Navigating the Troublesome Terrain of Coeducation:

Dean of Women's Rhetorical Efforts in Negotiating, Defining, and Constructing

Women's Place in Higher Education

by

Cheryl Price-McKell

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2022 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Maureen Daly Goggin, Chair
Shirley K. Rose
Krista Ratcliffe

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2022

ABSTRACT

The position of Dean of Women was created in response to novel exigencies rising from women's acceptance to coeducational institutions of higher learning in the late nineteenth century. While these early women administrators had a profound impact on women's higher education in the United States, their work has received relatively little attention. In response to this discriminatory erasure, this dissertation applies feminist historiographical approaches and qualitative methods that center these women and their rhetoric within the historical narrative.

In particular, this dissertation explores, synthesizes, and analyzes the archived rhetorical documents produced by the National Association of Deans of Women (NADW) and Evelyn Jones Kirmse, an early University of Arizona dean of women, between 1922 and 1942. By privileging the rhetoric of these women and positioning them as authorities of their own experience within hegemonically masculine coeducational systems and administrations, this dissertation brings to light their own theories, debates, and arguments concerning how to best make room for women in higher education professionally, physically, and intellectually.

While positing the complexity and efficacy of their rhetoric, this dissertation also marks critical ideological negotiations within the deans' arguments in response to socio-cultural shifts and opportunities born of the Progressive Era. By locating paradoxical navigations of traditional essentialist values and burgeoning progressive ideas within the deans' rhetoric, this dissertation provides an important illustration of the awkward stage of growth within feminism's development. It provides insight to deans of women's own

rhetorical explorations on how their identity and success should be constructed, attained, and measured in the new academic territory of coeducation.

DEDICATION

To Dad, for not allowing me to quit even when life became really hard.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As a student of ASU, I acknowledge the twenty-two Native Nations that have inhabited this land for centuries. The Tempe community I have called home during these last six years is located in the Salt River Valley on ancestral territories of Indigenous peoples, including the Akimel O'odham (Pima) and Pee Posh (Maricopa) Indian Communities, whose care and keeping of this land I revere. As a scholar of rhetoric, I particularly acknowledge the rich oral history and song culture of the O'Odham and Pee Posh, which are indelibly tied to their specific historic, cultural, and religious values.

This dissertation would not be possible without the support, encouragement, and guidance I have received throughout my education. Foremost among these are my committee members: Dr. Maureen Daly Goggin, Dr. Shirley K. Rose, and Dr. Krista Ratcliffe. I am grateful for their expressed enthusiasm for my work, their guidance in my research, their faith in my ability, and the priceless time they spent offering feedback.

I also must mention my Boise State graduate committee and other supportive professors and mentors. I especially would like to Dr. Whitney Douglas who changed everything when she introduced me to women's rhetoric and the archives. Her notes of encouragement remained on my bulletin board throughout my doctoral studies. I often turned to them when I needed some grounding and a reason to smile. I am also grateful for Dr. Kelly Meyers and Dr. Bruce Ballenger whose intellectual guidance and enthusiastic support for my research helped me to feel at home in academia. I would have never pursued my doctorate without their support and encouragement. I consider them all dear friends.

Other professors who deserve my gratitude are Dr. Keith Miller, Dr. Ellie Long, Dr. Kyle Jensen, Dr. Adelheid Thieme, Dr. Heidi Estrem, Dr. Tom J. Hillard, and Dr. Steven Olsen-Smith. The knowledge, advice, and encouragement I received from each of these mentors can never be repaid.

In addition to professors, I must thank my friends who have supported me throughout this project. All of my gratitude goes to those in my cohort, especially Dr. Kristin Bennett and Dr. Katy Alford, who made me laugh so often when I needed it most, and who constantly inspired me with their intellect and scholarship.

I express my deepest love and gratitude to the friends and family who have been by my side for longer than I can believe. First, my longtime friends Laurie Olsen, Denise Frame, Corinne Wall, Laura Larsen, Julie Harper, Elisha Figueroa, and Erika Devall. No matter how many miles separate us, I will always know these women have my back, and I will always be blessed and buoyed up by their love. My heart also goes out to my dear parents whose love and support has been so constant and sure that it is as normal to me as the air I breathe and the ground upon which I stand. Finally, I must thank my children whose love, patience, and support not only gives me joy beyond belief, but also the strength to push forward and upward. I am continually awestruck by their intellect, their generosity, their strength, and their uncanny ability to keep me happy and humble at the same time.

Ultimately, I thank God, the source of all good things in my life. I hope I always strive to pay forward a portion of all I have received.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

1 INTRODUCTION 1

The Need for Feminist Historiography 4

Focus of Research and Unique Scholarly Contribution 6

Project Overview 8

2 FEMINIST HISTORIOGRAPHICAL METHODOLOGY AND METHODS 12

Feminist Research Methodology 12

Feminist Rhetorical Historiography 14

Ethical Archival Research 19

Research Methods 22

A Narrative of My Research Experience 23

Research Interrupted 26

Data Selection and Analysis 28

3 WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE CONCERNING THE EVOLUTION AND THE TELLING 32

The Evolution of Women's Formal Education 32

Influencers in the Development of Coeducation 34

Resistance to Women's Presence on Coeducational Campuses 36

Efforts to Reify a Masculinist Academia 39

Deans of Women 42

Survey of Traditional Academic Historiography 44

The Need for Feminist Historiography 48

CHAPTER Page

Review of Guiding Methodology Scaffolding Feminist Historiography 51

Conclusion 58

4 "A DEAR BOUGHT HERITAGE:" RHETORICAL HISTORIES OF THE NADW AND EVELYN J. KIRMSE 59

The Organizing Efforts of Early Deans of Women 65

The Founding of the National Association of Deans of Women 68

The History of Evelyn Jones Kirmse 75

Kirmse's Ascension to Deanship 79

Kirmse's Arrival at the University of Arizona 80

Conclusion 84

5 CONSTRUCTING A PROFESSIONAL PLACE FOR DEANS OF WOMEN IN ACADEMIA 88

Literature Review 91

Recognizing the Rhetorical Value of Profession 96

Professionalization through Naming and Standardization 100

A Call for Research as Professional Criteria 104

Dean Kirmse's Professional Identity 109

Constructing a Professional Expertise in Personnel Work 115

Dean Kirmse's Efforts to Promote and Apply Her Expertise 120

Conclusion 123

6 DEANS OF WOMEN ARGUING FOR MATERIAL SPACE ON CAMPUS FOR WOMEN 127

CHAPTER Page

Gendered Rhetoric of Place and Space 129

The NADW Focus on Housing 136

Residential Housing for Women at the UA 138

Dean Kirmse's Housing Dilemma 140

Research-Backed Arguments for Women's Housing 141

The Cooperative Dorm: Constructing Inclusive Living Spaces 144

Dean Kirmse's Cooperative Dormitory 147

Deans' Voice in Architectural Plans 152

Constructing Space for Women through Fraternities/Sororities 156

NADW Discussions Concerning Women's Fraternities/Sororities 160

NADW Women Student Buildings 165

Acquiring the UA Women's Building 167

Arguing for Space for Deans of Women on Campus 169

In Search of Dean Kirmse's Office 171

Conclusion 174

7 "THE SITUATION CALLED FOR AN ORIENTATION:" DEANS OF WOMEN AND THE ORIENTATION OF WOMEN STUDENTS 176

Ideological Social Climate 179

History of Academic Orientation 182

Hermeneutic Phenomenology of "Orientation" 186

NADW and the Orientation of Women Students 190

Dean Kirmse's Orientation of Women Students 196

CHAPTER Page

Dean Kirmse's Orientation Argument to Students 198

Dean Kirmse's Public Argument for Practical Orientation 203

Conclusion 207

8 CONCLUSION 211

The Precarious Position of Dean of Women 213

The Slow Erasure of Deans of Women 216

Walking in Evelyn Kirmse's Footsteps 218

WORKS CITED 222

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Virginia Woolf once shared a telling story of a particular visit to a prestigious university in England. In her story, she describes approaching the crisply manicured campus by cutting across a stretch of lawn whereupon she is intercepted by a man, a Beadle whose "face expressed horror and indignation" at her thoughtless transgression. She had casually strayed from the narrow gravel path constructed, designated, and deemed appropriate for her gender and had stepped foot where only men were allowed to tread (7). Woolf corrects her error and proceeds to her destination: the famous university library. Attempting to open the weighty door, she is again intercepted by a flustered gentleman who informs her that "ladies are only admitted to the library if accompanied by a Fellow…or furnished with a letter of introduction" (9). Realizing the situation, Woolf walks away from the university as "gate after gate seems to close with gentle finality behind" her (16).

Woolf's anecdote offers an apt depiction of women's historical relationship with education, a relationship based on denial: denial of access, denial of confidence, denial of validation, denial of voice. As her tale demonstrates, nowhere has this denial been more conspicuous than on university campuses. In Woolf's day, the turn of the twentieth century, even as gates of access began to open for certain women, academic paths still retained the deep-set tread of original designs based on the assumption of women's exclusion.

The same year Virginia Woolf's story was first published—1929—another tale began to unfold on the other side of the world. As a recent graduate of George

Washington University, Evelyn Jones Kirmse[1] arrived in the sun-scorched Tucson valley to begin her tenure as University of Arizona's Dean of Women, the first academic administrative position filled by women on coeducational campuses. The differences between Woolf and Dean Kirmse's experience demonstrates the wide spectrum of burgeoning educational experiences of women during the Progressive Era as they negotiated uncharted academic paths newly afforded them. While elite universities on both sides of the Atlantic remained entrenched in traditions of masculine exclusivity and women's exclusion, a new type of coeducational land-grant institution in the United States was opening its gates to women, though often begrudgingly. The University of Arizona (UA) was such an institution. It opened as a coeducational land-grant college in 1891: twenty-one years before Arizona became a state and nearly forty years before Kirmse arrived. Its first enrollment was a fifteen-year old young lady named Clara Fish (Mitchell 25).

While many land-grant institutions opened their campuses to women alongside men, administrations were unsure of what to do with the women students. The "dean of women" position was created by university administrations in response to novel exigencies rising from coeducation. Commonly considered to be service positions, deans of women were originally seen as little more than chaperones: someone to appease parental concerns, to oversee the unique needs of women students, and to free male administrators from such minutia so they could focus on more pressing matters. Yet,

[1] Evelyn Jones Kirmse began her tenure at the UA under the name of Evelyn Jones. While she did not marry and assume the Kirmse surname until 1937, many of her reflections are written under this name. To avoid confusion, I have chosen to consistently refer to her by this name throughout the research. I refer to her as Dean Kirmse when referring to her writings composed as dean and as Kirmse when relating to reflections she wrote later in life.

since institution presidents sought out women with high academic credentials to hold these “service” positions, deans of women spared no time in elevating their endeavors to meet the level of their qualifications.

While there had been some influential localized meetings among women who held these positions up to this point, the National Association of Deans of Women (NADW) was organized in 1916 by novice deans of women seeking an opportunity to collaborate on best practices and to establish collective standards. This inaugural NADW meeting took place two years after the first appointment of a “dean of women” at the University of Arizona (UA). The archived writings and membership records of the NADW and those composed by Dean Kirmse and subsequent deans reveal an active relationship between the national organization and dean of women at the UA for at least thirty years.

Kirmse was the sixth dean of women at the UA; however, she was the first to be hired explicitly as a dean and the first with distinct qualifications and training for the position. Dean Kirmse also held the position much longer than any other dean at UA and was the only UA dean to hold executive leadership positions in the NADW. During her thirteen-year tenure as dean, Dean Kirmse would serve as NADW secretary for several years, as president of the Western NADW Chapter, and as chair of several membership and research committees. Kirmse was not only involved in national conversations concerning administrative identity, educational theory, and best practices; early examinations of archived professional reports, course designs, and correspondence suggest she wrestled with those issues and applied those best practices in her local UA decision-making.

The Need for Feminist Historiography

The advance of coeducation and women in university administration are significant components of the Progressive Era—a period of great socio-political change in the United States. The array of rhetorical documents composed by early women administrators like Dean Kirmse offer significant insight to women's historical experience in academia. While they can testify of the professionalism, accomplishments, and advocacy of the women who occupied those roles; these documents and writings can also demonstrate and reveal the discomfort and messiness often found in novel praxes where theory and practice meet. This is especially true for women seeking to get their footing and establish roots in traditionally hostile soils: soils long fostered on masculinist ideologies and women's exclusion. Considering women's navigation of coeducation during this time—as both administrators and students—gaining a better understanding their lived experience, and a greater overall comprehension of discriminatory systems and traditions that greeted them within higher education is important. This is especially true considering how lingering ripples of this discrimination continue to influence women, men, academia, and society to this day. It is surprising, then, that relatively little has been researched and written concerning women's own expressed experience and commentary during this time.

This is not to suggest a lack of revered histories of this period of academia. Yet, the difficulty women experienced in claiming their rightful place *within* coeducational spaces is mirrored by the struggle to find women in phallocentric histories *of* these spaces as well as in traditional historiographical theory and practice itself. Many historical accounts have, at best, fallen short of fully acknowledging women's academic presence

and contributions. At worst, such histories commit purposeful erasures based on the self-serving motives of those doing the writing.

The lack of scholarship concerning the dean of women office and the women who filled it may be attributed to a lingering opinion that theirs was simply a service position: an ad hoc position confined to serve the immediate needs of others (Bashaw). Yet, such notions that define the first academic administrative office held by women as service are revealing in and of themselves. Thus, I contend that research on the experience and legacy of deans of women is necessary if a more full and robust comprehension of women's experience of and impact on higher education is to be realized.

The research required to recognize and explore the rhetorical artifacts of these early women administrators requires different methods than what has long been established as "traditional." Traditional phallocentric histories not only minimize women's experience, but the insertion of women into such histories continues to promote and perpetuate rhetorical traditions built upon the assumption of women's inferiority and invisibility. When such methods have been used to write women into academic histories, women have been written *about* rather than recognized as the rightful and able authors of their own experience. Therefore, the goal of this project is not to simply insert the deans' rhetorical legacy into the spare cracks and crevices of masculine academic discourse, histories, or traditions. Doing so would require a violent chiseling down and reshaping of these women's unique rhetorical contributions. Their rhetoric is far too substantial to fit into such small spaces effectively and ethically. The goal of this project is to apply methods that best allow the dean subject-rhetors to convey their own lived experience within the hegemonically masculine institutions and societies through which they moved.

While women's history in higher education and their stories of struggles and triumphs can never be completely portrayed; the more these women's voices are involved in the telling of their stories, the more messy, varied, complex, and accurate they will be. This research demonstrates that deans of women intentionally and proactively influenced the quality of women's experience at coeducational institutions across the United States. As long as their voices remain unheard and unacknowledged, the history of women in academia will never be complete; and the lingering ripples of normalized academic discrimination can never be fully confronted.

Focus of Research and Unique Scholarly Contribution

The goal of my research was to explore, synthesize, and analyze the archived rhetorical documents of deans of women and rely on their expressed concerns, arguments, and values to produce a more authentic presentation of the academic woman's experience during the onset and rise of coeducation at the turn of the twentieth century. Relying on rhetorical expressions of the administrative women involved not only produced a more robust history of their experience but also provided insight into these women's proactive efforts to influence the trajectory and public face of their experience as they simultaneously maneuvered shifting gender roles and societal constructs.

This project focuses on the following research questions:

1. What prominent recurring rhetorical themes are found within the NADW artifacts housed at GWU? What themes, expectations, or expressed values are found within and across the collected NADW documents housed at the GWU library? Do these themes change or evolve over the years?

2. What do administrative documents archived at the UA reveal concerning Evelyn Jones Kirmse's experience and efforts as dean of women? What themes, expectations, or expressed values are found within and across collected documents housed at the UA library? Do these themes change or evolve over the years?
3. What correlation, if any, can be seen between topics and themes within documents composed by Dean Kirmse at the UA and those composed and distributed by the NADW? How do the chronological, situational, and thematic timelines correspond between the NADW and the UA deans of women rhetoric? When and how do these paths cross and deviate?
4. What corresponding rhetorical patterns and recurring themes concern women's navigation of and support within academic coeducational spaces? How, when, and where did women rhetorically conform to traditional systems and where do they rhetorically explore and/or promote new avenues and procedures?
5. What does analysis of these rhetorical documents reveal concerning the experience, concerns, actions, and impacts of deans of women on women's academic experience at the onset of coeducation and, in particular, during the years 1922-1942?

Based on findings and analysis derived from the application of feminist historiographical methodologies, I contend that primary rhetorical artifacts of the NADW reveal concerted efforts by deans of women from across the country to not only define and validate their own positions as a profession, but to also argue for women's right for academic spaces on campus as both administrators and students. Their writings and

rhetorical arguments also reveal debates concerning the “successful coed” identity and how to best orient women students towards that ideal. Rich stores of archived administrative documents, course designs, and reflections composed by Evelyn Jones Kirmse reveal direct correlation between these national conversations and provide practical examples of how these rhetorical acts and practices were put into practice.

While these rhetorical artifacts contain evidence of collaborative efforts to define and establish meaningful and productive identities for both deans and students, they also reveal critical ideological negotiations inherent in times of great social change. Specifically, they demonstrate the deans own paradoxical navigations of essentialist values and progressive perspectives with which women’s “success” in this new academic territory should be attained and measured**.** Most obvious are arguments fluctuating between promoting an essentialist feminine ethos and adherence to traditional social conventions to promoting women’s intellectual vigor, professional potential, and correlated acts of self-promotion.

Project Overview

I have divided this project into the following chapters in order to provide research transparency and context, and to convey my research findings concerning the deans of women’s rhetoric and its academic and social impact.

In Chapter 2, I provide the methodologies and methods that influence and frame my research and analysis of deans of women’s writing. I begin by offering a brief introduction of feminist research methodology. I then apply it to rhetorical historiography and describe how such theoretical framework creates ethical and generative space for the analysis of the dean’s written artifacts. I argue that feminist

historiographical methodologies and methods are necessary to highlight deans of women's efforts with respect to the women's original interests and intent.

The review of literature within Chapter 3 situates my research within ongoing conversations concerning women's academic experience. By synthesizing historical scholarship on coeducation's rise and often volatile development, I position women's academic experience within the patriarchal rhetorical efforts meant to marginalize women and reify traditional gender roles. I then bring together literature regarding feminist historiography to provide the framework I deem necessary for the ethical and effective writing of the dean's expressed experience and rhetorical efforts. I contend that such a review is vital in understanding the context in which deans of women and their women student charges experienced coeducation and for establishing the historiographical gap in which this project fits.

Turning more fully to the archives, Chapter 4 presents a history of the NADW and of Dean Kirmse largely composed by the deans themselves. Relying on their own reflections and documents, I relay the NADW origin story as expressed by founder Kathryn Sisson McLean and other members of the NADW. I then turn to Evelyn Kirmse's historical account of her early years and education in Washington D.C. and her path to the University of Arizona highlighting significant details she expressly emphasized in her accounts.

While providing such first-hand information is vital in contextualizing, understanding, and appreciating the deans' experience, I also note the original authors' awareness of the rhetorical nature of history-writing. The deans of women's efforts to document and archive their experience reveal an understanding of the rhetorical nature of

history-writing, and that they sought control over the telling of their stories and their legacy.

In Chapter 5, I examine the deans of women's arguments and efforts to validate their presence on coeducational campuses by defining and professionalizing their roles and contributions. I first provide literature on the rise of professionalism in the early twentieth century and how deans of women capitalized on the trend to establish a professional identity and ethos. I then turn to the primary NADW documents and records which demonstrate the organization's correlated efforts to argue, promote, and establish deans of women as experts in the field of academic personnel work. This is followed with an analysis of how these NADW conversations were put into action by Dean Kirmse on the University of Arizona campus.

Besides the professionalization of their position as deans, another pressing problem deans of women faced in the early years of coeducation was the lack of campus housing for women students. Chapters 6 examines the dean's tireless and often desperate efforts to address and remedy this need. I open this chapter by laying a foundation of scholarship on gendered rhetoric of place and space. I then synthesize the dean's arguments on both the national stage and at the UA concerning the normalized disproportionate lack of housing and campus spaces dedicated to women students. This includes deans arguing for a voice in the planning and construction of such spaces. This is followed by an overview of the dean's persistent arguments for their own professional offices on campus, arguments that met much resistance from masculine administrations.

This will be followed by Chapter 7 where I examine a third prominent discussion among deans of women as manifest by conference yearbooks: how to best orient women

students to higher education and to society at large. Following a brief discussion on the contextual social climate and a short history of academic orientation programs, I present a hermeneutic phenomenological analysis of "orientation" as a guiding framework that establishes the rhetorical nature of "orientation." This is followed by a synthesis of the NADW's and Dean Kirmse's arguments and attempts to orient the women students in their charge. Doing so, I present specific themes within the testimonials and proposed course designs to demonstrate how orientation courses for women became much more than tools of university acclimation. I argue that deans of women also used these courses as tools of cultural and moral re-orientation, which not only carried forward many traditional ideologies of womanhood, but which also addressed what they believed to be practical and realistic needs of women students.

CHAPTER 2

FEMINIST HISTORIOGRAPHICAL METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

This chapter describes the methodologies and methods that influence and frame my research and analysis of deans of women's writing. As I investigate the rhetoric of deans of women and their national organization, I contend that feminist methodologies shine the best light on these women's efforts with respect to the women's original interests and intent. After a brief introduction of feminist research methodology, I apply it to rhetorical historiography and describe how such theoretical framework creates ethical and generative space for the analysis of the dean's written artifacts. This is followed by a brief discussion on ethics in archival research and, finally, a narrative of my research process including my data selection and analysis.

Feminist Research Methodology

As Ballif argues, simply inserting women into a traditional phallocentric history isn't the answer for amending women's absence. New ways of *thinking about* and *doing* historiography are necessary, and archival work that brings women's history to light must be done in ethical ways that best portray their rhetorical intent and effect. This type of women's history demands methodologies different than what has been established as traditional (Ballif; Glen; Glen and Enoch; Enos; Kirsch; Lunsford). Richard Leo Enos for example, argues that in order to present "a sensitive accounting of women in the rhetorical tradition," three adjustments need to be made in traditional historical research methods:

> First, our mentality toward rhetoric must expand beyond civic, agonistic discourse to include alternative modes of expression used by women. Second, our efforts to discover primary evidence must intensify so that a more representative

> body of sources becomes available. This expanded body of evidence must include non-traditional sources that provide insight into the oral and literate practices of women. Third, historians of rhetoric must create methods of research and analysis that will provide a more sensitive accounting of primary material than current historical methods were designed to yield. (p. 65)

In other words, feminist research methodologies and methods need to be considered and employed.

At its very core, this is a feminist research project: it is *about* and *for* women. Rather than researching and creating knowledge about women simply for the sake of new information, feminist research always leads to the empowering of women. This feminist research methodology is described in Mary Fonow and Judith Cook's *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*. Feminist research, they propose, should incorporate methods based on the continuous personal reflexive analysis as well as looking forward to women's emancipation. Doing so allows recognition of the "affective components of research" which open important vantage points of emotion in women's lived experience as both researchers and participants (Fonow and Cook 3). Ignoring or discrediting such "affective components" undermines research ethos since emotion can never be fully detached.

Feminist research methods should recognize women's strategic rhetorical practice of making use of available means and everyday situations (Fonow and Cook). As Gesa Kirsch contends, doing so validates everyday events and common environments "which can help to valorize the lives of ordinary women and acknowledge the significance of daily lived experience" (*Ethical* 4). After all, through their everyday acts and seemingly mundane rhetorics, women have long influenced social trajectories and change. They have simply gone unacknowledged.

Feminist Rhetorical Historiography

Because women were largely kept from traditional podiums and platforms in the early days of coeducation, feminist historiographical research that highlights and privileges women's own rhetoric is necessary to consider the means available to them and recognize their strategic use of them: means that were often classified and filed away as 'ordinary' and 'prosaic.' Women's subordinate status often limited their rhetorical means to the "everyday" or the "mundane" (Biesecker; Bordelon; Goggin). This is illustrated in Suzanne Bordelon's article, "Muted Rhetors and the Mundane: The Case of Ruth Mary Weeks, Rewey Belle Inglis, and W. Wilbur Hatfield." Because women's voices have historically been "muted" by dominant groups, Bordelon argues, "mundane documents" not only reveal their suppressed voices but demonstrate how women and other marginalized groups used such mundane available means to rhetorically challenge and disrupt dominant discourses (334). The argument for the rich rhetorical nature of nontraditional women's texts is corroborated by Maureen Daly Goggin's research on the rhetorical nature of sampler making. Goggin quotes Merry Weisner's claim that when measured against canonized traditions, "women's work'…became an epithet for the boring, mundane, domestic tasks beneath the dignity [and validation] of a man" ("An Essamplaire" 312). Yet, as Goggin argues, researching such mundane women's texts often "brings into relief the rhetorical force of diverse material practices that create text and…push at the boundaries of what counts as rhetorical practice and who counts in its production" ("An Essamplaire" 309). Building upon such arguments, the "mundane" nature of documents, reports, proposals, and correspondence composed by local deans of women as well as the NADW were the most effective available means by which they

could not only name entrenched discriminatory masculine institutional practices but also the only accepted means by which women could rhetorically validate women's place on college campuses.

Methodologies best suited for analysis of the "nontraditional" rhetorical means and strategies employed by women's and other marginalized population must also break from rigid traditional theories and motivations. Feminist historiographers have long argued that researching and writing the history of women's lived experience demands methods beyond the hegemonic masculine traditions. As historian Gerda Lerner pointed out in 1979, researchers of women's history were already "dissatisfied with old questions and old methods" that discounted and ignored " the actual *experience* of women in the past" (*Majority* 153 emphasis original). Lerner argued that if fellow historians wanted to know of women's historical experience, they needed to listen to women's own descriptions found in "women's letters, diaries, autobiographies, and oral history sources," and listen to what they had to say (*Majority* 153).

This notion of listening has become foundational in feminist historiographical research. Twenty-six years after Lerner's challenge, Krista Ratcliffe would introduce and expound on the concept of "rhetorical listening" in ways particularly applicable to this project. In *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender. Whiteness*, Ratcliffe defines rhetorical listening as a purposeful "stance of openness" assumed by a recipient or researcher that not only leads to better communication but greater realization of identifications of people, texts, and cultures (1). Turning the intentional concept of "understanding" to the more open and receptive image of "standing under" allows dialogues—whether active or archived—to flow over us as researchers as we take time

to listen with suspended judgement for the contextual intent of the rhetor (Ratcliffe). This type of “eavesdropping” as a mode of historiography positions the researcher in the uncomfortable space that exists at the edge of their personal knowledge and beyond the noise of normalized traditions and preconceived expectations enabling better comprehension of the organic tenor and intent of archived voices (Ratcliffe 105).

Ratcliffe’s “eavesdropping” opens time and space for Jacqueline Royster and Gesa Kirsch’s concept of “strategic contemplation” as presented in their influential text *Feminist Rhetorical Practices New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies.* “Strategic contemplation” is one of four innovative “terms of engagement” Royster and Kirsch present as methodologies for productive critical and imaginative interaction with women throughout history that “enable a more dialogic relationship between past and present, their worlds and ours, their priorities and ours” (14). “Strategic contemplation” is a strategy that invites researchers to “linger deliberately inside of their research tasks,” allowing time and space to consider “impacts and consequences” of contexts on rhetorical events (Royster and Kirsch 84). This practice of deliberate and generative patience lessens the chance for reflexive assumptions and allows time and space to acknowledge affect and to contemplate more deeply on the rhetoric being studied. Doing so allows me, an eavesdropping researcher, to “render meaningfully, respectfully, honorably the works of those whom we study, even when we find ourselves disagreeing with some of their values, beliefs, or worldviews” (Royster and Kirsch 22). Thus, the added measure of patience and awareness enables a more accurate, authentic, and ethical research process.

Acknowledging the generative and vulnerable space within "eavesdropping" and "strategic contemplation" and the fact that we as archival researchers are uninvited strangers within these spaces engenders the respect and caution necessary to avoid common pitfalls and unethical leanings prone in archival research. Both methodologies help to avoid "archival motion sickness:" Bordelon's description of the type of dizziness felt when archival researchers rush past spaces of *not-knowing* and fail to acclimate to the contextual world of the subject rhetors (271). Investing time in "rhetorical listening" also insures greater protection from the pitfalls of hurried and irresponsible historiography such as "literacizing" or embellishing to create full narrative arcs of our subject rhetors' experience (Mastrangelo and L'Eplattenier 164), the act of "presentism" or interpreting the historical acts of women through normalized contemporary values (Sutherland 28), or failing to accurately "see" the people we work with due to a blind adherence to restrictive and uninterrogated disciplinary practices (Birmingham 145).

Applied to my historical project, the concepts of rhetorical listening and strategic contemplation are especially relevant. First, these approaches require that I suspend quick judgments and take the time necessary to read widely the primary and secondary texts available in order to properly contextualize my findings. Taking this time also allows me time to consider and check my own positionality and affectual responses to the writings. Finally, these practices allow the time and space necessary for meaningful themes to take shape and synthesize out of the analysis of the primary written artifacts.

Beyond enhancing contextual comprehension in archival research, "rhetorical listening" also engenders a historiographical awareness that Ratcliffe terms "history as usage" (107). As Ratcliffe points out, this understanding that history can best be

considered from a point of usage rather than from some constructed point of origin recognizes its circular nature: its way of circling through past and present, always impacting, always enacting the "*then-that-is-now* in our daily lives" (111). This circular nature of history is also acknowledged by Malea Powell's argument that "History is not a dead and remembered object; it is alive, and it speaks to us" (121).

This concept of "then-that-is-now" is prevalent in women's enduring relationship with higher education. While contemporary women have greater access to university campuses, academia continues to be a precarious space for them. In *Women Writing the Academy: Audience, Authority, and Transformation*, Gesa Kirsch also refers to Virginia Woolf's depiction of closed doors and closed gates on university campuses to illustrate how "women have been and are often still seen as 'others' and 'outsiders' in the academic context" (1). Once inside academia, women are still continually required to "prove their worth" with one hand while trying to "unbreak old norms" that demand such validation with the other (Kirsch 3). In her article, "The Politics of Mind: Women, Tradition, and the University," Carolyn g. Heilbrun also posits that because "women are raised to be untroublesome," women continue wrestle with the lingering whispers in the hallways and in their heads that suggest they should simply be grateful to "the nice gentlemen who have let them into their university" (293).

This circular nature of history also demonstrates the concept of "social circulation:" another methodological term of rhetorical engagement presented by Royster and Kirsch. "Social circulation," they explain, suggests a fluidity in how language, experience, and traditions "are carried on, changed, reinvented, and reused when they pass from one generation to the next" (101). The concept of "social circulation" offers

me, the archival researcher, a name, a metaphor, and a tool to apply in tracing the lived experiences and ideas across time and place bringing into relief not only connections between subject rhetors but with researchers and contemporary populations as well.

Since this type of feminist rhetorical research requires exploring and analyzing the contexts and rhetoric of women who are not present, "critical imagination" is yet another methodological "term of engagement" that is especially relevant to this type of feminist archival research (Royster and Kirsch 71). "Critical imagination" Royster and Kirsch explain, is a "critical stance" that values a level of "educated guessing" as a way of purposely "think[ing] between, above, around, and beyond limited evidence to speculate methodically about probabilities" (71). Employing critical imagination allows researchers room to mull over the gaps inherent in historical research and consider contextual and evidence-based possibilities that fleshes out the people, places, and artifacts we study. Applying critical imagination also allows feminist historiographers greater understanding of the subject's lived experience within historical contexts, which can shine a light on details and efforts that may appear to be mundane on the surface, but meaningful for the subject rhetor.

Ethical Archival Research

Such contemplative work demands a large measure of ethical grounding. Realizing not only the importance of recovering women's voices and compositions from the archive, but also in retaining the intent and integrity of these women's voices, Royster and Kirsch call for an "ethics of care and hope," which they explain as a commitment to "listen deeply to texts and images and for voices and sounds in order to better understand [the author's] views and ideas instead of just our own" (146).

Important in ethical consideration is a realization of the rhetorical nature of archives. Scholars broadly recognize archives and collections as rhetorical spaces (Biesecker; Enoch and VanHaitsma; Goggin; Morris and Rose; Ray). Angela Ray points out that "every stage of the [archival] process is rhetorical:" from creation to collection to processing to research (51). Goggin recognizes that researchers' ability to engage with past events "is limited to what prior groups deemed valuable and thus saved, and what was deemed less valuable and thus tossed" (330). Those objects that remain, Goggin argues, have been rhetorically constructed based on "social, cultural, class, race, gender, ethnicity, political, economic forces" (Goggin 330). Enoch and VanHaitsma also argue that "archives are dynamic sites of rhetorical power" created through rhetorical decision making in terms of selection, preservation, and presentation that "shape in important ways the kinds of meanings that can emerge from the sites" (218). Due to the rhetorical nature of every aspect of this work feminist researchers must not only be mindful of the many "invisible hands" that have influenced the creation, processing, and representation of artifacts of women's writing; but they must be mindful of their own positionality and ideological leanings (Morris and Rose). Thus, ethical archival research requires vigilant efforts towards self and contextual awareness and of the ways and means outside elements serve to impact subject perception throughout the process.

Understanding the importance of establishing an ethical working relationship with the National Association of Deans of Women and the University of Arizona's deans of women, specifically Evelyn Jones Kirmse, I worked on being self-aware of my process and checked tendencies to color the deans' original intent by self-serving expectations, hopes, interpretations, or biases. This required a suspension of my judgement through

"rhetorical listening" and "strategic contemplation" and a generous berth in the documents and records I analyzed, thus creating opportunity for these academic women's principles, goals, efforts, and accomplishments to rise to the surface opening up serendipitous possibilities that I could not anticipate. Such an open mind is not only crucial in ethical feminist recovery work, but when coupled with arduous preparation, it makes room for unexpected and significant findings. As Goggin points out, "inquisitive open minds, wisdom, knowing how to know, and dedicated hours can yield wondrous surprises" (*Serendipity* 6).

This type of feminist rhetorical recovery and analysis also required an awareness of the powerful influences of historical, socio-cultural context and ideologies. When discussing the experience of women, some traditional scholars in the past have argued the presence of essential differences between women and men in an effort to explain or study them as a whole. Yet, I contend that this position of essentialism does not acknowledge the troublesome social-political construction of gender and gender roles, race, and class; nor does it address the continually shifting construction of society at large. Poststructuralists recognize the construction of experience and identity as well as the illusion and danger of "one-story fits all" judgments and analyses. Poststructuralist research depends on the consideration of context and multiple, diverse perspectives. Therefore, rather than building on an essentialist foundation, this work stands on the poststructuralist assumption that gender and gender roles are malleable socio-cultural constructions; and that these constructions influence common ways women interpret, move through, establish their presence, and make their mark on society, specifically the university. At the same time, I recognize and respect the navigations between such

paradoxical philosophies deans of women were experiencing at the time of their writing and their work.

Research Methods

These feminist methodological approaches provide the theoretical foundation and scaffolding for my research practices. The following narrative of my research methods and experience is my effort to contextualize such theory and make the process of this historiographical project more concrete. As scholar and archival researcher Barbara L'Eplattenier explains, sharing such methods "make the invisible work of historical research visible" (69). I have found that putting such process work into words is not only vital in the construction and presentation of my research, but also beneficial to my personal development as a researcher. As with any process, this type of 'naming what I did' demands self-awareness and accountability while also affording space and fodder for practical improvement.

Sharing the methods of research is also paramount in establishing the ethos of research. Because of this, L'Eplattenier argues that archival rhetoric historiographers need to be more generous in sharing their practical methods and research experiences and all the inherent messiness of such research. As L'Eplattenier explains, discussing our primary research methods not only brings to light practical strategies and practices, it also "creates the depth and breadth of knowledge required to begin generalizing about the tools our discipline needs and uses" (68). Therefore, in what follows I share the story of how this research project developed, how I often stumbled my way through it, how I experienced moments of archival stupor and serendipity, and how patience allowed time and space for meaningful insights and connections.

A Narrative of My Research Experience

My research on the NADW and Evelyn Jones Kirmse was far from a linear process. My actual archival research began in 2018 when I was perusing *Arizona Archives Online* collections looking for a project for a seminar class on feminist composition. As a budding enthusiast of archival research, I spent far too much time exploring such archival rabbit holes. As I digitally wandered, I happened upon several digitized documents from University of Arizona's collection "Records Relating to Social Fundamentals, an Orientation Course Required for all Freshman Women." The photocopied documents contained simple drawings of hands and plates depicting proper methods for setting a dinner table and holding utensils. I was immediately intrigued. I wondered why such instruction was included in a university orientation and why this orientation was required of women students only. My imagination sprang into the type of self-righteous feminist indignation common in novice students of feminism. I wanted to learn more of this class and why it was taught.

Upon further inquiry and a day trip to Tucson, I found that these pages of etiquette lessons were a minute portion of a collection pertaining to an orientation course for women students at the UA beginning in 1930. Dean of Women Evelyn Jones Kirmse had designed the course, and this single box—.3 linear feet—contained files packed with Dean Kirmse's handwritten lesson plans and lecture notes. While at the UA's Special Collection library, I photographed all that I found interesting, which I realized later as a frustratingly lackadaisical hit-and-miss assemblage of bits and pieces of documents and notes that, without any proper notes, were difficult to decipher.

I mentioned this interesting collection to my dissertation chair, Maureen Daly Goggin a few days later. As an archival researcher, she also found the collection interesting and suggested it might be a possible dissertation research project. Following her advice, I began developing a plan of research that extended beyond the "Social Fundamentals" orientation course to Dean Kirmse herself. As I returned to the UA's Special Collections online finding aids, I was delighted to find a collection titled "Evelyn Kirmse University of Arizona Centennial Collection 1885-1986" that was 7 linear feet in size and contained 17 boxes. I quickly planned another trip to Tucson.

However, upon arriving at the library early in the morning of the first day of ASU's 2018 Spring Break and opening the collection, I was initially quite disappointed. I found that when Evelyn Kirmse was in her late 70s and early 80s, she worked diligently on assembling a history of the UA. Unfortunately, she passed away in 1986 before her history had taken shape. This "Centennial Collection" included her notes and compiled records for that history. Almost all the files contained within the collection boxes were stuffed with individual sheets of lined, yellow paper containing handwritten biographies of past board of regents and presidents, along with histories of colleges, instructors, and campus architecture. Many of the papers contained different drafts at different stages with Kirmse's distinctive cursive notes consistently marked out, rewritten, running up the margins, and abruptly ending mid-sentence. Most of the papers lacked logical order and subsequent pages were often found in different files and even different boxes.

During this initial exploration, I quickly opened each box, visually scanned the contents, and moved to the next box. I was disappointed and frustrated. I had travelled to the UA library hoping to find a pristine personal account of Kirmse's recorded life as

dean. That is not what I found. However, after lunch and some deep breathing, I started again from the beginning. While it was neither neat nor convenient, I gradually began finding papers where Kirmse shared interesting and meaningful accounts as a dean of women written in third-person. I found similar notes concerning the frustration of women's housing and "the dean's" efforts and influence in the construction of women's dorms. In short, as I began to acclimate to the collection, I began to see what I was initially hoping to find. Having learned my lesson from my first Special Collections visit, I took copious notes of what I found and where I found it; and I filled my cell phone with photographs of everything that appeared remotely significant. While the experience was more like scavenging than the 'big reveal' I had imagined, it ended up being very productive.

The following summer, I had been accepted to participate in the Rhetoric Society of America Institute seminar "The Politics and Practices of Archival Research." The Institute was held in Maryland and allowed participants time and support in individual local archival research. Knowing that Kirmse was a graduate of George Washington University (GWU) and had been briefly employed there as an assistant dean of women, I located the website for the Gelman Library Special Collections Research Center and poured over their online catalogue of archived collections in search of anything bearing Evelyn Jones Kirmse's name. While I found little concerning Kirmse's connection to GWU as a student or employee, I happened upon something much more compelling than expected: the full and official collection of the National Association of Deans of Women containing consistent and generous references to Kirmse's seventeen-year participation and contributions sprinkled throughout. While at the RSA Institute, I spent three days in

the Gelman Library and took over 1600 photographs of NADW documents, memos, correspondence, and conference yearbooks housed within the "National Education Association Records" and the "Office of University Relations Records" collections.

Upon returning home, I immediately set out organizing the photographs into digital files with the use of Topy, an archival document organizational app. As I began reading and studying the documents and conference yearbooks, I recognized prominent themes of dean professionalization, student orientation, student on-campus housing, sorority life, and best practices in administration: themes that were also commonly depicted in Dean Kirmse's collected documents at the UA. It was most interesting to see chronological thematic arguments moving back and forth between the national stage to Kirmse's local application at the UA.

At this point, while I felt confident that I had obtained enough writings produced and distributed by the NADW, I knew that I needed to return to the UA's Special Collections library at least one more time. Prominent NADW conference arguments pertaining to student housing and the dean's professional status led me to realize that I needed to extend my research to Dean Kirmse's broader circle. Having been in regular contact with archivists at the UA, and taking advantage of their expertise, I heeded their advice and began planning another trip south to research the collections of the university presidents and administrators with which Dean Kirmse had worked with. Thinking I had ample time, I scheduled a trip over ASU's 2020 Spring Break. Who would have guessed that the world would shut down the week of my final archival excursion?

Research Interrupted

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the UA Special Collections library closed its

doors and its service for approximately 18 months. It was an uneasy, frustrating, and outright frightening period of time; a period in which thoughts were preoccupied, time was spent transitioning to virtual instruction, and research was temporarily set aside.

As the initial shock of the pandemic eventually evolved into a routine restlessness, I began to organize the large amount of material I had on hand and tried not to worry about imaginary archival motherlodes sitting undiscovered within collections I was unable to access. While exaggerated under unprecedented circumstances, I feel this spirit of discontent is common among archival researchers. The romantic notion of the "yet to be discovered" that perpetually exists just around the corner or within the next collection compels us to keep digging and searching "just a little while longer." While not the motivating factor I would choose, the pandemic compelled me to stop and examine what I had already gathered. As I did so, I realized I already had plenty of meaningful rhetorical documents, and I began my analysis. However, the nagging sense of compromise remained.

Although my on-site primary research was on hold for about six months, when deemed safe, both the UA and GWU libraries began to offer limited remote service. Archivists and librarians at both institutions generously helped with several requests for scans of promising documents I had located in digital finding aids; but such guess-work and hit-and-miss methods were slow and frustrating. Archivists at the UA did inform me of their pandemic project of digitizing UA yearbooks. Following their invitation, I explored both the digitized yearbooks and digitized copies of old *Arizona Daily Star* newspapers. I found both sources to be surprisingly useful for their historical content and for their different representations of Dean Kirmse. Through this pandemic-induced

redirection, I gained a respect for digitized archives and how the different rhetorical artifacts led to a more robust and multifaceted picture of Dean Kirmse's experience.

I was finally able to return to the UA library when it offered limited access in September of 2021. I spent two days revisiting Kirmse's collections and re-scouring boxes and documents. While I was able to find valuable correspondence and records written by Dean Kirmse to University presidents Homer L. Shantz and Alfred Atkinson that added dimension and context, I was surprised at how complete my earlier research had been. Whether disoriented by the pandemic or impeded by pre-established notions of inadequacy, I realized I had wasted many hours feeling as if I was "making do" with what I had previously examined, when I actually had more than enough material.

Data Selection and Analysis

As I read, organized, and analyzed the dean of women's rhetorical documents, I employed strategic contemplation as I took time listen to and ponder about the voices, opinions, and testimonials shared within the different contexts and over the course of time. Doing so allowed me to recognize how the various writings depicted lively and ongoing conversations. I also applied critical imagination as I synthesized the arguments and the contexts. Both of these methods helped me make connections and draw meaningful and ethical conclusions.

After scouring the array of documents contained in the NADW collection, I decided to largely limit my analysis to the annual NADW conference yearbooks and the related NADW Research Committee reports. Based on my intent to place these women and their writing at the center of this research, I contend that these artifacts best represent the testimonials, the histories, and the arguments the deans wanted publicly shared and

distributed. These were the NADW's chosen public-facing arguments and were publications they were most proud of.

The NADW considered their conference yearbooks to be both important historical documents as well as valuable resources on the most pressing issues of the day (Kahle-Wickes 72). The idea of the "possibility of a Quarterly Bulletin for Deans of Women" containing conference proceedings and talks was first introduced at the NADW's fourth conference in 1919. However, "the realization of this long-felt need" would not take place until 1926 (Phillips, "History" 21).

In a reflective article, NADW founder K.S. (McLean) Phillips referred to the publication of conference yearbooks as a "long cherished dream come true" (145). She explained that "to glance at the row upon row of yearbooks in a library, from the earliest one—1922-1923—on to the last one—1937—is indeed to see the glowing record of our fast-growing and expanding organization" (145). Within these yearbooks, the NADW were able to show the public "what deans do, what they think, what their contributions are to the growing body of literature in the field of guidance" (Phillips 145).

My findings concerning the most prominent themes found within the NADW conference yearbooks are corroborated by the NADW's own research. In her 1936 NADW conference talk and subsequent yearbook publication, Anastasia Doyle of Stanford University shared her research findings in a talk titled "A Study of the Yearbooks of the NADW (1924-1935)" (108). Based on the general understanding that "the best of the program was printed in the yearbooks," Doyle argued that while the eleven yearbooks only "occupy about seven inches of shelf room" they contain an accurate "reflection of our profession" and how "we show ourselves" (108).

Doyle examined the subject matter published in eleven years of the thirteen years of yearbook publication to determine the most pressing issues for deans of women (113). By the time I read Doyle's talk and learned of her findings, I had already analyzed the earlier yearbook content and Dean Kirmse's artifacts and had determined my own list of top issues discussed by the deans. I was thrilled to find that Doyle's findings corroborated my own. Per our analyses, the deans' of women most pressing priorities were (1) the "Social Guidance and Orientation" of women students, (2) general "Duties of Deans," the top of which was student housing, and (3) "Deans Qualifications and Professional Training" (109). Doyle would close her conference yearbook analysis by pointing out to her fellow deans that

> In these major years of our existence as an organization, years fraught with developments and problems of a magnitude to stagger the ablest among us, they do tell us and all who read, what we have spent our time discussing, what problems and perplexities seemed to us to need cooperative thinking, what help we wanted from those outside our association, and, finally, in what fields we felt, as individuals, that we could add to the store of knowledge or the skills of the group. In the works which come from our own mouths, so to speak, we shall find our beautification or our condemnation. (113)

The NADW yearbooks were published between 1922 and 1937. Dean Kirmse's tenure as dean of women at the University of Arizona spanned the years 1929-1942. Therefore, my research focuses on the rhetorical materials written by the NADW and Dean Kirmse during and about the years spanning 1922 and 1942. I contend that the artifacts produced during this span of time is sufficient to demonstrate the dean's rhetorical endeavors ethically and effectively.

Due to the inductive nature of this research, I applied qualitative methods to study and identify recurring themes and prominent topics. I took time to "listen" for significant

themes and connections that organically emerged from authors' rhetoric and from the documents their successors and other stakeholders thought significant enough to save. Rather than entering these collections with heavy-handed expectations and theory, I followed Glenn and Enoch's lead and allowed "for a reciprocal process—one that lets the archives speak back to the theory and allows the findings there to push against, open up, question, extend, constrict, or even disregard the theoretical frame altogether" ("Drama" 334). I considered the documents analyzed as an extension of the person or organization that composed them and the unique context in which they were written (McKee and Porter 78). Thus, the subjects' rhetoric and expressed values and goals establish the framework of the project.

In the following chapter, I provide necessary background and historical context for the NADW's and Evelyn Jones Kirmse's professional rhetoric based largely on the dean's original historical writings. The NADW origin story is a compilation of histories composed by NADW founders and members. Dean Kirmse's history is largely composed of her personal writings, her reflections, and her formal introductions to the UA community. Chapter 3 not only lays a solid contextual foundation for the remainder of my dissertation, it also demonstrates the deans' proactive efforts to determine and write their own history.

CHAPTER 3

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE CONCERNING THE EVOLUTION AND THE TELLING

In the following review of literature, I synthesize historical scholarship depicting coeducation's development and shaky reception. I also surveys concerted patriarchal efforts to push back against women academics and students in order to reify traditional gender roles. Such a review is vital in understanding the context in which deans of women and their women student charges experienced coeducation and for establishing the historiographical gap in which this project fits.

The Evolution of Women's Formal Education

From the earliest arguments for the educating of women, the justifications have largely been different than the rationales for educating men with end goals often situated in service of men (Bashaw; Gordon; Rosenberg; Schwager; Solomon). As the dust settled from the Revolutionary War and a new nation busied itself constructing constitutions and ideologies, women may have been denied citizenship, but they were 'benevolently' heralded as the stewards of sons who were 'citizens in the making.' This role of Republican Mother called for the mother to be educated herself not only to "reflect the political independence" and "civic virtue" of the new nation;" but to teach sons how to enact it and to constrain husbands' lapses from it (Schwager 337). Historian Barbara Solomon notes that the decades between 1790 and 1850 "witnessed a remarkable growth" in women's education as social, religious, political, and economic conditions converged to improve accessibility. Yet, Sally Schwager points out that while girls were often taught the same subjects as boys, the rationale remained the same: girls were taught that they

may serve; boys were taught that they may rise and conquer (342). Thus, while the Republican Mother rationale opened new opportunities for women's education, it also served also to reinforce and perpetuate their subordinate status (Schwager 337).

This method of ordering and naming of roles continued to influence women's education into the nineteenth century. While Solomon describes the rise of women's higher education in the United States during the Victorian Era—approximately 107 women's schools, seminaries, academies were in operation between 1830-1870— Lynn D. Gordon points out that the basic rationale remained the same (Solomon 23). Yet now, the celebrated attributes of the Republican Mother—purity, piety, moral superiority, domesticity, and gentleness—were considered applicable in the public arenas of missionary work, temperance, moral reform, and abolition as well (Gordon 14). However, even with the socio-cultural constraints constricting women's higher education, a consistent paradox was gaining momentum. Schwager points out that while the education of women had long "served the conservative function of preserving dominant cultural values of domesticity and subservience," it also provided women with the experiences, logics, and skills to recognize and name inequity and seek radical change (343). For example, in 1853, abolitionist and suffragist Sarah Grimke predicted that men's efforts to educate women "will do a greater work than he anticipates. Prepare woman for duty and usefulness," she continued, "and she will laugh at any boundaries man may set for her" (qtd by Solomon 27).

Women's resistance against societal restraint gained momentum at the turn of the twentieth century. Labeled as the Progressive Era, this was a time of profound socio-cultural and political change. While significant traces of Victorian ideals continued to

weave throughout society, they were met with a new interweave of progressive ideas. Gordon points out that a new type of optimism and energy permeated Middle-Class America rising from a "confidence that human beings could ameliorate the deficiencies of the national life and still hold onto American traditions" (3). While Victorian ideals of "female-distinctiveness [and] moral superiority" lingered, they were combined with desires to apply them in service to society at large by means of robust education, social service, and political activism: endeavors traditionally distinguished as "the province of men" (Gordon 38). Such challenges to entrenched gender role consciousness naturally led to an unsettling mixture of confusion, defensiveness, and hope.

Influencers in the Development of Coeducation

While the assortment of elite women's colleges, seminaries, and academies provided a rigorous and well-respected education for a select few during the nineteenth century, the rise of coeducation paved the way for a more accessible higher education for women. The greatest impact on the rise of coeducation was the 1862 passing and the 1890 refunding of the Morrill Act: legislation encouraging and supporting utilitarian education in the form of land-grant universities throughout the United States (Eisenmann; Gordon; Kleszynski, Radke-Moss; Thelin). Sponsored by Senator Justin Morrill of Vermont, the Morrill Act was originally passed through Congress during the Civil War and signed into law by President Lincoln. It engendered greater access to public higher education that was both practical and affordable. As explained in John R. Thelin's 2011 work, *A History of American Higher Education*, the Morrill Act stipulated that states and territories establish collegiate programs supporting ""useful arts" such as agriculture, mechanics, mining, and military instruction" with money from the sale of remote

Western lands (267). This, combined with the 1887 Hatch Act funding agricultural research and experiment stations at the land-grant colleges, laid the groundwork for "the emergence of great land-grant research universities of the Midwest and West" (Thelin 269).

The concept of land-grant universities was especially appealing to Western states and remote territories due to its ideals of practicality and affordability. With the stated practical "arts" and goals of the Morrill Act being decidedly masculine in nature, it is rather ironic that many of these land-grant institutions opened as coeducational. Although the act didn't include any mention or requirements of coeducation, issues such as financial pressures and the demands of tax-paying parents of daughters compelled most land-grant institutions to accept women enrollment right from the start (Gordon; Kleszynski, Radke-Moss). While these institutions offered a regional and inexpensive alternative to costly Eastern women's colleges, they also appealed to localized ideologies that valued practical, real-world educations for women, educations that would prepare them for realistic domestic careers and lives as farm wives. Some of the more popular coursework for women students at coeducational institutions included the sciences, accounting, literary studies, and domestic science (Radke-Moss).

Between the mid- to late-nineteenth century, influences such as the Morrill Act, Western expansion, the Industrial Revolution, the suffrage movement, and the increased need for teachers resulted in women entering institutions of higher education in unprecedented numbers (Kleszynski; Nidiffer; Rosenberg; Solomon). Solomon points out that between the years 1870 and 1900, women's enrollment in higher education increased nearly eightfold: from 11,000 to 85,000 (58). While this rise in women's access to formal

higher education began in institutions such as seminaries, academies, and private women's colleges, by 1880, most women were entering coeducational institutions (Niffier, Gordon, Solomon).

Resistance to Women's Presence on Coeducational Campuses

Women's presence on campus, though publicly heralded, was immediately met with resistance. At the earliest signs of women's earnest interest and dedication in entering institutions of higher education, arguments against the idea began to circulate. The lowest fruit for antagonists were rationales based on biological difference (Clarke; Gordon; Nidiffer; Solomon). The most widely read was Edward Clarke's *Sex in Education: A Fair Chance for the Girls* published in 1873.

Soon after women began appealing for entrance to Harvard, Dr. Clarke—a retired professor at Harvard Medical School—published his study on the physical health of seven Vassar students (Solomon 56). While women had the capacity to learn, he argued, it wasn't in their best interest to do so at the same pace as men. Clarke argued that this acceleration of intellect would draw finite reserves of energy away from women's reproductive organs to their brain leading to an increase of "neuralgia, uterine disease, hysteria, and other derangements of the nervous system" (Clarke 18). Such rigorous study, according to Clarke, also resulted in masculinization of features and lower quality of offspring (Clarke 163). Solomon posits that Clarke's ethos grew from his expressed concern for women. After all, his claims were different than contemporary political arguments against women's rights: they were based on women's physical health. And, the public responded favorably. The popularity of *Sex in Education* demanded seventeen printings and remained strong well into the twentieth century (Solomon 57).

Other "experts" added their voice to Clarke's warning of women's physical and intellectual deficiencies. Historian Jana Nidiffer notes that British philosopher Herbert Spencer claimed women's body as a closed biological system: the expenditure of energy in one part necessarily depriving another (17). Likewise, Charles Darwin argued a "specialization of function" limiting women's prescribed role due to their smaller brain (Nidiffer, 2000 17). In addition, Paul J. Moebius, a German-born physician, wrote the following in 1907:

> If we wish a woman to fulfill her task of motherhood fully, she cannot possess a masculine brain. If the feminine abilities were developed to the same degree as those of the male, women's maternal organs would suffer, and we should have a repulsive and useless hybrid (Nidiffer 21).

Advocates of women's education were justifiably angered by such ill-founded claims (Nidiffer, Gordon, Solomon). Suffragists denounced faulty research; and women academics responded with their own studies highlighting the benefits of coeducation. The Association of Collegiate Alumnae surveyed the health statistics of 1290 college graduates and found no difference between men and women (Nidiffer 18). Yet, even after debunked, embers of the biological difference argument would sporadically rekindle the biological debate for decades.

While arguments against coeducation remained passionate, academic historian John Thelin notes that an interesting logical shift in rhetorical attacks on coeducation took place around the turn of the twentieth century. Whereas the concerns of parents, educators, and psychologists between 1880 in 1890 had been based on the argument that collegiate coeducation was harmful to women's health and aesthetic, by 1910 the claims had changed dramatically. Since "women seemed to have handled the burdens of serious

study and campus life quite well," Thelin explains, a new rationale argued that "their presence was harmful—or rather threatening—to college men" (189).

Whether such fears were based on fragile masculinity or upon the stigma that women's presence on campus signified a lack of institutional wealth and prestige, early discriminatory and abusive treatment of women on coeducational campuses was more common than not (Nidiffer, Radke-Moss, Rosenberg, Thelin). Rosalind Rosenberg suggests that discrimination was first expressed in the actions of professors and faculty. She points to the outright physical segregation in the classroom, but also notes more subtle practices of professors addressing coeducational classes as "gentlemen," refusing to address women students by anything other than their last name, ignoring women in general, and denying them traditional academic achievement recognition (113). Women were also regularly barred from appearing in the yearbook, joining honor societies, music groups, eating halls, and student organizations such as debate teams and fraternities (Rosenberg 112). Thelin also points out that faculty would often discourage women from enrolling in certain fields of study for fear of feminization of those fields; and would accuse women of becoming unfeminine themselves—looking physically worn out and deemed unsuitable for marriage or romance—practices that would continue for years to come (60).

Such open administrative and faculty hostility towards women naturally influenced attitudes of male students. Radke-Moss posits that the most "powerful tool" of peer-discrimination of women students came in the form of language: both the language of condescension and "the language of expectation" (50). Woven through stories, poems, songs, and editorials found in school papers and yearbooks, women students were

portrayed as dim-witted, silly, and unthinking simpletons. Even the label "coed" was originally used as a derogatory term (Nidiffer 23). When not outright hostile, male campus writers adopted condescending tones in describing women as foreigners or "captivating social curiosities" (Radke-Moss). Where men students were regularly described in terms of upwardly mobile, assertive, and high-achieving professionals; women students were often described as "our girls" or "wives-and mothers-in-training" (Radke-Moss 65). Thus, men casually and consistently rhetorically "reinforced the different moral, intellectual, and social expectations for men and women" (Radke-Moss 61).

Women holding the few faculty positions at coeducational institutions experienced similar forms of ostracism. Thelin suggests that women academics faced constant marginalization. Without tenure or comparable salaries, women were simultaneously considered a part of and apart from the faculty culture. Like their students, women were often excluded from faculty clubs or participation in faculty activities; and it was a common assumption that they would hold service duties above their teaching load. Such inhospitality often compelled women professors to seek positions at women's institutions or nonacademic positions such as federal agencies, museums, labs, etc. (Thelin 227).

Efforts to Reify a Masculinist Academia

Before women's presence on campus was fully established, rhetorical shifts in contemporary publications and discourse reveal a concerted effort to reify gender roles to the constructs of previous generations. This rhetorical manipulation to reestablish proper gender roles is present in Edward Clarke's cautionary tale of women's education. "Jane

in the factory" Clarke explains "can work more steadily with the loom, than Jane in college with the dictionary." And the "girl who makes the bed can safely work more steadily the whole year through, than her little mistress of sixteen who goes to school" (131). The reasons for this phenomenon, Clarke explains, has everything to do with the development of "the reproductive apparatus" fighting against unnatural demands of schooling (131). Therefore, argues Clarke, for their own good, let girls do that which they are *meant* to do.

Even with such sexist arguments, socio-cultural shifts concerning gender roles continued to change. As explained by Gordon, "changing gender role consciousness and confusion about the meaning of those changes" engendered an irrational fear that "women's presence threatened male dominance of social and institutional life, on and off the campus" (11). Off campus, fear of the "effeminization of American life and institutions" kindled by women's suffrage engendered reassertions of "Americans masculinity" in the form of "'muscular Christianity,' the Boy Scouts, wild West dime novels, competitive athletics" and other hyper-masculinist measures (Gordon 38). On campus, intense fears of feminization in courses and disciplines led professors and faculty to increase segregation and limit women's access to study (Gordon; Gorgosz; Solomon; Thelin). While he fails to name women's influence, the Progressive Era is the period when Laurence Veysey notes a correlated and stark rise in masculine rhetoric appearing in university presidential speeches linking the Greek ideals of assertive yet cultured manliness to mental discipline and moral character (28, 239).

These classically masculinist ideals heavily influenced the rise of university Greek life; and campus fraternity/sorority relations is an area where the reification of

gender roles was clearly played out (Gorgosz; Thelin). Through a rhetorical analysis of the famous fraternity song “The Sweetheart of Sigma Chi” composed in the late nineteenth century, Jon Gorgosz brings into relief strategic measures to restore the nature of women as aesthetic, self-sacrificing, and virtuous moral crusaders subservient to the position to men (358). As explained in his article, “The Campus Sweetheart: An Idealized, Gendered Image on College Campuses in the Early to Mid-Twentieth Century,” the popular song written by two fraternity boys at Albion College was one of the first pop-culture representations of the idealized, feminine college-sweetheart image. The song lyrics praise the “sweet co-ed” with aesthetically pleasing blue-eyes and blonde hair as the dream of every fraternity boy. This “hyper-feminized, restrictive form of femininity,” Gorgosz argues, was a response to the shifting role of women and “promoted traits that firmly placed women in the domestic sphere and men in the public” (360).

This type of gender role realignment was also encouraged within burgeoning fraternity and sorority relationships. Thelin notes an odd sense of ownership developed along with the association promoted by “a complex ritual of competitions and selection” (200). Sororities were lauded and celebrated in school papers and yearbooks as sources for homecoming queens and courts, and for hosting an array of beauty pageants and festivals through the academic year. These competitive displays led to rituals of serenading and “pinning” the best girls: a mark signifying the girl as chosen and “taken” by a man (201). Thelin notes a distinct correlation between the rise of sororities and shifts in women’s academic experience. Compared with the women undergraduates of the 1890s, sorority ‘coeds’ were less likely to pursue advanced degrees, especially in the learned profession of medicine or law” (Thelin 203).

Other scholars also note the negative effects discrimination, oppression, and manipulation had on women's place in higher education (Bashaw; Nidiffer; Klesynski; Solomon; Schwartz; Thelin). Because of discriminatory resistance in class, in administration, and later rationalizations through and due to the GI Bill, the number of women making up student bodies would continue to steadily decrease over the next few decades to once again reach 21% in 1955 (Schwartz 516). Women college students would not reach numbers comparable to the 1920s until the 1970s "ushered in another wave of feminist activity that focused attention on women's intellectual and professional potential" (Nidiffer, "Crumbs" 28).

The discrimination and manipulation of women students' perceived role was just one facet of gendering in higher ed; that of women administrators was equally problematic. It is interesting to note that the position of Dean of Women only lasted until the 1970s: a decade when arguments for women's rights once again rose in volume (Bashaw 15). During this time, key responsibilities that deans of women had held largely shifted into general student services and women's studies; and the administrative position eventually disappeared (Bashaw). The experiences and contributions of these women were simply filed away with little of the recognition they deserved.

Deans of Women

The literature that currently exists on the position and experience of deans of women during this time most often focus on the lives and contributions of a few select early women academics (Bashaw; Klink; Nidiffer; Schwartz). Carolyn T. Bashaw suggests that the lack of scholarship concerning this office may be due to a lingering notion that it was simply a service position. Yet, she also points out that "as the highest-

ranking woman on the coeducational campus, deans of women increasingly expanded their role from one of supervision to one of advocacy" (2). Bashaw claims the leadership and contributions of deans of women concerning the quality of academic life for women to be the "best-kept secret in the history of higher education" (2). The fact that so little is known of deans of women and their experience as forerunners on coeducational campuses and as student advocates on those campuses is a tragedy, especially considering the lasting effects of their influence.

Robert A. Schwartz also recognizes the important legacy deans of women. In his article, "Reconceptualizing the Leadership Roles of Women in Higher Education: A Brief History on the Importance of Deans of Women," Schwartz argues that overlooking and ignoring the impact of this position continues to have a negative effect on "the study of higher education in America" (503). Schwartz points out that deans of women developed a body of professional literature that included journals, research reports, and books. They worked hard to "professionalize" the position of dean and to legitimize their role on the pre-dominantly male college campuses (Schwartz, "Reconceptualizing" 506). Deans of women established a clear pattern of leadership, welcoming an unprecedented number of young women onto campus and guiding them through the rigors of college life.

While women's history in the academy—as students, as faculty, as administrators, as deans—and their stories of struggles and successes can never be completely portrayed; the more these women's voices are involved in the telling of their stories, the more messy, varied, complex, and accurate they will be. While the position no longer exists, deans of women were the first and often only administrative position open to women during the first decades of coeducation. Deans of women largely influenced the quality

of women's experience at coeducational institutions across the United States. As long as their story remains incomplete, the history of women in academia will never be complete.

Survey of Traditional Academic Historiography

Despite their many achievements, the position of deans of women and the administrators who held the position have generally been overlooked in traditional academic histories**.** This exclusion cannot be blamed on a lack of histories written during and of this academic period (Clark; Rudolph; Veblen; Veysey; Woody). Rather, the struggle to find women in prominent phallocentric histories *of* these spaces as well as in traditional historiographical theory and practice aptly reflect the difficulty women experienced in claiming their rightful place *within* coeducational spaces. Neither situation is a matter of chance. While many historical accounts have, at best, fallen short of fully acknowledging women's academic presence and contributions; at worse, such histories demonstrate purposeful erasures that satisfy self-serving motives of those doing the writing.

Close examination of publication dates of such academic histories reveals intriguing parallels between their content and the socio-cultural contexts in which they were published. It seems that periodic interest in women's rights activism—which often led to increased women's college enrollment—was closely followed by a new academic history on bookstore shelves. One of the earlies of such histories was Thorstein Veblen's *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*.

Veblen's history was published in 1918 just as the U.S. suffragist movement was peaking and the ratio of women students in coeducational universities had risen above

40% (Solomon 63). While Veblen does not refer to women in his history, he attributes what he sees as a deplorable lowering of intellectual excellence, inquiry, and standards to the rise of practical universities open to them. Veblen claims that the utilitarian objectives and broad student inclusion of such institutions undermined the more favorable "ideals of civilized life" promoted by elite universities. This, he argues, was manifest in the eroded attitudes of those employed and enrolled in such institutions and in the loss of respect for and from the community looking on (13).

Eleven years later—nine years after the passing of the Nineteenth Amendment—Thomas Woody would publish a very different academic history: a two-volume treatise, *A History of Women's Education in the United States*. In what he repeatedly describes as a recognition of "women's emancipation," Woody's work is to be commended. After all, he was progressive in recognizing "the comparative silence" in other educational histories "on the subject of women's education;" and sought to "bridge the gap in our information on this subject" (vii). He points out that "Woman has been punctuated as a question from ancient times;" and claims that his history finally "contains a partial record of *her* answers" (viii emphasis added). Yet, this is where Woody fails and, instead, falls in line with masculinist traditions. While noting exceptional women activists, scholars, and academics, Woody actually provides commentary on these women's experiences from newspapers, pamphlets, and proceedings written by men (ix). Rather than inviting women to answer questions concerning their identity and academic experience, Woody allows men to benevolently answer for them. Veiled in tone of patriarchal benevolence, Woody's expressed traditional research methods silenced the women he sought to

recognize (ix). His history demonstrates how the very question of "Woman" and her academic story has traditionally been appropriated by men.

Years later—in the '60s and '70s—the ongoing cultural conversation concerning women's educational rights would again swell as would publications of masculine histories on higher education. In his book, *The American College and University: A History* published in 1965, Frederick Rudolph addresses the question, "How and why and with what consequences have the American colleges and universities developed as they have?" (viii). Rudolph's broad historical survey spans from colonial times through the 1960s and includes chapters that range from "The Academic Balance of Power" to "The Rise of Football" and "The Academic Man." Nestled just over halfway through Rudolph's sprawling chronology lies a brief, segregated chapter interrupting the historical arc. It is titled "The Education of Women."

There is a distinct turn in Rudolph's tone in this chapter on women's education. Unlike other chapters, his language is softer and almost lilting. It reflects a nostalgia for bygone eras heralding women as separate and special. Rudolph's altered tone is brought into greater relief by his shift from documenting a collective national academic experience to describing women's separate experience. Positioning women as objects rather than acting subject ts, Rudolph explains to an assumed male audience that it was only a matter of time before "the college classroom should one day be blessed with the charms of femininity and graced by the presence of aspiring American womanhood" (307). Validating that many are "hard pressed to explain why" women need college, Rudolph graciously argues their right for self-improvement and the virtue of their presence on campus (317). Such value of the "coeducation experiment," he posits, can be

seen and measured by the “elevated table manners and dinner conversation” of women students and the increased manliness of the young men (328). With language and logic reminiscent of Edward Clarke’s 1873 argument, Rudolph suggests that such educational dividends *may* be worth the intellectual frustration women would surely encounter in the daily grind of their inevitable role as wife and mother (328). But, Rudolph asks, who would deny women of “fully-developed faculties,” especially if they can be acquired “without loss to woman’s crowning glory—her gentleness and grace” (328).

Even while women have been largely segregated, overlooked, or diminished within such histories, full erasure of their influence in academic history is impossible. A stark and telling correlation exists between women’s increasing presence in academic spaces and the rise in hyper-masculinist academic commentary and dialogue noted in the histories of these spaces. This parallel is evident in Laurence Veysey’s oft-cited historical work, *The Emergence of the American University*, published in 1970.

In this history of higher education, Veysey considers institutional evolutions and phases through a socio-cultural lens. He declares his work to be a celebration of “the academic man;” and he praises the American concept of higher education as “a capitalist enterprise” and a healthy competitive alliance with European institutions (vii, 3). Veysey recognizes and points out correlations between evolving “American” ideologies and how the American university emerged as a product of these cultural ideologies. Based on these proclamations, and by the phallocentric focus of his work, Veysey’s history not only offers a cultural perspective on the evolution of education in the United States, but in doing so, it also brings into relief the masculinist environments, systems, and attitudes women faced as they walked onto the grounds of these institutions.

Veysey's historical account does not include women. In fact, Veysey only mentions women several times and only as passive observers of academia rather than active participants. Yet, his casual omission of women cannot fully erase the prominence of their footprint on "the academic man" experience. For example, Veysey describes a stark and significant shift to hyper-masculine rhetoric in the speeches and public addresses of university presidents and administrators beginning in the 1880s. He notes a rise in written and spoken references connecting intelligence and human potential to classical Greek masculine virility. The presidents, Veysey points out, recognized masculinity as the source and representation of power; and they believed it was their described duty as presidential patriarchal overseers to instruct their students in the development of a balance of "aggressive action and virtuous self-control" (29). Veysey explains that this veiled hostility was also manifest in a rise in "aggressive administration" that was not only competitive but, at times, cut-throat. While Veysey repeatedly questions the cause of this increase in hyper-masculinist administrative rhetoric, he fails to note how each rhetorical wave corresponds to documented increases in women's occupation of coeducational institutions and administrative positions. Thus, despite Veysey's omissions, his documentation of men's defensive and hyper-phallocentric rhetoric brings women's impact on traditional academia into stark relief. The threat of women, it seems, was at least a contributing factor to the great mystery of academic hypermasculinity at the turn of the twentieth century.

The Need for Feminist Historiography

As this review of histories demonstrates, women have long been segregated or ignored in academic historiography. When women *are* written in academia, traditional

practices most often write *about* women rather than to give voice to women as constructors of their own experiential knowledge. In her article, "Cultural Sexism Is Ordinary: Writing and Re-Writing Women in Academia," Heather Savigny explains that women's invisibility in masculinist histories reflects an overshadowed academic experience played-out "against a backdrop of masculinist discourses" that determined and enforced the "structures, cultures, and the position" afforded them (2). Therefore, the application of traditional masculinist historiographical methods to write women's lived experience within hegemonically masculine institutions can only serve to prolong the oppression women endured within their initial experience of those institutions.

In light of Savigny's argument, histories such as Rudolph's and Veysey's are indeed limited at best; but they can also be valuable. Such histories not only depict normalized patriarchal ideologies influencing academic spaces, they also exemplify masculinist rhetoric that has long been the tradition in historiography. Savigny describes such performative methods of historical inclusion and casual omission as normalized cultural sexism. The "drip-drip effects" of such consistent and unrelenting sexist traditions appear in academic writing as well as in institutional practice resulting in subtle but definitive marginalization and/or erasure of women's experience and contributions (Savigny 6). Such histories not only minimize women's experience, but the insertion of women into such histories would continue to promote and perpetuate rhetorical traditions built upon the assumption of women's inferiority and intrusion (Ballif, Biesecker, Glen and Enoch, Kirsch, Lerner, Lunsford, Mattingly). Twisting and contorting women's experience to fit into such narrow historical discourses threatens to perpetuate the mistreatment women have endured throughout history.

The research required to explore the collections and artifacts of these early women administrators and students, and to consider the obstacles these women managed requires a different type of history than what has been recognized as "traditional." As Michelle Ballif argues, traditional phallocentric historiography that forces women into histories constructed upon the assumption of women's exclusion are acts of "violence" ("Re/Dressing" 92). Ballif points out that historians often enact such violence in the name of increasing women's value by bending her into shapes deemed "proper" and "legitimate" for the narrative they want to tell ("Re/Dressing" 92). Such performances of raising the Other by systems and practices that Other (v) not only fail to address ideologies that find women lacking in the first place but serve to perpetuate such ideologies (Ballif, "Re/Dressing" 92). Likewise, Barbara Biesecker compares this practice of adding women to patriarchal historiographical practices akin to affirmative action: "Token admission without changing status quo of power structures that enforce inequity" (143). Rather than change an oppressive norm, such histories rhetorically act-out and celebrate the oppression of women in real time. Gerda Lerner goes so far as to suggest that even positioning women's as "victims of oppression" frames their experience only in relation to the "standards and values established by men," which continues to measure women's experience only in comparison to or in light of men's (*Majority* 148).

Therefore, the end goal cannot be to simply fit women into the gaps of traditional academic history or add new chapters to a patriarchal rhetorical canon in order to fill a void. Hers is a different history experienced from a unique vantage point, which requires different questions and nontraditional methods to recognize and trace. Credible

considerations of women’s historical experiences call for new tellings of histories based on women’s account of their own experiences and research that welcomes the platforms, strategies, and rhetoric employed by women. This is a case long supported by Andrea Lunsford. As she posits in her classic introduction to *Reclaiming Rhetorica*, the foundational principle to feminist rhetorical research and historiography needs to be “diversity and inclusivity” rather than unity (7). This call for a disruption in the deceptively “seamless narrative” of rhetorical tradition also applies to historiography (Lunsford 6). The consideration and validation of countless experiential perspectives and multiple dimensions of past events undermines any notion of a singular, uninterrupted “True” history. The idea that masculinist representations of history somehow establish a type of strength in their rigidity is not only false but dangerous. Because of this, Savigny joins Lunsford’s call for feminist re-writing of histories as an act of resistance (Savigny 2). Since feminist research and writing can animate unheard voices, it can be used to “highlight and disrupt masculinist historiography in which gender has been and is continually ‘done’ to women or performed within the academy” (Savigny 2). Such feminist research can also identify and push against lingering ripples of such normalized discrimination that continues to influence women, men, academia, and society to this day.

Review of Guiding Methodology Scaffolding Feminist Historiography

Since simply inserting women into a traditional phallocentric history isn’t the answer for amending women’s absence, new ways of *thinking about* and *doing* historiography are necessary. Archival work that brings women’s history to light must be done in ethical ways that best portray their rhetorical intent and effect. This type of

women's history demands methodologies different than what has been established as traditional (Fonow and Cook; Glen and Enoch; Kirsch; Lunsford).

At its very core, this dissertation is a feminist research project: it is *about* and *for* women. Rather than researching and creating knowledge about women simply for the sake of new information, feminist research always leads to the empowering of women. This feminist research methodology is described in Mary Fonow and Judith Cook's classic *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research.* As they propose, feminist research incorporates methods based on continuous reflexive analysis as well as looking forward to women's ongoing emancipation. Doing so respects the "affective components of research" which opens important vantage points of emotion in women's lived experience as both researcher and participant (Fonow and Cook 3). Ignoring or discrediting such "affective components" undermines research ethos since emotion can never be fully detached. This dissertation also builds on Fonow and Cook's feminist methodology valuing women's "making use of the situation at hand" in order to highlight and validate the everyday events and common environments in which women worked towards goals and influenced change (Fonow and Cook 11). Such recognition of mundane acts validates the common intellect and prowess of women and "acknowledges the significance of daily lived experience" (Kirsch 4). After all, everyday acts in common environments heavily influence social trajectories and change.

Because women were largely kept from traditional podiums and platforms in the early days of coeducation, feminist research is necessary to validate the means and situations available to them—means often classified and filed away as ordinary and prosaic—and to recognize women's strategic use of such means (Biesecker; Bordelon;

Goggin). As argued by Suzanne Bordelon, because women's voices have historically been "muted" by dominant groups, "mundane documents" were the available means with which to rhetorically challenge and disrupt those dominant discourses (Bordelon 334). The argument for the rich rhetorical nature of mundane documents and everyday women's texts is corroborated by Maureen Daly Goggin's research on the rhetorical nature of sampler making. Goggin notes that when measured against canonized traditions, "women's work" was dehumanized, devalued, and situated beneath the sophistication and validation of men's (312). Yet, as Goggin argues, researching such mundane women's texts often "brings into relief the rhetorical force of diverse material practices that create text and…push at the boundaries of what counts as rhetorical practice and who counts in its production" (309).

Building upon such arguments, the "mundane" documents composed by early Arizona deans of women as well as the NADW represent the most effective available means by which they could rhetorically validate, assess, and influence women's place and experience on college campuses. Turning to these rhetorical documents allows this dissertation to shift the gaze from "male-oriented" consciousness to "female-oriented," which, as Lerner argues, is "most important and leads to challenging new interpretations" of women's history (*Why History* 153).

Methodologies best suited for analysis of the "nontraditional" rhetorical means and strategies employed by women's and other marginalized population must also break from rigid traditional theories and motivations. Of particular application in this type of feminist research is Krista Ratcliffe's concept of "rhetorical listening." In *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender. Whiteness*, Ratcliffe defines rhetorical listening as a

purposeful "stance of openness" assumed by a recipient or researcher that not only leads to better communication but greater realization of identifications of people, texts, and cultures (1). Turning the intentional concept of "understanding" to the more open and receptive image of "standing under" allows dialogues—whether active or archived—to flow over us as researchers as we take time to listen with suspended judgement for the contextual intent of the rhetor (Ratcliffe). This type of "eavesdropping" as a mode of historiography positions the researcher in the uncomfortable space that exists at the edge of their personal knowledge and beyond the noise of normalized traditions and preconceived expectations enabling better comprehension of the organic tenor and intent of archived voices (Ratcliffe 105).

Ratcliffe's "eavesdropping" opens time and space for Jacqueline Royster and Gesa Kirsch's concept of "strategic contemplation" as presented in their influential text *Feminist Rhetorical Practices New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies.* "Strategic contemplation" is one of four innovative "terms of engagement" Royster and Kirsch present as methodologies for productive critical and imaginative interaction with women throughout history that "enable a more dialogic relationship between past and present, their worlds and ours, their priorities and ours" (14). "Strategic contemplation" is a strategy that invites researchers to "linger deliberately inside of their research tasks," allowing time and space to consider "impacts and consequences" of contexts on rhetorical events (Royster and Kirsch 84). The added measure of patience and awareness enables a more accurate, authentic, and ethical research process.

Acknowledging the generative and vulnerable space within "eavesdropping" and "strategic contemplation" and the fact that we as archival researchers are uninvited

strangers within these spaces engenders the respect and caution necessary to avoid common pitfalls and unethical leanings prone in archival research. Both methodologies aid against Bordelon's warning of "archival motion sickness:" the type of dizziness that is felt when archival researchers rush past spaces of *not-knowing* and fail to acclimate to the contextual world of the subject rhetors (271). Investing time in "rhetorical listening" also insures greater protection from the pitfalls of hurried and irresponsible historiography such as "literacizing" or embellishing to create full narrative arcs of our subject rhetors' experience (Mastrangelo and L'Eplattenier 164), the act of "presentism" or interpreting the historical acts of women through normalized contemporary values (Sutherland 28), or failing to accurately "see" the people we work with due to a blind adherence to restrictive and uninterrogated disciplinary practices (Birmingham 145).

Beyond enhancing contextual comprehension in archival research, "rhetorical listening" also engenders a historiographical awareness that Ratcliffe terms "history as usage" (107). As Ratcliffe points out, this understanding that history can best be considered from a point of usage rather than from some constructed point of origin recognizes its circular nature: its way of circling through past and present, always impacting, always enacting the "*then-that-is-now* in our daily lives" (111). This circular nature of history is also acknowledged by Malea Powell's argument that "History is not a dead and remembered object; it is alive, and it speaks to us" (121).

A "then-that-is-now" consciousness is prevalent in women's enduring relationship with higher education. While contemporary women have greater access to university campuses, academia continues to be a precarious space for them (Barone; Brower; Clark; Crimmins; DeSole and Hoffmann; Heilbrun; Kirsch; Longman; Martin; Winslow). In

Women Writing the Academy: Audience, Authority, and Transformation, Gesa Kirsch also refers to Virginia Woolf's depiction of closed doors and closed gates on university campuses to illustrate how "women have been and are often still seen as 'others' and 'outsiders' in the academic context" (1). Once inside academia, women are still continually required to "prove their worth" with one hand while trying to "unbreak old norms" that demand such validation with the other (Kirsch, *Women Writing* 3). In her article, "The Politics of Mind: Women, Tradition, and the University," Carolyn G. Heilbrun also posits that because "women are raised to be untroublesome," women continue wrestle with the lingering whispers in the hallways and in their heads that suggest they should simply be grateful to "the nice gentlemen who have let them into their university" (293).

The frustration with the grateful and compliant academic woman trope as expressed by Kirsch and Heilbrun circles back around to the early coed experience. In the earliest known novel written by a woman graduate of a coeducational university, *An American Girl and Her Four Years in a Boy's College* published in 1878, Olive San Luis Anderson describes her experience as a coed through the voice of the novel's protagonist (Nidiffer "Crumbs" 13). While she expresses pride in attending such a respected institution and recognizes it as an opportunity afforded very few women, the protagonist also points out that "girls are not expected to have much class spirit yet, but are supposed to sit meekly by and say 'Thank you' for the crumbs that fall from the boys table" (Nidiffer 13).

Since this type of feminist rhetorical research requires exploring and analyzing the contexts and rhetoric of women who are not present, "critical imagination" is yet

another methodological "term of engagement" that is especially relevant to this type of feminist archival research (Royster and Kirsch 71). "Critical imagination" Royster and Kirsch explain, is a "critical stance" that values a level of "educated guessing" as a way of purposely "think[ing] between, above, around, and beyond limited evidence to speculate methodically about probabilities" (71). Such contemplative work demands a large measure of ethical grounding. Realizing not only the importance of recovering women's voices and compositions from the archive, but also in retaining the intent and integrity of these women's voices, Royster and Kirsch call for an "ethics of care and hope," which they explain as a commitment to "listen deeply to texts and images and for voices and sounds in order to better understand [the author's] views and ideas instead of just our own" (146).

Important in ethical consideration is a realization of the nature of archives. Scholars broadly recognize archives and collections as rhetorical spaces (Biesecker; Enoch and VanHaitsma; Goggin; Morris and Rose; Ray). Angela Ray points out that "every stage of the [archival] process is rhetorical:" from creation to collection to processing to research (51). Goggin recognizes that researchers' ability to engage with past events "is limited to what prior groups deemed valuable and thus saved, and what was deemed less valuable and thus tossed" (330). Those objects that remain, Goggin argues, have been rhetorically constructed based on "social, cultural, class, race, gender, ethnicity, political, economic forces (Goggin 330). Enoch and VanHaitsma also argue that "archives are dynamic sites of rhetorical power" created through rhetorical decision making in terms of selection, preservation, and presentation that "shape in important ways the kinds of meanings that can emerge from the sites" (218). Due to the rhetorical

nature of every aspect of this work, feminist researchers must not only be mindful of the many "invisible hands" that have influenced the creation, processing, and representation of artifacts of women's writing; but they must be mindful of their own positionality and ideological leanings (Morris and Rose). Thus, ethical archival research requires vigilant efforts towards self and contextual awareness and of the ways and means outside elements serve to impact subject perception throughout the process.

Conclusion

With respect for these women rhetors—and for the weightiness of feminist history-writing—Chapter 4 is an exercise in ethical archival research. Particularly, it is a practice in listening. As their publications and collections attest, both the NADW as an organization and Evelyn Jones Kirmse as an individual recognized the importance of recording their own history and did so regularly. In the following chapter, I not only provide foundational NADW and Kirmse origin stories and how they came to intersect, I welcome and consider *their* rhetorical stories of organizational formation and career development. The stories of how these women came to occupy their positions not only provide context for the remainder of my dissertation, they also demonstrate the deans' recognition of the rhetorical nature of history-writing and its effect on image, identity, and legacy. Documents suggest that both the NADW and Kirmse wanted a hand in the telling of their stories; and, in relying on their writings, I not only respect this objective but also recognize these women as the most reliable sources for their own history.

CHAPTER 4

"A DEAR BOUGHT HERITAGE:" RHETORICAL HISTORIES OF THE NADW AND EVELYN JONES KIRMSE

On a wet February evening in 1935, several hundred deans of women from institutions across the country gathered into the elegant dining room of the Chalfonte-Haddon Hall Hotel in Atlantic City, New Jersey. It was the first evening of the 19th NADW Annual Conference. Evelyn Jones Kirsme, the current NADW Executive Secretary, had travelled across the country to attend; and she joined the others for dinner and a guest speaker: historian, women's rights activist, and archivist, Mary Ritter Beard.

Beard's invitation to speak at the conference is significant in that it was unique. Among the previous eighteen conferences, she was one of the few speakers neither a "Dean of Women" nor affiliated with an institution of higher learning. Her inclusion on the program suggests the NADW Executive Board deemed Beard's expertise both relevant and valuable for their members and had gone out of their way to invite her.

Beard had gained respect as an archivist and a co-writer of American history with her husband, Charles and had recently published her first book on women's history in the United States, *On Understanding Women*. In her conference speech, Beard argues of "history's great crisis" in the United States: the lack of attention paid to women ("The New" 96). Referring to her book, Beard points out that "man has composed most of the written history," which had naturally led to biases based on "the bent of sex" (*On Understanding* 17). However, while Beard criticizes masculine histories as intentionally narrowing the frames of written history and propagating a negative sense of women's involvement, she also calls out women for accepting such warped historical accounts (*On*

Understanding 33). The writing of women's history, she argues, largely rests on the shoulders of women themselves. Beard then poses the following question: since "women have always been alive to everything that was going on in the world," why haven't "women scholars who have been admitted to the schools and libraries for research" worked harder to correct this "distortion" (*On Understanding* 31) Beard pointedly suggests that women scholars too often approach history "in the spirit of receptivity instead of inquiry" (*On Understanding* 31). Women scholars, she argues, "have taken over the historical and social teachings of their masculine professors—man-made views of the universe—without critical examination" (*On Understanding* 31). This practice, Beard claims, needed to be disrupted and altered.

During her speech, Beard charged the deans of women "with the responsibility of thinking for the nation" ("The New" 97). Beard rhetorically placed the historiographical crisis in their charge and left her audience with the question, "What do the fundamental assumptions derived from the history of women suggest as the present task for educators, including deans of women?" ("The New" 97). In arranging for Beard to speak to the NADW, the executive board reinforced her challenge towards women scholars. They recognized women's agency in documenting and constructing their own history as well as the potential influence that history would have on their future and the future of women in academia.

Historians carry great influence concerning how the past is defined and how it is carried forward. The writing of histories has never been a simple documentation of past phenomena but of deliberation: a purposeful choosing of which details to carry forward and which to ignore, and how those details are colored and arranged. Histories are

rhetorical. They are not constructed to aggrandize the past but are written in service of the present and to influence the future. Histories are specific and rhetorical productions of knowledge that serve the purposes of the writer in the moment of documentation with the hope of additionally influencing the future. As historian Joyce Goodman notes, history writing creates “coexisting moments” of intersections where “the virtual past – what was – inheres in the experience of the present – what is – and opens it up to virtual and radical futures – what will be” (848). In the written history, the past and present coexist and are codependent, always interacting, speaking to the other as well as the future.

As argued by Krista Ratcliffe, traditional assumptions of “history” as a controlled and contained phenomenon having an origin and a “linear, evolutionary progression” through time are misleading at best (107). In reality, “history” is ubiquitous: it is always acting in and on the present; and, as Ratcliffe attests, can best be considered from a point of contemporary usage rather than from a constructed point of origin (107). This paradigm shift recognizes the circular nature of history: its way of circling through past and present, always impacting, always identifying, always enacting the “then-that-is-now” in both collective and individual ways (Ratcliffe 111).

Beard recognized the social impact of recording women’s history and named women as those most responsible for the task. While she did not explicitly point to the rhetorical nature of history-writing, she realized the influence those holding the pen had on the history recorded. Those who choose what to document, how it is documented, and how it is passed on control not only the heritage and legacy of specific acts and happenings but also the identities of those involved.

Scholars have long recognized the rhetorical effects of archiving and history-writing on communal identity and the construction of social heritage (Apaydin, Brown, Bradley, Caron, Hirsch and Smith, Kaplan, Jimerson, Lin and Grey, Schwartz and Cook, Tucker, van den Dries and Schreurs,). Apaydin describes this type of cultural heritage construction through group archiving as a “cultural production” that “develops values and meanings for individuals and groups” while also “forming collective identities” (1). While archivist Elisabeth Kaplan considers identity as constructs of “social fiction;” she also acknowledges the rhetorical nature of these constructions (126). Those privileged to archive and write their own histories, Kaplan argues, and those who undertake “the nuts-and-bolts activities” required in such an endeavor—the "identifying, collecting, preserving, compiling, and publishing [of] archival materials”—have an opportunity to “make and present history” catered to meet their specific needs and goals (126, 130). And, as Schwartz and Cook argue, the influence and power held by those who archive to “shape and direct historical scholarship, collective memory, and national identity” must be recognized. Those who seize opportunities to archive, they suggest, “wield power over those very records central to memory and identity formation” (2).

It is interesting to note that the rhetorical construction of history and identity was actively encouraged and practiced in the United Stated in the nineteenth century as demonstrated in the rise of historical societies after the Revolutionary War (Tucker 6). As the century progressed, historical documenting became somewhat necessary for any organization or community seeking to present a cohesive identity to society (Tucker). By the turn of the twentieth century—when deans of women were in search of their professional and collective identity— state and organizational historical societies were

playing a prominent rhetorical role in defining and shaping the unique "American identity."

Deans of women’s diligence in documenting, distributing, and archiving their own histories suggests that they also recognized the rhetorical nature of history-writing and its impact on identity construction on both communal and personal levels. These women had experienced first-hand the socio-cultural and political changes of the Progressive Era; and they knew their position and their efforts were significant elements and signs of that change. This novel organization of women administrators not only sought to establish their mark in history; they claimed a voice in defining it. Their histories and the repeated publications of those histories in different formats and platforms demonstrates an effort to create and publicly promote a cohesive community identity that validated their professional efforts.

The import of being the authors of their own histories is demonstrated by the fact that both NADW founder and first president, Kathryn Sisson McLean, and Evelyn Kirmse would compose several histories of their experience throughout their lives and into their eighties. While McLean’s histories would be published in NADW booklets, pamphlets, and a final memoir, Kirmse’s main historical writings would remain unfinished. Brief autobiographies are found in letters written to her granddaughter and to George Washington University archivists; but most of Kirmse’s historical writings have remained undisturbed. She had longed to compose a history of the university that had been her home for over fifty years. Yellow-ruled notepads full of Kirmse’s disjointed drafts and graceful cursive would end up divided among folders, placed in boxes, and stored on eight linear feet of shelving in the University archive. McLean’s NADW

histories and Kirmse's histories were composed both early on in their professional development and years later as nostalgic retrospect. The time and effort these women devoted to documenting their stories is readily apparent and significant. Whether formally published or not, each is valuable. These histories written during different phases of the organization's and the deans' existence provide multi-dimensional perspectives and insight on their overall experience.

The purpose and goal of this chapter is twofold. First, it is to provide necessary backstory and context for the NADW's and Evelyn Jones Kirmse's professional rhetoric as composed by the deans themselves. Such first-hand information is vital in contextualizing, understanding, and appreciating the deans' rhetorical efforts, values, and accomplishments throughout their tenure. While laying this foundation of historical and contextual information is necessary, the second purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate the women authors' awareness of the rhetorical nature of history-writing. Their attention and efforts reveal that they not only understood history-writing as an act of organizational and individual ethos construction and heritage management, but that they surmised the rhetorical ramifications and sought for control of that construction as the primary authors of their stories.

The NADW origin story is a compilation of histories composed and/or published in 1926, 1938, 1950, and 1964. While it includes information on pre-NADW conferences composed by NADW third president Mary Ross Potter and executive secretary Kathryn G. Heath, the origin and early growth of the national association is largely drawn from the reflective writings of Kathryn Sisson McLean, NADW founder and first president. I synthesize the deans' writings to convey a chronological account of this history—as the

original authors do in their writing—however, I draw content from accounts written at different points in time to do so. For instance, while Potter's pre-NADW history was written in 1926, Heaths' was presented in 1975; and McLean's histories were penned in 1926, 1953, and 1964.

The NADW history will be followed by Evelyn J. Kirmse's historical account of her early years and education in Washington D.C. and her path to the University of Arizona. Drawing from official documents and reports composed between 1929 and 1942 as well as letters, notes, and rough drafts Kirmse composed the 1970s and 1980s, I share Kirmse's history as a dean of women while highlighting significant details she expressly emphasized in her accounts. I end by noting Kirmse's significant positions and contributions to the University in her later years not only because her UA tenure was impressive, but because she took the time to record them in her history and, thus, in the construction of her heritage.

The Organizing Efforts of Early Deans of Women

In the 1925 NADW Conference President's Report recorded in the annual yearbook, President Agnes E. Wells introduced the formation of a "research committee" meant "to meet the increased demand of deans" for data and scholarship concerning their position and responsibilities (Wells 9). The first undertaking of this committee was to document the association's history. A twenty-four-page booklet titled *Report of Committee on History of the National Association of Deans of Women* was published within the following year. It includes two chapters: The first chapter—written by Mary Ross Potter—presents a brief history of dean conferences that took place before the NADW organization. The second chapter, composed by McLean, includes the NADW

origin story and its growth over its first twenty years. This booklet of history would first be advertised and sold for ten cents at the 1926 NADW conference. Its full content would later be published in the 1927 NADW Conference Yearbook ensuring greater distribution to interested deans and institutions and demonstrating the high value the NADW executive placed on the historical accounts.

The historical booklet's first chapter is titled "History of Conferences of Deans of Women to the Organization of the National Association in 1917." Potter opens her history lamenting that "Deans of Women are a short-lived race" (1). To elaborate, she describes her disappointment in discovering that none of the women she hoped to interview for her history remained in office. Many, it appears, held "the deanship" only a few years before called away to other academic positions, to marriage, or to "broken health under the strain of the office" (Potter 1). Because of the few women who were able to "concur her report or offer their experience," Potter explains, "these annals of the Conferences of Deans of Women may not be complete" (1). The fleeting nature of first-hand dean experience Potter describes may have played a significant part in compelling the NADW Research Committee to compile these histories of deans.

While Potter explicitly points out that hers "is not a history of the deanship of women, but rather of conferences of deans of women," she does anchor her history to Marion Talbot. While women had been holding positions of "lady principal," "preceptress," and "advisor of women" for some time, Potter explains, Marion Talbot's 1895 appointment as Dean of Women at the University of Chicago is widely considered the first official appointment. It was Talbot's organization, accomplishments, and professionalism that "really made [the position] fashionable" (Potter 2). This respect for

Talbot is seconded in Kathryn Heath's history in which she describes Talbot as "34 years old, single and singular," out to prove "the common belief that education was too strenuous for the female mind [as] poppycock" (15). Talbot did so with the credibility of "a B.A. and an M.A. from Boston University and a B.S. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, of all places…such a formal education unusual, for a woman" (Heath 15).

Like most early deans of women, Talbot was left to define and determine her position as she went and with little guidance. Knowing that others were in similar situations, Talbot sought to connect with other deans of women for support and collaboration. In November 1903, in response to "hit and miss" invitations sent out by Talbot, eighteen women from midwestern institutions gathered in Chicago in what was later deemed ""The first Conference of Deans of Women" (Potter 2). After opening the conference with prayer, the deans devoted this inaugural meeting to discussing common issues such as the housing of women students and ways of influencing young women: topics, Potter suggests, which have consistently been "troubling the minds of the deans" since the position was first established (3).

Over the next fourteen years, at Talbot's invitation, a rotating assortment of deans would meet once or twice a year to discuss the demands of their position and needs of the students and best practices to meet those exigencies (Potter). This group appears quite exclusive—never including more than 18 deans at a time and never forming an official organization—yet they did make an impressive impact. The list of participants included Gertrude S. Martin of Cornell University who would conduct the first published survey of Deans of Women at coeducational universities measuring the stark rise of the position (Potter 2). Dean Louis Mathews also attended. Her highly respected 1915 publication,

The Dean of Women, would be the first practical handbook for deans of women, a publication which deans of women “the country over” would forever “owe a debt of gratitude” (Potter 2). Potter notes that while early dean of women positions were largely considered “disciplinarian” and “ornamental” in nature and usually filled with no indication of assigned duties, at the hand of these first deans and their collaborations, the position slowly “proceeded toward standardization” (3).

The Founding of the National Association of Deans of Women

The second chapter of the 1926 NADW Research Committee booklet is titled, “History of the National Association of Deans of Women.” It is written by Mrs. Ellis L Phillips—the former Dean Kathryn Sisson McLean—and Deans Mina Kerr and Agnes Wells (17). A discernable shift in language and tone is noted within the first sentence of this chapter. Unlike the distanced reverent accolades of Potter’s chapter, the language here is more intimate and celebratory, like friends getting together to reminisce and commemorate a collaborative accomplishment. This is understandable since the listed lead author is the now married and retired Kathryn Sisson McLean.

McLean had accepted her first position as dean nearly twenty years after Talbot and was the key organizing force and first president of The National Association of Deans of Women. In this NADW history, McLean is reconnecting with her organization to share her story with an audience of friends and former colleagues[2]. Besides this 1926 history, McLean employs this same celebratory tone and conversational language in her other historical accounts—a 1953 NADW article and a 1964 memoir—both of which I

[2] From this point forward, I will be using the name McLean in the writing of her history despite the printed byline since that was her name while dean and it is how she most often refers to herself in her history.

also incorporate into this history of the Association. Because McLean clearly argues that her upbringing, education, and circumstances were influential in her organization of the NADW, I rely on her memoir for relevant foundational backstory.

McLean's childhood had been spent moving among small towns in the rural Midwest with her family. She explains that her mother "was a college graduate in a time and in a part of the country when not very many people thought that education was of first importance for anybody—let alone for girls" (*My Room* 30). Because her mother established an "atmosphere of intellectual inquiry" wherever they lived, it was always clear that Sisson was expected to go to college (*My Room* 30).

After coming of age—and after spending two difficult years of teaching grade school in a rough and rustic Nebraska town—Sisson enrolled in Ohio Wesleyan University. She was immediately placed in a dorm room with three seniors. Unable to connect with these older students whose "interests and schedules were far different" from hers, McLean grew lonely and homesick. She eventually found comfort, guidance, and stability in Miss Windate, the dean of women (*My Room* 46). McLean describes Miss Windate as "tall, gracious, and a bit austere," always wearing "beautifully cut black dresses" and the epitome of "what an educated, accomplished middle-aged woman should be" (*My Room* 46). McLean writes, "I sat at her feet, literally, and I wanted to be just like her" (*My Room* 47).

Soon after McLean graduated in 1901, she met and married James d. McLean, which temporarily changed her plans. "I was a wife," she explains, "and I was going to be a mother, that was enough, I thought" (*My Room* 56). Soon after daughter Jean was born, McLean lost both her mother and her husband to cancer (*My Room* 57). After

spending the following two years teaching English at a local high school, McLean was offered a position of Dean of Women at the State Teachers College at Chadron, Nebraska (*My Room* 61).

Of her experience as dean, McLean explains that "there was no code yet for the kind of guidance work I was doing, so I had to make up my own rules as I went along" (*My Room* 61). In fact, the more she "worked and experimented at the job of deaning," the more McLean realized how little she knew. "Indeed," she adds, how little "no one knew about this whole area of guidance and help" for women students (*My Room* 62). Yet, the one thing McLean knew was that the need for this guidance was great. Women were entering colleges and universities constructed to meet the needs of men, not women. McLean posits that going to college was a different experience for women for many reasons: Women often had to live off campus—"in boarding houses and in private homes" (*My Room* 62). Many also had to work while they were attending classes; and they were judged by much more stringent and harsh moral criteria (*My Room* 62).

McLean knew that deans of women had been seeking out "occasional gatherings for the discussion of questions of mutual interest" as far back as 1892; and that more formal conferences had begun with Talbot in 1903. However, McLean also acknowledges those women and their meetings felt far-above and removed from her experience. In her 1926 history, McLean acknowledges Talbot's conferences but points out that the "newer group" of deans—referring to herself and her peers—were still "feeling their way and looking about for guidance and direction" ("History" 17). While the "Conferences of Deans of Women" were still being held, many in the rising generation of deans did not connect with the small and exclusive group of deans. McLean

explains that “the conviction grew in me” that if she wanted to advance and feel confident in her “chosen profession,” then she had to seek out education on her own. Determined to earn her master’s degree, McLean enrolled in summer courses at Columbia Teachers College: an institution she felt was “the pioneer in the field of education for women” (*My Room* 66).With her daughter Jean in tow, McLean moved to New York for the summer of 1915 and began her studies (*My Room* 63).

Upon her acceptance to Columbia Teaching College McLean “placed a notice” in the American Journal on Education seeking other deans who might be planning to summer in Columbia (“Beginnings” 143). Four deans responded to McLean’s notice: Bernice Sanford from Wisconsin, Gertrude Gardner from Nebraska, and Natalie Thorton from Minnesota, and Anne Dudley Blitz from New York (*My Room* 66). McLean writes that “You can image how exciting it was for the four of us to meet and realize that while in one way we were strangers, in another we were friends and comrades (*My Room* 66). The women began right away to meet once a week to discuss their common situations and needs.

Since all five women were “comparatively new at the work,” McLean points out, “what to do and how to do it—the technique of deaning, so to speak—was the absorbing thing” (“History” 17). After several weeks, McLean suggests that the deans “made bold” in several ways: First, they invited college president, Dr. Paul Monroe, to dinner and asked for his input and advice on “how to ‘dean’” (“History” 17). The dinner and discussion were such a success, McLean explains,

> they “petitioned” Dr. Monroe “to start a seminar in which the five of us, and anyone else who was interested, could discuss and study better ways of doing the

> jobs we held and build a curriculum for those who would study and hold the different jobs of deaning in the future. (*My Room* 67)

The following year, “the Teachers College offered its first course of study for deans and advisers of women” the following summer, instruction that other institutions eventually adopted (*My Room* 67).

The second “bold move” this small cohort of deans made was much more ambitious. Because they realized the need for a professional organization, they contacted the “powerful and important” National Education Association (NEA) and ask for permission to organize a Deans of Women meeting at their next annual meeting, which was conveniently scheduled in New York the following summer. Already cognoscente of building a professional identity, they also petitioned that their meeting be included in the NEA official program: “a privilege which [they] felt would give [them] the necessary educational standing” (“History” 18).

After securing permission to hold the meeting, McLean and the other deans immediately secured Gertrude Shorb Martin as the keynote speaker. Martin was the highly respected Advisor for Women at Cornell University and a participant of the original Talbot conferences; and, like the NEA’s support, Martin’s inclusion would validate the meeting’s ethos by creating a connecting bridge to the more established group of early deans.

McLean and her four colleagues named this first meeting “Conference of Deans of Women in Connection with the National Education Association” and arranged talks on topics ranging from “Essentials in Deaning” to “Conservation of Our Young Womanhood” to “Life in the Hall” (“History” 19). “You can image how we counted the

days until the NEA meeting," McLean explains, "wondering how many would attend the program we had planned so carefully" (*My Room* 67). The women cared deeply about their position and their program, "but we didn't know how many would join us in our belief' (*My Room* 67).

"Finally, the day came," McLean writes. As the time of the meeting approached, the five deans waited in the Horace Mann auditorium. "One by one and two by two our audience gathered," McLean explains, "After a while we counted about fifty, then a hundred, then almost miraculously, two hundred" gathered in response to their invitation (*My Room* 67). McLean shares that "we discussed everything that proper guidance might mean to undergraduates." She goes on to describe the "unmistakable enthusiasm and interest" which grew as the meeting progressed; and, by the meeting's end, "there was a great feeling of confidence and hope in the future of our association" (*My Room* 67).

"Emboldened" by the enthusiastic turnout and interest, Phillips and her founding colleagues remained after the meeting where they "named ourselves the National Association of Deans of Women" and elected officers (*My Room* 68). McLean was elected president by her peers; a move that left her feeling "deeply honored and very proud" (*My Room* 68)

Within the 1926 booklet on the NADW history, McLean also includes several post-conference testimonials of the success of their first meeting and the importance of their position as deans of women. First is an excerpt from a Journal of Education announcing their second NADW meeting the following year:

> There is no more significant position than that of deans of women in colleges and high schools, though its creation is quite recent. So important are the duties of these women that an Association of Deans of Women was organized at the

> meeting of the National Educational Association in New York in July and its meeting at Kansas City, Feb 26, 28 will be one of the most interesting series of meetings of the week ("History" 19).

In a later historical account, McLean would include the following excerpt from the NEA post-conference newsletter:

> At this meeting in July, 1916, no more interesting and affiliated group met than the one in connection with the Conference of Deans of Women.
> Deans of Women: No feature of college, university and normal schools is more significant than the new officer in most educational institutions—Dean of Women. She alone can help the impulsive girl, the unbalanced young woman, the susceptible one to a safe and sane safety-first life!!!
> No phase of the great meeting of the NEA will have a nobler mission ("Beginning" 143).

McLean's rhetorical choice to include these positive reviews by respected organizations and publications in her history suggests a continued intent to construct the professional ethos and identity of deans of women and the NADW not only for the deans in the trenches but for the legacy of women in academia as well. In a 1917 speech McLean gave before the entire NEA, she claimed that

> As we look at the subject of education for women in the light of the present, we know instinctively that the great opportunity lies in the opening of the many doors to women…When history, now being made, is written, one fact which the historian will dwell upon, if we mistake not, will be this emancipation, this seemingly sudden coming of women into their own." (*My Room* 76)

Years later, McLean would point to the remarkable growth of their organization from fifty original members in 1916 to 980 in 1926. "Those who first thought through this organization realized also a very fundamental fact," she argues, "that to rear a new building without a sure, tried foundation is perilous" ("Beginnings" 17).

The NADW would continue to grow in number, professionalism, and in prestige. Within ten years, an organizational constitution would be drafted, the annual conference yearbook would begin publication, and a permanent D.C. headquarters and secretary would become a reality. As McLean explains, with a lot of work and a steep learning curve, the NADW evolved from a "purely voluntary organization with records kept in a box under the Treasurer's bed…to a professional organization" respected throughout academia ("Beginnings" 145).[3]

The very year the NADW were setting up their new headquarters on 1201 Sixteenth Street in Washington, D.C., Evelyn J. Kirmse was closing the door on her short tenure as an Assistant Dean of Women at George Washington University four city blocks to the west. She would soon board a train headed for the new and somewhat foreign state of Arizona. Kirmse was to assume the position as University of Arizona's Dean of Women. While she would not be UA's first dean of women, she would be their longest standing dean of women in their history; and, in Kirmse's own words, she would be "the first UA Dean of Women educated and trained in the work of deanship and student personnel work," largely influenced by the NADW (Notes 460.16 UA History: Various Subject-Women 1918-1980 3476).

The History of Evelyn Jones Kirmse

Evelyn Jones Kirmse had held the position of Dean of Women at the University of Arizona for six years by the time Mary Ritter Beard tasked deans of women with the

[3] It is interesting to note that a few months after this inaugural meeting of the NADW, McLean would be offered the position of Dean of Women at Ohio Weleyan, her alma mater. She was "naturally overjoyed" when she learned that she and her daughter Jean would be living in the same on-campus suite once occupied by her former dean, mentor, and counselor, Miss Windate ("My Room" 68).

job of writing their history at the 1935 NADW Conference. Whether Beard's speech served as exigence or validation, Kirmse recognized the importance of history-writing and sought to author both her personal history and the history of her role at The University of Arizona. This is evident in the rich collection of not only family letters and administrative records Kirmse left behind, but also in the boxes of folders straining to contain reams of rough drafts and scribbled recollections of what she had hoped would become a formal history of the University—folders currently housed in UA's Special Collections.

Examining the historical, familial, and spatial context in which Kirmse was raised reveals her access to an intellectually stimulating environment that most women of her day did not enjoy. Evidence suggests that the factors of Kirmse's upbringing had the potential to influence the trajectory of her education and career choice to not only work in academia but to work specifically with women in academia. Growing up in Washington D.C. with its intellectual vibrancy and its greater balance of women holding positions of leadership would have granted Kirmse a level of comfort and confidence in such surroundings and roles. In other words, because of where she was raised and with whom, Kirmse was nourished from an early age on the type of intellectual stimulation and management that was necessary for her to successfully enter and negotiate the path of academic leadership.

Kirmse's Formative Years

In a letter to her granddaughter, Joanne Kirmse, written in 1985 on the eve of the child's school trip to the nation's capital, Kirmse takes the opportunity to share some history. Kirmse includes a cover page bearing the title "Your Family Background."

Within the letter, Kirmse describes a heritage of tobacco plantations, Confederate service, and coming-of-age railroad work that eventually led her grandparents to settle in Washington D.C.. Other grandparents immigrated from Canada and, at one time, had “a shoe store on Pennsylvania Avenue” (2). Kirmse’s parents, James and Mary Jones, would marry in a family home across the street from the Smithsonian before moving into their apartment two blocks away (2).

Kirmse was born on March 14, 1900. She was raised “in the shadow of the White House” and told her granddaughter that “Washington was an interesting place to grow up in” (3). History, education, and culture was part of Kirmse’s everyday life. As a newborn, she was baptized in the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, the same church “President Lincoln used to walk over to worship.” Kirmse’s would often sit in his pew (3). As a “tiny child,” Kirmse would play in the park surrounding the Smithsonian Buildings as well as throughout the halls of the museum. She admits avoiding the Native American exhibit, for she was “afraid of the models of Indians” wearing their “war paint and feathers” (“Your Family” 2). Thus, as a child, nationalism, culture, and history were Kirmse’s literal playground.

Even in her eighties, Kirmse told her granddaughter that she still enjoyed “a pretty good memory” and could remember being present for many historical and politically significant occasions. She recalled sitting on her Grandfather McCarthy’s shoulders to “see above the crowd as President Theodore Roosevelt’s inaugural parade marched by in 1905;” celebrating on Pennsylvania Avenue when WWI ended in 1918 and “the whole civilized world went wild;” and standing on the icy pavement on “a very cold gray day” in 1921 to watch President Harding walk behind a flag-draped casket and a horse bearing

an empty saddle the casket on his way to Arlington Cemetery to dedicate the tomb of the Unknown Soldier ("Your Family" 4).

As a youth, Kirmse was also exposed to women of influence and authority. As a "school-girl," Kirmse had the opportunity to attend the White House with several other girls for a personal tour with the First Lady where they "saw all the quarters of the family and visited with Mrs. Harding in her own bedroom!" ("Your Family" 3). Likewise, both Kirmse's grandmother and mother were actively engaged in the Washington D.C. community, and Kirmse would recall her mother receiving regular invitations to have tea with Eleanor Roosevelt in the White House (Broderick).

While she doesn't mention it, Kirmse's central location suggests that, as a 13-year-old, she may have been present at—or at least aware of—Alice Paul's first great suffrage parade down Pennsylvania Avenue on the eve of Woodrow Wilson's presidential inauguration. What would Kirmse have thought about lawyer Inez Milholland astride her white horse leading a procession of nine bands, four mounted brigades, three heralds, twenty-four floats, and more than 5,000 marchers all calling for women's voice to be heard and counted (Taylor)? What impact this would have on a teenage girl.

Like most of the few educated women of her time, Kirmse's academic and early work experience was also one of opportunity and access. When Kirmse earned her Bachelor of Arts from GWU in 1921, her graduation was held in the National Cathedral "on a hill high above the city." She would later spend "many days and hours in the Library of Congress [conducting] research for [a] master's degree" (Kirmse "Your Family" 3). During the two years of her graduate studies, Kirmse would accept her first

position in academia as “Head Mistress” for the Misses Eastman School for Girls in Washington DC (Broderick). Porter Sargent’s A Handbook of American Private Schools: An Annual Publication published in 1918 listed the school as a boarding school focused on “prepar[ing] girls for college” (Sargent 226). This would suggest an early interest in supporting women’s education that either influenced Kirmse’s position as Head Mistress or was fueled by it. Further evidence is the fact that within a year after her graduation, Kirmse accepted a position as secretary to the dean of women at George Washington University; and in 1925 she stepped into the role of Assistant Dean of Women (Kirmse “Notes for Marvin” 10).

Kirmse’s Ascension to Deanship

It was during her time as GWU’s Assistant Dean of Women that Kirmse’s life would take

an unexpected turn. In 1927, after a “forced resignation” from a volatile five-year presidency at The University of Arizona, Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin assumed the presidency at GWU (Kirmse “Notes for Marvin” 4). In a character witness letter Kirmse sent to GWU in 1984, she recalls that Marvin began upsetting the environment at her alma mater “almost immediately” (6).

Marvin brought with him a Miss Anna Pearl Cooper, who had been his Dean of Women at UA. Kirmse explains that Miss Cooper’s “Arizona contract had not been renewed as dean of women […] because she had sided openly with Marvin during his difficulties (Kirmse “Notes for Marvin” 6). Marvin’s intent was to award Cooper the position of dean of women at GWU, a position held by Anna L. Rose. With four years of experience and “pursuing doctoral studies in education and psychology at Columbia

University," Kirmse argues that Rose was decidedly more qualified for the position than Cooper. When Marvin couldn't convince the board of trustees to approve the change, he "constantly harassed and nit-pick[ed]" Rose until she took a position elsewhere; he then "abolished the office of dean of women" out of spite (Kirmse "Notes for Marvin" 7, 9). Kirmse was demoted and assigned to "edit the annual catalogue" (9). "It was evident by now," she later explained, "that there was no place for me at George Washington University in my chosen field;" and she began "searching for another position" immediately (Kirmse "Notes for Marvin" 9).

The following year, 1929, emboldened by the encouragement of "disgruntled" GWU colleagues unhappy with Marvin, Kirmse applied to the still-vacant Dean of Women position at UA and was hired. She explains that her colleagues "were delighted in the irony" of her heading to Marvin's previous institution to assume the position that Marvin had denied her at GWU ("Notes for Marvin" 9). Kirmse left D.C. the following summer and, after a long trek across the country, arrived in the newly established and somewhat foreign state of Arizona on a blistering July afternoon. She was welcomed to the University of Arizona by president, Homer LeRoy Chantz.

Kirmse's Arrival at the University of Arizona

In her rough drafts of UA history, Kirmse notes that when she arrived, UA had only "ended its days as a territorial University" seventeen years earlier and "still had many rough edges of its frontier beginnings to smooth out" (Early UA). She explains that even though "ashes from the fire of discord surrounding Marvin were still hot," UA was thriving: student enrollment had recently surpassed the 2000 mark and faculty had

increased by twenty "in addition to replacing those eliminated in his post-Marvin clean-up" (UA History).

Kirmse devotes a section in her unfinished history to the UA women who preceded her position as dean. She notes that the earliest appointments of supervision of women students, contrary to other faculty or administrative positions, had not been based on any level of "professional qualifications" (Early Student). While the non-academic supervision of men students loosely fell on faculty men who often allowed the young men to govern themselves, Kirmse claims that administrators saw young women as needing "rigid chaperonage taking the form of monitoring of all phases of their activities" (Early Student). Such "chaperonage," they determined, required strict minds rather than specialized training. Therefore, since the woman "mentor" or "preceptress" was considered little more than a "glorified police officer, respectability rather than academic prowess was the criterion for selection." Therefore, these "slots" were often filled by "Mother-in-laws, maiden aunts, [and] assorted collections of non-academic genteel ladies" (Early Student).

> No academic status attached to her position and her salary for twenty-four-hour days of watchful responsibility amounted to just about half the earnings of an instructor—the lowest paid of the teaching staff. What schooling she had was immaterial. She needed only to be a paragon considered essential by a conservative community and to be capable of inculcating those virtues in the young females in her charges. This she was expected to accomplish by example, firm social regulations, restricted living arrangements, and fear of discipline and the disapproval of polite society (Early Student).

Kirmse notes that this criterion was unsurprising since "no professional training for student personnel work was available in colleges of education until the 1920s" (Early Student). The women filling these early UA positions did not stay long. According to

Kirmse, they unceremoniously “came and went” (Early Student). This changed in 1913 with the designation of Miss Ida C. Reid.

Reid’s appointment over women students was significant, argues Kirmse, in that Reid had been an instructor in Math and English at UA since 1906 and was the first woman of such status to assume the position of “principle preceptress and Director of Women”. Assigning “supervision of women students to academically credited member of the University staff” Kirmse points out, “gave higher stakes to the responsibility,” which was reflected in salary: the established measurement of value on campus (Early UA). Authorized by the Board of Regents, University president Wilde offered Reid a salary of $1500 to assume the responsibility; an amount that Kirmse notes was “a good rate” compared with others on the faculty, “even some males” (Early UA). President Wilde would officially change Reid’s title to Dean of Women two years later (Early UA).

However, even with the new title, the administrative practice of assigning dean of women responsibility was recognized as a secondary service. Kirmse notes that the five deans that preceded her spent most of their time in other duties, usually instruction in the English Department. After Anna C. Cooper had left with the disgraced President Marvin in 1927, UA hired Dr. Clara S. Webster as the university women’s physician asking her to also fill the role of Dean of Women (Historical). Dr. Webster lived and worked in “a small, one-story building called ‘Coed Cottage’” where she would conduct dean responsibilities in the morning and hold medical office hours in the afternoon. This sufficed, Kirmse explains, until the spring of 1929 when Webster “had differences” with the head University Physician and abruptly resigned (Penned Reflections). Kirmse arrived the following summer.

“When I was appointed dean of women at UA in 1929,” Kirmse would later write, “I was the first person involved in student personnel work here to have professional training” (Penned Reflections). Surely the boldness in Kirmse’s statement demonstrates pride; yet it is more a declaration of fact and an argument that her education, training, and professionalism would drastically alter the position and the work.

The training that Kirmse received in student personnel work and in advising women students at GWU was the direct fruits of Kathryn Sisson McLean’s efforts in proposing relevant training at the Teacher’s College in 1915, training programs that quickly spread to other institutions and heavily influenced the research and professional efforts of the NADW. Kirmse supports her claims of training and expertise by noting her NADW activity from 1924 to1942 where she served “on numerous committees, participat[ed] in programs, and on the National Executive Committee as secretary” (Penned Reflections). Within her first year at UA, Kirmse writes that she also organized the Arizona Association of Deans and Advisors of Girls: “the first professional organization of counselors in Arizona,” and established a “Western Association of Deans of Women” under the NADW umbrella (Penned Reflections). Kirmse spent her entire deanship dedicated to ensuring women had their place—physically, intellectually, and historically—in academia.

In 1942, Kirmse was compelled to step down as dean during WWII when her husband of five years, Dr. Alvin Kirmse, a captain of medical corps of the National Guard, re-entered the army as a regimental surgeon (“Evelyn Jones”). After living on various army posts, Kirmse would return to Arizona in 1951 and accept an appointment

on Arizona's Board of Regents. She was the fourth women to serve on the board ("Evelyn Jones").

Kirmse notes in her rough history that it had been several years since a woman had served on the board; and her appointment had largely been a performative act (Penned Reflections). After the prestigious American Association of University Women (AAUW) threatened to retract their accreditation to UA because there were no women on their governing boards, the Arizona governor quickly reached out to Kirmse. Kirmse recognized at the time that hers' was a "token" appointment (Penned Reflections). However, eight years later, Kirmse would be elected as the first woman President of the Board ("Evelyn Jones").

After stepping down from the board, Kirmse accepted a lecturer position in the UA English department in 1960. Upon her retirement in 1973, she served as a part-time Special Assistant to University President John Schaefer. In 1980, Kirmse was awarded an honorary doctor of letters degree by the UA and was named as co-chairman of the "Centennial Steering Committee," where she served until October of 1985 (Warren). Kirmse passed away three months later ("Evelyn Jones Kirmse, '31).

Conclusion

The archived rhetorical documents of the NADW and Evelyn Jones Kirmse provide insight on ways the national conversations and practices practically played out in local contexts. They reveal concerted efforts by women administrators from across the country to not only define and promote their professional identities and that of the "successful coed" but to proactively document that work and construct their identity by writing and archiving their own history.

As van den Dries and Schrerus claim, one of the motivating factors of archival "heritage management" is the "bequest value:" the value those who document and archive place on histories as "something to be handed on to future generations" (289). Cultural heritage, and "the memory it embodies," they argue, is "vital" for individuals and organizations in forming "collective identities" that validate ethos in the moment and for posterity (289). The NADW founders, Evelyn J. Kirmse, and other deans of women recognized their work as meaningful, significant, and enduring. In naming, documenting, and archiving what they accomplished, they made presented their work as substantial, tangible, and collegiate. Through such work, the NADW and the position of Dean of Women constructed a contemporary collective identity that could be passed on to future generations.

In referring back to pioneering deans' historical accounts, former NADW executive secretary Kathryn Heath would describe this collective historical effort as a "dear bought heritage." (97). This heritage, she claimed, had been constructed by early deans and NADW leaders to help "young women 'have vision'' and to allow "us older ones 'our dreams'" (97). In other, less romantic words, through constructing and documenting their experiences, both the organizational history of the NADW and the individual histories of women like McLean and Kirmse establish an identity heritage that anchors and connects memories of the past while providing a foundation upon which academic women of the future can build.

As these brief histories demonstrate, deans of women—both as a collective and as individuals—were passionate and proactive in constructing their identity through the writing of their history. Their eagerness to have a hand in the documentation and

archiving of their histories suggests an awareness of its rhetorical nature and effect. Such work distinguishes the deans of women as rhetorical.

In the following chapters, I turn to examine three correlating themes and issues that received the most space and were most emphasized in both the NADW Conference Yearbooks and in Kirmse's documents. Each concerns the deans of women's rhetorical efforts in creating space for women on coed campuses: creating space professionally, physically, intellectually. In Chapter 5, I examine the deans of women's initial efforts to create a professional space for themselves on coeducational campuses by defining the roles they were to fill and then by professionalizing their positions. As the first in their field, deans of women had to name what they were to do in support of women on coed campuses before they could develop methods of forging pathways towards accomplishing it. This, they determined early on, required a coming together in collaborative discussions and concerted efforts. Through research, arguments, and documented efforts they worked to develop professional job descriptions, best practices, and professional criteria that would establish them as important administrators in higher education. Then, in Chapters 6, I examine the single most pressing problem deans of women faced in the early years of coeducation as documented in their earliest conference minutes and yearbooks: creating physical and metaphoric spaces for women on campuses and in administrative systems built to serve the needs of men. This need for space and the discussions on the types of space needed applied to both women students as well as women administrators. This will be followed by Chapter 7 where I examine the third prominent discussion among deans of women as manifest by conference yearbooks: their research and practical efforts concerning how to best define "success" for women students and how to best orient

women students to ensure that success in higher education and in society. Together, these chapters will provide a thorough overview and exploration of the pressing issues women faced in academia throughout the early decades of the twentieth century coupled with an examination of the deans of women's proactive rhetorical efforts to assess and best meet the challenges of those issues and, when possible, rectify them.

CHAPTER 5

CONSTRUCTING A PROFESSIONAL PLACE FOR DEANS OF WOMEN IN ACADEMIA

In the two years following the organization of the National Association of Deans of Women (NADW), founder and president Kathryn Sisson McLean invited several university presidents to address the deans of women at their annual conferences on the topic of "What a President May Expect from a Dean of Women" (Merrill and Bragdon). While this preceded the NADW conference yearbooks, several of these talks were included in the National Education Association annual bulletin. While the question was intended to clarify expectations and job descriptions, the president's comments reveal just the opposite. The subjective and ambiguous descriptions offered by these presidents suggest that many had not considered the position of "dean of women" beyond a means of dealing with the sharp increase in women students.

At the 1918 meeting, Nebraska State Normal School president, George S. Dick shared his expectations of dean of women responsibilities that safely focused on traditional physical and moral feminine characteristics rather than concrete practical job descriptions:

> As in every other line of work, not every person of proper age, weight, height, and dress can make a dean of women. She must be strong and well, with plenty of bone and muscle, and not too many nerves… She is expected to dress with becoming taste and judgement and to comply with sane manners and customs of the day. (Merrill and Bragdon 395)

The following year, E. A. Birge, president of the University of Wisconsin, stood before the NADW and responded to the same prompt. Rather than recommending physical ideals for effective deans of women, Birge focused on their moral responsibility

as exemplars for what he saw as a disconcerting influx of women students lacking "intellectual ambition" (Merrill and Bragdon 401). This responsibility, he rationalized, was naturally women's because "in the Western world and since the Middle Ages, the conventions of social life have been regulated primarily by women;" and, as the only women administrators, it is deans of women who must "deal with the life of the women students in all its aspects" and "fortify the weak against the influences of the outer world" (Merrill and Bragdon 401). Excusing his inability to offer specifics, Birge explains that the expectations of university presidents will always be "ill-defined" since the "anomalous" and "vague" position of dean of women allows for nothing else (Merrill and Bragdon 402).

While it is tempting to label President Birge's ambiguous description of the "dean of women" position as innately as dismissive, it does reveal the awkwardness surrounding this novel relationship between coeducational institution presidents and deans of women. While coeducation was new territory, it was built upon archaic and entrenched traditions of masculine privilege, prejudice, and practice, many of which were normalized, invisible, and challenging to navigate for even the most progressive presidents. In looking back on these talks five years later, NADW members Merrill and Bragdon recognized that the president's comments implied that the position of dean of women was not "conceived on a professional basis with a definite goal," and that without standard definitions, the position would never "be translated into a working program (11). The president's "very vagueness," Merrill and Bragdon posit, "points to a lack of clear conception" on the part of administrations when it came to addressing the holistic needs of women students (Merrill and Bragdon 11).

Early deans of women had the difficult task of finding their footing and proving their mettle as competent colleagues and leaders within administrative systems and spaces designed by men exclusively for men. This quest was compounded by the fact that women's success on campus carried the extra weight of proving antagonists wrong about women's intellectual ability and potential. Based on their writings and stated goals and efforts, deans of women understood the rhetorical significance of naming, developing, and promoting their position and their contributions. As their documents and publications demonstrate, aligning their work with burgeoning notions and measures of "professions" popular with their male colleagues during the early twentieth century was the shortest line between the deans of women and the recognition and respectability they sought and needed to reach the full potential of their objectives. Since the position of "deans of women" originated as little more than an ambiguous service position, this professionalization required deliberate rhetorical efforts to gain control of and dictate the content, arc, and trajectory of their story and their identity. While deans organically came together in a spirit of collaboration, support, and training, they came to acknowledge and rhetorically promote this training as an important first step towards professionalization. This was quickly followed by efforts to establish a cohesive professional association. These rhetorical acts created space for a profession wherein deans of women collectively gained control of their story, named what they did, determined and standardized the qualifications and training required to it well, conducted empirical research, and promoted their unique expertise; all in an effort to validate their presence in and contributions to academic administrations.

It is interesting to note that as deans of women worked towards establishing women in coeducational institutions, whether as administrators or students, their arguments often reveal lingering traces of Victorian essentialist ideals of womanhood. While such arguments based on women's higher moral consciousness and feminine attributes are still found, they are not as common within arguments for the professional nature of their positions. This subtle shift suggests a conscious rhetorical decision among deans of women that aligning with masculine professional conventions was in their best interest within the context of this argument at this point in time. However, the times when such essentialist arguments are employed demonstrates continued active theorizing and exploration of how to strike a balance between such ideals and progressive goals.

In what follows, I first provide literature on the rise of professionalism and its use by deans of women in building a professional identity and ethos. I then turn to the primary NADW documents and records which demonstrate the organization's intentional steps in arguing, establishing, and promoting their profession. I then demonstrate how these NADW conversations are put into action by Dean Kirmse on the University of Arizona campus.

Literature Review

The concept of "professionalism" was a cultural construct that emerged in the United Stated during the nineteenth century (Bledstein; Nidiffer; Freidson). While the label of "profession" had been relegated to the fields of medicine, law, and theology, a 1915 publication questioning the professional status of "social work" suggested a novel possibility of professions beyond those exclusive three (Nidiffer, *Pioneering* 6). This conversation quickly evolved into the nineteenth century cultural phenomenon of

professionalization as a means to elevate occupations and personal prestige to the status of professional through systemic naming, ordering, and rulemaking based on competition and individual tenacity. This socio-cultural construction was a means of identity-formation, validation, and self-promotion that helped to create a middleclass based on "measured powers of intelligence" (Bledstein x). Mid-Victorians applied the rhetoric of professionalism to not only construct a better living but to also distinguish themselves as above individuals of lower status and closer to those in higher society. Bledstein suggests that this grew into the "vertical vision" of the American dream: an almost evangelistic ideology of looking and reaching upward in pursuit of potential and fulfillment of the "true nature" of masculinity (105). While the construction of professions made upward mobility possible, it also allowed individuals and groups the mode and the means to establish social, gender, and racial segregation and stratification (Bledstein 105). Access to education played a large role in such stratification.

In the United States, where systems of apprenticeships were often spotty and short lived even in the nineteenth century, higher education became a gateway into and a defining feature of professions. As Bledstein explains, a diploma of higher education "served as the license with which an individual sought entry into the respectability and rewards of a profession" (33). This recognized certificate of credentialed intelligence, according to Eliot Freidson, suggested much more than everyday intelligence. It represented "formal knowledge:" the type of exclusive, governed, and recorded knowledge that was deemed commercially valuable, powerful, and a requisite of professionalization (Freidson 2). Institutions of higher learning, especially land-grant universities seeking to establish a marketable ethos, built up their essentiality by

screening student applicants, formalizing fields and degrees, and awarding degrees specific to named professions (Freidson 124). Before long, individual intelligence, determination, and tenacity rather than familial prestige became the marker of a successful American; and institutions of higher education became the gatekeepers to the professions and upward mobility.

When the Progressive Era arrived, changes in socio-political and economic circumstances converged with greater educational opportunities, which helped to make professional careers a more realistic possibility for more individuals. As higher education evolved alongside social values of masculine professionalization, institutions organized around the creation of fields and professions. Since the "dean of women" position was novel, unique, and gendered—few if any men sought or held the position—it became a space where women had more freedom and agency than usual to construct a profession (Antler; Bashaw; Hevel; Nidiffer 2000, 2001; Schwartz). As higher education became the gateway of professionalization for more fields and since masculine professions offered the only pattern available, deans of women recognized the path to credibility was to conform to that template.

As Michael Hevel points out, the initial steps toward deans of women assuming the position of a profession occurred somewhat organically. Occupying a new position within a burgeoning context that addressed the novel needs of a new population, deans of women looked to one another for information and ideas on how to best address the unique needs of women students in coeducational institutions. This initiated a pattern of connection, support, and collaboration. Yet, the writings and documents left by pioneering deans of women suggest that around the turn of the twentieth century, this

practice began to coalesce into something more formal. Recognizing the rise in women student enrollment, the increase of women holding their administrative position, and the lingering dismissals and condescension they had encountered on campus from male colleagues, deans of women began to purposefully explore, discuss, establish, and promote their position as a profession.

In her history of the position, Jana Nidiffer suggests that the professionalization of the position of dean of women can be divided into five phases. She refers to the first phase as the "historical backdrop" which lasted between 1833-1892 when women would serve as matrons over women students. The second phase, Nidiffer explains, is a "pre-professional" phase between 1982-1901 wherein administrators recognized that women students had "unmet needs" and deans of women were first hired. Nidiffer's third phase covers the years 1901-1906 when the deans first came together to discuss common issues and participate in "collective activity." This is followed by a fourth stage of "becoming an expert" between when deans of women began to research their position between 1906-1911. This is followed by Nidiffer's fifth stage where the "attributes of the profession" became tangible through the formation of the NADW and the rise of training (Nidiffer *Pioneering* 12).

While Nidiffer's research offers vital historical information and arguments concerning the dean's experience, the documents written by the NADW and the deans themselves undermine any idea that their efforts to professionalize can be as easily measured and compartmentalized as Nidiffer suggests. Based on the conversations manifest in the NADW's conference yearbooks alone, deans of women spent decades after their organization working to establish and maintain their professional ethos; and

rather than a linear progression, their efforts continually circled back to re-examine definitions, roles, and needs. In fact, I argue that most of the concerted, intentional efforts to professionalize began with the organization of the NADW rather than ended with it. This quest was a messy effort in that deans of women had to continually name, assess, quantify, and argue for a professional status and for recognition of their professional administrative contributions. The effort to fit into masculinist systems of competitive professionalism while also incorporating feminist values of collaboration, listening, and self-awareness also made for some fruitfully messy dialogue and rhetorical situations that were smart, significant, provocative, and insightful.

Based on prominent patterns and themes within the NADW yearbooks and documents and within Dean Kirmse's papers, I recognize certain moves enacted by deans of women in their quest for a professional identity and recognition as conscious and intentional. These moves include (1) a public recognition and argument of the social value ascribed to professionalization, (2) an effort to name and standardize what deans of women do, and (3) an effort to establish deans of women as experts in academic personnel work. The remainder of this chapter will rely on the dean's rhetorical artifacts—both the published and the archived mundane—to demonstrate these concerted efforts to professionalize their position. As mentioned earlier, rather than linear or chronological steps in their progression, the dean's actions and concentrated efforts on both national and local stages ebbed and flowed as they continually revisited, revised, promoted, and animated their profession throughout first twenty-five years of their organization. Therefore, since the dean's work to professionalize was not neatly organized into progressive steps, rather than look at their efforts chronologically, I

examine these efforts individually as they took place starting from the NADW's organization throughout Dean Kirmse's tenure as Dean of Women at the UA. I focus on the national conversations first, followed by Dean Kirmse's application of those conversations in her local context at the UA.

Recognizing the Rhetorical Social Significance of 'Professionalization'

As their history demonstrates, the acts of seeking connection, education, and professional development organically grew out of the deans of women's novel position within the uncharted territory of coeducation and the increase of women entering higher education. The first deans of women were trailblazers, and their discussions and documentations suggest that they knew it. As women in higher education during the Progressive Era, they were cognizant of contemporary social changes; and their rhetoric suggests an awareness that their acts could have significant effect on women's experience as students and as administrators for years to come. While the learning curve was hurried and steep for deans of women and those holding this administrative position were often required to decipher and invent their responsibilities and objectives in real time, deans of women did not mindlessly react to exigent situations.

Coming together to talk, listen, and compare situations exposed the ambiguity of their position and engendered discussions on common practical problems and possible answers that could have never developed if deans had remained in isolation. While small and exclusive, Marion Talbot's early meetings raised awareness and opened a dialogue on just how vague and disparate deans of women's experiences were. As a participant of these meetings, Louis Kimball Mathews recognized the importance of defining the position of "dean of women" and the latent potential of coordinated efforts towards the

standardization of the position. This led to her groundbreaking 1915 book, *The Dean of Women*.

Woven within Mathews' limited study of deans of women and the wide array of responsibilities placed upon them is a subtle yet consistent argument asserting the critical value of the position. This argument suggests that Mathews' audience extended beyond her fellow deans of women to the administrations wherein they were placed and the institution presidents who supervised their efforts. Mathews points out to her audience that while the position of "dean of women" may have started as a "vague fumbling about" to meet a pressing practical need, it had grown alongside the number of students it served and its complexity now demanded "more precise definitions" and correlated efforts (13). Comparing to the onset of coeducation when the only stated requirement for women matrons was a warm body and a love of girls, Mathews argues that more authority and more specialized methods and techniques are needed to effectively supervise and guide women students (12). She argues that

> No 'glorified chaperon' will be able to grasp the situation and cope with it; no woman who merely 'loves girls' in a vague, emotional fashion will be able to convince a faculty of men or a body of hard-headed trustees of the necessity under which they labor of meeting the present economic, social, intellectual, and spiritual needs of women. More than charm and natural social gifts are required of a leader in women's education; the times call for an intellectual, spiritual, and social equipment of the highest order on the part of those who are to contribute a sane, clear-cut, and large-minded point of view. (18)

Yet, even with the ambiguity with which their position first came about, Mathews argues that deans of women were emerging as definite and influential academic administrators with the potential to become "experts of women's education in a coeducational institution" (16).

It is interesting to note that Mathews published her book the same year NADW founder Kathryn Sisson McLean first enrolled in summer courses at Columbia Teacher's College as a new dean of women. While the education courses didn't cater to her specific role as dean, McLean connected with the four other deans also enrolled to discuss common issues and needs that transcended their individual campuses. The following year, they gained permission for classes and training specifically tailored to their needs as deans of women. Their appreciation and hunger for collaboration inspired these four deans of women to establish a more expansive and inclusive association the following year. Modeling nearly every act of what would be critical in the deans of women's quest for professionalization, these four deans of women, led by McLean, formed the key driving influence and organization for their professionalization: the NADW.

While the formation of the NADW was an important factor in the professionalization of their position, the deans of women recognized it as the catalyst it was rather than an end in and of itself. Following patterns and constructs of contemporary professional associations, the founding executive board wasted no time in laying a distinct foundation for the NADW including a formal platform, objectives, and by-laws. While it is not clear whether there was an earlier draft, the NADW drafted, approved, and published the following association objective at the 1922 annual meeting:

> The object of this association shall be to make clear to the public and to governing boards of educational institutions, where girls and women are educated, the necessity of having in each of these institutions a competent and thoroughly trained woman as dean of women, or of girls; to establish a high standard of qualifications and to secure adequate professional recognition for the position of dean of women; to study the problems common to all deans of women and to disseminate information valuable in the solution of them; to foster a spirit of unity and co-operation among deans of women; and through the realization of this

object best serve the education of women by making more significant the service of deans of women. ("Bylaws")

The initial platform also approved at the 1922 NADW conference is particularly interesting as it clearly foreshadows the pursuit of the professional ethos the NADW sought and promoted for years to come. Two years later, NADW president Agnes E. Wells argued that the demands of their profession required that they "keep our ideals ahead of our aims in order to aim in the right direction" ("President's" 1924 11). Her proposed answer was to name, document, and collectively ratify the Association's aims in the form of an official platform which would strengthen the Association's professional status ("President's" 1924 12). Wells' platform divides this pursuit into five goals the deans would work toward: First, the placement of "a thoroughly educated and otherwise qualified dean of women" in all institutions of higher education enrolling fifty or more women students (12). Second, the "publication and general distribution" of dean's research concerning "the various phases of their work." Third, the organization of state and local associations of deans in all states" where warranted. Fourth, "thorough investigations of educational and social problems" to better position institutions of higher education as contributors to "public welfare" (12). And fifth, to cooperate with "organizations and with men and women of intelligence and vision…who recognize that there is a scope to the work of deans of women which as yet has not been realized." In other words, the NADW's early path towards professionalization included establishing their presence on all campuses warranted by the needs of women students, validating and supporting their academic contributions with research, and arguing their role in elevating the social value of institutions of higher education ("President's" 1924 12).

Thus, the NADW's objective was to not only argue for their worth as necessary and valuable contributors in the administration of higher education for women but to also name, develop, and promote those contributions within their membership as professional. Yet, what did the deans actually bring to the table? What did they contribute and how were those contributions to be measured? The dean's published conversations concerning naming what they did demonstrate the difficulty in determining what was required of this novel position. The varying arguments demonstrate the contextual complexities deans of women wrestled with in constructing identities as women administrative professionals. Their debates reveal a navigation of shifting gender roles and values of the Progressive Era and efforts to establish a new ethos out of evolving and somewhat dissonant ideologies. Such critical weighing of progressive and essentialist ideals is understandable considering that living up to socio-cultural essentialist ideals of "womanhood" had been foundational to the identity-formation and credibility of women for generations.

Professionalization through Naming and Standardization

The 1924 NADW conference yearbook was the first to include what would become the standard yearbook content over the next thirteen years: an itinerary of the program, reports from the executive board and committees, and copies of talks deemed worthy for wider distribution. Three such talks fell under the title of "Qualifications for Deans of Women;" and their consecutive placement on the program highlights the deans' interest in and struggle with determining tangible qualifications and whether standard qualifications were necessary (117-135).

The first talk in the series was presented by NADW member Sarah M. Sturtevant, the head of the department of advisers of women at the Columbia Teacher's College

(117). This presentation appears to be the first of many talks, articles, and books that would position Sturtevant as an authority of dean's education and training. Over time, she would come to be recognized as having trained more deans of women than any other college professor ("Columbia Head").

As with many deans and educators discussing the position, Sturtevant acknowledges that the office of dean of women is so new that its significance is often overlooked. Like Mathews argued nine years earlier, Sturtevant quickly dismisses, however, any notion that deans of women were simply chaperones. She argues that dean's work

> is not merely a salmagundi of pick-up jobs, of managing details of parties, of serving on committees, of chaperoning dances; deans are not primarily patterns of social decorum, assistant clerks to principals and presidents, and not yet confidential agents of colleges to speak to girls on subjects taboo to men. (120)

Rather, the dean's expertise, Sturtevant explains, is "a new kind of specialized skill which has for its aim the effecting of better adjustments between individuals and the world in which they must live" (120). Sturtevant goes on to explain that a dean

> must be a leader in the best sense of the word, possessed of the intellectual gifts of originality, good judgment, and insight, motivated by clearly defined purposes, large enough to take in the whole of life, and real enough to demand her tenacious loyalty; and last but not least, inspired by that sympathy, humility, and love which characterize the greatest leadership. (121)

Yet, even in sharing this description—a type of character job description quite popular in these early discussions—Sturtevant recognizes the impossibility of such ambiguity. After all, how does one teach originality and insight? How does one study humility and love? Sturtevant's answer entails research and standardization of best practices. She argues for the need to examine what deans are doing, measure and analyze

the tasks, and then distribute the findings among NADW members. By doing so, Sturtevant claims that "it is possible to arrive at some principles of procedure based upon scientific data which will save time over the old trial and error method" (122). She then argues that the importance of deans' work also warrants recruitment and graduate training. Such "professional preparation" is not only vital to fulfill the task, Sturtevant claims, it will lead to the recognition of the field as a profession (123). It is time, she points out, that "presidents and the deans themselves recognize the professional status of people trained in the technique of dealing with human relations" (123). In other words, Sturtevant recognized the need to not only convince university administrations of the professional standing of deans of women, but to convince the deans themselves.

However, not all NADW members agreed that research, education, and standardization was the path forward. The two deans that followed Sturtevant on the program believed ambiguity to be innate to the position and each valued the passing of lore over empirical evidence. Their language also suggests they retained a firm grasp on traditional gender valuations approaches to dean of women qualifications. For instance, after Miriam F. Carpenter, the Adviser of Women in the Graduate School of Education at Harvard, praises Sturtevant's remarks she suggests that dean's work "differs so radically" from one institution to another, standard practices would seldom apply (124). Rather, Carpenter argues for the development of relevant personality traits such as tolerance, selflessness, sensitiveness, and a sense of humor that can be applied to the unique needs of women students (125). She also suggests that deans of women seek the advice of male peers rather than waste time treading new paths. Sharing with her NADW audience her

own experience of seeking advice, Carpenter describes what she found to be “the qualifications that college officials want in their deans” by asking

> Can you call good-looking clothes a qualification? Well, whether you can or not, you've got to have them!...Nothing so commands the respect of a girl as a dean with a gown or hat a trifle ahead of hers in line or prevailing color! And the effect upon any woman of being thoroughly and quietly well-dressed is highly invigorating. It not only makes easy the task of putting the fear of God into the heart of a sophisticated sophomore, but she will be much more impressed by your remarks than as if she could say to herself, “Much she knows about it, she doesn’t even know waistlines have gone out! (127)

Carpenter’s talk is followed by Edith A. Barnard, the Dean of Women at State Teachers College in Missouri who also refers to several male educators as qualified voices in naming meaningful qualifications for deans of women. This, she argues, is necessary since the position of dean is so young and often unwelcomed by male peers (132). However, Barnard also considered the opinions of at least forty women enrolled at the Teacher’s College—some of whom were deans of women and others hopeful of becoming deans—to determine the qualities and attributes desired in deans of women. Her final list of qualities most desirable in deans of women include an intimate knowledge of and sympathy towards young people, a strong influential character, high ideals, vision, womanliness, pleasing personality, and good judgment (132). She goes on to explain that deans of women

> should of course be dignified, but not stiff and unapproachable; she must be able to be the good comrade on occasion. She must be up to date in her knowledge of the education and work of women, their relations toward the home, toward vocations, politics, labor, social service, apportionment of income and so forth and so forth. And she must be thoroughly conversant with social customs and conventions. (133)

All three talks reveal an exploration of untested ground. While Sturtevant would go on to campaign for quantified research and standardized qualifications and a professional ethos, it is understandable that deans wrestled with holding onto the socio-culturally conditioned gender values they had inherited, cultivated, and had perhaps gained recognition for. Their discussions demonstrate how difficult it would be to step into new opportunities, spaces, and professional identities within a culture and an engrained mindset that still values traditional forms of gender credibility.

However, Sturtevant's argument for concrete definitions and standardized best practices was not falling on deaf ears. The following year, Josephine P. Simrall would also ask conference attendees if they could "rest content with being a glorified chaperone" or as an administrative figurehead in a skirt (56). While she contends that the duties of a chaperone or an administrative assistant would be much easier than those deans of women face daily, Simrall quickly points out that deans of women are educators and administers. She posits that if deans of women ever hope to reach their full potential, they must weed out the hundreds of non-essential "demands that clutter up their day," standardize their position, and establish it as a profession (56).

A Call for Research as Professional Criteria

It appears that the NADW Executive Board also agreed with Sturtevant's call to define and standardize the work of deans of women. To keep the association heading "in the right direction," 1924 NADW president Agnes E. Wells argues for the need to determine common "duties, needs, and ideas of members" through comprehensive research ("President's" 1924 10). The following year, Wells led the Executive Board in passing a motion to "assemble and publish…theses and articles on the qualifications,

preparations, work and other interests of Deans and Advisors" and to distribute the resources to NADW members and administrative stakeholders ("President's" 1925 9). To bolster this objective, Wells also introduced a new NADW Research Committee of three deans who would work alongside the Press and Publications Committee ("President's" 1925 9). It is interesting to note that Sarah M. Sturtevant was included in this inaugural Research Committee. The first product of this collaboration was a 48-page booklet titled *The Vocation of Dean* published in 1926 written by Ruth A. Merrill and Helen D. Bragdon.

In the brief introduction to *The Vocation of Dean,* Merrill and Bragdon position the publication as a research-based clarification of the "dean of women" position. Due to its hurried origin, the Merrill and Bragdon point out that deans of women stepped into their roles with little more guidance than "'Go ahead and make of the position what you can'" and no regard to "training or qualifications" (3). However, they argue that if the position of dean of women is ever to have "a real meaning," it must not be reduced to "a catch-all for odd jobs which no one else wants to do" (12). Rather, Merrill and Bragdon content that the position and duties must be named and distinguished as vital in "effecting better adjustments between individuals [i.e., women students] and the world in which they live" (12).

To establish a workable definition of the position, Merrill and Bragdon explain that the research committee sent questionnaires to seventy institutions, including universities, coeducational colleges, and women's colleges asking women what they had made of the position and what qualifications they deemed necessary. The findings—quantified and presented in the order of popularity—included abstract traits ranging from

tact, patience, sympathy, firmness to sense of humor, progressiveness, logical, and good Christian character (11). These various descriptors, they posit, "is itself proof of the fact that there is a lack of clear conception of objectives" when determining the dean of women position (10). Merrill and Bragdon contend that this failure to distinguish clear objectives and qualifications "is not only on the part of faculty, administrative officers and students, but a large share of the responsibility rests with the deans themselves" (11). They add that deans' failure to recognize their own position "as a profession in itself with very definite qualifications and training necessary" has been a "chief deterrent to the proper development of the office" (24).

On behalf of the research committee, Merrill and Bragdon conclude that if the "bewildering variety, vagueness, and first aid aspects of the office of dean can be replaced by constructive deanships, efficient in their different methods and environments but *unified* in their motives and aims, the work of deans may be of unique value to education" (47). The clarification and professionalization of their field, they argued, would enable deans of women to "exert a strong influence in the further articulation of the objectives of higher education" (47). More importantly, they continued, deans of women unified by a common purpose could be "the most powerful champions of the individual in the educational system (47). Merrill and Bragdon close this booklet by quoting a comment Sarah M. Sturtevant made three years prior. "Putting yourself into people," Sturtevant claimed, "is the creed of deans…After all, human values are the supreme values, and that supreme values should have supreme emphasis" (48).

The NADW's argument to professionalize the dean of women position would continue for years. The 1927 NADW conference yearbook includes another presentation

by Sturtevant in which she shares her own study of the "dean of women" position ("A Study"). For this study, Sturtevant surveyed 503 colleges and universities in order to identify and analyze "certain facts" about deans of women and the performance of their "duties" ("A Study" 96). Sturtevant recognized this information as vital in establishing the proper "vocational guidance of deans and for the curricula of professional courses for deans" ("A Study" 96).

While much of Sturtevant's presentation is expository—most deans of women held at least a bachelor's degree with 28.6 holding a PhD and frequently taught in addition to administrative work—she did note some interesting trends ("A Study" 97). Based on her findings, Sturtevant argues that while the title of "dean" suggests that their work is considered a profession by "forward thinking presidents," their working conditions do not reflect the respect of a profession ("A Study" 97). Sturtevant notes that many deans of women carry a teaching load of 15-20 hours a week along with additional service requirements. This "burden of work," she states, is "incompatible either with best results to the education of young women or with the health of the dean herself" ("A Study" 97). This issue is compounded by the fact that with a median salary of $2766.66, deans of women's earnings are "relatively small compared to other positions" ("A Study" 97). Sturtevant closes her presentation with several questions for the NADW members to consider:

> If the work of dean is coming to be regarded as a profession by far sighted college and university presidents, does that not put upon deans themselves the responsibility of developing professional subject matter and technique which shall be worthy of a profession?
> If the dean's office is to be conceived as an administrative one concerned in a vital way with the education of women, and as a personnel bureau, should not her

> office be organized as a department of student life, [with] a staff adequate to this task?
>
> Should not the office be more adequately defined by the NADW, the AAUW, and other organizations interested in women's education, in terms of time, salary, official appointment and opportunity to do the work assigned? ("A Study" 98)

With these questions, Sturtevant positioned her audience of deans as agents of their own professional trajectory. While masculinist academic traditions, unequal recognition, and normalized bias would always be a discriminatory factor, Sturtevant argued that deans of women—incited by research-based insight and a recognition of the importance of their work—had to be proactive in forming and sustaining their own professional identity.

In her President's Report at this same 1927 NADW conference, Dorothy Stimpson rhetorically joined Sturtevant to argue that "the future of our profession as such" was the most important problem facing deans (37). "Has not the time come," she asks, "for us to … set standards for the deanship in training, in variety and quantity of duties, in the importance and recognition of the position?" (37). Stimpson posits that research and publishing was the best means of gaining that professional standing. "Surely an organization as large as ours," she claims, "should be able to find in its work the material for at least six or eight articles by its members every year" (37). After all, she warrants, deans of women "have a responsibility to ourselves and to our profession as well as to our students" to work to their full potential; and documenting their work would provide tangible proof of their qualifications and value (37).

As the best available means for the publication of research relevant to deans of women, the NADW conference yearbook would continue to publish, highlight, and call for significant empirical research as a method to gain and retain a professional ethos. Over the decade following Sturtevant and Stimpson's call to arms, the yearbook would

devote more and more of its pages to research until finally transitioning into the Journal of the National Association of Deans of Women in 1937.

Dean Kirmse's Professional Identity

Dean Kirmse had been a member of the NADW for at least five years before accepting the position of dean of women at the University of Arizona (UA). During her time as Assistant Dean of Women at George Washington University, Kirmse attended several conferences and was surely aware of conversations concerning the professionalization of her position and her field. Her own reflection written decades later pointing out that she was the first dean of women at the UA who was professionally trained suggests that "professionalism" was an important element of her academic identity right from the start (Penned Reflections). Yet, the rhetoric surrounding Kirmse's arrival in 1929—two years after Sturtevant and Stimpson's call for proactive professionalization—suggest that her identity as a professional was both novel and noteworthy on this campus. Recognizing the dean of women as a profession in and of itself would understandably seem extra-ordinary at the UA considering that previous deans of women had all been hired internally and usually assumed the role part-time while also retaining positions as full-time instructors or campus physicians with little to no specialized training. Because of this, attitudes towards the position at the UA when Kirmse arrived seemed to retain shadows of the "chaperone" or "fixer of the women problem" mindset. Dean Kirmse's credentials and initial self-promotion, however, not only countered such stereotypes, it simultaneously impressed and unsettled.

The local newspaper, the Arizona Daily Star, broke the story of Kirmse's hire the day after it happened: June 5, 1929 ("Board Picks"). University president Shantz, the

paper states, had received sixty-five applications for the position and interviewed thirty hopeful candidates before offering the position to Kirmse. The Star lauded Kirmse's education and qualifications and exclaimed that while Kirmse was a "comparatively young women" to her predecessors, she came to Tucson "with the highest of recommendations and the most convincing and substantial of records." The article goes on to share Kirmse's "extensive record:"

> [Kirmse] is a graduate of GWU; she holds an AB degree received in 1921 and an AM degree received this year (1929); she has done extensive graduate work in psychology, English, and education. She is present assistant dean of women at GW, a position which she has held for the last four years; she is working on a survey of vocational opportunities for women in government service; she has done work for various societies and schools; she is a member of the NADW of which she is regional secretary for Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. ("Board Picks")

The Star ends its story by quoting President Shantz as stating that "the newly appointed dean has had wide experience with college women as a dean, as a sorority officer, and as a personnel officer" ("Board Picks").

Kirmse had obviously impressed President Shantz and the Star journalist. By the end of her first academic year, the Dean Kirmse would also impress the student body. The brief introduction included in the 1930 UA Yearbook exemplifies, however, the clinging gendered lens women administrators endured and Kirmse had inherited ("Dean"). "Miss Evelyn [Kirmse], our new Dean of Women," the student-author writes, "is one of the most capable leaders of the weaker sex that this school has seen in all its trials and tribulations" (27). This same gendered evaluation is also manifest in the following yearbook as the writer claims it "difficult to remember the dignity of [Dean Kirmse's] office," due to Dean Kirmse's "youthful enthusiasm, her youthful spirit, and,

best of all, her youthful appearance" as the UA's Dean of Women ("Dean"). Thus, while Dean Kirmse's administrative skills and experience was commended on one hand, her femininity was being considered and evaluated on the other. This binary, she would later explain, created an atmosphere of mistrust as she stepped into the established—albeit poorly—administrative space of the UA Dean of Women office. Applying her professional expertise and implementing best practices and objectives based on research and training was not to be an easy sell.

In a report titled "Department of the Dean of Women: Summary of Activities – 1929 through 1935" written sometime after her deanship, Kirmse describes her experience arriving at the UA in 1929 and her "difficulty in promoting the job description and professional organization as promoted by the NADW" (Report Drafts). Within the report, Kirmse explains that she quickly found that "there were no records in the files to indicate or interpret any program in which the immediate predecessor had been engaged." All she had to go on was the "hearsay and reports" she could gather from the assistant dean: a graduate student who had held the position for two years. This assistant informed Dean Kirmse that there was "very little business" required of the dean other than the "rush of registration." With only a few letters coming and going from the office, the assistant explained, "she had plenty of time to pursue her studies in law during office hours" (Report Drafts).

With little to go on, Dean Kirmse spent much of her first year at the UA engaged in "watchful waiting" as she studied and analyzed the program, "or lack of program" as she saw it ((Report Drafts). Kirmse later explained that her plan was to identify "constructive" practices and policies of her predecessor and incorporate them into "an

intelligently planned program for the development of the welfare of the women students." She started by conducting a study of student orientation practices to see how it could better address women students. She also studied the UA's Panhellenic system and practices in order to establish "a better and more honest system of rushing the following year" (Report Drafts). However, notwithstanding her enthusiasm, Kirmse explains that her efforts were "greatly handicapped" during her first year at the UA by an "untrained and unsympathetic staff [who] exhibited plainly an unwillingness to do things which had not been done before, such things necessarily requiring more effort than long-accustomed habits" (Report Drafts).

However, Dean Kirmse persisted; and—writing of her experience within the report in third-person point-of-view—the end of her first academic year "found the dean with an analysis of her situation completed and her plan for the next year outlined" (Report Drafts). This analysis and plan included Dean Kirmse following Sturtevant's advice to define the position she held and outline the responsibilities. Dean Kirmse also took the initiative to record how and where the position of dean of women fit into the UA administrative hierarchy:

> Definition:
> The recognized object of the work of a dean of women is to provide a normal social life for every student, and to be a cooperative and integrating force in the college administration in all phases of its activity pertaining to the welfare of the women students, including administrative, academic, social, health, and personal welfare. The word "social" is to be understood in its broadest sense, that is, all relations with the student's fellows and society. It is not limited to that phase of social activity classed as entertainment, and parties, but includes it in its scope. It should not be considered as opposed to the term "academic" but should include this term also as the academic phase of the student's life is only one phase of his whole personality. To cultivate a normal social life for students is to provide for their development to the fullest extent of their intelligence and personality, and to

provide experiences which will train them in making happy adjustments to life in all of its phases.

Method and Duties:

To officially supervise the college life of all women. To provide physical, social, and academic environment in which each student can develop to her maximum capacity.

Status and Rank:

The Dean ranks as an administrative officer on a parity with the deans of several colleges, registrar, comptroller, health director, and all other officers who are responsible directly to the President and no individual department. Her function is to serve as a cooperative member of this group.

Division of Work:

A. Administrative
    a. General University Committees
    b. Departmental
        i. Office Administration
        ii. Staff
        iii. Dormitory operation
B. Academic
    a. Teaching
    b. Academic guidance of women students in cooperation with academic deans
    c. Research
C. Professional and Community Service
D. Social
    a. This includes all work with students which does not come under items A, B, or C, and is divided as follows:
        i. Orientation
        ii. Health
        iii. Housing
        iv. Student Government
        v. Student organizations
        vi. Student Committees
        vii. Social and Ethical Guidance
        viii. Vocational and Economic Guidance
        ix. Student Body Affairs Including Both Men and Women
        x. Personality Problems of Students
        xi. Discipline
        xii. Student Social Affairs. (Report Drafts)

Thus, Dean Kirmse spared no time her first year at the UA incorporating the best practices being discussed by the NADW and establishing a job description that was more professional and more effective. She also wasted no time in forming associations and collaborations that would better serve the women students across the state of Arizona.

By the following spring, Dean Kirmse had already travelled across the state speaking to local communities, high school administrations, and the Arizona Normal School[4] on ways to better prepare and support women students in higher education, an outreach never conceived by earlier deans of women at the UA. During this time, Dean Kirmse also conducted a study of "the degree of personnel work" the high schools were offering their students during this time (Report Drafts). By the end of the summer, Dean Kirmse, had determined a need for standardization of programs, purposes, and goals not only at the UA but throughout the state. In collaboration with the Phoenix Union High School dean of girls, Dean Kirmse began to lay the groundwork for what would become the Arizona Association of Deans and Advisors (Report Drafts II).

The following December, Dean Kirmse invited the deans of women and deans of girls throughout the state to the UA for "an organization meeting" (Report Drafts II). The keynote speaker she arranged was none other than Sarah M. Sturtevant who the Arizona Star touted as "the eminent authority in her field in America." Sturtevant's address was followed by a "lively discussion" on unifying the efforts and training of the profession throughout the state ("Campus Events").

[4] The Arizona Normal School—an institution devoted to the education of teachers— would eventually become Arizona State University

Dean Kirmse would continue over the next decade to conduct research, to present her work on a national and regional level, to hold executive positions at the NADW, and to established professional associations. In turn, she and other deans of women across the country measured, theorized, and explored the multidimensional needs of the students in their charge occupying an important niche as professionals and experts in the field of academic personnel work.

Constructing a Professional Expertise in Personnel Work

As the evolution of NADW conference topics and messages indicate, deans experienced and encouraged an increased awareness and appreciation for all aspects in the education of women students. No longer solely focused on proving their intellectual ability alone, deans of women began to recognize women students' as whole persons needing holistic guidance and support. Through their research, the NADW found that advising women students concerning vocational, physical, financial, emotional, social, and cultural development was necessary if deans were to help students make the most of their education and achieve the full measure of their potential. This holistic focus created a new administrative niche within the industrial "personnel movement" of the day (Schwartz "Lessons"). The NADW recognized the importance of their occupation of this niche not only for helping women students but also for their profession, and they began to rhetorically promote training in science-based guidance practices and a professional identity as experts in academic personnel work. Acquiring, honing, and rhetorically promoting this expertise served to move deans of women further away from lingering social stereotypes while also positioning them as vital members of administrations.

While the “personnel movement” had appeared in industrial management practices during the late nineteenth century, the first recorded consideration and application of it in academia was by Walter Dill Scott at Northwestern University in the 1920s (Schwartz “Lessons” 3). As pointed out by Robert A. Swartz, a 1931 U.S. Office of Education report on land-grant colleges noted that "personnel service" —a term used in industry to describe programs designed to increase employee quality of life to improve worker experience and increase retention— had found a place in academic administration (“Lessons” 513). Such work called for a more holistic view of and support for the needs of students beyond simply the academic. This included students’ financial, housing, physical and mental health, social, and vocational needs. Esther Lloyd-Jones, a graduate student of Scott’s, would eventually join Sturtevant at the Teacher’s College of Columbia and as a member of the NADW where she continued her extensive research on the topic, published, and strongly encouraged deans of women in their pursuit of professionalism by seizing the reins of personnel work (Schwartz “Lessons” 3).

In 1928 Jane Louise Jones, a graduate student within Sturtevant’s department at Teachers College published a research study titled *A Personnel Study of Women Deans in Colleges and Universities*. Through questionnaires and interviews, Jones gathered data concerning responsibilities associated with personnel work from 263 deans of women across the United States (Jones 12). Based on her assessment, Jones declares that “the work of deans of women has taken its place among the professions;” and she partially bases her assessment on dean’s “specialized training in their professional expertise in academic personnel work” (112). The increased recognition of this expertise, Jones

argues, was due to the concerted efforts of the NADW, which proactively "spread the word to deans of women and other faculty members across the country" (112).

The NADW's promotion of this expertise is manifest in an interesting discussion they arranged at the 1931 NADW conference concerning "The Dean of Women and Her Relation to the Personnel Office" (103-112). The two deans of women leading the discussion—Florence Robnett of Northwestern University and Lucy D. Slowe of Howard University—argued the importance of this expertise and urged their audience to name and act on it at every opportunity. First on the program, Robnett lays out a list of eighteen responsibilities that falls under the jurisdiction of the dean of women's office, including managing housing for women, supervising all social activities involving university women, advising on financial issues, establishing women self-government associations, offering academic and vocational guidance and instruction, governing student discipline, and tracking the physical health and mental hygiene of all women students (103). Robnett then offers practical logistical insights on how her office handles this wide array of responsibilities.

When Dean Lucy D. Slowe enters the conversation, she rhetorically steps back from the organizational minutia and spends what she describes as her "short time allotted" to raise a few "fundamental" questions concerning the whole concept of "dean of women" and what should be their primary focus (111). Acknowledging the list of responsibilities laid out by Robnett, Slowe points out that "personnel work simply means working with the personal problems of the students" (111). Slowe goes on to argue that if deans of women are to do this work effectively, they need the recognized authority that would ensure cooperation of organizations, departments, and offices across the campus.

Deans of women, Slowe argues, need to be recognized as "the executive officer in women's affairs" (111). Slowe points out that "after all is said, the dean of women is the only officer in the university who deals with a woman student as a complete human being" (112). "If this is true," she continues, the dean of women "is the coordinating official for women's interests and, in my judgment, should be their chief personnel officer" (112).

Over the next decade, the NADW Research Committee would publish several documents and pamphlets containing research projects concerning personnel work. Two that appear to be the most widely distributed include a 1933 booklet titled *Relationships in the Performance of Personnel Duties*, which provides a quantified survey of job descriptions and responsibilities noting certain aspects that should be considered "personnel work" (*Relationships*). These, the NADW Research Committee posits, involve student admission, orientation, counseling, housing, health, and extra-curricular.

Another prominent booklet published by the NADW Research Committee is *The Dean of Women in the Institution of Higher Learning* which was first published in 1938 with a second edition distributed in 1950. This booklet appears to be a culmination of the NADW conversations that had spanned the previous decade; and its reprint twelve years later suggests its perceived enduring value to dean's work. Its purpose is to tangibly document and describe the profession of dean of women and to describe their expertise in academic personnel work. The Research Committee opens each booklet by establishing that

> The dean of women in the institution of higher learning is a major officer in the personnel program for students of the institution. The central task which she shares in such a program is that of accomplishing the best development of each

> individual student, including the physical, social, moral, religious, and aesthetic as well as intellectual aspects of the individual. (5)

The introduction ends with the argument that

> The extraordinary wave of interest in student personnel work which has swept across the educational world, and which has given rise to many unrelated and individual projects arising simultaneously on individual campuses makes it absolutely necessary to appoint people specifically delegated to take such leadership. On most campuses the dean of women is charged with these responsibilities for women students. (5)

One of the few substantial revisions in the 1950 edition is in how the "dean of women" position is defined (*The Dean*). The comparison between the two demonstrates an evolution in how the Research Committee not only wanted deans of women to be recognized professionally but also in how their language evolved to align with current professional standards. In 1938, the Research Committee explained that "the dean's day is occupied with such activities as the following:"

1. Counseling with individual students.
2. Working with student leaders, committees, and other groups.
3. Conferring with the president and other college officers regarding matters affecting the best development of students.
4. Discussing with faculty members, individually or in case conference, the strengths and weaknesses of individual students and the adjustments that should be made for them. (6-7)

The same section of the 1950 publication is much more direct, specific, and complex. Rather than describing "the dean's day," the Research Committee offers "the following definition of her position."

> The dean of women is an administrative officer whose responsibilities are:
>
> 1. To develop through shared thinking with the president, the dean of men, other appropriate administrative officers and faculty and student committees the philosophy and policies of a student personnel program

appropriate to her institution and to share in coordinating and integrating the program of personnel work;

2. To be concerned with the quality of campus life in general, with special responsibility for the needs of women students; and to give leadership in its improvement individually and through service upon appropriate committees;
3. To act as counselor or chairman of counselors for women in their particular problems of adjustment, to act as adviser or adviser ex-officio in all areas of student life with which women are concerned, and to do research in problems of student life with special reference to the education of women;
4. To represent women and the feminine point of view in administrative and faculty councils and to serve on administrative councils and faculty committees that deal with problems which concern women. (11)

Significant in this list of responsibilities is how the research committee now positions deans of women on equal footing with the male administrators as "shared" thinkers alongside the president and other administrative officers. The second and third points of responsibility focus on their expertise in student personnel work. The last responsibility, while pointing to the importance of representation, interestingly reveals lingering essentialist ideals as the committee promotes the value of their "feminine point of view" in discussions concerning women students.

Dean Kirmse's Professional Efforts to Promote and Apply Her Expertise

Whether she realized it before she first stepped onto the UA campus in 1929 or soon after she arrived, Dean Kirmse knew that she was the only person on campus professionally trained in "student personnel work" (Penned Reflections). Being new on campus, being the only woman holding an administrative position and the only person trained in personnel work undoubtedly led to moments of isolation and frustration as Dean Kirmse attempted to apply and enact what she knew. This is apparent in Kirmse's

description of the initial cool reception by her staff. However, Dean Kirmse— armed with research and the support of the NADW—wasted no time in assessing her situation and applying her expertise in personnel work. Kirmse's writing suggest that helping women students govern themselves was one aspect of academic personnel work that was both first on the list and close to her heart (Early UA History).

In some reflections written decades later, Kirmse recalls an association for women students which had been casually organized at the UA before her arrival. Adding some historical context, Kirmse explains in her notes that as the Women's Suffrage movement gained momentum nationally, "'nice women' in Arizona, sympathetic though they might be with the cause, did not join protest marches nor did they demand their rights too vociferously" (Early UA History). Yet Kirmse speculates that "some of the excitement generated by their more militant sisters elsewhere must have affected their attitudes—especially among the campus coeds." Kirmse continues to explain that, inspired by the movement, "the University of Arizona girls asked for and received for the first time a voice, albeit weak, in governing their own lives." On May 10, 1913, she explains, the Arizona Board of Regents approved the following recommendation of President Wilde:

> Whereas there has been a strong desire among the young women of the University for a scheme of self-governing and whereas this desire has now been put in definite form by some of the most trustworthy women on the campus, I would recommend a year's trial of …an elected student council in charge of dormitory governing and overseeing the enforcement of chaperone requirements and curfews. (Early UA History)

This was the beginning of the Associated Women Students of the UA: a women student's self-government organization. However, by the time Dean Kirmse arrived sixteen years later, she saw that the student governing council largely existed in name

only. Kirmse recalls that, consequentially, "the comings and goings of coeds" were strictly supervised "with appropriate disciplinary action imposed by colleges when rules were violated." While she saw this as necessary due to "the times" in which they lived, Dean Kirmse also realized the pedagogical value of self-government. Enlisting input from the women students holding positions within the existing Associated Women Students (AWS), Dean Kirmse explains that she set about assessing and reorganizing the council to better "hand over to the women students themselves almost complete responsibility for promoting, administering, and disciplining" (Penned Reflections).

Dean Kirmse goes on to explain that "with the dean of women and her staff acting in an advisory capacity, they achieved a smoothly working, highly successful student government in all aspects of campus life participated in by women" within her first year at the UA. By creating "a general council consisting of representatives from each campus living group including town girls working in conjunction with an executive AWS committee with the assistant dean of women advising," the women students "made regulations, promoted social life, and academic interests and administered both rewards and discipline" (Penned Reflections). Over Dean Kirmse's first year, more independence was given to women students, and while the standards set out by the student council were even more strict than what had previously been enforced, the women students felt more "freedom" and control since they were at the helm.

Whether from her success with student government or with her work reorganizing and implementing the roles of her office, it did not take long before Dean Kirmse's expertise in academic personnel work was recognized and sought out by other members of the UA faculty. During the summer of 1931, at the request of the Dean of the College

of Education, Dean Kirmse designed and presented a graduate course in personnel methods (Report Drafts II). The course was considered such a success that it was immediately added as a requirement of the College of Education graduates: English 205. Kirmse points out that the first enrollees of this new course were "the members of the dean's staff, including the sorority house mothers," who were all required to attend (Report Drafts).

Holding herself to the same professional standard, Kirmse points out that as dean, she "continued to take special courses in vocational and personnel guidance at George Washington University" every summer she could get away (Report Drafts). She also remained active serving on NADW executive boards, presiding over the Western Association of Deans of Women, and as a "consultant" for the National Committee on the Emergency on Education. Later in life, Kirmse would serve on the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) and become the ABOR's first woman president in 1958, a position she held for two years ("Board's Election).

Conclusion

The writings of both the NADW and Dean Kirmse demonstrate mindful, collaborative, and coordinated efforts to establish a professional identity and promote themselves as experts in academic personnel work. As women stepping into spaces and positions that had long been exclusively masculine, their road to professional recognition and respect was difficult, risky, and often messy. Since women were largely considered tolerated interlopers in institutions of higher education and questions of their intellectual ability still hung over many campuses and mindsets, deans of women had to work much harder than men to define their roles and prove their mettle as academic professionals.

Yet, this new position of dean also allowed women an unusual level of freedom. Granted, deans of women were still trying to establish their profession within a space dominated and controlled by men, but since they were not seeking a traditional man's position and most men did not wish to be dean of women, women had room to define and construct their profession with a certain level of autonomy. While the evolution of their rhetoric demonstrates the difficulty of doing so, the NADW and Dean Kirmse were largely effective in positioning themselves as professionals and valuable assets to academic administrations.

Considering the value she placed on establishing a professional identity, the evolution of Dean Kirmse's rhetorical portrayal in the UA Yearbook is telling. Within two years of stepping into the dean of women position, Dean Kirmse's influence in how she was to be professionally presented—by students as well as by colleagues—is apparent. Whether she specifically sought a more professional introduction in the yearbook or that it was student's response to Dean Kirmse's everyday comportment cannot be determined; yet the shift is unmistakable. Rather than the initial descriptions of Dean Kirmse as a "capable leader of the weaker sex" as described in 1930 or claims that her best qualities being her "youthful enthusiasm, her youthful spirit, and, best of all, her youthful appearance" as in 1931, the 1932 UA Yearbook states that

> Miss Evelyn Wellington Jones, Dean of Women, defines her official duties and privileges as being: to sponsor the activities of the women students; to co- operate with other University officers in providing physical, social, and academic environment in which each woman can develop her maximum capacity; and to be generally responsible for their welfare.
>
> Officially she does all that, and very effectively. But unofficially she does a great deal in addition. Dean Jones creates with each woman student a sincere and

> pleasurable relationship amounting to something higher than official acquaintance. She is a personal adviser of the practical modern variety. Her many offices of trust are tribute from the University to Dean Jones' clear judgment, reliability, and popularity. (“The Dean” 21)

While the 1932 entry is a marked improvement over the jovial and slightly dismissive introductions in earlier UA yearbooks, years that follow would also describe her work as “the work of only about a thousand mothers in the care of their daughters,” and laud her ability to break from the dean of women mold of “bespectacled scowls” to be, instead, “the smiling, kindly, sympathetic person of pleasant and simple dignity whom the co-eds come immediately to love” (“Dean E. W.”).

While these yearbook entries demonstrate an increased respect garnered by her professional manner, they also depict the instability of shifting gender norms and expectations during the Progressive Era. As women entering spaces and positions that had previously been closed to them, deans of women navigated progressive paths while still relying on the essentialist ideologies they had inherited and long embraced. While traversing these somewhat paradoxical paths and compelled to prove antagonists wrong and justify their rightful place in higher education, deans of women worked to establish their identity and ethos as professionals by applying contemporary masculinist measures of the concept. While they went above and beyond many of their male counterparts and deans of women were largely successful and became a valuable position on coed campuses, it is important to consider how long such patriarchal negotiations, compromises, and conformations could be sustained? This is a question I will continue to explore going forward.

In the following chapters, I examine two areas where, according to their writings, deans of women most prominently placed their professional interests: constructing spaces for women on campus both physically and intellectually. In Chapter 6, I rely on the writings of the NADW and Dean Kirmse to explore how deans of women argued and created spaces for women both on coeducational campuses that resisted the presence of women students and in traditional academic offices that provided little space if any to women administrators.

CHAPTER 6

DEANS OF WOMEN ARGUING FOR MATERIAL SPACE ON CAMPUS FOR WOMEN

The University of Arizona's first yearbook was published twelve years after the university first opened its doors to students. Beyond the royal blue binding, the UA's inaugural "annual" is unlike modern yearbooks. It opens with an architectural history of the UA interspersed between several sepia photographs of several lonely buildings sprinkled at the foot of the Tucson Mountains before a desolate expanse of desert sand and cacti. This is followed by photographs of the faculty, the yearbook editorial staff, members of the football team, three men's fraternities, and the cadet battalion along with editorials, stories, university songs, jokes, and advertisements. Other than four women included in the faculty of eighteen, the yearbook includes no photographs of women students.

No records remain that state how many of the UA's 205 students were women in 1903 (Registration). The several times women students are mentioned in the yearbook, it is usually as passive observers of college activities or as the gracious sponsors of parties and dances. A clue as to why the UA women students have been largely excluded can be found in a short story tucked within the yearbook's literary section showcasing student work, a story surprisingly written by a woman student.

"By Order of the Regents" was written by sophomore Georgiana Colton, a member of the literary society. Colton's work of fiction ultimately becomes a meandering gothic tale of séances and ghostly apparitions from Tucson's past; however, it does not open as such. Under the guise of fiction, Colton's story begins as one of protest. Set on

the UA campus, Colton's story opens on several women students gathered in a dorm room on the upper floor of North Hall, which, as Colton points out, "isn't but half a dormitory, after all." Colton describes the gathering as an emergency "girls meeting." A notice had been placed on the campus bulletin board earlier that day that demanded immediate discussion. The notice included a map of the UA campus covered with red markings indicating where women students were allowed to tread and where they were not. The map was followed by a list of penalties for transgressors.

"It's an insult," Colton's main character declares, "an insult to every one of us! We are shut up like prisoners and not allowed to walk where we please, for fear we will see a boy."

Another girl chimes in, "Why don't they chaperone us to classes and have us all sit in a row, and then take us across the 'limits,' back to the dormitory after class."

"Yes," answers the main character, "and we are in college, too, and right here on the campus we can't go where we please…we can't even go to the tennis court."

Colton describes the girls discussing their outrage late into the night.

The following morning, Colton's "fictional" characters shared their grievances with some male peers who asserted that they would never allow themselves to be "shut up in such a way." This confirmed to the "coeds" that their rights as students were being violated.

"We mustn't stand for it," they declared.

However, Colton abruptly ends this introductory dilemma by explaining that the students had learned that "talking did not mend matters;" and, as they moved on to other adventures, "it was only now and then that the 'limits' were spoken of again."

Colton's frustration as a woman student confronting gendered restrictions at a coeducational institution in 1903 is barely concealed within the details of her story. Like many women across the country, Colton had worked hard for the chance to enroll in an institution of higher education and was deemed qualified to do so only to find that her qualifications and tuition granted her less access, less space, and less opportunity than the same measures granted men.

Reflecting on this period at the UA years later, Kirmse corroborates the gender inequity that Colton wrote about and argues that while "men students suffered no restrictions regarding either their comings and goings or their destinations" during this time, "the young ladies did" (Historical Notes). While Kirmse acknowledges that the "ridiculously harsh" rules reflected societal conventions, she also contends that "a double standard prevailed" (Historical Notes). Where "regulations were strict" for women students under the rationale that they "required more 'protection,'" she argues, the "escapades of the male population were excused because "boys will be boys" (Historical Notes). Therefore, she points out, men could walk and roam where they wanted, but women's movement was constantly monitored and restricted to designated "proper" spaces (Historical Notes).

The Gendered Rhetoric of Place and Space

As a finite commodity, the acquisition and occupation of material space in the world has long been recognized as subject to competing forces, forces often based on exaggerated and misguiding needs and socio-cultural arguments of those seeking to gain and/or retain ground. While often normalized to the point of invisibility and misidentified ideology, such traditions of competition for space have often turned violent leaving scars

that have been handed down from generation to generation. This phenomenon both affects and is affected by the fact that all constructed space is rhetorical, it has both the power to influence the actions taking place within and without its established boundaries and the identity formation of all those involved. This is especially true when it comes to actions, boundaries, and identities concerning constructs of gender.

The amount of scholarship focused on the rhetorical nature of space[5] is robust and compelling (Alzeer; Barone; Enoch; Löw; Marback; Massey; Mountford; Spain; Yanni). This is especially true when applied to spaces on coeducational campuses in the early twentieth century. Scholar Roxanne Mountford describes constructions of space and the meanings attached to them as "communicative events" in that they both inscribe meaning and are inscribed with meaning (45). Just as architecture physically influences and controls experiences and behaviors of inhabitants and spectators with walls that block, contain, and segregate, corridors that dictate paths and (ends), and skyscrapers that tower above and overshadow; such structures also influence the identity constructs of those that engage with them whether as occupants or as outside observers (Mountford 98). Mountford argues that material spaces work in tandem with the "cultural dimensions" of those spaces—dimensions she describes as "social imaginary"—which carry powerful traces of historical socio-cultural rhetorics inscribing hierarchal significance to spaces and locations and to those that reside or walk there (49).

In a similar vein, Martina Löw argues the persuasive nature and intent in constructions of space. She explains that acts of creating spaces out of what is deemed

[5] I apply Mountford's use of "space" throughout this chapter to encompass both tactile and material locations and constructions as well as the metaphoric landscapes and creations of culture, traditions, laws, and ideologies that both adhere to and emanate from them (41).

chaos or untamed wilderness involves not only the construction of material boundaries and borders, but also a synthesis of symbolic cultural expectations and dictations of what can take place within those bounds and by whom. These elements, Löw suggests, influence audience/participant perception compelling the audience/participant to reassess their own placement and identity in response (128). Löw posits that this is space-identity phenomenon is especially relevant as pertaining to gender construction. She explains that individuals encounter spaces through a "double existence" experiencing them as both a "placed object" and as "a medium of perception" (120). "As such" individuals are "staged, styled, [and] genderized" eventually serving as both constructs and constructors of the spaces they inhabit and observe (120).

Gendered spaces are reciprocal in nature: they are both gendered and they gender. As a feminist geographer, Daphne Spain points out, notions of femininity and masculinity have long been constructed and shaped by the construction of specific spaces and the activities acted out in those spaces (7). Such gendered spaces, she claims, both shape and are shaped by, the daily activities within designated spaces that become mundane, unexamined, and fixed (28). Over time, expectations of how women and men occupy those spaces and behave within them eventually evolve from what *might be* to what *is* to what *ought* to be (Löw 28 emphasis original). Doreen Massey corroborates Spain's notion of the reciprocal rhetorical effect of gendered geography. Once spaces have been gendered, Massey claims, "they both reflect and affect the ways in which gender is constructed and understood" (179). Such genderizations of spaces has not only limited women's mobility spatially but also dictated the realm of acceptable identities women can assume and enact within those spaces. Gendered spaces have been used to promote

and perpetuate inequity, subordination, segregation, and social stratification (Alzeer; Massey; Mountford; Spain).

The rhetorical nature of gendered spaces has long played out on coeducational campuses, most specifically in how spaces are constructed in ways that influence identity formation and determine access to knowledge, status, and autonomy. Spain pays particular attention to the roles geography and constructions of space have had on gender relations in higher education, specifically its role in determining who has had access to what types of information and knowledge, who has been denied, and to what effect. She points out that constructing locations of knowledge in spaces women were unable to access—as in early days of higher education in North America—was a means of reinforcing the "existing gender stratification systems" regulating women and men to difference spheres and what was appropriate knowledge and behavior within those spheres (4). This type of constructed "spatial segregation," Spain argues, has long been a mechanism used by groups and individuals with greater power to establish and maintain advantage over subordinates (15). "By controlling access to knowledge and resources through the control of space," she posits, "the dominant group's ability to retain and reinforce its position is enhanced." (15). Therefore, since spatial boundaries dividing gendered locations played a major role in women's subordination, in order for women to gain more knowledge, they had to take great risk to cross those dominant boundaries and enter new spaces (Spain).

While women eventually enrolled in coeducational institutions alongside men, as Georgiana Colton's yearbook story depicts, women were initially relegated to specific areas while men enjoyed open access to most quarters of campus. Spain points to a

correlation between increased women's access to higher education and coeducational campuses and increased socio-political access to greater rights and status, particularly as voting citizens (5). Once material spatial barriers determining, segregating, and stratifying gendered spaces were breached, she asserts, parallel ideologies and social oppressions weakened (5).

Architectural historian Carla Yanni recognizes the rhetorical nature and history of spaces on university campuses in both how they have been planned and constructed and how they have been occupied. In her book, *Living on Campus: An Architectural History of the American Dormitory*, Yanni points to a turn in the nineteenth century where psychiatrists, urban designers, prison wardens, and architects began considering how constructed environments could influence and transform behavior by controlling access, segregation, and use of space (2). Yanni applies the concept of "environmental determinism" to describe the strategically "ordered environments" Victorian psychologists constructed to control behavior and affect change within those under their care (2). She argues that this method also applied to gendered spaces on campus. Rather than "mute containers for the temporary storage of youthful bodies and emergent minds," she claims that residence halls "constitute historical evidence of the educational ideals of the people who built them" (2). And, just as ideals are dynamic and always in flux, so too is the nature of gendered spaces.

As a means of examination and analysis of the rhetorical nature and use of gendered material spaces like those on coeducational campuses, Massey, calls for examining specific moments throughout history when the fluidity of rhetorically gendered spaces is most visible. This, she claims, enables a level of articulation of

dynamic social relations that are often too complex to articulate otherwise (5). Such scholarship brings into relief the unstable and complex ways material spaces have been impacted and continue to impact social relations and individuals across time and beyond its boundaries. This is especially valuable since "the particular mix of social relations which are thus part of what defines the uniqueness of any place is by no means all included within that place itself" (Massey 5).

Exploring the rhetorical nature of women's spaces on coeducational campuses and the efforts of deans of women in both navigating and carving out a space for themselves and for women students is just the type of critical moment of significance described by Massey. Traditional post-secondary campuses had long been designed to serve masculine needs alone. The fact that women began to be allowed on such campuses did not suggest accommodation. Rather, the spatial needs of women students and administrators were most often put on a back burner and disregarded. Based on the content and the large number of rhetorical documents produced by the NADW and by Dean Kirmse concerning the matter, deans of women spent years arguing for material space on coeducational campuses specifically designed and dedicated for women's use. They knew that universities would continue to be coeducational in name only and women administrators and women students would continue to be seen as guests or interlopers rather than contributing members until they acquired that space. Deans of women worked to establish material and rhetorical spaces for women students by arguing for on-campus housing, supporting women's fraternity system, and by securing their own administrative offices. They also argued for their authority in having a voice in the planning and construction of these spaces.

In what follows, I rely on the recorded experiences and arguments of the NADW and Dean Kirmse to demonstrate how they first argued for proper housing for women students through residential housing, cooperative dormitories, and women's fraternities. This is followed by the NADW's arguments and Dean Kirmse's efforts in acquiring campus buildings designated specifically for the needs and use of women students. Finally, I explore the arguments pertaining to deans of women's campus offices demonstrating the continual fight for the right of their own professional space. Along the way, I point to interesting reasonings, warrants, and claims that demonstrate the dean's navigation of changing socio-cultural and gender norms and their efforts to define and name women's place in higher education and their desired objectives.

The NADW Focus on Housing

While women had been granted the right to attend the same universities as men, fully accessing, assuming, and occupying a space on campus was a different story. The documental legacy of deans of women reveals their awareness of the impact, relevance, and significance of women occupying physical space on campus and heavily discussed the best methods to ensure that occupancy. This was especially true concerning space for women students to live on campus just as the men. In arguing for on-campus housing for women, deans of women not only sought the safety and security of their charges, but also recognized the rhetorical aspect such tangible spaces would supply as well. Permanent on-campus structures made the argument that women belonged on campus and were recognized as worthy and enduring members of the institution. As such, residential on-campus housing was an important topic of discussion since the deans first began meeting fourteen years before the NADW was organized.

As Mary Ross Potter pointed out in her 1926 history, from the very first Chicago meeting of eighteen Deans of Women in 1903 through to the organization of the NADW in 1917 and beyond, a major discussion on every agenda was the housing of women students and arguing for the value of having them live on campus in dorms or residence halls. “The question of housing of women students was then, as now,” she explains, “troubling the minds of the deans” (3). As fledgling coeducational universities began to spring up across the country, women students were most commonly housed in boarding houses or personal homes on the outskirts of campus while the few on-campus dormitories were reserved for male students. Thus, women were literally and physically relegated to the margins of campus having to leave their living quarters to visit the university by day only to return to its periphery at night.

With the few campuses with on-campus dormitories for women, the early deans meeting in 1903 already espoused the advantages. Quoting minutes from this early meeting, Potter explains how early deans of women were already arguing that residence halls served to unify women students, to elevate their friendships and “social life,” and to offer experiences that enhanced “social polish” (3). The early deans also claimed that students housed with families or in boarding houses are often required to work long hours for inadequate lodging while dormitories provided room and board “better adapted to women doing brain work” (Potter 3).

Among the deans of women gathering in these early conferences was Louis Kimball Mathews who would later write the 1915 groundbreaking study *The Dean of Women* (2). Based on her survey of deans, Mathews corroborates her colleagues claims that

> One of the most obvious as well as the most complex problems with which the dean of women has to deal is that of finding and keeping suitable living conditions for the women students under her care…The state universities, supported as they have always been by public taxation, have rarely made any effort to erect halls of residence; but where they have put up such a building, it has been for the young men. (40)

Following their 1922 conference, the NADW published a pamphlet titled *Eighth Annual Conference of Deans of Women: Papers Read Before Sectional Meeting*. This pamphlet would turn out to be the inaugural NADW conference yearbook. Understanding that these deans of women were treading on unfamiliar ground, the NADW recognized the worth of practical experiential knowledge and deans who have ventured forth and found success were invited to share their experience. The first "paper" included in this pamphlet is "Method of Obtaining Women's Dormitories at Kansas Educational Institutions" by Dean Ann Dudley Blitz of the University of Kansas where she shares the practical steps of her process obtaining on-campus housing for women. Its privileged placement in the pamphlet suggests that the NADW recognized that deans needed such an example of rhetorical strategy if they were to secure housing for their students.

Blitz opens her paper by lamenting the "little sentiment for dormitories in Kansas" arguing for the "unfavorable conditions in which the young women in state schools lived," something with which most other deans could relate. Blitz then proceeds to describe her ten-year effort to obtain on-campus residence halls: her messy and inventive methods of obtaining backing and funds, and her frustrating red-tape navigations with the Kansas Council, the Kansas Legislature, the university president, and the board of regents. "It was no small task to conduct the campaign, of course" she explains, "petitions, letters, and telegrams were called for from local constituents to

overcome opposition or stir the active interest of Legislative members. (2). Once a bill was introduced into the House of Representatives, it was met with "considerable" resistance (3). Blitz contends that this may be due to the fact that it was introduced "by a woman, had the support of all the women members, and was intended to be treated as a woman's measure" (3). After a "lively fight was made against it," Blitz shares that while it only passed after being reduced to half the initial amount, it was still deemed a reward for the "untiring" work that went into securing it (3).

Residential Housing for Women at the UA

As with other coeducational land grant universities, making space for women on campus was not a natural administrative inclination at the University of Arizona. In order to appreciate Dean Kirmse's experience and efforts, it is important to examine the historical context of women's housing at the UA. In her article, "The Founding of the University of Arizona," Margaret Mitchell explains that in the first few years after the University of Arizona first enrolled students in 1891, all "classrooms and living arrangements were makeshift" (23). While the bulk of students were local and lived at home, the regents approved a men's dormitory at the onset, yet financial problems postponed the groundbreaking. Men students subsequently boarded in the main building on campus and the few out-of-town women students were placed in spare rooms in the married faculty cottages (23). Mrs. L. A. Buell—the wife of a faculty member—supervised the young ladies (31). Mitchell explains that "The school furnished cots, but students brought their own mattresses, and pillows, towels, washbasins, pitchers, and slop jars" (24). She goes on to point out that "students ate with the faculty and their families in the dining room on the lower floor of Main" (24).

In 1895, four years after the inaugural year, the student body increased to one hundred students and a temporary "small wooden building" named Liberty Hall was built to accommodate the male students. Two years later, North Hall—a more permanent stone dormitory—was erected for male students (1903 UA Yearbook). This was followed by another men's dormitory built in 1899: a building eventually named Apache Hall (Cooper). In 1901, ten years after the university opened and after three men's dormitories had been built, North Hall was repurposed as a campus dining hall with some of the rooms being set aside for women students (1903 UA Yearbook). Within the following ten years, North Hall—an impressive two story, red brick men's dorm—was also constructed.

It was not until 1920—29 years after inauguration, 25 years after first men's dorm, and nine years before Dean Kirmse's arrival—that President Dr. Rufus B. von KleinSmid spoke with the governor about the university's need of a new women's dormitory and the UA broke ground for the construction of Maricopa Hall (Cooper). Even though women now made up nearly 40% of the student body at the UA, this would be the first building constructed on campus that was intended for them (1920 UA Yearbook). Up to this point, women students had lived in spare rooms, basements, refurbished and repurposed buildings, and in the corners of various faculty cottages. As historian Douglas D. Martin described, women students had been moved from one space to another, as "sort of waifs in a collegiate storm" (Cooper). Four men's dormitories had been constructed up to this point, and Cochise Hall, a fifth men's dormitory, would follow within the same year. It would be another seventeen years before two more dormitories were constructed for expressed use of women students—Gila and Yuma Halls in 1937—and this only after

years of Dean Kirmse's ongoing arguments and desperate community appeals seeking boarding rooms for the overflow of women students.

Dean Kirmse's Housing Dilemma

These community appeals—an act that would become an annual tradition— began soon after Dean Kirmse's arrival at the UA. They were most often published in the local newspaper, *The Arizona Daily Star*. While Kirmse does not write these articles, she is continually quoted and referenced by the staff writers as the source of information and her voice is noticeable within the text. In these articles, Dean Kirmse contends that the need for housing was most severe during the first month of the academic year before girls were accepted into sororities. She argues for the girls' competence and credibility as they are "registered girls who are eager to work" for their room and board, who are willing and able to compensate costs by "assisting with housework or in the care of children" or by offering clerical or sales work. ("Situations").

By 1934, Dean Kirmse's calls for community housing grew in intensity. In an August column published in the *Arizona Daily Star,* she explained that at the onset of the previous year, the women's dorm had housed 160 women even with its stated capacity of 113 students. This year, Dean Kirmse expected even more women student applicants ("Big Year"). Two months later, Dean Kirmse held a "news conference" where she explained "the dormitory situation" and argued for "community support" ("Housing Needed") Relayed in *The Arizona Daily Star* under the title "Housing Needed for Co-eds: Dean [Kirmse] Seeking New Quarters to Relieve Dormitory," Dean Kirmse's accompanying press release argued that

> Maricopa Hall has more than reached its capacity and every available inch of the sleeping porches and shared rooms has been taken. A few rooms even have been arranged in the basement of the building. No additional space is available on the campus and off-campus accommodations will have to be found.
> We ask that residents about the university who have available room for from one- to three or four girls get in touch with her at the dean of women's office. The girls will be permanent for the remainder of the year and placed only in homes where they could be happy and respect the regulations of the institution. ("Housing Needed")

The following September, Dean Kirmse found herself facing an even greater shortage of housing. After already placing more than one hundred women students in "in-town homes" over the previous week, Kirmse declared that "we have used up every approved room listed with us" and that 30 more girls will today have to be placed in town homes as all rooms on campus "are filled to the bursting point" ("Another Plea"). The Star article goes on to explain that while Dean Kirmse's office usually has 175 or 180 women applying for housing at this point, "as of 3:30 yesterday afternoon the office had 220 girls to care for with a long waiting line out from Co-ed cottage to the sidewalk." And this was just the first day of "freshmen registration." Upperclassmen were due to arrive the following week. Similar pleas for women's housing are found in *The Arizona Daily Star* during the late summer of 1936 as well ("Student Housing).

Research-Backed Arguments for Women's Housing

Dean Kirmse's annual scramble for women's housing was a familiar practice for many deans of women, and it was frustrating on several levels. While the rhetorical implications of women living on campus was significant, both the NADW and Dean Kirmse also witnessed and argued a clear relationship between housing and student academic success. The academic success of women students was of paramount

importance for the deans of women especially considering the harsh discriminatory accusations women had endured questioning their ability to succeed in education at the same pace and in the same environments as men.

Just as Dean Kirmse's housing problems were reaching a head and women students were dealing with housing issues not experienced by men, the *1936 NADW Conference Yearbook* published a "Summary of 1935 Investigations Relating to Work of the Dean." Within this summary is a short section titled "Adequate Housing Plans for Students," which argues for a clear "relation between student housing and university success" (69). After analyzing the records of 3,345 students, the committee contends that students living on campus in residence halls "were superior in scholarship" to those who lived off-campus in private homes (69). The academic success rate was even lower, they claim, for women students who roomed in community boarding houses (69). The committee concludes that on-campus housing not only lessens stress for students who do not need to deal with less stable and supportive environments, on-campus housing also serves as a source of education in its own right that enhances a student's academic education (70).

Dean Kirmse also saw the impact of inadequate living conditions play out in women student's academic success at the UA. In 1936, the UA received a Public Works Administration (PWA) federal loan-grant[6] for the construction two new women's dormitories: Gila and Yuma Halls (Cooper). In an interview published in *The Arizona*

[6] Public Works Administration grants were created as part of the Roosevelt's National Recovery Act during the Great Depression to aid in the building of public structures (National). It provided the funds for ten new UA buildings, which, according to Kirmse, was "a silver lining in the cloud of the Depression" (Report Drafts II).

Star in November 1936, titled “Crowding Hits Grade Records: Dean Reveals Difficulty of Study in Present Situation,” Dean Kirmse expresses her relief concerning plans for new women’s dormitories. She also warrants the construction with evidence she acquired through her own study of the toll overcrowded and unstable housing was having on the UA women student’s academic success. In the article, Dean Kirmse shares that nearly 50% of the women students who were living three to a room designed for two students had been placed “on the preliminary delinquent list for doing failing work.” Dean Kirmse argued that it was

> impossible for the women to do their studying under these conditions for the rooms are equipped for only two women, there being but two worktables, two chairs, two small closets and two chests of drawers. The third girl must use part of table, closet, and drawer space with the other girls and is almost a waif when it comes to studying for when two girls are at the tables the third one must take either to the day bed or an easy chair without writing conveniences. Two of the three girls sleep on the required sleeping porches and the third one sleeps in the room after the other two have decided to toddle off to bed. (“Crowding”)

Beyond the academic impact of sufficient on-campus housing, living in dormitories was recognized as a large part of the “college life” students sought out. Living on campus not only manifest student’s right to be at the university, it positioned occupants as members of a social and an intellectual community; a membership that had been denied to many women students at the UA. The UA students expressed the cultural value of dorm living themselves in descriptions found in the UA Yearbook.

As early as 1921, students at the UA already recognized that “dormitory life makes a most lasting impression upon a student” (“Dormitories” 161). In an introduction to the dormitory section in the 1921 UA Yearbook, the student author points out that a student’s “earliest idea of a university is that of a place where a large number of

congenial young people live and study" ("Dormitories 161). The author claims that once a student arrives on campus, the dormitory becomes "his home and the other students living there become his closest friends" ("Dormitories 161). "The dormitories," the writer continues, "have had an important part in infusing the loyal Arizona spirit." Dorm living, they continue, creates a strong sense of student pride and loyalty, it is the epitome of "college life," and a vital source of "many happy memories" ("Dormitories 161).

Considering Dean Kirmse's 1936 interview in *The Arizona Daily Star*, it is telling that she explicitly points out that since the PWA money was specifically granted for women's dormitories "none of it can or will be used for a dining hall" ("Crowding"). This comment suggests that Dean Kirmse may have experienced the frustration of bait-and-switch administrative tactics when, under the guise of greater import, funds had been shifted away from addressing the needs of women students. This frustration is most evident in Dean Kirmse's experience of establishing a cooperative dorm for women on the UA campus, a style of dormitory that both the NADW and Dean Kirmse valued for its role in providing more equitable financial access for women students.

The Cooperative Dorm: Creating Inclusive Living Spaces

Deans of Women were cognizant of the elements impeding women's access to on-campus housing. They realized that many families and women who desired to attend institutions of higher education may not have the option to attend. As a guiding principle, land-grant universities were to provide greater populations access to practical instruction, an idea which pushed against the notion that higher education was reserved for the upper-class only. Therefore, money was a common denominator in many administrative discussions on coeducational campuses. One of the concepts deans of women developed

in response to financial needs of students was the cooperative dormitory: a form of residential living where women student-occupants devoted a number of hours each week towards the operation and maintenance of the dormitory—e.g., services such as cleaning and cooking—in exchange for lower housing fees. As early as 1915, Louis Kimball Mathews recognized the need to help students willing to "work their way" to their college degree (78). In her book, *The Dean of Women*, she argues that

> The cooperative dormitory is becoming more and more a necessity for young women who are eager and earnest, serious-minded and able, but who, by dint of circumstances, have not the thing which should count least in getting an education—money. (78)

Mathews contends that state and land grant universities should be especially cognizant of such needs and seek out affordable housing options if those institutions are to fulfill their obligation of providing higher education "to every young man and young woman within their boundaries who has the desire and the ability to get it" (80).

It wasn't until the Great Depression hit approximately fifteen years later that Mathew's idea began to take hold among deans of women with greater force. In a talk titled "Cooperative Housing" published in the 1933 NADW Conference Yearbook, G.B. Franklin—the Dean of Women at Boston University—makes a strong case for providing women students with such an option. Addressing her colleagues, Franklin shares a study of prospective students her dean's office conducted several years earlier. She explains that they discovered "many high school girls [who] were graduating with honors," and even receiving scholarship offers from the AAUW, college clubs, and other local organizations. Yet, she posits, these girls were turning down the scholarships due to the anticipated additional costs of attending college. Franklin argues that her study revealed

that “having been brought up in the more rural communities,” these girls considered themselves unqualified for finding part-time work in college towns (111). “However,” argues Franklin, since “this type of girl has usually been brought up to take an active part in home management and housework, she would feel very much at home in a cooperative dormitory.” Therefore, she contends, cooperative dormitories are an excellent way to “reduce the cost of education for the individual student” (111).

The topic of providing cooperative living options for students must have been important to the NADW executive board because Franklin’s talk is immediately followed by a second testimony and rhetorical blueprint for acquiring such a dorm. In her talk, “Cooperative Dormitories at Northwestern University,” Florence Schee Robnett shares her experience setting up a cooperative dormitory. After explaining her methods and structure and management decisions, Robnett claims that the only obstacle standing in the way of a successful cooperative dormitory is “the social system of a university campus” that places a stigma on frugal living (114). While the sorority system contributes to this stigma, claims Robnett, the fear of “social snobbery” may be more firmly rooted in the minds of the cooperative dorm residents rather than in the attitudes and actions of their peers, especially during the current “financial strain” of the nation (114). Overall, Robnett argues, the value of cooperative living claiming that “the social life in these dormitories is a happy one [and] no girl need feel apologetic with a social life as varied and interesting as is found in cooperative dormitories” (115).

Dean Kirmse’s Cooperative Dormitory

The same year these talks were presented at the NADW Conference, Dean Kirmse also had her sights on establishing a cooperative dormitory for women at the UA.

While the 1925 UA Yearbook mentions an early attempt at a cooperative dormitory system for women students; the plan was abandoned after the first semester due to the lack of sufficient facilities (Cooper 161). It would be four more years before Dean Kirmse would arrive and another four before she successfully established such a dorm.

In a 1933 administrative report justifying her course of action, Dean Kirmse explains that after her arrival, she quickly noticed that "there were many girls unable to remain in the University, or to return from the previous years because of the financial difficulty and the lack of opportunities for employment." Dean Kirmse points out that 'for some time [she] had been making a study of cooperative houses in operation on other campuses" and had discovered that "Coeds faced even worse odds than their boy friends" since much of the available work on campus "was completely off limits for females" (Report Drafts).

In discussing her experiences to architectural historian James Cooper years later, Kirmse claims that her interest in such an endeavor grew exponentially after attending the 1932, NADW Conference held in Detroit. Knowing that the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor was one of a few coeducational institutions offering cooperative dormitories for women, Kirmse explains that she took extra time to tour the facility and discuss the project with the local dean of women. After returning to Tucson, she immediately went to work seeking approval and making arrangements at the UA (Cooper). The following year, in 1933, Pima Hall—a small, hand-me-down dormitory/dining hall formally known as the men's North Hall—opened as "a new experiment" of cooperative living for thirty women ("Pima Hall").

Looking back at the experience, Kirmse posits that she had to be financially creative in setting up the cooperative dormitory having only received one-hundred and fifty dollars "to furnish the kitchen" (Cooper). This was a limited budget even in 1933. She points out that the first thing she purchased was a "second-hand wood refrigerator [that] had to be fed huge chunks of ice daily" and the drip pan "emptied religiously each night" to prevent flooding (MS 460). She goes on to explain that

> Their dining tables consisted of boards stretched across sawhorses, camouflaged with the cheapest obtainable cotton damask cloths from Penney's. Old-fashioned wooded folding chairs salvaged from Buildings and Grounds had to be positioned carefully lest they collapse without warning to dump visiting dinner guests unceremoniously onto the hard uncarpeted floor. Table silver from the dime store at ten cents each shared honors with dishes of comparable quality purchased at special prices from cooperating Tucson merchants, not only glad to make even discount sales in a slow market, but honestly anxious to help. Banana split dishes the China department at Steinfeld's had been unable to move became bargain pickle and jelly servers. After student cooks had emptied their first cotton flour sacks, dish towels became available to dry the hand-washed dishes. Wrestling with the ancient cookstove, addicted to explosions in the midst of meal preparation, and keeping the bare wooden kitchen floor scrubbed clean enough to pass inspection contributed rather to togetherness rather than frustration (Report Drafts).

Even with her depictions of compromise and hard work, Kirmse's pride is evident as she describes the "heart appeal" the local community had for Pima Hall. Tucson residents, she recalls, as well as members of faculty and administration continually dropped off produce and kitchen staples. Dean Kirmse notes that even President Shantz "would bring back to Pima fruit as well as lettuce" he acquired at roadside stands. "It seemed," declared Dean Kirmse, "the whole town and campus were interested" (Report Drafts).

Dean Kirmse also worked with the dietician in the home economics department to create healthy and frugal menus for the students and chose a student who was a home economics major to fill the position of "house manager" (Cooper). This extra effort, Kirmse argues, was worth the time because while food became scarce during the Depression, "the girls were getting all they needed," which couldn't be said for all students at the UA (Cooper).

Published the following year, the 1934 UA yearbook reported the Pima Hall cooperative dormitory "a glorious success [that] has helped keep many a worthy girl in school" (213). The article goes on to point out that "the plan was so successful that girls must apply for the rooms in the hall in advance" (213). This success was attributed to the strong organization and the work ethics of the women students. "Each girl" the writer explains, "had a particular duty to perform. Some did housework, some cooked, others performed still other duties. From time to time the assignments were shifted, so that all got experience in several fields" (213). This extra cooperative effort "allowed the girls to live for the exceedingly low amount of fifteen dollars a month" (213). The yearbook passage closes by attributing "much of the success of the movement" to the managing sponsor, Dean Kirmse (213).

Respect for the cooperative dorm was noted in descriptive passages included in the next several yearbooks. In 1935, the Pima Hall women were declared "more Greek than the Greeks" and described as "Living in semi-seclusion in a grey stone house, these girls maintained, by their own work, an organization which enables them to go through the school year with a minimum of expense and a maximum of pleasure" (195). In 1936, the Pima Hall women were praised for their heightened sense of "domesticity" and active

participation “in both social and sport life” (167). While such accolades of success continued over the years, a brief caption placed under Dean Kirmse’s photograph in the 1939 yearbook revealed that “This year her greatest struggle was directed against efforts to abolish Pima Hall, one of her favorite projects.” (11).

Homer LeRoy Shantz had held the position of the UA president for all of Dean Kirmse’s tenure at the UA thus far. He had hired Dean Kirmse and had been a source of consistent support. When Shantz left in 1937 to pursue research interests, Paul S. Burgess, the Dean of Agriculture, served as interim president for less than a year followed by the appointment of Alfred Atkinson. Within weeks of Atkinson’s arrival, Kirmse recalls being invited into his office where he informed her that “the girls in the cooperative Pima Hall would have to move;” Atkinson was giving Pima Hall to the Business and Public Administration College for offices and classrooms (Cooper). Kirmse understood that “he meant that the cooperative unit would be abolished” (Cooper). Not willing to walk away from a successful operation that served the needs of so many women students, Kirmse recalled “prevail[ing] upon the administration to permit us to rent a building” so that they might “continue the operation.” After several weeks, Dean Kirmse was given the approval and eventually secured a building just off campus owned by the Dean of Men’s wife (Cooper). The cooperative dormitory operated in this off-campus building for the next two years.

In 1939, Dean Kirmse received a surprising telephone call. She recalled President Atkinson asking her “if I could build a building to care for those girls for $40,000 (Cooper). Kirmse’s response was ‘You get the money, and we’ll do it.” Kirmse explains that she did not know where Atkinson found the money. She knew that universities “can

legally use money left over from other buildings for a legitimate purpose," but she never asked. "I was so glad to get the money," she declared, "I didn't care where it came from" (Cooper).

Dean Kirmse immediately called her secretary, filled her in, and said, "Don't make any appointments for me until we get going on this." In a bold move, she then "got out a T-square and a ruler and a lot of pencils and started to work on the floor plans" (Cooper). Kirmse argues that "by that time, I had worked enough with other buildings to know" the basics of what was required architecturally and what was needed by the students. After collaborating with her staff, Dean Kirmse explains that she confidently took her drafts to the architect. All that was needed, she claims, was a few final "adjustments and changes" (Cooper).

In an interview published in *The Arizona Daily Star* article, Dean Kirmse pointed out that she and her building committee worked with the architect and builders every step of the way ("RFC"). After convincing Atkinson of her ability and important perspective, Dean Kirmse had formed the building committee herself. It consisted of the assistant dean of women, a graduate alumnus of Pima Hall, and two current student occupants ("RFC"). Such a move demonstrates Dean Kirmse's attitude that women were capable and had the authority to determine their own best living conditions on campus and her efforts to make sure their experience and desires were considered.

Deans' Voice in Architectural Plans

Kirmse's confidence in stepping into the position of novice architect and designer of the women's cooperative dormitory reflected years of NADW conversations arguing for that right and for the invaluable perspective deans of women have in determining

women's spaces on campus. As early as the 1925 NADW Conference, deans were espousing the value of their perspective in designing material spaces for women on campus.

In a talk published in the 1925 NADW Yearbook titled simply "Residence Halls," Mrs. Julius O. Schlotterbeck of the University of Michigan acknowledged that an architect may know more about "materials, ventilating systems, the proportions of pleasing rooms, proportions of spaces to openings, and so on;" yet, she asked her colleagues, "who knows more about the social and intellectual sides of the life of the girls at a college than the dean of women?" (133). While "she has not the technical knowledge" concerning plans and specifications, Scholtterbeck argues, a dean of women "can read plans and understand buildings" and better understand "the life of the girls" than any man on or off campus if only she had the opportunity to learn (133).

In a NADW booklet titled "Relationships in the Performance of Personal Duty" compiled by the Research Committee approximately seven years later, the committee shares their findings from a study surveying "planning committees" involved in the design and construction of women's dormitories at twelve institutions[7]. They found that two-thirds of these committees included the institution's dean of women who made valuable contributions to the projects (40). The committee argues that deans of women should have a seat at the table when women's living conditions are discussed and planned. Consulting a range of experts each offering unique perspectives, they warrant,

---

[7] While this NADW booklet is undated, the cited publications were published between 1925-1932, so it is assumed that the booklet was published soon thereafter.

would result in dormitories "more perfect from the standpoint of their educational functions as well as their architectural structure" (*Relationships* 40).

The NADW not only promoted deans of women involvement in the design and construction of women's spaces and dormitories on campus, they also provided deans with practical training and support to help them succeed. Around the same time that the NADW Research Committee published their survey on dormitory planning committees, the 1932 NADW executive board commissioned respected Boston architect I. Howland Jones to compile a booklet that would eventually be titled "The Planning of Girls Dormitories with Drawings Illustrating Several Types." Jones opens the booklet by stating that "the design of a dormitory for a girl's school or college is an architectural problem which calls for the most skillful planning, and its arrangement both from an architectural and a practical standpoint requires very careful consideration" ("The Planning" 1). He then fills the next five pages with a survey of practical advice and descriptions of everything needing consideration when building a dormitory. This includes Jones' recommendations on the size of rooms, corridors, and eating areas. It includes requirements concerning "toilet room" facilities precisely down to the number of stalls, showers, and mirrors needed in each floor's restroom ("The Planning" 2). He lays out in detail his recommendations concerning bedrooms: the size of windows and closets and the best placement of light switches and "double plug receptacles" ("The Planning" 2). Jones finally closes with what he deems as "the most important consideration in designing buildings of this sort," which is "a domestic and homelike quality" ("The Planning" 5).

> The building should contain the usual comforts and facilities found in any well-designed home, but above all it should have a character both inside and out which a girl will remember with pleasure and affection when she looks back on her school and college life. ("The Planning" 5)

Jones follows these written recommendations with twelve pages of attractive architectural sketches of dormitories along with examples of detailed floorplans.

By providing NADW members with this beginner's manual of dormitory architecture, the 1932 NADW executive committee were acting on Schlotterbeck's 1925 argument that, with training, deans of women were both important and capable voices in the planning and design of women's on-campus housing. As Dean Kirmse was serving on executive NADW committees and boards surrounding the publication of architect Jones' guide, she would have had easy access to the information. It would have offered her and her fellow deans of women the basic knowledge and the language with which to engage in meaningful conversations concerning the design of women's living spaces on campus. It would have provided Dean Kirmse with seeds of confidence in sharing her perspective and recommendations when working on the building committee of the 1937 build of Gila and Yuma Halls; and it would have readied her to get out her pencils and begin sketching a new cooperative dormitory after that 1939 phone call from President Atkinson. This resource of information would have also given Dean Kirmse and other deans a foundation on which to stand when pushing back against attempts to patronize or disregard their requests.

Such masculine patronization is apparent in a personal experience Kirmse chose to record in her UA history notes. Within her anecdote, Kirmse strategically depicts her experience to demonstrate the absurdity of men presuming to know women's

architectural needs and preferences. She explains that when construction was to begin on Gila and Yuma Halls in 1936, President Shantz who had helped secure the PWA funding had just retired, so Dean Kirmse was left to work with interim president, Paul Burgess. Kirmse clearly expressed her frustration in working with President Burgess even though he held the position for less than a year. According to Kirmse, President Burgess was a misogynist who did not approve of women students on campus (Cooper). Kirmse posited that as the former Dean of the College of Agriculture, he repeatedly complained that “he didn’t see why they wanted to spend as much as $150,000 to build a dormitory when all that money could be used for Agriculture” (Cooper).

In this particular anecdote, Kirmse describes a time when she met with Burgess and the planning committee to discuss concerns she had regarding the lack of bathtubs in the original architectural drawings for the new dormitories. Feeling strongly that there should be at least one bathroom equipped with bathtub per floor, Dean Kirmse made her case before Burgess, the architect, and several other men. According to Kirmse, Burgess immediately pushed back claiming that he “couldn’t see any reason to spend any more money on the plumbing.” Seeing that she was not backing down, Kirmse explains that he then “fervently” proclaimed, “You can’t tell me there’s any girl on this campus who needs to take a bath more than once a week” (Cooper). Kirmse describes a silence that followed such a preposterous claim. The silence finally gave way to several chuckles and a mix of odd expressions. Kirmse explained that she “was aghast.” Finally, she states, the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds stopped laughing long enough to say, “‘I hate to tell you this, but some of these girls take more than one shower a day, especially when they come home from the athletic field’” (Cooper). Kirmse explains that her argument

prevailed, they ended up getting their bathtubs, "and we all thought it was wonderful" (Cooper).

Constructing Space for Women through Fraternities/Sororities

Concerning the housing of students at coeducational institutions, the history and impact of women's fraternities[8] is closely entwined with on-campus residential housing. Both living situations were supervised and regulated at some level by deans of women; and both were matters often discussed in national and local conversations. Deans of women relied on fraternity housing for a good portion of women students. They also wrestled with the resulting social hierarchies among the students. Beyond simply a means of housing women students, the organization of women's fraternities were another means by which women students could take charge of constructing their own spaces on campus. The origin story of women's fraternities adds important context to the deans' efforts regarding them.

On the evening of January 27, 1870, as temperatures dipped well below freezing outside, four young women at Asbury College in Greencastle, Indiana, met in a darkened room and ceremoniously created a new secret society: Kappa Alpha Theta, the first known women's fraternity (Turk 13). Up to this point, women students at Asbury—like most women attending newly converted coeducational campuses—had experienced

[8] Turk notes an interesting and relevant detail concerning the use of "fraternity" and "sorority" (165). As she explains, women's Greek societies founded before the turn of the twentieth century were recognized as women's "fraternities" rather than as sororities. The word "sorority" did not exist until 1882. The word itself was the creation of a male Latin professor at Syracuse University who suggested that women students needed a separate and more 'feminine' name for their associations. While acceptance of the new term initially spread to campuses across the country, in 1915, Kappa Alpha Theta alumni argued that the legitimate term fraternity came from "an abstract feminine Latin noun," which applies the concept of brotherhood to both men and women, and since 'soror,' was man-made and incorrect, they were to avoid its use (Turk 165) For a short period of time, most major women's Greek societies also re-claimed the use of fraternity before eventually falling back into the pattern of "sorority."

strong and often hostile resistance to their presence. Male students and faculty had launched campaigns arguing that women's presence "would soil Asbury's reputation and endanger its national stature" (Turk 16). They also issued an ultimatum calling for the removal of women under the threat of a mass withdrawal of men students (Turk 16). Having been insulted, criticized, ignored, and derided, the women students sought to prove their critics wrong. As Betty Locke Hamilton, one of the four founders of Kappa Alpha Theta, would later recall, "somehow we realized that we were not going to college just for ourselves—but for all the girls who would follow, if we could just win out." (Turk 18).

Forming their own clubs and fraternities was one strategy for arguing their space on campus and proving their academic ability. It was also necessary for them to take matters into their own hands as most organized activities and clubs on campus were not available to women students simply because they were women.

In her history *Bound by a Mighty Vow: Sisterhood and Women's Fraternities, 1870-1920,* Diana B. Turk offers a rich depiction of women's fraternities on coeducational campuses over their first fifty years. She explains that men's collegiate fraternities were first organized in the late eighteenth century and quickly grew to at least forty-eight official men's fraternities each with multiple chapters on multiple college campuses by 1870 (3). As coeducational institutions began to form, women's exclusion from such organizations became more apparent and more intentional and rhetorical. While there were only approximately 11,000 women students in post-secondary education in 1870, this number was growing exponentially, and the resistance was strong (Solomon 58). Very few clubs or organizations existed on campuses for women; and, as

Turk argues, women forming the first fraternity in 1870 was their way of pushing against the hostilities they continually faced on coeducational campuses and make a space for themselves academically, socially, and physically on campus (2). These women students also recognized their need for one another's support in navigating the often-hostile terrain on coed campuses and in proving their academic competency and potential to learn alongside men and at the same pace. Between 1870 and 1920, the number of nationally recognized Greek societies for women increased to twenty-one involving roughly thirty percent of the women student population (Turk 166).

The organization Greek societies and the University of Arizona align with Turk's overview of national trends. Three men's fraternities—the Delta Phi, the Epsilon Pi Eta, and the Theta Nu Epsilon—were organized within the UA's first ten years (Walker). It would be another five years before Gamma Phi Sigma, the UA's first women's fraternity, would be established in 1916 ("Gamma Phi"). By the time Dean Kirmse arrived at the UA five years later, women's fraternity houses would become instrumental in helping her deal with the severe housing problems for women students. However, as attitudes within and about Greek life evolved from its inaugural generation onward, the relationship between deans of women and Panhellenic[9] organizations became complicated and uneasy.

As in other academic situations for women college students, the second generation of Greek society sisters no longer carried the weight of breaking new ground and proving women's ability to succeed and thrive on coed campuses. Therefore, the goals and actions of women's fraternities turned along with the twentieth century (Turk

[9]Panhellenic is the umbrella term for the national organizations of women's Greek societies.

43). No longer serving as societies dedicated to supporting and assisting fellow women students in staking their claim and standing their ground on coed campuses, women's fraternities became social entities, concentrating more time and effort on the social and extracurricular college life than on academic success. Where the first generation of women's fraternities based their membership criteria on measurements of scholarship and discipline, twentieth century societies pledged members according to appearance, social class, and "ephemeral social graces" (Turk 73).

This shift in attitude both mirrored and encouraged campus cultural changes that were already taking place on coed campuses. As access widened and middle-class students were enrolling alongside those from more affluent families, social class distinctions were becoming more apparent and more purposeful on campuses. This was happening both in and out of Greek social systems. This inimical attitude is manifest in bold language within a unique section of editorial and mockery tucked into the end of the 1922 UA Yearbook titled "Fraternities""

> Fraternities are an excuse for ambitious and aspiring students to get into society and politics. If a fellow has lots of money, they take it all—if he has none, they don't even take him. The fraternity folk trip over the campus with their aristocratic beaks extended upwards, and they gaze into the azure heavens like a butler in the movies. They never see anyone except their own fraternity brothers or sisters and when one of them crosses their path, their noses come down, they whisper, they gossip, they slap one another on the back until each coughs a slight dissipated cough. Here is the main office of the gossip factory. This is the only way fraternities cooperate with each other. If it were not for fraternities, there would be no gossip, and if it were not for fraternities there would be no need for gossip. Each helps the other.
> A little Barbarian from North Hall just about described fraternities when she made a few statements just after sorority bids had come out. "Prat people are conceited and selfish and stuck up and snobs and big heads and bone heads and boobs, so there, 1 didn't want a bid anyway. My mother wouldn't let me join if I wanted

> to." It is true a fraternity does have a bad effect sometimes, especially on a Frosh. You can pick them out every time. They immediately feel apart from the ordinary boys of the dorms and they don't have to strain themselves to show it. (259)

These shifts in fraternity values and goals added to the somewhat difficult relationship between women fraternity members and deans of women. This first generation was determined and focused on constructing space for themselves on university campuses and in university systems. Turk notes that many of the first generation of fraternity sisters—women who were bound to one another in their determined and focused quest of proving their scholarly mettle—went on to accept positions as deans of women for the next generation. The disparity between the first generational values of creating spaces for women and proving their mettle within those spaces and the second generational values of freedom and agency within those spaces, Turk points out, complicated the relationship between the deans of women, the fraternity members, and the national Panhellenic organizations (3). This discord is readily apparent in the NADW conference discussions and in Dean Kirmse's professional documents.

NADW Discussions Concerning Women's Fraternities/Sororities

As early members of women's fraternities, and as administrators often desperate to arrange housing for women students, deans of women recognized the value of the Greek societies. However, deans also witnessed the subsequent evolution of elitism in the form of class discrimination, exclusivity, and competition. Depending on one aspect of Greek societies while discouraging others made for a complicated and uneasy relationship. This is readily apparent in the NADW writings and discussions as early as Louis Kimball Mathews' 1915 observations. Recognizing that the "'fraternity house' was an obvious solution" to the practical and vital necessity of finding suitable room and

board for women students and a valuable environment for social education, in very strong terms Mathews also warns of the “vulgarity and folly” often demonstrated by the girls during the season of rushing as well as frivolous behavior such as

> Putting on one’s best clothes before breakfast that the freshman daughter of some well-to-do business man [sic] may be duly impressed with the prosperity of a society, of spending money day after day on drives and dances, is as nauseating as it is incredible and worthless. It gives a wrong emphasis at the beginning, it sounds a false note, and it brings down the wrath and unsparing criticism of a whole State. (67)

Subsequent NADW Conference talks published over the first decade of conference yearbooks demonstrate that navigating this bumpy relationship with Greek societies remained a point of discontent for some time.

Included in the 1922 NADW Conference pamphlet are two talks that demonstrate the NADW’s interest in improving women student’s relationships Greek societies. First, Lillian W. Tompson, the National Panhellenic Delegate for Gamma Phi Beta, presents “The Future of Sororities from a Panhellenic Standpoint.” Since Tompson was not a dean of women, her appearance suggests that the NADW executive board went out of their way to include her perspective and encourage an attitude of collaboration on the part of the NADW members. Within her talk, Tompson praises the national fraternity organization’s work establishing national policies that increase campus fraternity friendliness, promote wholesome activities, and discourage behavior unbecoming of a Greek society (15). She also explains new systems of national offices and delegates that visit and monitor student activity within the society. “Every difficulty that comes before a dean of women, comes also before a national fraternity officer,” she claims, “only it comes to her from every quarter of the United States and in the most varied forms” (16).

Tompson ends by espousing the benefits of the fraternity house both for the girls and for the institution in both providing much needed housing and in the education of participating in a social system of living (16).

Offering the perspective of a dean of women, Mary Ross Potter, Dean of Women at Northwestern University, argues what she sees as the "Future of Sororities" on coed campuses.

She opens stating the situation deans face:

> When the colleges, having provided the best instruction possible, considered their obligation fulfilled, there was great need especially for women, who were none too welcome, of help in providing suitable housing and right conditions of social life, and the sorority was created out of a very real need. It met that need well. (18)

She then contends that the sororities have "changed in their nature" (18). While they still provide needed housing, provide space for friendships to flourish, provide opportunities of leadership, she argues, she then turns to ask whether they are "measuring up entirely to their opportunity for service to college women either within or without their ranks" (18). Potter then warns her fellow deans of the separation of social classes promoted by sorority rushing and, comparing the effect to private and public elementary schools, she explains the consequences when people of different backgrounds and incomes are divided rather than working alongside one another and learning from one another (18). While Potter recognizes the benefits and the good within the sorority system, she also warns against the group thinking they promote: the emphasis of the group at the expense of the campus at large, [over] the individual in the group, [and] at the expense of the girl outside" (19).

Eight years later, the deans were still discussing best practices for working with the Greek societies on campus. The 1930 NADW Conference included an organized "Institute Discussion" wherein approximately 25 deans gathered to discuss "Sororities: Their Place in Campus Life" ("Institute" 188). Dean Kirmse happened to serve as scribe for the discussion therefore choosing what details of the discussion to include in the conference yearbook report.

In her report, Dean Kirmse suggests that the conversation was an "interesting and stimulating exchange of experiences and ideas" ("Institute" 188). She particularly notes an "interesting…trend of sympathy" as the deans questioned the high level of "close supervision and regulation under which the sororities have been brought" ("Institute" 188). Dean Kirmse also describes the deans' discussion concerning the spirit of snobbishness and exclusivity fostered within sororities that countered the deans' attempts towards "a wholesome and democratic spirit" among women students ("Institute" 188). However, the deans also acknowledged that heavy handed attempts to regulate such tendencies had only "set up additional artificial barriers" (188). In what Dean Kirmse considered "the most interesting and significant portion of the meeting," the deans encouraged one another to consider how "sororities can and should be a constructive force on the campus" and that they can assist the dean in housing, student government, and administration as long as "the spirit of the group is developed to emphasize university spirit rather than individual chapter spirit" ("Institute" 188).

The following year, 1933, Dean Kirmse would present a paper at the NADW conference that was published in the Conference Yearbook titled "Sororities" wherein she argued another troubling turn in Greek societies: "a current emergency peculiar to

present conditions" of the national economic depression (107). Acknowledging that the original creation of these societies was meant to make space for women on campus and to validate their worthy occupation of that space, Dean Kirmse draws attention to a significant turn of expression within Greek societies: women students were no longer "'joining a sorority' but 'joining a house'" with the emphasis becoming more strongly placed on the "four walls and a roof" (107). Naming the context of the Great Depression in which they were living, Dean Kirmse calls out "the lavish housing costs of fraternity housing [which was] now bearing down on the students" (107). Contrasting "the old days," Dean Kirmse posits that sorority competition is no longer intent on drawing the finest girls into the society but for attracting "any girl who has sufficient money" (108). Dean Kirmse argues the financial and social implications of this shift by sharing the findings of a study she conducted of the Greek societies at the UA. Her study involved a close examination of all house financial budgets and anonymous questionnaires submitted by all sorority juniors and seniors (109).

Based on her findings, Dean Kirmse argues that women students are torn; they are loyal and affectionate towards their charters, yet they also recognize barriers their membership creates for developing outside friendships and a connection to the university as a whole (109). Women sorority members also described the constant worry of financial obligations of affording what Dean Kirmse calls the "short-lived luxury" of being able to boast the finest houses (107). Dean Kirmse concludes by recognizing the values found within Greek societies—including housing, leadership development, and self-government opportunities—yet also argues for deans to place more pressure on national organizations to stop the celebration of lavish lifestyles and housing lest, she

warns, the societies will actually limit women student's access to spaces at the university rather than create them (110). Negotiating for more affordable and equitable access to spaces specifically designed and designated for women on campus was a constant argument for deans of women.

NADW Women Student Buildings

Deans consistently argued that designating stable and permanent spaces on campus wherein women students could live was a practical necessity which would allow them to better focus on studies and succeed intellectually alongside men. They also argued that on-campus housing was paramount in demonstrating women's permanence on campus, that their enrollment was not considered an "experiment" or a terminable invitation. Yet, deans of women realized early on that establishing material spatial equity for women students and administers on campus extended far beyond residential housing. The construction of other buildings on campus specifically designed for and devoted to women students was not only rhetorical as expressions of permanence and belonging but also served practical needs. As early as 1925, members of the NADW were arguing for student buildings for women and organizing discussions on their value and calling for testimonials where deans of women would share their experiential knowledge in acquiring them. One such group discussion titled "Student Buildings" took place at the 1925 NADW Conference where several deans described their experience and offered their advice. As with other rhetorical efforts to define and establish women's place and spaces on coeducational campuses, this discussion offers a glimpse into the messiness of unsettled and transitioning gender ideologies and values concerning the purpose and goals of women's education.

Irma Voigt of Ohio State was the first to argue for the value of a women's student building in how it not only offers women students needed space on campus but also allows space for what she deemed as proper and valuable social education beyond simple academics. "If education does anything for a person," she posits,

> it should give him[10] a higher appreciation of the beautiful things in the way of home surroundings, art, music; it should give him a different attitude toward people; it should give him a different respect for his own powers of self-expression, and also for his own obligations in the matter of the self-expression of other people. (136)

Voigt claims that such a space is needed on campus that can afford and generate opportunities for young women to learn the finer attributes of living which have "lasting merit" (137). For, as Voigt claimed, women students should hone certain skills of the "hostess" in order to fulfill their most likely roles and contributions to "community life" (137).

Voigt's testimonial is followed by two more talks. First is a lengthy presentation by Florence Goodspeed in which she shares her practical experience gaining the funding and erecting such a woman's building at Chicago University (141). Goodspeed also makes a point to emphasize the role interior design has in influencing the social education of friendliness, grace, and style (141). Goodspeed goes into detail on including the furnishings, rugs, and artwork representative of a fine home and how such a space would influence and inspire women students in seeking and establishing the same in the years beyond academia. This is followed by a third presentation wherein Jean Hamilton of the University of Michigan testifies that such buildings are not only "the biggest

---

[10] Using the masculine pronoun when referring to women was a common rhetorical practice in much of the writing up to this point in time.

unifying force" for women on campus, they are also the best environment for the "all-around" social training that women students need for life after the university (148).

Acquiring the UA Women's Building

Still working at George Washington University as the secretary to the Dean of Women in 1925, it is unclear whether Dean Kirmse attended that year's NADW Conference and the discussion on "Student Buildings;" however, her boss—Dean Anna L. Rose—is listed among the conference attendees and likely would have received the conference yearbook in which the discussion was published. Whether this yearbook is where Dean Kirmse first gained an appreciation for women's campus buildings is unclear, but evidence of that value is not.

In Dean Kirmse's "Annual Report to the President for the year 1930-31"—the second year of her tenure at the University of Arizona—Dean Kirmse boldly proclaims the need for a "building used as a women's center" ("Annual" 20). Her argument for this building is logical and initially does not reflect any particular hold on essentialist feminine values or needs. Dean Kirmse points to the lack of space afforded women on campus, space specifically established and designated to meet the needs of both women students and administrators. The women students living off campus, she argues, need an on-campus "dressing room and lavatory" for practical purposes ("Annual" 20). They also need a permanent and concrete spaces to meet as committees and councils, to hold "Social Fundamentals laboratory meetings"—a significant component of the women student's orientation program—as well as other events where they currently must scour and scavenge campus spaces unused or unreserved for other needs ("Annual" 21). Dean

Kirmse also contends that such a building should also include “a suitably arranged suite for the Dean of Women’s offices (“Annual” 21).

Dean Kirmse’s argument was eventually effective, for within five years such a building was constructed. In her notes of history written years later, Kirmse explains that she eventually altered her argument to appeal to the social biases of her audience of men that occupied administrative offices and the board of regents. She explains that her final winning “talking point” was that a women’s center could also “provide a social center on campus,” drawing students back to campus from the public “social halls with their built-in bars and inadequate social controls.” She suggests that her most convincing argument was that the women’s building would provide greater control over women students and protection against what was deemed immoral behavior (UA 460.16 “Kirmse History”).

By appealing to the mindset of her audience, Dean Kirmse received approval for the building. Once it was built, Kirmse would recall that “the whole facility became the home of women” on campus (Penned Reflections). The established social spaces became centers where students were encouraged to properly mingle and socialize, and where they could be monitored as they did so (Penned Reflections”). Kirmse explains that, most importantly, “For the first time, the women now had a building designed primarily for their use, not a hand-me-down vacated by the boys for newer and better quarters” (Penned Reflections). The UA Women’s Building included rooms for instruction and conferencing, a new lunch counter equipped with “a second-hand soda fountain and operator” providing “‘drug-store’ lunches, sandwiches, etc.” (Penned Reflections). Moreover, the facility included a gym floor restricted for use of women students only, which “did not have to double in brass for dances and meetings” and a “modern

swimming pool" exclusively for women (Penned Reflections). Most significant for Kirmse, was that this facility named and designated for the UA women was "located at the very heart of the campus" (Penned Reflections).

Kirmse considered the completion of the Women's Building as one of her "major achievements" (Penned Reflections). However, while the original concept for the Women's Building included offices for the Dean of Women staff, more space was devoted for women's PE than originally anticipated. Dean Kirmse and her staff were still without a permanent space on campus: a telling inconvenience that had vexed the UA deans of women since the position was first created.

Arguing for Space for Deans of Women on Campus

As Bledstein had noted, during this time when "professions" were being claimed, argued, and constructed to validate positions of expertise, there were certain criteria and symbols that distinguished professionals and separated them from "laymen and inexperienced practitioners" (98). One such symbol of distinction and respect was a permanent office (98). Deans of women and the NADW recognized this and strongly encouraged deans of women to not only secure their own permanent space on campus, but also argued the rhetorical nature of that space. As with women student's spaces on campus, the arguments concerning office design and décor demonstrate the dean's own somewhat conflicting ideas and feelings on what they brought to the administrative table and how they wanted to be seen.

In "The Dean's Desk," a presentation included in the 1927 NADW Conference Yearbook, Virginia Judy Esterly shares her experience in setting up her office at Berkley. She argues that the dean's physical office is more than just four walls, that each dean

"builds with bricks of her own making an edifice not standardized in design nor materials and limited seriously only be her own limitations" (77). Esterly points out that "the office, like the job, will be like unto the dean herself;" and that within this space, deans of women have the opportunity to determine and construct the identity she will present to the public. This identity, Esterly acknowledges, is complex and at times paradoxical. The office, she attests, should contain all elements that would ensure the happiness of the dean occupying it, present her in a personable light, and create a friendly atmosphere. The office should include fine furnishings and artwork mixed with a few personalized mementos that reveal the dean's unique personality (78). However, the office should also include what Esterly considers to be "standard requirements:" an outer office for the secretary and filing cabinets, lots of filing cabinets. According to Esterly, while the secretary is both practical and professionally aesthetic, it is the filing cabinets that best represent and determine the dean's sphere of administrative authority (81). If the dean of women is to be recognized as the lead administrator of women student's affairs on campus and be able to fulfill such a role, her office needs to contain relevant and pressing information about the women students. It is up to the dean, Esterly posits, to build relationships with the different departments and offices on campus and convince them of her right to copies of the various student documents (81). Esterly suggests these files cabinets should include student personal, health, financial, housing, activity, and academic records as well as the dean's professional reports and documentation. Inadvertently demonstrating the paradox of which she spoke, Esterly also recommends that these file cabinets should be placed out of the way so not to interfere with the office's tasteful and feminine décor (81). Esterly also urges that the dean's office must

be located in the Administration Building, "both for the proximity to scholastic and financial records and for its own dignified presence with the other administrative offices" (79).

In Search of Dean Kirmse's Office

While Esterly and other NADW members spoke of the importance of establishing a permanent and professional office, Dean Kirmse's experience demonstrates how difficult acquiring a permanent office was for many deans of women. The removal of Dean Kirmse's offices from the UA Women's Building plans exemplifies a somewhat flippant attitude that the spatial needs of deans of women were not taken seriously by other administrators, and deans of women were often called to make do with leftover and hand-me-down spaces: an apt rhetorical representation of the dismissal and exclusion they had to deal with as women working in masculine administrations.

In September of 1937, the year following the opening of the new Women's Building on campus, *The Arizona Star* published a column titled "Dean of Women is Moving Again." The column opens comparing Dean Kirmse to "Moses in the wilderness" as she and her staff have 'wandered about from one campus spot to another" for years, moving six times within the last nine months alone. It seemed to the writer that Dean Kirmse had long been treated as an afterthought. Her office location was perpetually temporary, only staying in one place until someone or something deemed more important would take it from her. Within the span of a few years, the dean of women offices had moved from the old co-ed cottage to the old president's house to a building called the "old Y hut" to a small corner of Maricopa Hall ("Dean"). "Yesterday," the writer explains, Dean Kirmse and her staff were "given temporary

quarters on the first floor of the library building" until they would settle into what would be their first permanent home in a wing of the new Gila Hall women's dormitory. How Kirmse arranged offices in Gila Hall is a story that reveals not only her struggle to claim her own space on campus, but the dismissive masculinist administrative attitudes she had to deal with and push against in staking that claim.

Both in her interview with historian Cooper and in her historical notes, Kirmse shares her constant frustration working with the interim president, Paul Burgess. Even before the Women's Building, Kirmse explained, she had been promised office space in a new Administration Building: another construction made possible by PWA grants (Cooper, Report Drafts). Up to that point, she had only been allotted one or two rooms located here and there for office space. "I really needed three rooms," Kirmse explained, "one for my secretary-receptionist [in a] public waiting room, one for my assistant, and one for me." Like other NADW deans, Kirmse also realized the need for privacy as she "did a great deal of business with students that was confidential [and] couldn't very well share a room" (Cooper).

Kirmse explains that while she appreciated the offer of space in the new Administration building, she also had concerns about it. "I hadn't wanted to go over there, really," she states, "but there was nothing else to do" as she needed the space. Kirmse contends that there were two schools of thought among NADW members concerning student relations during that period of time. There were those who argued that the dean of women's offices "should be in the administrative group of offices in order to bolster the administrative rank of the dean" and to remove "that old stigma that the Dean of Women was a matron [rather than] an educator" (Cooper).

However, Kirmse revealed that she “belonged to the opposite school.” She did not place the value of her rank and prestige above the needs and accessibility of the women students and expressed her preference to being closer to the women students rather than other administrators. Kirmse explained that she wanted to be “located where it was easiest for the students to get to her.” She warranted that “students don't congregate or go voluntarily to administrative offices,” and she wanted her office to be “in the students' very path” (Cooper).

Kirmse explains that while she wrestled with conflicting feelings concerning where she wanted her office located, President Burgess unexpectedly called her to his office and announced that he was making up her mind for her; he was changing the plans of the Administration Building and giving the Director of Student Activities one of Dean Kirmse’s promised offices. Kirmse points out that she was not surprised, stating that “when he took office, President Burgess thought the work of the dean of women was not of sufficient importance to allocate as much space as she had been promised” (Report Drafts). Dean Kirmse told Burgess that his plan was unacceptable. She could not operate with one room due to the confidential nature of student conversations. Burgess’s response was to dramatically throw up his hands in frustration (Cooper).

Kirmse recalled that she looked at the man and said, “I think the answer to this, Dr. Burgess, is that you don't care whether you have a Dean of Women or not.” She then challenged his discrimination by noting its foundation of willful ignorance. “You,” she continued, “are not settled on any idea of how my work can be efficiently done.” Throwing up his hands again, Burgess asked Dean Kirmse what she wanted him to do. “I told him,” she explained, “that I didn't care where he put me as long as I had space in

which to operate." Remembering her own conflict, Dean Kirmse suggested that Burgess "take some of the space in Gila Hall and put [her offices] over there." Burgess could not understand why she would want to work out of a dormitory rather than the Administrative Building—acknowledging his own understanding of rhetorical spaces—and Dean Kirmse informed him that she "knew the layout of the plan for the building" since she helped design it, and it was the only choice since she "couldn't operate under the situation that he had described."

With some last-minute adjustments to the plans that included an additional outside entrance, Dean Kirmse set up her offices in the east end of the first floor of Gila Hall. She declared that she was pleased with both her argument and its effect, for her new offices "worked very, very well" (Cooper).

Conclusion

Even as a coeducational university open to women students from the onset, the documents, writings, and interviews conducted by the NADW and Dean Kirmse demonstrate that spaces for women on campus was neither guaranteed nor easy to come by. Generations of patriarchal and masculinist discourse had normalized college campus as spaces for men. Simply being accepted to the university did not guarantee space there for women. If the women administrators and students desired spaces of their own, they had to argue for it, and then position themselves in the construction of it to ensure their professional perspectives were involved in the construction.

As both national and local rhetoric demonstrates, building spaces for women on coed campus not only cemented and validated women's place in higher education

alongside men, it also created spaces where deans of women could train and influence them.

The paradox of creating space for women while also wanting to dictate the behavior of women within those spaces demonstrates the complexity of this period in time. It brings into relief how the NADW and local deans of women were called on to navigate the uncharted territory of coed campuses while also steering through churning and changing socio-cultural practices, freedoms, and opportunities of the Progressive Era. Their writings and presentations demonstrate their own often paradoxical navigation of changing gender expectations and ideologies.

This navigation of changing socio-cultural expectations and values is also manifest in the following chapter on the dean's conversations and efforts to orient women students. In the chapter, I examine the publications and documents of the NADW and Dean Kirmse that contain discussions and arguments concerning what it means to be a "successful" women student, what women students need to know in order to achieve that success and constructing a curriculum that leads to that success.

CHAPTER 7

"THE SITUATION CALLED FOR AN ORIENTATION:" DEANS OF WOMEN AND THE ORIENTATION OF WOMEN STUDENTS

The eleventh annual NADW conference was held at Chicago's Blackstone Hotel in February 1924. The mansion-turned-upscale hotel was an apt setting for a conference largely focused on guiding women students through times of great change. Opening the five-day event, NADW President Agnes E. Wells noted how rights, opportunity, and lived experiences had drastically changed for women in the United States in the last few years alone (10). While most social changes require hindsight to clearly view, deans of women like Wells knew they were standing at a unique and somewhat dizzying culmination of decades-long fight for women's suffrage and women's rights. By the 1924 NADW Conference and Well's "President's Report," seventy-six years had passed since the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention, four years had passed since the Nineteenth Amendment awarded women the right to vote, and the full elimination of oppressive coverture common laws was nearly complete (Hoff). President Wells understood that contemporary women students were living in a society quite different from what the deans had experienced. She also understood that if they wanted to effectively guide, advise, and orient these students in higher education, deans of women had to acknowledge the changing times and adjust to them.

In her conference address, Wells shares an anecdote of a mother excitedly gifting a newly published book on "wireless" breakthroughs to a son interested in technology. The son is unimpressed. To the mother's chagrin, the son thumbs through the book pointing out all its outdated content. Wells presents this example of a mother's naivete on

rapidly changing technology to suggest that "perhaps we [as the first generation of women students and current deans of women] don't see and understand the social problems as we ought" (10). Perhaps deans, she declares, do not recognize as well as women students how quickly society has changed. Wells wonders aloud how deans of women can hope to guide women students through social and political times already so different than they experienced as students, during times when women's opportunities, freedoms, and access seem to shift on a weekly basis, during times when women students are quick to question convention? Wells points out that

> Just as Einstein launched his theories challenging the world to prove them untrue, so the young people of today are thrusting upon us their theories, carried out in direct actions, challenging us to prove that they are not as sound as ours. Is the old way all wrong or all right, or only partly wrong and partly right? And who is competent to decide between the old and the new? Just as in science, young people know more today than college professors knew ten years ago, so in the social world our young people may have a clearer vision than we think. (10)

Wells then calls on deans of women to instruct, guide, and orient women students for the students' time rather than according to the experience and times of the previous generation (10).

Yet—and here is where the dean's own ideological wrestle and/or social growing pains is manifest—Wells also suggests while women students understood contemporary society better than most deans, most deans could see a fuller breadth of society that the younger generation could not. She suggests that "if the world is 'skew,'' and the younger generation has lost touch with tradition and convention, the older generation allowed it to happen. She argues that "we have given the young people of today more temptations as well as more privileges than we had in our 'bubbling period' and we expect them to react

as we reacted" (10). Wells ends her report by suggesting that "In order to meet the demands made upon us by our students and try to understand the "skew," we must keep our ideals ahead of our aims in order to aim in the right direction" (11).

As demonstrated in the rhetorical shifts within Well's report alone, deans of women found themselves striving to gain their own solid footing during this time of shifting socio-cultural landscapes. Invitations to explore the social territories and opportunities that were opening for women were often followed by appeals to retain and promote time-honored ideologies and conventions. Determining how to best orient women students during a time when deans of women were experiencing their own level of social disorientation had to be an arduous task. Therefore, a level of rhetorical vacillation and contradiction in their writings is to be expected.

Perhaps because of their own sense of disorientation, discussions on orienting women students were common and often passionate among early deans of women. According to NADW Research Committee analysis of talks published in the yearbooks, student orientation was one of the top three points of interest during their first ten years of conferences ("Yearbook" 38; Doyle 108). It was also the focus of one of Dean Kirmse's first official acts as the University of Arizona's dean of women. Having been involved in the NADW as an assistant dean of women at George Washington University, Dean Kirmse was apparently aware of the ongoing interest in orientating women students, since her first "project" at the UA was a "thorough research" of the existing Freshman Week orientation program. Her findings prompted her to design a new orientation program "more suitable for women students" (Report Drafts). Recognizing "college orientation" as a rhetorical act, this chapter addresses questions concerning the goals and

purposes the NADW and Dean Kirmse expressed during these conversations, plans, and programs, and how they argued for the value of such orientation to the students and to the administration.

Ideological Social Climate

In order to appreciate the arguments and rationales expressed by the deans of women during the 1920s through the 1940s, it is important to consider the social climate at the time and the common essentialist ideologies. Most common was the paradoxical belief that women were just as intellectually capable as men but that they were also endowed with specific needs, abilities, talents, and duties. Historian Jana Nidiffer explains that to adapt to shifting gender roles and opinions, a rhetorical bridge was created "between the older view that feminine uniqueness implied intellectual limitations—"true womanhood"—and the more nascent belief that women were as rational as men, but still distinct—"new womanhood" (*Pioneering* 142)

As Nidiffer explains, this rhetorical bridge helped in navigating competing concurrent ideologies. The first was based on "modernist ideas" that all humans are inherently rational and "women were as capable of intellectual thought as men" (*Pioneering* 47). The second still held onto aging "vestiges of Victorian notions of propriety and separate spheres" as well as Darwinian notions of the biological and intellectual gender differences "designed by God to ensure reproduction' (Nidiffer "Crumbs" 47). Thus, while women began to be considered equal to men, they were considered, by others and by themselves, inherently different and morally superior to men at the same time.

In her historical scholarship titled, "The New Era and the New Woman," K. Clements claims that the women's movement combined with post-war technological advances to create a wave of optimism and social change during the 1920s. Contemporary writers of the time hailed it as "The New Era" which invited social revisions of "what it meant to be a woman in the United States" (425). Clements points out that the women's movement influenced had a profound effect even among those considered most conservative, for while they might have publicly "proclaimed women's duty to uphold their traditional domestic function," they were open to women's right to assume more public roles (426). Thus, a "pervasive sense of newness" and the possibility of reconsidering and/or redefining women's roles influenced the nation, even those who spurned "new style" or any other kind of feminism the "woman movement" had produced (Clements 428).

Recalling historian Mary Ritter Beard's 1935 NADW Conference talk, she referred to the 1920s as an "intellectual climate" that was "charged with the idea of society-as-change" (97). She also recognized that such ideas of progressive change were so novel, women were continually called to battle against "the resurgence of old ideas" and values that had governed and constrained women for generations. Hence, she proclaimed to the deans, the educators of young women must continually re-examine their own roles in society and to what negative ideologies they continue to cling. Beard often argued that women could be their worst enemy when it came to progress simply because they found it impossible to imagine a life and agency beyond what they had been handed (*On Understanding* 31). Beard's claim especially applied to deans of women

responsible for advising and instructing women students experiencing a college life and society very different than what they had experienced at their age.

It is within this shifting social climate that deans of women were discussing and debating how to best orient young women students. As Solomon noted in her history, many of the deans of women were first-generation women college students. They had pushed through opposition, achieved academic success, and validated their intellectual prowess through discipline, hard work, and adherence to strict codes of conduct. Based on their own experience, deans of women recognized orientation programs as opportunities where they could not only help women students acclimate to their new surroundings on campus but where they could pass-on the lessons they had learned. Their writings suggest that deans of women saw themselves as experienced guides but also as watchmen on the tower endowed with a clarity of both hind and foresight unavailable to women students dizzied by shifting contemporary values.

However, the deans of women's writing also reveal their own hesitation and uneasy navigation of shifting gender role expectations and social ideologies. While deans of women advocated for women's equal rights to occupy space on campus and for their own professional administrative ethos—two issues beyond traditional precedent—they were slower to challenge normalized gender constructs and consider the possibility of new roles for women. Their rhetoric suggests that they considered it their responsibility to help women students recognize and embrace opportunities afforded them in The New Era without losing touch with the essentialist ideologies, values, and ethos that deans of women relied on themselves and recognized as key to their academic success and happiness. While deans of women celebrated the fact that more women were gaining

access to education, they also saw that the younger generation was not *doing* academia as they had done it or acting in society as they had. The rhetoric of deans of women suggests that while they saw it as their duty to orient women students to academia and society, they also feared the loss of time-honored social conventions they deemed necessary if women students hoped to succeed as a the "new women" of The New Era in a manner the deans envisioned. Deans of women were also practical, especially those at land-grant universities. Even when they acknowledged the constraints of tradition and social convention, many deans of women argued for providing women students with the practical education most applicable for their likely futures as wives, mothers, and homemakers: roles many deans of women continued to argue as women's most important calling.

In order to fully appreciate the complex nature and effect of the dean's efforts to orient the women students in their charge, I first share a brief history of post-secondary orientation practices followed by an examination of orientation as a rhetorical act. Since I draw heavily on Sara Ahmed's hermeneutic phenomenology of the term 'orientation' within her book *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*, I also take time to briefly review hermeneutic phenomenology as a theoretical lens and a qualitative research method, which allows for a better understanding the implications of orientation as a rhetorical act. Taking time to wade through and sit in such theoretical inquiry brings into relief the depth and complexity of the dean of women's concerted efforts to orient students.

I then apply this brief hermeneutic phenomenological exploration of 'orientation' to the orientation of women students during the 1920s and 1930s: Dean Kirmse's tenure

as dean of women at the University of Arizona. Doing so, I conceptualize the term and its use and effect within the context of women's experience—both *acting* as women administrators and *being acted upon* as women students—on coeducational campuses. Drawing on Ahmed's methods and theory, I explore the complex notion, act, and intended effect of women student orientation during this time. I contend that Ahmed's interpretative practices and ruminations provide an effective framework to explore and analyze the deans of women's efforts to orient the women students in their charge.

As I then synthesize the NADW's and Dean Kirmse's acts and programs of orientation, I employ hermeneutic phenomenology as described by Susan Crowther et al. as a method of "crafting stories." Crowther et al.'s method of storytelling is reminiscent of Royster and Kirsch's method of "critical imagination." Both methods are used to identify specific themes within NADW published rhetorical testimonials and arguments and Dean Kirmse's rhetorical course designs, lecture notes, written defenses, and historical reflections. Fleshing out these themes into an expanding story helps to demonstrate how orientation courses for women became much more than tools of university acclimation. Deans of women also used these courses as tools of moral and social orientation, which not only carried forward many traditional ideologies of womanhood, but which also addressed the practical and realistic needs of women students, many of whom deans acknowledged were most likely to lead lives as wives, mothers, homemakers, and community leaders.

History of Academic Orientation

According to scholarship on the history of freshman orientation in the U.S., such programs began to appear relatively soon after the appearance of higher education in

general (Fabich, Finnegan and Alleman, Mack, Mason, Patton, Warner). Records of staff and tutors formally assigned to assist Harvard students in their transition into college appear within a decade of its 1636 founding (Patton 18). However, formal administrative programs designed to orient new students did not materialize until the late 1880s. Boston University's formally documented orientation program in 1888 is considered to be the first (Fabich, Mack). Coinciding with the hiring of deans of women and their development of personnel services, student orientation programs increased during the early 1920s. In her history of college orientation, Mary Jo Fabich claims that by 1925, at least 25 institutions across the U.S. had designed and implemented formal student orientation programs such as "freshman weeks" (7).

In her 1948 thesis providing an overview of deans of women responsibilities, Nadine K. Warner suggests that a study conducted by Henry J. Doerman of the University of Maine largely influenced the boom in orientation programs in the 1920s (9). In his study, Doerman quantified a serious problem with the retention of freshman students. He noted that on average, one-third of the freshmen students enrolled in institutions of higher learning "dropped out at or before the end of their first year" (Warner 9). In some institutions, these numbers were far worse. Out of 1,100 freshmen enrolled in the University of Minnesota in 1920, 58% dropped out within the first semester; 28% of which left with "satisfactory records" (Warner 9). Building on Doerman's claims, Warner contends the issue with women student retention to lie in the obvious "gap" between the "exuberance and confidence" they experienced their senior years of high school in their hometowns to the "blooming, hazy confusion" they felt as soon as they stepped on a coeducational college campus (10). She also claims this gap is

exaggerated by the increase of freedom and autonomy women students experienced coupled with a lack of supervision (10). This gap, Warner claims, created a "crying need on the part of incoming college students" that demanded an administrative solution (10).

The 1942 NADW Research Committee's publication, a booklet titled *Orientation of Freshmen in Colleges and Universities,* also provides an historical overview of college and university orientation programs and their evolution over the previous fifteen years. The committee confirms student retention as the original exigence for orientation, but also claims that deans of women's expertise in personnel work and their attention to holistic student needs added dimension to the traditionally masculine nature of orientation, which allowed for the orientation of the whole student ("Orientation" 18). They argue that to help women students "discover their position" in the twentieth century, deans of women re-envisioned and developed orientation programs that provided women students with skills to think for themselves beyond academic contexts ("Orientation" 15). Such an outcome, they claim, required deans to conduct "careful analysis, extension diagnosis, remedial treatment, and constant follow-up" with students: work which could not be accomplished during a whirlwind "Freshman Week" orientation ("Orientation" 18). Applying the masculine pronoun to women—a common though jarring rhetorical practice at the time—the committee explains that "a student personnel point of view" obliged deans of women to "consider the freshman student as a whole—his social relationships, his intellectual capacity, his emotional makeup, his physical condition, his vocational aptitudes, his moral and religious values, [and] his aesthetic appreciations" ("Orientation" 25). Therefore, considering the amount of student orientation required and its potential lifelong impact on the student's quality of life, the

Research Committee invited deans to consider the task of orientation "as a process, not an event" ("Orientation" 22).

Hermeneutic Phenomenology of "Orientation"

To consider more critically the acts and implications of the dean's efforts to orient women students, a close examination of the rhetorical nature of orientation is helpful. Hermeneutic phenomenology provides the methodological and theoretical scaffolding in which to do so. Hermeneutic phenomenology is a qualitative research method broadly defined as a study and interpretive analysis of conscious and expressed lived experiences of phenomena and/or concepts (Bynum and Varpio, Crowther et al., Kafle, Sloan and Bowe, Suddick et al.) Sloan and Bowe argue that such analysis uncovers patterns and themes of human behavior that can be best determined by the "phenomena of experience" rather than by "objective, physically described reality that is external to the individual" (1291). They explain that applying hermeneutics to texts written or recorded by individuals experiencing a specific phenomenon can locate meaningful "thematic interpretations of expressed lived experience," which can then be further examined and analyzed (1291). Bynum and Varpio add that hermeneutic phenomenology, often referred to as interpretive phenomenology, "seeks to uncover the meaning and central structures, or essences, of a participant's lived experience with a phenomenon and the contextual forces that shape it" (252). They further claim that the method allows for the greater understanding of contextual environmental and social forces imprinting upon and shaping the experience as well as the experiencer (252). Thus, hermeneutics phenomenology explores interpretations of conscious experience to name, clarify, and give meaning to collective social experience.

Important to hermeneutic phenomenology is a recognition of and value for multiple interpretations, which counters the notion of objective or definitive experience or renderings of experience. This recognition takes into account the experience of the researcher. Thus, hermeneutic phenomenology as a methodology demands a self-awareness, positionality, and reflexivity within the researcher (Sloan and Bowe, Bynum and Varpio). Rather than intent on keeping a researcher in check, such reflexivity aids in interpretation by demanding conscientious methods, interpretation, and analysis (Sloan and Bowe 1297). Bynum and Vario explain that when using this method, researchers are required to acknowledge and reflect on the ways their own lived experience and ways of knowing is "embedded in and essential to" their unique process of interpretation (252). They go on to explain that, when using hermeneutic phenomenology, researchers are expected to continuously record their reflections and return to them often. Such introspection creates a generative cycle of continuous inquiry leading to more "robust and nuanced analyses" (253).

In light of hermeneutic phenomenology, orientation is an interesting concept. Oxford definitions of the term abound depending upon the context within it is used: environmental, medical, ecological, archeological, spiritual, etc. However, a running theme across all such definitions involves "alignment" to an established standard. Understanding that all things inherently "align" to something by simply existing, is any claim to "orient" actually a claim to "re-orient" or realign from one standard to another? Considering the orientation of women students in the early years of coeducation, what were they being re-aligned or re-oriented towards, around, or from?

At first glance, Ahmed's definition of orientation appears simple: "Orientations involve different ways of registering the proximity of objects and others" (3). Yet, she goes on to point out that orientations not only shape "how we inhabit space," but they also determine "how we apprehend this world of shared inhabitance, as well as 'who' or 'what' we direct our energy and attention toward" (3).

As Ahmed contends, orientation is an embodied act. Orientations attempt to point minds and bodies toward or away from certain objects, ideals, and other bodies. Orientations can also press against, mark, and shape the body as they shape actions of the body (Ahmed 58). The experience of orientation does develop or take place in isolation; rather, orientations are experienced within a tense interplay between an individual experience and the individual's interaction among the social institutions the systems through which they move (Patton 55). Collective individual orientations also impacts and shapes society. As Ahmed points out, like the individual, "the social also has its skin" that carries a multitude of "impressions" left by the orientations of bygone generations (9). Thus, orientation is an ongoing human experience in response to the constant pressure of historical, systemic, and socio-cultural orientations continually pressing on the individual. Historical orientations accumulate, carry forward, and replicate over time, continuing to influence and orientate present-day bodies, systems, and societies.

Post-secondary orientation programs have always existed within the space and time of newcomers arriving in an unfamiliar space already occupied by those assumed to be oriented. In the case of women students entering coeducational institutions of higher education during the early twentieth century, most were away from their families for the first time entering a situation unfamiliar to most women of the previous generation. These

women students often had to set aside the familiarity of their homelife, previous identity, and worldview and then conform into a particular type of student, intellectual, and woman. Such an experience could be disorienting to say the least. As Ahmed suggests, “losing one’s place, and an effect of the loss of a place” can also be “a violent feeling” (160). She points out that since disorientation compels the eager embrace of new orientation, examining such experiences can provide illuminating insights on what it means to both become oriented and to orient others (4).

Coeducational post-secondary campuses of the 1920s through the1940s in the United States is a complex, unstable, intriguing, and rich context in which to investigate deans of women’s acts of orientation. The rhetoric of deans of women, on both the national and local stage, demonstrate that they sought to not only minimize student disorientation but to encourage student alignment to certain standards. Deans of women wanted the women students in their charge to succeed. They wanted to provide students with the education and the orientation that they determined would best help them do so. The trick was in determining how to do so in a society where gender roles were in flux. As first-generation women college graduates, deans of women knew what had worked for them. They had worked hard to “succeed” in their specific social climate, so they wanted to pass down the values and ideologies that had had worked for them even as they acknowledged that women students and times were changing. Exploring this social navigation is interesting in its own right, but considering the ways such practices affected the trajectory of women’s academic experience for years to come is most compelling.

Going forward, I craft a “phenomenological story” from the dean’s rhetoric concerning orientation as suggested by Crowther et al. (Crowther et al. 827). I contend

that bringing together thematically related texts in such a way best represents their shared experience with orientation which cannot be fully captured by clinical disparate analysis. In other words, storytelling adds flesh to the clinical bones of analysis to better grasp the fullness of the phenomenon of orientation. I build this story by presenting the dean's arguments, testimonies, and reflections concerning orientation chronologically from the early 1920s through the early 1940s. Though the ideologies and arguments did not develop in a simple linear pattern with the passing of time, I follow the evolution chronologically to present arguments and debates on the national stage and how these were manifest in Dean Kirmse's own written experiences at the University of Arizona.

NADW and the Orientation of Women Students

The earliest recorded conversation among NADW members concerning orientation of women students was at their 1919 conference—two years after the association was founded— where a Dean F. Louise Nordin claimed the following benefits of college orientation: the opportunity to greet students with a friendly welcome, to "dissuade unfit" students from committing to the semester, to introduce students to the student association, to demonstrate "the true spirit of the college," and to help students adjust and settle in (Pierce 122). Nordin's list reflects initial administrative goals to improve student retention and success. Yet, even from the beginning, deans of women recognized that women students would benefit from more a more holistic orientation.

In her memoir, NADW founder Kathryn Sisson McLean recalls early discussions among founding members of the NADW concerning the need to educate women students of life beyond the academic (*My Room* 95). "We give no courses which link up with life

outside," she points out, "and we make no attempt to articulate the life of the college woman with the life of the community in which she is to live for one or four years" (*My Room* 96). McLean explains that she and other deans quickly recognized a need for "social education," in order to help women students develop a more "cultivated personality" (*My Room* 95).

McLean's recollection is corroborated by the NADW Conference talks on "orientation" during the years immediately following Nordin's 1919 remarks. In these early conversations, deans discussed orientation as a means of introducing and/or re-aligning women students with proper social conventions rather than new intellectual or social opportunities. For example, in her 1923 NADW conference talk, Dean Mary Louise Brown explained that an orientation course was an opportunity to give first-year women students "a view of the world as made of interrelated parts;" yet, the purpose of such a lesson, she contends, is that once the girls can picture their place in the world,

> all the trifles concerned with disobedience to regulations, questions of dress and conduct, the responsibility towards other students, towards the college, and later to the world at large, will be straightened out with but little attention being paid to them as separate and distinct problems. (634)

Brown contends that ample discussions on "custom, convention, and tradition" should help to promote the "self-reverence and self-control" that many women students appeared to lack; attributes they needed if they wish to be successful and happy as women beyond academia (634).

Brown's proposed answer to the dilemma was a semester long orientation course that opened with a discussion on the construction of modern society and traditional customs "as found in books such as Van Loon's *Story of Mankind* and Chapin's

Evolution," followed by discussions on "what customs are fundamental and what may be changed" (634). Brown suggests that this discussion—and the entire orientation course—culminate with a section dedicated to "marriage preparation" and "family relations" (634). The suggestion of such an orientation course design suggests that the deans themselves struggled to fully consider or comprehend women's potential beyond the traditional "view of the world" they had been conditioned to recognize as innate.

It is interesting to note that Brown's conference talk espousing a student re-alignment to traditional standards and conventions was only a year before NADW President Agnes Wells' anecdote comparing society to the swiftly changing technology of "wireless" radio. Both arguments acknowledged the changing social experience of women students, and both arguments defended the teaching of traditional social conventions. Perhaps this slight contradiction stems from ongoing patriarchal arguments that formal education threatened feminine ethos and the deans continued hyperawareness of and determination to prove men's derogatory rhetoric wrong.

This concern of lost feminine ethos is also manifest in Dean Helen M. Smith's 1924 NADW talk where she passionately warns her fellow deans that the younger generation of "college women in a co-educational or coordinate university will all but 'sell their birthright for a mess of pottage'" (104). Smith applies this biblical allusion of self-sabotage to argue that while students' immature desires to "join with their brothers in any enterprise"—whether "to develop university spirit…to make a larger showing…[or] to contribute the "finer touches' in the affair"—may provide fleeting pleasure, it will eventually cause them to "give away a half or three-quarters or practically all of their

opportunity for training" in the aspects of life that will lead to women's greatest familial happiness and success (104). Smith goes on to argue that

> deans of women in co-educational institutions have 'a solemn and difficult duty' to provide instruction and training to women students for 'life after graduation,' which training must often be "conserved for them against their [the students'] inclinations by the dean of women. (104)

Arguments pertaining to women's continued adherence to social conventions such as Brown's and Smith's confirm Clements' claim that the new rights and opportunities made available during the early 20th century could not easily erase generations of gender and social conditioning concerning "'innate' women's maternal and homemaking roles" (Clements 428). Such arguments purported by deans depict their somewhat novel position as they struggled to define the shifting roles of educated women. In many aspects, this was volatile ground. While women enjoyed new political rights and opportunities, gender discrimination continued. While deans of women encouraged their students and one another to take advantage of their nascent rights, their rhetoric suggests trepidation in doing so the wrong way. Against vehement accusations, these early women students and administrators had demonstrated that they could intellectually hold their own alongside men. They had often done so by embracing and exploiting social constructions of a feminine moral ethos. Therefore, it can be imagined how these women would want to avoid anything, including the performance of the students in their charge, that might be used as evidence of women's inferiority or that might injure the moral feminine identity that they had used to their advantage. Also, while women celebrated the prospects of greater rights, they did not want their rights and their opportunities determined and designed according to hegemonic masculine standards (Clement 454).

Therefore, it is not surprising that the dean's writings and talks reveal conflicting arguments as they worked to determine new identities and roles untethered by patriarchal masculinist standards, and how to best orient and practically educate women students.

Ideologies considering women's highest calling to be wives and mothers remained strong throughout the 1920s. Because of this, most women students still considered education and a career as an interim activity or as something to enhance their performance in these callings. The fight for women's rights had allowed women to consider new possibilities and aspirations; but defining them was another thing (Clement 460). This naturally led to internal and social conflicts, contrariness, indecisiveness, and the appearance of irresolution. Writing about the experience in her 1925 *Harper's Bazaar* article, "Feminism's Awkward Age," women right's author Elizabeth Breuer explained that feminism was experiencing its normal phase of growing pains. While the young concept of feminism often appeared indecisive, clumsy, and unruly like its teenage equivalent, Breuer argues, it also displayed moments of burgeoning insight, innovation, and dignity. Breuer points out that women figuring out how to adjust to their rightful place in a society built according to "masculine standards" without abandoning the innate feminine identities, goals and gifts "which she cannot leave behind if she is to be happy as a woman" (545). Breuer describes this as attempting to "straddle two horses and ride them both to a victorious finish" (545). Yet, Breuer also contends that the freedom to seek out fulfillment in both aspects defines what it means to be a "feminist" (545). She argues that

> The feminist who thinks of herself as a conscious factor in this changing process of customs and conduct will make mistakes, sometimes frightful ones. But the error that is done through love and through honesty is not an error in the end. It is

> a path explored. It is enriching to all human life because it is a finding the way to the truth. (550)

I share Breuer's argument not only because she was a contemporary to the deans of women during this time, but also because her article includes much of their common language. Many considered this period of social, cultural, and technological advances as the opening of a New Era," which made possible a "new woman," which was defined as "a woman who, while affirming her commitment to traditional domestic values, also insisted on her right to take advantage of new opportunities" (Clements).

At the 1930 NADW Conference, Florence Hale of Maine's State Department of Education spoke concerning the need to promote this idea of "new womanhood" and to educate young women for fulfilling lives in this New Era. After acknowledging the "women of the Old World" who had, through "daring perseverance and industry," secured the rights and privileges women currently enjoyed, Hale argues that while women have more resources than ever before to ensure her happiness, women students must be trained "to think straight, stand steadfastly for the right" (203). Yet, Hale's rationale for such education is an acknowledgment that "girls will be placed in life where they will need to have a safe and sure philosophy to enable them to work out their destinies as mothers of the citizens of this new world" (204).

As Hale's argument demonstrates, while deans of women discussed the shifting expectations and opportunities of the New Era, and as they attempted to step into and embrace new opportunities themselves, identifying normalized and entrenched gender conventions and discrimination took time. The rhetoric of deans of women demonstrates lingering efforts to engage in common misogynistic accusations before identifying them

as such. For instance, Hale closes her 1930 conference talk by imploring deans of women to encourage a realignment towards feminine "poise and for spiritual completeness" within women students (203). "Only by so doing," she argues,

> can we keep this new woman, with her opportunities for participation in economic and political life from becoming too hard, too cynical, too businesslike to emulate the calm serenity of [women who have gone before]. It is mutually advantageous for woman to have her business and civic success, but to achieve it, hard blows are given and taken, illusions ofttimes dispelled and without some resource in which to take refuge, the modern woman's spirit is in danger of becoming hard and calculating. (204)

Dean Kirmse's Orientation of Women Students

Dean Kirmse attended the 1930 NADW Conference. Since one of Dean Kirmse's first projects at the University of Arizona was to research the efficacy of Freshman Week as an orientation program, chances are that she participated in several conversations on orientation recorded in the yearbook and listened to Florence Hale's talk (Report Drafts II). This would help to explain Dean Kirmse's early conclusion regarding "the inadequacy of the general Freshman Orientation Program [at the UA] as it applied to women students" (Report Drafts II). Dean Kirmse immediately set out to design an orientation program more acceptable.

Reflecting on this experience fifty years later, Kirmse explained her reasons for developing an orientation course specifically catered to women students (Handwritten Reflections). Having been born, raised, and educated in Washington D.C.—arguably considered one of the more sophisticated cities in the country—Dean Kirmse realized that she was not the only woman on campus experiencing a type of culture shock. In her historical notes and reflections, Kirmse explains that upon her arrival at the UA, she

quickly realized that a larger proportion of women students came to the University from the state's smallest and most remote high schools. She points out that "they came in from the back country ranches, completely innocent of the ways of the more sophisticated world that college graduation would project them into" (Handwritten Reflections). Dean Kirmse saw that many women students brought with them "some unique customs of the desert region," some of which Kirmse considered "more consistent with some sort of law west of the Pecos than with what would go in larger cities where many would find themselves after graduation" (Handwritten Reflections). She noted that "as ranch and farm girls, they understood cattle, horses, agriculture," but little of the world beyond. Kirmse felt that the University owed it to their women students to help remove "some of the edge off provincialism" before they were sent out into the world. "The situation," Dean Kirmse proclaimed, "called for an orientation" (Handwritten Reflections).

Over the following year, Dean Kirmse collaborated with two other faculty women at the UA —Ina Gittings, director of women's Physical Ed and Stella Mather, Head of Home Economics—to design an orientation program to serve approximately 100 women students. Their eventual "brainchild" was a course titled "Social Fundamentals:" a semester long orientation which would not only prepare women students for "general campus life," but would also provide them with valuable instruction for their "after-college experience" (Report Drafts II).

Designing the course was one thing, but Dean Kirmse needed administrative support and recognition if the course was to be "legitimately be considered of collegiate academic quality" (Handwritten Reflections). Kirmse explains that she, Gittings, and Mather never intended to offer credit for the course, but they did want to require

attendance. This necessitated approval by the Advisory Council consisting of the university president, the deans, and the registrar. “Considering the non-academic quality of the program,” she writes, “the planners half expected to be laughed out of court.” However, to the “surprise and delight” of all three women, the Advisory Council not only “enthusiastically” agreed to the proposed course, but they also granted it one unit of credit and approved it as a graduation requirement for all first-year women students. “Thus,” Kirmse proclaimed, “Social Fundamentals was born” (Handwritten Reflections).

When the orientation course began in 1931, it consisted entirely of lectures delivered by the founding faculty women and invited specialists, both from the campus faculty and the community. Kirmse explains that lectures covered “etiquette and good manners, personnel ethics, vocational guidance, hygiene, principles of clothing selection and buying, principles of nutrition, marriage and family relationships, and yes, even personal discussions about sex.” Additional laboratory sections were soon added where fifteen to twenty girls had the opportunity to “practice of the social graces” through the planning and execution of “an afternoon reception.” Originally held at Dean Kirmse’s home, these receptions were considered practical assignments where each student “was expected to appear appropriately dressed,” and complete assignments in “preparation, hostessing and social graces” (Report Drafts II).

Dean Kirmse’s Orientation Argument to Students

Among the folders containing notes of reflection, correspondence, and reports are several containing Dean Kirmse’s “Introduction to Social Fundamentals” lecture notes. Some pages are typed, some pages are a collage of notes typed elsewhere and pasted in, some pages are handwritten with the misspellings, bullet points, doodles, and several

layers of annotation as is common in personal notes. All are found on the yellowing pages of a small 3-hole notebook. The annotations suggest that these notes had been used year after year. Most are notes from the course introduction lecture wherein Dean Kirmse presents her argument before the women students of the importance of the orientation they are to receive.

According to her notes, Dean Kirmse opened her introductory lecture by acknowledging that "a college student is a young person who wants to be successful" (Orientation Course). Dean Kirmse points out to her students that proper orientation and guidance can set them off on the right course towards the success they desire. She defines "orientation" as "providing material which will set the student to thinking for himself about problems and attitudes, and to formulating opinions, convictions, and beliefs about them." Orientation, she claims, can "help the individual to adjust herself in the best possible way to living in a social world" and lead to "self-discovery and self-direction" (Lecture Notes)**.** Thus, Dean Kirmse suggests to the students that with the proper social orientation, they will be better prepared and positioned to manage their own actions and progress.

Dean Kirmse's lecture outline repeatedly refers to improved social interaction as a goal for the course, and includes several penciled and underlined marginal notes proclaiming, "<u>not etiquette</u>" (Lecture Notes, underscore original). In fact, while she believes etiquette to be an important element in socio-cultural orientation, Dean Kirmse continually points out—to women students, to the administration, and to the community—that there is much more to Social Fundamentals than simply "learning which fork to pick" (Handwritten Reflections). Dean Kirmse explicitly addresses the

question, "What is this course?" and promptly explains to her students that it "deals with these things which are necessary to adequate social relationships" (Lecture Notes). Dean Kirmse explicitly defines social in her notes as "pertaining to intercourse with others of one's kind…adapting to society as a social organism...having to do with human intercourse [and] social consciousness." Penciled in between her typed notes is the declaration "not etiquette" (Lecture Notes).

After defining the goal and purpose of the course, Dean Kirmse's notes suggest that her first step in orienting the students was to name their multifaceted identities as women. Referring to the questions, "Who am I? What am I? What am I here for?," Dean Kirmse answers

1. I am a bodily being:
   Carefully constructed system of systems: head, trunk, limbs, internal & sense organs, transportation apparatus, healing apparatus, ventilating apparatus, communications system, etc.
2. I am an intellectual being:
   A mind capable of knowing—can see, hear, taste, smell, imagine, remember, form ideas, make judgements, reason to conclusions, be guided by rational feelings, act intelligently, work intellectual
3. I am a moral being:
   Have ideas of what is right and wrong—demand justice, equity, kindness, truth, and safety
   Must be free from immoralities and perversions—
4. I am an aesthetic being:
   Joy of living comes from sense of beauty—in nature—in people—all would be barren without some appeal to sense of beauty.
   Must be free from crudities and callousness—refined in taste and judgment—
5. I am a religious being:
   Craving for a higher life and realization of shortcomings proof of this—
   Must have something—very nature demands it.
6. I am a social being:

> Must be free from embarrassments and sense of inferiority, helplessness and failure—respect others as respect self—ready to put self in place of another—to be a leader through mastery of knowledge of social amenities-self-control—wholehearted altruism—wholesome view of social relations pertaining to home, country, work, and play. (AZ 519 Lecture Notes)

After encouraging this multifaceted level of self-awareness Dean Kirmse's notes turn to "moral virtues," which she claims to be "the foundation of society." However, she also suggests that "virtue in itself is not enough;" but it must be "adorned and strengthened" with "politeness…manners, [and] graces" (AZ 519 Lecture Notes underscore original). "Courtesies come from the heart," she continues, and "when they are practiced with all the heart, a moral elevation ensues" (Lecture Notes).

Dean Kirmse's notes on moral virtues is followed by a section titled "Conventions & Morals." Like the NADW conference talks, Dean Kirmse's bulleted notes suggest that a re-orientation towards established and traditional conventions is necessary in the students' attainment of moral virtue and social success. In fact, Dean Kirmse uses the word "indispensable" to describe such established moral conventions. She states that while "conventionality" is often considered outdated and "hypocritical" by a younger generation wanting to be "natural," she contends that conventionalities "soften and smooth the details of life" and have been developed through the "experiments and experience" of those who have gone before. She claims that conventions were "established to regulate [the] rights of individuals," and one "might as well try to abolish clothes as to abolish them" (Lecture Notes).

Dean Kirmse's notes confirm her persistent claim that "Social Fundamentals" was much more than a course on etiquette. As she would later describe, "Emily Post" may have been "a bribe" to garner the attention of women students and perhaps the approval

of administrators, but orienting the women students towards "tried and true" social conventions was the main goal (Handwritten Reflections).

Dean Kirmse's lesson plans and rationales would continue to align with NADW conversations throughout her tenure. These conversations on orientation often wove into conversations on women's education in general. For instance, in Ninetta M. Runnals 1932 NADW Conference talk titled, "Orientation Courses for Women," she argues that the two most prominent questions throughout history concerning the education of women have been whether they have the right or the natural ability to be educated and, if so, what their education should consist of. Runnals points out that while "the first question has been settled for some time," the second is still up for debate. The problem, she contends, is that in their attempt to prove themselves just as intellectually able as men, women had adopted men's traditional disciplines and curriculum. However, she attests, "the question has arisen as to whether women's part in life activities is to be exactly like men's" or that women "being exposed to an education devised by men to meet the needs of men" honestly meets their needs and desires (130).

Runnals goes on to claim orientation courses for women should be "a means to enable women to comprehend their particular whare [sic] in the unity of life." Women students, she contends, "must see the whole in order to be able to recognize their part" (130). Runnals contends that women students must not be constrained by educational conventions and traditions that center on men. She suggests that orientation courses for women students need to bridge the gap between academic college courses and the life women will most likely lead. As evidence, Runnals shares the results of a survey where women students expressed their top desired discussion topics for orientation: "food and

nutrition, hygiene of the nervous system, marriage, and the reproductive system" (132). Runnals asks fellow deans of women if these are not the types of topics they should be discussing.

Dean Kirmse's Public Argument for Practical Orientation

The year following Runnel's NADW Conference talk, Dean Kirmse published an article in the March 1933 *Arizona Woman* magazine titled, "What Are We Educating Our Girls For." Dean Kirmse's argument seems to respond to Runnals' in interesting and surprising ways. In her article, Dean Kirmse suggests that it is self-defeating in many aspects to provide an education for women students that parallels men's. She points out that since the most common and still sought-after place for women actually remains "the home," then institutions—especially land-grant institutions providing practical educations—should prepare women for that role and how it is expanding into the social realm. Dean Kirmse argues that while it is trendy to suggest women want more than the home, most will admit it to be their true desire, if pressed. "No normal woman" Dean Kirmse claims, "will deny if you pin her down, that the life which gives most fulfillment to her sex is homemaking:" a somewhat surprising comment coming from a woman whose work thus far had focused on expanding opportunities for women (6).

It is important to note that Dean Kirmse wrote this article when she was thirty-three years old and single. She would remain single until her thirty-seventh year; at which point she would appeal to the UA president Alfred Atkinson to retain her position as Dean after her marriage. Atkinson's official response, as captured within an archived memo, was to express his desire to retain Dean Kirmse, but to also state that he had "reservations…about the difficulty which you might experience in maintaining your

home and at the same time maintaining your professional interests as Dean of Women." Atkinson resolved that "if at the end of the year, 1938-39, it is apparent that there is conflict in these two interests," that he will not continue her appointment (Post-Marriage). Dean Kirmse retained her position until circumstances of war caused her to leave in 1942. This suggests that she eventually considered career and family as compatible and preferrable options for women.

Considering this experience, her earlier writings, and her language in the article, I suggest that in her *Arizona Woman* article, Dean Kirmse's is not so much arguing that women's place *should* be in the home exclusively, but that this social trajectory is the most common for women; and—due to patriarchal constructs, conditioning, and convictions—the most popular choice for women. Therefore, she suggests that institutions of higher learning have a practical duty to prepare them for it.

Reflective of Hales' 1930 NADW Conference talk, Dean Kirmse reminds her audience that it had not been many years since the country was divided into two camps concerning whether it was right and proper for women to "desert home and fireside" to seek an education or cast a vote ("Wat Are We" 5). Having won greater rights and opportunities, Dean Kirmse agrees with Runnals in that in

> their zeal to establish these rights and batter down educational doors hitherto closed to them, the pioneers confused equal opportunity with identity of program. What was given to men was demanded for women in its identical form. Nothing that was not similar in the masculine program was acceptable. No doubt the women were governed by their inherent and ever-present suspicion that the male might put something over, and it was all or nothing. No substitutes were allowed. (6).

Dean Kirmse goes on to wonder "whether those well-meaning pioneers might not have done our girls an injustice in giving them exactly what men had with no thought that they were preparing them for an entirely different life" (6).

Dean Kirmse points out that the claim of "woman's place is in the home" came to be recognized as a negative "battle cry" of those opposing both rights and education for women and came to carry negative connotations as such. However, Dean Kirmse contends, that even though the idea may not be publicly popular among women students, "ask your modern girl what she plans to do after leaving school," and while the young women "will not be frank in her answer…in her heart she has visions of her own hearth and family" (6). With this in mind, Dean Kirmse suggests that educators must set their own interests aside and determine what is practically in the best interest of the woman student. "If the girls are given only preparation for non-homemaking professions," Kirmse argues, "the colleges are giving them only fifty percent of the working equipment which they have a right to expect" (14). Kirmse's description of women students' inner conflict concerning career potential versus the traditional feminine ethos embedded in motherhood and homemaking is significant. Her claim that orientation programs should reinforce traditional goals rather than foster progressive ideas demonstrates the difficult nature of social and ideological re-orientation in situations where orientations have long aligned with hegemonic constructs.

It is at this point in Dean Kirmse's article—after laying out the evidence and the argument that women students need a more practical and holistic education—that she presents her "Social Fundamentals" course as an answer. Dean Kirmse explains that this orientation course was specifically designed to provide women students with the breadth

of social orientation and education they need to succeed in the life they will most likely lead. She admits that “Social Fundamentals” did not align with traditional masculine orientation programs, but she also contends that it should not. “Equal rights,” she argues, should not be measured by or constrained within an “identical program” (“What Are We” 14). She warrants that “equal opportunity for women means opportunity for scientific training in the profession which they will ultimately adopt” (14). Dean Kirmse explains that the “primary objective in the education of women of Arizona” is to assist them in developing to the “maximum of their of their capacity” (14). This, she contends, requires that women not only acknowledge the practical options available to them, but to also “develop a satisfactory philosophy of life” that will make the most of those options and lead to a “well-rounded and happy” life (14). After all, Dean Kirmse explains, while the phrase

> Woman’s place is in the home” is a slogan which for some reason has become odious… let us then substitute for it “Woman’s profession is the home.” There is no use in denying it or being ashamed of it. Statistics prove that homemaking is still the favorite indoor sport for woman. If this be true, what is there wrong in training for it? (14)

Close examination of Dean Kirmse’s rhetoric within her *Arizona Woman* article reveals a more practical argument for orienting women students towards the lifestyles and roles that they are most likely to hold. However, other deans of women argued that re-orienting students towards traditional conventions, ideologies, and roles as more moral than practical. For example, in her NADW conference talk presented the year following Dean Kirmse’s article, Dean Grace Loucks Elliott of New York argues that deans have done students a disservice by giving them too much unbridled freedom of choice and imagination. Elliott claims that deans of women should teach women students “traditional

mores" which will endow students with stabilizing anchors so they can stand in an unstable "world in so much flux" (135). Elliott laments that "We have given them freedom without the values to assure its sound use" (136). The answer, she suggests, is for deans to increase orientation programs that offer instruction in personal development and traditional social conventions (137). She argues that

> Since life is made or broken not so much by knowledge of mathematics, of Latin, of science, or of English as by success or failure in her personal and group relationships, she [the woman student] needs to understand people; she needs the best material available for understanding the family and the relation between the sexes. She needs positive ideals for family and married life (140).

This sentiment was also expressed in a conference roundtable discussion that same year in which "deans from all parts of the country expressed the need" to send young women into society "not only fitted to cope with life but prepared to keep life's standards moving forward" ("Panel Discussion").

Conclusion

NADW President, Agnes E. Wells closes her 1925 NADW Conference report by publicly thanking the speakers "who have given of their time and strength and wisdom to help us in our work." She goes on to describe their "work" as trying "to develop ideal college women:" a work for which they "need all possible help and inspiration" (10). These correlating efforts to determine, name, and "develop" an "ideal college woman" largely influenced orientation programs like Dean Kirmse's "Social Fundamentals" course. Deans of women knew society and gender roles were shifting within the "New Era." It was a hopeful time, but it was also an uneasy time as women considered, examined, and explored new social terrains and the "ideal college woman" who could best traverse them.

Orientation programs such as these are rhetorical. Based on Ahmed's phenomenological framework, efforts designed to align minds and bodies towards determined standards not only influence the movements of individuals but also shape the societies in which they move. Deans of women considered orientation programs as opportunities to influence students' navigation of new socio-cultural roles and expectations; but these courses were also attempts to have a say concerning the social shifts themselves. Orientation programs gave deans of women a platform from which they could design and promote conventions they wanted carried forward into the next generation. It was also an opportunity to realign and orient women students away from contemporary practices that threatened to undermine such conventions.

Within their writings, the deans reveal their own wrestle between progressive ideas and practical education that would best prepare women students for the most likely role they would have in society. Their writings also demonstrate the awkward and somewhat unnerving position of women letting go of certain traditional values and identities that had been oppressive, yet for which women had also earned a certain feminine moral ethos. While re-orientation towards traditional essentialist ideologies and ethos of womanhood appeared to be a moral argument for some deans of women, Dean Kirmse and others considered instruction in homemaking and familial skills as practical preparation for the likely futures of women students. The fact that Dean Kirmse's proposed Social Fundamentals course—a course that oriented women students towards a more traditional education—was so wholeheartedly and enthusiastically supported by the University of Arizona's all male Board of Regents suggests that deans of women were at

least encouraged in such traditional instruction and re-orientation by men whose lives and privileged identities were also unsettled by shifting rights and gender roles.

Dean Kirmse's original "Social Fundamentals" course design changed very little over her tenure as dean at the University of Arizona. However, in the year following her departure in 1942, the new dean of women, Emma K. Burgess, proposed an interesting revision to the course description (Miscellaneous Forms). The description had originally read

> Social fundamentals: Dean of Women-Special Lectures. Required of all Freshman women. Factors in right living and social adjustment; personal hygiene; nutrition; costume; social usage; the choice of an occupation; personal and ethical problems. Lecture 1 hour per week; laboratory 1 hour per week to be arranged.

Dean Burgess proposed the following change:

> Dean of Women-Special Lectures. Required of all Freshman women. Lectures open without credit to all other regularly enrolled students. Emphasis is given to Mental Health, Study Skills, Vocational & Educational Guidance, Religion, and related subjects. Lecture 1 hour. Section meetings 1 hour. (Miscellaneous Forms)

Dean Burgess's rationale for the change was to "meet the requests of all other regularly enrolled students, including male students, who desired to enroll in the course" (Miscellaneous Forms). Over the following eight years this course was offered, changes in the course description and deans of women's reports reveal a synchronized watering-down of cultural and moral orientation, the inclusion of men students, and a return to a coeducational academic and campus-focused orientation.

Because there is no neat denouement or clear-cut end to this story of orientation, it is not a story in the traditional sense, but a vignette depicting deans of women's efforts to influence the orientation of women students and society during the early years of

coeducation. Considering the circular nature of history, this interpretive sketch of orientation as a lived and rhetorical experience demonstrates how orientations accrue, perpetuate, and replicate across time continually influencing and aligning bodies, systems, and societies. The arguments and efforts of deans of women concerning orientation exemplify what Ahmed argues to be the perpetual human negotiation between social acclimation and social influence. I posit that fleshing out the thematic correlations and story lines rising from their rhetoric highlights the ways deans of women designed orientation courses as not simply tools of university acclimation but as mechanisms for preserving and promoting traditional social ideologies of womanhood. I also claim that such interpretive analysis demonstrates the difficulty deans of women experienced in trying to align such ideologies with changing societal gender expectations as well as their own evolving ideas of women's social capabilities and contributions. Such analysis offers a unique and valuable window through which feminism's awkward stage of growth can be examined and deans of women's efforts can be better understood and appreciated.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

This dissertation is an example of feminist historiography. It is a project resulting from the synthesis and analysis of early deans of women's rhetorical artifacts, recognizing themes therein, and analyzing what they reveal concerning these women's intentions, efforts, and expressed experience. Based on their rhetorical documents, I recognize that members of the National Association of Deans of Women (NADW) and individual professionals, as represented by Dean Kirmse, recognized the significance of their work. They also understood the rhetorical nature of history-writing and went out of their way to document and control the telling of their stories, the framing of their academic contributions, and the fashioning of their legacy. By concentrating on their writings, this project privileges the voices of deans of women and recognizes them as authorities of their own dealings with masculine systems and administrations on coeducational campuses. It also privileges deans of women's own theories, debates, and arguments concerning how to influence change within brusque hegemonic academic environments and make room for women professionally, physically, and intellectually. As a result, I contend that the writings and documented conversations of these deans of women reveal purposeful, organized, and concerted efforts to define, validate, and name their profession while simultaneously arguing for their students' right to study, learn, socialize, exist, and thrive on university campuses alongside men.

This dissertation also makes a significant contribution by capturing deans of women's awkward negotiations of shifting gender roles and social ideologies as women navigated the nascent rights and opportunities born of the Progressive Era. Most

compelling is how this project locates and examines interesting paradoxical debates as deans of women rhetorically promoted women's intellectual and professional capacities as equal or superior to men's while also holding fast to Victorian essentialist ideologies concerning women's inherent abilities, and needs, and callings. Rhetorical debates among deans of women demonstrate active theorizing and exploration of how to strike a balance between progressive endeavors and traditional ideals lauding women's heightened moral consciousness and appointed errand as wives and mothers. NADW founder McLean described this struggle in her 1964 memoir. She recalled that while "the world was changing fast and women's place in it even faster" during early twentieth century, women remained "determined to affirm the essential role of the woman as wife, mother, and homemaker" (*My Room* 71). However, McLean quickly adds that "we were just as determined that she should not be restricted to these functions and horizons" (*My Room* 71).

While indications of this ideological negotiation of gender roles appear in deans of women's arguments concerning women's work and rightful place on campus, it is most evident in their debates concerning the proper orientation of women students. Talks and reports composed by both the NADW and Dean Kirmse suggest that deans saw themselves not only as experienced guides but also as guardians responsible for protecting young women dizzied by shifting social morals and gender roles. Therefore, deans of women considered themselves duty-bound help women students embrace new opportunities without letting go of time-honored gender norms and social conventions: two acts that were most often contrary and incompatible. Therefore, within this realm and

within rhetorical exaggerations common during such times of growth, deans of women's shifting ideological rationales and arguments are most pronounced and most interesting.

Capturing these acts of "awkward" feminist navigation and the fumbling that often ensue during times of major social change is an important element in feminist historiography. As historian Lerner emphasized in 1979,

> Women's history must contain not only the activities and events in which women participated, but the record of changes and shifts in their perception of themselves and their roles…The most advanced conceptual level by which women's history can now be defined must include an account of the female experience as it changes over time and should include the development of feminist consciousness as an essential aspect of women's historical past. (*Majority* 161)

The Precarious Position of Dean of Women

While feminist awkwardness was an appropriate marker of social growth for deans of women during this period, their continued awkward and alien positioning within masculinist administrations, norms, and efforts was not. Since deans of women were continually called on to conform to academic systems catered to and administered by men, their positions continued to be rocky and insecure. Lois Mathews recognized deans of women's precarious position when she wrote her 1915 manual, *The Dean of Women*. She knew that simply allowing women on campus alongside men was far cry from considering them as peers and equals. She noted that

> The danger is that coeducational institutions will continue to be in the future as the vast majority have been in the past—institutions for men, with requirements set at a man's pace and to meet his needs, where women are admitted, rather than institutions which provide with equal readiness, ingenuity, and enthusiasm courses for both sexes. (14)

No matter the clear arguments made by deans of women that theirs' was a professional position, that they were leading experts in academic personnel work, that

they made explicit and measurable contributions to academic administrations, deans of women were continually called-on to argue their worth and fight for their right to exist in the male-dominated system of higher education. Dean Kirmse was no exception.

Whether it was required of her or a preemptive move on Dean Kirmse's part, within weeks of Alfred Atkinson assuming the position of university president in 1937, she presented him with a flow chart titled, "Department of the Dean of Woman 1937-38: Scope and Distribution of Work." It appears to have been as a prop associated with a verbal presentation (Chart). The fact that Atkinson retained this chart and archived it suggests he found it significant and perhaps even impressive.

In order for the chart to contain a full representation of her work and worth, it includes three large file folders opened and taped together as backdrop. Upon this thick manilla banner are glued an assortment of square and rectangle pieces of paper of different sizes each containing typed descriptions of Dean Kirmse's responsibilities, accomplishments, and governance. Black markered lines and arrows visually connect these glued texts to create a broad flow chart. The following note is glued to the upper right corner:

> To President Atkinson
> Because, during the past two decades, the work of the college dean of women has developed far beyond the old connotation of chaperon and has acquired so many ramifications, I am submitting for your information material which will indicate to you the scope and development of the work of this department of the University of Arizona and will in a measure show what we are trying to accomplish.
> If you wish more detailed information on any of the points indicated, I shall be very happy to provide it. I have on file also, if you should wish to see it, a resume of the work of the department during the present incumbency.
> Signed: Evelyn Jones [Kirmse], Dean of Women (Chart)

On this chart, Dean Kirmse divided her work into the following four categories and subcategories:

1. Administration
    1.1. University
    1.2. Departmental
2. Academic
    2.1. Teaching
    2.2. Guidance
    2.3. Research and Study in Progress
3. Professional and Community Relations
    3.1. Organization Activities, Etc.
4. Social (Direct Work with Students)
    4.1. Associated Women Students (Student Government)
    4.2. Individual and Group Guidance
    4.3. Health
    4.4. Social Activities
    4.5. Orientation
    4.6. Women's Organizations
    4.7. Discipline

With the aid of this chart, Dean Kirmse argued for the worth of her efforts and the value of her administrative position. Evidence suggests that her argument was both necessary and effective. While she eventually enjoyed a productive and cordial professional relationship with Atkinson, it looked to be hard-earned. For example, one of Atkinson's first acts was to give Dean Kirmse's beloved Pima Hall to the Business and Public Administration College for offices and classrooms (Cooper). Yet, within the following year—perhaps after she had proved her worth—he also surprised her with funds to build a new cooperative dormitory. Atkinson also expressed serious concerns

with keeping Dean Kirmse on after her marriage—another time when Dean Kirmse had to persuade him of her ability—yet both administrators ended up successfully working together for several years after. These examples demonstrate how male administrators were never fully satisfied with women's administrative contributions and always questioning their ability and commitment.

The Slow Erasure of Deans of Women

As previously mentioned in Chapter 5, the 1938 NADW Research Committee published a booklet titled *The Dean of Women in the Institution of Higher Learning*. This booklet defines and describes the position of dean of women as a profession and argues deans' expertise in academic personnel work. A second edition of this booklet was updated published in 1950.

While the 1950 edition contained more specific descriptions and definitions of the deans' work, the research committee also notes a new and troubling trend emerging at coeducational institutions: the establishment of a "director of student personnel work," a position filled by a male administrator (*The Dean* 12). They explain that this position creates

> a confusing and difficult situation whether the dean of women is directly responsible to the director of student personnel work or coordinate with him. In the former case, unless the situation is large and the director is on the vice-presidential level, the dean of women is likely to be cut out of service upon councils and committees where the point of view of women is essential. Also, when she is no longer coordinate in rank with the academic deans, she loses the force of leadership and the women students of the campus lose a woman leader with who to identify themselves. (*The Dean* 12)

This marks the beginning of a national administrative trend. Deans of women's efforts to develop and tout their expertise in student personnel work was turning out to be

a two-edged sword. The work was indeed valuable and received recognition; but because of its value, it was slowly but clearly being consumed and overtaken by men (Schwartz). Student personnel matters began to be combined into single programs and the head of new programs were always men.

Reflecting on the demise of the position at the UA from the vantage point of her retirement, Kirmse recognized that the dean of women position began to disappear under administrative rationales during the 1960s. She pointed out that during this resurgence of feminism and women's rights, it became "vogue" for academic administrations to eliminate non-coeducational—i.e. non-women-focused—programs and organizations under the performative guise of equality. "Hence," Kirmse contends, "women [at the UA] no longer handled their own affairs and discipline as they had for many years under the guidance of the Dean of Women," and the position eventually became "a casualty of the time" (Penned Reflections).

Despite all they accomplished and contributed to academia, deans of women were slowly relegated to positions of less authority and their positions were either discontinued or were retired with them. However, many of the ideas, theories, concepts, and goals developed by deans of women were carried forward by the men who had assumed their roles of leadership without mention of those who developed them (Schwartz). The dean of women position completely disappeared by the 1980s, within a century of when it was created (Bashaw).

As for the NADW, it changed its name in 1956 to National Association of Women Deans and Counselors (NAWDC) (Bashaw). The name changed again in 1973 when it became the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and

Counselors (NAWDAC). In 1991, "again reflecting changes in the student personnel profession," the organization became the National Association for Women in Education (NAWE) (Bashaw 158). Increased competition from other associations, a lack of funding, and a decrease in single-sex organizations contributed to the association deciding to officially cease operating in 2000 (Gangone). It eventually merged with the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators leaving behind considerable funding earmarked for the National Conference for College Women Student Leaders (Sartorius 187).

Walking in Evelyn Kirmse's Footsteps

Years ago, I read Gesa E. Kirsch argue for the epistemological value of physically walking in the footsteps of the historical subject of our research. More recently, Maureen Daly Goggin urged me to get outside of the UA Special Collections library and experience the physical spaces that Evelyn Jones Kirmse once experienced. Goggin had learned through her own personal research projects that there is value in standing where a historical subject once stood and moving where they once moved. Doing so, she explained, not only allows for greater understanding of their experience but opens the door for surprising insights. Therefore, on my last visit to the UA library, I made a point to leave the shadows of the archive and explore the spaces and the buildings once familiar to Kirmse, many of which were constructed as a result of Kirmse's efforts.

It was a warm Friday in October, and the Tucson sun had cooled to a bearable eighty-five degrees. Finding that Kirmse's early dorms were still in use, I walked across the campus in search of them. Students were mulling about the grounds talking, eating,

and contemplating. As I walked from the east side of campus to the west, palms and ponderosa pines grew in size and buildings aged. It was as if I was walking back in time.

I eventually happened upon Kirmse's row of original women's dormitories, three in a row, all built of the same red clay brick. I admired the classic chevron pattern across Gila Hall, the regal columns of Maricopa Hall, and the arches of Yuma. While was satisfying to see students casually filing in and out of their doors as they would have a century earlier, these were not the buildings I was most interested in.

As explained in Chapter 4, one of Kirmse's proudest achievements was the development and success of her cooperative women's dormitory, Pima Hall. Kirmse had not only successfully argued for the dormitory, but she also headed the building committee, personally drafted the original architectural sketches, and managed its operation for nine years. I was happy to discover that Kirmse's original building— now named the Slonaker House after a popular athletics manager—still stands just behind this red brick trio of dormitories. It currently houses offices dedicated to the honors college as well as alumni and campus IT services.

As I rounded Yuma Hall, I recognized the building right away. Sitting across a busy side street, Pima Hall's vintage sand-colored stucco, red tile roof, and overly generous porch looks anachronistic surrounded by modern buildings. As I approached, I noticed a black iron plaque attached to the stucco just right of the front door. In shallow relief, the first three lines of the plaque read "Pima Hall," "University of Arizona," "Erected 1940." This information is followed by the name of Arizona's governor, all nine names of the Arizona Board of Regents, UA president Atkinson, the R.W. Womack Construction Company, and architect Roy Place. I was disappointed. I suppose I knew

better than to expect to find Kirmse's name on the plaque; but I had hoped. This disappointment continued as I roamed around the Saltillo tiled lobby and into the small courtyard. There was nothing to suggest or acknowledge Kirmse's original influence in Pima Hall's creation.

Leaving, I retraced my steps and once again faced Gila Hall. I had been told of a small memorial that included mention of Kirmse, and I wanted to find it before returning to my research in the archives. It took some time to locate.

A small blue sign reading "Women's Plaza of Honor: Celebrating women's lives—past, present, and future" marks a narrow alley tucked between the Emil W. Haury Anthropology Building and the Centennial Hall theater. A river of inlayed blue pebbles drifts through the center of the gray cement sidewalk. While evergreen maples and palms offer a nice respite from the sun, the walkway first appears the same as others around campus. However, upon closer examination I notice some artistic flares bearing the names of women: colorful bricks in the boarder, ceramic leaves embedded in the blue pebbled concrete, a couple fountains, and several green benches donning small bronze name plates.

Walking in the shade, I could not help but think of how the first deans of women had argued for women's right to equal spaces on campus, spaces designed and designated for the specific use of women. This narrow garden walkway hidden in the shadows of large and prominent buildings bearing the names of men felt sadly inevitable.

As the narrow walkway approaches the street, it opens up into a small circular plaza. The blue pebbled river swells and then spirals around until disappearing in a point at the center. Concrete arches circle the little plaza. Each arch bears a title categorizing

the women whose names are etched into the columns: “Southern Arizona Women Activists,” “The Taylor Women,” African American Women,” Inspirational Women of Arizona,” “First Women Administrators.” There it was. That was the arch where the library archivist told me I should find Evelyn Kirmse’s name. I looked, but her name was not among the twenty-four listed. I looked again, again, and again. I walked back and forth along the memorial alleyway meant to honor all the women who had impacted the University. I examined everything that could possibly contain an etching of Evelyn Kirmse’s name, but I never found it.

When women have been fortunate enough to be written into academia, they have most often been written about. This dissertation, however, relies on the writings these deans of women composed themselves. Its goal is to recognize their evidential desire to compose their own experience and construct their own body of knowledge. With this dissertation, I interrupt the predominate masculine narratives of academic history that have defined and confined women’s presence, involvement, and influence into sporadic endnotes, rare marginal mentions, and narrow alley gardens. While such feminist historiography can be considered feminist acts of resistance that unsettle and revise dominant discourses, it fails in comparison to the deans of women themselves who disrupted entrenched masculine academic cultural norms in order to create generative spaces for women, all the while documenting and archiving their reasonings, arguments, and acts for those who would follow in their footsteps. Theirs was the epitome of enduring resistance.

WORKS CITED

Ahmed, Sara. *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others.* Duke University Press, 2006.

Alzeer, Gergana. "Types and Dynamics of Gendered Space: A Case of Emirati Female Learners in a Single-Gender Context." Gender and Education, vol. 30, no. 3, Routledge, 2018, pp. 360–78, doi:10.1080/09540253.2016.1205183.

"Annual Report of Dean of Women". Evelyn Jones Kirmse, Evelyn Kirmse Centennial Collection MS460, Box 14, pp. 20-21. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

"Another Plea is Made for Rooms: Dean Jones Asks All Who Will Rent to Do-eds to Notify Her," *The Arizona Daily Star,* 10 September 1935, p. 3.

Antler, Joyce. *The Educated Woman and Professionalization: The Struggle for a New Feminine Identity*, 1890-1920. 1977. SUNY. PhD dissertation.

Apaydin, Veysel " Introduction: Why Cultural Memory and Heritage?" *Critical Perspectives on Cultural Memory and Heritage.* UCL Press, 2020. https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781787354845.

Ballif, Michelle, et al. *Women's Ways of Making It in Rhetoric and Composition*. Routledge, 2008.

Ballif, Michelle. "Re/Dressing Histories: Or, On Re/Covering Figures Who Have Been Laid Bare by Our Gaze." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 1, 1992, pp. 91–98.

Barnard, Edith A. "Educational and Other Qualifications for Deans of Women," *Eleventh Yearbook,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1924, pp. 130-135. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 7. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Barone, Carlo, and Giulia Assirelli. "Gender Segregation in Higher Education: An Empirical Test of Seven Explanations." *Higher Education*, vol. 79, no. 1, Springer, 2020, pp. 55–78, doi:10.1007/s10734-019-00396-2.

Barone, Carlo. "Some Things Never Change: Gender Segregation in Higher Education Across Eight Nations and Three Decades." *Sociology of Education*, vol. 84, no. 2, American Sociological Association, Apr. 2011, pp. 157–76. doi:10.1177/0038040711402099.

Bashaw, Carolyn T. "Reassessment and Redefinition:'" The NAWDC and Higher Education for Women," *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical*

and Contemporary Perspectives, edited by Jana Nidiffer and Carolyn Terry Bashaw, State University of New York Press, 2001, pp. 157-182.

Bashaw, Carolyn T. *"Stalwart Women:" A Historical Analysis of Deans of Women in the South.* Teacher's College Press, 1999.

Beard, Mary Ritter "The New Feminism," *1935 Yearbook: Volume 13*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1935, pp. 96-97. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 5. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Beard, Mary Ritter. *On Understanding Women.* Longmans, Green and Co., 1931.

Biesecker, Barbara A. "Of Historicity, Rhetoric: The Archive as Scene of Invention." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2006, pp. 124–131.

Biesecker, Barbara. "Coming to Terms with Recent Attempts to Write Women into the History of Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1992, pp. 140–161.

"Big Year Seen for University." *The Arizona Daily Star,* 29 August 1934, p. 2.

Birmingham, Elizabeth. "'I See Dead People:' Archive, Crypt, and an Argument for the Researcher's Sixth Sense." *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process,* edited by Gesa Kirsch and Liz Rohan, Southern Illinois University Press, 2008, pp. 139-146.

Bledstein, Burton J. *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America*. Norton, 1976.

Blitz, Ann Dudley. "Method of Obtaining Women's Dormitories at Kansas Educational Institutions." *Eighth Annual Conference of Deans of Women: Papers Read Before Sectional Meeting.* Hathitrust. 1922, pp. 1-3. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc2.ark:/13960/t4bp0096t

"Board Picks Dean of Women, Fills Other Faculty Places," *The Arizona Daily Star,* 5 June 1929, p. 12.

"Board's Election Marks Milestone: Evelyn Jones Kirmse is First Woman to Serve as President of Regents," *The Arizona Daily Star*, 30 Jan 1958, p. 11.

Bordelon, Suzanne. "Muted Rhetors and the Mundane: The Case of Ruth Mary Weeks, Rewey Belle Inglis, and W. Wilbur Hatfield." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 64, no. 2, 2012, pp. 332–356.

Bradley, Harriet. "The Seductions of the Archive: Voices Lost and Found." History of the Human Sciences, vol. 12, no. 2, May 1999, pp. 107–122. doi:10.1177/09526959922120270.

Breuer, Elizabeth. "Feminism's Awkward Age." *Harper's Magazine*, vol. 150, 1925, pp. 545-551.

Broderick, Joanne Kirmse. "Memories of Grandmother, Evelyn Kirmse." Received by Cheryl Price-McKell, 23 March 2018.

Brower, Schwartz. "'Is It Because I'm a Woman?' Gender-Based Attributional Ambiguity in Higher Education Administration." *Gender and Education*, vol. 31, no. 1, Routledge, Jan. 2019, pp. 117–35, doi:10.1080/09540253.2017.1324131.

Brown, Caroline. "Memory, Identity and the Archival Paradigm: Introduction to the Special Issue." *Archival Science*, vol. 13, no. 2-3, 2013, pp. 85–93.

Brown, Mary Louise. "Talks to Freshmen—Their Content and Value." *1923: Report of the Tenth Annual Meeting of NADW: Addresses and Proceedings of the Sixty-First Annual Meeting of the National Education Association,* 1923, pp. 634-635. https://www.google.com/books/edition/Addresses_and_Proceedings_National_Educa/RdUtAQAAIAAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0.

"Bylaws" *Twelfth Yearbook,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1925, p. x. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 8. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Bynum, William, and Lara Varpio. "When I Say … Hermeneutic Phenomenology." *Medical Education*, vol. 52, no. 3, Wiley, 2018, pp. 252–53, https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13414.

"Campus Events," *The Arizona Daily Star*, 14 Dec 1930, p 13.

Caron, Daniel J., and Andreas Kellerhals. "Archiving for Self-Ascertainment, Identity-Building and Permanent Self-Questioning: Archives Between Skepticism and Certitude." *Archival Science*, vol. 13, no. 2-3, Springer Netherlands, 2012, pp. 207–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-012-9189-y.

Carpenter, Miriam F. "Educational and Other Qualifications for Deans of Women," *Eleventh Yearbook,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1924, pp. 124-130. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 7. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Chart. Evelyn Jones Kirmse, University of Arizona Office of the President Papers: Alfred Atkinson (1937-1947), AZ 426, Box 10, Folder: Dean of Women (Evelyn Jones Kirmse, 1937-1939). Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Clarke, Edward. *Sex in Education; Or, a Fair Chance for the Girls*. J. R. Osgood & Company, 1873.

Clements, K. A. "The New Era and the New Woman." *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2004, pp. 425-462. *ProQuest*, http://login.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/new-era-woman/docview/212436556/se-2?accountid=4485.

Colton, Georgianna. “By Order of the Regents.” *1903 Burro, University of Arizona Yearbook,* Associated Students of the University of Arizona, n.p., LD198.7, Box D4, 1903. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188229

“Columbia Head Here Tuesday; Sarah M. Sturtevant Will Address Students at Assembly,” *College Eye*. University of Northern Iowa. October 23, 1931. https://indexuni.library.uni.edu/articles/183506).

Cooper, James F. *Places in the Sun*. Westernlore Press, 1989.

Correspondence. Evelyn Jones Kirmse, Evelyn Kirmse Centennial Collection, MS460, Box 17, Folder “Compilation: Correspondence (Various General) (1973-1985).” Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Crimmins, Gail. “Strategies for Resisting Sexism in the Academy: Higher Education, Gender and Intersectionality.” *Strategies for Resisting Sexism in the Academy*, Springer Publishing, 2019.

Crowther, Susan, et al. “Crafting Stories in Hermeneutic Phenomenology Research: A Methodological Device.” *Qualitative Health Research*, vol. 27, no. 6, SAGE Publications, 2017, pp. 826–35, https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316656161.

“Crowding Hits Grade Records: Dean Reveals Difficulty of Study in Present Situation,” *The Arizona Star*, 1 November 1936, p. 7.

“Dean E. W. Jones,” *1934 Desert,* University of Arizona Yearbooks, Associated Students of the University of Arizona, p. 23. LD198.7, Box D4, 1934. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188850.

“Dean of Women is Moving Again,” *The Arizona Star,* 9 September 1937, p. 3.

“Dean of Women,” *1930 Desert, University of Arizona Yearbooks,* Associated Students of the University of Arizona, p. 27. LD198.7, Box D4, 1930. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188829

“Dean of Women,” *1930 Desert, University of Arizona Yearbooks.* Associated Students of the University of Arizona, LD198.7, Box D4, 1930. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188829

“Dean of Women.” *1939 Desert, University of Arizona Yearbook*, Associated Students of the University of Arizona, 1939, p. 11. LD198.7, Box D4, Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188851.

DeSole, Gloria, and Leonore Hoffmann. *Rocking the Boat : Academic Women and Academic Processes.* Modern Language Association of America, 1981.

"Dormitories." *1921 Desert, University of Arizona Yearbook,* Associated Students of the University of Arizona, 1921, p. 161. LD198.7, Box D4, Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188802.

Douglas, Jennifer. "Origins and Beyond: The Ongoing Evolution of Archival Ideas about Provenance," *Currents of Archival Thinking*, edited by Heather MacNeil and Eastwood, Terry 2nd Edition. 2nd ed., Libraries Unlimited, 2017, pp. 25-52.

Doyle, Anastasia. "A Study of the Yearbooks of the N.A.D.W. (1924-1935)," 1936 Yearbook: Volume 14, National Association of Deans of Women Research Committee, 1936, pp. 108-115. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731, File 6. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Dries, Monique van den and José Schreurs "A Glimpse into the Crystal Ball: How do We Select the Memory of the Future?" Edited by Veysel Apaydin, *Critical Perspectives on Cultural Memory and Heritage*, UCL Press, 2020, pp. 289-306. https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781787354845.

Early Student Supervision. Evelyn Jones Kirmse, Evelyn Kirmse Centennial Collection, MS460, Box 3, Folder "University of Arizona History: Events –1914-1918." Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Early UA History. Evelyn Jones Kirmse, *Evelyn Kirmse Centennial Collection,* MS460, Box 3, Folder "University of Arizona History: Events – 1900-1913." Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Eighth Annual Conference of Deans of Women: Papers Read Before Sectional Meeting, National Association of Deans of Women, 1922. Hathitrust. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc2.ark:/13960/t4bp0096t

Eisenmann, Linda. "Reconsidering a Classic: Assessing the History of Women's Higher Education a Dozen Years after Barbara Solomon." *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 67, no. 4, 1997, pp. 689–717.

Elliott, Grace Loucks. "How Can We Aid Girls at the College Level in Solving Emotional Problems?" *1934 Yearbook: Volume 12,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1934, pp. 134-140. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 4. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Enoch, Jessica. "A Woman's Place Is in the School: Rhetorics of Gendered Space in Nineteenth-Century America." *College English*, vol. 70, no. 3, National Council of Teachers of English, 2008, pp. 275–95.

Enoch, Jessica, and Pamela VanHaitsma. "Archival Literacy: Reading the Rhetoric of Digital Archives in the Undergraduate Classroom." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 67, no. 2, 2015, pp. 216–242.

Enoch, Jessica. “Changing Research Methods, Changing History: A Reflection on Language, Location, and Archive.” *Composition Studies*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2010, pp. 47–73.

Enoch, Jessica. “Releasing Hold: Feminist Historiography Without the Tradition.” *Theorizing Histories of Rhetoric*. Edited by Michelle Ballif. Southern Illinois UP, 2013. pp. 58–73

Esterly, Virginia Judy. “The Dean’s Desk,” 1927, *Fourteenth Yearbook 1927,* National Association of Deans of Women pp. 77-90. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 10. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

“Evelyn Jones Kirmse, ’31 Dean of Women, Now Arizona Regent,” *The Arizona Daily Star*, October 28, 1956, p. 5.

Fabich, Mary Jo “The History of NODA.” *The Journal of College Orientation and Transition*, vol. 15, no. 1, University of Minnesota Libraries Publishing, 2007, https://doi.org/10.24926/jcotr.v15i1.2676.

"Feminism: The Fight for Suffrage." *American Decades*, edited by Judith S. Baughman, et al., vol. 2: 1910-1919. link.gale.com/apps/doc/CX3468300453/GVRL?u=asuniv&sid=bookmark-GVRL&xid=b9ae0556.

Finnegan, Dorothy E., and Nathan F. Alleman. “The YMCA and the Origins of American Freshman Orientation Programs.” *Historical Studies in Education,* vol. 25, no. 1, Mar. 2013, pp. 95–114. EBSCOhost, search-ebscohost-com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=31h&AN=91547347&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

Fonow, Mary Margaret, and Judith A. Cook. *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*. Indiana University Press, 1991.

Forms and Tests. Box AZ 519 Records Relating to Social Fundamentals, an Orientation Course Required for all Freshman Women 1934-1949, Folder 1938/39-1940/41 “Social Fundamentals.” Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Franklin, G.B. “Cooperative Housing,” *1933 Yearbook: Volume 11*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1933, pp. 111-114. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

“Fraternities.” *1922 Desert, University of Arizona Yearbook,* Associated Students of the University of Arizona, p. 259, LD198.7, Box D4, 1903. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, http://hdl.handle.net/10150/579093.

Freidson, Eliot. *Professional Powers: A Study of the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge.* University of Chicago Press, 1986.

"Gamma Phi Sigma Sorority." *1916 Desert, University of Arizona Yearbook,* Associated Students of the University of Arizona, LD198.7, Box D4, 1903. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188752.

Gangone, Lynn M. "The National Association for Women in Education: An Enduring Legacy." *Journal about Women in Higher Education.* 2009, vol. 1, no. 1, 2009, pp. 2009.

Glenn, C. "Truth, Lies, and Method: Revisiting Feminist Historiography." *College English*, vol. 62, no. 3, 2000, pp. 387–89, https://doi.org/10.2307/378937.

Glenn, Cheryl, and Enoch, Jessica. "Drama in the Archives: Rereading Methods, Rewriting History." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 61, no. 2, 2009, pp. 321–342.

Goggin, Maureen Daly and Peter N. Goggin. *Serendipity in Rhetoric, Writing, and Literacy Research.* Utah State UP, 2018.

Goggin, Maureen Daly. "An Essamplaire Essai on the Rhetoricity of Needlework Sampler-Making: A Contribution to Theorizing and Historicizing Rhetorical Praxis." Rhetoric Review, vol. 21, no. 4, 2002, pp. 309–338.

Goodman, Joyce. "Afterword: Histories of Women's Higher Education, Time, and Temporalities." *Paedagogica Historica,* vol. 56, no. 6, Routledge, 2020, pp. 847–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.2020.1822891.

Goodspeed, Florence. "The Ida Noyes Hall," *1925: Twelfth Yearbook*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1925, pp. 141-145. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 8. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Gordon, Lynn D. *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era*. Yale UP, 1990.

Gorgosz, Jon. "The Campus Sweetheart: An Idealized, Gendered Image on College Campuses in the Early to Mid-Twentieth Century." *American Educational History Journal*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2014, pp. 357–372.

Hale, Florence. "The Education of Women for the New World." *Seventeenth Yearbook 1930*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1930, pp. 203-204. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 1. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Hamilton, Jean. "Student Buildings," *1925: Twelfth Yearbook*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1925, p. 148. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 8. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Handwritten Reflections. AZ 519 Records Relating to Social Fundamentals, an Orientation Course Required for all Freshman Women 1934-1949, Folder: Evelyn J. Kirmse's Historical Notes (1980s). Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Heath, K. G. "Our Heritage Speaks." *Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, vol. 49, 1986, pp. 14-21.

Heilbrun, Carolyn G. "The Politics of Mind: Women, Tradition, and the University." *Papers on Language & Literature*, vol. 50, no. 3/4, Summer/Fall2014, pp. 281-297.

Hevel, Michael S. "Toward a History of Student Affairs: A Synthesis of Research, 1996–2015." *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 57, no. 7, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016, pp. 844–62, https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2016.0082.

Historical Notes. Evelyn Jones Kirmse, Evelyn Kirmse Centennial Collection MS460, Box 14, Folder "University of Arizona History: Various Subject-Dean of Women." Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Hoff, Joan. *Law, Gender, and Injustice: a Legal History of U.S. Women*. New York University Press, 1991.

"Housing Needed for U.A. Co-Eds: Dean Jones Seeking New Quarters to Relieve Two Dormitories," *The Arizona Daily Star,* 3 October 1934, p. 4.

"Institute: Sororities: Their Place in Campus Life," *Seventeenth Yearbook 1930*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1930, pp. 188-189. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 1. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Jimerson, Randall C., "Archives and memory", *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives*, vol.19 no. 3, 2003, pp.89-95. https://doi.org/10.1108/10650750310490289.

Jones, Jane Louise. *A Personnel Study of Women Deans in Colleges and Universities.* Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.

Kafle, Narayan Prasad. "Hermeneutic Phenomenological Research Method Simplified." *Bodhi: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. vol 5, 2011, pp. 181-200.

Kahle-Wickes, Helen Louise. *A Professional Curriculum Preparing for the Position of Dean of Women*. 1929. University of Southern California, PhD dissertation.

Kaplan, Elisabeth. "We Are What We Collect, We Collect What We Are: Archives and the Construction of Identity." *The American Archivist*, vol. 63, no. 1, Society of American Archivists, 2000, pp. 126–51. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.63.1.h554377531233l05.

Kirmse, Evelyn Jones. "'Your Family Background:' A Letter to Granddaughter Joanne Kirmse." 4 June 1985. Personal Collection of Joanne Kirmse Broderick.

[Kirmse] Jones, Evelyn W. "Sororities," *1933 Yearbook: Volume 11*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1933, pp. 107-110. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

[Kirmse] Jones, Evelyn. "What Are We Educating Our Girls For? *Arizona Woman,* March 1933, pp. 5-6, 14, AZ 420 Office of the President Papers; Homer L. Shantz (1928-1936); Series IV; Box 8, Folder Jones, Evelyn W. Dean of Women, 1929-1936. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Kirsch, Gesa. "Being on Location: Serendipity, Place, and Archival Research." *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process.* Southern Illinois University Press, 2008, pp. 20-27.

-- *Ethical Dilemmas in Feminist Research the Politics of Location, Interpretation, and Publication*. State University of New York Press, 1999.

-- *Women Writing the Academy : Audience, Authority, and Transformation*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1993.

Kirsch, Gesa., et al. *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process.* Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.

Kleszynski, Margaret A. *Cultural, Economic and Social Influences on Coeducation in the United States and Implications for Student Services*. ERIC Clearinghouse, 1994.

L'Eplattenier, Barbara E. "An Argument for Archival Research Methods: Thinking Beyond Methodology." *College English*, vol. 72, no. 1, NCTE, 2009, pp. 67–79.

Lecture Notes. AZ 519 Records Relating to Social Fundamentals, an Orientation Course Required for all Freshman Women 1934-1949, Folder: Evelyn J. Kirmse's Early Lecture Notes. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Patriarchy.* Oxford University Press, 1986.

-- *The Majority Finds Its Past: Placing Women in History*. Oxford University Press, 1979.

-- *Why History Matters: Life and Thought.* Oxford University Press, 1997.

Liu, Yihan and Christopher Grey. "History, Gendered Space and Organizational Identity: An Archival Study of a University Building" *Human Relations*, vol. 71 no. 5, 2018, pp 640-667.

Longman, Karen, et al. *Women and Leadership in Higher Education* . Information Age Publishing Inc., 2014.

Löw, Martina. "The Social Construction of Space and Gender." *European Journal of Women's Studies,* vol. 13, no. 2, 2006, pp. 119–133; http://ejw.sagepub.com DOI: 10.1177/1350506806062751.

Lunsford, Andrea A. “On Reclaiming Rhetorica,” *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*, edited by Andrea A. Lunsford, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995, pp. 3-8.

Mack, Craig E. “A Brief Overview of the Orientation, Transition, and Retention Field,” *Designing Successful Transitions: A Guide for Orienting Students to College*, ed Jeanine A. Ward-Roof. University of South Carolina Press. 2010. pp. 3-10.

Marback, Richard. “The Rhetorical Space of Robben Island.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 2, Taylor & Francis Group, 2004, pp. 7–27. doi:10.1080/02773940409391279.

Marianne Hirsch and Valerie Smith “Feminism and Cultural Memory: An Introduction” Gender and Cultural Memory Special Issue Editors Marianne Hirsch and Valerie Smith. *Signs* , vol. 28, no. 1, Autumn 2002, pp. 1-19.

Martin, Jennifer L. *Women as Leaders in Education Succeeding Despite Inequity, Discrimination, and Other Challenges*. Praeger, 2011.

Mason, Justina. *Exploring the Impact of New Student Orientation at 2-Year Colleges: A Mixed-Methods Study*, Drexel University, Ann Arbor, 2020. *ProQuest*, http://login.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/exploring-impact-new-student-orientation-at-2/docview/2466335915/se-2?accountid=4485.

Massey, Doreen B. *Space, Place, and Gender.* University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Mastrangelo, Lisa and Barbara L’Eplattenier. “Stumbling in the Archives: A Tale of Two Novices.” *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process,* edited by Gesa Kirsch and Liz Rohan, Southern Illinois University Press, 2008, pp. 161-170.

Mathews, Lois Kimball. *The Dean of Women,* Houghton Mifflin, 1915. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/wu.89098886658.

Mattingly, Carol. “Telling Evidence: Rethinking What Counts in Rhetoric.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2002, pp. 99–108.

[McLean] Phillips, K. S. “Beginnings.” *Journal of the National Association of Deans of Women*, vol. 16, 1953, pp. 143-145.

[McLean] Phillips, Kathryn Sisson. *My Room in the World: The Story of a Life of Service, Dedication, and Love*. Abingdon Press, 1964.

McKee, Heidi A., and Porter, James E. “The Ethics of Archival Research.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2012, pp. 59–81.

Merrill, Ruth and Helen Bragdon. *The Vocation of Dean.* 1926, National Education Association Records 1005.RG, Series 27, Box 4167, Folder 11. Special

Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Miscellaneous Forms and Memos. Box AZ 519 Records Relating to Social Fundamentals, an Orientation Course Required for all Freshman Women 1934-1949, Folder 1941/42-1943/44 "Social Fundamentals." Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Mitchell, Margaret. "The Founding of the University of Arizona," *Arizona and the West*, vol. 27, no. 1, Spring, 1985, pp. 5-36 .

Morris, Sammie L. and Shirley K. Rose. "Invisible Hands: Recognizing Archivists' Works to Make Records Accessible." *Working in the Archives: Practical Research Methods for Rhetoric and Composition*, edited by Alexis E. Ramsey et al., Southern Illinois UP, 2010, pp. 51-78.

Mountford, Roxanne. "On Gender and Rhetorical Space." Rhetoric Society Quarterly, vol. 31, no. 1, Taylor & Francis Group, 2001, pp. 41–71. doi:10.1080/02773940109391194.

National Archives. "Records of the Public Works Administration [PWA]." *Guide to Federal Records*, https://www.archives.gov/research/guide-fed-records/groups/135.html

Nidiffer, Jana. *Pioneering Deans of Women: More than Wise and Pious Matrons*. Teachers College Press, 2000.

-- "Advocates on Campus: Deans of Women Create a New Profession" *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by Jana Nidiffer and Carolyn Terry Bashaw, State University of New York Press, 2001, pp. 135-156.

-- "Crumbs from the Boy's Table: The First Century of Coeducation," *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by Jana Nidiffer and Carolyn Terry Bashaw, State University of New York Press, 2001, pp. 13-34.

Notes for the Marvin File, Evelyn Jones Kirmse, 1984, MS 2130 Guide to the Alumni Class Materials, 1823-1998, Box 34, Folder 10. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Orientation Course Material. AZ 519 Records Relating to Social Fundamentals, an Orientation Course Required for all Freshman Women 1934-1949, Folder: Miscellaneous Material (Mostly Undated). Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

"Orientation of Freshmen in Colleges and Universities" Research Division for the National Association of Deans of Women, 1942. National Education Association Records 1005.RG, Series 27, Box 4167. Folder 1. Special Collections Research

Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC. (4073-4090)

"Panel Discussion on the Relation of the Dean to the Personnel Program of the Secondary School." *1934 Yearbook: Volume 12,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1934, pp. 177-179. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 4. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Parrish, Susan Scott. "Rummaging/In and Out of Holds." *American Literary History*, vol. 22, no. 2, 2010, pp. 289–301.

Patton, Anna L. *Welcome to New Student Orientation!: A Thought Experiment on Alternative Models of Student Orientation(s)*, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Ann Arbor, 2017.

Penned Reflections. Evelyn Jones Kirmse, Evelyn Kirmse Centennial Collection MS460, Box 16, Folder "University of Arizona History: Various Subject-Women 1918-1980." Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Phillips, Ellis L, Mina Kerr, and Agnes Wells. "History of the National Association of Deans of Women" *Report of Committee on History of the National Association of Deans of Women.* 1926, pp. 17-24; National Education Association Records 1005.RG. Box 4167. Folder 5. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Pierce, Anna Eloise. "Helping the Freshmen Women to Make an Early and Successful Adjustment to Their New Environment," *1923: Report of the Tenth Annual Meeting of National Association of Deans of Women,* 1923, pp. 121-131. National Education Association Records MS2281, Series 6, Subseries 28, Box 1730. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

"Pima Hall." *1933 Desert, University of Arizona Yearbook*, Associated Students of the University of Arizona, 1933, p. 231. LD198.7, Box D4, Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/579125.

"Pima Hall." *1934 Desert, University of Arizona Yearbook*, Associated Students of the University of Arizona, 1934, p. 213. LD198.7, Box D4, Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188850.

"Pima." 1935 *Desert, University of Arizona Yearbook*, Associated Students of the University of Arizona, 1935, p. 195. LD198.7, Box D4, Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188871.

"Pima Hall." 1936 *Desert, University of Arizona Yearbook*, Associated Students of the University of Arizona, 1936, p. 167. LD198.7, Box D4, Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/579124.

Post-Marriage Memo. Alfred Atkinson, University of Arizona Office of the President Papers: Alfred Atkinson (1937-1947), AZ 426, Box 10, Folder: Dean of Women (Evelyn Jones Kirmse, 1937-1939). Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Potter, Mary Ross "History of Conferences of Deans of Women to the Organization of the National Association in 1917" *Report of Committee on History of the National Association of Deans of Women*. 1926, pp. 1-16; National Education Association Records 1005.RG., Series 27, Box 4167. Folder 5. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Potter, Mary Ross. "Future of Sororities." *Eighth Annual Conference of Deans of Women: Papers Read Before Sectional Meeting.* Hathitrust. 1922, pp. 18-21. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc2.ark:/13960/t4bp0096t.

Powell, Malea. "Dreaming Charles Eastman: Cultural Memory, Autobiography, and Geography in Indigenous Rhetorical Histories." *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process,* edited by Gesa Kirsch and Liz Rohan, Southern Illinois University Press, 2008, pp. 115-127.

Radke-Moss, Andrea G. *Bright Epoch: Women & Coeducation in the American West*. University of Nebraska Press, 2008.

Ratcliffe, Krista. *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender. Whiteness*. Southern Illinois UP, 2005.

Ray, Angela, "Rhetoric and the Archive." *Review of Communication,* vol. 16, no. 1, 2016, pp. 43-59.

Registration Ledger. University of Arizona Office of the Registrar, University of Arizona Statistical Record 1891-1926, AZ 449. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Relationships in the Performance of Personal [sic] *Duty,* National Association of Deans of Women, n.d., National Education Association Records 1005.RG, Series 27, Box 4167, Folder 4. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Report Drafts and Notes. Evelyn Jones Kirmse, Evelyn Kirmse Centennial Collection MS460, Box 4, Folder "University of Arizona History: Events- 1930s (1), 1930-1939." Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Report Drafts II and Notes. Evelyn Jones Kirmse, Evelyn Kirmse Centennial Collection MS460, Box 4, Folder "University of Arizona History: Events- 1930s (2), 1930-1939." Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

"RFC Approves UA Dormitory: Woman's Cooperative Home Assured through Federal Aid Loan," The Arizona Star, 11 February 1940, p. 1.

Richard Leo Enos, “The Archaeology of Women in Rhetoric: Rhetorical Sequencing as a Research Method for Historical Scholarship,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32 (2002): 65-80.

Robnett, Florence Schee, “Cooperative Dormitories at Northwestern University,” *1933 Yearbook: Volume 11*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1933, pp. 114-115. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Robnett, Florence. “The Dean of Women and Her Relation to the Personnel Office,” *1931 Yearbook: Volume 9*, National Association of Deans of Women, pp. 103-110. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 1. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones and Gesa Kirsch. *Feminist Rhetorical Practices New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*. Southern Illinois UP, 2012.

Rudolph, Frederick., and John R. Thelin. *The American College and University: A History.* University of Georgia Press, 1990.

Runnals, Ninetta M. “Orientation Courses for Women.” *1932 Yearbook: Volume 10,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1932, pp. 129-132. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Savigny, Heather. “Cultural Sexism Is Ordinary: Writing and Re-Writing Women in Academia.” *Gender, Work & Organization*, vol. 24, no. 6, 2017, pp. 643–655.

Schlotterbeck, Mrs. Julius O. “Residence Halls,” *1925: Twelfth Yearbook*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1925, pp. 133-136. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 8. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Schwager, Sally. “Educating Women in America.” *Signs*, vol. 12, no. 2, 1987, pp. 333–372.

Schwartz, Joan, and M. Cook. “Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory.” *Archival Science*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2002, pp. 1–19.

Schwartz, Robert A. “Reconceptualizing the Leadership Roles of Women in Higher Education: A Brief History on the Importance of Deans of Women.” *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 68 no. 5, 1997, pp. 502-522.

Simeone, Angela. *Academic Women : Working Towards Equality*. Bergin & Garvey, 1987.

Simrall, Josephine P. "The Dean of Women on the Campus of 1925" *Twelfth Yearbook,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1925, pp. 54-59. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 8. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

"Situations of All Kinds Needed for Girls at University." *The Arizona Daily Star*, 8 September 1932, p. 11.

Sloan, Art, and Brian Bowe. "Phenomenology and Hermeneutic Phenomenology: The Philosophy, the Methodologies, and Using Hermeneutic Phenomenology to Investigate Lecturers' Experiences of Curriculum Design." *Quality & Quantity*, vol. 48, no. 3, Springer Netherlands, 2013, pp. 1291–303, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9835-3.

Slowe, Lucy D. "The Dean of Women and Her Relation to the Personnel Office," *1931 Yearbook: Volume 9*, National Association of Deans of Women, pp. 111-112. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 1. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Smith, Helen M. "College Social Life and Its Training for Functioning After Graduation," *Eleventh Yearbook,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1924, pp. 101-105. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 7. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Solomon, Barbara Miller. *In the Company of Educated Women: a History of Women and Higher Education in America*. Yale University Press, 1985.

Spain, Daphne. "Space and Status." *Gendered Spaces.* University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Stimpson, Dorothy. "Report of the President." *Fourteenth Yearbook 1927*, National Association of Deans of Women, pp. 35-38. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1730. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

"Student Housing Will be Problem at U. of A." *The Arizona Daily Star,* 28 August 1936, p. 4.

Sturtevant, Sarah M. "A Study of the Office of Dean of Women in Colleges and Universities" 1927, *Fourteenth Yearbook 1927,* National Association of Deans of Women pp. 95-98. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 10. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Sturtevant, Sarah M. "The Qualifications and Preparation of Deans of Women," *Eleventh Yearbook,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1924, pp. 117-123. National Education Association Records, MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 7. Special

Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Suddick, Kitty Maria, et al. “The Work of Hermeneutic Phenomenology.” *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 19, SAGE Publications, 2020, p. 1-14, https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920947600.

“Summary of 1935 Investigations Relating to Work of the Dean,” 1936 Yearbook: Volume 14, National Association of Deans of Women Research Committee, 1936, pp. 59-70. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Sutherland. Christine Mason. “Feminist Historiography: Research Methods in Rhetoric,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol. 32, no.1, 2002, pp. 109-122.

“The Dean of Women,” *1932 Desert, University of Arizona Yearbooks,* Associated Students of the University of Arizona, p. 21. LD198.7, Box D4, 1932. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/579092

The Dean of Women in the Institution of Higher Learning, NADW Research Committee, 1938 and 1950, National Education Association Records 1005.RG, Series 27, Box 4166, Folder 9 “The Dean of Women in the Institution of Higher Learning 1938-1950.” Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

“The Planning of Girls Dormitories with Drawings Illustrating Several Types,” Howland Jones, 1932, National Education Association Records 1005.RG, Series 27, Box 4167, Folder 3, Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Thelin, John R. *A History of American Higher Education*. 2nd ed., Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

Tompson, Lilliann W. “The Future of Sororities from a Panhellenic Standpoint.” *Eighth Annual Conference of Deans of Women: Papers Read Before Sectional Meeting*. Hathitrust. 1922, pp. 15-17. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc2.ark:/13960/t4bp0096t.

Tucker, Louis Leonard. "Massachusetts." *Historical Consciousness in the Early Republic: The Origins of State Historical Societies, Museums, and Collections, 1791-1861*, edited by H. G. Jones, North Carolinian Society, Inc. 1995, pp. 1-28.

Turk, Diana B. *Bound by a Mighty Vow: Sisterhood and Women’s Fraternities, 1870-1920*. NYUP. 2004

UA History. Evelyn Jones Kirmse, Evelyn Kirmse Centennial Collection, 460, Box 3, Folder “University of Arizona History: Events –1920’s, 1920-1929.” Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ.

Veblen, Thorstein. *The Higher Learning in America : A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*. Viking Press, 1935.

Veysey, Laurence R. *The Emergence of the American University*. University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Voigt, Irma. "Student Buildings," *1925: Twelfth Yearbook*, National Association of Deans of Women, 1925, pp. 136-140. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 8. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Walker, Mark. "Brief History University of Arizona." *1903 Burro, University of Arizona Yearbook,* Associated Students of the University of Arizona, n.p., LD198.7, Box D4, 1903. Special Collections at the University of Arizona Libraries, Tucson, AZ. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/188229.

Warner, Nadine K. *Duties of a Dean of Women: Current Practices and Accepted Procedures.* ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 1948.

Warren, Chip. "Evelyn Kirmse, 'Grand Old Lady' of UA, Dead at 85" *The Arizona Daily Star*, January 30, 1986, p. 4.

Wells, Agnes E. "President's Report." *National Association of Deans of Women Twelfth Yearbook*. 1924 pp. 10-12. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 7. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Wells, Agnes E. "President's Report." *National Association of Deans of Women Twelfth Yearbook*. 1925 pp. 8-10. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1730, Folder 8. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.

Winslow, Sarah. "Gender Inequality and Time Allocations Among Academic Faculty." *Gender & Society*, vol. 24, no. 6, SAGE Publications, Dec. 2010, pp. 769–93.

Woody, Thomas. *A History of Women's Education in the United States*. The Science Press, 1929.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas*, Oxford UP, 2008.

Yanni, Carla. *Living on Campus: An Architectural History of the American Dormitory*. University of Minnesota Press, 2019.

"Yearbook." *1932 Yearbook: Volume 10,* National Association of Deans of Women, 1932, p. 38. National Education Association Records MS2281, Box 1731. Folder 2. Special Collections Research Center, The George Washington University Libraries, Washington, DC.