



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

Chancellor's Honors Program Projects

Supervised Undergraduate Student Research
and Creative Work

Spring 5-2000

Choosing a Field of Study and Future Career: At the College Level

Lueshawna Lynn Lietzke
University of Tennessee - Knoxville

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj

Recommended Citation

Lietzke, Lueshawna Lynn, "Choosing a Field of Study and Future Career: At the College Level" (2000).
Chancellor's Honors Program Projects.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj/404

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Supervised Undergraduate Student Research and Creative Work at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chancellor's Honors Program Projects by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

**Choosing a Field of Study and Future Career:
At the College Level**

Lueshawna Lietzke

May 2, 2000

Career Opportunities and Choices – An Introduction

How do college students choose their majors and careers? Sure, potential salary plays a major role, as does any talent said students were born with. The availability of jobs around the students' preferred area of residence, career growth potential — all of these and more are factors in how students choose their careers. So how much does societal influence affect what careers male and female students choose?

At the turn of this century, the only “respectable” jobs open to women were those of homemaker, housekeeper, cook or maid. Women’s independence, their right to vote, and gender equality didn’t yet exist in law or in society. At the very least, women who worked at jobs other than those “open” to them were considered unnatural and unattractive, ape-leaders who didn’t know or care about their “proper place in society.”

The World Wars brought women into the workforce while the men went off to fight in Europe. Women were expected to uphold patriotic spirit and “support their men” by manning assembly lines in factories, making everything from nuts and bolts to the ship those nuts and bolts held together. Women worked in welding, plumbing, medicine, architecture, engineering, construction, and many other jobs previously available only to men.

When the World Wars ended, however, men needed their jobs back, and wanted a return to the gender-defined roles of man-as-breadwinner, woman-as-homemaker. Women were shut out of jobs or prevented from advancing further in their jobs in a society effort to send the women back to their homes “where they belonged.”

Those women who continued to work, and those who entered the workforce after them, have often encountered an invisible social barrier, called the “glass ceiling,” that prevents advancement in their career fields or keeps them from fully doing their jobs, causing discouragement, frustration, and intimidation. As word about these discouraging careers spread, female students tended to shy away from these jobs unless they were determined and dedicated.

At the end of this century, some bias still exists against women working in some careers, though with increased attention given to the matter by such programs as affirmative action, the problem is slowly deteriorating. In such careers as politics, surgery, some branches of engineering, agriculture, university-level teaching, and other jobs that now rely more on intelligence than strength, women are still pioneers in this "era of equality."

But we are also seeing an opposite trend with men's careers. It could be that with women's entrance into "male territory" of suffrage and employment, men feel they must be more 'masculine' and have a fear of being too 'feminine' in their feelings, extracurricular activities, or careers. It could also be that men may feel threatened by women's success in some jobs and thus decide to avoid comparisons to women in those jobs. Or it could be that with more women entering the job market, employers have a wider field of potential employees and thus can pick the best-qualified person (male or female) for the job. Whatever the reason, people have slowly come to think of some careers — notably dance, fashion, music and primary school teaching, among others — as "women's careers," which would be 'too easy' or 'too feminine' for men to make their living in. This attitude has seemed to increase, despite the fact that around a century or two ago, *all* the careers were considered "men's careers."

Some of those attitudes appear to be hanging around still on the University of Tennessee campus, perhaps also at universities elsewhere, due to disproportionate numbers of men and women in various majors. Though women dominate the liberal arts and communications curriculums, and men dominate the science-related and business curriculums, I believe these attitudes of "men's careers" and "women's careers" have little influence on men and women at the college level when they choose their majors and future career tracks. I will look at college statistics on how many females and males graduate from each college each year, to get an idea of which majors have disproportionate numbers of men and women. I plan to survey students of different majors (in such classes as freshman composition classes) as to what they think

about women in a male-dominated major or men in a female-dominated major.

As a female college student formerly on the pre-medicine track, I have faced some mild societal opposition to my career plans. At a lecture four years ago, I was told by the guest speaker that my goal to enter orthopedic surgery was, in effect, 'unrealistic.' This speaker (a male orthopedic surgeon) told me that I would be entering a "good old boys" world and I would probably have to fight the male establishment for promotions, pay raises, etc. Now I'm in a different major and planning a different career (unrelated to the speaker's statements) in the humanities, and I've noticed few male students in my upper-level English courses, while an engineering class I started to take four years ago was made up almost exclusively of male students.

Role Salience

Choosing a career takes time, and though many people make multiple career decisions throughout their lives, students decide upon a course of study and possible careers within a year or two of reaching collegiate level in their schooling. By the time they reach their senior year in college, most have a pretty good idea what skills and activities they are good at, and what skills and activities they are better off not doing. Many students make their career choices based on activities they enjoy doing or activities they are good at doing, and thus have a high commitment to their jobs. Other students make their career choices based on how lucrative the job market is in their field. Those who base their career choices on salaries in those fields sometimes find that they do not have a high commitment to their job and experience early career burnout. They assess their options and either stay with their career or move to another career where they have a higher level of role salience in their work.

Ellen Piel Cook describes and analyzes a construct of role salience by Donald Super, a noted theorist, researcher and counselor. "For Super, career decisions are only one aspect of life as a journey, made richer through self-understanding and choices based on personal goals and meanings... This vision of a life career is both noble and vague — inevitably so because its exact countours are shaped by the particulars of an individual's life events" (Cook, 1994). Cook goes on to describe Super's work on role salience and adds to it research on gender issues in multiple roles.

Role salience is a variety of combinations of three qualities: emotional commitment to the role, participation in the role, and knowledge about the role. Career counselors assess the level of worker role salience in their clients, and if the role salience level is low, advise the clients to seek other occupations they might enjoy more. Super developed a Salience Inventory that assesses the three qualities above in five roles we enact in our lives: studying, working, community service, leisure time, and family/home. The inventory rates time spent in each of these areas on a scale of 1 (never or rarely) to 10 (always or often). Cook comments in her study,

“The distinctions between types of roles and levels of participation, commitment, and values expectation in each one permit some interesting insights into the individual. For example, Nevill [Super’s partner in the Saliency Inventory] and Super suggested that a person may spend many hours on a job (high participation) yet have low commitment to it, whereas another person may feel highly committed to a certain career yet have done very little to put the choice into action (low participation). They also noted that values can be implemented in a variety of ways as well: achievement through community service, social interaction through the worker role, and so on. Observations about an individual’s role salience may also temper interpretation of other career measures, for example, a flat profile on an interest inventory might be understandable for an individual with low work salience” (Cook, 1994).

Cook notes that role preferences are influenced by a number of factors outside the individual’s own character, such as gender stereotyping; social constructs, if you will. Cook’s own research on gender roles finds consistencies with Super’s role salience. In Neville and Super’s study (Qtd. in Cook, 1994), women regularly reported greater participation in home-oriented roles than did men. In American society, women are still expected, for the most part, to take care of the home in addition to their careers outside the home; thus, the salience of home roles competes with work role salience. Societal expectations of gender roles shape individuals, their environments and their interactions with others, from the time babies are dressed in pink or blue, to the toys they are allowed to play with, to the way they perform in school and beyond. Accordingly, those expectations would also shape what careers are ‘gender appropriate.’ “Men’s and women’s life careers are often so different not because of biological predestination, but because our sex-differentiated society expects and molds them to be different from birth until death,” Cook explains, adding, “Gender influences the nature of role priorities and enactment over time, how individuals perceive various roles, and role juggling during adulthood” (Cook, 1994).

While men often define themselves throughout their lives by their careers (barring unemployment), women often have to deal with multiple roles of homemaker and mother in addition to their careers outside the home, limiting time commitment to

any one role. Many studies have shown that in the last few decades, women have had more choice in what careers they could enter, but generally those careers are considered in addition to, not substitution for, home and family care. Career choices for women, and sometimes for men, depend on available support and assistance from other people. Juggling multiple roles does not necessarily mean more stress for women (or men); for many people, the satisfaction they find in work outside the home may offset any stress they find in their other roles as husband, wife, parent, etc., or vice versa.

Though past studies have failed to include other subjects beyond those in white, heterosexual relationships, "traditionally in our gender-differentiated society, the sexes are supposed to aspire to roles distinctive in their significance and implications for daily life, and like it. They still do so in many important respects, but... the personal variations on gender-based themes can be endless" (Cook, 1994), she concludes.

Women in Science

In the last two decades, studies on science classes have shown that Americans lag far behind other countries in teaching science and math to our students. American women lag even further behind in science and math literacy. Many girls claim lack of interest in science- and math-related subjects and careers, but these attitudes were fostered long before they started thinking about careers. Multiple studies of schoolchildren in primary schools across the country have found a noticeable teaching bias in academic classes, by both male and female teachers. Male students are given more attention than female students in class, receive more praise for their work, and receive extra help and encouragement from teachers in those classes. Female students are less called upon, less encouraged and receive less help with classwork (Dweck et al., 1980; Irvine, 1985).

Although female students tend to have better grades in all subjects, even in subjects that male students excel in on ability tests (Kimball, 1989), high school female

students stop taking, or even avoid, classes in math and the sciences. This attitude continues through college and into the workplace. Another result of this trend is that female students' failure to take advanced math and science courses in high school prevents them from taking more advanced math and science courses in college, which in turn cuts them out of opportunities for ever-growing job markets in computing and engineering.

Researcher Hilary M. Lips (Radford University, Virginia) has done several studies on gender differences in attitudes toward and enjoyment of math and science. In a 1992 study, she examined gender- and science-related attitudes as predictors of academic choices by those students in their college years. She lists a few factors that might explain why women are so little represented in the sciences at the college level and beyond: gender differences in the number of math and science courses completed in high school, gender-related differences in confidence or enjoyment in math and science ability, and gender-related differences in amounts of encouragement from others to pursue careers in math and science.

"For most students, however," Lips notes, "academic and career-related choices are probably not dictated simply by background and simultaneous forces, but also by the pull of future plans. Students, at least by the college level, often choose their courses with a view to their future career and family roles; they must ask themselves whether they will fit comfortably into a particular career and whether that career will accommodate their other needs and values" (Lips, 63). She cites several studies linking women's well-documented tendency to choose nonmathematical and nonscientific programs of study to their attitudes about scientists and science careers and says, "In this regard, it is of interest to examine entering university students' attitudes about important considerations in choosing a career and dimensions of their attitudes toward scientific careers and the scientist role in particular (Lips, 63). Past studies of students' attitudes about school subjects have shown that female students regard marriage and childrearing as one factor in their choice of careers.

These studies relate to a common conception that careers based on math and science are seen as more demanding and difficult than other careers, which makes it difficult to combine those careers with other roles in life. The role salience, above, then comes into play, limiting the amount of attention a person in multiple roles can pay to a particular role at any one time. Lips surveyed first-year college students of both genders and predicted that some of the results of her study would find that women would place more emphasis on the importance of combining multiple life roles (marriage/family and career) than would men, and that students would see scientific careers as being incompatible with having a family life.

What she found was that male students indicated stronger leanings to careers in math and science than did female students, though female students tended to indicate strong interest in biology-related careers. She found that, as predicted, female students placed more importance than male students on having people-oriented careers, combining career and family, and being helpful to others. Some surprising results were that female students had less concern than did male students about the ability to combine science- or math-related careers with marriage and family, and that students of both sexes viewed careers in the sciences as not excessively difficult. Lips comments, "It appears that the men in this sample, more than the women, may have been attracted to the mathematics and science by the idea of a challenge, and/or that they liked the image of themselves as willing and able to tackle a difficult, demanding program of work.... In any case, the perception of science as difficult did not seem to deter these students, male or female, from pursuing it" (Lips, 1992).

Myths and Legends

In the last century, one common education myth was that females shouldn't be educated because it was bad for their health. Doctors believed that education diverted blood flow from the ovaries to the brain, which would make educated women less likely to reproduce and more prone to insanity (Sadker 1999). It sounds ridiculous, but that's what people believed at the time.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states that "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" (U.S. DOL, Section 1681). Though prohibited by law, some subtle gender bias still exists in classrooms across the nation. Unfortunately, much of the gender bias today comes not from teachers, but from peers at early ages. Children ridicule what they see as 'different,' and even in this era of equality for women and men, some careers are persistently stereotyped as 'male' or 'female' work.

No Girls Guys Allowed

Another myth — that male students aren't affected by gender bias — has also been shown to be untrue. Though male students receive much attention from teachers in all levels of school, are accepted to prestigious colleges, receive more scholarship aid than females, and in general have a better slice of the American schooling pie, there are some disadvantages. While society has begun to accept females in more diverse roles beyond mother, housekeeper, wife and sister and a handful of 'female' careers, there has been a growing backlash against males crossing the gender line.

From day one, males are encouraged by parents, teachers and other adults to play with 'masculine' toys (tools, cars and trucks, sports equipment) and play 'masculine' games (football or other sports, army camp, exploring), and are punished, sometimes publicly humiliated, if they deviate from this society-determined norm for

males. The 'encouragement' only gets stronger in adolescence, only at this level, the majority of the pressure to conform comes from the peers, not the parents. Males are taught to be macho, stoic, sexist sports heroes who make average grades (since doing too well in school is 'nerdy') and get drunk at parties. Anything else is labeled as 'wimpy,' 'sissy,' 'nerdy' or 'queer.' Anything else is an anathema to be shunned and ridiculed, in society's eyes.

In the journal Educational Leadership, David Sadker points out that sexism hurts both genders. "Boys are stereotyped into gender roles earlier and more rigidly than females. Three out of four boys report that they were targets of sexual harassment — usually taunts challenging their masculinity. Males who express an interest in careers typically thought of as 'feminine' also encounter social pressures. The percentage of males in elementary teaching, for instance, is smaller today than when Title IX [prohibiting gender bias in schools or school-related activities] came out a quarter of a century ago" (Sadker, 1999).

Basically the attitude in our society is that whatever girls do, boys should *not* do. If girls play with dolls, makeup and jewelry, boys shouldn't have anything to do with these things. If girls enjoy fairy tales and playing 'house,' boys should scoff at and make fun of these things. And it goes further: If female students study the arts, male students should study anything but the arts. If female students study nursing, male students should stay away from the nursing profession. If female students break into the medical field as physicians, males should find another 'manly' profession. For every step forward that females make, it seems, society pressures males to take an equal number of steps backward.

National Numbers

Female students make better grades across the board in all subjects than male students do (Kimball, 1989, as quoted in Hyde, 1996), and are less frequently held back a grade in secondary schools. And look at these statistics:

- Almost 60 percent of college students across the country are female.
- In 1999, female students earned 57 percent of all bachelor's degrees granted (compared with 43 percent in 1970, and less than 24 percent in 1950).
- By 2008, female students will outnumber male students in both undergraduate and graduate programs in the U.S. by 9.2 million to 6.9 million (U.S. News & World Report, see 'Koerner' for reference).

Those statistics look great for female students in all levels of schooling. But there is also a statistic in the same U.S. News & World Report that doesn't look so good for female students: women with bachelor's degrees make, on average, only \$4,708 more than men with only high school diplomas — nearly \$20,000 less than men with the same level of education. And some in the education field are concerned "that most areas of study preferred by women — English over engineering, psychology over computer science — are reinforcing their secondary position in the economy. 'Every sort of job that's associated with females is also associated with declining status,' says Barbara Miller, an anthropologist and former director of women's studies at George Washington. 'They're less economically promising in terms of lifetime earnings'" (Koerner).

Women and Computers

While numbers of female students in some traditionally 'male' majors, such as business, have increased, engineering and science programs are predominantly male-populated. The same article mentioned above also mentioned one area where women are noticeably absent — computer science. At almost any level of school, male students have more computer experience than female students, and male students tend to populate computer science and computer design classes, while female students tend to enroll in more word processing and clerical classes (Sadker, 1999).

The "less learning, more earning" attitude is already prevalent in the sports world (witness both the NFL and NBA drafts), and has drawn students over the past

decade into the ever-growing computer industry, where the jobs are lucrative and numerous. Students are weighing the benefits of earning their bachelor's degrees (and debt from student loans) with the high-paying salaries of jobs open to computer-savvy students fresh from high school. "If making money is your first goal, and if you are competent in high-paying skills, there's no reason to finish your degree,' says Stephen Trachtenberg, president of George Washington University in Washington, D.C. ... His son, a 1997 graduate of Columbia University, had a roommate who dropped out during his sophomore year to take a computer-related job. 'By the time my son got his B.A., his former roommate was making \$100,000 a year,' says Trachtenberg" (Koerner).

But who are the computer companies hiring? Intel, for an example, travels across the country looking for students willing to delay college to work in their chip-making plants... and most of the workers Intel recruits are male students (Koerner).

Big Orange Numbers

For the past three years the University of Tennessee has compiled fact books for the academic years of 1997-1998, 1998-1999, and 1999-2000 containing statistics about the university, such as state funding allotted to the university, expenditures in running a university, and the number of students enrolled in each college by race and gender, among other things. [The numbers on gender in several colleges reflect the number of students who have officially declared their majors, and does not include those students who are in the college tracks but have not declared their majors.] Some colleges, such as the College of Architecture & Design, have been fairly even in numbers of male and female students over the three years. Other colleges, such as the College of Arts & Sciences, the College of Business Administration, the College of Education, and the College of Communications, consistently lean toward one gender over the three years (female, male, female, and female, respectively). The startling numbers — those colleges with over 60 percent of students of one gender — can be found in the colleges of Agriculture Sciences & Natural

Resources, Engineering, Human Ecology, Nursing, and Social Work. In the College of Agriculture Sciences & Natural Resources, the gender gap has decreased over the last three years from over 60 percent males to around 57 percent males. Student numbers in the College of Engineering have seen percentages of 81.4 percent, 81.8 percent, and 81.1 percent of male students and just over 18 percent of female students in the college. With these numbers, it is no wonder that the engineering class I sat in on for a day had so few females in it! The colleges of Human Ecology, Nursing, and Social Work have an opposite trend: over the last three years, the colleges have numbered an increase in female students and a decrease in male students. In Human Ecology, the percentages range from 75.3 percent in 1997-1998, to 76.1 percent last year, to 77.6 percent this year. In the College of Nursing, females have made up 90.1 percent, 89.0 percent, and 91.1 percent of the students over the last three years. And in the College of Social Work, the numbers of female students are even larger: 91.0 percent in 1997-1998, 91.7 percent last year, and 95.1 percent this year (UT Fact Books, 1997-1999).

What do these numbers tell us? One implication could be that fewer female students are coming to UT for the agriculture and engineering programs and fewer male students for the human ecology, nursing and social work programs, because they are choosing to go to other universities where they might have more of a chance of graduating in these programs. Another implication is that fewer females are taking an interest in agriculture or engineering and fewer males are interested in human ecology, nursing, or social work. A third implication is that female and male students are staying away from majors where they will be in the minority out of concern that peers and instructors will discourage them from studying those subjects.

First-year Opinions

What did incoming UT students think? A small sample of first-year students from several sections of English 102 (a required class for all first year students, with the exception of honors students) were surveyed near the end of their first year. Subjects

listed their gender, their major of study and their intended career field. Relatively few of those I surveyed were still undecided in their choice of major or career. Subjects ranked several factors in choosing a major and career field in importance to them, answered four questions about their regard for fellow students in various majors, and answered a few questions about why gender career trends exist today.

First, in ranking the factors important in choosing a major of study and a career field, most subjects listed interest in the major/career as their most important factor, with the belief that they could do well in the job following close behind. About half the students also ranked "respect from peers" high on their list, a number of them ranking it in the top half of 12 factors. For those students who had decided on a major and career, "amount/cost of education" finished near the end of the importance rankings.

In their regard for fellow students in various majors, almost all said they would have as much respect for an engineering or business major as they would for an arts or social work major. Most said they would have equal respect for a male student in a traditionally 'male' career field, such as science, as they would for a male student in a non-traditionally 'male' career field, such as nursing or social work. However, the subjects were divided on their respect for a female student in a non-traditional career. Roughly half said they would have equal respect for female students in both traditional and non-traditional careers, but the other half said they would have more respect for female students in such non-traditional careers as engineering or chemistry.

Their answers on the third section yielded some interesting comments. First, most subjects said on the second section that they would have equal respect for male students in either traditional careers or non-traditional careers. Most of these same students also answered that they would think a male student in nursing, social work, languages arts or human ecology ('female' careers) was studying something that truly interested him and "more power to him" for doing so, as a few said on their surveys. A few, however, answered differently. A female student undecided about her major said a male student in a non-traditional major or career field would cause her to "wonder

why and maybe question [his] sexuality." And one male student in finance said he thought a male student in a non-traditional major or career field would have "many female features" — read out of a social context, it might mean that the non-traditional male student has qualities of nurturance and access to his emotions, qualities associated with females. In a societal context (for example, if this were said in a class discussion), the same statement might carry a connotation of 'weak,' 'queer,' or 'female,' something very few male students would likely appreciate. Another male student, this one considering a career in either medicine or business, said, "Male nurses? What a wimp!" A fourth student, a female considering a major in broadcasting or film studies, said she "might assume that [a non-traditional male student] must not have very big goals for himself." Some people in nursing, social work, languages, arts, or human ecology might disagree with this, believing their goals are just as high as a would-be engineer's goals. However, these students were in the minority; most subjects believed a male student in these non-traditional fields was going after a career because it would please him, not because it was expected of him.

Other interesting individual results: one female student, a sophomore in physics, ranked "respect from peers" and "ability to combine future career with family life" as equally important factors (her most important factors, in fact) in choosing her major (she did not write down any intended career). While about a dozen female students ranked "ability to combine future career with family" as their top priority when choosing a major or career, one male student also thought "ability to combine future career with family" would be the most important factor when he considered a major (that male student has yet to decide on either major or career). The male student in finance mentioned above said he would have less respect for a business major than he would for a social work major (isn't finance in the College of Business?). And a female student majoring in secondary education ranked a write-in answer, "loving children" well down on her list of factors in choosing her career.

In Conclusion

At the college level, society seems to hold little sway in how students choose their majors and future careers. Apparently, students are already indoctrinated into the gender-stereotyped system long before they get to college levels. The true gender bias begins in infancy and blooms throughout childhood, when impressionability is high and cognitive pictures of 'men's roles' and 'women's roles' begin to form. By the time they head to college, students have a pretty good idea what they 'should' and 'should not' do for their careers, though they may give other reasons, such as 'There are no open markets for that career' or 'I won't be able to combine this career with a family' as explanations why they avoid some careers.

How do we combat gender bias, then, if the majority of it occurs before high school? We can train primary school teachers to spot gender bias in their classroom activities and in their students' play and to combat it with non-gender-stereotyped activities in the classrooms. We can work with the advertising and media industries to show more non-gender-stereotyped images on television, in newspapers and magazines, and in advertisements. And we can also continue working toward "equal pay for equal work" for both genders.

There will always be some things that one gender might be better at than the other, and vice versa. But maybe after some social reform, students of both genders can choose their careers without regard to 'traditional' gender roles.

Works Cited

- Dweck, Carol, Therese E. Goetz, and Nan L. Strauss. "Sex Differences in Learned Helplessness: IV. An Experimental and Naturalistic Study of the Failure Generalization and its Mediators." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38 (1980): 441-452.
- Cook, Ellen Piel. "Role Salience and Multiple Roles: a Gender Perspective." The Career Development Quarterly, 43 (1994): 85-94.
- Hyde, Janet Shibley. Half the Human Experience. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1996.
- Koerner, Brendan I. "Where the Boys Aren't." U.S. News & World Report. 28 Feb. 1999. <<http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/990208/8gap.htm>>. (13 Apr. 2000).
- Lips, Hilary M. "Gender- and Science-related Attitudes as Predictors of College Students' Academic Choices." Journal of Vocational Behavior, 40 (1992): 62-80.
- Sadker, Myra and David Sadker. Failing at Fairness: How America's Schools Cheat Girls. New York: Macmillan, 1994.
- Sadker, David. "Gender Equity: Still Knocking at the Classroom Door." Educational Leadership 56.7 (1999): 22-26.
- Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972. Title 20 U.S.C. Sections 1681-1688. <<http://www.dol.gov/dol/oasam/public/regs/statutes/titleix.htm>> (1 May 2000).

Appendix A: UT Statistics

Enrollment by Level, College & Gender, Fall 1997

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
University Total	25,039	12,289	12,750
Undergraduate Total	19,061	9,520	9,541
Graduate Total	5,978	2,769	3,209

Undergraduate

Ag. Sci. & Nat. Res.	1,037	658	379
Architecture & Design	425	224	201
Arts & Sciences	5,990	2,738	3,252
Business Admin.	2,515	1,497	1,018
Communications	957	388	569
Education	847	309	538
Engineering	1,764	1,436	328
Human Ecology	1,024	252	772
Nursing	556	55	501
Social Work	155	14	141
University	3,791	1,949	1,842

Graduate / Prof.

Ag. Sci. & Nat. Res.	200	131	69
Architecture & Design	97	59	38
Arts & Sciences	1,400	730	670
Biomed. Science	15	7	8
Business Admin.	395	256	139
Communications	138	62	76
Education	1,103	356	747
Engineering	535	443	92
Human Ecology	435	140	295
Information Science	187	38	149
Intercollegiate Programs	108	57	51
Law	486	266	220
Nursing	147	28	119
Social Work	381	62	319
University	351	134	217

Enrollment by Level, College & Gender, Fall 1998

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
University Total	25,612	12,394	13,218
Undergraduate Total	19,693	9,717	9,976
Graduate Total	5,919	2,677	3,242

Undergraduate

Ag. Sci. & Nat. Res.	1,049	620	429
Architecture & Design	442	229	213
Arts & Sciences	5,981	2,715	3,266
Business Admin.	2,795	1,654	1,141
Communications	1,115	417	698
Education	826	312	514
Engineering	1,757	1,438	319
Human Ecology	1,063	254	809
Nursing	490	54	436
Social Work	157	13	144
University	4,017	2,010	2,007

Graduate / Prof.

Ag. Sci. & Nat. Res.	216	134	82
Architecture & Design	73	46	27
Arts & Sciences	1,401	722	679
Biomed. Science	9	5	4
Business Admin.	478	304	174
Communications	124	58	66
Education	1,133	350	783
Engineering	513	409	104
Human Ecology	424	124	300
Information Science	171	29	142
Intercollegiate Programs	35	19	16
Law	483	265	218
Nursing	145	26	119
Social Work	406	69	337
University	308	117	191

Enrollment by Level, College & Gender, Fall 1999

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
University Total	25,981	12,493	13,488
Undergraduate Total	20,259	9,912	10,347
Graduate Total	5,722	2,581	3,141

Undergraduate

Ag. Sci. & Nat. Res.	1,038	601	437
Architecture & Design	446	221	225
Arts & Sciences	6,021	2,649	3,372
Business Admin.	3,051	1,812	1,239
Communications	1,161	447	714
Education	900	348	552
Engineering	1,786	1,448	338
Human Ecology	1,096	246	850
Nursing	527	47	480
Social Work	122	6	116

University	4,111	2,087	2,024
<u>Graduate / Prof.</u>			
Ag. Sci. & Nat. Res.	200	116	84
Architecture & Design	40	30	10
Arts & Sciences	1,357	699	658
Business Admin.	526	360	166
Communications	108	45	63
Education	1,065	328	737
Engineering	475	384	91
Human Ecology	390	108	282
Information Science	169	31	138
Intercollegiate Programs	29	13	16
Law	473	253	220
Nursing	140	17	123
Social Work	434	70	364
University	316	127	189