DISAPPOINTMENT IN DISCOURSE: WOMEN UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA BEFORE 1970*

Mary Kinnear

The proportion of women university teachers in Canada changed little between the 1920s and 1970, when the Royal Commission on the Status of Women found that the number of men was "roughly six times greater than the number of women," and that the women were concentrated in the lower ranks.[1] This study analyses the numbers and distribution of women faculty at one provincial university and uses the testimony and perspective of women professors to help explain their low numbers and position relative to men. It argues that informal barriers, hiring and promotion criteria maintained by the university, and a shared consensus on the part of women and men about appropriate behaviour for women served to minimize women's participation in the profession.

Manitoba Colleges and the University

Until 1904 all university-level instruction in Manitoba was offered by denominational colleges: St. Boniface, Roman Catholic, founded in 1854; St. John's College, Anglican (1866); and Manitoba College, Presbyterian (1871). All three had come together in 1877 to found the University of Manitoba, whose function was to examine candidates and award degrees. Instruction was provided by the colleges, whose number was augmented by a fourth, Wesley College (Methodist), founded in 1873 and after 1888 affiliated with the university. In 1904 the university itself ventured into teaching, and the Faculty of Science was established. In 1910, three more chairs, in English, History, and Political Economy, were set up. Over the next ten years the university established itself as the major instructor as well as examiner. By an Act of the Legislature in 1917 "the colleges, the mother institutions of the university, were to swing out into more remote orbits...no longer the constituent colleges of a university republic." Manitoba and Wesley Colleges came together in 1928 as United College, and with St. Boniface and St. John's continued to offer courses to students and employment to staff until the late 1960s.[2]

© *HSE/RHÉ* 4, 2 (1992) : 269 - 287

As well as this nucleus of instruction in Arts, Science, and Engineering offered by the university and the colleges (which also taught Theology), there were other institutions which gravitated towards the university and were eventually incorporated. The Manitoba Medical College was founded in 1883 and the Manitoba Agricultural College in 1906. Each eventually became a Faculty of the university, Medicine in 1920 and Agriculture in 1924. The Manitoba Law School was established by the university in partnership with the Law Society of Manitoba in 1914 and although a Bachelor of Laws degree was awarded by the university, the Faculty of Law was not absorbed into the university until 1966. Most faculties and schools grew from within the university: Education in 1935, Social Work in 1943, Music in 1944, Architecture in 1948, Commerce in 1949, Art in 1950, Pharmacy in 1951, Dentistry in 1959, and Nursing in 1963.

Piecemeal pedagogical growth was reflected in the physical plant. The colleges had their own buildings, St. John's initially near the Anglican cathedral in the North End until 1945 when it moved into a large house on Broadway near the Legislature. United College was a mile to the west on Portage Avenue. The university buildings, confined at first to science instruction, were located on Broadway. Lillian Allen, later a university professor, was in 1921 a student registering "in the old red brick law courts building on Kennedy street called the arts building,...a low strung-out temporary building with class rooms...flanked to the north and west by the provincial jail and their exercise yard. We saw a lot of the prisoners since little groups of them with a trustee did a lot of the cleaning and snow removal. Then, like us, they attended the twenty minute chapel held in the Assembly room between the day's first two lectures."[3] The temporary accommodations were still there in 1938: "a huddle of shabby structures with a distressingly temporary air like old warehouses pressed into service."[4]

The Faculty of Medicine remained at the old Medical College, a couple of miles northwest from the Broadway buildings. The Faculty of Agriculture was located in distant splendour, ten miles south, on a bend in the Red River in Fort Garry, a site at which additional university structures were subsequently built. For over thirty years most third and fourth-year instruction for undergraduates was offered at Fort Garry or the colleges, while junior years were taught downtown on Broadway. Only after 1950 was the Broadway campus abandoned and most instruction offered at Fort Garry.[5]

Women's Place

The first women university teachers in the province taught French and Modern Languages, but little more than names and dates distinguish Madame Moreau de Beauvriere, a lecturer in French at St. John's, 1893-1900; Lorraine Duval, who taught Languages at Manitoba College, 1901-11; Marion Rowell, who taught French and German at Wesley, 1910-18; and Helen Ross, who taught

Languages at Manitoba College, 1911-14.[6] The first woman to teach at the University of Manitoba was Maude Bissett in Classics from 1914 until 1920.[7] In 1919 she was joined by three other full-time women: in French, Celine Ballu, "a charming woman...an excellent teacher," and Mlle Haynaud, and in English, Emma Pope.[8] This number was reduced to two for most of the interwar period.[9]

In addition to the full-time employees there were several sessional appointments. The first woman described as a sessional appointment was Lucy Chaplin, listed for one year in 1917 in the English department. The designation "sessional" referred to those appointed for one session only, not on a continuing basis, and included lecturers as well as laboratory assistants and demonstrators who were generally senior undergraduate students. There were anomalies: one sessional was appointed repeatedly, and one demonstrator was highly qualified, with a doctorate. Both anomalies were women.[10] Among the sessionals in the Faculty of Arts and Science in the interwar years, the proportion of women ranged between 17% in 1925-26 and 35% in 1930. During the 1930s when fewer sessionals were employed by all faculties, the proportion of women was higher, about a third of the total.[11] There were thus more women among the casual academic employees of the university than among the full-time, even though they were still in a small minority there.

Of a different calibre was the administrative appointment of Dean of Women. Dr Ursilla Macdonnell, Dean of Women 1920-44, had sound academic credentials. At a time when the doctorate was by no means normal for teaching in the Faculty of Arts and Science, she had a Ph.D. from Queen's University. She taught in the English department in addition to her decanal duties, which carried wide-ranging responsibilities for the welfare of the female students.[12] From the beginning her salary was superior to that of the other women, starting at $2,800 in 1920, when Bissett was paid $2,500, Ballu $2,200, and Haynaud, $2,000. Compared with the regular male teaching staff, Macdonnell's salary was at that time equivalent to a newly appointed Assistant Professor's. By 1926 she had improved her relative position: that year she received $4,000, whilst Ballu and Haynaud were getting $2,800 and $2,500 respectively.[13]

Until the end of World War II, most women university teachers were located not in Arts or Science departments but in the Home Economics department of the Faculty of Agriculture.[14] Geographically, they were separated from the downtown campus and located at Fort Garry. There, academic instruction was augmented by practical training in home and family management, for the students were taught and supervised in housekeeping and childrearing in purpose-built houses on the university site.[15] In 1946 women university teachers in Home Economics accounted for half of all the women on the university faculty. From 1924, when the faculty was incorporated into the university, until 1945, they had indeed provided more than half: 80% in 1925, and 56% in 1945. This proportion steadily declined: by 1955 it was 29%, and by 1965, 26%. Nevertheless, this was a substantial enough phalanx of women to affect seriously any profile of the woman university teacher in Manitoba before 1970.

During the war new programmes were established which provided opportunities for more women faculty. In 1938 a programme in Interior Design was started, and from the outset women were appointed as instructors, at first as sessionals, and after 1942 on a full-time basis. Social Work began in 1943 with two full-time faculty, one of them a woman. By 1951 women had taken over all the full-time positions, a supremacy retained for five years, and by 1960 there were still 76% women in the Social Work faculty. That percentage declined, for reasons suggested below. Nursing began in 1947, and its faculty have always been female. Another opportunity for a few women was inaugurated in 1951, when physical education was made compulsory for all students. The proportion of P.E. women instructors never equalled the proportion of women students, but was nevertheless relatively high, ranging from 33% to an occasional 50% at some time in the duration of the compulsory policy.

The highest overall proportions of women university teachers, spread over all faculties,[16] were found between 1943 and 1956, when the percentages ranged between 15% and 18% of the total academic staff. The forties recruitment can readily be explained by the war and then by the temporary post-war accommodation of the veterans in special multi-shift utilization of university resources both of physical plant and of personnel. The post-1950 addition, however, is not to be explained by an increased participation of women in the existing departments, but by the creation of the new programmes and units where more women than men were hired, in Interior Design, Social Work, and Nursing. The Faculty of Arts had 8% women on the eve of the war. This rose to 16% in 1945, and even to 25% in 1947. But in 1952 it was back to its pre-war level of 8%, and went down even further over the next dozen years. At the end of our period, in 1969, when total university full-time staff numbers had expanded to 872 (from 194 in 1949), the percentage of women in Arts was 9%; Science was lower. In the 1920s and 1930s there had been two full-time women. Science appointed no more women until 1950. From then until 1969 the percentage of women in Science ranged from 3% to 9%. In 1969, at the height of the expansion, there were 10 women in Science, or 6%.

Women's Witness

Numbers do not communicate the women's work experience. Other sources must be consulted to know their perceptions, ambitions, and observations. Written material was sparse. For this study, one woman who kept a diary made it available. Another wrote a brief account of her career. Most information came from the memories of the fifty-three women who agreed to be surveyed, either by interview or questionnaire.[17]

A best estimate of the total number of women who taught full-time between 1914, when the first woman was appointed, and 1970, is 376.[18] The 53 respon-

dents to the survey were concentrated among the more recent (that is, previous to 1970) appointments, but nevertheless spanned forty years. They were drawn from all faculties which employed women, and were found mostly in Agriculture and Home Economics, Education and Physical Education, Social Work, and Arts.[19]

The survey was designed to elicit comments on the women's entry into the profession, the changing gender balance within faculties, the shifting emphases between teaching and research, problems of working mothers, and, throughout, how they survived. The study, through the survey, was intended to illuminate the profession of university teaching through the sensibility of the few women who were in it.

The survey also tested hypotheses informed by the recently developing literature which describes the behaviour of women university teachers in the past.[20] At the present stage of scholarship, this can be characterized as having three approaches: celebratory, mythic, and consciously strategic. The first celebrates the achievements of women scholars.[21] The second attempts to explain the women's intellectual persistence in the face of continuing low status by reference to "a continuum of outsiderness" for women in the academy. Life in the academy, claim the authors of a book subtitled *Outsiders in the Sacred Grove*, "cast" women in subordinate, supportive roles. Swept up in an intellectual quest of mythic proportion, women were to be seen as minor characters ineluctably confined to margins.[22] The third derives from *Unequal Colleagues*, an American account of nine pioneer women professionals who survived through a set of strategies identified as superperformance, innovation, separatism, and subordination.[23] The results of this study, focused through the eyes of women professionals, showed less drama and more resignation than what has so far been evident in the existing historiography.

Entry and Training

The first question considered in an interview was "How did you choose your work?" The most common explanation for choice of career was "I fell into it," or "it was circumstances more than anything else."[24] The choice was rarely deliberate. One of the few who had set her sights on university teaching said, "*It* chose *me*," but having qualified herself with a doctorate then found that the late 1940s was not a good time for a woman to enter the profession. "All the male professors who had been off in the war were returning." She worked in a non-academic job for a year before becoming a university teacher.[25] Another certainly intended to become a professor at the age of 14, but was mistaken about the particular subject she ended up teaching, although her choices were both in the Faculty of Arts.[26] All the others described circuitous routes to their final niche of university teaching. There were not too many different paths. Some

started off choosing teaching and working in the school system: this was widespread in the Faculty of Education. Others worked as practitioners in the field. That was true for Home Economics, Social Work, and health professions, including Nursing, Medical Rehabilitation, and Dental Hygiene. As late as the 1960s, the horizons of many women were limited by the prospect of teaching, nursing, office work, and marriage as appropriate careers for women.[27] If a person had a definite distaste for one or more of these, her options were even more circumscribed.

Most said they went into graduate work because they liked, and were good at, the work. This proficiency was usually discovered and encouraged in high school, often, but not exclusively, through the direct encouragement of an enthusiastic or perceptive teacher.[28]

Almost all had parents who gave emotional support, and frequently material support as well. Those who mentioned parents were most apt to mention fathers, but mothers, too, were important. One woman who was raised by her breadwinner widowed mother noted the considerable sacrifices she had made. In her case, this support was counterbalanced by the reiterated scepticism of her paternal grandmother. The grandmother had no instinctive respect for a woman or man remaining outside the labour force in order to pursue advanced training. "The typical thing to do was to quit school in grade 10 or grade 11 and get a job and continue to live at home and help out. So my father's family was very critical...it was a waste to educate a woman....But, when I graduated from university, [my grandmother] was the proudest person you've ever seen."[29]

These assumptions were not widespread among the largely middle-class families rearing the first generations of women academics. Even when the parental education level was low (one woman's father had only three years of formal schooling, in Europe) the family nevertheless revered education.[30] More usual were accounts of families where one parent at least, usually the father, had a university education. The mother, too, often had further education, most often teacher training. Although most mothers with a job had retired from the labour force at marriage, the occasional woman continued to work subsequently, the odd one or two even after parenthood. No circumstance was reported of parental opposition to the burgeoning scholar.

Though a woman's inclination towards higher education might be benignly regarded, she was less likely to find external support thereafter. In a few cases, a professor's suggestion that a good student continue into graduate studies was indeed critical.[31] Many, however, noted their own pursuit in the face of indifference and even hostility. In a few disciplines, women students came up against the ingrained conservative assumption that the scholar was recognizable only as a man: the face of the existing professoriate.[32] Doubtless this widespread perception served to keep out many— perhaps hundreds of—potential challengers altogether. Only the determined, persistent, and possibly naive, remained to fight the battle in the more male-dominated subject areas.

Shifting Expectations over Time

In Arts and Science a successful male undergraduate would be targeted by his professors and individually invited to consider graduate work. A Master's degree in the early years of the university was a necessary training for the university teacher and even though the doctorate was not the universal prerequisite that it became after 1970, it was still a useful degree to have. Academic qualification was not so significant in the faculties which offered more of a vocational training. Engineering, for instance, regularly recruited from practising engineers. Medicine at Manitoba, until after World War II, was geared much more towards clinical training than research and mobilized the resources of large numbers of doctors, many of whom worked on a part-time basis giving an occasional lecture and supervising the clinical training of medical students.[33] Law, too, displayed similar tendencies.[34] This practical model of the trade school oriented less towards research and more towards the preparation of practitioners in the field, tended to value the teacher who had contacts in the community, for students' placement opportunities, and who could give the practical instruction valued by a new recruit who wanted to know how, rather than why, to practise his trade.

The faculties and schools which employed most women university teachers followed this latter model. Recruiters in Home Economics welcomed as teachers people who had been working in institutions: for example, as dieticians in hospitals. The Faculty of Education recruited senior practitioners from the schools, inspectors, officers of the Manitoba Teachers' Society, and school principals, as well as schoolteachers who had made a reputation as curriculum innovators. The School of Nursing recruited from nursing supervisors as well as from instructors in the hospitals. Social Work similarly hired practising social workers into its ranks.

Not surprisingly, with this emphasis on practical experience, there was a marked tendency on the part of the women university teachers to marginalize, indeed to disparage, the value of a research degree. Such lack of respect, bordering on contempt, for the doctorate, was understandable when the mission of these schools was to reproduce the existing structure of knowledge and apply it in the practical setting of the telephone and power companies, doctors' clinics, law offices, hospitals, school and welfare agencies. After World War II, at different paces in different disciplines, each of these areas shifted the emphasis of its mission to include more analysis of alternative strategies to the status quo. Programmes and curricula were reformulated to include more consideration of critiques and a wider education for students, even though practical training continued to be paramount. In some schools and faculties the incorporation of a wider context and theoretical and research component was achieved before 1970. In others, the shift was only just beginning. At the same time, the older mindset persisted.

The trend in many instances was accompanied by a clear gender implication. In Home Economics, Education, and Social Work a high proportion of the old guard was women. Under the new regimes, possession of a graduate degree counted for more than service in the field. Women were slower to prepare themselves with this qualification, and suffered for it most obviously in terms of a declining presence. Home Economics in 1965 had its first man appointed as Director. This was explicitly to cope with problems perceived to be basically gender problems, not only of qualifications and research orientation, but also of networking. The Dean of Agriculture "went out looking for a male Dean." "Women were not being heard in the upper echelons" of the university. "Only men could talk to men in washrooms and corridors." It was thought "we could compete better in that milieu with a male dean."[35] The School saw a reduction in the proportion of its female staff from 100% in 1964 to 87% in 1968, a trend which continued while the overall numbers on staff rose by a third, from 21 to 28. The shift towards a greater emphasis on research, accompanied by a higher proportion of male appointments, was replicated in Education and Social Work.[36] In each of these schools or faculties, the trend persisted during the next generation. By 1989, Home Economics was down to 64% female; Education was 22%, and Social Work was 41%.

Once on the faculty, there was a job to be done and there were expectations to meet. Concerning the work, most women had a good idea what teaching would be like, although the actual mixture of teaching, research, and administration took some by surprise. Juggling the mixture remained problematic for many.

The demands of teaching were usually straightforward. "I wanted to teach particular things...theory courses. I had that opportunity. I was good, so I got more and more."[37] A woman used to the stress and long hours of schoolteaching was agreeably surprised. "Here you could take a *break* after class. You could *have coffee*. And then there was less preparation."[38] "I discovered I loved teaching," said one. She was "fairly successful" and valued "the ego satisfaction."[39] Some tried very hard to live up to their own high standards for the presentation of material and giving attention to individual students. One in Medicine had previously worked in a state-of-the-art research institute in the United States and was dismayed at the ill-equipped laboratories and lack of technicians, but set to work willingly. She found teaching an intellectual challenge: "a way to organise yourself well and to get your thoughts in the right perspective. If nothing's clear in your own head you can't project it to the students." At first she went to the length of practising every lecture: "I would rehearse it."[40] She was unusual in that her department head often used to attend lectures delivered in his department. Most felt themselves on their own: "I had my own expectations, to try very hard," said one, a "good" teacher, "although I didn't know it then," not until 1972 when the students' union published a course-by-course review of individual instructors.[41] Another found lecture preparation time-consuming. She always had a heavy teaching load and was aware it was more than her (male) colleagues, some of whom were "very bad at

it."[42] Only a few women expressed a less than enthusiastic preference for teaching. One discovered at the outset of her career she wasn't "cut out to be a teacher" but nevertheless discharged the duties satisfactorily.[43]

There was more ambivalence over research expectations. Among the early women teachers, scholarship was viewed as a rather leisurely pleasure to be indulged in almost as a hobby. They felt no pressure to publish. One woman had published several books before coming on faculty, but made no bones about describing them as anything other than school texts, "spoonfeeding the teachers." Not that she despised this work: their royalties bought her house.[44] But this was not research. One who taught at St. John's College had a heavy teaching load and was bringing up two children on her own. "I did no research."[45] Another took ten years to complete an Oxford research degree, the B.Litt., and acknowledged other priorities before research.[46] Doris Saunders, Dean of Junior Women, echoed the ethos of a British, rather than American, university model in 1944. She quoted the remarks of Sidney Smith, President of the University of Manitoba 1934-44, at which time he left to become President of the University of Toronto. "'Intellectualism alone is not enough. In stock-taking and in formulating plans, universities should seek to cultivate, also, the emotional, the aesthetic, and the spiritual life of the individual.' This worthy aim requires a staff sufficiently large to guarantee that the individual student will become known to at least one member of the staff capable of guiding him or her in the desired direction."[47]

Later generations of university women teachers were mixed in their views of research. One entering Law in the late 1960s had expected more stress on research and scholarship than she found.[48] Another, in Arts, similarly thought research would be emphasized more than teaching and in her first years tried to give it priority. She found great satisfaction in the anthropological field work she did. It "provided meaning, and fun, and intellectual enquiry." Her commitment remained strong but turned a little sour over a gender-related dispute. She arranged to take a male assistant with her on a field trip. Her department head ordered her to include the assistant's wife, despite the fact that the plans were approved by all concerned. Having the necessary funds from a granting agency, the professor disregarded the head, who left the department soon afterwards. She later discovered that her salary had been severely held back in comparison with other members of the department, an abuse of power she attributed to her defiance.[49]

A woman member of the Faculty of Medicine identified a gender-related problem of a different sort. There were fewer than half-a-dozen women academics in the faculty and about the same number in part-time clinical positions. At a research seminar, a female professor made a comment on the previous work of a colleague's wife. Afterwards another colleague took her aside and said such forwardness was unwise. In another instance, a wife who had trained as a nurse criticized the professor's manner as "too abrupt." These episodes "taught me to be very careful of wives."[50]

Administrative chores evoked a variety of comment. One woman with quiet calculation avoided committees. "I hated meetings...I determined to walk a tightrope course, not be so stupid I would be fired, but at a crucial point if my name was up, to ask some rather stupid question, so the voters would think twice before putting me on the committee."[51] Some used to get incensed at the grandstanding that went on in committees, and tried to avoid them.[52] Another found herself always expected to perform administrative functions of a social nature, to arrange for receptions, daily coffee, and retirement parties, and did so. She was disappointed to receive a negative recognition in comments such as, "I'm so glad you've got the time to do this" from colleagues.[53] One took her administrative responsibilities so seriously that as a department head with a limited budget she did her own typing and managed the departmental office.[54] Another, who administered an off-campus programme in addition to a full teaching and research load for many years, was chagrined by the ingratitude of the university when she was not awarded administrative leave on stepping down from the position. Yet she would do it again. "Someone has to do it."[55]

The expectations of teaching, research, and administration shifted over time. Particularly in the newer faculties with a mission to train practitioners, staff recruited with initial expectations of contributing to that purpose sometimes felt betrayed when their work went unrewarded under a regime with different demands.

Most of the women in Social Work were hired from the field, that is after working for a social work agency and often as a supervisor of students in their clinical setting. During this time period they rarely had a research background, and did not see themselves as "academic." Yet during the 1960s new (male) academic administrators introduced a demand for research into expectations of the staff, which could lead to considerable anxiety.[56] The situation was paralleled at a later date in Dental Hygiene. Some teachers were inspired by the prospect: "The research was exciting." Even when staff were willing and eager to respond to the new demands, in these intensely practical training schools, there was the problem of providing time. "There was no change in the teaching workload."[57] Social workers, nurses, teachers, dental hygienists (and others, including lawyers, engineers, and medical doctors) still had to be shown how to practise their profession. Yet the staff who gained the career rewards were those who produced evidence of research.[58]

In retrospect, a member of the Education Faculty, in the late 1960s just encountering this new orientation, thought the university administration could have done much more to expedite its acceptance through the provision of research assistance. At the time, she preferred not "to play the university game."[59] This to a large extent was perceived as men enforcing new rules to keep out women. In Social Work, "there were very few of them in the beginning....Either they went on for further education or they moved into executive positions." Having acquired graduate degrees, men came quickly to dominate the administrations of Social Work, Education, even Home Economics. Women were outmanoeuvred.

The new men moved to privilege the new research component. "Men became part of the [Social Work] profession and that really set a whole different tone...the subtle kind of discrimination...the boys' club...there were things got decided not at meetings...I just stayed out of it, I thought 'what the heck,' I didn't really want to move. You know, I just begin to realise how unambitious I really was."[60]

Rewards

As late as 1969-70, department heads and deans still kept considerable executive authority to themselves. The era of due process, committees, unionization, and accountability was still in the future. Paternalism could occasionally benefit individual women. One member of the small pre-expansion Education Faculty knew she had a heavier teaching load than the men, and never questioned this publicly. Out of the blue she received an additional cheque for $1,000 from the university president in recognition, she presumed, of an inadequate salary. But she made no fuss: "I was too busy to politick."[61] In another department a woman who knew her colleagues' salaries prepared for a meeting with her head with a list of staff. "You could draw a line across the list: women were below the line, and men were above." The head coyly referred to men's having dependents in order to explain their larger salaries. The woman described this argument as a baby bonus and the head agreed to make amends. "The salaries got bumped up, substantially. They were still out of whack but not so badly out of whack."[62] The paternalist structure served more to echo and reinforce the patriarchy of the wider society rather than to effect remedies.

All the women surveyed were asked whether, so far as they knew, their employment conditions relating to salary, security, and promotion were the same as those of their male colleagues. A few were confident that the conditions were the same, as far as they could tell. Most knew their salaries were lower and their progress through the ranks was slower. This knowledge affected them in different ways.

Doris Saunders, appointed in 1928, was "perfectly sure they were getting more...it never bothered me." She did not enquire about such things: "I was not outwardly ambitious. I felt privileged to be there." A woman in Arts was unconcerned about equity: "I was simply maintaining what I was interested in—teaching."[63] Another Arts woman distinguished her own attitude to career progress from that of the men: "They look after themselves. I try to help others."[64] One had a decidedly less sanguine view. In a memorandum, "For the Record. A Condemnation: Why I have no real love for the U of M. My Lament," she noted her anger at her perpetually low salary. "I only went up when the floor went up...I never got a merit raise. I devoted my time to teaching...U. authorities rarely give a damn about ability to teach, it's the letters after your name on the calendar that count."[65]

For those still on staff in the mid-1970s, confirmation that their salaries were indeed lower than male colleagues' came with the first University of Manitoba Faculty Association contract, which included an Inequities Fund to which an aggrieved member could apply.[66] Several women noted they had received what appeared to be substantial ($1,500-$2,000) adjustments, and, like others, thought the problem was dealt with.[67] Another, in Arts, felt that her slow career progress, in comparison with a man who completed his graduate degree after her, was due to her being married. "There was an expectation that [my husband] would be moved." She felt resentful, but also felt she should not make too much fuss. "I didn't complain very much....Having a job was a fluke."[68] With irony, one woman ruefully remarked, "We were much too ladylike to discuss salaries."[69]

Like her, several women disliked the suspicion or knowledge that their salaries were not on a par with equally qualified men, but took no individual initiative to attempt to remedy the problem. One woman, in Education, did not sit tight. She had been recruited from the school system where "men and women were paid equal. I did not *know* that *you negotiate* when you join the faculty." She had earned an annual salary of $8,200. The Dean offered her $8,500, which she accepted, only to find others in a comparable situation being offered ten, twelve, and thirteen thousand. Shortly afterward, at the completion of her Ph.D., she discovered a man in the same position was being paid 30% more than she was. In this instance she was able to mobilize the support of her male department head in a successful bid to rectify the discrepancy.[70]

Despite the deterrents some women became, and remained, university professors. The reasons why are partly to be found in the pleasure they found in their work. Some enjoyed their work with other women.[71] Many liked the contact with students. "There is a constantly changing body of students" and you could "avoid getting stuck in a time warp."[72] Teaching, with its "intellectual exercise and mental keenness" was satisfying.[73] "When you have control, things are a lot better," noted another, and university professors, varying from faculty to faculty, had a considerable amount of personal control over their daily and yearly routine, course content, methods of teaching, and research.[74] "The environment permits greater difference and also allows considerable anonymity—you can get on with what you want to do."[75] "I have a strong commitment that the information I give to people will help them have a fuller, more meaningful life."[76] And who could query the satisfaction of a woman in Medicine: "When I began, 90% of the patients in my field of research died; now over 60% live."[77] Significantly, the only interviewees who mentioned the money as a satisfaction were widows and divorcées—those with a licence to be breadwinners.[78]

The work also brought its irritations. Timewasting in meetings was widely disliked, even though the proliferation of committees was understood to be partly a consequence of a welcome move away from executive arbitrariness. The lack of longterm government planning, with its significance for research funding, was a bother for some. It was frustrating not to be able to publish more.[79] It was not always possible to master the teaching material.[80] One woman expressed an

explicit gender analogy. "I could have done more had I been two people rather than one...or a man," but in that case, "with more ruthlessness, there wouldn't have been the other half of my very schizoid existence."[81]

For all their actual shared experience, the women on faculty had very little to do with each other. There was no overt solidarity, political or social. There were no formal or informal associations beyond the personal gatherings of a few friends. Some consciously avoided the company of other women. "I had a contempt for women's groups."[82] Many had not the time, even if they had desired stronger connections. "My hands were more than filled," and after a day at the university "you want to get away from work."[83] One questioned the assumption that an organization of academic women was desirable. Rather, it was better to integrate women into the existing structures and work "in the big leagues"—in the major university committees, in administration and executive positions.[84] No respondent identified the absence of a women's academic association as having any bearing on discrimination.

The Model Professional

All the women described themselves as busy, but none more so than at the time they had children at home. In this respect there was a clear generational difference. Before World War II, it was rare to find a married woman employed full-time as a professor at the University of Manitoba. The matter-of-fact observation of Mary Kelso, who in 1918 was appointed Director of Home Economics, that "in 1921 I resigned to be married," was a commonplace attitude.[85] One woman employed before World War II at St John's College was married, but emphasized how very unusual it was for a married woman with a husband to be working for pay.[86] After the war, single women, either never married or widows, remained more common than married women. Only in the 1960s were married women hired to any extent, and this trend then continued.

For the years of this study, therefore, the vast majority of academic women had neither husband nor children to care for. Some were expected to care for parents, but several lived with a mother who effectively worked as housekeeper.[87] There was a distinct demographic difference between the earlier university women and those hired beginning in the 1960s. Those of the older generation who were married would be expected to run a household and look after their husbands but they tended to be childless. The very real double burden experienced by working mothers was uncommon for most of these particular professional women before 1970.

When a university professor was also a mother the tendency was for other people, and for her too, to consider that this was very much her own personal business. A widow teaching in Home Economics, hired in 1964, was told that her job must come first and her children second and there was to be "no excuse."[88]

The private, individual nature of motherhood was thoroughly accepted by one woman who returned to university teaching in 1962 after a gap during which she raised three children to adolescence. At a social event her department head jokingly asked her husband what he would do if she came home from a day's work cross and bad-tempered. Before her husband could reply, the woman interjected that if it ever came to that, she would quit her job.[89]

These stories confirm that the model professional was a man, who had no direct daily responsibility for the rearing of children; that the model wife put the demands of her husband before her own; and that the model mother similarly subordinated her own interests to those of her children. A woman professional was by definition in conflict. The breadwinner role of a woman with dependents was acceptable. She was working from necessity. But a wife who had a husband to support her must be working from ambition, and this did not conform to the model. The experience of women university professors at the University of Manitoba indicates that before 1970 the existing models were scarcely questioned, at least by behaviour.

Most of these professors were single. They believed that the difficulties of combining career and motherhood were almost insuperable. "It would have been impossible for me to do the amount of work I did and be married and run a house. My mother was always supportive and provided the home background, so I could concentrate entirely on university work, as men do."[90]

The few university teachers who did combine career and motherhood recognized the problem of a double burden but neither magnified it nor exaggerated their own efforts. "You cannot operate full time in both fields. I have learned every shortcut in the book."[91] Even though the professional woman who is married has become more common in the 1990s than the single, these women interviewees accepted no new norm integrating career and family. The old dualities lingered.

Manitoba Weather

Discrimination was either denied, or accommodated: it was not frontally challenged. "We almost *accepted* the experience of being excluded, as a woman, as ethnic...there was not much overt protest."[92] Ethnic discrimination against students was explicitly outlawed after a committee of the Manitoba Legislature in 1944 received a brief charging racial discrimination against Jews and other ethnic minorities in the selection of medical students.[93] In sexual discrimination, individual women were ready to excuse discriminatory practice on the grounds that the men did not know what they were doing. Concerning promotion, they tended to put the blame for slower promotion on themselves, mainly identifying a smaller research output or, particularly in the professional schools, the lack of a research degree.

The idea of a chilly climate, of an atmosphere inhospitable to women, was recognizable however. It was almost impossible for each woman not to feel a stranger in a private men's club. The women did not necessarily feel rancour. Inevitably made to feel intruders, most women kept away from the Faculty Club and informal gatherings of men, even though they knew that much university business was conducted in informal settings, particularly before unionization. "Networking works in their favour....Men relax, they have coffee, they tell jokes, they have wives at home so they can come in at eight and read the newspapers."[94]

Three particular elements of the situation at the University of Manitoba combined to reinforce existing notions about woman's place in society. First was the existence of a high proportion of women university teachers in Home Economics. By pedagogy and precept they emphasized domestic responsibilities as a woman's primary obligation. Almost to a woman the Home Economics faculty women were single or widowed and did not challenge the notion that a normal family had a husband as breadwinner. Two other factors served to minimize ideological challenge. Most non-Home Economics women faculty were dispersed among nurturing occupations: Social Work, Nursing, and Education. Here they were not so obviously in competition with men for the jobs, at least until the insistence on research and publication was introduced into the qualifications for entry and promotion. Third, women were virtually absent from the faculties attracting large budgets in the university: Agriculture, and Arts and Science. The women were assigned to separatism, not from their own choice, but by default.

A composite picture of women university teachers would necessarily carry distortions. Yet certain generalizations can be made about their shared conditions. Most were aware they were not being treated like the men on faculty and each found her own way to accommodate unfairness. Many suffered personal hurt. Only a very few made a fuss. Evidence suggests they calculated that the game was worth the candle. Before 1970 they had no alternative but to accept the university's conditions. Frequently resentful at their subordination, their low numbers and lack of collective awareness did not allow them to contemplate strategies of resistance or reform. Modest in scholarly achievement, concerned not to appear personally ambitious, with few exceptions in agreement with the dominant cultural domestic demands on a woman, they were neither the academic superperformers nor the innovators of the *Unequal Colleagues* thesis. Nor were there signs of the magical enchantment discerned in *Outsiders in the Sacred Grove*.

Material elicited from the Manitoba women contributes little to a celebration of academic success measured by traditional criteria. The data display little of the epic quest described by historians who have discerned myths in the lives of female academics. The respondents' testimony puts into question the relevance of attributing conscious career-management to women who had little direct influence over their career progress. If there was heroism, it was in the individual strategies each woman made for herself in coping with a thoughtless and

sometimes deliberate sexism built into the system. Particularly difficult were the juggling acts of the women, few for most of the period but increasing in numbers towards the end of the 1960s, who balanced their academic work with motherhood at a time, moreover, when research performance was becoming a more insistent demand of the job. Here in their homes were superperformance and innovation, hidden from the workplace professional history of university women.

NOTES

* I thank SSHRCC for financial assistance. I am grateful to Constance Backhouse, Angela Davis, John Kendle, Michael Kinnear, and A.M.C. Waterman for their encouragement and advice, and I thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive criticism.

1. *Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970), 93.
2. W.L. Morton, *One University: A History of the University of Manitoba* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1957): 106.
3. University of Manitoba Archives (UMA), Lillian Allen Diary, 1921, I, 2, 14.
4. Fredelle Bruser Maynard, *Raisins and Almonds* (Toronto: Doubleday, 1972), 137.
5. UMA, Calendar 1961, 28.
6. William J. Fraser, *A History of the First Hundred Years of St. John's College, Winnipeg 1866-1966* (Winnipeg: Wallingford Press, 1966), 39; A.G. Bedford, *The University of Winnipeg: A History of the Founding Colleges* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), 393-420.
7. Bissett had a B.A. from the University of Manitoba and won a travelling scholarship to the University of Chicago in 1909. She taught at Wesley College 1912-14.
8. UMA, Allen Diary, 1924, I, 2, 25.
9. From 1920 to 1922 there were three full-time women in Arts departments: Ballu and Haynaud in French, and Flora Ross Amos in English. Amos left in 1923, Haynaud in 1927. In 1928 Doris Saunders was appointed in English and taught until er retirement in 1967. One woman was appointed in a Science department: Eileen Bulman, Zoology, 1920-25, and another, Jessie Roberts in Chemistry, 1932-34.
10. Anna Jones was a sessional assistant in German for a total of 16 years: 1923-33, 1938-41, and 1943-46. Jones was unusual also in that she was married. Another repeating sessional was Margaret Dudley, a student demonstrator in Botany in 1927, then 1928-31 after she had graduated with a B.Sc. In 1937 she was a special lecturer, having earned a Minnesota Ph.D., and a demonstrator, 1939-43.
11. University of Manitoba (UM), Board of Governors Papers (BOG). Minutes, 1918-1939.
12. UMA, Presidents' Papers, Annual Reports, Report of Dean of Women Students 1923-24, 65; UM, BOG, Minutes, 8 Sept. 1933.
13. UM, BOG, Minutes, 5 Apr. 1920, 111-12; 2 May 1921, 187-88; 20 May 1926, 114-16.
14. The statistics were compiled from university calendars, 1914-70, in the University Archives.
15. Johanna Gudrun Wilson, *A History of Home Economics Education in Manitoba* (Winnipeg: Manitoba Home Economics Association, 1969): 54-55.

16. All faculties except Medicine. The Faculty of Arts and Science was not divided into separate faculties until 1970. In this study, the faculties have been retroactively defined by their post-1970 organization of departments.
17. Their contributions are cited in the references by name or by number according to their expressed preference and are distinguished by the year of their initial full-time appointment at the University of Manitoba.
18. The primary source for identification was the university calendars in the University Archives. These data were supplemented by material provided by the Staff Benefits Office. A list of surviving teachers was compiled, and addresses were found for 86 women. A request to participate in this study was made to them, and 53 agreed to be surveyed.
19. *Table I: Appointment year of respondents.*

Five year period starting:								
1925	1930	1935	1940	1945	1950	1955	1960	1965
1	2	0	2	4	4	4	13	23

Table II Faculties of respondents.

AgHE	Arts	Dent	Arch	Law	Med	MReh	Nurs	EdPE	Sci	SW
9	11	1	2	1	4	2	5	8	3	7

20. Alison Prentice and Marjorie R. Theobald, "The Historiography of Women Teachers: A Retrospect," and Susan Gelman, "Selected Bibliography," in Alison Prentice and Marjorie Theobald, eds., *Women Who Taught: Perspectives on the History of Women and Teaching* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991); 3-33, 285-301. In addition to works mentioned therein, see Constance Backhouse, "Women Faculty at the University of Western Ontario: Reflections on the Employment Equity Award," *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 4 (1990): 36-65; Anne Rochon Ford, *A Path Not Strewn with Roses: One Hundred Years of Women at the University of Toronto 1884-1984* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985); Joy Parr, ed., *Still Running* (Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University Alumnae Association, 1987); Prentice, "Bluestockings at Work: The History of Women's Employment in Universities," paper presented to the Canadian Historical Association, Queen's University, 1991; Lee Stewart, *"It's Up To You": Women at UBC in the Early Years* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1990); Barbara Miller Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985); Jill McCalla Vickers and June Adam, *But Can You Type? Canadian Universities and the Status of Women* (Toronto: Clarke Irwin & Co. in association with the Canadian Association of University Teachers, 1977).
21. For example, Margaret Gillett and Kay Sibbald, eds., *A Fair Shake: Autobiographical Essays by McGill Women* (Montreal: Eden Press, 1984); Margaret Judson, *Breaking the Barrier: A Professional Autobiography by a Woman Educator and Historian Before the Women's Movement* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1984).
22. Nadya Aisenberg and Mona Harrington, *Women of Academe: Outsiders in the Sacred Grove* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988): x-xii, 20-40, 74.

23. Penina Migdal Glazer and Miriam Slater, *Unequal Colleagues: The Entrance of Women into the Professions 1891-1940* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1987): 211.
24. For example, #42, 1966; Lois Emory, 1967; #30, 1960; #7, 1969.
25. #32, 1954.
26. #5, 1959.
27. #13, 1967; #29, 1968; #19, 1969.
28. #5, 1959.
29. Wendy Dahlgren, 1966.
30. #17, 1969.
31. Joan Townsend, 1964; #8, 1969; #5, 1959.
32. #1, 1964; #21, 1963.
33. Terence Moore, *Joe Doupe: Bedside Physiologist* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1989), 57-66.
34. *Legal Education in Manitoba* (Winnipeg: Faculty of Law, Robson Hall, University of Manitoba, 1969), 4.
35. #2, 1963; #13, 1967.
36. Education in 1959 had 6 full-time staff, a third of whom were women. By 1969 there were over ten times as many full-time staff (68), and the proportion of women was beginning to erode: it was down to 30%. Social Work in its full-time complement of staff after World War II was over 70% women, a figure which excluded the part-time field instructors, the vast majority of whom were female. During the 1960s, full-time staff increased by a factor of five, yet the percentage of women was reduced from 85% to 51%.
37. Dahlgren, 1966.
38. #10, 1965.
39. #5, 1959.
40. Esther Yamada, 1960.
41. #8, 1969.
42. #3, 1959.
43. #1, 1964.
44. #9, 1946.
45. Mary Wees, 1933.
46. Doris Saunders, 1928.
47. UMA, Presidents' Papers, Annual Reports, Report of the Dean of Junior Women, 1943-44, 140.
48. Janet Baldwin, 1967.
49. Townsend, 1964.
50. Yamada, 1960.
51. UMA, Allen Diary, 1937, I, 5, 19.
52. #24, 1960; #17, 1969.
53. #35, 1956.
54. Joan Harland, 1942.
55. #3, 1959.
56. #17, 1969.
57. Margery Forgay, 1963.
58. #15, 1965.
59. Ibid.
60. #24, 1960.

61. #9, 1946.
62. Dahlgren, 1966.
63. #21, 1963.
64. #8, 1969.
65. UMA, Lillian Allen Papers, My Lament, I, 1.
66. UMFA Collective Agreement, 1975.
67. #17, 1969.
68. #5, 1959.
69. Ruth Grahame, 1962.
70. #10, 1965.
71. Virginia Berry, 1943; #24, 1960.
72. Baldwin, 1967.
73. Yamada, 1960; Saunders, 1928; Shirley Leach, 1960.
74. #13, 1967.
75. Baldwin, 1967.
76. #3, 1959.
77. #23, 1969.
78. Patricia Powell, 1969; Townsend, 1964; #25, 1964.
79. #3, 1959.
80. Berry, 1943.
81. #21, 1963.
82. #5, 1959.
83. #25, 1964.
84. #1, 1964.
85. School of Home Economics, University of Manitoba, 50th Anniversary 1910-1960, 28.
86. Conversation with Margaret Morton, 12 Mar. 1991.
87. Harland, 1942; Audrey Fridfinnson, 1952; Saunders, 1928.
88. #25, 1964.
89. #21, 1963.
90. Harland, 1942.
91. #21, 1963.
92. Ibid.
93. *Winnipeg Free Press*, 16 Mar. 1944; Paul Axelrod, *Making a Middle Class: Student Life in English Canada during the Thirties* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990), 33.
94. #10, 1963.