

**SOCIETY***Faculty Women:  
A Political Profile*

"Sex Differences in Academe" by Everett C. Ladd, Jr. and Seymour Martin Lipset, in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 10, 1976), 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Since 1970, there has been a steady increase in the proportion of women on American college faculties; now 37 percent of the teachers under 30 are female. Women teaching the social sciences tend to be more "radical"; but otherwise "men and women [teachers] differ little in their general social and political orientations," according to broad surveys by Ladd, a University of Connecticut political scientist, and Lipset, a Stanford sociologist. The sharpest male-female differences concern teaching and research. Forty-six percent of the women, compared to 34 percent of the men, "strongly agree" that teaching effectiveness, not scholarly publication, should be the primary criterion for promotion. One-third of the men and only one-fourth of the women believe that good teaching requires involvement in research. Actual behavior reflects these views with 61 percent of the women and less than 50 percent of the men declaring they had not published anything in the past two years.

Male and female faculty members hold remarkably similar views on political and social issues (63 percent of both groups voted for George McGovern in 1972; 31 percent of the men and 33 percent of the women had a positive attitude toward President Ford; 31 percent of the women and 29 percent of the men said big corporations should be taken out of private ownership and run in the public interest; 58 percent of both groups favored legalizing marijuana; and only a small proportion—27 percent of the men and 20 percent of the women—opposed the hiring of homosexual teachers).

While more women teachers than men regard most American colleges as "racist" (51 percent vs. 40 percent), only a small percentage of women (26 percent) favor "preferential" hiring for women and blacks. Thus, the authors conclude, the growing presence of women on college faculties has not greatly increased the preëxisting liberalism of the teaching profession or reduced faculty support for competitive, meritocratic standards.

*Why Those SAT  
Scores Dropped*

"Family Configuration and Intelligence" by R. B. Zajonc, in *Science* (Apr. 1976), 1515 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Since 1962, there has been a steady decline in average Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of high-school seniors. Zajonc, a psychology professor at the University of Michigan, sees a significant association between variations in individuals' aggregate test scores and variations in patterns of "family configuration" (the number of children and the

**SOCIETY**

order of their birth). He concludes that a reversal of the downward trend in SAT scores will soon appear.

Research findings, Zajonc writes, show intellectual performance improves with decreasing family size, except in one-parent homes; test scores reflect even the temporary absence of a parent. Firstborn children perform better than later children, especially when intervals between births are relatively short. Long spacing between siblings benefits the later child by permitting development in a more "mature" environment. The only child suffers from the lack of opportunity to teach younger siblings—a handicap affecting last-born children, too.

Thus, some of the decline in SAT scores may be attributed to a steady fall in the percentage of first children born between 1947 and 1962 (from 42 percent to 27 percent), resulting in fewer children taking the SAT who have the intellectual advantages of being firstborn. The proportion of first children has been steadily increasing since 1963, and children born in that year, who will take the SAT in 1980, already show improved scholastic performance.

### *Future Limits On Leisure*

"The Future of Free Time" by Alexander Szalai, in *Futures* (June 1976), IPC Science and Technology Press Ltd., 32 High St., Guildford, Surrey, England GU1 3EW.

There are signs that even as free time increases, it is becoming less free. Reporting on last April's Second World Congress on Free Time and Self-Fulfillment in Brussels, Szalai, an economist at Karl Marx University, Budapest, writes that recent concentration by unions and employers on easing the daily grind often resulted in 30-60-minute reductions in the work day that people easily frittered away. However, past reductions in both work day and work week (to seven or eight hours on the job, five days a week) have changed popular demands. Instead of further reductions in the workday, employees want longer weekends and vacations.

"The future seems to belong to the accumulated use of free time," says Szalai, who notes that a worker allowed to trade a 30-minute reduction in his eight-hour day for "accumulated time off" could enjoy an extra three weeks of paid vacation every year. Such practices, if widespread could have a profound impact on tourism, sports, and other leisure industries. But few forms of leisure can be enjoyed without commercially produced goods and services. In socialist, planned economies, such goods and services—from ski boots to bathing suits, books, movies, and dance halls—are available only if government planners provide them. In capitalist countries, Szalai predicts, environmental concerns will probably increase government curbs on the unfettered enjoyment of added leisure (e.g., limits on the use of motor vehicles or on public access to wilderness areas).