This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

BEING THE OTHER WOMEN IN TRADITIONALLY MALE-DOMINATED FIELDS

presented by

Elizabeth Brooke Kelly

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Master's degree in Sociology

Rita A. Gallin
Major professor

Date March 12, 1999

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
APR 1 0 2001		
APR 0 2 2002		

BEING THE OTHER
WOMEN IN TRADITIONALLY MALE-DOMINATED FIELDS

By

Elizabeth Brooke Kelly

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ART

Department of Sociology

1999

ABSTRACT

BEING THE OTHER
WOMEN IN TRADITIONALLY MALE-DOMINATED FIELDS

By

Elizabeth Brooke Kelly

This paper seeks to examine the subjective experiences of women in traditionally male-dominated fields and, more specifically, to document the strategies women in these fields utilize to deal with *being the other*.[1] To do so, I rely on twenty-one in-depth interviews with female students in the fields of architecture and engineering. Four strategies for dealing with being the other emerged from these interviews: de-emphasizing femaleness, constructing another "other," rejecting otherness, and collective resistance. The findings of this research suggest a need to build upon the pivotal works of others such as Joan Acker (1991), Rossabeth Moss Kanter (1977), and Jennifer L. Pierce (1995), acknowledging that the women in these fields utilize multiple strategies according to the situation and context in which they find themselves. These findings are significant to the study of gender since, in many cases, these women's actions transcend dichotomous notions of "masculine" versus "feminine" behavior. Policy implications for the entrance of women into these fields is also addressed briefly.

---

[1] As defined by Aturo Madrid (1998, 23).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project began as my honors thesis at the University of Florida. Joe Feagin, my advisor and mentor, provided direction, intellectual guidance, and encouragement not only in the initial stages of this project, but also in the continuation of my graduate education. His kind, but forceful nudges play a significant role in my academic standing and work today.

This project would not have made it to completion without the guidance of Marilyn Aronoff, Rita Gallin, and Steve Gold. As my committee members, they each contributed pivotal insights, suggestions, and an abundance of patience in editing multiple drafts. I am particularly grateful to Rita Gallin, my advisor, for her perseverance in "talking through" ideas with me over and over again. I would not have made it to this final draft without her. Participating in Maxine Baca Zinn's panel on filling in gaps in feminist sociology encouraged me to examine this research through a slightly different lens which has ultimately enriched the final product.

Finally, I am indebted to the twenty-one women who contributed their time, insights, and experiences. I regret that I cannot acknowledge them by name here. Without them this paper would not be possible since their lived experiences are the driving force behind this project. I hope that I have represented them well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION....1

LITERATURE REVIEW....2

METHODS....5

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION....8
Being the Other in a Gendered Institution....8
Dealing with Otherness....12
De-emphasizing Femaleness....13
Constructing Another "Other"....17
Rejecting Otherness....22
Collective Resistance....25

CONCLUSIONS....30

APPENDIX A
Interview Questions....37

APPENDIX B
Consent Form....40

LITERATURE CITED....41

INTRODUCTION

In 1993 women made up only 22.4 percent of the science and engineering labor force. Of the 55,000 registered architects in the U.S., only 11 percent were women in 1996 (Jordan Sieder 1996, 67), although women made up one-third of the total number of architecture students in undergraduate and graduate programs in 1995 (Bussel 1995, 45). These numbers suggest that the fields of engineering and architecture remain male-dominated. This paper, based on interviews with female students of engineering and architecture, explores the way women in male-dominated fields perceive and deal with their marginal status as women. Utilizing Joan Acker's (1991) framework for gendered institutions and Arturo Madrid's (1998) theoretical perspective on being *the other*, I elaborate on how women are made to feel like *the other* within what are defined as men's fields. Then I present four ways women deal with their "otherness." In the conclusion, I highlight the significance and implications of the findings. I propose that although women's lives and experiences as architects and engineers are limited by institutional constraints, at the same time, they actively resist and seek ways of dealing with such a location of isolation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Much of the literature on women in male-dominated fields has addressed the question, "Are women really capable of doing science and engineering?" (Hargens, McCann, and Reskin 1978; Cole and Zuckerman 1987; Grant, Simpson, and Rong 1986; Reskin 1978; Luukkonen-Gronow and Stolte-Heiskanen 1983). Many of these works set out to demonstrate women's capabilities in such fields. Other works have focused on the barriers women face in these fields (such as discrimination in employment practices, salary, and promotions to management) as well as the exclusion of women in science from social networks that provide access to important career opportunities (Haberfeld and Shenhav 1990; Shenhav and Haberfeld 1988; Suzanna Rose 1989). Several have highlighted the way women in traditionally male-dominated fields are relegated to positions that are lower in status than those occupied by men (Reskin and Roos 1990; Sally Hacker 1990; Christine Williams 1989). In many ways, these works have played an important role in laying out the context in which women in male-dominated fields must function.

Joan Acker's (1991) conceptualization of a "gendered institution" helps to further define a context in which power and privilege is distributed according to gender. Acker takes a radical view of organizations, locating gender within organizational structures, rather than as a variable that is external to those structures. In her article "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gender Construction," Acker

insists that institutions are inherently "gendered" and the structure of organizations is male-based. In her words,

> To say that an organization, or any other analytic unit is **gendered** means that advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity, are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine (Acker 1991, 167).

Although jobs and hierarchies of organizations depend on the assumption that a worker is abstract, without a human body or gender, in reality, the concept of both "job" and of "real worker" are deeply gendered. "The concept of a universal worker excludes and marginalizes women who cannot, almost by definition, achieve the qualities of a real worker because to do so is to become like a man" (Acker 1991, 171-2). This is certainly the case in engineering and architecture, which are *explicitly* defined as men's fields rather than assumed to be neutral occupations.

While much research has served to lay out the context in which women in these fields must function, other research has addressed how women handle such a context. For example, in her discussion of tokens, or a numerical minority in an occupational group, Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1977) proposes that tokens feel strong pressure to conform to existing gender norms within the workplace and work to minimize the differences which exist between themselves as tokens and the dominant group. Thus, from Kanter's perspective, one's position within an organization determines behavior. Regardless of the gender of a person, if she or he

represents a numerical minority the individual will conform to the gender behavior of the dominant group, whatever gender that group may be.

In one sense, Jennifer L. Pierce's work on female and male litigators expands on Kanter's perspective. She concedes that not all women take on a male-based or "adversarial" model of litigation. In fact, she finds that few women do this, but most women utilize an "ethic of caring" or a female-based model in their litigation practices. In her study of female and male litigators, Jennifer L. Pierce (1995) finds that most of the "emotional labor" (Hochschild 1983) in law firms is carried out by women.[1]

Thus, much of the literature produced by scholars has examined women's competency in the field and/or attempted to disclose the barriers which women face. What has not been done, however, is to problematize the marginalization of women within these fields as the "other," although Acker's discussion suggests that women in these fields are like an "other," specifically a gendered other.

According to Arturo Madrid (1998, 23):

> Being *the other* means feeling different; is awareness of being distinct; is consciousness of being dissimilar. It means being outside the game, outside the circle, outside the set. It means being on the edges, on the margins, on the periphery. Otherness means feeling excluded, closed out, precluded, even disdained and scorned.

---

[1] Although Pierce also found that some women displayed a split or blending of these two models in their litigating, her discussion of gendered litigation focuses on a dichotomy based on traditional notions of "feminine" and "masculine" behavior.

> It produces a sense of isolation, of apartness, or disconnectedness, of alienation.
>
> Being *the other* involves contradictory phenomenon. On the one hand being the other frequently means being invisible. . . . On the other hand, being the other sometimes involves sticking out like a sore thumb. What is she/he doing here?
>
> If one is *the other*, one will inevitably be perceived unidimensionally; will be seen stereotypically; will be defined and delimited by mental sets that may not bear much relation to existing realities. . . .
>
> For some of us being the other is only annoying; for others it is debilitating; for still others it is damning. Many try to flee otherness by taking on protective colorations that provide invisibility, whether of dress or speech or manner or name. Only a fortunate few succeed.

Here, Madrid theorizes about the subjective experience of being *the other* and makes suggestions for the different ways that those who have been positioned as *the other* may deal with such a predicament. To examine the subjective experience of being the other in traditionally male-dominated fields I turn to the data developed through qualitative interviews with women in engineering and architecture.

METHODS

My data were developed through open-ended interviews with twenty-one female students in engineering and architecture.[2] These women were college students at the time of the interviews, ranging from junior-level undergraduates to graduate students. Both of these majors involve entry into the field or work environment as part of the educational process. During the interviews many women spoke freely about their experiences in

[2] One woman I spoke with had already completed a degree in engineering, had worked in the field, and had quit and changed to another field.

the workplace. This combination of recent entry into the academic field and also into the working field allowed me to speak to these women at a relatively early point in their acclimation process to these fields.

My data come from two series of in-depth interviews. The first series of interviews took place during 1995 and 1996 in a college town located in the southern United States. During this time I spoke with five women students in architecture and six in engineering. In 1996 and 1997, I spoke with ten women studying engineering in the mid-west region of the U.S.[3] Although I did not specifically ask women to identify themselves demographically according to race and class,[4] from what I can gather from our discussions two women out of both sets of interviews were not born in the United States: one was from Asia, the other from Northern Europe, one woman identified herself as first generation Asian-American, one woman identified herself as Black, one woman spoke of her Egyptian ancestry, two women spoke of their working-class backgrounds, and one woman identified herself as a lesbian. Thus, my sample is largely white and middle-class.

I created my sample in a variety of ways. I was able to approach all of the architecture students in the classroom where they do most of their

---

[3] Although the majority of the women with whom I spoke were involved in engineering, those interviews with women in architecture remain relevant to my discussion of women in traditionally male-dominated fields.

[4] I had not planned to problematize racial/ethnic or class differences because the majority of my sample consisted of white middle-class women, as is the case in these fields in general.

work. The women in engineering in the south constituted a snowball sample; women I knew and interviewed and other people who knew of my research project gave me the names of women they knew. In the second set of interviews I did not have a network from which to begin a snowball sample, so I relied on flyers. These fliers explained briefly who I am, the topic and purpose of my research, and how women could contact me if they were willing to donate their time and experiences.[5]

The interviews were largely exploratory in nature, covering a range of topics from how a woman became involved in architecture or engineering to incidents of sex discrimination and strategies for dealing with such occurrences (see Appendix A). Interview questions were modeled after those of Christine Williams (1989) and were often followed with additional questions to probe responses. The interviews were tape recorded and usually lasted between one hour and one hour and a half.

The interviews themselves were conducted in a range of settings. In the first set of interviews, the respondent and I largely negotiated the setting. Settings ranged from deserted classrooms, to outdoor benches, to

[5] This last method of meeting respondents failed to yield a diverse sample. In their article, "Race and Class Bias in Qaulitative Research on Women"(1991), Lynn Weber Cannon, Elizabeth Higginbotham, and Marianne L. A. Leung discuss the importance of integrating race and class into qualitative research on women. In their paper they discuss how flyers and other such solicitations tend to yield a largely white middle-class sample. This proved to be the case in my second set of interviews.

respondents' apartments.[6] The second group of interviews was conducted in private rooms in a university setting. Prior to each interview a consent paragraph (see Appendix B) was read to each respondent explaining who I was, what I was doing, and that they were not obligated to participate. At this time I asked for their permission to interview and record them and also assured them that their responses would be confidential. For this reason, I have been very careful about which excerpts I select. I have assigned each woman whom I quote in this paper a pseudonym that I use as a reference to protect her identity.

In the next section, I discuss the subjective experiences of these women as "others" within a gendered institution. (Since I did not directly observe the actions of these women, we must depend on their own interpretations and discussions of their actions and even what they claim they will do.) Then I focus on four techniques presented in the context of these interviews for dealing with being *the other* in gendered institutions such as architecture and engineering.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Being *the Other* in a Gendered Institution

Even though not every woman I spoke with discussed her feelings of marginalization as a woman as ever present, many women did disclose

[6] In all of these cases the comfort level of the respondent was considered since I usually let her suggest where she would prefer to meet after presenting various options. In cases where we met in an interior space I insisted that we meet in private.

incidents in which they were made to feel *the other*. According to Madrid, being the other involves contradictory phenomenon. It frequently involves "being invisible" and sometimes involves "sticking out like a sore thumb." The women with whom I spoke discussed different occasions in which they were made to feel like an other in both of these contradictory ways.

Several women discussed the way professors' use of language contributed to their feelings of exclusion, or invisibility and the taken for granted male-based "nature" of engineering or architecture. In the following excerpt Sarah discusses the use of male-based language in the classroom by male professors.

> Sometimes you'll feel excluded because you're a woman and some man is standing up there going, "When the engineer, and he and he. . . ." And they're not doing it on purpose, but you're like, "Well, excuse me, so does that mean I'm not getting a job when I'm done?" I had a professor who constantly did that last semester and . . . when there's two-hundred men in there and there's three women and they say "you guys" that means you **guys**, you know what I mean and they forget that there's women in there. It's just not very nice to be sitting there and feeling that way. (Sarah)

Here Sarah highlights the taken for granted nature of engineering as a man's field. Although Sarah mitigates her exclusion by denying the intentionality of the professor in this case, in another instance she gives an example of blatant exclusion.

> I was taking electrical engineering and there was this TA who was there from 3:00 to 4:00 or something like that and I had a question on a homework problem so I went there and he was late, or I was early; I was there at 2:45. As I was sitting there a lot of men came in and I was kind of sitting [near the] door so that he would know I was there first and you know, go around the room. He walks in and the room is full of men. It's a small room, and there's no reason for

> him to assume that I wasn't there first or something and he walked in and I went [gestures with hand in the air about to say something] and he went straight to the guys and went "Hey, what's up?" and started helping them. And I just got up and left, and I never went again because he really didn't even, I mean he looked at me, and I started speaking to him and he just turned around and didn't even care. (Sarah)

In this case Sarah is made to feel invisible, as if she were not even there. She is convinced that the teaching assistant saw her gesture and intentionally overlooked her and assisted her male peers. As Madrid puts it, "otherness means feeling excluded, closed out . . . invisible" (1998, 23).

The "contradiction of being an other," involves "marking" as well, and the women also discussed occasions in which they were explicitly singled out as women who do not fit, or to use Madrid's words, occasions in which they were made to "stick out like a sore thumb." In the following excerpt a male professor tries to emphasize that engineering is men's work and that the women in the class do not belong in factory work.

> We were sitting in our . . . class . . . and it just so happened that that day the four girls in the class were sitting together . . . and [the professor] was about to show us this movie . . . and he was just doing this little lead in thing . . . that you really need to remember that factories are noisy, dirty, smelly, unaccommodating places to work. And he was looking at the girls the entire time. He didn't ever waver his gaze, . . . and he said that once and then he said it again. He said they're dirty, they're smelly, they're unaccommodating, they're dirty, he just kept going on and on and I said, "Is there a reason why you're looking at the girls when you're saying this?" I actually said this and he didn't say anything back, but he said it again, "And you're going to have to disabuse yourself of the fact that factories are nice places to work because they're not, they're usually dirty... " and he went on and on. (Claire)

Thus, it appears that the professor intentionally tried to set off the women in the class as women who are incapable of handling the factory environment. His visual focus on the women in the class serves to single them out and set them apart, to make them stick out, and mark them as women—counterpoised to men.

The following excerpt further illustrates the extent to which "man" is the norm in engineering.

> This one guy, he was a supervisor . . . and one year on secretary's day he brought me some flowers. And he didn't understand why I was angry. As a matter of fact if you met him on the street right now he still probably doesn't understand why I was so mad at him for buying me flowers. . . . You know how he rationalized it? . . . where we were located at that time there weren't very many women anywhere except for the department secretaries. He said well other women got flowers, so I thought you'd want some too. I was not real happy with that. (Heather)

In this case, the flowers serve to mark Heather as a woman, which in her supervisor's mind becomes synonymous with secretary. This differentiates Heather from male engineers; it sets her apart and marks her as different from the other engineers. The fact that her supervisor could not understand why this angered Heather, demonstrates the extent to which gendered definitions of engineers, which position women as "other," are embedded not only in the structure of the institution, but within the thinking of those involved with these institutions.

These quotes illustrate the way women in gendered institutions are made to feel *the other* because they are women. Women are either marked as different—given flowers like the secretaries—or excluded, or ignored

altogether. Whether women are made to stand out in a negative way or are ignored, in both cases they are marginialized as an "other," as a woman who does not fit in the position of engineer or architect.

Jennifer explained the dilemma of being a woman in engineering in the following way:

> It's kind of like . . . a square peg in a round hole . . . and everyone says, well, you can't put a square peg in a round hole, but if you get a big enough hammer eventually it will fit . . . like I'm going to fit into this round hole and I'm going to have to mold a little this way and mold a little that way and I can make it an it's just a matter of putting in enough effort. (Jennifer)

Jennifer's statement illustrates the structural constraints of being a woman in what is defined as a "man's field" in which women do not fit by definition as a "square peg in a round hole." She illustrates the reality of being different, being "other." She also stresses, however, the importance of finding a way to diminish one's difference. The question becomes then: "How do women in these fields perceive and deal with their "otherness"?

Dealing with Otherness

Many women did not just accept their status as an "other" within a gendered institution, as suggested by the anger expressed by some of the women in the previous quotes, but found ways to deal with their marginality. Four strategies emerged in the interviews. In some cases women labored to diminish their status as *the other* by de-emphasizing those aspects of themselves which define them as "other," as a woman in a man's field. Women also attempted to diminish their status as other by

constructing a dichotomy in which they could be categorized as a "good woman" in contrast to others who were defined as "bad women." On some occasions, women rejected their "otherness" altogether and sought to prove their competency *as women*. Forming coalitions with other women presented another way of dealing with the alienation and isolation of being the other.

De-emphasizing Femaleness

> Many try to flee otherness by taking on protective colorations that provide invisibility, whether of dress or speech or manner or name. Only a fortunate few succeed (Madrid 1998, 23).

One way to deal with being marked as an "other" is to de-emphasize those aspects of yourself which make you the other, in this case which mark you as a woman. Women discussed changes in their dress, handwriting, and other self-alterations they made in order to down play the fact that they are women. They did this often in the hope that they might be considered as "no different than the guy sitting next to them."

Here Lisa discusses her initial attempts to de-emphasize the fact that she is a woman.

> I was very uncomfortable with showing any feminine traits. I dressed almost exclusively in very baggy clothes to conceal the fact that I had a figure. . . . I had the sloppiest handwriting possible so it wouldn't look like a girls handwriting. I did everything possible [to avoid] being perceived as, "Oh she's just like a woman.". . . Now sometimes I even write in cursive and try not to make it sloppy, and I feel like, Oh well, it's okay to bake cookies sometimes. And I think a lot of my original discomfort with the idea of being feminine came from knowing that I was in this male field. . . . I think that the

> most strongly shaping influence on my career has been coming to terms with, "It's okay to be a girl." (Lisa)

Lisa's actions and her struggle are inextricably tied to her conceptualization of engineering as a man's field and of herself as the other within that context. She deals with her marginality by trying to de-emphasize those aspects of her appearance which define her as an "other," as a woman. Here Lisa attempts to un-mark herself as a woman until she is able to "come to terms with, 'It's okay to be a girl.'" Even after Lisa discusses this point of resolution, she speaks of the necessity of being "feminine" in private and in other venues outside of engineering.

Although Lisa discusses this process with a point of resolution in which her gender identity is no longer problematic for her, other women discussed this practice of de-emphasizing their femaleness as a necessity filled with self-contradiction. This apparent need to de-emphasize one's femaleness in order to be accepted as a "neutral" engineer presented a double-bind for many of the women who preferred to "do gender" (West and Zimmerman 1991) according to more traditional guidelines. Some women discussed dilemmas about having to present themselves in ways that were contradictory to their "true" selves.

> I like to dress up, and I like to paint my nails, and I like all that stuff, but I'm still smart, but I don't always do that because I don't want people to see me, you know *I want them to see me as an engineer, not as a girl.* How bad does that sound? You know, it's almost like some things aren't accepted . . . it's not accepted to wear pink and be frilly and all that and to be taken seriously. So yeah, I guess I change how I would like to dress versus how I dress. (Mary, emphasis added)

Mary discusses this process of de-emphasizing femaleness as a necessity, which ultimately results in her alienation from her self. Although de-emphasizing femaleness represents one way of dealing with being the other, it does not necessarily mitigate an individual's alienation, and some women do not perceive this strategy to be much of a choice.

Nancy further illustrates the fixedness of this double-bind for her: "It's really hard, you can't really make yourself like a man because then you're said to be strange, but then you can't really make yourself totally like a soft vulnerable woman." Such is the nature of a "double bind"[7] (Frye 1998) in which women are automatically marginalized as *the other* because they are women, but if they "do gender" according to a masculine model, or if they are perceived to be "doing gender" in such a way, they are denigrated and sanctioned. De-emphasizing femaleness has limited effectiveness in diminishing a woman's status as an other and can sometimes result in a woman being labeled as a "bitch" as will be discussed later.

"One of the Guys"

One of the goals in de-emphasizing one's femaleness and diminishing one's status as an other is ultimately to be accepted as "just one of the guys." Many women expressed a general need and/or desire to

[7] In her article, "Oppression," Marilyn Frye defines the double bind of oppressed persons as "situations in which options are reduced to a very few and all of them expose one to penalty, censure, or deprivation (49).

be accepted and thought of as "just like the guy sitting next to me." Such a categorization mitigates or at least diminishes one's status as a female other. In the following excerpt Ellen discusses her delight at being mistaken for "one of the guys."

> After my thermodynamics class the twelve of us, we would go to lunch, and it was actually me and eleven other guys, and every day we would go to lunch and they would be like, "Gee, isn't it nice just the guys eating?" And that was their way of teasing me because they were kind of teasing me, saying "Oh yeah, [Ellen]'s not a girl." And at the same time I kind of took it as a compliment because that just meant that they included me in their group, that they didn't see me as anything different. Not saying I want to be male. . . . I don't want to be male, but I do want to be considered their equal. (Ellen)

It is significant that in order to be considered an "equal," an engineer, Ellen felt as if she had to be considered "one of the guys" or a non-woman. Indeed, many of the women with whom I spoke resented references and/or gestures that singled them out as women. One woman discussed her frustration with the suggestion that "ladies go first" because she did not want to be seen as different.

Thus, de-emphasizing femininity/femaleness is one way women dealt with being the other in a "man's field." Women made efforts to un-mark themselves as women, as *the other*. The effectiveness of their efforts in diminishing their status as an "other," however, was limited by the double-bind that women in these fields face and the self-contradictions such efforts present for some of them.

Constructing Another "Other"

Some women were able to de-emphasize their own marginal status as *the other* by constructing a dichotomy in which "good women" were distinguished from "bad women" in the field. By highlighting their distinctiveness from "bad" women, whom they labeled "boat rockers, feminists, and/or bitches," they were able to form alliances with men. More specifically, by creating an inferior female "other," they were able to show that they were "one of the guys." Some women with whom I spoke discussed incidents in which they categorized female colleagues as such the "other" while others discussed occasions in which they were categorized as this type of tarnished female "other."

In the following excerpt Barbara adopts this approach in her discussion of a woman she has categorized as a "feminist."

> *I've run into things that are a result of feminists.* I know this one guy in a nuclear plant, and nuclear plants are mostly all guys, very very few women. . . . He happened to have his whole office pretty much papered in snap-on tool calendars . . . that feature tools, and every tool was held by a woman in a bikini. . . nothing was untasteful really. . . . It doesn't bother me, that's his taste, it's his office. . . . But one day I went in [and] . . . he was on the phone so I sat in the door and . . . looked at all the calendars all over the place, he got off the phone and he was very defensive. "I know they're all naked, if you don't like it we can go talk some place else." . . . I guess he'd run into somebody who . . . tried to file a grievance against him because of how his office was decorated. She was like *on a crusade to take care of everything.* . . . I have more problems with men who have run into radical female engineers than I have with men in general. (Barbara, emphasis added)

In this excerpt Barbara is able to ally herself with the men in the field through her critique of "the feminist" women who are on a "crusade"

against the men in the field. According to Barbara these women create problems for her by making it more difficult for her to establish herself as "one of the guys."

It should also be noted that in differentiating herself from these "feminists, bitches, and boat rockers," a woman makes herself vulnerable to what might be construed of as an objectifying atmosphere. Being "one of the guys" often requires tolerance of the objectification of women and/or sexual harassment. This is further illustrated in the following excerpt in which Nancy reports on an occasion where she is sanctioned and defined as a "bad woman" by female—and male—peers for her intolerance of a remark which objectified women.

> We were all working in the studio and he turned over to his friend and said, "Oh did you see any naked girls this weekend?" And it just really upset me and I turned around and I was like what are you two talking about . . . and then after that moment I was coined the feminist in my class just because I said that. . . . Another time we were all discussing a roof in our class . . . and again the guys were like "Oh why don't you put a naked lady on the roof?" and I was just appalled . . . *And again I said something and they all looked at me, **everyone** looked at me, **none** of the girls supported me, they all looked at me funny like there was something wrong with me, that I was uptight, that I was a prude or whatever* . . . but I was really upset that they would say something like that *and that's one of the times when I really felt like I'm a **woman** in architecture.* (Nancy, emphasis added)

Nancy is censured as "other," as a "feminist," thus highlighting the fact that , "Otherness means feeling excluded, closed out, precluded, even disdained and scorned. [Such a categorization] produces a sense of isolation, of apartness, or disconnectedness, of alienation" (Madrid 1998,

23). Here, Nancy is scorned by male and female peers alike. As a result, she is made to feel marked as a woman in a man's field: "that's one of the times when I really felt like I'm a **woman** in architecture."

Thus, although the category of the "bad woman" serves to diminish some women's marginality as *the other*, it stands as a threat to all women as well. Any woman can be threatened with these epithets, and it is not only women who marginalize other women in this manner. As the following excerpt illustrates, men are able to utilize these threatening epithets as well. This is because fear of being ostracized as "bitches, feminists, and/or boat rockers" prompts women to act in ways which may be antithetical to their intentions or desires. In the following excerpt Connie's fear of being categorized as a "girl who causes trouble" leads her to decide not to act. She discusses her frustration at one of her male supervisors who witnesses another supervisor making an inappropriate comment to Connie. Rather than saying something to the supervisor who initiated the inappropriate comment at the time the comment was made, the other supervisor waited until his co-worker was gone to "apologize" for his behavior.

> I feel like if [I'm] in that situation and I make a bigger deal of it . . . I mean these are internships and they're for two months. *I want everybody to like me as much as possible, not to be like, that girl is causing trouble, so I wasn't about to say anything*, but then he [her other supervisor who witnessed the harassment] . . . I was mad because he didn't take the initiative to say anything, but then said it later. Like sorry you have to deal with that or something like that, and I was like, Well, you know you were there, you could have said something, but you can't really say that. (Connie, emphasis added)

Although Connie wishes to contest both of her supervisors' behaviors, one for making the comment and one for not reprimanding the man who made the comment, she chooses not to say anything out of a desire to be accepted and because of the threat of being categorized as a boat rocker or trouble-maker, specifically a *girl* who causes trouble.

Thus far my discussion has dealt with what constitutes a "feminist" or a "boat rocker." Although what differentiates a "feminist" from a "boat rocker" or a "bitch" often varies, generally the label "feminist" or "boat rocker" is assigned to women who are perceived to draw attention to themselves as women, usually by refusing to tolerate the objectification of women. Utilizing the discussion of de-emphasizing femaleness from the previous section, we could say that in these cases women do not make attempts to play down their femaleness and become "one of the guys." Nonetheless, as part of the double-bind women face in these fields, they are denigrated for de-emphasizing their femaleness as well. Women who de-emphasize their femaleness, often refusing to do the "emotional labor" (Hochschild 1983) which is expected of women, are often denigrated as "bitches." Nancy's discussion of female professors in her field illustrates this category of the "bitch."

> Well look at all the female professors at [this university] . . .they're all very tightly dressed, even if they wear mini-skirts they're wearing stockings underneath it or there's this one woman who wears slacks and long sleeved shirts like every single day, that's what she wears . . . and people . . . [say] 'What's wrong with her she seems so serious and she's so; is there something wrong with her? I

> walk by her she never says Hello to me.' And it's like, I think the kind of clothes that she wears they start to think that she's too serious or she's too masculine and they don't think that that's probably just what she needs to do to be where she is . . . Definitely the women that I've seen who are doing it, the female professors, and the one's in those firms are super tough and before I even meet them a lot of times other students tell me, 'Oh she's a bitch; she's such a bitch.' Or 'She's so weird or . . ..' I've heard stories about these women like, Oh she picks her teeth in public, and all these things and I have this whole impression of them. Then when I meet them I'm like, No they're just really strong women. I think that they just have to be. (Nancy)

Thus, the female professors who Nancy speaks of are defined as "bitches" by female and male students largely for their refusal to do the "emotional labor" which is expected of women. They "seem so serious . . . [and] never say Hello" as well as the perception that they are "super tough." Nancy discusses the necessity that they be this way in order to survive, but because of the double-bind women face within these fields, women are denigrated as "bitches" when they do too good of a job of de-emphasizing their femaleness. In this case their behavior appears to be too masculine to some of the people with whom Nancy interacts and transcends simple changes in dress and handwriting. Thus, these women are expected to accommodate in ways that are apparently contradictory and are held in a double bind by men and by other women.

The following quote from Lisa illustrates some of the difficulties in coping with such contradictory expectations. Below is her response to my question, "What does it take to be a woman in engineering?"

> To be a woman I think you need to be cognizant of the fact that there might be some bad apples out there who think that you don't

> belong there and be cognizant of the possibility of needing to prove yourself, but you need be careful not to have a chip on your shoulder all the time. But have it in your pocket and ready to put it up there if you need it (Lisa).

Here Lisa poignantly expresses the need to be prepared to be a "bitch" if the necessity arises, but not to give the impression that one is a "bitch" or has a "chip on her shoulder" even when defensive or "unfeminine" responses become necessary. Embedded within the need and desire to "fit in," there is an acknowledgment within many of these women's discussions that there will be times when they are perceived as a "square peg in a round whole" and, in these cases, other strategies become necessary.

Rejecting Otherness

In some cases women refused to de-emphasize those aspects of themselves which marked them as women, as the "other." Instead, they set out to prove that being a woman, what marks them as the other, does not make them incapable of doing engineering or architecture. In this case women rejected the gendered institution which defines them as women who do not fit, as gendered others. Essentially in these cases women proposed: I *am* a woman *and* I *can* do engineering and I will show you! Such a rejection of the field as a "man's field," a rejection of the identity which has been created for women according to the gendered institution, ultimately calls the nature of the "gendered institution" into question.

> Coming out of high school I came in here almost like a Crusader, like no one's going to tell me that a woman can't do what I want to do. No one's going to tell me that . . . I really just wanted all the people around me to know that I didn't care what their opinions were, I was going to be successful and it didn't matter if I was woman or not. (Beth)

Here Beth discusses her quest to demonstrate the irrelevancy of what marks her as "other," the fact that she is a woman.

In a similar vein, Susan discusses an incident in which her friend rejects some men's definition of her as a gendered other who is incapable of doing engineering. Rather than attempting to un-mark herself as a woman, Susan's friend's actions demonstrate that gender is an invalid marker of legitimacy for an engineer. She proves that despite her otherness, her location on the margins, despite the way she is ostracized by male co-workers, she is a capable engineer. In this way, she ultimately destabilizes the assumption that she is an incapable engineer because she is a woman.

> I have another friend who is . . . the only electrical engineer in a mechanical engineering firm. They rely on her for everything. And she has a problem: she's a four foot eleven Asian woman and she has the hardest time with men trusting her judgment and her design. . . She was pregnant and she had to make sure seven or eight [of her designs] were set up before she left and she was on a mission. Things were breaking down she had to fix . . . and there was a guy there who had pretty much watched over her shoulder the whole time, and he was like, "This isn't going to work!" And she was like, "Yes it's going to work; just watch; come back at four and you'll see!" And he came back at four just to throw it in her face, but it worked and he just grunted and left....She loved rubbing it in their faces that what she was doing was right and that she was a very competent engineer. (Susan)

The fact that Susan's friend is able to prove her competency as an engineer again and again *as a woman*, and at this time as a pregnant Asian woman, automatically calls the "nature" of the gendered institution which places her on the margins into question. If by definition a woman does not fit in the position of engineer, and if as a woman she proves that she can do the same work as a man, without de-emphasizing her femaleness, then she calls the gendered institution into question.

In some cases women's rejection of their otherness involved assertions of their woman-ness, or a refusal to de-emphasize their femaleness. Some women discussed the price involved. Claire's quote is reminiscent of previous discussions of the double-bind.

> But I don't think women should want to be men. I mean I wore a dress every day at my job. I refuse to wear suits. I don't like suits. Suits make me feel like a man and I don't think that I should have to mold myself into one to try to succeed and I won't. So if you call me up in ten years and I'm not an engineer, that may be why. (Claire)

Although Claire may choose to assert the fact that she is a woman, rather than attempt to de-emphasize this marker, she realizes that she may ultimately pay a price for this. Refusing the definition ascribed to her as "other" may not actually diminish her marginal status and may ultimately diminish her success in the field.

In my discussion with Claire she questioned the definition of engineering as a "man's field" by suggesting alternative models. Rather than attempting to alter her self in order to diminish her otherness, Claire

suggests that women fit into engineering *as women*. She stresses the importance of bringing women's perspectives and insights into the center as important contributions, rather than as irrelevant and marginal interests.

> I think that women are definitely breaking into engineering. I think they're showing the traditionally male-dominated people that there is a valid reason to have a woman engineer on a team or in the organizations because of our different perspective, our emphasis on people and relationships. I think women have an advantage of looking at the whole system. I think men are really good at looking at the big picture, but I think women especially are good at looking at the big picture because we know the inter-relationships between people and things and stuff. I think it's more of an intuitive thing. Not to say that men aren't good at it, I think that women are just gifted somehow in that respect. (Claire)

Thus, Claire calls for a restructuring of engineering as a discipline, as a gendered institution to include women as central rather than exclude women as peripheral. She questions the "nature" of the institution, arguing that women have special skills to contribute to engineering as a discipline. Rather than attempting to hide or change their identities, these women assert that they are women *and* they are capable engineers and architects. This case is not a matter of accommodation, of self-alteration, but one of assertion.

Collective Resistance

> Otherness means feeling excluded, closed out, precluded, even disdained and scorned. It produces a sense of isolation, of apartness, or disconnectedness, of alienation (Madrid 1998, 23).

Women often dealt with and diminished the alienation of being *the other* by forming alliances with other women. Many women spoke about

how important it was to have other women with whom to participate in group projects, to study, or to sit in class. Objectification is a common way women are marked as women within the context of a "mans' field." Women often spoke of "checking their sanity" and "laughing off" such incidents with other women as ways of dealing with times when they were made to feel like an other. Allying with other women made women feel less of an "other" and less alienated. Below Amy discusses the ways women support each other.

> We joke around about, Yeah we're the only three [women] in the class, we've got to be supportive. . . At the time you generally smile and nod. Afterwards . . . you can have a good cuss session, a good cup of coffee. Generally, it just helps to talk about it I think. For me it's more, I'll mention it to the girls to make sure I'm not crazy. (Amy)

Amy's discussion of "mentioning it to the girls to make sure I'm not crazy" brings up another function of group alliances for women: sanity checks. Many of the incidents women encounter involve subtle or ambiguous forms of discrimination[8] which leave them wondering if they are being "paranoid" or "overreacting" in taking offense or considering taking action. Talking things over and sharing definitions of certain situations such as sexual harassment as well as information about which professors to avoid serve as valuable networks that help women cope with some of the isolation they feel. The following remarks by Emily illustrate this point.

> My friend said she had the same experience with [a professor]. . . . "Oh be careful when you see him; he's awful; he's just going to put his hand on your shoulder or this or that.". . . Well, when it happened to me I thought, Oh he's just probably, it was nothing. And then when [my friend] said something similar it kind of made me think twice. (Emily)

Emily's insight illustrates not only the ambiguities involved in many of the incidents women encounter, but the importance of interactions with other women to define such ambiguous situations. If Emily had not had such an interaction with one of her female peers, she may have dismissed the professor's conduct as "nothing."

Humor or "laughing it off" also serves to alleviate feelings of isolation. Some of the women discussed how they were able to play down the significance of incidents which occurred by making a joke out of it with female—and in some cases male—peers.

> She was at one table; I was at another table. And a professor who she didn't know came in and sat down next to us and he just spent the entire seminar staring at her chest. . . . It was just unbelievable that this guy was just so enraptured with this young lady's chest. . . . afterwards she came up to us and she's like, Who the hell was sitting next to me, what a pig?! She went on and on and on, and now between her and I it's a joke, where we just say, "Oh you're wearing that pink shirt. . . ." (Jennifer)

In this case Jennifer's friend was marked as a woman by being objectified. Through humor, Jennifer and her friend down play the significance of this incident as well as support each other, making them each feel less alienated than they might as isolates.

---

[8] See Benokraitis and Feagin's *Modern Sexism: Blatant, Subtle, and Covert Discrimination.*

Another woman discussed how she and other women utilized a list serve to protest the treatment they received from male peers. After being involved in a group project, a male in the group suggested that at the demonstration for this project Beth should stand by the display as a "pretty girl." Even though Beth possessed extensive knowledge of the project, in standing next to it she felt that she was defined as a woman rather than as an engineer. Through a list serve Beth was able to protest this incident and receive support from other women.

> I posted an e-mail . . . saying that that might have been funny for [the men involved], but it wasn't funny for me to make that kind of a joke or reference to any of the women on the team, that that's what our role was. I was kind of long winded about it and I got really upset and the other women on the team who tended to be on the quiet side voiced up and they backed me on it, saying, "No, this isn't right for you guys to treat us like this, we're an equal part of this team." And I think, I don't know if I got more respect after that or if some of the guys were scared of talking to me after that, but things calmed down and they stopped making comments about women in that regard. (Beth)

In several cases women allied with each other and resisted discrimination by professors or other male peers. Several women discussed their experience with a professor who systematically ignored them and their work.

> Most of the women got together and were upset about it because in that class, it was really competitive, . . . but me and a couple of other girls we kind of bonded together especially [Rose], she had a really rough time with this professor and I think that we kind of bonded and talked about it often, but I think that it just sort of . . . we had evaluations [of the professor and the course] we could write up and so we all just wrote out what we thought at evaluations (Nancy)

These women formed an informal support group to mitigate the strains of what they found be an alienating classroom environment. They also spoke of joking about the fact that the professor paid little attention to them, and they would "compete" to see who could keep his attention for more than five minutes. Their alliance ultimately ended when they took action by writing the evaluations of the professor.

Thus, not only did women's alliances with other women serve to lessen their own sense of isolation and alienation, but in some cases women were able to collectively define situations, such as cases of sexual harassment or discrimination which they may have otherwise over-looked or interpreted as an instance of paranoia on their part. In some cases women took collective action in opposition to gendered discrimination by male peers and professors. Because "isolation" is a characteristic of being the other, just knowing there were other women facing similar situations was helpful to most women. The women with whom I spoke stressed the importance of increasing the number of women in these fields, particularly the number of female professors who also provide a source of support when they are present.

> I think once I started having female professors which was about a year ago, it started to really change the way I saw my role within the department and within the field of architecture. Definitely this one woman really changed the way I felt because she used to present architects and things in our class and she would present female architects which we had never gone over before. (Nancy)

Simply having other women around and knowing that other women are successful in the field can lessen women's feelings of isolation and in some cases lead to collective action.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this paper has been to discuss how women in traditionally male-dominated fields perceive and deal with their otherness. This research contributes to the literature on women in traditionally male-dominated fields in several ways, as a humble attempt to build on and embellish the works of others such as Acker, Kanter, and Pierce. It makes a methodological contribution to the literature by documenting the "lived experiences" of these women as actors within gendered institutions. Substantively, I have shown how women utilize multiple strategies on different occasions and in different contexts in which women's actions often challenge dichotomous understandings of "feminine" versus "masculine" behavior. Viewing these women as actors or "pioneers" within these fields illustrates the potential for change within these institutions. Finally, I will briefly address the implication of this research with regard to admission policies for women within such programs.

The findings of this study provide support for Acker's (1991) argument, since assumptions about the competency—or incompetency—of an architect or engineer are embedded within institutions where power and privilege are distributed according to presumed differences between women and men. Within this dichotomy, men are valued while women are

devalued. Men are the norm while women are the deviant "other." Many women spoke of assumptions about their own competency as based in such a dichotomy. According to many of the women with whom I spoke, these institutions operate under the assumption that men are competent engineers or architects until they disprove this "fact," while women are perceived to be incompetent architects or engineers until they prove otherwise. And women have to "prove" their competency again and again. Not only does this reference many men's privileged position—as part of the unearned package of rights which they can cash in on every day[9]—but this also positions women on the periphery, on the margins as *the other*. Such assumptions present barriers to women's success in the field and trap women in a double-bind in which they are often subject to contradictory expectations since being a woman is viewed as contradictory to being an architect according to the dichotomous definitions of these fields.

Thus, this study demonstrates that women in these fields are subject to structural constraints according to the limiting dichotomies of a gendered institution. However, the main contribution of this research lies in its focus on the subjective experience, or women's lived experiences of being the other, and particularly of how women deal with being the other. The findings of this research regarding women's attempts to de-emphasize their femaleness and to become "one of the guys" (13-16) certainly

---

[9] Peggy McIntosh discusses her own privilege as a white woman in order to address the topic of male privilege in her article "White Privilege and

supports Kanter's proposal about women's actions as tokens within these fields. These findings also support Pierce's discussion of an "adversarial" or male-based model of behavior. Similarly, Pierce's discussion of an "ethic of caring" finds support in some of the actions of the women with whom I spoke who proposed a more female-oriented model of engineering.[10] However, this does not encompass all of the strategies for dealing with being the other which emerged in this research. Although the work of Acker, Kanter, and Pierce contribute important insights into the understanding of the present findings, this research suggests a need to build further upon these findings. Thus, there are gaps in the literature which this research begins to fill.

Rather than consistently utilizing one approach of behavior, this research suggests that women utilize multiple strategies in different contexts and circumstances. Many women acknowledged the necessity of being prepared for more than one strategy according to the context and reactions of others involved.[11] For example, as discussed previously, on

---

Male Privilege."

[10] Unlike Pierce, I did not find that the majority of the women in my sample utilized an "ethic of caring" or sought to initiate a model of architecture/ engineering based upon attributes of behavior recognized as more feminine. Only one woman with whom I spoke sought to actively create or suggest such a new model of architecture/ engineering. Such a finding merits further investigation since my findings cannot be viewed as representative due to the small sample size.

[11] See Lisa's discussion of the necessity of "carrying a chip" in your pocket to place upon your shoulder if necessary (21-2). As discussed previously this quote illustrates the necessity of multiple strategies since

some occasions women refused to de-emphasize their femininity and conform to the existing model of architecture/engineering, and in some cases, women asserted, rather than minimized the differences between themselves and the dominant group.[12] My research suggests that conformity, or "de-emphasizing femaleness," may be only one strategy in an array of options and actions open to these women as social actors. The strategies outlined and discussed here may merely scratch the surface of the multiple ways women cope and act in their everyday lives within gendered institutions. Thus, there is a need for further research and documentation with an acknowledgment of these women's active roles in creating and implementing such strategies. To expand on Kanter's discussion of these women as "tokens," perhaps we should acknowledge them as "pioneers" in their field since their actions suggest a potential for change.

As pioneers, these women's actions serve to question the nature of gendered institutions. The numerical presence of women in these fields alone serves as a challenge to the status quo. Further, circumstances in which the women with whom I spoke rejected the definition of their field as a "man's field" and the identity ascribed to them under the auspices of such a gendered institution presents further challenges. Some women (see

---

women are held accountable to contradictory expectations. (That is, they must be prepared to be a "bitch" without appearing as such.)

quotes from Beth, Susan, and Claire, 22-25) set out to demonstrate that gender is an invalid marker of competency for an architect or engineer. In rejecting their otherness these women defy the "nature" of gendered institutions. If by definition a woman does not fit into the position of engineer, and as a woman she proves that she can do the same work as a man without de-emphasizing her femaleness, then her actions elicit a questioning of the basis of such assumptions about women in these fields. By calling the nature of these gendered institutions into question and by refusing to act in a consistantly "feminine" or "masculine" manner, these women's actions also transcend dichotomous understandings of women and men and "feminine" versus "masculine" behaviors since such notions are embedded within the "nature" and definition of a gendered institution.

Similarly, the fact that women are entering these fields at all places the nature of these gendered institutions into question. Many of the women with whom I spoke discussed the importance of recruiting more women into these fields as one solution to the problem of isolation which they faced and to the definition of the fields as the domain of men. As my findings indicate, forming alliances with other women is one way many women were able to deal with being *the other* and in some cases to question the nature of gendered institutions. In addition, female

---

[12] The epitome of asserting what makes one "other" in this case, an assertion of one's "femininity," lies in Claire's discussion (see discussion in "Rejecting Otherness" section).

professors in the field, where they were actually present,[13] played a crucial role in redefining gendered notions of architecture and engineering.[14] Thus, there is an urgent need for more women in these fields.

Nevertheless, the solution should not be simplified to numbers and quotas. Previous research (Reskin and Roos 1990; Sally Hacker 1990; Christine Williams 1989) suggests that an increase in the number of women does not necessarily lead to a shift or redefinition of a gendered institution, but can merely lead to a restructuring of that institution along the lines of power and privilege such that the profession itself, or a sector of it, becomes "feminized." Such a process usually entails low status, prestige, and pay for the sector of the profession in which women find themselves. Therefore, careful attention and consideration must be paid to changes within these fields with regard to gender. Simple quotas cannot be assumed to take care of the intricate complexities of such an institutionally embedded problem.

Thus, with regard to the study of gender, the results of this research suggest the potential for new ways of thinking about women's responses to gendered institutions, by building on the pivotal work of others such as Acker, Kanter, and Pierce. Of course, consideration must be given to the

---

[13] Many women had trouble conjuring up one female professor in their field. Some women had never had a female professor, or may have only remembered one statistics instructor who was marginally related to their department.

small size of this sample, but these findings speak to the complexities of women's responses and the need for further research to fill in gaps, documenting and acknowledging the multiplicity of possibilities for action and interactions which change and shift over time.

[14] Recall Nancy's discussion of a female professor's influence over her and that professors presentation of female architects as a novelty in Nancy's career. (You will find Nancy's quote at the end of the previous section.)

APPENDIX A

Interview Questions

What is your impression of women's position in [your field] today?

How do people react when you tell them your major? When did you decide to major in [ ]? What influenced your decision? Were you encouraged or discouraged by anyone? Were there any other fields you were thinking of instead?

What aspects of [your field] appealed to you in particular? Were there any aspects that did not appeal to you? Did you see your sex as a possible impediment to your success in the field?

Approximately how many students in [your field] would you say are women? Why do you think there are so few women? Do you feel that the department does anything to make a more comfortable environment for women or to encourage women to join the field?

What is it like to be a woman in [your field]?

(At this point during the interview I turned off the recorder and showed the participant note cards with five incidents that other women had disclosed. These came from books or were altered versions of my first interviews. I explained to the women as they read these items, that it was important for them to think about specific things which had happened to them and other women they know. Hopefully in looking at these we can better understand what is going on and if it is printed other people can understand the unnecessary pain and frustration sexism causes. The cards were not added until after the first three interviews.)

Contents of Note Cards:
1. A woman who was doing well in a technical class was told by her male peers that she must be sleeping with the TA.
2. A woman working for an architecture firm was told by some men that she worked with that she should wear tighter clothing that "shows off" her figure.
3. "While in the hall, one junior faculty came up to me and said, 'I feel bad about it, but I really do feel women are genetically inferior in math'...other junior faculty would say similar upsetting things...Eventually ...I just locked myself in my office and didn't come out for four years" (Benokraitis and Feagin 1995, 41).

4. "I remember when I was in shop class in high school when my teacher ignored my suggestion for rebuilding a fence. He said the materials weren't readily accessible. Yet, my cousin came in three class periods later and made the same suggestion. His class voted and they decided to look for extra wood and then rebuilt the fence that enclosed the school yard. I don't think he wanted to help me and the other girls in my class to search for materials. My cousin's class was all boys." (Benokraitis and Feagin, 88).

...continued interview

Have you or any women you have spoken to ever felt excluded by male peers? in social circles? Do male peers attempt to help you with problems in [your field]? Do you feel that male peers listen to and respect your ideas and opinions? Have you ever been treated unfairly by male students in group projects? Has a male or a group of males taken credit for your ideas? Have you witnessed or spoken to other women who have received such treatment?

Do you feel that the women in your department are supportive of each other, or do you feel that there is tension between the women? Why? (This question was also added after the third interview.)

(For this question I asked that the respondents not disclose names because of the nature of one university's sexual harassment policy.) I read the definition of sexual harassment given in Modern Sexism (Benokraitis and Feagin 73).
Have you or other women you have spoken to ever been sexually harassed by a male peer, professor, or advisor?
(The following more specific questions on sexual harassment were added after the third interview.)
Have you or other women you have spoken to ever been touched by a male peer, professor, or advisor in a way that made you feel uncomfortable or you felt was inappropriately sexual? Have you or other women you have spoken to ever had male professors, peers, or advisors make gestures of a sexual nature in reference to your body or stare at your body in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? Have you or other women you have spoken to ever had male professors, peers, or advisors make jokes about your body? Have male peers, professors, or advisors ever made non-reciprocated requests for sexual intercourse, or other advances of a sexual nature towards you or other women you have spoken to?
(Probing questions) Can you recount the specific incident? What was said or done? What did you do in response? How did it make you feel? Did you take any legal action? Did you speak to any other women about your experience?

How do you and other women you know cope with such incidents? What toll does this have on you and them emotionally? How do these obstacles you face effect your performance as a student of [ ]?

Have your opinions about the field changed as a result of any discrimination you have encountered or witnessed?

What does it take to be a woman in [your field]? Does it require any criterion different from what is required of a man in the same field? Do you feel that you and/or other women [in your field] need to exert greater energy than the men in order to receive recognition and be successful? If so what toll does this have on you and/or them personally?

Where do you see yourself in ten years? Is success in [your field] an attainable goal for you? Do you see your success in [your field] impeded by your gender? Was being a woman in [your field] as difficult as you had anticipated?

How do you feel about the Shannon Faulkner case? (This was a current event during my first set of interviews. I replaced it with more general questions for the second set of interviews.): How do you feel about women entering the military? How do you feel about affirmative action?

Do you consider yourself a feminist?
Why or why not??

APPENDIX B

Consent Form:

My name is Brooke Kelly. I am a graduate student in sociology. As part of an ongoing research project I am speaking to women students of architecture and engineering about their experiences as women in a traditionally male-dominated field. I will be asking questions pertaining to your experiences in engineering/architecture. Some questions are general, and others are more personal. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer. If at any time during the interview you decide you no longer wish to continue, please say so, and it will not be held against you in any way. The interview will take approximately an hour to an hour and a half. With your permission this interview will be audiotaped. Only myself and the research team will have access to the tape. The tape will be transcribed with names deleted, after which the contents of the taped interview will be destroyed. If you would like a copy of papers which utilize your interview or if you have any questions or concerns regarding this interview feel free to contact me at KELLYEL1@pilot.msu.edu or you can let me know now and I will contact you or send you my paper when it is finished.

I understand that I am not obligated to complete or even begin this interview and that precautions will be taken to keep my identity confidential. I give my consent to have this interview audiotaped under the above conditions. (You may give consent either orally now or by signing this form below.)

Signature _____
Date

LITERATURE CITED

Acker, Joan. 1991. Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gender Construction. In *The Social Construction of Gender*, edited by Judith Lorber and Susan A. Farrell Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Benokraitis, Nijole V. and Joe R. Feagin. 1995. *Modern Sexism: Blatant, Subtle, and Covert Discrimination.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Bussel, Abby. 1995. Women in Architecture: Leveling the Playing Field. In *Progressive Architecture.* November 45-49, 86.

Cannon, Lynn Weber, Elizabeth Higginbotham, and Marianne L. A. Leung. 1991. Race and Class Bias in Qualitative Research on Women. In *The Social Construction of Gender*, edited by Judith Lorber and Susan A. Farrell. London, England: Sage Publications.

Cole, Jonathon R., and Harriet Zuckerman. 1991. Marriage, Motherhood, and Research Performance in Science. In *The Outer Circle: Women in the Scientific Community,* edited by Harriet Zuckerman, Jonathan R. Cole, and John T. Bruer. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Frye, Marilyn. 1998. Oppression. In *Race, Class, and Gender,* edited by Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Giuffre, Patti A. and Christine L. Williams. 1997. Boundary Lines: Labeling Sexual Harassment in Restaurants. In *Through the Prism of Difference: Readings on Sex and Gender,* edited by Maxine Baca Zinn, Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Michael A. Messner. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Grant, Linda, Layne A Simpson, and Xue Lan Rong. 1990. Gender, Parenthood, and Work Hours of Physicians. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 52:39-49.

Haberfeld, Yitchak, and Yehouda Shenhav. 1990. Are Women and Blacks Closing the Gap? Salary Discrimination in American Science During the 1970s and 1980s. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 44:68-82.

Hacker, Sally. 1990. *"Doing It the Hard Way:" Investigations of Gender and Technology*, edited by Dorothy E. Smith and Susan M. Turner. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Hargens, Lowell L., James C. McCann, and Barbara F. Reskin. 1978. Productivity and Reproductivity: Fertility and Professional Achievement among Research Scientists. *Social Forces* 57:154-164.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Jordan Sieder, Jill. 1996. A Building of Her Own. In *U.S. News and World Report.* October 14. 67.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Coorporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Luukkonen-Gronow, Terttu and Veronica Stolte-Heiskanen. 1983. Myths and Realities of Role Incompatibility of Women Scientists. *Acta Sociologica* 26:267-280.

McIntosh, Peggy. 1998. White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondence Through Work in Women's Studies. In *Race, Class, and Gender,* edited by Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Madrid, Arturo. 1998. Missing People and Others: Joining Together to Expand the Circle. In *Race, Class, and Gender,* edited by Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Pierce, Jennifer L., 1995. *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reskin, Barbara F. 1978. Scientific Productivity, Sex, and Location in the Institution of Science. *American Journal of Sociology* 83:1235-1244.

Rose, Suzanna. 1989. Women Biologists and the "Old Boy" Network. *Women's Studies International Forum.* 12:349-354.

Shenhav, Yehouda A., and Yitchak Haberfeld. 1988. Scientists in Organizations: Discrimination Processes in an Internal Labor Market. *The Sociological Quarterly*. 29:451-462.

West, Candice and Don H. Zimmerman. 1991. Doing Gender. In *The Social Construction of Gender*, edited by Judith Lorber and Susan A. Farrell. London, England: Sage Publications.

Williams, Christine L. 1989. *Gender Differences at Work*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.