree of success, while varying among institutions, often is heavily weighted down by the more traditional image of the role of women in higher education.
Chapter Summary

The literature on the effects of coeducation on the institution and the first-female students, during the initial transition period of conversion, may be summarized around the following observations. The focus of the literature is on the effects on the women students. Particular attention is given to the social aspects of college and campus life rather than academic integrity and student self-fulfillment. In addition, the literature suggests little support that institutions were able to meet the needs of their first female students. The uneven balance between men and women on campus allowed for little opportunity for female students to build student relationships and often instead caused conflict between the sexes. Moreover, the literature, while it provides information on the initial period of coeducation and some effects of coeducation on student and institution, does not indicate attempts made by researchers to study the long-range effects of coeducation on either the college or the college student.

A historical account of the University of Virginia's decision to admit women to its undergraduate colleges and a description of the transitional years of coeducation follow in Chapter Three.
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CHAPTER THREE

The First Years of Coeducation at the University of Virginia 1970 - 1974

The Development of Coeducation

In February 1970 the University of Virginia's plan for the admission of women to its undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences was approved by a special three-judge federal court. The plan involved a two-year scheme for the gradual admission of women to the college beginning in September 1970. By the Fall of 1972 the entrance of women into the University would not be restricted and would be on the same basis as men. The University of Virginia's final decision to implement complete coeducation marked not only the end of a lengthy institutional wide debate over the University's responsibility to educate women but also the admission of women into the undergraduate colleges was perhaps the most important resolution in the history of the institution.

Founded by Thomas Jefferson, the University of Virginia began instruction in 1825. Its first students, numbering 123, were a part of a dramatically new approach
to higher education as the University was the first state
college of its kind to be "dedicated to the education of
leaders in practical and public services."² Today, the
University of Virginia consists of 10 schools offering
bachelor degrees in 52 fields and programs, the master's in
93, the educational specialist in six fields, the doctorate
in 53, and the first professional degree in two areas. The
total enrollment exceeds 16,000 students, including
approximately 11,000 undergraduates. Women make up over
one-half of the student body with an even ratio of men and
women students in the undergraduate classes.³

Although in the 1980's coeducation at the University
of Virginia is "firmly and happily entrenched" in the
community, the University was the last state-supported
school, nationally, to admit women.⁴ As late as 1910 the
three state colleges - William and Mary, Virginia Military
Institute, and the University of Virginia - remained all
male.⁵ At the University of Virginia, attempts to foster
coeducational "feelings" began as early as 1880 with the
faculty recommending to the College the admission of women
students. Finally, in 1920 the Board of Visitors altered
its decision against coeducation and allowed women over
twenty years of age to enter the professional and graduate
school. Fifty years later the University of Virginia
agreed to the entrance of women into the undergraduate
Advocacy for coeducation in the undergraduate colleges gained strength by the late 1960s. University of Virginia's President Edgar Shannon sought approval from the Board of Visitors the recommendation to study the "need for the admission of women to the College of Arts and Sciences." A Special University Committee on the Admission of Women to the College of Arts and Sciences, headed by Professor T. Braxton Woody, was appointed on May 26, 1967. The Committee's Report recommending the enrollment of women to the colleges was presented to the Board of Visitors in November 1968.

The Committee gathered the opinions of lawyers, University faculty and students, and alumni. Starting with the legal aspects of coeducation, the Committee reported that there was no positive evidence that a court "might hold that women cannot be excluded from the College of Arts and Sciences"; but more importantly to consider, it summarized, was that "the problem of discrimination has legal as well as moral implications."

Some 700 faculty members were sent letters requesting their opinions with regards to the need for the admission of women to the undergraduate colleges. Only 157 replies were received of which 141 favored coeducation, 9 were
opposed and 7 had no real preference. Among the replies of the faculty were comments expressing both the social and academic necessity of admitting women students as well as the beneficial aspects of coeducation to the University community.

The presence of women would improve the educational process considerably, would represent a challenge to the intellectual development of our men, and would also help in the natural development of the character and personality of both men and women.

I am concerned over the somewhat unreal sexual relations which seem to be caused by the present imbalance between males and females in the university community. In my opinion the adjustment problems of the entering college student are difficult enough today without our placing him in too artificial an environment. And if he is going to be competing either with women or for them for the rest of his life, why shouldn't he do so at the first stages of his advanced intellectual and social career?

The Woody Committee, as it was called, felt polling the entire student body was not feasible. Instead, various student organizations and societies on campus were asked to submit opinions on the admission of women to the college. Replies from the students were mixed but in general agreement toward the need for coeducation at the University. A somewhat disheartening lack of response came from the alumni. From the approximately 40,000 alumni polled, the Committee received only 98 replies from which 29 approved coeducation and 69 were opposed. Comments in
opposition to the admission of women "generally expressed a desire to preserve the status quo, the sanctity of our time-honored traditions, and the uniqueness of the University as one of the few remaining male sanctuaries."13

While it was the opinion of the majority of the Committee, after study, that there existed the need for the admission of women to the College of Arts and Sciences, they, in addition to this recommendation, presented their concerns over the possible negative effects coeducation may have on the University. Their reservations included: (1) The possible effect on the Honor system. That is, the entry of women to the College would hurt the existing Honor System; (2) The possible effect on women's colleges in Virginia. Competition for highly qualified women students would have an adverse effect on other state-supported and private colleges for women in Virginia; (3) The possible diminishment of alumni and student support in opposition to coeducation; (4) The possible diminishment of separate educational opportunities for both men and women students; and (5) The possible diversion of University developmental resources; coeducation would make substantial demands on already limited resources.14

In the Committee's opinion, the principal factors which lead to their recommendation overrode most problems.
The principal factors included in their statement were: (1) the present arrangement unfairly discriminated against women by denying them equal opportunities as with men; (2) the social life would improve for students of both sexes under coeducation; and (3) the quality of academic life would be strengthened by the admission of women to the colleges.15

On December 14, 1966 the Board of Visitors received the Woody Report. The document and its recommendation were never acted upon by the Board. Rather a request was made to the President of the University to continue studying the "feasibility of the recommendations" with the understanding that the Board would act at their February Meeting.16

In February 1969 the Board of Visitors agreed to rescind the resolution on the admission of women but plans for the implementation of coeducation were never discussed. Three months later, on March 29, 1969, the American Civil Liberties Union of Virginia filed suit in the Federal Court in Richmond charging that the University of Virginia was discriminating against women in its admission program. The President and Board of Visitors answered the lawsuit in September, 1969 with a plan for the admission of women to the college whereby in 1980 women would comprise 35% of the undergraduate student body. The ACLU lawyers found the scheme to impede total and equal admission of women to the
University. Thus, in February of 1970 a new two-year plan for the implementation of coeducation at the University of Virginia was approved by the Federal court. A declaration of change in policy towards the formal admission of women to the undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences appeared in the Board of Visitor Minutes on October 30, 1969 stating:

That the restrictions heretofore placed on the admission of women to the undergraduate schools at Charlottesville be and they hereby are unconditionally removed, so that there be no resolution on admission of women applicants to the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, including, without limitation, its College of Arts and Sciences and other undergraduate schools, other than the same restrictions imposed upon male applicants for admission to such schools, provided, only, that the number of women may be limited during such temporary transition period as may be determined necessary by the Board for the implementation of this resolution; and that all such applicants shall be considered irrespective of their sex.18

Several months later the student newspaper, The Cavalier Daily, printed the following editorial regarding the change in the admission status of women to the University:

As the University approaches the advent of undergraduate coeducation which will begin next fall, there are some feelings of apprehension, confusion, and bafflement among students, faculty and administrators on the subject. No one in Charlottesville can say, at least with conviction and reliability, what
problems will be faced next year and how they all should be handled to alleviate any strains that could develop. There is a sense of the "great unknown."

It continues:

We must remember that the University is no longer a men's school allowing lucky women entrance, but an institution where both sexes may "follow truth, wherever it may lead."

Again we call upon the University to intensify its study and planning for coeducation so that we may lead in the light and not follow blundering in the dark.19

The conditions the first 350 first-female students encountered as they entered as freshmen in September of 1970 will be the basis of this chapter.

Role Models: Princeton and Yale Universities

The University of Virginia's decision to admit women in 1970 was not a decision prompted solely on the recommendations of the Woody Committee. Paralleling the Report were the plans at both Princeton and Yale Universities to go coeducational. In 1968 the Princeton Report on Coeducation was released which made a strong case favoring full coeducation. Faced with a changing national stance towards greater opportunity for women, the Report stated:

"We believe that for Princeton to remain an all-male institution in the face of today's
evolving social system would not be keeping with the past willingness to change with the times; it would be to go back on her tradition of seizing every opportunity to improve the quality and relevance of the education she provides."20

After considering a coordinate merger with Vassar College, Yale University found the admission of women to its own campus the only plausible alternative. Thus, in September 1969 both universities opened their doors to their first undergraduate women.

At Princeton 177 women, divided evenly between freshmen and transfer students, were admitted the fall semester creating in the student body a ratio of 20:1, men to women.21 President Kingmen Brewster at Yale University proposed that the college initially limit coeducation and according to plan, 500 women were admitted - 250 freshmen girls and 250 transfer students.22

Since both Princeton and Yale held long-standing traditions of being exclusively male colleges, and both approximated the same number of male undergraduates as did the University of Virginia, their plans for the admission of women (and the speed to which they were to be admitted) were eagerly reviewed by members of the Virginia community. Moreover, as the University of Virginia approached the advent of undergraduate coeducation in 1970, the lessons
which could be learned from Yale and Princeton were of great importance to the College.

As role models the problems each of the universities faced in their initial years of coeducation were exemplary for the University of Virginia. Princeton, where size, tradition, and type of students more closely resembled Virginia's community, overwhelmingly received the bulk of attention and criticism from Charlottesville. Noted The Cavalier Daily, "Probably the central difficulty which is connected to all of the specific problems that have developed (since coeducation took place at Yale and Princeton) is the general attitudes of many of the people who are connected with the universities in a variety of positions from students to alumni." Further, "The girls at Yale and Princeton are regrettably regarded as exceptions and not as contributing elements in the growth and understanding of each individual student."23

Criticism often cited by Virginia was that both Yale and Princeton faced a deterioration of relations between men and women students because of an initial "unrealistic expectation about coeducation" leading to "the return of the practice by the male students of finding female companionship and comfort outside the walls of the university." In addition, as the numbers of women students increased, the universities were assured of an
intensification of their housing crisis and a fear of loss in quality of education as a result of the growth in seminars and classes.24

Yet problems faced by both Princeton and Yale during the initial period of coeducation were neither unexpected nor unmanageable. Nor were these problems any different or more difficult than the ones the University of Virginia would encounter during its own transition to coeducation. The shortage of student housing caused by the influx of female undergraduates; the swelling of classes and lectures halls which threatened the overall quality of education; and, most obviously, the difficulty for the institution to accept change and, thereby, to accept, for the first time in its history, women as part of the undergraduate student body, was in no way easy for the individual universities.

In retrospect, the establishment of coeducation at Princeton and Yale is regarded as a success at least in overall numbers. In 1969 the enrollment of the undergraduate women at Princeton comprised only 4% of the student body. A decade later this figure had risen to 36%.25 In addition to enrollment figures, women at Princeton have since become well entrenched in the campus life, willing to assume leadership roles in “almost every position of major responsibility open to general
competition at Princeton."26 Most profound, however, is the effect coeducation has had on the academic life both in course election and majors as well as a variety of effects on classroom discussion, course content and the curriculum in general.27 The 1980 President’s Report on Coeducation notes:

The overall impact that coeducation has had on Princeton is of course far greater than what can be seen through the experiences of any single generation of students. Most fundamentally, coeducation has demonstrated that Princeton has the institutional capacity to change in important respects while at the same time preserving and strengthening its essential attributes."28

A decade after Yale University enrolled female undergraduates, its alumnae generally agreed "women are now comfortable at Yale, although they have their gripes."29 By 1979, women made up 45% of the undergraduate freshmen and 38% of the total university population. As the "superwomen" disappears from the image of the Yale "coed," women have become involved in all University activities. Perhaps the single greatest complaint expressed by women students is the overall number of women faculty. Only 4% of the tenured faculty at Yale in 1980 were women. But in looking back ten years after Yale became coeducational, it was felt by most alumnae and undergraduates alike, "the entry of women turned this place into a true University."30
While the University of Virginia has observed and shared in the Princeton and Yale experience, its own experience with becoming coeducational may be considered different in three ways. First, the University of Virginia is a state supported institution rather than a private university. Its student body is largely made up of Virginia residents and its selection as a college choice is due partially to state supported and lower in-state tuition. As a state school, the University of Virginia has a strong commitment to public education. Secondly, the University of Virginia is geographically located in the South. While it has shared with both Princeton and Yale a long history of being an all male college, its southern heritage is equally strong. The role its "southernness" played in the initial acceptance of women as undergraduate students is an important consideration to the overall success of coeducation. Thirdly, the final reason the University of Virginia moved in the direction to accept women in 1970 was not due to either economic difficulties, self-improvement, or because of a need to keep with changing social values. Rather, the prompt decision towards coeducation was based on external pressure - namely, a state and federal mandate and charges against the University's admission policy of discrimination against women.
These three points of difference make the conversion to coeducation at the University of Virginia unique. A discussion of the implementation policies as set by the University as well as the initial years of coeducation are what follow.

Coeducation at the University of Virginia: 1970-1974

The establishment of undergraduate coeducation at the University of Virginia affected virtually every aspect of the University community. The 350 selected women who would enter in 1970 faced an environment in a state of frantic change. There was the problem of how to arrange for their housing and residence quarters; the implementation and expansion of University policies including changes to admission standards and financial aid; the arrangement of new safety and security measures deemed more appropriate for women students; and, most obviously, there was the overall tension in the community as to what women would eventually do to the University’s 150 year tradition.

An equal concern (and of particular interest here) was, in light of the historical significance of the University of Virginia’s transition to coeducation, “what effect this particular environment may have on the quality of education for the first-class of female students?” A
discussion of the implementation of new standards to the University as well as the many alterations made to the existing grounds and campus during the first years of coeducation may offer insight as to the University of Virginia ability to serve its first-class of undergraduate women.

Admissions:

The suggested formula for the initial entry of women into the University of Virginia's undergraduate colleges was to be limited. 450 women were to be admitted in 1970, 550 in 1971, and equal admission of all qualified students, both male and female, thereafter. The approach for admitting women included a plan whereby coeducation would be achieved by adding women to the current enrollment of men. The two-year transition period was considered a feasible time frame with the number of women eligible for admission representing maximums board members believed the University could initially accommodate.31

Both the claims for the needed "transition period" and the admissions approach to add women to the enrollment were concerns for members of the student body. The Student Council Committee on Coeducation advocated in their report to University officials that women should be enrolled as a
part of the entry class and not in addition to male students, thereby alleviating any possible escalation in the enrollment until "the University was prepared to handle the increasing numbers without injury to the quality of undergraduate education." Students efforts, however, did not change the adopted plan for admission. In the Fall of 1970, women were to make up an additional 9.7% of the regular male enrollment.

In less than one year, coeducation at the University of Virginia as an educational option for women was in ascent. Applications from women had increased more than 150 percent from the first year. Dean of Admissions at Virginia, Dr. Ern stated: "For the undergraduate school alone, 2500 women have applied, a comparison to 1970's total of 550." Further, "The women who are applying are well qualified. Statistically, the men and women are even closer this year, and we thought we were already pretty evenly matched."

An important study conducted by the Student Affairs Office in 1971 found that first year women were satisfied with the enrollment procedures that had been followed in admitting 350 women the initial year; but they felt future Virginia enrollment should move towards a more equal male-female ratio by admitting more women and by decreasing the number of entering men.
By the end of the two-year transition period, women comprised 39% of the entry class and the college was 45% female. Moreover, these figures were to continue to rise. At the beginning of the 1974 Fall semester, the first-year class of 2,317 was 42% female. Coeducation at the University of Virginia had been achieved, at least in numbers.

_Housing and Security:_

The arrangement of housing for the new "coeds" was perhaps the single greatest concern for school officials. The problems extended beyond the consideration of available space to the larger questions of parietal hours, coeducation or combined resident housing, and, finally, security. In long range planning, the University of Virginia was assured of being faced with a similar crisis as did both Princeton and Yale Universities. With the influx of women students, Virginia would see a "housing crunch by 1973" with enrollment predicted to reach 2200 in 1972 and jump to 3185 by 1980.

The initial plans for dormitory facilities called for both undergraduate and graduate women to live in the Alderman Road area. In addition, preparation for female
students to occupy traditionally all-male dormitories was to begin immediately. Associate Dean of Students Annette Gibbs remembered getting ready for the entry of women: "The court action moved up the conversion to coeducation by two years. We had no prior set ideas of what was needed to be done. Getting ready mostly took place behind the scenes. The physical concerns were first with new lighting, draperies, etc. to be added to the dorms and landscaping around the grounds. The biggest concern, however, was the plumbing and the bathrooms. The University had no female rest rooms available to students. These changes took four years before they were accomplished." 38

Some aspects of the previously all-male sanctuaries on Alderman Road could not be easily altered. In The Cavalier Daily these conditions were described:

For those who have never been in a suite of the new dorms, the bathrooms contain one urinal. Without the urinal, facilities let are adequate to meet the needs of ten women. But, what to do with the one urinal? Rumor has it that housing decided to leave the urinals, but added a bouquet of flowers to each one. This solved the problem neatly, but one wonders if the Housing Office considers the women to be a passing phase, their demise necessitating only the removal of the bouquet. 39

The decision to have coeducational or combined-resident living arrangements met strong objections from alumni, parents, and students. The majority of concerns
were identified with regards to safety and privacy interest for the new women undergraduates. Prior to the admission of women, the Student Council Committee on Coeducation stated:

Some of the most important arguments in favor of co-ed dorms are social rather than security or privacy arguments. The primary argument presented is that co-ed dorms will create a more natural atmosphere for normal associations and will lead to a better assimilation of women into the University life. The major consideration felt by men and women undergraduates were, while co-ed dorms will increase natural inter-relationships based on friendship and common interests. Yet the social concerns of women must also be considered. The privacy considerations is most important - in our society women are taught privacy more than men. Women may not want men around their rooms and suites as much as men want women around. The real answer to this question cannot be found until women arrive.40

In her study, Mayer questioned the opinions of new first-year women with regards to their living arrangements and found that some parents still worried about the degree of safety in the dormitories as well as the lack of restrictions in residence housing.41 To accommodate these concerns, the Student Affairs Office developed a Campus Escort Service for the women students. The service was to provide women transportation within the grounds as well as into the Charlottesville community.

Regardless of parental and alumni objections, the
first-year women generally favored coeducational housing. The Student Affairs Office cited that women felt relatively safe and secure in the resident halls. In addition, coeducational living was strongly preferred over the tradition single-sex dormitory arrangement. It was strongly recommended by the sample of first-class women that there be an expansion of coeducational resident halls, converting more dormitories facilities to combine resident living.42

One member of the first class stated that the coeducational dormitories created a more natural relationship between men and women students. "I got to be chummy with the men. This was, in part, due to the housing arrangement. U.Va put all the girls approximately in the same area - stay together and stick together! I was in the only co-ed dorm - all freshmen and all Echols Scholars (except my floor). Housing, therefore, played a big part in who you got to know and hung around with." Not all comments regarding coed dorms were favorable. One woman commented that the coeducational arrangement was a misnomer. "The dorm is organized horizontally with little vertical movement between floors. Realistically, this is not coeducational living but rather like living in an apartment or hotel."43

Another first-year woman stated the "suite
arrangement" to accommodate first and second year women, "physically created separation among the women. There was no whole dorm interaction. In my 3rd and 4th year I lived in Mary Munford. Even then there was a lot of isolation among the women. No floor meeting or gathering took place. (It was as if) we were programmed not to get together - it was not a cool thing to do."

By the second and third year of coeducation at Virginia, there was strong discussion over the removal of the remaining single-sex dorms for women. President Shannon, in reply to a petition for the conversion of these dormitories, stated he would continue to hold Roberta Gwathmey House and the new section of Mary Munford for women. In the President's housing proposal a portion of the entering first-year women would be housed in Gwantmey and that the same number of upper-class would be placed in one of the dormitories in the Alderman area:

This would permit the first-year women who preferred such an arrangement an opportunity to associate with upper-class women, while the upper-class women would enjoy and benefit from essentially being big sisters to these first-year students.44

Regardless of the advantages of both single-sex dorm arrangements versus coeducational residential living, the University of Virginia was to continue to accommodate its
female students with both options. Dabney explained: "President Shannon felt that students should have the choice of living in mixed dormitories or in those reserved for a single sex, and he saw to it that they had the opportunity to choose. Nationwide changes in the mores concerning relations between the sexes had brought about a brand-new situation at Virginia and at nearly all other colleges and universities."

It may be assumed that the first women students generally found their living arrangement both pleasant and within their expectations. With the exception of needed security and safety measures, women felt safe on campus. Institutionally, housing would continue to be a problem for the University of Virginia. But the housing crisis or "crunch" created during the first years of coeducation forced the establishment of new institutional-wide guidelines which were in a positive direction for the successful assimilation of women students at the University of Virginia.

Academic Instruction and Curriculum:

One of the principal factors leading to the Woody Committee's decision favoring coeducation in the undergraduate colleges was in their conclusion that "the
quality of academic life in the University at Charlottesville would be strengthened by coeducation. Admission of women would raise the overall level of the student body, give it a new intellectual dimension and, at the same time, give new vigor to some branches of the curriculum." Changes to the curriculum and anticipated effects to both departments and course offerings, as a result of the entry of women in the Fall of 1970, led students, administration, and faculty alike into discussion of what first details needed to be dealt with.

One caution of the student body was directed towards the increase in the enrollment possibly creating a decrease in the overall quality of the academic instruction. Moreover, since it was generally agreed upon that growth in departments and courses would depend greatly on the preference of entering women, students were troubled by the seemingly lax stance taken by some academic departments (and the College administration) toward the allocation of new resources to alleviate inadequacy in the curriculum. "Many departments in the College are taking an easy attitude toward the changes coeducation should bring about in their own courses and approaches." Just as important a problem as the allocation of resources for change in the curriculum was the need for change and growth in the faculty. The Student Committee on
Coeducation advocated that, in light of the advent of coeducation, there was a "definite need for a large increase in the number - and percentage - of women faculty members." 48

Many of the cautions of the Student Committee became real concerns for the first class of women. Based on the opinions of a sample of women collected during the first year of coeducation, guidelines for meeting the needs of the first-year women and for improving conditions within Virginia's new environment of coeducation were devised. Among these guidelines were needed improvement in the academic instruction and professional staff and services. Recommendations included:

1. Since desires were apparent for smaller classes and closer contact with professors, an increase in the number of academic faculty should be considered.

2. Since larger lecture classes were regarded as ineffective, curricular revisions should be undertaken to provide more seminar sessions.

3. Since requests were conveyed for additional courses to meet curricular interests of women students, efforts should be devoted toward determining the degree of interest in specific courses and toward making desirable additions to the curriculum. 49

Need for greater flexibility and expansion in the curriculum became more apparent as the first class of women
advanced into their junior and senior years. "One reason the College wanted to wait on its implementation to coeducation was because she wanted to gain from Princeton's mistakes," explained Dean Gibbs. "The kind of student the University attracted was similar academically and socially to the student Princeton would attract. In addition, the first class of women were academically better than their male classmates. Even in the sciences, the women did as well as the men. There was not a problem in the academic program until the 3rd and 4th year. These first women desired other courses than what were being offered or made available by the College."50

The attitude of the male faculty toward women students appeared initially to be a greater problem than the inadequate curriculum. "The older male faculty did not want to see women in their classroom, admitting these students would be trouble in class," stated Gibbs. "But after a few years, the same male faculty found that women were not any trouble and, in fact, enjoyed having academic dialogue with them."51

One member of the first class of women stated that while she found the academic program to be satisfying and had, overall "a good experience with professors," there were some troubling incidences. "During my freshman year I took a French class and no male student would sit next to
me." Later, as a declared architecture major, she remembered in class "the professor critiqued the assignments of the male students while with the women he talked about cooking."

Regardless of the barriers of inadequate curriculum and the initial estrangement from male faculty, the first class of women students - and women admitting thereafter - generally accelerated academically. One measure of this success was in the increased number of women who participated in the Echols Scholars program (a program designed to meet the individual interest of exceptionally able entering students to the University). Beginning in the Fall of 1971, 27 first-year women joined the program - a significant increase to the 17 women included in the program the first year of coeducation in the undergraduate colleges.52

Social and University-sponsored Activities:

To the women students who were admitted to the University of Virginia in 1970, it looked as though the college had not prepared for their entrance. "This would be a justifiable statement," stated Gibbs, "President Shannon wanted the conversion to coeducation to go well. He, however, had two objectives in the transition. First,
he wanted the rich tradition of student self-governance at Mr. Jefferson's University to come to mean the same thing to women as it did to men. Secondly, he wanted women to be treated exactly like men."53 The results of both meant a hard transition for the first-female class. "In the beginning, there were no women sports, no sororities, no service support, no women honors group, no women faculty (there was less than a 7:1 male to female ratio existing among the faculty and only two women in the administration). Shannon said he didn't want the first class of women to be pigeon-holed with regards to their needs and wants. Rather let the women tell us what they wanted."54

What exactly the specific needs and desires of the female students were not known among themselves and it took some time before there was communication with the University. "These first girls were bright, articulate and trailblazers - whether they wanted to be or not. At first the girls didn't seem to want anything."55

"In the absence of sororities and intramural sports the outside community of Charlottesville became involved to help provide the girls with something to do. Many of the churches and synagogues extended themselves as support groups outside the classroom," explained Gibbs.56 One of
the more popular off-campus activities among the women was the Madison Hall Big Sister Program, a volunteer group providing tutoring to Charlottesville young women.

"What impressed me the most about U.Va was the volunteer system. It was a wonderful network of services - ahead of its time," remembered one member of the first class. "It could only be enhanced by women and, therefore, reach a larger population. I was an active volunteer for four years acting as a big sister to little black girls in the area. I also tutored in the high school."

By their 2nd and 3rd years the students began to express their own needs and wishes. The establishment of intramural and intercollegiate sports were among the activities desired by members of the first class. Based upon the polled opinions of students, The Student Affairs Office suggested to Administration the expansion of necessary facilities and professional staff to offer a diversified program of women athletics. Intramural and intercollegiate field hockey were the first sports activities to be established.

Whether to have sororities on the grounds or not remained to be a heated topic. "Alumni involvement to help the first class of women became more of a hindrance than a help particularly as it pertained to sororities on
the Grounds. The girls received too much pressure from National Groups. Their response, Don't call us, We'll call you." remembered Gibbs. The sororities of the day meant "white gloves and tea and not what the new group wanted. I wanted the girls themselves to initiate the interest in sororities."58

Why did not women at the University of Virginia ever become enthusiastic about sororities? Part of the reason could be explained by the type of women who attended the University. A still greater reason for the ill popularity of women fraternities at the University of Virginia was due to the suite living arrangement for first-year women. "By the time the women have entered their second year and are permitted to seek off-grounds housing," stated Gibbs, "many of them are tired of living in a group atmosphere."59

In 1975 only five sororities, including two unofficial and unchartered social sororities, existed on the grounds and claimed about 90 members - a small fraction of the total undergraduate female enrollment. In comparison to this figure, it was estimated that nearly 50 percent of all undergraduate men belong to fraternities.60

The establishment of other types of social programs and organizations for women was slower than athletic activities. One reason, even though the restriction
against the admission of women among various societies and organizations were soon to be dropped, was that many of the women were hesitant to join some of the traditionally all-male organizations feeling as though they were intruding in male dominant turf. Dabney cites, "The Ravens, IMPs, and Tilkas soon took them (women) in, as did the Air Force ROTC. The Jefferson Literary Society maintained its male chauvinist stance until 1972, when the threat of a suit caused it to relent. Omicron Delta Kappa leadership society began electing women in 1974. Eli Banana, the last holdout of importance, had not admitted any by that year and gave no evidence of planning to do so in the future. The privilege of living on the Lawn and Ranges was accorded to leading women students in the early seventies.‘61

Thus, of the many open barriers women students faced their first years, the lack of women activities was perhaps the greatest single barrier. This was due partially to the implementation of coeducation being advanced by two years; partially because of the stance taken by President Shannon to keep all options open to the first women; and perhaps partially because of the general hesitation of the women students not to override the long standing traditions of the University. But to obtain their own activities and to belong to existing organizations, these first women had become "trailblazers - whether they wanted to be or not."
Institutional Traditions:

One of the concerns members at the University of Virginia had about a move towards coeducation was its possible threat to the University’s long-standing traditions. Just as change to an institution can effect the overall quality of education for women students so can, in turn, the presence of women effect the traditions of an institution. The traditions of the University of Virginia generally include "coats-and-ties, fraternities, road-tripping, the 'Virginia Gentleman,' drinking, 'big weekends,' and the Honor System - all wrapped up in the concept of the gentleman’s university and the attitudes of the students."\(^{62}\) The presence of women as students was thought to possibly destroy these customs at Virginia. As pointedly stated:

A University is for learning and discussion, but when it is co-educational it becomes a place for playing and for love. So College Humor summed up the co-educational evil. The University is not yet a place for playing and love, we are bold to say. However, the encouragement of women students and rapid increases in their enrollment such as has been recently evident will not eliminate the coeducational misfortune.\(^{63}\)

The strongest argument against the conversion to coeducation was the threat to the College’s Honor System. While agreeing to the need for the entry of women in the
undergraduate colleges, the Woody Report's principal and final conclusion was it was not in the best interest of the Honor System to make the University coeducational. The conclusion was based on evidence of study which cited that "an honor system at a co-ed school is slightly less than half as effective as an honor system at an all male school." Favoring coeducation was evidence that, at the time of the Woody Report, the University was already coeducational and both the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Honor Committee had stated to the Woody Committee that "they saw no detriment to the effectiveness of the Honor System in the present enrollment of some 1000 women in the University."

The threat to the long-standing tradition of "road-tripping" on the weekends would depend on the initial acceptance of the women by male students. In the first months of coeducation the women were generally ignored by their male classmates. "We are not ostracized, just ignored. It's kind of maddening for guys to come visit you on Sunday night and tell you what a good time they had meeting girls at Sweet Briar and Hollins." Another student remembered in the first months: "Yes you were labeled but not because you were the first women co-eds but because you were freshmen. Nobody thought of it as hostile - it was rather seen as a joking thing. All the girls
comisserated about no integration but we didn’t feel we were less integrated than the first year men. You didn’t have much contact with the upper classes unless you already knew somebody.”

Women also found that they were thought of as "oddities" by women attending colleges in the surrounding areas. "We were seen as three-headed freaks," stated one member of the first class, "not very feminine and male crazy. Often we were asked by the girls: What made us go (to U.Va)? Why were we there? Perhaps it was envy."

The overall sentiment among the first-female class was they tried hard to be accepted in the University but it was going to take time. Their presence on campus, however, was not to be ignored particularly with regards to their appearance and in their dress. Dabney writes:

"The hundreds of girls who entered in 1970 seemed to want to outdo the boys in the slovenliness of their dress. As was the prevailing custom during that period throughout the United States, both groups garbed themselves in patched, faded, frayed blue jeans. The boys wore long, unkempt hair and beat-up shoes. Both groups began dressing more neatly as the years passed, but in 1970 the emphasis was on the sloppiest conceivable attire."

Often it was where you geographically came from that labeled your appearance and how you would act in the University community. For an example: Northern girls were
considered to be more aggressive and more willing to break into the traditional all-male custom than the southern girls. "I enjoyed being feminine and Southern," remembered one member of the first class. "I seemed to be much more boy crazy than others. The girls from New York or New Jersey were different - usually on 'The Pill' and smoked dope. The D.C. girls and girls from Northern Virginia were somewhere in between - that is, they did all the things that the Northern girls did but they wore skirts. I guess I was very moralistic then."

To accommodate the special needs of women students, the University would have to extend its programs and services. For an example: health and clinical services were practically non-existent on the predominantly all-male campus. The Counselors Committee on Human Sexuality was established to fill such a void. The Committee, represented by dormitory counselors, student and professional advisors, and physicians, was geared to meet the educational and clinical needs of the University women.69

The acceptance of women into the various honor and social organization on the grounds proved to be a long and painful process. While barriers were dropped by most of the societies, it took years for some of the all-male
"strongholds' to freely accept women students. One example of resistance was in accepting women as residents on The Lawn - the traditional housing for "the big men on campus." In 1973, out of the 165 applications for the Lawn's 47 spaces only three were women.70

While the effects of coeducation on the long-standing traditions at Virginia can not be accurately measured, the school's appearance and attitudes had changed in the four years women had been members of the undergraduate classes. One faction of this change appeared in the distinction between the "Old U" and the "New U." Stated in the Richmond New Leader:

Old U people, so the story goes, are male, conservative, wear coats and ties, belong to fraternities, party and drink beer. The New U types, who have increased in numbers during the last few years, are liberal, casually dressed, racially and sexually tolerant and sometimes out-and out radicals. The two factions, it is implied, wage a never-ending struggle for control in the arena of campus life and organizations.71

Coeducation at the University of Virginia seemed to be a positive move for the once all-male bastion of Old U. As predicted by the Student Committee on Coeducation prior to the conversion to coeducation: "Co-education will not destroy good traditions. It will provide the opportunity to develop new and better traditions. If mediocrity - or
"State Uism," to use the popular term - results, it is the fault of students, faculty, and administrators, not co-education. 72

Chapter Summary

The University of Virginia's decision to become coeducational in its undergraduate colleges followed a lengthy institutional debate over the University's responsibility to educate women. Based on the recommendations of a University appointed committee to study the "need for the admission of women to the College of Arts and Sciences," the Board of Visitors elected to begin plans for the entry of women. A legal suit, filed by the American Civil Liberties Union in 1969, charging the University with discrimination against women in their admission policy accelerated the conversion to coeducation by two years. Thus, in the Fall of 1970 the University of Virginia opened its doors to its first-class of undergraduate women.

Virginia's decision favoring coeducation was also prompted by the release of the Princeton Report on Coeducation which made a strong case for the entry of women to its University. Similarly, Yale University elected to become coeducation in the Fall of 1969. While these
universities were to act as role models, Virginia's own experience with becoming coeducational differed in three ways: The University of Virginia was a state supported institution rather than a private university; the University of Virginia was a southern school; and, the University of Virginia's final decision to elect coeducation was prompted by federal and state mandates over charges of discrimination.

The establishment of coeducation in the undergraduate colleges required the University of Virginia to make alterations to existing grounds and campus facilities. These changes prompted University-wide debate over the preparations for the first female class. Particular areas addressed were: a new admissions policy; the arrangement of housing for the women; changes and expansion to academic instruction and the college curriculum; the expansion of University-sponsored activities to include the interests of women students; and, most profoundly, the effect the entry of women would have on the University's long-standing traditions and character as a "gentlemen's university." By the Fall of 1975 women represented 42% of the total undergraduate student body. The conversion to coeducation at the University of Virginia seemed to be successful, at least in numbers.
A summary of the opinions of a sample group of the first female class regarding aspects of their college experience follows in Chapter Four.
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CHAPTER FOUR

Summary of Research Questionnaire

Objective One

To determine the reasons first-female students chose to attend the University of Virginia.

Question One:

What factors most influenced your decision to attend the University of Virginia?

Fifteen (or 54%) of those sampled stated academic reputation as being a primary factor which influenced their decision to attend the University of Virginia in 1970. Twelve responses (43%) included low in-state tuition as a factor. The opportunity to be a member of the first class of female undergraduates was influential for twelve women (43%) in choosing the institution. The University of Virginia's geographic location, as well as the Charlottesville community, were included in ten answers (36%). Additional reasons given for attending the University of Virginia were: The University's grounds and physical campus (6 responses); schoolmates' and friends'
recommendations (3 responses); parental influence in the college selection process (2 responses); the University's reputation as a "party school" (1 response); high school counseling and recruitment process (1 response); and the University's School of Nursing program (1 response). Having a father or brother who had attended the University of Virginia were included in the decision for two members of the group.

**Objective Two**

To determine the personal and professional ambitions of the first-female students and whether these ambitions were changed or enhanced after exposure to the University of Virginia's environment.

**Question Two:**

While you were attending the University of Virginia did you make any decisions regarding future career or professional ambitions? If so, what were they?

With few exceptions (82%), the test sample felt that they had made a decision regarding their future career or profession while in attendance at the University of Virginia. Only four women (14%) responded that they had not decided on career goals while in college.
The two most frequent career choices were in education and law. To attend graduate school was a decision for five (17%) of the women. Specific disciplines of study included the fields of social work, linguistics, counseling and medicine. A business career was a choice for two women. Specifically, a business career combining international relations and language was an ambition for one.

Other responses to the question indicated a shift in future career or professional ambition while attending the University of Virginia. Three women, originally intending careers in education, became interested in pursuing professions in theology, counseling, and editorial work. Other responses indicated changing ideologies towards a career or professional direction. One woman spoke of her "discovery of the desire and ability to work with people and communication skills." Similarly, another participant stated she realized her career would have to involve working with people.

Question Three:

Did the University of Virginia affect these ambitions? If so, how?

Sixteen members (57%) of the sample group responded
that they felt the University of Virginia had affected their future ambitions regarding career choice and profession. Academic program and course offerings were viewed as having the strongest effect on the career decisions. In addition, "peer" relationships in the sense of peer ambition or peer "pressure" to attend graduate or professional school after college was seen as a factor affecting career ambitions. Several women felt exposure to new people and a diversity of ideas, gained by attending the University of Virginia, attributed to personal and the development of new skills, which in turn affected their career choice and ambition.

The University of Virginia had no effect on career choice for six participants (21%). Six women (21%) were uncertain if their attendance at the University of Virginia had any effect on their professional or career direction. Negative responses towards the University's influence on professional direction included statements regarding the lack of career counseling available to students. Only one suggested she had received "good advice" from her professors or school counselors regarding the decision to attend graduate school. Moreover, some women felt that there were pressures to pursue careers in a particular field because of inadequate course or program offerings. One woman stated: "I felt I was railroaded into the area
that I chose (education) for lack of knowing about other possibilities."

Question Four:

How would you describe your future ambitions for personal fulfillment as an individual when you were attending the University of Virginia?

Future ambitions for personal or professional fulfillment were varied among respondents. Shared comments for several women included a future with a balance between marriage and a family and a professional career. A number of participants indicated having a strong ambition toward a definite goal, including a planned career in medicine, business, or graduate work in a specific field. Many of these women reported that during their college years, future personal fulfillment meant maintaining strong commitments with friends and relationships, doing well academically, graduating and finding a job, or becoming financially secure, independent and self-sufficient. Only six respondents (21%) indicated that they gave no real thought toward future ambitions as college students or that they could not remember such aspirations.
Objective Three

To discover the impressions of the first-female students regarding the academic offerings and effectiveness of instruction that were available to them at the University of Virginia.

Question Five:

Were you satisfied with the course offerings of your academic program at the University of Virginia?

Almost all participants (75%) indicated that they were generally satisfied with the course offerings at the University of Virginia. It was said that a good variety and diversity among academic programs offered students a broad spectrum of courses both in their major fields and in outside electives. Courses were, in addition, considered to be sufficiently challenging and complex or "meaty" by a number of the women. Professors' cooperation and enthusiasm as well as the instructors' knowledge of their fields was, in addition, a shared comment among participants. Four (14%) were satisfied but with reservations about overall programs. Areas of improvement included a need for more applied or practical courses and a decrease in the class size to promote greater individual participation.
Only a few women said that they were dissatisfied with their academic course offerings while attending the University of Virginia. Two subjects commented that they "wrote their own major" because particular academic programs were weak or non-existent. A third respondent complained of course repetition.

Question Six:

How did you regard the effectiveness of the academic instruction you received at the University of Virginia?

The academic instruction received at the University of Virginia was generally regarded as being effective by almost all of the women (82%). An appraisal of instruction as being "excellent," "great," or "very effective" was indicated by twelve women (43%). Several of the respondents felt the instruction to be uneven but tended to regard it, on the whole, as good. Acclaim for the academic program at the University was often directed towards a professor or a memorable course. In addition, responses to the question included having a "good" experience with professors and felt that they were helpful.

Only two participants (7%) rated the academic program
at the University of Virginia as being ineffective. Disappointment in instruction was generally directed towards a particular field, course, or instructor. A number of the women stated that class size was too large and deterred from individual attention particularly in the lecture courses attended the first two years.

Question Seven:

Was your choice of academic major influenced by the academic offerings available to you?

Approximately half of the sample (54%) stated that their choice of major was not influenced by the academic programs at the University of Virginia. A number of these women reported that their choice of primary academic field was decided prior to attending college.

Thirteen women (46%) responded that the academic instruction received at the University of Virginia had influenced their choice of major. Limitations in course offerings or in specific academic programs, rather than excellence, were the primary reason given for final selection in a major field of study. Only a few participants indicated that choice of final major was a direct result of courses and instruction.
Objective Four

To determine the reactions of the first-female students' experiences regarding the general social atmosphere and University-sponsored activities available to them.

Question Eight:

How personally important were social activities to your life at the University?

Twenty-six women (93%) in the sample rated social activities as an important aspect of their life at the University of Virginia. From this group, twenty participants (71%) described the social side of their college experience as being "very important." Two women indicated that campus or social activities were of no importance.

Overwhelmingly, the women found their social activities to revolve around meeting different people, being with friends, and enjoying the campus environment rather than participating in any of the University-sponsored programs. One ranked social activities as the number one item of importance over academic pursuit. Another respondent commented that, retrospectively, social
activities were to her so "overly" important she felt she had wasted a "very valuable opportunity in my four years of college." Being a member of a small number of women on campus, meant for one subject, "being overwhelmed by boys, constantly."

Question Nine:

In what University-sponsored activities did you participate in while going to college?

Almost all of the women (82%) participated in at least one University-sponsored activity while attending college. Only five women (18%) responded that they were never involved in an organized program or activity at the University. University-sponsored activities mentioned were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th># Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Counselor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports/Intramurals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Hall Big Sister Program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays, Films, Concerts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Events</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Gov’t Committees</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Guides</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Newspaper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Singers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Players</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Radio Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity Parties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Debating Club</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Environment Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Ten:

Did you join a sorority?

All the women responded that they had not join a sorority while attending the University of Virginia. The majority of the subjects indicated that they were unaware of the existence of sororities on the campus (the only one mentioned was a sorority for nurses) but would not have been interested in joining one given the opportunity. For one who wrote that joining a sorority in college would have stigmatized her and "segregated" her from the rest of the women, commented: "retrospectively, I would have liked the opportunity to join with other women for the net-working experience...This was probably a time when we needed the acculturation into the lifestyle more than ever."

Question Eleven:

What were your opinions regarding the program of activities available to women students at the University?

The majority of the sample group (64%) responded that they were unaware of any programs or activities
specifically directed towards women students or felt the activities available for women at the University of Virginia were not adequate. Several women remembered the only female-specific activities were those activities they developed themselves while students. Fewer than half of the participants indicated that the organized programs which included female students as being adequate or "good" or limited but capable of expansion. Sports' events and intramurals were the most frequently stated activities participated in by the women. An escort service, developed for the safety of the female students, was mentioned by several of the women in the survey.

A frequent response among the participants was that the inadequacy of organized programs for women was to be expected. One stated that the absence of such programs did not bother her and she was unconcerned at that time. For another, "It seemed to me that women students had to systematically break their way into all the established activities, such as debating and the newspaper. By the fourth year, it seemed we had succeeded in most." Not all women felt as comfortable with the environment: "There were none [programs specific for women] to speak of when I entered the University of Virginia with the first class in 1970. This, I feel, was an abysmal failing of the school. The University of Virginia really just dumped us there."
Objective Five

To discover the reactions of the first-female students regarding resident hall living during their college years.

Emphasis will be on the following factors:

a. combined residence hall living  
b. residence hall counseling and advising  
c. security and general safety  
d. physical facilities  
e. food services

Question Twelve:

What were your reactions to combined or coeducation residence hall living?

Most of the sample of first-female students saw coeducational dormitory living favorably. Seventeen women (61%) answered that they had no objections to the existence of combined resident-hall living quarters and, as students, found them to be a "perfectly normal arrangement." Comments such as: "no big deal!" "comfortable," "felt safer," "a relaxed atmosphere" were written by a number of the participants. One who had worked as a resident advisor in a coeducational dorm stated that she saw combined residence hall living a good way for women to get to know each other, and become friends, without the artificial structures of dating. Similarly, a respondent expressed that coeducation was a reasonable lifestyle.
preferable to all-male or all-female dormitories. Two women, while stating they had liked coeducational living, felt the environment as having few restrictions, little privacy, and being a poor atmosphere for studying.

Six women (21%) responded unfavorably to the coeducational resident-living arrangement existing when they were students. Again, no privacy, a bad atmosphere for studying, and an inability to meet more female students were complaints expressed by the participants. For one, "men and boys were everywhere. We had no privacy at all and were constantly besieged by males swarming around the dormitory."

Among the participants in the survey, four (14%) were neutral on the subject of coeducation or combined residence living. One subject did not answer the question.

Question Thirteen:

Was the residence hall counseling and advisory program helpful to you? If so, in what way?

The majority of women (57%) responded that the residence counseling and advisory program was not helpful to them as students. Five (18%) stated they were unaware of a program in existence at the University of Virginia.
The strongest complaint shared by the group was the absence of any counseling program. Comments regarding the dormitory advisors varied with the strength or weakness of the individual RA's assigned to the suites. "I was unaware of any program existing except for my RA telling you to go register and not go out alone," expressed on woman in the group. Another member wrote: "we pretty much took care of ourselves, the counselor was pretty poor." For yet another first-female student, "Much more help (counseling and advising) was needed at the time and none was available. There were so few women around you could look up to or even talk with...Someone needed to be designated as the leader."

Seven women (25%) indicated in their answers that they had found the residence counseling and advisory program was helpful as a procedural and information resource during orientation. Only a few of the participants stated that they would have felt comfortable seeking advice from their resident advisor. There was no indication among the responses of any outside advisory or counseling program (other than in the dormitories) available to women students on campus.

Question Fourteen:

Did you feel the need for additional security measures, i.e., lighting, security guards, etc.? Why?
A large majority of the women (71%) felt that they were safe while living at the University of Virginia with no need for additional security measures. Out of the eight women (29%) who expressed the need for greater safety conditions, only one stated having had harm done to her person or personal belonging because of limited security measures in the dormitory.

A greater concern was expressed over the limited security on the University grounds. Ten (36%) women indicated the grounds were poorly lit at night and had felt some anxiety about walking alone on the grounds after dark. Several indicated that a University escort service was developed to increase safety conditions. In addition, it was stated that women who lived off grounds were given advice on security measures from the Grounds Police.

Question Fifteen:

What were your feelings regarding the physical facilities in your residence hall?

Twenty-six subjects (93%) said the physical facilities of the residence living at the University of Virginia were good or adequate. The novelty of living in a traditionally all-male dormitory posed some obstacles for the first-
female students but, on the whole, the conditions were seen as livable. Five women (18%) mentioned that during their first year they made "planters" out of the men's urinals in the suites bathrooms.

The dormitory "suites" were described as being both a good and bad arrangement. In addition to four women indicating that the suite arrangement was pleasant and amiable, one stated the resident living structure in Madison Hall the easiest arrangement because of the access to the bathroom and showers. Two of the respondents felt at a disadvantage living in the dormitory suites. "One disadvantage to the suites was that they helped to create isolation. I only knew seven other first-year students and the resident advisor in my suite. I knew very few other female students." Similarly, in describing her reaction to the suite arrangement during the first year, one woman stated the suites led to "no whole dorm interaction" among women.

Inadequate residence facilities were indicated by two women. One complaint was the feeling that the old dorms were both noisy with minimal quiet time for studying. In addition, it was indicated that there was no privacy for students.
Question Sixteen:

What were your opinions of the food services available to you as a resident student?

Over half of the responses (57%) indicated adequate food services available to students at the University of Virginia. Three women rated the facilities as being good or very sufficient. It was the opinion of ten members of the survey (36%) that the food services available to them as students were not adequate stating food, on the whole, was overcooked, too starchy and bland, and offered students little variety.

Newcombe Hall was rated as being "pretty awful" or "terrible serving students basic foods as well as being a distance from the dormitories. Another facility mentioned by several of the women was the Glass Hat serving good but mostly junk food in addition to being a little expensive. Two women responded that they did not participate in of the University-sponsored services but found there to be a limited availability and choice of food late at night or in close proximity to the dormitory.

Objective Six

To find which counseling and advisory services were
used by first-female students and to determine what were their perceptions of the effectiveness of these services.

Question Seventeen:

Did you have any need or desire to use the counseling and advisory services available at the University?

Half of the women (54%) answered that they felt they needed to use counseling or advisory services while college students. Nine subjects (32%) indicated no desire for such services. Four women (14%) indicated a need for counseling but were unaware of these services existing on campus.

Assistance on academic problems was sought primarily from the University faculty. Eleven of the participants (39%) stated they went to a professor for individual course problems while six subjects (21%) answered they chose to go to their academic advisor or academic dean for advice. Two women indicated they went to their friends if they were having a problem with a subject or course. Six of the participants (21%) said that they never had academic problems and/or sought no outside help or counsel. Two subjects did not answer the question.

Twenty women (71%) stated they needed outside advice with a social or emotional problem while college students.
Fourteen of the subjects (50%) went to either friends, roommates, or home for outside help. The student health services, dorm counselors, or student counseling center were used for social or emotional problems for six of the participants (21%). Four responses (14%) indicated that they had either no need for outside help or they used no University-sponsored service.

Eighteen women (64%) responded that they personally used one or more of the University-sponsored services as students. Four subjects (14%) sought help from the Student Counseling Center. Two from this group found the service helpful while the others remembered the center as "horrible" or the advisors ineffective. The Career Planning and Placement Office was rated as being a good or adequate service by four of the women. Similarly, three women (11%) responded that the Student Health Office was helpful as a service. Four out of five of the women who sought help from academic advisors said that they found their advisor to be supportive. One who claimed she used the University's Mental Health Service remembered her experience as a good one. Eight subjects (29%) responded that they never personally used any services on campus and had no basis for rating the effectiveness of the programs.
Objective Seven

To discover the most difficult adjustments to University life experienced by the first-female students.

Question Eighteen:

Were there any difficult adjustments to University life you confronted as a member of the first-female class?

Feeling like an "oddity" on campus was an obstacle faced by female undergraduates at the University of Virginia. Other barriers mentioned in the survey were attitudes of male students; the prejudice of older male professors against women students; and the feeling your presence on campus was "breaking tradition." Nineteen members of the sample group (68%) stated there were difficult adjustments to University life as member of the first-female class of undergraduate students. Initially, many women felt intimidated by their male classmates and had difficulty with constant staring. For one, "you were either worshiped or reviled. Either the men were thrilled to have you there, or they hated you for being there. There were few men who just looked upon you as potential friends."

For a number of the women the feeling of being a
minority group or an "oddity" on campus lessened over the years. One respondent stated "the atmosphere changed a lot and you became more comfortable." For another, after the first year, she felt she "belonged to the University."

Question Nineteen:

In what ways did the University assist a first-female student in her initial adjustment to the University community?

Over half of the sample population (61%) said the University of Virginia had not given any special assistance to help them adjust to University living other than what was provided to any first year student. Encouraging students to talk with advisors; planned orientation of the University; social "mixers;" dissemination of informational brochures; and the institution of dorm counselors were mentioned as being helpful and supportive mechanisms the University offered to the new class.

Several women responded that the University assisted them best in adjusting to college life by letting them be themselves to "unobtrusively become part of the community." It was felt that the University let the first coeducational class start on the "same footing" by not discriminating between male and female first year students. One woman
wrote: "The University seemed anxious to make us comfortable and make us feel proud that we were chosen to be pioneers of sorts."

Objective Eight

To determine whether being a "minority group" at the University fostered feelings of "discrimination" or was in any way considered disadvantageous to the women students.

Question Twenty:

What were your views regarding the number (350) of first-female students admitted in 1970?

Eleven of the women (39%) stated the admission of 350 female students in the first coeducational class at the University of Virginia was too small of a number and indicated a larger group of female students would have helped in their assimilation into the community. Several women stated it was an outrage for a state-supported institution to limit the number of female students initially or that such limitation was unfair without open competition for placement with male counterparts. One woman said a greater number of female classmates would have made their class less conspicuous and she was glad to see
more females the following year.

Ten responses (38%) indicated that the limited number of first-female students was a good way for the University community to accept coeducation gradually. In addition, several of these women felt honored to be a part of a limited group of recognized students. Five women (18%) answered they had never evaluated the number of students which composed the first class undergraduate women and/or it was not a matter of concern to them at the time.

Question Twenty-one:

Did you experience any incidents of female "discrimination" while in attendance at the University of Virginia? If so, please describe.

Twenty women (71%) indicated having no feelings of discrimination while students at the University of Virginia. Any incidents of felt separation between male and female students, or from the faculty, were not regarded as overt intentions of discrimination. One woman stated that she received "a few comments from professors but overall felt I was received and treated courteously while at the University." Another felt no negative discrimination but she recognized limitations for women students in the academic instruction and in the
University's faculty. "There were very few women professors and not much of an emphasis on women's culture. Women students need positive role models and the exposure to women artists."

Eight women (29%) answered that they had personal experiences of discrimination while in college. One spoke of an incident happening on a date during the first days of school. "After writing on ours arms and legs with black marker 'Bring Back the Old U.,' they (the students' dates) dumped us in a remote part of town. I almost left then." Another woman felt discriminated against from students in the nearby all-female schools. "Frequently, on the weekends, when these females were 'bussed in' and I would be at a party and run into one of these visitors and they found out that I attended the University, they would indicate by their comments and their expressions that they thought we were most unusual and abnormal." Comments, however, regarding situations of discrimination were generally feelings of neglect and being an "odity" to the environment. Only one subject's statement was hostile. "U.Va was an incredible bastion of chauvinism of all types."
Objective Nine

To determine the reactions of the first-female students regarding the effects of coeducation may have had upon the traditions at the University.

Question Twenty-Two:

Did you feel that coeducation affected the traditional features of the University of Virginia?

The feeling that coeducation had affected the traditional features of the University of Virginia was indicated by twenty-three respondents (82%). For one first-female student, the admission of women to the undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences, "broke down the tradition of homogeneous upper/middle class, white, southern males who ruled the place." For another, the change was seen as positive. Female undergraduates had "undercut the elitist nature of the school." Male students could "learn to relate to women" thus altering the image of the school's reputation. "Fraternities had become less dominant, dress less conservative, the school became more open-minded, less traditional and more natural feeling," was a comment shared by a number of the respondents. Similarly, another commented: "It (coeducation) attempted to put Mr. Jefferson's ideas about equality to the test."
Five of these women (18%) stated that while the admission of women had altered the tradition of the University of Virginia, the strength of the "times" (late 1960's and early 1970's) was affecting college and university campuses around the country and its effect on the University of Virginia could not be separated from the advent of coeducation.

Five of the participants (18%) indicated they had not felt coeducation affected the traditional atmosphere at the University. Female students, for several of the respondents, shared in all aspects of life. For one, while she felt some change had taken place with coeducation, "the quality of education was not adversely affected, but perhaps enhanced." Similarly, another woman wrote: "I don't think it (coeducation) damaged any of the good traditional features such as the honor system or academic excellence, but it put the pressure on the University to accept in-state students and begin to limit it's (U.Va's) scope." Only one woman complained that with the institution of women as undergraduate students there was, initially, negativism among certain of the male clubs and societies which sought to prevent women from membership.
**Objective Ten**

To discuss constructive suggestions for improving the coeducational experience for women at the University of Virginia based on the first-female students' reflections on their quality of life within the University community.

**Question Twenty-Three:**

Based on your experience at the University of Virginia, what constructive suggestions can you make for improving conditions that affect the life of women students in the University community?

Eighteen women (64%) responded with suggestions for improving the conditions that affect female students in the University community. Twelve of the subjects (43%) suggested the need for more personal and career counseling services made available to female students including seminars on women's sexuality, health, and programs directed at specific supportive needs. Three participants (11%) commented on the need to increase the number of visible female faculty and administrators. In addition, a greater emphasis placed on women's studies and women's activities would benefit female students in a University environment. One woman felt better and tighter security, as well as increased transportation facilities around campus would improve the conditions for women.
undergraduates. Another woman felt the University could do best for its coeds by "bringing in good students, encouraging individuality, and by de-emphasizing the social aspects of college."
Summary of the Objectives of the Study

Objective One:

The majority of the women in the sample indicated a combination of reasons for selecting the University of Virginia as their college choice. Academic reputation was the factor most frequently indicated by the subjects as influencing their decision. The University of Virginia being a state-supported institution and paying in-state tuition were also important factors for many of the women. Being the first-female student to attend the University of Virginia's undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences ranked high in importance, although few women mentioned it as the primary reason for their choice of college. Geographic location, as well as the University's grounds and physical campus were other reasons frequently given in deciding to attend the University of Virginia.

Objective Two:

The majority of women felt they had made a decision toward a career or profession while students at the University of Virginia. Law and Education were the two most frequent career choices mentioned by the subjects. A decision to attend graduate school was stated by a number of the participants.
Only half of the subjects indicated their attendance at the University of Virginia had any influence on the career or personal ambitions. The University's academic instruction and course offerings were cited as having the strongest affect on professional direction. Peer relationships and peer ambition or peer "pressures" were also stated as having had enhanced the women's own personal ambitions. Several of the subjects indicated that the University's curriculum had a negative affect on their career decisions claiming inadequate program offerings had directed them away from their initial interests.

Future ambitions for personal and professional fulfillment varied among the sample population. An ambition given by a number of the women was the desire to balance marriage and family with a professional career. Several participants indicated that as students they had definite personal and professional goals including a career in medicine, business, or to pursue specific graduate work. Other ambitions regarded by the women included maintaining strong ties with friends, becoming financially secure, independent and self sufficient after graduation.

Objective Three:

With few exceptions, the sample group of women was
generally satisfied with the academic offerings available at the University of Virginia. It was indicated in the answers that there was a good variety and diversification among courses, both in major fields and outside electives.

Almost half of the subjects answered that the academic instruction they received as students was "very" effective and sufficiently challenging. But a number of the respondents felt crowded lecture courses deterred from individual student attention.

Half of the participants stated that their decision for choice of academic major was not influenced by the courses and instruction they received at the University of Virginia. The choice in primary academic field of study was, for many of these women, decided on before attending college. Only a few surveyed stated that their choice in academic major was a direct result of their academic program at the University (a listing of academic majors declared by the sample group appears in Appendix I).

Objective Four:

Social activities were rated as an important aspect of college life for the majority of the women. The activities involved with campus friends and surrounding informal functions were stated more frequently and considered more
important than attending University-sponsored activities.

University-sponsored programs and functions were, however, participated in by almost all the women. The most frequently mentioned activities included: involvement in campus sports and intramurals; membership in the University's Resident Counselor program; and acting as a "big sister" in the Madison Hall volunteer program. No one in the survey responded that she had joined a campus sorority while in attendance at the University of Virginia. In addition, many of the women stated they would not have joined a sorority if given the opportunity.

Few participants indicated an awareness of programs specific for women students with the exception of activities which they had developed for themselves. The inadequacy of any organized activities intended for female students was expected by many of the students particularly during the initial years of coeducation at the University.

Objective Five:

Coeducational dormitory living was seen favorably by most of the sample of first-female students who felt combined resident halls to be perfectly normal arrangements. The women whose statements were against coeducational living arrangements claimed the atmosphere
which prevailed was both disturbing and noisy allowing students little privacy or time for their studies.

Resident counselors or advisors were considered to be ineffective for the majority of women. It was indicated that the individual RA's were generally not available to students or were unaware of the needs of first year students. Those responding favorably to the resident counseling program cited the RA's as being helpful to them as an informational resource during orientation.

A majority of the sample felt that they were safe while living at the University of Virginia with no need for additional security measures. Campus grounds were of a greater concern for the women than the dormitory or building security citing the limited and poor lighting conditions caused anxiety for many women who needed to walk around campus after dark. It was stated that an escort service was developed by the University to increase safety conditions for female students on the grounds.

The physical facilities on the University of Virginia campus were generally regarded as being in good or adequate condition. The dormitory "suites," which many female students lived in their first two years, were said to be the easiest arrangement for women living in a traditionally all-male hall and provided better access to both bathroom
and showers. General complaints about facilities on the grounds were limited to the older dormitories finding them to a poor environment in which to study and very noisy.

Objective Six:

Only half of the women stated that they had a use for a counseling or advisory service while in college. Professors and academic advisors were primarily sought out in incidents of academic problems or individual course difficulties. The majority of women who stated needing outside support for an emotional or social problem went to friends for advice. University-sponsored services including the Student Health Office and Student Counseling Center, were avenues of assistance for several of the women who had a personal or social problem as students.

Over half of those responding to the question stated they had personally used one or more of the University-sponsored services as students. By in large, of the services mentioned, including the Career and Planning Office and the University Mental Health Center, the women found the facilities provided adequate or good services.

Objective Seven:

A majority of the group stated that there were
difficult adjustments to University life as a member of the first-female class of undergraduate women. A feeling as though you were an oddity on campus and being constantly stared at by male classmates were problems for many of the students. In addition, the attitudes of older male faculty members against female students in the classroom was a barrier during the first year of coeducation. For a number of women, the feeling of “being a minority on campus” lessened over the four years.

It was the feeling of over half that the University of Virginia had not given them any special assistance in adjusting to the community other than assistance given to any first year student. Several of the women responded that they felt the University assisted them best during the first year by letting them be themselves and, thereby, assimilate into the community on their own. In addition, it was suggested that the University seemed anxious to make the first female students comfortable in the environment.

Objective Eight:

The majority of responses indicated that they regarded the 350 female students admitted to the first coeducational class as too small a size. It was felt that a greater number of women students would have helped their
assimilation into the University and would have initially created less disparity between male and female undergraduates. Several women responded that the limited number of first-female students was a good way for the school to accept coeducation gradually. Moreover, a number of subjects stated that they felt honored to be a part of a small group of recognized students.

Only a few of the women described personal incidents of open discrimination and ill-treatment while they were undergraduates. Otherwise, the majority of the sample population said they experienced no incidents of female discrimination while students at the University of Virginia. A feeling of separation from male students or from male professors was generally regarded as a mild reaction to the presence of women on campus and not overt discrimination against female students. Several women stated that they found the community, on the whole, supportive and courteous, wanting them to belonged.

Objective Nine:

Almost all of the women in the survey responded that they felt coeducation had affected the traditional features of the University of Virginia. Breaking down the elitist attitude of the University, causing it to become less conservative, more open-minded and less concerned about
all-male clubs, societies and fraternities, were general comments made about the altering image of Virginia. In addition, while a number of the subjects indicated the admission of women had affected the traditions of the University, they clarified their statements to include the strength of the "times" (late 1960's and early 1970's) as equally influencing the changing image on campus. Those felt that coeducation had no effect on the traditions of the University cited that the long-standing honor-system and academic reputation of the institution had not been changed but, rather, enhanced by the presence of women. Further, female students just shared in all aspects of the college life.

Objective Ten:

From the women who responded with suggestions for improving conditions that affected the life of female students in a University community, the majority stated a need for increased number of personal and career counseling services. These services should include seminars on women's health and sexuality, and programs directed at women's specific needs. It was also the feeling that the number of visible female faculty and administrators should be greater, as well as the availability of women's studies in the academic program.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has investigated the educational conditions existing for women undergraduates during the initial years of coeducation in a previously all-male institution of higher education. The choice of the University of Virginia as a case study was based on its significance as a southern, state university which claims, in addition, national visibility. The process used to conduct the investigation was through a questionnaire administered to a small sample of first-female students who attend the University of Virginia between the years 1970-1974. The questionnaire was developed from an original set of interview questions prepared by the Student Affairs Office in a 1971 study and asked the sample to respond, retrospectively, to conditions existing at the University of Virginia while they were undergraduate students. The findings from the questionnaire were used to generate insights, revelations and suggested patterns as to the University of Virginia's ability to serve its first class of women. To this purpose, the investigation: (1) identified to what extent the University of Virginia served
its initial class of female undergraduates; (2) identified, in light of the historical significance of the University of Virginia's transition to coeducation, the effect this particular environment had on the women's college experience; and (3) identified what effects attending a predominantly all-male institution may have had on the long-range goals and ambitions of the first-female students. As a collective biography of a selective group of women, generalizations regarding their attitudes towards the University of Virginia applied only to the sample group. No generalizations extended to the total population of first-female students who attended the University of Virginia beginning in 1970.

In Chapter Five, the conclusions and recommendations of the study are as follows: (1) a summary of the general attitudes and evaluation of the sample group towards their college experience are compared to the findings of the 1971 study; (2) conclusions are drawn regarding the University of Virginia's ability to serve its first undergraduate women; (3) implications for institutional behavior are presented with recommendations for institutional policy and change.

The collective responses of the small group of first-female undergraduate women at the University of Virginia
towards their college experience offer one perspective as to the conditions existing during the first years of coeducation. A biographical profile of the sample group follows:

As a group, the women were bright, articulate, and enthusiastic about their college years at the University of Virginia. Going to Virginia meant to them attending a school with high academic standards while benefiting from the lower, in-state tuition. Moreover, in their overall decision to attend the University of Virginia the practicality in attending a state university seemed to overshadow the significance of being a member of the first-female undergraduate class.

For the group, going to college had a particular means to an end. Overall, it was important to have decided, while attending college, future professional or career goals. To combine a career with the traditional role of marriage and a family remained a strong aspiration among the group. It may be assumed that for many students, the college experience enhanced or affected their future ambitions and long-range goals by opening new avenues of possibilities. Many of the women described ways they had "grown" while students at the University of Virginia, suggesting that the environment and the people therein were strong influences in their lives.
High academic standards appeared to be an important motivator in achievement for the women while attending the University of Virginia. It may be concluded that the group was generally satisfied with the academic offerings made available to them at Virginia. Coursework was frequently mentioned as being challenging and stimulating. But while the most frequent choices of academic major - Education, English, and Psychology - were, in part, both anticipated and predictable for women at the time, selection of a field of concentration may have also been a result of a limitation in the academic curriculum specific to women interests.

As a group, participation in social and collegiate functions were of extreme importance. College life, including activities involving campus friends and informal activities, were as crucial to the women as were academics. Because there were initially no activities for the women, claims to a specific program or activity became increasingly more a concern during the college years. Moreover, while fraternities and the activities surrounding fraternity life remained strong on Virginia's grounds during the early 1970's, involvement in such areas as the Madison Big Sister Program or up-starting and participating in a all-women intramural hockey team overshadowed the more
conventional needs for "sororities." It may be suggested that for the group, involvement in the community meant acceptance in the community.

One reflection of both the particularities of the group and of the changing climate on college campuses around the country was in the appeal towards combined or coeducational resident living arrangements as a preference over single-sex dormitories. While criticism of little privacy in the rooms and noisy halls prevailed upon the comments of the women, generally they favored coeducational living on the University grounds.

As a group, the women exhibited pride in the traditions of the University of Virginia. Valuing the strongholds of the honor system and academic excellence; they felt the character of Virginia had been preserved regardless of the advent of coeducation. While suggesting the number of first females admitted to be too small an initial sample, the women saw themselves as being honored and "special." Further they viewed the University of Virginia a "special institution" to have attended as a college. The women felt the breaking down of the "elitist" attitude of Virginia's gentlemen was more a reflection of the "times" than an effect of the entry of women to the University.
As in the case of the findings just stated, the attitudes of the sample group toward their experience at the University of Virginia did not vary from their responses made in 1971. While any direct comparison of the two studies would not be valid, it is interesting to note the similarities in the sample's responses.

Crowded lecture halls and large classes continued to be regarded as an area of dissatisfaction for the group. In addition, the women remembered feeling that the academic curriculum was too limited in courses specific to women's interests.

Safety conditions on the University grounds were perceived to be a continuous problem for women. While an escort service was developed by the University to provide transportation for female students around the University, general lighting remained inadequate in many areas of the grounds, posing an unsafe atmosphere.

The need for the expanded offerings of women athletic and extracurricular programs remained a strong sentiment among the women. Many in the group, 11 years after graduation, recalled that the University sponsored no special activities or programs for women other than those the women created for themselves. While in 1971 it was suggested by the group that more publicity be given to the
available University activities, 11 years later the women remembered finding sponsored programs scarce around the grounds.

It was generally agreed in 1971 that the University food services needed improvement. Women expressed a desire for extended hours at both main dormitory cafeterias. In addition, a suggestion to make food services more convenient to the students was advocated by the group. Among the comments of the women in the present investigation, food and the University's food service were remembered as a problem for them at the University of Virginia.

In spite of general satisfaction with their educational experience at the University of Virginia, the women in both studies described difficult adjustments to University life as a member of the first-female class. As stated by one subject: "It felt odd to be the only female in advance-placed classes and I was somewhat intimidated by that experience my first year. We all had to get used to being regarded as objects of curiosity at best, and sex objects at worst." One criticism of the students was that the University did not provide them adequate assistance in the beginning. This was remembered by many of the women as making their adjustment to college life more difficult.
Differences among the two studies were centered around responses to professional and personal ambitions. While in both studies the majority of the women indicated that the University had an effect on their personal and professional ambitions, the comments regarding future ambitions and personal fulfillment in the present study revealed a certain sophistication and perception not found earlier. In 1971, personal ambitions for the women were directed towards independence, the opportunity to pursue a career on her own, and to someday combine a career with marriage and a family. In retrospect, the group felt that job security and financial independence had been a definite goal. Among responses were comments regarding planned careers in medicine, business, foreign service, and pursuing specific graduate work. In the present research it is important to note that while not the majority, a number of the sample group did not imply that the University of Virginia had an effect on their professional ambitions. This suggests the college experience, for these women, may not have been as influential as would be assumed. Such a finding could also suggest that the University was not able to adequately meet the needs of these women in the areas of professional guidance.

Another difference among the two studies was in the responses regarding discrimination. While in the 1971
study it was concluded that the subjects felt satisfied with their acceptance in the University community and perceived no discrimination towards women students; the present research found that a number of the women (30%) had experienced some incidents of female discrimination while they were students. This finding suggests the women in the sample may have gained in their insights (with regards to problems encountered by being the first undergraduate women at Virginia) as they matured or distanced from the situation.

One factor in evaluating the overall conversion to coeducation is how the entrance of women into a predominantly all-male environment altered the mission or posture of an institution. Evidence found at the United States Naval Academy upon the admission of women was that a strong and distinctive mission of an established all-male institution may not be changed by the admission of women students. Women students may rather be assimilated into the existing environment without evidence of alteration to the institution.¹

At the University of Virginia, the last stronghold to accept women were the all-male clubs, societies and organizations existing on the grounds. It may be concluded that one reason these organizations were slow in dropping their restrictions and accepting women was because the
women were not aggressively trying to gain membership. The image of the "southern woman" may have been a prevailing factor why the first women did not initially intrude on traditional male territory. This peculiarity in the women's attitudes was not found among universities in the North and Northeast where the first women undergraduates were eager to break into the dominant male turf. When the restriction began to loosen at Virginia, women slowly gained membership in these organizations. It may be assumed that women may have been initially assimilated into the existing environment without alteration to the institution.

Additionally, a primary factor affecting the conversion to coeducation at the University of Virginia and its initial acceptance of women as students was the strength of the "times" (late 1960's and early 1970's). The atmosphere on many college campuses in the early 1970's reflected a general "loosening" of conditions and a greater sensitivity towards changing societal values. The climate prevailing at the University of Virginia was no exception. In the late 1960's, members of the Virginia community were strongly advocating the need to accept women. By 1970, the formed Student Committee on Coeducation were appealing to the University's administration to provide adequate and equal conditions for women students while criticizing both
administration and the faculty towards their seemingly conservative approach towards the entry of women to the College. With the advent of coeducation, the University of Virginia had the advantages of watching both Princeton and Yale Universities fumble with their first female class. As such, both universities acted as role models for Virginia's own conversion to coeducation. Thus it must be concluded that the entry of undergraduate women at the University of Virginia occurred at a ripe time for the institution. In addition, any continued measurement of the coeducational conditions existing at Virginia after 1970 must be in conjunction with the prevailing "climate" on other college and university campuses.

The investigation for this study was based on the premise that female students attending coeducational institutions confront institutional or structural barriers which interfere with the quality of undergraduate life. Accordingly, during an institution's transition to coeducation, institutional barriers can be either strengthened or created, thus adversely affecting the quality of undergraduate life for its first-female class. It is a conclusion of this investigation that while the University of Virginia was able to meet some of the needs of its initial class of female undergraduates, overall the University fell short of adequately serving its women
students. More specifically, the first undergraduate women at the University of Virginia faced barriers in the areas of the academic programming and instruction; social and student services, and career and personal counseling. In addition, the findings of this study revealed that the women sampled felt socially isolated and perceived some forms of discrimination towards women students.

Reflected in the respondents answers was their perception of the scarcity of women faculty and administrators at the University of Virginia in the early 1970's. As cited by Tiball, the aspect of providing adequate role models for female students (as afforded in many women's colleges) has been an area of particular concern in institutions converting to coeducation as well as in traditional coeducational colleges throughout the country. While alleviation of the problem at the University of Virginia would have taken additional time than the first few years of coeducation to build up the number of women faculty and administrators, it may be assumed that the scarcity of women in these ranks who could serve as role models was a serious barrier for the first women undergraduates.

A more crucial problem perceived by the undergraduate women was the lack of social and University-sponsored
programs. Overall the sample remembered few programs available to women students at the University. More importantly, while many of the women responded that they had been either accepting, unaware or unconcerned by the "inaccessibility" of activities for women, in retrospect, a number of the sample realized they had missed an important aspect of their undergraduate life. Stated by one member of the group, "There were very few (activities available to women), but at the time I wasn't sensitive to the idea that we were entitled to them as men. Also I made allowances because we were new on the scene and we did receive a lot of attention."

Similarly, the lack of adequate career and personal counseling services was viewed as a serious omission in the University community. It was suggested by over half of the respondents that improvement was needed in these program or service areas. One important factor underlying the inadequacy in these areas was that in the early 1970's, counseling services were scarce on most university and college campuses. Therefore the inadequacy felt at the University of Virginia should not be overly criticized or isolated.

The findings of this study suggest that there were important areas in which the University of Virginia did not meet the needs of its first-female class, that there were
indeed institutional barriers perhaps not clearly understood by the College's administration and faculty. Moreover, the women themselves may have held few expectations for immediate change or may not have perceived that they had different needs as the first class of undergraduate women. However, it is suggested in the responses of the sample group that a number of perceptions of the women towards their college experience seemed to have developed or sharpened over time.

In addition, while the first women undergraduates at the University of Virginia faced certain obstacles or barriers in the academic instruction and in the kinds of services available to them, it must also be observed that the many areas of difficulty and concern for the first-female class were not unique problems at all. The complaints regarding poor food services, large lecture halls and crowded classrooms, the need for additional safety measures, limitations in the curriculum, and the difficulty in the housing arrangement, may all be considered universal complaints made by most college students during that same period and by today's students as well. Thus, while the first class of undergraduate women to attend the University of Virginia must be considered a "special group," aspects of their college experience must be regarded as typical and common to this day.
The obstacles faced by the first-female class at the University of Virginia might have been alleviated if the University's administration had taken alternate routes in its implementation of coeducation. Possible recommendations for a smoother transition of the entry of women at the University of Virginia are as follows:

The formula for the entry of women into the University of Virginia's undergraduate colleges was to be initially limited. Moreover, the approach for admitting women included a plan whereby coeducation would be achieved by adding women to the current enrollment without decreasing the number of entering men. In the Fall of 1970, women were to make-up an additional 9.7% of the regular male enrollment.

Although the admission of women would become equal to and on the same basis as men by the year 1972, the real problem existed in the University's ability to initially accommodate for the increase in enrollment caused by the entry of women. Similarly, admission of women at Princeton and Yale Universities were "in addition to" the regular enrollment of men. In both universities, the increase in numbers created difficulties in the housing accommodations and caused speculation into the overall quality of undergraduate education under these new conditions. The
University of Virginia confronted the same problems. In addition, the initial number of first-female undergraduates (350) was seen to be too small a group creating a sense of isolation among the women. A more desirable formula for the entry of women to the University of Virginia would have been an initial move towards a more equalized male-female ratio by admitting more women and by decreasing the number of entering men. This plan would have stabilized the enrollment as well as created less disparity between male and female students.

President Shannon's initial plan for the University's undergraduate women included the objectives whereby the rich tradition of student self-governance at the University of Virginia would come to mean the same thing to women as it did to men. Secondly, Shannon wanted women to be treated exactly like men. To accomplish such a plan, Shannon felt the first women should not be pigeon-holed with regards to their needs and wants; but rather the women should decide these things for themselves. Theoretically, this idea would have worked had the first women come to college with preconceived ideas of what the college experience should include. Unfortunately, it was expressed by most women a concern over the lack of initial support given to them by the University. Moreover, most of the women felt the University should have sponsored more
activities which included women and were centered around women's interests. It took the undergraduates until their 3rd and 4th years at the University before deciding on their needs and to, further, communicate these desires to the appropriate administrative channels. Thus, the more pertinent concern of President Shannon and the University's administration should have been to establish at least a superstructure of services to accommodate the needs of the women and, perhaps, suggested guidelines for initial goals the undergraduates should strive towards while making the adjustment to the University community.

This study was to focus on the comments of a small group of first-female students toward their college experience in the context of a historical event and thus to determine, retrospectively, the University of Virginia's ability to serve its first undergraduate women. As such, the investigation has been focused on this goal. The first women who attended the University of Virginia in 1970 - if they can be represented by the sample group - were women who shaped their college experience for themselves within an environment of significant (but not necessarily adverse) change. These women came away from their experience with some criticism but with generally favorable impressions and memories of their undergraduate days. While they did not choose to attend the University of Virginia only on the
basis of becoming a member of the first class of undergraduate women; nor attempt to radically alter the traditional image of the University with their presence, these women created for those to follow a solid path of acceptance by the University community. It must be a conclusion of this research that the first undergraduate women at the University of Virginia were pioneers - modest perhaps - but indeed pioneers.
Notes


Appendix A

Personal Profile of Sample Group of First-Female Students

1. Current Home Residence of Sample Group:
   
   Virginia: 13
   Other: New York 3
   Arizona 2
   Maryland 1
   Ohio 1
   Massachusetts 1
   New Hampshire 1
   West Virginia 1
   New Jersey 1
   Wisconsin 1
   South Carolina 1
   California 1
   North Carolina 1

2. Home Residence While Attending The University of Virginia:

   Virginia: 22
   Other: Maryland 2
   Pennsylvania 1
   South Carolina 1
   West Virginia 1
   Illinois 1

3. Academic Majors Pursued at the University of Virginia:

   Majors:
   
   Elementary Education 3
   Psychology 3
   English 3
   Commerce 2
   Sociology 2
   Religious Studies 2 (1 as a double major)
   Linguistics 1
   German 1
   Land Use Studies 1 (interdepartmental)
   Anthropology 1
   History 1
   Creative Arts 1
French 1
English Education 1
French Education 1
Audiology 1
Internat'1 Relations 1
Nursing 1
Architecture 1
University Major 1

Minors Declared:
Mathematics 1
History 1
Political Science 1
Speech Pathology 1
Drama 1
Drama Education 1

4. Number of Students Graduating in:

1974 - 23
1973 - 2
1975 - 3 (1 from another institution)

5. Number of Students Graduating From:

School of Arts and Sciences: 18
School of Education: 6
School of Nursing: 1
School of Commerce: 1
School of Architecture 1

6. Number of Students Attending Professional or Graduate Schools:

Disciplines: Law 8 (1 no degree)
M.Ed. 2 (Counseling; Audiology)
M.A. 2 (Psychology; Linquistics)
M.S.W. 2
Medicine 2 (1 anticipated degree)
Ph.D. 2 (Psych; ABD Linquistics)
Management 1 (no degree)
Comp. Science 1 (A.A.S.)
Reading Educ. 1 (no degree)
Art Educ. 1 (no degree)
7. Students' First Jobs After Graduation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker, public welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer, church related</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitress, bartender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Agent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiologist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker for Mentally Retarded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life, University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy Editor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER Clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Program, US Navy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Auditor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Intern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Respondents' Current Occupation or Profession:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife/mother</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Clerk/Federal District Judge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiologist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelance Writer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant/ U.S. Senator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed/ Jazz Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actress/Drama Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing/Training and Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator/Volunteerism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator/Volunteerism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Therapist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Supv./ Advertising</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor/Management Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Auditor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Office Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Research Questionnaire

Instructions:

Please answer all questions listed below. Return the completed questionnaire by June 25, 1985. (Note: All data collected will be presented in the aggregate. Any responses quoted in the final paper will be kept anonymous.)

Questions:

1. What factors most influenced your decision to attend the University of Virginia?

2. While you were attending the University of Virginia did you make any decisions regarding future career or professional ambitions? If so, what were they?

3. Did the University affect these ambitions? If so, how?

4. How would you describe your future ambitions for personal fulfillment as an individual when you were attending the University of Virginia?

5. Were you satisfied with the course offerings of your academic program at the University of Virginia? Why, of why not?
6. How did you regard the effectiveness of the academic instruction you received at the University? If so, in what way?

7. Was your choice for an academic major influenced by the academic course offerings available to you?

8. How personally important were social activities to your life at the University?

9. In what University-sponsored activities did you participate in while going to college?

10. Did you join a sorority?

11. What were your opinions regarding the program of activities available to women students at the University?

12. What was your reactions to combined or coeducation residence hall living?

13. Was the residence hall counseling and advising program helpful to you? If so, in what ways?

14. Did you feel the need for additional security measures, i.e. lighting, security guards, etc.? Why?
15. What were your feelings regarding the physical facilities in your residence hall?

16. What were your opinions of the food services available to you as a resident student?

17. Did you have any need or desire to use the counseling and advisory services available at the University?
   a. Where did you go at the University to seek help with an academic problem?
   b. Where did you go to seek help with a social or emotional problem?
   c. What counseling and advisory services did you personally use at the University?
   d. How did you regard the effectiveness of these counseling and advisory services?

18. Were there any difficult adjustments to University life you confronted as a member of the first-female class?

19. In what ways did the University assist a first-female student in her initial adjustment to the University community?

20. What were your views regarding the number (350) of first-female students admitted in 1970?
21. Did you experience any incidents of female "discrimination" while in attendance at the University of Virginia? If so, please describe.

22. Did you feel that coeducation affected the traditional features of the University of Virginia? If so, how?

23. Based on your experience at the University of Virginia, what constructive suggestions can you make for improving conditions that affect the life of women students in the University community?

24. Are there any other areas of concern that you wish to express regarding your experience within the first coeducational years at the University of Virginia that have not been elicited in the questions above? If so, please describe.
Personal Data:

1. What was your home address while attending the University of Virginia?

2. Your academic major: minor:

3. Year graduated from the University of Virginia?
   Did you graduate from the School of Arts and Sciences?

4. What was your first job after graduation?

5. Have you attended a professional or graduate school?
   If so, Where:
   Subject Studied:
   Degree:

6. What is your current occupation?

7. Do you wish to receive a copy of the study's results?

Signature:______________________________
Dear X:

I am a doctoral student at the College of William and Mary. As a part of my thesis on the overall educational conditions existing for women students during the initial years of coeducation, I have chosen to study the University of Virginia and its first class of undergraduate women students. One phase of my research will be to investigate 50 first-female students and the general perceptions and evaluation of their college experience. Your name has been chosen from a sample of women participants of a 1971 study conducted by the Students Affairs Office at the University of Virginia to determine the general attitudes of women undergraduates after their freshman year.

I am asking you to complete a questionnaire which focuses on aspects of your college life including your personal reactions to conditions affecting women students in the University community. I welcome any additional comments you may have regarding your years at the University of Virginia and as a member of the first class of undergraduate women.

In advance, I wish to thank you for your cooperation in participating in this study. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Louise L. Robertson
Dear X:

The replies to my questionnaire regarding coeducation at the University of Virginia have been steady but slow. From the responses thus far, it is evident that there remains strong feelings among your classmates towards their college experience. I hope you will find the time to respond. If you prefer, call me collect and we can discuss the questions individually.

I look forward to reading your comments. Again, in advance, I thank you for your cooperation and assistance in this study.

Sincerely,

Louise L. Robertson
Dear

I wish to thank you for your participation in my study on the University of Virginia and its first class of undergraduate women students. As a member of this class, the reflections of your college experience helped me to better understand the educational conditions existing for women students who attended Virginia in the early years of coeducation.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding the results of the study. Again, I appreciate your part in my research.

Sincerely,

Louise L. Robertson
Appendix D

Accumulative Summary of Research Questionnaire

Question One:

What factors most influenced your decision to attend the University of Virginia?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reputation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Tuition</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Female Class</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Family</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds &amp; Campus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Programs Offered</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted/Application Deadline</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Choice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Recruitment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation/Party School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Two:

While you were attending the University of Virginia did you make any decisions regarding future career or professional ambitions?

Yes: 23
No: 4
Uncertain: 1
Question Three:

Did the University affect these ambitions?

Yes: 16
No: 6
Possibly: 6

Question Four:

How would you describe your future ambitions for personal fulfillment as an individual when you were attending the University of Virginia?

General Responses  # of Responses

Doing well academically; graduating and finding a job; being independent and financially secure  7

No real thought towards future ambitions as a college student or could not remember them if they did  6

A balance between marriage and a family and a professional career  5

Planned career in medicine, business, foreign service, or to pursue specific graduate work.  5

Maintaining strong commitments with friends and relationships  2

To involve self in many opportunities available to her  1

Involvement in community problem
Question Five:

Were you satisfied with the course offerings of your academic program?

- Satisfied: 21
- Not Satisfied: 3
- Speculative: 4

Question Six:

How did you regard the effectiveness of the academic instruction you received at the university?

- Very Effective: 12
- Effective: 11
- Not Effective: 2
- Uneven: 3

Question Seven:

Was your choice of academic major influenced by the academic course offerings available to you?

- Yes: 13
- No: 15

Academic Majors Declared by Sample Group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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French Education 1
Audiology 1
International Relations 1
Nursing 1
Architecture 1
University Major 1

Question Eight:

How personally important were social activities to your life at the University?

Very Important: 20
Important: 6
Not Important: 2

Question Nine:

In what University-sponsored activities did you participate in while going to college? (Listing of activities appears in Chapter Four)

Participated: 23
Did Not Participate: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Counselor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports/Intramurals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Hall Big Sister Program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays, Films, Concerts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Events</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Gov't Committees</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Guides</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Newspaper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Singers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Players</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Radio Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity Parties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Debating Club</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Environment Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Committee/Human Sexuality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Ten:

Did you join a sorority?

Yes: 0
No: 28

Question Eleven:

What were your opinions regarding the program of activities available to women students?

Very Adequate: 2
Adequate: 8
Not Adequate: 10
Unaware/No opinion: 8

Question Twelve:

What were your reactions to combined or coeducation residence hall living?

Favorable: 17
Unfavorable: 6
Neutral: 4
No Comment: 1

Question Thirteen:

Was the residence hall counseling and advising program helpful to you?

Yes: 7
No: 16
Neutral/Unaware: 5

Question Fourteen:

Did you feel a need for additional security measures?

Yes: 8
No: 20
Question Fifteen:
What were your feelings regarding the physical facilities in your residence hall?
Adequate/Good: 26
Not Adequate: 2

Question Sixteen:
What were your opinions of the food services available to you as a resident student?
Very Sufficient/Good: 3
Adequate: 13
Not Adequate: 10
Did Not Participate: 2

Question Seventeen:
Did you have any need or desire to use the counseling and advisory services available at the University?
Yes: 15
No: 9
Unaware of Services: 4

Question Eighteen:
Were there any difficult adjustments to University life you confronted as a member of the first-female class?
Yes: 19
No: 9

Question Nineteen:
In what ways did the University assist a first-female student in her initial adjustment to the University community?
Did provide assistance: 10
Did not provide assistance: 17
No Answer: 1
Question Twenty:

What were your views regarding the number (350) of first-female students admitted in 1970?

General Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial number of women admitted to small and limited</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited number of first-female students a good way for University community to gradually accept co-education; honored to be a part of a limited group of recognized students</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion or never gave it much thought</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women seemed similar (academically and socially) with those attended high school with</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sense of what was the whole class; very difficult to meet other women except those women in your suite</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Twenty-one:

Did you experience any incidents of female "discrimination" while in attendance at the University of Virginia?

Yes: 8
No: 20

Question Twenty-two:

Did you feel coeducation affected the traditional features of the University of Virginia?

Yes: 23
No: 5
Question Twenty-three:

Based on your experience at the University of Virginia, what constructive suggestions can you make for improving conditions that affect the life of women students in the University community?

General Responses:  

| Need of more personal and career services available to women students including: seminars on women's sexuality; health and hygiene; seminars on group relations and supportive group interaction | 12 |
| Increased need for visible female faculty and administrators | 3 |
| Greater emphasis on women's studies and women's activities | 2 |
| Tighter security | 1 |
Appendix E

A Comparison of Two Studies*

Note: Because of the differences in sample sizes, results appear as percentages of the total number of responses.

What factors influenced students' decision to attend the University of Virginia?

Reasons for selecting the University of Virginia as a college choice did not significantly differ between responses in 1971 and the present research. In both studies, one or a combination of factors were stated as influencing students' decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-state school/</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation/</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty of grounds &amp; campus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-female class</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programs offered</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family attendance/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female ratio</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed setting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted/application deadline</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Choice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Recruitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decisions toward choice of future career or profession while attending the University of Virginia:

A large number of the women had either strongly investigated or decided on specific career choices while they were students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect of the University of Virginia on personal and professional ambitions:

A significant number of responses in both studies indicated the University of Virginia had an affect on personal and professional ambitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you describe your future ambitions for personal fulfillment as an individual:

Over half of the responses in the 1971 study included a combination of career and marriage as important future ambitions. In addition, a career involved with serving others was indicated has holding importance in the future.
1971 Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th># of Responses (sample size 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>career and independence are most important for immediate future</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hope to eventually combine career and marriage</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want a career that will offer service to others</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The women remembered their future ambitions while students to include job security and independence. A balance between a career and marriage was also a significant personal goal in addition to having decided on a planned profession. A service career was mentioned by only one member of the sample.

1985 Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th># of Responses (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>doing well academically; graduating and finding a job; independent and financially secure</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a balance between marriage and a family and a professional career</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned career in medicine, business, foreign service, or to pursue specific graduate work</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement in community problem solving and helping others</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choice of Academic Major:

A comparison of desired academic majors to actual majors declared by the sample population showed English, education, and psychology to be the most frequently chosen field of concentration in both studies.
### 1971 Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific choices</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(sample size 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychology/sociology</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commerce</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>math</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miscellaneous</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1985 Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Majors declared</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(sample size 28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary education</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychology</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commerce</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociology</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious studies</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anthropology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative arts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audiology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international relations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architecture</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university major</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opinion of course offerings of academic program:**

Eighty percent (80%) of the first-year students were very satisfied or generally satisfied with their course
offerings. Similarly, the majority of the 1985 sample (75%) stated they were generally satisfied with their academic program at the University of Virginia.

Effectiveness of the academic instruction received at the University of Virginia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective:</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Effective/uneven:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of Social Activities to Life at the University of Virginia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important:</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important:</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in one or more University-sponsored activities as a student:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated:</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Participate:</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Interest in Sororities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Opinion regarding program of activities available to women students at the University of Virginia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Adequate</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware/No opinion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reactions to combined or coeducation residence hall living:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorably/Prefer &quot;coed&quot;</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorably/Prefer &quot;all-girl&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preference</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Was the residence hall counseling and advisory programs helpful to you as students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/unaware</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need for additional security measures, i.e.; lighting, security, guards, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study</th>
<th>1985 Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sample size 50)</td>
<td>(sample size 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feelings regarding physical facilities in residence halls:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study</th>
<th>1985 Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sample size 50)</td>
<td>(sample size 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good/Adequate, but room for improvement:</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinion of food services available to resident students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study</th>
<th>1985 Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sample size 50)</td>
<td>(sample size 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Adequate:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate:</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Inadequate:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Participate:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need or desire to use the counseling and advisory services available at the University of Virginia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of Services:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difficult adjustments to University life as a member of the first-female class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University assistance to first-female students in making the initial adjustments to the University of Virginia:

Eighty-six percent (86%) of the women, during their first year, felt the University of Virginia could provide assistance in the initial adjustment to University life. In comparison, only thirty-eight (38%) of the sample stated that they remembered receiving assistance from the University in the initial adjustment to University other than orientation.

Views regarding the number (350) of first-female students admitted in 1970 to the University of Virginia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study (sample size 50)</th>
<th>1985 Study (sample size 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial # of women:</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfactory, reasonable number: 78 38
No opinion: 4 18

Women similar with h.s. (academically and socially: - 3.5

No sense of what was the whole class: 3.5

Experience any incidents of female "discrimination" while in attendance at the University of Virginia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study</th>
<th>1985 Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sample size 50)</td>
<td>(sample size 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinion regarding coeducation affecting the traditional features of the University of Virginia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Study</th>
<th>1985 Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sample size 50)</td>
<td>(sample size 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 1971 data presented in Appendix E was taken from E.A. Mayer, "A Study of the Attitudes of a Sample of the Initial Class of First-year Women Admitted to Resident Living at the University of Virginia" (Ph.D Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1971).
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The purpose of this study was to investigate the educational conditions existing for women students during the initial years of coeducation at an institution. The choice of the University of Virginia as a case study was based on its significance as a southern, state university which claims, in addition, national visibility.

A questionnaire was administered to a small sample of first-female students who attended Virginia between the years 1970-1974. The questionnaire, developed from an original set of interview questions prepared by Virginia's Student Affairs Office in a 1971 study, asked the sample to respond, retrospectively, to conditions existing at Virginia while they were undergraduate students.

The research was based on the premise that female students attending coeducational institutions confront institutional barriers which interfere with the quality of undergraduate life. This study examined if institutional barriers (which may be either strengthened or created during a transition to coeducation) affected the quality of undergraduate life for Virginia's first class of women.

It was concluded that while Virginia was able to meet some of the needs of its initial class of female undergraduates, overall it fell short of adequately serving these women students. More specifically, the women faced barriers in the areas of academic programming and instruction; social and student services; and career and personal counseling. In addition, it was revealed that the women in the sample felt, as undergraduates, socially isolated and (while not overtly) perceived discrimination towards women students.

The obstacles faced by the first-female class may have been alleviated if the University of Virginia had (1) initially moved towards a more equalized male-female student ratio; and (2) initially established more adequate services for its undergraduate women.