

***"Our struggle is also a struggle of memory
against forgetting."(1)***

Introduction

This essay focuses on the development and early activism of the Association for Women Faculty, an organization created by and for women faculty and professionals at the University of Arizona. To contextualize the climate in which this association arose, this work first examines the history of women's organizing at the University of Arizona during the 1970s. AWF arose around 1982 from the ashes of these earlier, somewhat more radical attempts to organize women on campus, and went on to agitate throughout the 1980s within the University of Arizona system through a series of organized challenges to University administrators. This organization is still active, and continues to monitor the status of women at the University of Arizona.(2)

Specifically, this work is a case study of the ways in which women at one university organized to challenge salary inequities and the history of their struggle to raise consciousness about as well as to protest these inequities within the University of Arizona system. The Association for Women Faculty (AWF), has made real strides in both questioning and breaking down the dominant structures at the University of Arizona that for years favored male faculty and academic professionals.(3) This case of feminist organizing within academia for pay equity (4) will provide an analysis of the effects and the limitations of the kind of efforts AWF undertook to achieve pay equity at the University of Arizona.

This work examines the perceptions and the motivations of the founders and early members of AWF in striving for salary equity. The narratives that make up this story come from multiple voices, which share a general tenor of conscious activism yet also at times contradict one another, disagreeing, for example over methods used. Through a narrative retelling, this essay seeks to reconstruct the history of these women's struggle from their own voices.(5) They not only tell the story, they are the story. The many areas in which AWF continues to be active

suggests that this early struggle had a significant impact on the consciousness of women faculty and professionals at the University of Arizona. This form of "feminist consciousness,"(6) on some level, seems a necessary prerequisite to activism and change.

History of Women Organizing at the University of Arizona

This essay draws upon historical research to create a case study of the Association For Women Faculty at the University of Arizona, an organization which arose in the early 1980s to challenge salary inequities and other issues of gender discrimination. To this day, AWF continues to monitor the status of women at the University of Arizona.(7) The period of activism I am specifically examining occurred largely during the early and mid-1980s. By this point, feminism had infiltrated the walls of academe,(8) establishing itself through Women's Studies programs and departments.(9)

Many of the founders of Women's Studies were feminists interested in expanding the scope of feminist theory and knowledge to include activism. At the same time, there was an increasing number of women being hired on as faculty and professionals within higher education.(10) AWF formed at a point in history during which women in academia were openly organizing to challenge the discriminations they faced.(11) Much of this organization was influenced and begun by feminist academics.(12)

"The Group": The Committee on the Status of University Women

Women with activist and feminist consciousness began infiltrating the academy by the late 1960s.(13) By 1971, a group of women faculty members at the University of Arizona raised the awareness of women on campus by bringing suit against the University, President Harvill and the Board of Regents, claiming that

the University's anti-nepotism rule (14) was a clear case of discrimination against women, in direct violation of the Equal Employment Act of 1963 and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.(15) The University's anti-nepotism regulations (enacted in the mid-1930's) "effectively prohibited women married to men with faculty appointments from being hired in faculty positions."(16) The Board of Regents settled out of court just before the case went to trial, taking the anti-nepotism rule off the books and hiring two of the plaintiffs as faculty members. This case acted as a catalyst for organizing women within the university system.

Women at the University of Arizona first joined together to protest individual and collective discrimination in 1972.(17) In the fall of that year, about 20 women, mostly faculty, came together for an organizing meeting. Initially calling themselves "The Group" (in order to keep a low-profile) and later adopting the name "The Committee on the Status of University Women" (CSUW), this organization was made up of faculty, professionals, administrators, staff, and students, both graduate and undergraduate. Similar to the later tactics of AWF, the job of representing the organization fell on the few tenured faculty women who, unlike faculty women without tenure, did not fear jeopardizing their chances for tenure by their involvement with a "woman's group."

By the spring of 1973, this committee had adopted a constitution and had gained recognition as a campus organization. This early organization seems to have favored radical approaches to changing women's situation,(18) challenging the university system itself with vocal protest and the use of the media to highlight the issues they wanted the university to address.(19) Yet by the end of the decade, the organization was disintegrating, and no records of the organization exist past early 1979.

There appears to be a number of reasons why this early organization fell apart. CSUW, like AWF, relied on senior, tenured women to speak for and represent the organization.(20) Unfortunately, at the time of this organization's existence,

there were very few women in this position, placing the burden of visible activism almost solely on this small group of women.(21) This often led to burn-out for many of these faculty women.(22) In addition, many university women were hesitant to become involved actively with CSUW, due to both a lack of radical feminist consciousness among many women at the University of Arizona as well as out of fear, it seems, of how it might affect their careers.(23) Finally, it seems that within the group the diversity of interests made it difficult to focus in on key issues and have successful collaborative efforts. CSUW represented, basically, all women on campus; but staff, student, and faculty women each had different pressing issues they wanted to address, which in the end appear to have been too much for the organization to manage successfully.

A History of the Association For Women Faculty

The disintegration of the earlier organization did not end all agitation on the University of Arizona campus by women faculty and professionals. If anything, the activism and agitation of CSUW throughout the 1970s helped to raise the consciousness of campus women, prompting further organization and activism by women.(24) Through this connection, the actions of women at the University of Arizona during the 1970s are directly linked to the formation of AWF during the early 1980s. By this time, feminists working both inside and outside of academia had brought to light significant inequalities between men and women in the U.S. that resulted directly from sexist discrimination. Having already begun the fight to end such discrimination at the University of Arizona, key faculty and professional women would continue this work into the 1980s.

Women became reactivated at the University of Arizona when key organizers and activists from Women's Studies to the Law School began rejuvenating women's collaborative efforts on campus around the end of 1981. In the spring of 1982, a group of women faculty sat down to have lunch and discuss the situation of women at the University of Arizona. Through their discussion, these women

realized that serious issues regarding women's position within the academy remained unresolved. By the end of the meal, the Association for Women Faculty (AWF) had been formed.(25) A number of women were significantly involved, such as Karen Anderson (History), Ruth Dickstein (UA Main Library), Myra Dinnerstein (Women's Studies), Mary Doyle (College of Law), Shirley Fahey (College of Medicine), Yetta Goodman (Education), and the "driving force" behind the pay equity study, Helen Ingram (Political Science).(26) This organization would go on to address numerous issues impacting women in the academy from 1982 to today, with a clear focus on feminist activism.(27) Many of AWF's key early organizers were extremely feminist, and worked to push a feminist agenda while working with a number of conservative women faculty within a conservative state.(28)

This handful of women faced a quite difficult task when they decided to try to organize women faculty and professionals at the University of Arizona. Hesitancy to join a "women's group" made initial recruitment difficult, and the strategies used by professional women to organize (forming women's associations) do not always establish the solidarity of labor unions. Additionally, as within most institutions, the University of Arizona had women firmly enmeshed in bureaucracy. To change the structure of the institution, AWF had to work within the structure itself, yet the very mechanisms of the bureaucracy work to maintain the status quo.(29) AWF received little to no support from the administration, which at times actually worked against this organization.(30) For example, the administration refused to turn over its faculty lists when AWF was initially trying to establish contact with women on campus.(31) Instead, the members of the AWF had to request this information from every individual department on campus.(32) Such roadblocks were not uncommon. Yet despite these obstacles, AWF experienced its highest rates of participation during the 1980s pay equity struggle.(33) The efforts AWF sought to pursue required raising the consciousness of a number of women on campus about the gendered dynamics of discrimination, which AWF did through mailings, the 1983 salary study, press

releases, meetings, and special events.(34)

Strategies for Success: Pay Equity

The Association for Women Faculty's early history centers on two significant stages.(35) AWF first focused on "getting the university to *acknowledge* [the inequities and gender discrimination]...", the next step involved "getting the University to *do* something about it!".(36) The first stage of AWF's activism involved naming and identifying the problem, collecting data, and doing the necessary consciousness-raising to activate women on campus.(37) The second stage involved actual advocacy, targeting a problem all faculty and professional women had in common--pay inequities.(38) Early on, the organization decided to limit its initial focus of action to this primary issue of salary equity. Through surveys, the members of AWF had identified pay inequities as the major grievance of women faculty and professionals on campus. At this point, AWF decided to proceed by implementing and publishing its first salary study.(39)

The 1982/83 salary study was one of the Association's most important early projects. (40) The results of the salary study were distributed through mass mailings to faculty and professional women to share these findings. This extensive study revealed salary disparities ranging from \$2,000 to \$15,000, (41) with an average gap of \$4,300 between similarly situated male and female faculty.(42) This study revealed that, with academic rank and years of employment held constant, the average annual salary for men was \$36,600 and for women--\$32,300. This study found that men and women's salaries do indeed differ greatly according to gender.(43) The study concluded that "the sex-based salary differentials which have been identified are too strong to be disregarded. The statistical testing indicates that there is virtually no possibility that these differences could have occurred by chance alone".(44) Key AWF leaders went public with the results of this study, holding a press conference to highlight the drastic inequities revealed in the salary study.(45) Although "there is always

some tweak, some qualifier to justify any kind of inequity" (46), the salary gap revealed by this study was far too large to ignore.

This study was a monumental achievement for this organization as it forced administrative recognition of salary inequities, prompting the administration of the University of Arizona to begin a pay adjustment process. It is important to keep in mind that the final salary adjustment process put into place was designed by University administrators, though, and not AWF. This process was put into place in 1985/86 by the University's administrators at the urging of the Arizona Legislature and the Board of Regents (47), a direct result of the organizing and activism of AWF.(48) It also eventually prompted the Board of Regents (with continuing pressure from AWF members) to create a Commission on the Status of Women. In addition, the study raised awareness among women campus-wide that these inequities existed, and they existed blatantly. This is significant, because a consciousness of the institutional inequities of faculty and professional women was necessary for action. Once academic women at the University of Arizona became aware of these gaps, it became more difficult to ignore or dismiss gender inequities--they needed to be addressed thoughtfully, seriously, and actively.

Pay equity acted as a catalyst issue for AWF. "I would say that...finding the issue made the organization; in other words, that there was an interaction between identifying the issue that had meaning for all the members and establishing the organization."(49) AWF and salary equity had, in a sense, a reciprocal relationship; that is, they both arose and gained strength at the same time from each other.

And I think that--we never would have articulated it this way, we would be embarrassed to say this, but--I think that there is something in our culture about the idea that our worth is measured in dollars; and it was not just that there was an unfairness about it, but that there's a kind of denigration going on with it--that you're being deemed to be 'less valuable' to the institution, and that your worth as a faculty is being denied.(50)

This issue clearly struck a nerve with women, prompting the highest numbers of active members AWF has ever seen.(51) As consciousness was raised, women became prepared to act, and act they did, in a very vocal, very powerful manner. The united efforts of campus women prompted change within the university system. After deciding to focus on the issue of pay equity, AWF engaged in a variety of tactics to push the University to address their grievances such as: writing letters to university administrators as well as key Arizona legislators, threatening litigation for failure to comply with federal legislation regarding equal employment opportunities and treatment, (52) and even using the press to call attention to the University's discriminatory policies and actions.(53) AWF members also met with administrative officials and Regents to discuss the concerns of women faculty and professionals.

As was the case with CSUW, leadership was composed primarily of senior tenured faculty.(54) Many felt this was important for the organization to be taken seriously as a collective group (55); also, it was a less risky tactic than individual, untenured women protesting on their own. Monthly meetings and newsletters served to keep members informed, and special noon-time programs were designed to present different issues faced by women in higher education. Within the organization, officers were selected to fulfill certain roles, and committees were established to address particular issues.(56)

Additionally, the core members of AWF gathered and split up a phone list of the Arizona Board of Regents, and each one became a primary contact with one of the Regents. "We...knew we had to make connections with administrators...to let them in on the fact that they had a responsibility to women faculty's agenda."(57) Using this tactic meant that a group of core AWF members got to know these Regents on a first-name basis, which had significant implications for the organization's negotiations.(58)

In 1984-85, two years after the salary study was implemented and public attention had been focused on the pay gap between male and female academics, the University began making salary adjustments.(59) Significantly, studies in 1987 and 1992 have continued to reveal a need for equity (60), yet the University has since dismantled its salary adjustment process. The question remains: why has it taken so long to enact changes at the institutional level?

I think that the central administration of this university realized that there probably were salary inequities, that they probably were deep-seated, long standing, and impenetrable from the point of view of being scientific about pursuing them...and so I imagine that any kind of sense of what would be 'good' and 'right' to pursue would be offset by the fact that this was going to be a horrible mess and it was going to require a lot of work and effort on the part of an institutional research office or some other source...it could have been that the administrative structure of the university would have continued just the way it was forever--I mean, we can't say right now whether any of the senior administrators on this campus...would ever have thought about addressing salary inequities had there not been that political action on our part.(61)

Given these obstacles, it seems likely that without the activism and persistence of AWF, salary inequities may not have been addressed. "I think maybe the administration themselves wanted to be responsive, but they wouldn't have been without us, and so we...kept pushing at them, and it forced them to be even a little more responsive than they might have been otherwise."(62) Administrators argued that equity would be too expensive to grant, a common justification for continuing inequitable wages.

The process has sometimes been costly, and certainly the fear of high costs has kept many employers from initiating [and maintaining] pay equity. Yet, in most cases, employer costs have not been high. Keep in mind, too, that there is a cost in keeping the system biased. That cost is borne by the people in jobs receiving biased wages--those discriminated against bear the cost of discrimination, in lower wages, fewer opportunities, and lack of respect for the value of their work.(63)

Although getting any process put in place was a remarkable achievement, the actual "process" of salary equity adjustment at the University of Arizona had many practical limitations, such as the need to find a "similarly situated" male *willing* to share his curriculum vita (CV), which are not public records. "Everybody had difficulty finding somebody that they could compare themselves to, even knowing--I mean, the worst thing is, how do you know how much to ask for...how do you put an amount on who you are?"(64) The individualized strategy for going about adjusting strategies has negatively impacted many women working in fields in which there are no "similarly situated males." This impacted women in a variety of ways:

...I think that the way the structure was set up--that you had to find this 'comparable' male--it sort of...structured your sense of what was appropriate in a way that might not have been in fact what was going on...I think on all sides it gave the sense that there's a false precision to the process; that we might as well admit that there's a certain subjectivity to salary setting.(65)

Not everyone, and certainly not all women were pleased with the outcome; some viewed the salary increases "as not much more than a token."(66) Given the fact that this salary equity adjustment process has since ceased, it seems this sentiment was not completely off-base.

Through the use of feminist theories and practices, organizations such as the Association for Women Faculty have made tremendous gains for women in academia. Organizations similar to AWF have often relied upon feminist strategies such as "equal pay for equal worth" to challenge salary inequities. This choice of strategies is integrally connected to the organizational structure of AWF. AWF is a professional women's organizations, and historically there are very specific ways in which professional women engage in activism.

In particular, professional women tend to form professional organizations, not labor unions.(67) If these organizations do not have the full support of women colleagues, their bargaining power may be quite restrained. Although academics are becoming "laborized" in terms of their treatment at the hands of 'management' in colleges and universities, professors and professionals alike seem quite hesitant to unionize, and are certainly not likely to do so in right-to-work states such as Arizona. The practical realities of women's organizing at the professional level has impacted the success of AWF's salary equity struggle. "I don't know how we can ever have serious equity without some kind of scale, some kind of unionization."(68) The methods employed by AWF offer us concrete strategies for getting women to work together for change within an institutional structure. The history and outcome of AWF's efforts highlight pitfalls for future organizers to contemplate before reinventing the wheel, such as the University's ability to subvert AWF's goal of achieving salary equity.(69)

AWF's salary equity struggle is perceived as one of the most successful actions undertaken by the organization.(70) The methods used by the organization provide an effective model for addressing salary grievances within higher education. Following this study, the University came up with \$200,000 to begin its salary equity adjustment process in the fall of 1984.(71) In 1984-1985, 329 UA women applied for salary equity review (4 administrative, 215 faculty, and 110 professional women); 183 were rewarded salary increases (4 administrative, 121 faculty, and 58 professional women). \$538,126.00 was ultimately awarded during

this period.(72) Yet troubling issues remained, the most significant of which was the alleged mishandling of states funds (handed down to the University to make equity adjustments) by top-level administrators.(73)

Additional successes of AWF include the implementation (after over 10 years of struggle) of a parental leave policy, the increased awareness of women's status on campus and of existing biases which function to the detriment of women, and the building of a community; "...there was the time when we were all pretty isolated in our own departments...".(74) "I think the interpersonal connections are stronger than anything we've printed or done."(75) AWF put women in contact with other women, which was an important step in the process of bringing women together to act. "AWF and the general presence of feminist scholars has enhanced the reputation of the University as a place for other women scholars to work."(76) AWF's presence has raised the standards by which the University of Arizona's steps towards equality are measured to this day, while at the same time improving the campus climate for academics and professionals.(77)

On AWF and Activism

At its heart, AWF was and still is an activist-based organization. It has always been important for members to understand "...that discrimination was institutional, that it was systematic, and that it wasn't going to be easily remedied."(78) Indeed, many of the issues raised by AWF throughout the 1980s have yet to be sufficiently addressed or remedied. The hard-won salary adjustment process, as noted, no longer is in effect at the University of Arizona, and no other method to ensure pay equity is currently being used in place of this process.(79)

Nonetheless, AWF exhibited and still exhibits a number of significant strengths, the primary one being its ability to unite women in collaborative effort.(80) This is reflective of "...the whole notion that you can't do anything by yourself...if you're

not working with an organizational structure, forget it, I mean, unless you want to be for yourself."(81) As Sheila Slaughter and countless others have noted, there is "power in collective action!".(82) Collective action is necessary for change; in addition, I would agree that radical approaches need to be integrated into such collective action. "...I think collective action helps...it also helps if you have numerous strategies...and also have collective ones and then radical ones..."(83) Yet AWF was, in a sense, "[made up of]...women...trying to deal with the art of the possible rather than the art of the confrontational."(84)

Although women have been working in higher education since the middle of the last century, there remains a perception that women entering the academy as faculty and professionals are entering a male domain. "The world is a man's world, and how do you live in a man's world without becoming a man? It's easy to say be a tough woman, be like men and you'll make it...I don't think there should be a contradiction."(85) AWF has sought to break down the structural impediments of the academy that claim to hold no gender biases, yet clearly have different implications for men and women. One question raised by AWF members early on was "How do we live in this institution? How do we make this place more comfortable for all of us?".(86) Across disciplines, colleges, and schools too numerous to list, women have related stories of how they have coped with the pressures they face working within a system designed for the male norm and reluctant to change. These experiences inspired women to work together to "...remake the University, so it was a different and better place, rather than doing just what men do."(87) AWF members envisioned equality and worked to transform the reality of the institutional structure to reflect that vision. The results have been mixed; "I don't think we have solved all of the attitude problems...but I do think we have changed the overt behaviors."(88)

AWF was successful in "[letting] the administration know that there was a united voice that represented women and that that made them strong; that they had to pay attention to it; the voice...hadn't been paid attention to, and...it was a

representative voice...".(89) AWF continues in this role, providing the university "a clearer conduit to 'the woman's point of view', as if that were singular."(90) AWF also connected a community of women, many of whom had been isolated within their own departments prior to becoming involved with AWF.(91) AWF functioned as a "place of camaraderie," bringing women together and creating an activist community of women within the academy.(92) Significantly, "In this case, community was formed surrounding some intentions and some action; and that forms community better than just sitting around, talking about our problems."(93) Additionally, through connecting junior and senior faculty women, AWF has and continues to function actively as a mentoring organization for women faculty, professionals, graduate students, and post doctorates.(94)

The women who chose to be actively involved with AWF did so for a number of reasons. Some came out of a feminist "...commitment to changing the institution so it's better for women"(95), others sought involvement with other women on campus to establish community and connections(96), and to build camaraderie.(97) Others came out of their feelings of anger and agitation at the way they perceived they were being exploited by the university. When asked how women felt during the salary equity struggle, Myra Dinnerstein replied quite succinctly "Angry!...I think that women were very angry and felt very used"(98); significantly, this anger was transformed into action. Still others were motivated by their experiences with collective action..."...We assumed we would be activists...many of us came out of the student movement, and we had experienced as a part of our socialization, collective action and what it can do."(99) Finally, a sense of difference, of being outsiders within the academy, also drew women together. "I think this sense of difference, that women felt they were...overworked, overburdened...I think that did add to a sense of commonality among the women."(100)

Evaluation: Where are We Today?

So, how successful has this activism been in addressing the grievances of female faculty and professionals at the University of Arizona? Today, "...many UA women are finding that remedies to the ills that plague women in academia--gender balance and salary equity--are a long time in coming."(101) The Commission on the Status of Women is currently undertaking a gender salary equity study of UA faculty and professionals. Preliminary findings indicate a salary gap between male and female faculty of between \$4,500 annually for lecturers to a \$17,000 gap annually for tenured faculty.(102)

As to gender balance within the University, in 1985 women constituted 19.65% of the University of Arizona's 'general faculty'. By 1995 women made up 30% of the University's 'general faculty', an increase of just over 10%.(103) Yet while these numbers may look good, they hide a disturbing trend--namely, that the majority of this increase in female faculty representation is occurring at the level of research associates, instructors, and non-tenure track positions.(104) These positions involve a substantial amount of work at a lower pay scale than full professorships, without the potential reward of tenure.

Although the number of women reaching the rank of full professor has been slowly increasing over the past twenty years, by 1995, just 12.8% of the UA's full professors were women.(105) Thus still today it seems apparent that the University's employment practices, whether consciously or unconsciously, remain discriminatory, although not as overtly as during the 1970s and 1980s. More significantly, these trends illustrate that change comes slowly. This is precisely why Karen Anderson feels that "activism and commitment" were and are the most important qualities for those involved with the Association for Women Faculty.(106) Without an awareness of the struggle for equity in the early 1980s and the implementation of a salary equity adjustment process by 1985, faculty and professionals would not be aware that this process has been dismantled. Without activism and commitment by these women to challenge the biases they face in academy, the biases will remain.

Clearly, women faculty themselves are aware of and angered by salary inequities and other discriminatory practices within university systems. Channeling this frustration into effective political action requires a great deal of effort and energy on the part of female faculty, already overburdened in terms of their teaching load, committee work, and advising responsibilities. (107) This is where "sisterhood counts"; women's networks at universities provide friendship, support, and professional networks while at the same time providing strength in numbers as well as acting as organized monitors of women's rights.(108)

At issue is the future status of women employed both at the University of Arizona and institutions of higher education nationwide. History has shown that advances towards equality made by women are often met with resistance and backlash, and this is no less true of labor struggles in higher education and elsewhere. Although this may require more effort than many women can commit to, we must keep constantly vigilant and aware to ensure that the equity fought for and gained during the 1980s does not continue to slip away; indeed, it is still necessary to actively insist that further measures be taken to ensure equity between the genders in the workplace.

Until now, attention to salary disparities by sex in higher education has largely been restricted to statistical studies showing the failure of universities to compensate female faculty for factors that affect pay at the same rate they did men in the same departments. However, such studies, and the remedies they have motivated, have failed to address the problem of interdepartmental differentials that disadvantage women. Nor have they addressed problems caused by certain common salary-setting practices that systematically and unfairly disadvantage women. These practices need to be examined on *every* campus and modified. Unless that occurs, the salary gap will persist. (*italics mine*)(109)

The activism of AWF really started something at the University of Arizona. The work of many dedicated women has raised awareness across campus of the need for united efforts to challenge salary inequities. Yet to this day, inequities remain.(110) There is still much work to be done.

Conclusion

...The kind of empowerment that a group of women receives, both collectively and individually, from participating [in consciousness-raising groups, and I would add

activism] is not power based on control over others or a simple increase in the individual capacities of each woman. Rather than being "power over" or "power to," empowerment is "power with"--that is, an interrelationship in which the whole group creates more energy to change the world in its joint support of each individual than any one individual would have on her own.

This essay has focused in specifically on the Association for Women Faculty, a women's faculty and professional organization at the University of Arizona which has worked to monitor women's status at the University for the last 15 years and has actively protested the inequities faced by women in the academy. The women involved with the Association for Women Faculty put into practice what academic feminists have been doing in theory, to some extent, in their struggle for women's equality within the academy. The Association for Women Faculty presents us with an example of women in academia challenging the status quo by connecting theory, practice, and consciousness through collective action. This combination of theory and practice, as well as the power of collective action, is clearly necessary to enact change within academic institutions. The women involved with AWF were and still are agents in their own lives. They have claimed their agency through their feminist activism, specifically through challenging the discriminatory practices they have encountered in university systems.

Kesselman et. al. report that: "Pay equity campaigns can take three forms: litigation, collective bargaining, and legislation."(112) At most institutions of higher learning, including the University of Arizona, all three of these methods have been used. In the case of the Association for Women Faculty at the University of Arizona, a combination of legal, political, and academic pressure was used by faculty women to press for pay equity measures. The organization's most common strategy for addressing grievances has been to go directly to university administration with the concerns of female faculty and professionals. This approach has been by far the most successful method through which the AWF communicated their grievances to both University of Arizona's administration as well as to the Arizona State Legislature.

Feminists working within academia have a wide variety of approaches to challenging women's subordinate position in the academy, such as forming labor unions, associations, and collectives; litigation; integrating into male-dominated disciplines and administrations, as well as forming our own radical enclaves within academe where feminist theory thrives. The formation of Women's Studies programs and departments has presented a multi-faceted challenge to the traditional norms of academic institutions through its interdisciplinary, anti-hierarchical, often post-modern approach. Changing the structures of the academy requires challenging the students to rethink "learning" itself, which is something feminists in academia have been doing for years.

Organizations such as AWF have enabled women to present (*at least in appearance*) a united front to administrators and a 'collective voice' of protest against discrimination. This type of united political action has proven to be an effective strategy for providing women with a forum to demand equity and fair treatment. Women who have organized collectively within academia have had a history of effectively challenging blatant discrimination and inequalities at numerous universities.(113) These organizations provide support networks for women; through such groups, women began to realize they were not alone in their experiences of discrimination and harassment. This realization, that discrimination was both institutional and pervasive, enabled women to take action and empowered them to challenge their subordinate status in the academy.(114)

Pointing out the changes that AWF has effected within the university system, this work highlights what AWF provides for the campus community. It also highlights the need for continued organization and agitation by women to address the continuing discrimination against women faculty, professionals, graduate students and post-doctoral students. In particular, it illustrates the need to get all women, junior, senior, and in-between, active and directly involved in campus women's organizations to continue educating and agitating for change. Although

getting any process put in place was a remarkable achievement, the actual "process" of salary equity adjustment at the University of Arizona still has many practical limitations. AWF was successful in protesting for a change, yet the resulting change has not been totally effective, and this work has explored some of the reasons why.

Remembering our history and the efforts of women working for gender justice empowers people with consciousness. Women as well as men now entering academia need to be made aware of the struggles women in higher education have historically faced, as well as the methods women have successfully used to challenge discrimination. We must also acknowledge that a great many inequalities still exist, both in higher education and more generally in the ways in which men and women's labor is valued differently economically. In particular, women's inequity in terms of salaries within academe is clearly a grievance that requires action, both on the part of faculty and administrators. Until women's inequalities within the labor market, such as salary inequities, are acknowledged and addressed more effectively than they have been so far, this struggle must continue.

I'd like to thank all of my interview subjects for their time and thoughtful responses during the interviews.

*Words and Text by Roberta Moore, unless otherwise noted
Copyright 1998*

ENDNOTES

¹ bell hooks, Yearning: race, gender and cultural politics, (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1990).

² In addition to the Commission on the Status of Women, <<http://w3.arizona.edu/~csw/>> formed in 1992 by the Arizona Board of Regents. This Commission is in existence until the year 2000.

³ "Academic professionals" is a term which refers to a variety of research and professional jobs within the university that do not necessarily involve teaching.

⁴ "Salary equity" or "pay equity" are less controversial terms for "comparable worth". Although the activists in AWF tried to pursue equitable wages using this method (*Yetta Goodman, Oral History: Oct. 15th 1997*), the University has chosen to implement the bare minimum measures required by law--equal pay for equal work.

⁵ AWF continues to this day its struggle for pay equity. See Karen Anderson's recent article from the AWF Dec. 1997 newsletter and published on the AWF webpage <w3.arizona.edu/~awf/home.htm>; follow the "pay equity" link.

⁶ Although many AWF members did not initially and may still not identify themselves as feminists, from my interviews it has become clear that these women did become aware of differential treatment towards them based upon their gender. Thus, feminist or not, issues such as pay equity clearly impact many women.

⁷ In addition to the Commission on the Status of Women, <<http://w3.arizona.edu/~csw/>> formed in 1992 by the Arizona Board of Regents. This commission, established at all three Arizona institutions of higher learning, will be in existence only until the year 2000.

⁸ Feminist Academics: Creative Agents for Change. Ed. by Louise Morley and Val Walsh. Taylor and Francis: London, England 1995.

⁹ "Women's Studies: The Idea and the Ideas", by Catharine Stimpson. In Women in Higher Education: A Feminist Perspective ed. by Judith Glazer, Estela Bensimon, and Barbara Townsend. Ginn Press: Needham Heights, MA, 1993, pg. 545.

¹⁰ "The Inequitable Treatment of Women Faculty in Higher Education", Christine Maitland. Women in Higher Education: Changes and Challenges, ed. by Lynne Welch. Praeger: NY, 1990, pg. 246.

¹¹ See Feminist Academics: Creative Agents for Change. Ed. by Louise Morley and Val Walsh, 1995. Also see Joan Abramson's The Invisible Woman: Discrimination in the Academic Profession. Jossey-Bass publishers: San Francisco, 1975.

¹² This was the case at the University of Arizona, where a number of feminist faculty members actively worked to create and sustain women's collaborative action and protest via AWF. (Myra Dinnerstein, Oral History, 7-16-97).

¹³ Dr. Shirley Fahey, Oral History (May 9th, 1997).

¹⁴ UA's anti-nepotism rule was put into place in the mid-1930's during the Great Depression; it appears to have been a way to justify the dismissal of academic wives working in the University during this period. See the Diaries of Emily Walsh, 1935 and 1936 volumes; housed at the Arizona Historical Society, Tucson, AZ.

¹⁵ "History of the Association for Women Faculty", compiled by Yetta Goodman, date unknown. Among AWF's records and papers, housed in the University of Arizona's Special Collections. Also see Elaine Sorensen's Comparable Worth: Is it a Worthy Policy?, "Legal Context" pg. 14-19.

¹⁶ *ibid.*

¹⁷ The following history was related to me by Dr. Shirley Fahey, Oral History, 5-9-97. It is supported by the papers in existence for CSUW, housed with AWF's papers at the University of Arizona's Special Collections.

¹⁸ Two of the primary leaders of this organization, one a faculty member and the other a graduate student, were in particular radical leaders. It seems quite likely that the changing political climate of 1979-1980, with the election of Ronald Reagan, impacted the political atmosphere of the University, making the somewhat more conservative approach of AWF in a sense a political necessity to work within a conservative university system.

¹⁹ CSUW's activism produced over 20 articles from the period of 1973-1974 alone, published in the campus paper, the Arizona Daily Wildcat, the Tucson Citizen, the Arizona Daily Star, and New Times. These articles chronicle discrimination in hiring, salary equity, tenure and promotion, and in the lack of representation of women and minorities, especially in science, engineering, and medicine. Copies of these articles are in the CSUW folder in AWF's Archives, Special Collections, University of Arizona Library, Tucson, AZ.

²⁰ "History of the Association for Women Faculty", compiled by Yetta Goodman, date unknown. Among AWF's records and papers, housed in the University of Arizona's Special Collections.

²¹ Dr. Shirley Fahey, Oral History (May 9th, 1997).

²² *ibid.*

²³ Minutes of the Committee on the Status of University Women, Feb. 15th, 1974. Association for Women Faculty Archives, Special Collections, University of Arizona Library, Tucson, AZ.

²⁴ This activism was not limited to faculty and professional women; staff women, led by activists in the Women's Studies department, attempted to unionize during the early 1980s. These efforts were quickly squashed.

²⁵ No records exist of the meeting or of AWF activities prior to 1983. Recollections of this meeting exist today primarily in the memories of the women involved.

²⁶ This story was related to me at the first AWF group meeting I attended last February. In attendance were: Yetta Goodman, Karen Anderson, Margaret Briehl, Sheila Slaughter, Myra Dinnerstein, Ruth Dickstein, and myself. This history was expressed again by Myra Dinnerstein (July 16th, 1997), Yetta Goodman (Oct. 15, 1997), and Karen Anderson (May 1st, 1997). It is also included in the "History of the Association For Women Faculty", AWF Collection, UA Special Collections.

²⁷ The economic, racial, and social location of these women in many ways impacted this movement. All of these initial organizers were married, professional white women; their status and position gave them some measure of security not necessarily afforded to all women working in academic institutions.

²⁸ Myra Dinnerstein, Oral Interview (July 16th, 1997).

²⁹ Karen Anderson, Oral Interview (April 3rd, 1997).

³⁰ Karen Anderson, Oral Interview (April 3rd, 1997); Judy Temple, Oral Interview (March 27th, 1997).

³¹ Karen Anderson, Oral Interview (May 1st, 1997).

³² Group Interview with The Association for Women Faculty, (Feb. 12th, 1997).

³³ Out of just over 800 faculty and professional women, 536 were AWF members during 1984-1985. Membership List File and Executive Committee Minutes, 1984-85 Academic Year. AWF Archives, Special Collections, University of Arizona Library, Tucson.

³⁴ Sarah Dinham, Oral Interview (Oct. 2nd, 1997).

³⁵ As related to me by Myra Dinnerstein, Oral History, (July 16th, 1997).

³⁶ Myra Dinnerstein, Oral History (July 16th, 1997).

³⁷ Helen Ingram and Mary Doyle were two crucial early leaders of AWF.

³⁸ These two early "stages" of AWF's activism were described to me by Myra Dinnerstein, Oral History (July 16th, 1997).

³⁹ Association For Women Faculty, Summary Report on the Status of Women: Faculty Salaries by Gender, 1982-1983. Study Group Members: Ellen Altman, Elizabeth Atwater, Terence Burke, Mary Doyle, Shirley Nickols Fahey, Helen Ingram, Arlene Morris, Anne Shipley, and Mary Wetzel; Statistical Consultants: Lawrence Aleamoni, Sarah Dinham. Sept. 6th, 1983, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ. Study housed in AWF Archives, UA Special Collections.

⁴⁰ Association For Women Faculty, Summary Report on the Status of Women: Faculty Salaries by Gender, 1982-1983, (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona, 1983).

⁴¹ Yetta Goodman, Oral History, 10-15-97. Also see the 1982-83 salary study initiated and published by AWF (because the University of Arizona is a public university, faculty salaries are public record.) Summary Report: Faculty Salaries by Gender. Sept. 6th, 1983, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ. Study housed in AWF Archives, UA Special Collections.

⁴² *ibid.* Also see AWF 1991-1992 Membership/Activity flyer, AWF Collection, UA Special Collections, under "A History".

⁴³ AWF Faculty Salary Study, University of Arizona: Tucson, 1982.

⁴⁴ AWF Faculty Salary Study, 1982, pg. 10.

⁴⁵ Sarah Dinham, Oral History (Oct. 2nd, 1997).

⁴⁶ Judy Temple, Oral History (July 23rd, 1997).

⁴⁷ AWF made a point of connecting with Regents and legislators and pressuring them to enact change. Sarah Dinham, Oral History (Oct. 2nd, 1997).

⁴⁸ Yet additional studies, such as Kay Moore's 1997 study and Ron Oaxaca's 1992 study, found continuing disparities between male and female salaries.

⁴⁹ Myra Dinnerstein, Oral History (July 16th, 1997).

⁵⁰ Karen Anderson, Oral History (May 1st, 1997).

⁵¹ Out of just over 800 faculty and professional women, 536 were AWF members during 1984-1985. Membership List File and Executive Committee Minutes, 1984-85 Academic Year. AWF Archives, Special Collections, University of Arizona Library, Tucson.

⁵² These methods are documented in AWF's historical papers and were corroborated by oral histories (Myra Dinnerstein; July 16th, 1997). The legislation which the University was, consciously or not, violating includes the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title VI and VII (The Higher Education Amendments, 1972) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As noted, the University had already been under investigation by a federal regulatory commission in 1970 for violation of some of these significant pieces of legislation. (Shirley Fahey; May 9th, 1997).

⁵³ "Women Professors at UA Are Paid Less at All Levels" Arizona Daily Star (Sept. 14th, 1983); "Study Indicates Faculty Salary Discrepancies" Arizona Advocate (Sept./Oct. 1983); "Women's Faculty Group Seeks Funds to Right Inequities" AZ Daily Wildcat (Oct. 7th, 1983); "Koffler Downplays Bias in Pay Inequities" Arizona Daily Star (May 25th, 1984); "UA Panel Asks Pay Hikes for 100 Tenure-Track Women", Arizona Daily Star (June 5th, 1984), "U of A Faculty Women Say Pay Increase Proposal is Big Disappointment" Tucson Citizen (June 7th, 1984); "Delay of Pay Raises Questioned" AZ Daily Wildcat (June 12th, 1984); "Token Pay Increase" letter to the Editor by Mary Doyle, Arizona Daily Star (June 16th, 1984); "UA Moves Toward Equity With Pay Hikes for Women", Arizona Daily Star (July 6th, 1984); "UA Women to Get Salary Increases" AZ Daily Wildcat (July 10th, 1984); "Some UA Women Say Equity Raises too Small" Tucson Citizen (July 16th, 1984); "UA Women Given Pay Adjustments" Lo Que Pasa (July 16th, 1984); "UA's Salaries for Women, Minorities to be Examined for Pay Inequities" AZ Daily

Wildcat (Sept. 16th, 1984). This is just a sampling of the media's coverage of AWF's equity struggle; over 100 articles were published on this topic from 1983-1986. These and additional news coverage of AWF are in the Pay Equity Folders, AWF Archives, UA Special Collections, Tucson, AZ.

⁵⁴ Sheila Slaughter, Oral History (Oct. 7th, 1997).

⁵⁵ Sarah Dinham, Oral History (Oct. 2nd, 1997).

⁵⁶ Offices include: President, Vice-President, Secretary, and Treasurer/Dues Secretary. *Bylaws of AWF, AWF Archives, UA Special Collections*. Committees formed during the course of AWF's existence include: Pay Equity Committee, Action Committee, Family Care Committee, Status of Faculty Women Committee, and Professional Women's Concerns. AWF also maintains a newsletter editor. *AWF Archives, UA Special Collections*.

⁵⁷ Yetta Goodman, Oral History (Oct. 15th, 1997).

⁵⁸ Sarah Dinham, Oral History (Oct. 2nd, 1997). The Arizona Board of Regents is the governing body of Arizona's university system.

⁵⁹ In 1984-1985, 329 UA women applied for salary equity review (4 administrative, 215 faculty, and 110 professional women); 183 were rewarded salary increases (4 administrative, 121 faculty, and 58 professional women). *Summary: 1984-1985 Salary Equity Review*, Pay Equity Folders, AWF Archives, UA Special Collections, Tucson, AZ. \$538, 126.00 was ultimately awarded during this period (just over half of what AWF had been pushing for; "Ask \$1 Million to Fix Pay, Say Women at UA" Arizona Daily Star (October 7th, 1983). AWF Archives, UA Special Collections, Tucson, AZ.

⁶⁰ Kathryn Moore, Hiring and Retaining Women Faculty at the University of Arizona: A Report to Provost Nils Hasselmo and the Association of Women Faculty, 1987. This study is among the archives of the Association for Women Faculty, Special Collections, UA Library. Also see: cite Oaxaca study

⁶¹ Sarah Dinham, Oral History (Oct. 2nd, 1997).

⁶² Yetta Goodman, Oral History (July 23rd, 1997).

⁶³ Lynda Ames, Erase the Bias (Vol. #2 and #8: 1993).

⁶⁴ Yetta Goodman, Oral History (July 23rd, 1997).

⁶⁵ Karen Anderson, Oral History (May 1st, 1997).

⁶⁶ Mary Doyle, President of AWF 1984-85, Letter to the Editor of the Arizona Daily Star, 6-16-84.

⁶⁷ Barbara Harris, "Beyond Her Sphere: Women and the Professions in American History," (Greenwood Press: Westport, Connecticut 1978), pg. 189-190.

⁶⁸ Yetta Goodman, Oral History (Oct. 15th, 1997).

⁶⁹ The Commission on the Status of Women is currently undertaking a gender salary equity study of UA faculty and professionals. Preliminary findings indicate a salary gap between male and female faculty of between \$4,500 annually for lecturers to a \$17,000 gap annually for tenured faculty. The study is due to be completed this year, 1998. CSW Minutes, March 1998. Located in the CSW file, AWF Archives, UA Special Collections Library, Tucson, AZ.

⁷⁰ Yet pay inequity remains an issue for AWF and women faculty and professionals to this day.

⁷¹ AWF 1991-1992 Membership/Activity flyer, under "A History" and "Association for Women Faculty Newsletter," Vol. 2, #4, 1984. AWF Collection, UA Special Collections, Tucson, AZ.

⁷² "Summary: 1984-1985 Salary Equity Review," Pay Equity Folders, AWF Archives, UA Special Collections, Tucson, AZ.

⁷³ Over 50% of the women I spoke with, both in preliminary meetings and during the interviews, mentioned this grievance without any prompting or specific questioning by myself. This trend lead me to conclude that there is a widespread perception that state funds were intentionally misdirected by administrators, going into general departmental funding instead of being used as directed by the AZ Legislature for equity adjustments.

⁷⁴ Sarah Dinham, Oral History (Oct. 2nd, 1997).

⁷⁵ Judy Temple, Oral History (July 7th, 1997).

⁷⁶ Kathryn Moore, Hiring and Retaining Women Faculty at the University of Arizona: A Report to Provost Nils Hasselmo and the Association of Women Faculty, 1987. AWF Collection, University of Arizona Special Collections.

⁷⁷ Currently (1997-98 academic year), AWF has been working to raise awareness of the University of Arizona's quiet, non-publicized dismantling of Affirmative Action programs and funding through highlighting the benefits the University receives with diversity of sex, race, ethnicity, and ability. See AWF Board Minutes and Email Correspondence, 1997-1998 File, AWF Collection, UA Special Collections.

⁷⁸ Karen Anderson, Oral History (May 1st, 1997).

⁷⁹ Karen Anderson, AWF Executive Board Member and Action Committee Chair, March 5th, 1998.

⁸⁰ Myra Dinnerstein, Oral History (July 17th, 1997).

⁸¹ Yetta Goodman, Oral History (Oct. 15th, 1997).

⁸² Sheila Slaughter, Oral History (Oct. 7th, 1997).

⁸³ *ibid.*

⁸⁴ Ruth Dickstein, Oral History (July 11th, 1997).

⁸⁵ Yetta Goodman, Oral History (Oct. 15th, 1997).

⁸⁶ Yetta Goodman, Oral History (Oct. 15th, 1997).

⁸⁷ Sheila Slaughter, Oral History (Oct. 7th, 1997).

⁸⁸ Yetta Goodman, Oral History (Oct. 15th, 1997).

⁸⁹ Myra Dinnerstein, Oral History (July 17th, 1997).

⁹⁰ Judy Temple, Oral History (July 7th, 1997).

⁹¹ Sarah Dinham, Oral History (Oct. 2nd, 1997).

⁹² Ruth Dickstein, Oral History (July 11th, 1997).

⁹³ Sarah Dinham, Oral History (Oct. 2nd, 1997).

⁹⁴ AWF is currently in the process of establishing a counterpart organization for graduate women.

⁹⁵ Sheila Slaughter, Oral History (Oct. 7th, 1997).

⁹⁶ Sarah Dinham, Oral History (Oct. 2nd, 1997).

⁹⁷ Ruth Dickstein, Oral History (July 11th, 1997).

⁹⁸ Myra Dinnerstein, Oral History (July 17th, 1997). In this interview, Myra drew connections between "the consciousness, the anger, [and] the action" necessary to launch a successful struggle for equity.

⁹⁹ Sheila Slaughter, Oral History (Oct. 7th, 1997).

¹⁰⁰ Myra Dinnerstein, Oral History (July 16th, 1997).

¹⁰¹ Kate Cassidy, "Women's Work", Arizona Alumnus Vol. 74, #2 (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Alumni Association, Spring 1997) pg. 17.

¹⁰² The study is due to be completed this year, 1998. CSW Minutes, March 1998. Located in the CSW file, AWF Archives, UA Special Collections Library, Tucson, AZ.

¹⁰³ Kate Cassidy, "Women's Work" in Arizona Alumnus. Vol. 74, #2. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Alumni Association: Spring, 1997, pg. 17.

¹⁰⁴ *ibid.*, pg. 17.

¹⁰⁵ *ibid.*, pg. 18

¹⁰⁶ Karen Anderson, Oral Interview (May 1st, 1997).

¹⁰⁷ Angela Simone, Academic Women Working Towards Equality, pg. 67.

¹⁰⁸ Athena Theodore, The Campus Troublemakers: Academic Women in Protest, pg. 207-217.

¹⁰⁹ AAUP Committee, "Salary Setting Practices that Unfairly Disadvantage Women Faculty," Women in Higher Education: A Feminist Perspective, pg. 365.

¹¹⁰ The Commission on the Status of Women is currently undertaking yet another salary study across campus. Preliminary findings are showing drastic inequities between male and female salaries, as well as between races/ethnicities. These findings highlight significant disparities between men and women in terms of pay at all levels of employment.

¹¹¹ Ann Ferguson, "Feminist Communities and Moral Revolution", Feminism and Community, ed. Penny Weiss and Marilyn Friedman. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995, pg. 375.

¹¹² Kesselman, McNair, and Schniedewind, Women, Images and Realities, pg. 178.

¹¹³ See Angela Simone, Academic Women Working Towards Equality.

¹¹⁴ Karen Anderson, Oral History (May 1st, 1997).