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Abstract:

Women have lived much of their lives in institutionalized spaces. These spaces, such as capitol buildings and schools, are owned and regulated by the government. To explore women’s access to institutionalized spaces in the mid/late twentieth century, I have analyzed five oral history interviews. These are all with and/or about Maurine Neuberger, Karen Jensen, and Linda Stonecipher. I share pieces of their stories. Oral Histories exhibit a direct and personal recounting of the ways in which American society has regulated women’s access to institutional spaces, and how some attempted to surpass the expectations placed upon them. All these oral histories exhibit some of the ways the women were separated from men, and treated differently than men as students, athletes, and professionals. Because of separation by gender, many sports became uniquely male or female, think football versus field hockey. Neuberger in the 1920s, and Jensen and Stonecipher in the 1970s, all studied Physical Education. Into at least the 1970s, most men’s P.E. programs had separate, newer buildings, and women were taught with completely different educational philosophies. Directly opposing men, women’s athletic and academic programs focused on non-competition and non-commercialization. All three women worked in industries dominated by men (coaches, educators, Jensen was an athletic trainer, and Neuberger a politician). My unique oral histories contribute to the current research by adding more voices and stories to the larger discussion of women in sport and institutional space, both popular scholarly discussions today.
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Following are the first words from an hours long interview with Maurine Neuberger; they began what became this paper: “This is an interview with Maurine Neuberger in her home in Northwest Portland. The date is August 26, 1991. The interviewer for the Oregon Historical Society is Clark Hansen. This is tape 1 Side A.” In the fall of 1991 Maurine Neuberger, a retired teacher and senator, sat down with Clark Hansen from the Oregon History Society to talk about her life. She explains openly and candidly her, and her late husband’s experiences, in the 1960s as Oregonians and politicians, at both the state and national level. She also discusses her role as the first female senator from Oregon, and one of the first female elected officials in the United States. Hansen asked questions no other source about her had ever answered. It is from this conversation that the following paper has emerged.¹

Oral Histories exhibit a direct and personal recounting of the ways in which American society has regulated women’s access to institutional spaces, and how some attempted to surpass the expectations placed upon them. Throughout the twentieth century, American society gradually opened institutional space to new ideas and new people; these areas, such as capitol buildings and schools, are owned and regulated by the government, such as capitol buildings and schools. Women have a complicated relationship with them. Academic spaces and government facilities are often highly regulated institutionalized spaces men and women spend much of their lives interacting. The study of oral history is an effective way to study larger marginalized groups, specifically women, by examining personal experiences.

For my research, I conducted two oral history interviews, one with Karen Jensen and the other with Linda Stonecipher. I also collected three other interviews from various sources which either are with, or discuss, Maurine Neuberger. All my interviews discuss these three specific women in institutional spaces. This research participates in the current scholarly discussions by adding further evidence to the stories of women who attempted to live and work in a world that was not always open to them. Following their lives in a predominately chronological manner, I break Neuberger, Jensen, and Stonecipher’s ideas into three distinct sections, athletics, academics, and professionals.

This paper follows a clear path beginning with an introduction about the women I focused this research on. Oral histories are valuable as a methodology because they are colloquial and direct. Conducting two interviews for my research allowed me to ask specific questions and gave personal experiences to the ideas of women in institutional space. This research argues that women experience inequality in institutional spaces, especially athletics. My research focuses on these three women’s transition into institutionalized space as athletes, students, and professionals. My first argument is that women have been separated and treated differently from men in the sports they played. Because sport and physical activity can define how different genders are perceived and work with one another, participation in such activities can alter perception of women’s femininity. Secondly, in college, as Physical Education Majors, all three women followed different curriculum than men attending universities for the same degrees. And then discuss their experiences as professionals (coaches, teachers, trainers, and politicians). In many circumstances the women as professionals were not awarded the same resources as their male colleagues, or were separated from them. Concluding, institutional spaces are
inherently segregated, and continue to be today. The women discussed in the following work all experienced discrimination and difficulties, and are examples of the larger issue of women working for opportunity that is equal to that available to the men around them.

* * *

Karen Jensen was born in Denver, Colorado in 1949, and graduated from high school in 1967. Her undergraduate degree is in History, with a minor in Physical Education, from the University of Northern Colorado (or UNC), though it was called Colorado State College when she was a freshman. After undergrad, Jensen taught Physical Education in the Denver Public School District for five years, before earning her master's degree from Indiana State University in Athletic Training in 1977. Along with her master’s, Jensen also has sixty additional hours, which includes the first year of medical school, though taken as a non-medical student. “Other programs did not have just humans as the focus. I did not want to work with raptors, cats nor dogs.” She knew she wanted to work with the human body, and chose programs specifically for such a focus. Jensen’s final career was as an athletic trainer primarily for college students, though she spent one year in El Paso Texas with high school students. For the rest of Jensen’s professional career, 1989 through 2005, she worked at Western State College (now Western State University of Colorado). She explains, “For 14 of those years, I was the athletic trainer, coordinator of the student athletic training internship and teacher.”

She worked in a wide variety of sports with both male and female athletes.2

Linda Stonecipher was born in 1955 to farmers near the small town of Kentland, Indiana. She graduated from South Newton High School in 1974, and then attended

---

Indiana State University, majoring in Physical Education, with minors in Health and English. After undergrad, she taught High School Physical Education and coached several sports, including track, which she never participated in as an athlete. Stonecipher admits “it was unusual even ‘back in the day’ for someone right out of college to take on three head coaching positions.” From 1982-1987 she taught and coached at Skidmore College while getting a Master’s in Physical Education, with an emphasis on coaching from the University of Iowa (earned in 1984). Knowing she did not wish to remain a coach or athlete for her entire career, after several years at Skidmore she chose to leave and earn her Doctorate in Exercise Science and Nutrition from Purdue University. She completes her final degree in 1990. She then taught health at University of Texas at Arlington until the heat got the better of her, and she chose to move and teach health and nutrition courses at Western Oregon University (WOU). She has remained at WOU, in different capacities, until today.

Maurine Neuberger was born near Salem, Oregon in 1906 to a doctor and teacher/housewife who were incredibly politically active. She grew up in the Portland/Salem area, and eventually attended Oregon Normal School (now Western Oregon University) for two years in preparation to become a teacher. She graduated in 1923 when she was 17, earning what today would be roughly equivalent to a Community College associate degree. Lying about her age (to seem 18), Neuberger taught in a small “country” school in Newberg, Oregon for three years. She then chose to return to university to complete a full undergraduate degree to teach high school. She attended University of Oregon for one year, earning a degree in Physical Education (a relatively  

3 Jensen and Stonecipher were at Indiana State University simultaneously, though in different levels of their education
4 Oral History Interview with Linda Stonecipher, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 10, 2017.
new program) because of an influential professor, and her interest in dance. She taught Physical Education in the Portland School District, and then in Rhode Island for a year as an ‘exchange teacher.” After some time traveling and teaching, Neuberger married Richard (Dick) Neuberger in 1945 in Montana, after he proposed through a letter. They were both congress-people in Oregon, she was in the House and he was in the Senate, until Dick became a U.S. senator for Oregon in 1955. She resigned her position in the house to travel to Washington with him. Dick died in 1960 still in office. As Kimberly Jensen wrote for the Oregon Encyclopedia, “Many Democrats hoped that Governor Mark Hatfield would appoint Neuberger to fill her husband's seat, but he declined. She ran for the seat in November 1960 and won with 54 percent of the vote. She represented Oregon in Washington, D.C., for one six-year term.” Her time in office, following Dick’s policies, was focused on legislation around health policies, natural parks in Oregon, and general human equality. Her story as an oral history is unique and telling regarding the life of a woman who spent most of her life in institutional spaces.

* * *

To begin discussing oral histories, we must define what they are. The Oral History Association (OHA) is the primary professional association regarding oral histories today. According to the association, an interview “begins with an audio or video recording of a first-person account made by an interviewer with an interviewee (also referred to as narrator), both of whom have the conscious intention of creating a

---

6 Oral History Interview with Neuberger B. Neuberger, August 26 - December 12, 1991, Tape 1, Side 1, 2; Tape 2, Side 1.
permanent record to contribute to an understanding of the past.” My role as an oral historian is to “[preserve] and [make] history accessible to future researchers and members of the public. Historians conduct and collect oral histories to create an in-depth colloquial account of the past. As a methodology, oral history differs from official government records and journals because of the personal nature of interviews.⁷

As an interviewer, I must protect the privacy of my interviewees and attempt to stay true to their experiences. Both women signed contracts stipulating where their interviews are available as well as permitting me to share their stories. Maintaining their voice as I write is vital because time changes and the societal perception of events changes as well. Though using sources such as these to re-interpret events is a benefit of studying in modern America, there also exists a risk that these subjects may encounter my research and disagree with my portrayal of them.

Because I study and write about the recent past, many of the subjects I interviewed and included in this paper are still living today. Creating and asking specific questions is the exciting part of conducting oral history, and it is what makes it incredibly valuable to historians who study more modern topics. Jensen and Stonecipher answered my questions, and follow up questions, as my research progressed. Other historians whose subjects are long gone do not get this benefit, and have to use less direct means of collecting information, or oral histories that are collected by others.

The three women I discuss in this research, Karen Jensen, Linda Stonecipher, and Maurine Neuberger, each provide a unique account of pieces of their lives. These include their education, athletics, and various jobs. I conducted two of my own interviews, one

with Karen Jensen and another with Linda Stonecipher. I also collected three others, two with Maurine Neuberger, and one which mentions her. All these people spoke of their experiences, and though they most likely were provided with the questions beforehand, they still spoke unrehearsed. These oral histories, full of unique vocal patterns and word choice, allowed me to develop professional, but personal, relationships with my subjects.

Two oral histories were conducted exclusively for this research. Karen Jensen was interviewed through email only, while Linda Stonecipher’s was initiated through email, then conducted in person. These methods are different and create somewhat separate responses, and initiate different tangents. Asking for clarification is significantly easier in personal discussion, though in many ways digital interaction is more efficient. Utilizing email gives the narrator more time to develop their exact responses and tinker with word choice, and the I did not have to work to transcribe the interview afterwards, yet it makes the interview process more practiced and defeats some aspects of the personal nature of oral history. With Linda’s interview, I sat for hours listening and transcribing exactly what she said including inflection. It is time consuming. Sitting together and discussing first-hand accounts is valuable and provides the researcher context and emotion behind what they are writing about. Uniquely, oral histories provide this opportunity, to perceive more than words on a page.

Conducting my own interviews meant I got the opportunity to choose specific, targeted questions. I inquired specifically about the encouragement they received from young adults and peers to be athletic as a student, a topic I did not find present in other sources. I have included an appendix of the questions I asked the two women at the end of this paper. I conducted two separate sets. The initial set of questions, the exclusively
email portion, I asked opening, general, questions such as “Where are you from? And “When you were born. The answers they provided helped me tailor the larger set to their specific experiences.

In the second set, the questions were more specific, and more complex to answer. Who examples are, “Were you encouraged by adults and peers to be athletic as a student in school,” and “As a coach what were the differences between the men’s and women’s teams? Were students in general aware of their rights as athletes?” Other sources did not ask these questions.

Using the three interviews with and about Neuberger were wonderful and full of information, but incredibly limiting. The questions focus on her time as a senator, and on other politicians in the 1960s and 1970s. The sections that discuss her athleticism, and even her time in office, are small and quickly moved past. This is not at the fault of the interviewer, they moved past her comments about locker rooms to again talk about Washington D.C., their purpose behind interview her.

I use several different interviews to piece together some of Neuberger’s life. One was by Clark Hansen for the Oregon Historical Society. The initial interview was in 1991 and was primarily to record her husband’s experiences as a senator. Hansen asks questions that lead her to discuss Richard and other (male) politicians. The information she provides about herself simply serves to set up background for Richard Neuberger. They both skip quickly past the sections I would have loved more. Neuberger unintentionally provides valuable insight into the ideas this research discusses, and I only take small pieces of the interview series as part of my argument. It is important to both recognize this limitation, and respect the original context and purpose of Neuberger’s
words. It is imperative to include the context that Neuberger did not intend her interview to be used in the way I am using it. I cannot know if she would accept how this research uses her words and experiences, and must be respectful. The other interview with Neuberger, was conducted in 1970 by Ann M. Campbell. I also use an interview that mentions her. Donald A. Ritchie interviewed Francis R. Valeo in 1985. The two men discuss many aspects of American politics in the twentieth century and mention Neuberger’s time as a senator, which I use later in this paper.

I take Jensen and Stonecipher’s experiences primarily as athletes, students, and teachers and connect with Neuberger’s time as a teacher and politician. These ideas will be further expanded later, but all three women spend most of their lives, from early childhood through their professional careers, in institutional spaces. Neuberger lived and worked before the other women, and her time as a senator may feel disconnected from the other women. She does not provide a substantial amount of information about her early life, or about sports. There are gaps in her story, however, her story displays the larger idea of American politics and the place of women in America before Stonecipher and Jensen began college and joined the work force.

This work does not contain any oral histories regarding women of color in institutional space which is a significant limitation. Their hurdles have been larger and more difficult than anyone else’s in American society. The scope of this research is unable to include the entire topic of discrimination which is larger and more complicated than the topic of white women. Collecting more oral histories is beyond what I am capable of and I wish to avoid tokenizing marginalized communities, women of color are more than their race and gender.
My research is available through Western Oregon University on Digital Commons and is under the umbrella of creative commons licensing. Digital Commons is a collection of research and projects over the last few years from other students, as well as my own. It is an inter-disciplinary collection of research from the University. As stated previously, all the questions I asked are included at the end of this research. Neuberger’s 1992 interview is published and available through the Oregon Historical Society, and the others carry links in my bibliography and her earlier one is available online at the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum website. The internet has made oral history a more applicable methodology.

As work under creative commons licensing, parts of my interviews, the questions I asked, and my writing here that is available is free to be used by others for their research. Creative Commons automatically gives me permission to reuse and share the research and work of others, and vice-versa. The license is malleable, and provides scholars opportunity to define how their research can be used without complicated legal processes. Such licenses could not have existed before the internet. It allows students, and other people, to build on and share research, if it is properly cited, without fearing legal repercussions.

All the subjects of these interviews have willingly provided their stories and lives with historians to share with future generations. Taking the research from others has allowed me to more fully flesh out my argument of women in institutionalized space, and conducting my own gave me personal insight, and further directed how and what I wrote for this research. They shared stories no other medium could have collected. I am thankful to be able to add to the existing research, and include the interpretations other
historians have made about women in institutionalized space in the twentieth century.

* * *

Other historians discuss and examine women’s place in institutional space. The larger historical narrative, institutional spaces, legislation, and gender intersect in municipal swimming pools. *Contested Waters: A Social History of Swimming Pools in America* by Jeff Wiltse provides a comprehensive analysis of swimming pools in American culture, which are generally owned and managed by the government. Early public pools, were first used as baths to ensure public sanitation. “In response to popular acceptance of the germ theory of disease transmission— which made pools obsolete as baths— and renewed enthusiasm for athletics and physical exercise among the urban middle class, residents and public officials in several northern cities reconceived municipal pools as sports and fitness facilities.” Pools, institutional spaces (government owned properties), became spaces of health and fitness for both men and women, though women and men had access to different days, more of which were open for men. Early “municipal pools were not, however, segregated along racial or ethnic lines.” All people were technically allowed, though, “when blacks sought admission to pools earmarked for whites, attendants discouraged them from entering, but did not outright deny them admission.” In this case, “Enforcement then fell to white swimmers who often harassed and assaulted black Americans who transgressed this new racial boundary.”

Starting in the 1920s, Wiltse finds that as pools became more social sexualized spaces. With less clothing, and less of an emphasis on health, they became increasingly

---

segregated based on race instead of gender. Wiltse writes, “When cities permitted males and females to swim together, white swimmers and public officials suddenly attempted to separate blacks from whites. Although the rationale remained mostly unspoken, northern whites in general objected to black men having the opportunity to interact with white women at such intimate and erotic public spaces.” This was, in many ways, to protect women from people of color. “Municipal pools became such vital community institutions in large part because they were uniquely intimate and sociable places.” “People gathered together at municipal pools. They changed clothes next to one another, showered together, negotiated crowded spaces, and lay out on sandy beaches. These activities necessitated interaction and dialogue” and changed the face of interaction of women in institutional space. Women became objects to be looked at in municipal pools, instead of spaces for health and fitness. For women to be accepted in institutional spaces, they had to become sexual objects. Such perceptions have somewhat changed, and many movements and ideas had to work together to do so.9

In her book, Born for Liberty, Sara M. Evans outlines the state of American women’s rights in different eras, and how feminist movements progressed. She argues the 1970s was a decade of increased women’s liberation movements. She finds that women were “willing to make public charges against discriminatory employers both for themselves individually, and for women as a class.” Women began to further advocate for equality as they realized their experiences were “part of a larger pattern.” Evans writes, “the power of female solidarity and community in consciousness-raising

---

9 Jeff Wiltse, Contested Waters: A Social History of Swimming Pools in America, 89, 109, 110-113 123.
groups…led to an emphasis on issues uniquely female.”¹⁰ Women became increasingly aware of, and willing to fight against, national discrimination in the workplaces, as well as in other areas of life. 1972, Evans argues, was a “watershed year,” where feminist legislation, with massive social backing, was passed through congress relatively easily.¹¹

Tucked into the larger Education Amendment of 1972, Title IX was a small thirty-seven-word slice that changed gendered athletics in America. It states, "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Susan Ware explains the significance of this bill, “The law was designed to fill a gap in coverage of the path-breaking Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which banned discrimination based on race, sex, national origin, and religion in employment, but did not apply to educational institutions.” Many women used athletics to define their own abilities and to prove their physical abilities and strengths.¹²

Where Susan Ware provides a short history of Title IX (and then provides a platform for others to speak), Deborah L Brake, in Getting in the Game: Title IX and the Women's Sports Revolution, provides an in-depth analysis of the law, much of which is beyond the scope of this research. She argues that Title IX focuses on “results over process” to create a space in which women could be included in athletics; the processes of attaining equality was less important than achieving equality. She finds that while congress was debating the bill, some were worried it would be turned and used for sports (specifically football), but “at the time” the sentiment “was overshadowed but the

¹⁰ Sara Evans, Born for Liberty, 293.
¹¹ Sara Evans, Born for Liberty, 291, 293.
¹² Susan Ware, “Introduction: Title IX—Thirty-Seven Words that Changed American Sports,” 3.
consensus on the need to expand women’s access to educational opportunities.” In the beginning, Title IX was focused primarily on academics and spaces within school buildings.\(^\text{13}\)

Title IX was enacted into law in 1972, and quickly came to reference sports. “In 1971, fewer than 300,000 high school girls nationwide participated in interscholastic athletics,” and “there were fewer than 32,000 women who played intercollegiate sports.” Women were a significant minority in athletic spaces. As Brake explains, “female athletes have to struggle not only to be taken seriously as women, but also taken seriously as athletes” as they entered masculine spaces. Countless men did not want women participating in sport, and women did not want to be in a space they were not accepted. The issues did not end with the creation of the bill, there was still a complicated process in interpretation and implementation. Such legislation also did not direct effect women in a way they actively noticed. This research focuses very on Title IX, or its impact on the American public. Both Jensen and Stonecipher found it directly affected them very little, they simply played sports. Title IX created complicated gender dynamics between male and female sports, and those who study sport recognize the separation of men and women in sport is a complicated topic.\(^\text{14}\)

Part of the separation is at the hands of educators and officials who regulated sports, and continue to do so into today. There were three groups worth mentioning in this research: The Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW), the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW), and the National Collegiate Association of Athletics (NCAA). The CIAW, established in 1966, was managed by

---


\(^{14}\) Deborah L. Brake, *Getting in the Game: Title IX and the Women's Sports*, 20, 29, 91.
women. They were created to encourage young women to join athletics. They also organized national championships for women’s sports. The CIAW focused on a philosophy of non-competition and maintaining women in leadership positions.15

The AIAW, first organized in 1971, developed from the CIAW’s realization that women’s sport needed an organized system to “coordinate its activities.” Similarly, “the AIAW shared a commitment to a more participation-orientated, less elitist approach to sports that differed fundamentally from the reigning model of sports which intertwined competition, winning, and commercialization.” Women wanted to protect their students and players from the gradually encroaching, male dominated, NCAA.16

Until the passage of Title IX women’s athletics programs, as degrees and individual sports, were essentially left alone by male sports. When Title IX legitimized women’s athletics, the NCAA “began aggressively eyeing women’s sports.” The NCAA had previously been the most outspoken critic of Title IX, aggressively lobbying against it. After Title IX’s passage, “once it became clear that Title IX was not going away, the NCAA decided that at least it could try to harness women’s sports, in part to make sure there was no competition for its power and control over men’s.” By the early 1980’s, the significantly wealthier NCAA successfully forced the AIAW to fold. As Ware argues in a strongly biased statement, “a significant chance for a different kind of women’s athletics — less commercial, more focused on education and participation, potentially less exploitive — had been lost.”17

15 Susan Ware, “Introduction: Title IX—Thirty-seven Words that Changed American Sports,” Title IX: A Brief History with Documents, (Boston: Bedford/ St. Martins, 2007), 11-12.
16 Susan Ware, “Introduction,” 11-12.
17 Susan Ware, “Introduction,” 11-12.
Some feminist scholars argue segregation in athletics is inherently sexist and defines differences in the abilities of male and female athletes, others disagree. This research does not choose a side in this argument. It is a complicated issue with positive and negative points for both, and is important to address as an idea. As Deborah Brake writes, “separating women from men in athletic competition sends the message that men are better athletes.”\(^\text{18}\) She later references a law professor, Karen Tokarz, who argues “sex segregation in sports ‘fosters the myth of male supremacy’ and ‘perpetuates the sex role stereotype of women as passive and weak.”\(^\text{19}\) Conversely, proponents of sex separation argue “giving women control over their own resources would allow them to develop their own model of sports rather than simply replicate what men had designed for themselves. Separation would allow women broader opportunities in sport.”\(^\text{20}\) Brake argues that many “physical educators… would have been pleased with separate teams, as long as they had sufficient resources to succeed.”\(^\text{21}\) They wanted, or would accept gender segregation so long as they had the ability to create well-funded, supported athletic spaces for their athletes. Separation provides resources and focus on women where, if they were on men’s teams, they could get lost in the larger sport. Separation simultaneously means women are often treated as second class citizens.

Separating men and women in athletics centers directly around the debate between equity and equality. Daniel Moeckli writes, “all human beings, regardless of their status or membership of a particular group, are entitled to the same minimal set of

\(^{19}\) Deborah L. Brake, *Getting in the Game*, 29.
basic rights.” But, “in a capitalist society” people must be “winners and losers.” In practice equality is not always reality, thus the concept of equity emerges. Susan Ware found a simple explanation of equity that directly pertains to sport. Minnesota gender activist Dorothy McIntyre wrote “if we are going to give jockstraps out to the men, then we should provide [sports] bras for the women.” Providing the exact same resources, in short treating everyone in an identical manner, is not always the most effective way to manage them. This research does not argue that men and women must be treated the same, as all people should not be treated the same. It is rather to see that different communities need different resources and support. Women in sport do not have identical needs to men, however, their needs are still valuable, and they should still be treated as equals. The women I interviewed for this research explained moments where they felt distinct disparities between male and female athletes.

* * *

As athletes, Jensen and Stonecipher faced separation from male athletes. Primarily, female athletes were treated differently than male in the sports they had access to, as well as the resources their teams received. Some sports (such as field hockey) were uniquely gendered, and the American public questioned the femininity of women who played sports. Many concerns Americans had regarding women in sports were voiced pre-1970s and pre-Title IX, but pervious societal perceptions still influenced them as athletes. Unlike the other two women, Maurine Neuberger’s athleticism is unknown. She

---

22 Donald G. Mathews and Jane Sherron De Hart, Sex Gender, and the politics of the ERA, 321.
23 Donald G. Mathews and Jane Sherron De Hart, Sex Gender, and the politics of the ERA, 224.
barely mentions her interest in physical activity aside from a brief mention of enjoying
dance in college (as she explains, a precursor to the use of aerobic dance as exercise). Stonecipher most heavily felt separation from her male counterparts.

While discussing her lack of official uniform, Stonecipher explains moments
where she was treated differently from male athletes. “The first year I played volleyball
we actually just bought some shirts and mom sewed numbers on our shirt, kind of a
scraggly group.” Her volleyball team did not receive official uniforms for two years, and
they played softball in jeans and matching shirts. Stonecipher did not purchase proper
athletic sweats until after graduating high school. Unlike the boys, she explains, “None of
the girls in my high school had a pair of sweats, it’s not like I was late catching on.” The
girls were, in repeating the phrase, “a scraggly group,” versus the better funded and
clothed boys’ sports. Women were athletic, but still had access to different “gear” than
the young men at her school. Lacking proper clothing fundamentally made them seem
less legitimate than their male counterparts.

Aside from which sports they played, when I asked Stonecipher and Jensen if they
were encouraged by adults to be athletic they responded similarly. Jensen wrote, “Things
were very different then. We were not seen as proper athletes as we did not compete in
high school; it was really just a special PE class. I took the class as some of my friends
did.” Later, in college, sport “was just a continuation” of before, “it was something to
do with a couple of play days every year” so “encouragement was not an issue.”

Stonecipher said, “I grew up in an era where girls didn’t do much because there wasn’t

---

26 Oral History Interview with Linda Stonecipher, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 10, 2017.
much in terms of what the schools offered, and nothing in the community.”

She supposed this meant it was not equal with the boys in her area but was still “as equal as it could have been.”

During Jensen and Stonecipher’s time in college athletics, they noticed gender inequities regarding their athletic facilities. Jensen found imbalances affected her very little; in college gymnastics, the men and women “shared a small gym,” they had equal facilities. She aspired to play sports and often did not notice if she received less than, or was treated differently from, male athletes. Stonecipher’s university had gender separated athletic buildings and each played in their gender’s facility. Stonecipher found these differences to be fair which “circles back to equity versus equality;” men’s athletics attracted larger crowds and thus need larger spaces to accommodate the crowds. For big games at other schools the women would play sometimes basketball in the intimidating “men’s arena”; “it was a big space.” The men had larger, more expensive, more modern spaces, to learn and play their sports, and she was only allowed in those spaces during specific instances. Men had better physical resources.

Sports separation by gender also allows many sports to become uniquely gendered as “male and female athletes are channeled into ‘gender-appropriate’ sports.” For a modern example think football and baseball versus field hockey and softball.

Schools push women into more traditionally feminine sports; such sports were seen as

29 Oral History Interview with Linda Stonecipher, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 10, 2017.
30 Oral History Interview with Linda Stonecipher, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 10, 2017.
32 During my interviews with Jensen and Stonecipher I included a conversation about the idea of equity versus equality, which was a significant portion of previous drafts.
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less competitive and less aggressive than men’s.\textsuperscript{38} Susan Cahn argues Americans saw female athletes who strayed from gender norms, and the specific sports provided for them, as aggressive and mannish, carrying a distinct threat of lesbianism and sexual deviance.\textsuperscript{39} The AIAW helped enforce these ideas, and regulate them. Specifically gendered sports divide men and women and again push the idea that the two cannot be accomplished at the same activities. Believing softball as an exclusively “women’s” sport implies something specifically feminine about a sport which has no gender. Similarly attaching masculinity to more physically aggressive sports, such as hockey, implies women are not aggressive, or that men are inherently aggressive. Changing strong societal perceptions in athletic abilities took time and societal swings. All three women addressed in this research attended the institutional space of public school from kindergarten through college, and experienced gender inequities and bias. Neuberger, Jensen, and Stonecipher display the gradual shifts as female student athletes joined organized sports in larger numbers than ever before.

Karen Jensen’s athletic opportunities as a student were restricted to feminine sports. In high school, she participated in gymnastics competitively “as it was one of the few options available” to her. In college, she joined gymnastics and field hockey (a women’s only sport) in a more casual, as she calls “play day,” setting.\textsuperscript{40} Sara Evans explains “play days” as games that were less competitive and do not have “star” players.\textsuperscript{41} These two sports, field hockey and gymnastics contain specific feminine


\textsuperscript{39} Susan Cahn, \textit{Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Women’s Sport}, 174.

\textsuperscript{40} Oral History Interview with Karen Jensen, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 17, 2017.

gender connotation. “[Field] hockey was an elite all-female sport.” Cahn argues because field hockey was “never popular among American boys and men, it was designated as an exclusively female sport from the beginning. Consequently, it remained free from charges of mannishness.” Similarly, gymnastics were feminine due to their link with beauty and grace, and their lack of physical contact between participants. As a student she was not able to attempt less traditionally feminine sports.

Conversely, Stonecipher played sports that were comparatively seen as more physical and aggressive than those Jensen played. In fact, Stonecipher helped launch several of her high school teams. This was in part because she had a motivated community of students, and willing adults. She described the process. “I had a high school physical education teacher who was willing, when a few of us talked to her, to take on the role of a coach,” though she had absolutely zero coaching experience before that. As Stonecipher explains, she joined in softball and track when they “first started for girls when I was in the 8th grade,” then “volleyball when I was a freshman, and basketball when I was a sophomore.” In total, including college, she “played varsity softball for five years, volleyball for four years, [and] basketball for three years.” The quality and quantity of teams her school were roughly the same as the other schools in the area.

Softball and basketball, two of the primary sports Stonecipher participated in, have been controversial in the U.S.; it is telling of the changes in America that Stonecipher could start these teams with little to no community pushback. Softball, a
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“working class sport” adapted from baseball, was first co-recreational, but gradually became primarily a woman’s sport. 1940s proponents of softball wanted to push away the “mannish tint,” making their players as physically feminine as possible, and punished those who would not conform to regulations. Similarly, Cahn argues women in basketball were first embraced by Americans, but the sport developed “a reputation as a ‘masculine endeavor unsuited to feminine athletes.’” Some physical educations, the same women who would eventually create the CIAW and the AIAW, even attempted to create new “girls-rules” to limited physical contact between players and “to make a ‘masculine’ sport compatible with womanhood.”

Cahn finds “by the 1950s all female athletes… operated under a cloud of sexual suspicion.” She continues “The fear of lesbianism was the greatest where a sport had a particularly masculine image… Basketball and softball fit the bill on both counts.” Stating this is not to question or discuss the sexuality of female athletes, or the women interviewed for this research, but to address the concept that these two sports were deemed inappropriate for women only twenty years before the 1970s, when Stonecipher was playing without complaint.
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Figure 1: Linda Stonecipher (#32) Indiana State Women’s Volleyball Team (taken 1974-77). Courtesy of Linda Stonecipher.

Figure 2: Linda Stonecipher (right) and Terri Hale (left) Indiana State Women’s Basketball Team (1975-76). Courtesy of Linda Stonecipher.
American culture made significant leaps, from fearing and questioning women’s participation in athletics, to teenagers making their own teams without their community fighting back. Men’s sexuality in sport was not questioned because they were expected to be strong and competitive. Separate spaces for gendered sports brought separate pressures and expectations. Cahn argues women were expected to be less competitive, and maintain their beauty and femininity while competing. The AIAW enforced such stereotypes when they attempted to limit competition for male sports but not female sports. The American public constantly questioned women’s physical gender as well as their sexuality.\textsuperscript{52}

Neuberger, Jensen, and Stonecipher grew up across the across the country in different periods of times; they were different, but their experiences connect them. Jensen and Stonecipher were only a few years apart, but what sports and resources they had access to were dissimilar. Stonecipher had several sports to choose from, while Jensen only had gymnastics. No matter the resources, Neuberger, Jensen, and Stonecipher, were women who found importance and joy in remaining active, and in working with other people.

* * *

Neuberger, Jensen, and Stonecipher were all Physical Education majors, and like their experiences as athletes, female Physical Education majors were treated differently than male. This was in part due to the stigma of women in athletics, discussed previously, but also due to the female physical educators who came before. Female educators wanted control over women’s sports and athletic programs and feared men’s domination. Cahn

\textsuperscript{52} Susan Cahn, \textit{Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Women’s Sport}, 181.
argues “To guard against such an outcome the profession articulated an adamantly separatist philosophy that insisted on the importance of women coaches, officials, and administrators.”

Female educators enforced the separation of men and women to control the education of young women, and set their own educational philosophy. Their philosophies match with the difference between the NCAA and the AIAW, focusing on collaboration and non-competition, as well as independence from male educators and officials.

Educators developing Physical Education degree programs for women centered on concern over the female body. Anxiety over the health of women in academics initiated women’s Physical Education programs and degrees. School administrators were anxious about women not getting enough blood flow sitting in classes and so, in the early twentieth century, women began to teach “mandatory health and exercise classes.”

These classes gradually developed into full programs to teach women to be physical educators. Educators developed their own philosophy and believed “the welfare, health, and education of women [depended] upon the women experts on girls and women’s athletics organizing themselves” as opposed to joining with men.

By the 1920s female physical educators had their own, organized, programs, and “had grown confident of their ability to set the athletic course for their female charges.” In the following decade Neuberger reveals how established such programs were (1930s Oregon was not the pinnacle of reputable universities). Neuberger first began her time at
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the University of Oregon during the 1930s, first as a general education major, then as a physical education major. She had not planned on this degree, but her and her class mates all had a female professor who inspired and pushed them to become P.E. teachers. She does not mention men in the same degree program, implying Neuberger was not in major courses with her male colleagues. Similarly, Jensen briefly explains, “my high school and college classes were all female,” and this was in the 1970’s. Widespread, multi-generational access to such programs implies they were well grounded in academia and their gender separation was as well.

Stonecipher further explains the separation of men and women during her formative years at Indiana State University. The men’s Physical Education programs “had an entirely different facility. Women had a building with [gyms] and classrooms” on the opposite side of campus. When asked if she found the men’s program to be better she responded,

At the college level I barely interacted with the men’s program. They had different facilities, different teachers. I can’t compare, but I can tell you, the program I was in was really top-notch for teaching females how to be good teachers, I had some amazing faculty. I walked out of there with skills I needed to be a good teacher. Whatever the men’s facilities were like, I can’t imagine the program was any better.

While the quality of education was the same, the facilities were different. The “men had a much larger, bigger, newer, facility.” The men were continuously provided significantly better resources in their physical spaces, as well as their gear.

Clothing and uniforms were contentious subjects for female Physical Education majors. Cahn argues, in the early years, “departments warned against ‘casual styles’ that
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might ‘lead us back into some dangerous channels.’ They implemented dress codes forbidding slacks and men’s shirts or socks, adding a ban on ‘boyish haircuts’ and ‘unshaved legs.’ While this was many years before Stonecipher was a student, it still shows a tone educators held regarding women’s clothing and physical appearance. Stonecipher dealt with specific clothing standards; she said the “requirement at Indiana State University was that for all of the P.E. activity classes that I was in… blue shorts and a white shirt. And that was all you could wear.” She adds, “and also sweats, there were blue sweats.” Uniforms were available for purchase at the university bookstore and nowhere else. She believes these were the sake of professionalism, but one could also argue educators and the American public more closely watched and regulated women’s clothing. Men certainly also had uniforms, but they do not carry the same social weight and background as women’s clothing regulation. American society did not argue the masculinity and sexuality of male athletes based on their uniforms and haircuts as they did for women.

Women did not receive the same education as their male colleagues. Even if women received the same quality of education, they were not treated as equals with the same academic needs, inherently dividing them. In many ways, this is because Female educators wanted to control the students that came out of their programs. Women wanted to define their own teachers, and the future of female students at the college level as well as below. Fundamentally, even women’s quality of education was the same or better than men’s, they were still separated. This is vital considering that women had the same
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capabilities, but continued to be treated as different than men. In Stonecipher’s experiences the men often got the superior resources. Aside from resources, the divisions and separation continued into all three women’s professional lives.

* * *

Professionally, all three women worked in industries dominated by men. They were often treated differently than men, and had access to different resources. Their experiences differ, but all faced separation from their male colleagues in both physical space and treatment. All three were educators for a time and recognized limitations as women and noticed issues that women working in institutionalized spaces continuously faced, particularly when interacting with male students and colleagues.

Aside from her work as a Physical Education instructor, physical activity was an important aspect of Maurine Neuberger’s life as a senator in Washington D.C. She was told by a doctor to exercise due to a medical operation just before the 1961 senate session. She explained, “the doctor wanted me to be sure I had exercise, so I just told Senator Mansfield I had to have exercise and he said, ‘go to the gym,’ so that’s what I did.” She “took advantage of the gym.” Neuberger’s experiences attempting to use the gym, is mentioned in passing while describing some of her interactions with top male senators. In the morning, “As soon as I got [to the Senate building] I went to the gym for exercise and played some handball with one of the directors and went swimming and got ready to go the committees by nine o’clock.” Nonchalantly, she explains herself as possibly the first woman to request to utilize the gym.69

69 Oral History Interview with Neuberger B. Neuberger, August 26 - December 12, 1991, Tape 8, Side 1.
Neuberger continued to use the senate gym during her tenure. At that time, it had no women’s locker rooms for her to change and shower. The interview asks, “but since there hadn’t been women prior to your tenure and Margaret Chase Smith’s term, did they have facilities for women, shower facilities, locker facilities…?” She responded, “We had, no, there were no special facilities. There had been women [in the Senate] before, but they had been appointed, and I don’t think anybody thought there would be much of a problem about having women.” She continues, “I think the other women didn’t want to use it…Margaret Smith didn’t want to use it, but I liked to play handball and racquetball and so on.”

She explains, because women did not have their own locker room, she was forced to come before the gym opened to the men, from eight to nine in the morning, to play handball and exercise. Neuberger had to request a change to the existing system to utilize the gym.

In an interview in 1985 Francis R. Valeo, administration assistant to Mike Mansfield (majority leader) during Neuberger’s tenure, provided some insight into how administrators had to make changes for female senators. He explains, offices in the senate were given out based on seniority. “The only exception Mansfield made to this was to recognize that Margaret Chase Smith needed one of these rooms, and Mrs. Neuberger, who was then a member on the Democratic side.” There were concerns regarding offices, “They had complained to him about no bathroom for women senators in the Capitol. There were two offices side by side which shared a bathroom, so he put the two women
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senators in those offices.” Mansfield had to rearrange the established system to give the two women access to washrooms.  

Figure 3: Maurine Neuberger with Sen. Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, Oregon Historical Society, Org Lot 1007, Folder 23, Box 1.

Chase Smith and Neuberger were not close. In her 1970 interview Neuberger explains she and Chase Smith “were poles apart in temperament and personality.” She elaborates, “She was nice to me. But we had no intimacy or no communication, and the people thought because we were the only two women senators, we would.” They were in different political parties, and had different government philosophies. As Neuberger says, “politics was more her life and her career. To me, it wasn't.” They should not have been placed in neighboring offices, but they had to be.

The United States government built the capitol, an institutional space, in 1793 with the needs of men in mind. In much of the country, women could not vote or run for office until 1920. Oregon allowed women to vote in 1912, but Maurine Neuberger was

---

still one of the first dozen female senators in Washington D.C. The thought process is logical; if women cannot be senators, then why would a locker room be built for them? Women joining the government was groundbreaking, but in the almost century since that point, Oregon has yet to elect another female U.S. senator. According to one source, the gym was not officially opened for women, with their own locker room, until 1983.73 Women in the Senate did not have a bathroom near the senate floor until 1993, and women in the House of Representatives did not have one near until 2011.74 The issues that Neuberger faced were not easily resolved, it took time, money, and an increased feminine presence in elected officials, and women still are treated differently than men.

Segregation and limitations regarding space and people were prevalent in Jensen’s professional career in athletics as a teacher, a coach, and a physical trainer. As an athletic trainer, she “worked with [Indiana State University’s] women's gymnastics team as well as a local high school's women's basketball and volleyball teams.” While in El Paso, Jensen worked as an athletic trainer for all women’s' teams.” “Additionally, [she] helped a few young males who needed help when their male athletic trainer was not available.” She explains, “This aspect of my job would not have been condoned by parents nor school personnel.” She was the only person available to work with these young men, and her school built a literal wall in the men’s locker rooms to completely segregate her from any other part of the space outside of where she needed to work. She explains the background to this incident.75

“I taught in a high school whose students were 90%+, first or second generation from Mexico. To understand, you need to know that the young women would not talk directly about sanitary pads with me, even though I taught health as well as PE. No young woman would see the male athletic trainer (the one at the same school was not a positive professional) as he worked in the boy’s locker rooms. I saw a few males because the male [athletic trainer] was not always in the building. I saw the guys in the gym and no one knew we were talking about injuries. The young men would not tell their parents nor coaches. Talking about one’s body was a guarded subject.”

She could do this because no one was talking about their bodies around other teachers or to parents, and often she was the only option as physical trainer.76

After she left Texas, back in Colorado, Jensen explains more of her difficulties as a trainer. “I was often the only woman in the athletics department in vans/buses, or at away games.” She “often [stayed] at motels as there was no place to do so at other schools” with the athletes, other coaches, and trainers. Jensen was needed to be present, but was a bother as other schools were forced to make special arrangements. While training, she often “went into the men’s locker rooms by telling the guys to close their eyes as [she] was coming through.” She worked with football players “after damage to external genitalia or possible unreported concussion were sustained.” In her early years as a trainer “training room was part of the men’s locker room.” As a woman, she was not truly welcome in their space, and was often separated from the teams and their experiences because of her gender, but it was part of her role as an athletic trainer. No one else was taking care of these students, so Jensen had to step into the position. Jensen

was as capable as any male athletic trainer, but was treated differently, recognizing this as a problem. Her role as an educator displays further changes in women in sport.\(^{77}\)

An important note for both Jensen and Stonecipher is the structure of their classes as Physical Education teachers. As a student teacher Stonecipher taught both male and female students,\(^ {78}\) as did Jensen. In her interview Jensen said, “when I started teaching high school, the classes were all coed as were the classes I taught at Western [Colorado University].”\(^ {79}\) As students their classes had been gender segregated, though somewhere between their High School graduation and beginning to teach, it changed with time. Teachers could teach opposite, or mixed, gender classes, a step in the direction of gender equality.

* * *

All three women noticed, and criticized, scarcity in female leadership, and lack of acceptance of professional women in institutional spaces. Many women do not have direct control over their own and other’s futures, and have few female role models as they develop. Women who do not have significant female role models are less likely to see themselves in that position, and are less likely to aspire to such positions. All three women saw a lack of leadership correlate to the lack of future interest in leadership, as well as the necessity for women to be accepted in, and join, athletics as well as in government spaces.

Neuberger and her recorded experiences with athletics, ended with the senate gym, but she was a continual advocate for women and promoted equality throughout her

\(^{77}\) Oral History Interview with Karen Jensen, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 17, 2017.
\(^{78}\) Oral History Interview with Linda Stonecipher, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 10, 2017.
\(^{79}\) Oral History Interview with Karen Jensen, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 17, 2017.
political career, which should not be lost to time. She wrote “Man has no right, in a
democracy, to translate his prejudices into actions that deny or infringe the rights and liberties of others.” She also later stated, “the whole purpose of…Civil Rights… is not to make bad people good, but to make good people safe.” She believed that people had a right to life, safety and happiness, a right to be comfortable and have access to the resources and space they needed. She wanted to be an active woman in a man’s world and it was a complicated process as she tried to find access to that.80

Neuberger believed that the reason more women are not elected was a gendered problem. Women worked in their homes—they took care of the family— but they did not make social connections like men. Men did not want to support a candidate they did not know. They knew Neuberger because she had worked with her husband and was following in his steps; she had name recognition but most women did not; “They don’t give money to a housewife. She’s got to really go out and grovel for campaign funds.” Women, in their restriction to domestic spaces, and the need to protect them from the outside, as discussed previously, did not have the resources to build an effective political campaign. She goes on to discuss the changes that had been made, but that progress was still needed regarding women in politics.81

Stonecipher and Jensen strongly believe that the disparities of women in leadership positions is an ongoing issue; Stonecipher finds the future of athletics, and the future of Title IX cases, to be related. Jensen’s interview contained small moments of inequality, she said her university in Colorado “recently hired a woman to coach

81 Oral History Interview with Neuberger B. Neuberger, August 26 - December 12, 1991.
basketball, and a player said she had never had a woman coach before." She says men would complain about needing to add women’s sports and then hire men to coach them.

Ware found in 1973 women coached 92% of women’s teams, which dropped significantly after this point. When the AIAW folded in the early 1980s, the male-dominated NCAA took control of women’s sports. Men took over head coaching positions as well as the education of female students. Currently women hold only one in five collegiate coaching positions, coaching fewer than half of women’s collegiate teams and only two or three percent of men’s teams. A massive amount of new jobs have been created in women’s athletics in the last four decades, but most of them have gone to men.

Stonecipher said,

I’ve observed sort of through my lifetime that that is true, if there is anything that right now bothers me, I think this is part of what you want to get at, in terms of gender lack of equity for females. It’s in the coaching realm. It annoys me the number of male coaches for women’s teams. We have that issue here [at Western Oregon University]. Then I struggle because I also believe that you should have the best person.

Fundamentally the continued debate is, the best person should be hired for the job, no matter the gender, but what if women are not given the opportunities to become the best at such jobs? Stonecipher continues, “if the men are more experienced and have better records, then we need to ask questions, why is that? Because I can’t believe it’s because

---

84 Susan Ware, “Introduction,” 11-12.
85 Susan Ware, “Introduction,” 11-12.
86 Susan Ware, “Introduction,” 11-12.
87 Susan Ware, “Introduction,” 11-12.
88 Oral History Interview with Linda Stonecipher, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 10, 2017.
89 Oral History Interview with Linda Stonecipher, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 10, 2017.
they have basketball. I just can’t believe there is something inherently special about men that gives them an edge to be better coaches.\textsuperscript{90} The issue is larger and systematic in the world of institutionalized space.

The experiences of women in institutional space exhibit many of the limitations women face in American culture, in the twentieth century and into the twenty-first. While this is a popular discussion in the larger field of history, my unique sources add new voices to the larger story of institutional segregation and gender bias. Oral history is a valuable tool to place individuals in the larger narrative because of their personal nature. The oral histories I collected here are examples of the larger issue of women in institutional spaces. The three women were very much a part of the world they lived, and were susceptible to the bias and societal expectations around them. There is a larger systematic issue of inequality addressed here. It is an ongoing discussion which will hopefully continue to grow and develop with time and further focus.

\textsuperscript{90} Oral History Interview with Linda Stonecipher, Interviewed by Brianna Williford, March 10, 2017.
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Appendix 1: Linda Stonecipher Oral History Interview Questions:

Introduction Questions:
Due to my interest in gendered space I’ll be using Title IX as one portion of my study. I’d like the interview to include your experiences with athletics and gendered space—separated or segregated—or the impact of new laws and policies. In addition to the questions above, could you give me some brief overview of some of the experiences you’d like to share that relate to my topic so I can formulate questions for the interview? Do you have any other suggestions for direction I can take for this interview?

Final Questions:
Were you encouraged by adults and peers to be athletic as a student in high school? In college?
Did you have access to a female locker room or changing/showering spaces in high school? In college?
Did your sports have their own facilities and equipment?
Did you feel that those facilities were equal in comparison to what men’s athletics received? Do you have any specific examples of this?
You touch on the limited selection of athletic-wear for women, especially for running. When you were in school what were the options for both men and women? How did it change as time went on?
You said before that for both undergrad and graduate school the men’s and women’s PE programs were completely separated; I would love to talk about that.
—Was the quality of education different?
—How did the programs interact?
—Was the women’s program on its own or was it subordinate to the men’s?
—At what points were they combined?
—How were the segregated programs different from undergrad to graduate school?
You mention you did not enjoy recruiting at a Division 1 level, why is what? What were your experiences recruiting?
As a coach what were the differences between the men’s and women’s teams? Were students in general aware of their rights as athletes?
I have researched some into the pushback from women joining the NCAA and the campaigns on either side. What was your involvement in that disagreement at the time and has it changed over time? What were the arguments that you experienced?
What was the transition between the AIAW to the NCAA like?
From your experiences what were the differences between the two organizations?
Were there women in leadership positions in athletics administration when you were in school? How often did that occur? How did people react differently to men versus women in leadership positions?
You mention that as an athlete and as a coach you were not involved with athletic policies. When you were still in high school were you aware of the passing of the education amendments of 1972, and in that Title IX?
Do you know when you first became aware of it? If so, explain that process.
How did you see differences in the enforcement and perception of Title IX between the 1970s, 80s, and 90s? What were those differences to you?
Did your schools and universities have any issues or lawsuits regarding Title IX?
To you what is the difference between equality and equity?
Is there anything else that I did not ask that you would like to add or discuss? Is there any other direction you think I should research within these topics?
Appendix 2: Karen Jensen Oral History Interview Questions:

Introduction Questions:
Due to my interest in gendered space I’ll be using Title IX as one portion of my study. I’d like the interview to include your experiences with athletics and gendered space—separated or segregated—or the impact of new laws and policies. In addition to the questions above, could you give me some brief overview of some of the experiences you’d like to share that relate to my topic so I can formulate questions for the interview? Do you have any other suggestions for direction I can take for this interview?

Final Questions:
Were you encouraged by adults and peers to be athletic as a student in high school? In college?
Did you have access to a female locker room in high school? In college?
Did that access to locker rooms change throughout your participation in athletics, and were you aware of those changes as they happened?
Did your sports have their own facilities and equipment?
Did you feel that those facilities were equal in comparison to what men’s athletics received? Do you remember anything specifically about this?
Did you notice a difference in the access to and quality of athletic clothing and accessories between men and women? How did that change as you were in school and then a trainer?
Were the Physical Education programs separated when you were in undergrad, did you notice a change in the programs over time?
Why did you choose to be an athletic trainer? Were there many women in the profession at this time and did that change? Were there difficulties getting jobs as a woman in this field, even in women’s sports?
When you trained with young men in Texas you mention that this was not condoned by parents or school personnel, but were there any actual negative reactions from individuals or groups? Was there a similar reaction to men working with young women?
What were some of your roles as an athletics trainer on the various sports you listed previously?
What were some difficulties being a woman in athletic space working with college age men and women?
In the sports you taught were there men in those classes and were the sports that were competitive taken seriously?
Why did you finish one year of medical school as a non-medical student?
I have researched some into the pushback from women joining the NCAA and the campaigns on either side. Did you experience any opinions regarding the two organizations as a woman involved in both men’s and women’s athletics?
What was the transition between the AIAW to the NCAA like at your university?
From your experiences what were the differences between the two organizations?
To you what is the difference between equality and equity?
Were you aware of the passing of Title IX in 1972?
Do you know when you first became aware of it? If so, explain that process.
How did you see differences in the enforcement and perception of Title IX between the 1970s, 80s, and 90s? What were those differences to you?
Did your schools and universities have any issues or lawsuits regarding Title IX? Is there anything else that I did not ask that you would like to add or discuss? Is there any other direction you think I should research within these topics?