SESSION 4: Title IX

Readings to complete before class:


Discussion notes:

(1) Sandler: “Too Strong for a Woman”

- Sandler described by the New York Times as “the godmother of Title IX.”

- “Nice girls aren’t feminists” theme.

- “She [Rep. Edith Green (OR)] informed us that it would be better if we did not lobby because there was no opposition to the bill, and the less that people knew about the bill, the better its chances were for passage. We were skeptical, but she was absolutely right” (Jossey-Bass Reader p. 10).

(2) Title IX itself

- Clause (2): Good that they allow a grace period for schools changing to coed.

- Clause (3): Religious objections: But can’t religious schools then just do whatever they want then? (In other situations, yes for some things and no for others – e.g. religious schools still have a minimum standard for secular subjects that they must teach to children, but can focus on their religious beliefs like public schools cannot.)
• Is legislation the way to change these issues? Is Title IX enough? What about enforcement?

(3) U.S. Dept of Education: “25 Years of Progress”

• Overall, great! But how can we tell what effects are due to Title IX and what are due to general societal trends?

(4) Toppo: “Single-Sex Schools”

• More on this coming up in Session 6.

(5) Irving: “Wrestling with Title IX”

• Interesting note: Author is a well-known writer of various books, including The Cider House Rules (made into a 1999 Oscar-winning movie), that often deal with feminism.

• A shame that most people know Title IX as a sports gender law and not a much broader and more powerful and important law.
  o Maybe because there’s a lot of money in sports, so this gets attention, whereas fewer people might care about the gender ratio of a science classroom

• Personal anecdote: Brother at University of Pittsburgh, where there’s enormously expensive (and profitable) men’s basketball and football teams. To “balance” the amount of money the school spends on them, they offer ridiculously specialized and obscure women’s sports that no one really wants. (Similar to Arizona rowing team example.)

• Could argue that women aren’t as interested in sports as men because there aren’t enough opportunities, encouragement, scholarships, prestige, etc. – which could be helped by keeping the sports interpretation Title IX as is.

• Or could argue that there’s just a statistical fact: that boys like sports more than girls – maybe because of biology, and maybe because of society, and maybe because of a mixture of the two – but the fact remains. Thus, spending should be divvied up accordingly.
  o But then couldn’t you make this argument about non-sports subjects, too? e.g. “Girls just don’t like computers as much as boys, so let’s not care if they’re outnumbered in computer science 3-1.”