

Amanda Conway
Gender at Duke
Dr. Jean O'Barr
From the Archives to the Tower

Introduction:

There is no “Katharine M. Banham” room in Perkins. There is no portrait of her adorning the walls of Gilbert-Adams. There is no psychology scholarship in her name nor is there a philanthropic group in her honor. Apparently there *is* a room dedicated to her in the Social-Psychology building but few know where to find it is and even fewer know it exists. Not long ago K. Banham’s presence – on this campus, in the Durham community, and throughout the professional field of psychology – was palpable. Though the profound impact she had lingers, recognition of this remarkable woman and the extensive effect she had mostly lies buried in a few random books in the dusty stacks of Perkins. Rather than simply curse this patriarchal institution we call Duke University, I have decided to employ my frustration as a stimulus. Like Katharine Banham successfully did time and time again, I have identified a need and have moved to fill it.

I initially ventured to the University Archives with the intent of using Katharine Banham as a lens through which to view Duke from 1947 to 1967. Upon perusing her meticulously documented life, however, I shifted my focus to the lens itself. While her impact on Duke renders us valuable information about the nature of the University at that point in time, even more revealing is what lies behind those achievements.

Katharine Banham was a pioneer. Just as Lewis and Clark ventured into the unknown West, she blindly went where few women had gone before – academia. With no map to follow, she blazed her own trail, documenting her route – complete with numerous detours – in the process. Analysis of this documentation would function as the

manual for future brave women, to whom she provided tools to both encourage and assuage their intellectual journey through higher education.

At a time when we are eliciting all resources possible to achieve the goal of “a world of full equality and respect for all”¹ as stated by President Brodhead, it seems appropriate to resurrect Katharine Banham’s experience from the Archives to the forefront. For, we can learn a great deal about both her as a person and Duke as an institution from the obstacles she overcame, the programs she instituted, and the type of individual she was.

Methods:

In order to investigate this topic, I used primarily the Katharine M. Banham Papers, 1910-1995. The collection spans seventy five years and is composed of an impressive, yet daunting 20,000 items. Due to its extensive nature, I had to choose an appropriate basis by which to limit my focus. My original intent was to concentrate on the period during which she served as an Assistant Professor of Clinical Psychology at Duke University – that is, from 1946 until 1967. As I built up my knowledge of Katharine Banham, however, I became increasingly aware of how arbitrary my time frame was. I naively assumed that most of her contributions were made in the role of classroom professor, and therefore that her impact would diminish substantially post-tenure. Consequently, I expanded my time frame beyond 1967. I, however, found it difficult to render too much information from K. Banham’s experiences at Duke, without knowledge of her educational background as they exposed key aspects of her personal development. I therefore expanded my time frame before 1946, back to her days at the Sheffield High School for Girls in the early 20th century.

¹ Minai, Leanora. "The Women's Initiative." Working At Duke Sept. 2006, Volume1, Issue 6 ed.: 1

Because the collection is off site, I had to request specific boxes out of the eighteen in the collection. I utilized the online preliminary description of the collection provided by the University Archives to help me form a basis for my selections. I knew I wanted to analyze correspondence in order to render information about K. Banham, the nature of student faculty relationships, and the conditions of Duke and academia as a whole, particularly for a female professor and psychologist in the mid 1900s.

After reading through innumerable letters of correspondence, ranging from students to the American Association of University Women and the Golden Age Society, I wanted to learn more about the purposes of these organizations: their establishment, goals, procedures, and impacts, as well as the role K. Banham and the University carried out in each.

As I later reveal, I planned on dividing K. Banham's leadership and involvement in organizations and agencies among those relating to Duke those relating to Durham and those on the National Scale. This, too, was arbitrary as almost everything which K. Banham founded or in which she played a role incorporated various demographics, blurred lines between the town and the university, and often brought independent agencies together to accomplish a common goal.

Instead I went through the Organizations and Agencies boxes, first selecting folders that I expected to be of interest, sometimes choosing the next based on interrelatedness, other times simply because they were convenient. On the whole I collected more information than necessary. I subsequently went through the documents I accrued, determined what information each rendered, and attempted to identify connections among them. I included organizations or programs which highlighted

different aspects of K. Banham and of her capabilities as well as ones which revealed interesting programs and policies endorsed by the University.

For much of the story behind her academic accolades I referred to Katharine Banham's pages in Models of Achievement: Reflections of Eminent Women in Psychology. Other diversions from the Katharine M. Banham papers were the Teacher Course Evaluation Books and Meet Your Teacher in order to formulate the students' perception of K. Banham. I additionally referred to the 1961 Handbook to contextualize the Experimental Dormitory in existence from 1961 to 1964.

Body:

Reading in between the Lines...of one *Impressive Resume*

Katharine M. Banham's resume, like brief biographical entries in her name, highlight her impressive educational background. From her enrollment at the Sheffield High School for Girls to her Doctorate from the University of Montreal, her scholarly journey proves that a solid academic foundation is fundamental to a successful pursuit of lofty educational aspirations – particularly for a member of the vanguard². What is more impressive and more important than what is listed on K. Banham's resume, however, is what is *not* noted. Her educational path, while precisely enumerated, was anything but smooth and continuous. In fact, beginning with her decision to study psychology as early as High School, Banham faced myriad obstacles. She writes “the vast realm of the

² - Resume, Katharine M. Banham, May 7, 1947.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring and Summer, 1947 Correspondence About Job Vacancies; Photograph; Miscellaneous Items.

mind...[was] a topic of absorbing interest to me.”³ Yet when Katharine Banham revealed to her “science mistress” her intent to study psychology, she was met with disappointment and discouragement. Like many English majors face today, she was challenged with the question, “and when you have studied it, what are you going to do with it?”⁴ Although she was warned of the lack of teaching positions in psychology in higher education and especially in high schools, Banham did not succumb. As she did throughout her life, she here demonstrated remarkable foresight, believing “the subject was so important that there would soon be many more openings for psychologists in teacher-training colleges and universities.”⁵

In addition to the footnote which should be appended to psychology, an extensive explanation ought to accompany acknowledgement of K. Banham’s B. Sc. in psychology and physiology from the University of Manchester in 1919. Cambridge was her first choice. Both her father and grandfather had attended school in Cambridge and along with Oxford and London it was one of the only universities which she knew to offer psychology courses. Although her father was a physician, he was called to duty as an army officer during World War I and hence could not afford the tuition of any of the three prestigious universities. Rather than relinquish or act out against her father, Katharine Banham exhibited another one of the paramount qualities to which her successes can be attributed: that is, flexibility. She turned to one of her fathers’ colleagues, a government school supervisor, who advised her to apply to the lesser expensive University of Manchester and also for an “educational bursary” by the

³ O’connell, Agnes N., and Nancy F. Russo, eds. Models of Achievement: Reflections of Eminent Women in Psychology. New York: Columbia UP, 1983. 28.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ - Ibid.

National Board of Education. Succeeding on both counts, she not only enrolled at the University of Manchester in 1916, she became the first *student* there to pursue an honors degree in psychology. Note the absence of the gendered qualifier: she was the first *student* – not *female* student – but first among both genders to undertake such an endeavor. Although Katharine Banham expressed genuine interest in these challenging classes, she soon faced another obstacle as she contracted the Spanish flu during her final year of study. Weak and out of classes for almost a month, she was encouraged to work towards a regular Bachelor's of Science degree in psychology and physiology rather than the honors degree. While she followed this advice and pushed on, before long K. Banham found herself in yet another trying situation – this time as one of just two female students in a hundred person general physiology course. This would not be the only time she would be one of only two female intellectuals among myriad of her male counterparts. To intensify things, her professor who was the 'formal greeting, lock the door when class begins' type, once stated "in class that he did not know why we wanted to take his course, we were not students of medicine."⁶ She not only successfully completed her requirements for the class, but because she respected Professor Stirling and genuinely liked his lectures, she even took it a second year "for the sheer enjoyment."⁷ Evidence of Katharine Banham's pure love of learning, of the processes of acquiring and retaining knowledge, and of encouraging the academic endeavors of female students, is observable throughout her life. During her final year of undergraduate study at Manchester, psychology became established as a separate department. Hence, K.

⁶ Ibid. p.30.

⁷ Ibid.

Banham was among the first to graduate with a B. Sc in psychology from the University of Manchester in 1919.

Another crucial component of Katharine Banham's educational background (and personal development) is unjustly omitted from the Academic History narrative of her resume. Having stayed an additional year at Manchester, by 1920 she earned a diploma in education from the University. While a graduate degree warrants celebration, because psychology was not taught below the university level, K. Banham required further education. With the end of the War came her father's return to his practice, enabling her to attend graduate school at Cambridge. Though she fulfilled the requirements for a Master's of Science degree, completing the necessary courses, experimental work, and even her "little thesis," only men were granted degrees at Cambridge. As was the case for undergraduate women at Duke until the Giles sisters made history in 1878, women at Cambridge could attend classes and take tests, but they could *not* receive degrees. In spite of this clear instance of gender inequity, K. Banham has stated directly, "Looking back on the years, I do not think that the fact, in itself, of being a woman has interfered with my progress as a psychologist."⁸ She reasons that if she did not come out on top in a given competitive situation, there were additional factors at play which ought to be accounted for. Her positive attitude and composed temperament enabled K. Banham to achieve all she did in the face of such grave gender imbalances. Rather than abandon her pursuit of a master's degree, Katharine Banham once again exhibited her flexibility and "[looked] toward possibilities abroad."

⁸ Ibid. p. 38.

There is even more to the hardship not accounted for in mere mention of her “M.A. in Psychology (Toronto)”⁹ accolade. At the suggestion of a professor on leave from Harvard, she applied to Bryn Mawr and a university at Toronto, of which she had never before heard. One would assume accepting a lectureship offer from Toronto would be a source of joy for Banham. It was – for a day. That is, until she received an offer from Bryn Mawr for an international fellowship which she “regrettably” had to decline. K. Banham conveys the impressiveness of this honor, citing a day off from school was given to the Sheffield High School in recognition of one of her classmates receiving a Bryn Mawr fellowship. Although not a direct impediment in K. Banham’s intellectual journey, the accumulation of such disappointments, missed opportunities or “regrettable” decisions, becomes palpable and discouraging. Her rough journey from Liverpool to Montreal and eventually Toronto, illustrates the state of gender politics abroad in 1921. As she recounted to the Durham Branch of AAUW in their final meeting, the small passenger ship was segregated by sex – this included the separation of spouses. Therefore, for ten days K. Banham roomed with three other women, one of whom wore a wig. Exposing her lighthearted demeanor, she humorously admits, “I had never seen one before. My social education was beginning.”¹⁰ Despite her image as a highly esteemed figure, K. Banham never took herself too seriously. In fact, she jokes of

⁹ Resume, Katharine M. Banham, May 7, 1947.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring and Summer, 1947 Correspondence About Job Vacancies; Photograph; Miscellaneous Items.

¹⁰ Speech, Katharine M. Banham to AAUW Durham Branch (Final Meeting), May 3, 1976.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. A.A.U.W. Durham Branch, Notices, Final Meeting w/ Speech by KMB, 1976.

“somehow...[acquiring] a reputation as the Campus buffoon.”¹¹ Her sense of humor and optimism undoubtedly enabled her to not only survive but to excel in the face of obstacles.

After finally arriving in Toronto, Katharine Banham began teaching courses in experimental and social psychology. She soon asked the professor for whom she was teaching about working towards a master’s degree in psychology. He thought it “unnecessary,” asking why she wanted to do that. Though he justified that her prior education and graduate work were equivalent to such a degree, she refused to accept his rationale and reasoned that “an M.A. looks better on paper.”¹² Professor Brett acquiesced, which ultimately accounts for the resulting: “1923, M.A. in Psychology (Toronto).”¹³

Following her migration from Toronto to Montreal to be a research psychologist for the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene, Katharine Banham conducted research at the McGill University Nursery School. This rendered her inspiration for her book The Social and Emotional Development of the Preschool Child published in 1931. Like the many achievements noted before it, “1929-36 Assistant professor of Abnormal Psychology, Faculty of Medicine, McGill University”¹⁴ is grossly understated. It is a disservice to Katharine Banham, for marginalizing this feat, and it is a disservice to us, for failing to acknowledge her preceding intellectual expedition. Sixty years later,

¹¹ - Letter, Katharine M. Banham to AAUW, December 3, 1967.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University.

¹² O'Connell, Agnes N., and Nancy F. Russo, eds. Models of Achievement: Reflections of Eminent Women in Psychology. New York: Columbia UP, 1983. 33.

¹³ Resume, Katharine M. Banham, May 7, 1947.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring and Summer, 1947 Correspondence About Job Vacancies; Photograph; Miscellaneous Items.

¹⁴ - Ibid

reflecting on this promotion, K. Banham reveals, “This was a unique occurrence. I marvel still that it ever happened. I was only the second woman to be appointed to a faculty position in the School of Medicine.”¹⁵ She goes on to say that she and Dr. Maud Abbot, the first appointed, “were good friends and walked beside each other in academic robes on Degree Day, or Commencement.”¹⁶ Simply noting that she was an assistant professor at McGill to some extent elicits respect. However, her personal account, through contextualization and humanization, enables us to begin to decipher who Katharine Banham truly was, perceive the inconceivability of her accomplishments, and identify the means by which she could make such pioneering strides. It is by now clear that K. Banham valued her relationships with her female colleagues, or rather colleague, in various contexts. “[Walking] beside each other in academic robes” symbolizes a unity between the two as they marched among a sea of their male counterparts.

Lastly, but perhaps most significant is what is unsaid regarding “1934, D. Phil. in Psychology (Universite de Montreal).”¹⁷ It would have been extremely convenient for Katharine Banham to pursue her doctorate at McGill – for, the degree was crucial to advancement in either academic or applied psychology. Instead she demonstrates her compassion and concern for others as she admits, “I felt...that I could not, in all fairness, try for a degree at McGill and put my friends and colleagues in the embarrassing position of having to pass or fail me upon examination.”¹⁸ This further shows the difficulty of earning such a distinction. Katharine Banham consequently applied and was accepted to

¹⁵ O'connell, Agnes N., and Nancy F. Russo, eds. Models of Achievement: Reflections of Eminent Women in Psychology. New York: Columbia UP, 1983. 33.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Resume, Katharine M. Banham, May 7, 1947.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring and Summer, 1947 Correspondence About Job Vacancies; Photograph; Miscellaneous Items.

¹⁸ O'connell, Agnes N., and Nancy F. Russo, eds. Models of Achievement: Reflections of Eminent Women in Psychology. New York: Columbia UP, 1983. 34.

the doctoral program at the University of Montreal. As if getting a doctorate were not challenging in and of itself, since The University of Montreal was a French Canadian University, all lectures were presented in French. Equipped with but a high-school level knowledge of the language, Banham improved her French with the aid of her French Canadian peers. Language, it turned out, was not the only barrier standing between her and the degree she aspired for. K. Banham was required to take a tutorial with the Dean of Philosophy who was also a Dominican priest. In order to meet with him, she had to go to the Dominican monastery where women were rarely allowed at the time. Consequently, to make it appropriate, their tutorials were conducted through a window in a confessional box! Each time Katharine Banham entered the monastery, she “was made conscious” of her perceived inferiority. To reiterate her flexibility and determination: she took classes in a foreign language and in a confessional. All this and she was still sans doctoral degree!

Finally, in July of 1934 she submitted her thesis titled, “The Emotional Development of the Preschool Child.” Now, the only thing standing between K. Banham and this coveted degree was the oral exam. After overcoming all of the obstacles she faced and putting every ounce of effort into her academic endeavors, it came down to this one moment. It was held in a tiered lecture room, filled almost entirely with scholarly men from various disciplines who donned “academic robes and monastic habits.”¹⁹ Though, the front row just so happened to be occupied by the provost and deans. The entire oral exam was spoken in French and *anyone* was at liberty to ask her questions, including “the monastic philosophers [who] certainly put [her] to the test.”²⁰ One cannot

¹⁹ Ibid. 35.

²⁰ Ibid. 35.

help but wonder whether the circumstances of the oral exam for her male colleagues would have been the same. After standing in front of that lecture hall of men awaiting a decision for what “seemed like eternity,” Katharine Banham finally received her doctorate, becoming the first woman to earn a Doctorate of Philosophy from the University of Montreal! She sincerely regards this as “one of the most ecstatic moments of [her] life.”²¹ After mentioning that her achievement made French-Canadian headlines, she writes, “This, apparently, had never happened before.”²² In addition to being flexible, insightful, intelligent, dedicated, courageous, compassionate, and driven, among other things, we can say that Katharine Banham was modest.

It is for the above reasons that I turned my focus from listing the distant inventory of decrees accrued, to what the resumes and biographical entries leave out. It is for the above reasons that I shifted my aim from simply investigating *what* Katharine Banham achieved at Duke and in Durham to who she was and *how* she did it. Only then can we truly comprehend the impact she had on students, faculty, administration, and the community, and, alternately, the effect these individuals and institutions had on her. This further will enable her story to once again function as a source of inspiration, and change.

Non-Dichotomous Spheres of Influence

I had initial intentions of dividing the next part of my paper into three sections: organizations in which K. Banham participated or founded 1) at Duke University, 2) in the town of Durham, and 3) on the National, or rather *International*, Level. Due to the nature of her leadership and the scope of her influence, however, it became clear that distinctions based on the three foot high wall are not only arbitrary, they are *impossible* to

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

make. Katharine Banham did not view the trivial wall surrounding the Woman's College campus as the symbolic divider we see it as today. She had intentions of influencing Duke and Durham alike from the moment she accepted the position at our Gothic Wonderland. To Dean Wannamaker she articulated, "I look forward with pleasant anticipation to joining the staff of the University, and to the work and social life in the Durham community."²³ Rather than by geographic bounds, I have instead opted to organize her contributions based on the roles she assumed. Her undertakings in these positions both influenced and, to a large extent, were influenced *by* the University – by the needs of students, professors, administrators, and residents of Durham alike, or, conversely, by a *lack* of acknowledgement by any of the aforementioned groups. Consequently, an investigation of K. Banham's roles simultaneously exposes both subtleties and universalities which characterized the nature of Duke University in the second half of the 20th century.

Katharine Banham: Renaissance Woman

At a time when categorical "women's roles" were confined to wife, mother, secretary, nurse, and teacher, Katharine M. Banham epitomized the revolutionary concept of the Renaissance *woman*. Katharine Banham was a clinical psychologist, an educator, a philanthropist, a supporter of the arts and a benefactor of women's studies.

Wanted: Clinical Psychologist

²³ Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Dean Wannamaker, June 29, 1946.
In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring – Fall 1945, Summer, 1946 Correspondence About Vacant Positions.

Katharine Banham was a clinical psychologist. The primary reason she came to Duke in 1946 was specifically to help start the Department of Clinical Psychology. As she explained in her letter of resignation to the New Jersey Board of Children's Guardians, she accepted the position of assistant professor at Duke "to help to train clinical psychologists."²⁴ Having reached "middle age" as she described her place in life, she deemed it "appropriate to think in terms of helping to train younger psychologists."²⁵ As she correctly anticipated thirty years earlier at Sheffield High School for Girls, a need indeed arose for psychologists. In the letter she goes on to explain, "There is a growing demand for trained personnel in applied psychology and those of us who have experience in this field are needed to instruct new students to carry on and develop clinical work."²⁶ One could easily interpret this as a call to duty, deducing that it was not so much a choice as an obligation. We know, however, that she chose to study psychology because she truly believed the subject was so important that opportunities would arise. Hence, in teaching at Duke she was in fact realizing her ambitions, her anticipated purpose, not fulfilling a perceived duty.

The Patriarchy of Academia: Enter at Your Own Risk

Katharine Banham's decision to come to Duke given this daunting task is particularly revealing – both of her leadership qualities and of the patriarchal conditions dominating Duke and academia in 1946. K. Banham was hired as the first female faculty member of the Department of Psychology, at a time when men accounted for somewhere

²⁴ Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Mr. J.E. Alloway, July, 1, 1946.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring – Fall 1945, Summer, 1946 Correspondence About Vacant Positions.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

between 87.7% and 91.4% of the overall faculty at Duke.²⁷ Founded on religious principles by Quakers and Methodists, it seems only fitting – at least according to those reigning over Duke at the time – that men should hold positions of power within the University. Not even taking into account administrative positions, women composed just 12.3% of Duke Faculty as of 1950.²⁸ Considering World War II pulled men out of the lecture hall and onto the battle field, this statistic is even higher than the 8.6% it was in 1940 and the 8.7% it would return to just three years after Katharine Banham’s retirement from Duke in 1967.²⁹ It is unfair, however, to imply this gender bias applies exclusively to Duke. Though disproportionately low at the most competitive universities, the dismal number of women with doctorates reflects a national or *societal* failure, rather than one particular to Duke.

Gender imbalance in higher education is likewise evident abroad. In a 1949 letter to Dr. Banham, The General Secretary to The British Psychological Society writes, “I doubt whether you will find that the number of women Fellows with doctorates is very considerable.”³⁰ Recalling that K. Banham was denied a master’s degree from Cambridge in 1920 based purely on her Y-chromosome deficiency, it does not come as a surprise that the number of British women with doctorates is not “considerable.” Although the topic of giving degrees to women was discussed at Cambridge in 1921, the proposal was rejected. It would be another twenty seven years, in 1948, until women

²⁷ Graph, % of Women on Trinity College Faculty.

In: Women at Trinity and Duke Exhibit Catalog, 1986, University Archives, Duke University.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Letter, Alec Rodger to Katharine M. Banham, November, 10, 1949

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Fall, 1948; Spring, Summer and Fall 1949 Correspondence.

would be admitted to Cambridge with equal rights as their male peers.³¹ Before discussing specifically K. Banham's countless feats and tangible impact achieved through her various roles, in addition to the role played by Duke in her undertaking such endeavors, we contextualize further to comprehend just how groundbreaking her strides were. The document of concern is a form letter dated May of 1947 acknowledging receipt of Dr. Banham's application for the Chair of Psychology at The University of Sheffield. I am curious if her applying for this position was common knowledge among her peers at Duke or if that would have caused controversy. Either way, K. Banham explains in her application, while "I have no wish to leave...my mother is getting on in years and I would like to be where I can visit her and other members of the family more frequently than at present."³² She clearly values her family and is so dedicated to ensuring the well being of her mother that she resigned as President of the International Council of Women Psychologists in 1954 before officially taking office.³³ This mere quarter sheet of a form letter epitomizes the international scope of this inequity. The note is marred by three x's strategically typed over the "Sir" of "Dear Sir," which appears as the default heading. Beside the trio of x's "Madam" appears in bold type.³⁴ It is not only assumed that men constitute the *majority* of applicants for positions in higher education,

³¹ O'Connell, Agnes N., and Nancy F. Russo, eds. Models of Achievement: Reflections of Eminent Women in Psychology. New York: Columbia UP, 1983. 28.

³² Application Letter, Katharine M. Banham to A.W. Chapman, Esq, May 7, 1947.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring and Summer, 1947 Correspondence About Job Vacancies; Photograph; Miscellaneous Items.

³³ Speech, Katharine M. Banham to AAUW Durham Branch (Final Meeting), May 3, 1976.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. A.A.U.W. Durham Branch, Notices, Final Meeting w/ Speech by KMB, 1976.

³⁴ Letter, A.W. Chapman to Katharine M. Banham, May 12, 1947.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring and Summer, 1947 Correspondence About Job Vacancies; Photograph; Miscellaneous Items.

but there are *so* few female applicants that they feel no need to simply change the greeting to Dear (blank).

Against the Odds

Now that the stage has been set, now that we have some concept of how rare it was for a female *intellectual* to break into the male dominated sphere of academia, for a female *psychologist* to break into the male dominated sphere of applied science, it is appropriate to analyze what Katharine Banham did, what she experienced, once she was “in.” Once again, Katharine Banham was a clinical psychologist. It was because of this role that she was hired to give birth to a program for the training of future clinical psychologists. With no set of directions, no example to follow, and no Dr. Maud Abbot to walk beside in academic robes or otherwise, the stakes were high. Until Dr. Wally Reichenberg-Hackett arrived at Duke, becoming the second woman faculty member of the Psychology Department, anything K. Banham said, or did, or took on, became not only a reflection of her own ideas and efforts; as the only woman, she spoke for herself and simultaneously she spoke for “women.” Given these trying conditions, on second thought, I cannot help but question whether K. Banham’s motivation to apply for a professorship at The University of Sheffield was truly a desire to see her family more frequently. It seems possible that, after being at Duke just a year, K. Banham realized this was not what she signed up for. With no female colleagues in her department and the overwhelming task of establishing a new department, one could not blame her for exploring potential opportunities. Perhaps she sought opportunities in which she would be given the resources and guidance to aid her in these challenges – support which Duke did not necessarily provide. Looking back K. Banham positively (or perhaps

euphemistically) identifies it as a “challenge” rendering “new experiences and much personal satisfaction.”³⁵ Her ability to meet such a challenge should not, however, come as a surprise as she had previously “demonstrated a real talent for meeting the challenge of establishing a program of psychological service for the New Jersey State Board of Children’s Guardians.”³⁶

A Concept of CAPS

Just months after shattering the glass ceiling of Duke’s Department of Psychology, Katharine Banham took an instrumental role in the conception of a Counselling Service for Duke University Students. As will be revealed in constructing the undergraduates’ perspective of K. Banham, in 1948, it was not uncommon for relationships between professors and their students to be of a personal nature as well. While it was not considered inappropriate for “individual students to seek consultation [from staff members of the Psychology Department] regarding their personal and vocational problems,”³⁷ the demands grew so copious that the department had to develop a program to fill the need. At the time The Bureau of Testing and Guidance provided students with an indication of their overall academic ability and some specific aptitudes on West Campus. It was not, however, “equipped to provide a personal consultation service...[to] help the students to discover, and adjust to those difficulties of a non

³⁵ O’connell, Agnes N., and Nancy F. Russo, eds. Models of Achievement: Reflections of Eminent Women in Psychology. New York: Columbia UP, 1983. 33.

³⁶ Letter, J.E. Alloway to Katharine M. Banham, July 9, 1946.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring – Fall 1945, Summer, 1946 Correspondence About Vacant Positions.

³⁷ Letter of Recommendations, Katharine M. Banham, J. Goffard, and J. Ohlson to Dean Herring et al., January 29, 1948.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Freshmen Counseling Committee, 1948.

academic nature that impede their progress.”³⁸ This recommendation, drafted by K. Banham and two of her male colleagues, points out the failure of students, “particularly in the Woman’s College,” to consider “the kind of position they will take when they leave the University.”³⁹ Having identified her passion for psychology early on, unlike these women, Katharine Banham went through college with some sense of direction and aspirations for her future. With her own experience as comparison, and the perceptive skills of a clinical psychologist, Banham was aware these female students regretted not thinking seriously about their future in earlier stages of college. She, consequently, sought to guide them in selecting more appropriate classes to prepare them for their chosen careers. To solve these departmental wide problems, the Freshmen Counselling Committee proposed a service, originally calling it a Personnel Department or Service, yet re-labeling it a counseling service in a subsequent revision.⁴⁰ The nonexistence of a university accepted title for such a program highlights just how uncharted this territory was. The counselling service was to provide a testing service measuring general mental ability, special aptitudes and disabilities, reading, interests and personality traits. It additionally included resources to support educational guidance, vocational guidance, and personal consultation service. Letters of correspondence from undergraduates indicate not only that K. Banham provided such consultation services, but that they were indispensable to the insecure, naive freshmen.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Letter, Katharine M. Banham, J. Goffard, and J. Ohlson to Dr. D.K. Adams, January 30, 1948. In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Freshman Counseling Committee, 1948.

With her extensive educational background in the field of psychology, Katharine Banham was additionally responsible for “preparing, checking, and evaluating reading lists for the freshman advisors.”⁴¹ The task was a laborious one, for which a grateful Dean Ellen Huckabee wrote to Kay, “I can not tell you how much I appreciated your interest and helpfulness.”⁴² It is here important to note the *private* acknowledgement of Katharine Banham’s efforts. While Dean Huckabee thanks Kay for her labors, it is likely that few – if any – others, were aware of all she had put into the book list and into the overall development of the Counselling Service. Though she was fundamental in the establishment of this Service, though she worked tirelessly to ensure that her idea materialized, it was Duke University, *not* Katharine Banham, which ultimately received public credit for the Counselling Service.

The transformation of the reading list was particularly enlightening, beginning as four separate bibliographies, each of which was intended for a specific demographic: Academic Counsellors, Vocational Counsellors, House Counsellors and Freshman Counsellors, Students, in addition to a Supplemental Reading List, and general Books on Adolescence. Condensing these six into a singular comprehensive list, Katharine Banham reorganized the final version of the book list by topic rather than by audience. As a result, between outlining the major themes of concern to freshmen and selecting revealing book titles, her book list exposes more of the nature of college life in 1948, than one would expect. These areas of potential counselling include Starting in College; Social Competence; Thinking, Talking, and Reading; Personal Appearance; Health;

⁴¹ Letter, Ellen Huckabee to Katharine M. Banham, March 15, 1948.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Freshman Counseling Committee, 1948.

⁴² *Ibid.*

Personality and Character Development; Marriage Family Relationships and Home-Making; and If She Goes to Work. With titles such as “The Charm of Fine Manners,” “Designing Women: The Art Technique and Cost of Being Beautiful,” “The Wholesome Personality,” “How to Arrange Flowers,” and “You Can be Happily Married” one is likely to make a conclusion mirroring that of the Design for a Duchess manual detailing the responsibility of being proper and popular.⁴³ Although “Give Yourself a Background” is listed under Thinking, Talking, Reading, it is important to note that the last category is titled “*If She Goes to Work*” not *When*. This further illustrates that while women were entering the realm of higher education in the mid 20th century, their academic preparation was not necessarily intended as preparation for future careers.

More illuminating than the book list compiled by K. Banham is her address to freshman advisors concerning their two-fold responsibility of both orientation and counseling. As she outlines the three functions of the counselors it is as if she is outlining her *own* functions within the Duke and Durham communities. First, the advisors are to give information in a clear and friendly manner which will enable new students to become oriented to their work and living arrangements as quickly and painlessly as possible. As an educator and a trainer of clinical psychologists, she presented information in such an understandable and approachable manner. Next, the advisors are to be alert and sensitive to student’s adjustment difficulties (ie to spot trouble in the brewing before it develops into something serious). This ability to spot potential trouble or sense potential needs seemed to be K. Banham’s sixth sense. Third, they are to

⁴³ Bibliography, Katharine M. Banham, 1948.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Freshman Counseling Committee, 1948.

provide a means of help for minor adjustment problems. Katharine Banham suggests, for instance, sharing experiences to let the saddened student know “that she is not alone, others have felt that way before, and she has a friend at school.”⁴⁴ These basic functions and tools by which to carry them out are followed by K. Banham’s list of 10 Do’s and Don’ts for Counselors on Personal Problems. In actuality, they are principles according to which everyone should live. In number five she articulates, “Don’t be too influenced by outward appearances. Do remember we are all human...we’re frightened when we feel we can’t measure up to what is expected of us, or what we expect of ourselves.”⁴⁵ This is precisely the type of advice women at Duke, fighting to keep up with the impossible expectations which warrant the effortless perfection coinage, needed to hear then and need to hear now. In additional “Do’s” Katharine Banham, not surprisingly, advocates tolerance, patience, and empathy.

K. Banham’s extensive involvement in the conceptualization and functioning of the Freshman Counselling committee illuminates a great deal about Duke’s administration during her tenure. It seems that time and again, the administration would consent to the projects, clubs, and services proposed by Katharine Banham, who sought to fill the needs the administration not only failed to fill, but even failed to *recognize*. Those in power frequently expressed enthusiasm for her ideas; however, their involvement in such endeavors rarely went beyond accepting proposals. Just as K. Banham was hired to birth the Clinical Psychology Department and was expected to do

⁴⁴ Address to Freshman Advisors, Katharine M. Banham, September 28, 1948.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Freshman Counseling Committee, 1948.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

so sans sufficient resources, she was often given permission to establish the programs she wished but was then on her own to make it happen.

Develop Freedom by Developing Maturity

As a psychologist Katharine Banham was also pivotal in the formation and monitoring of the Experimental Dormitory between 1961 and 1964. Like the goals of the Freshman Councelling Committee, in a general sense the aim of this project was to provide an environment, a set of conditions and tools, which fosters personal and intellectual development in these female students. The specific purpose of the Experimental Dormitory, according to handwritten minutes from a brainstorming session among female faculty and administrators of the Women's College, is "A residential situation that could be more conducive to our education, offering opportunities for development of maturity and responsibility."⁴⁶ The faculty and administrators present expressed a multitude of seemingly valid needs. Their concerns reflect an observed motion towards conformity, that, in 1961, female students are "becoming more and more alike at Duke."⁴⁷ Miss Hill similarly viewed the dorm as a means of encouraging diversity in an active way rather than "passive conformity to the social pattern."⁴⁸ Miss Mackleburg expressed a need for an integration of social and intellectual life as well as a different atmosphere in the dorm to foster independent thinking. Her sentiments, combined with Miss Benedict's perceived need for an opportunity to discuss interesting material from class work, seem to mirror motivations behind the aim of the contemporary FOCUS program.

⁴⁶ Minutes of the Experimental Dormitory Committee, Katharine M. Banham, March 24, 1961.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Experimental Dormitory, 1961-1964.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

In April of 1963, the students involved submitted “A Proposal for the Evolution of the Experimental Dormitory.” Believing the Experimental Dormitory to be “a place for remolding the forms of campus life toward the needs and abilities of the more able,” they proposed two measures, “which may be useful in widening the scope of [their] lives.”⁴⁹ To contextualize, the dormitory rules in the early 1960s involved “In-and-Out Cards” which recorded the whereabouts of each student of the Woman’s College. Using the card was required when leaving East Campus if returning after 7:30 pm, leaving Durham, going to the Infirmary, engaging in any physical activity with the exception of physical education classes, picnics, dances, and cabin parties. Special leave cards, to be signed by the House Counselor, were necessitated for day trips exceeding a 25 mile radius, non commercial flights, and not sleeping in one’s dorm. Furthermore, female students were only permitted to go to the “social rooms” of male dormitories during visiting hours and “men callers” were prohibited from entering a female student’s room. The only exceptions made were for family members.⁵⁰ According to the 1961 handbook, failure to comply with the regulations could result in suspension or expulsion.

With the status quo now identified, we can evaluate more accurately the proposed changes in the Experimental Dormitory rules. First, “wherever the interests of other members permit, we would propose that our rooms be open to men Friday, Saturday and Sunday evenings from 7 – 10 and Saturday and Sunday afternoons from 1-5” on the conditions that “the girl announces the man’s presence before he walks on the hall,” the

⁴⁹ Proposal, Experimental Dormitory residents, April 1963.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Experimental Dormitory, 1961-1964.

⁵⁰ Women’s College Handbook, 1960-1961. Women’s College Government. Duke University, Durham, NC.

door is left ajar “unless more than two people in a room threaten to be noisy,” and the room and suite doors are correctly marked.⁵¹ Assuming the check next to the proposal signifies acceptability, Katharine Banham agreed to this proposal as long as the men were “accompanied by a dorm member” and with acknowledgment that this was “not to be an open house – only by invitation” as her margin notes indicate. She certainly advocated marginally increased individual liberties for the deserving; however order and tastefulness were to be maintained. K. Banham did not, however, condone the second measure that girls receive individual keys to the dorm since the logistics were unclear of “all keys [being] kept in a central place and checked for loss at a specified hour each day.”⁵² This exemplifies how Katharine Banham could have such close personal relationships with her students, counseling them on their personal troubles, and yet still warrant their respect.

For some time students accepted the regulations of the Woman’s College without a fight, as they were likely of an equal stringency as their rules at home. Perhaps because the girls of the Experimental Dorm expected additional freedom, or perhaps because it reflected a cultural shift, indicated by the suggestion of “Do Adolescents Need Parents?” on the Freshman Councilling Committee book list, by 1963 the girls authoring this proposal were not so compliant. They admit finding limitations concerning their whereabouts “to be quite unnecessary and rather insulting but believe that detailed knowledge of each other’s whereabouts contributes to safety and communication.”⁵³ As

⁵¹ Proposal, Experimental Dormitory residents, April 1963.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Experimental Dormitory, 1961-1964.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

a result, they suggest agreeing among themselves that they should “sign out explicitly and shall feel free to visit friends in their homes even if these be apartments.”⁵⁴ In response K. Banham inquires, once again penciled in the margins, “Would parents agree to this, for girls under 21 years?”⁵⁵ Even though these women were given more freedom, in turn encouraging personal maturity and acceptance of responsibility, orderliness and significant regulations were upheld. Although Katharine Banham subscribed to this concept of merited freedom, she did not hesitate to express her honest reservations regarding the proposals of the girls in the Experimental Dormitory. She was not only looking to maintain an orderly environment, she truly took the girls well-being into consideration. After all, if not prompted by K. Banham, who would think to consider her parents’ consent?

To take a step back, the mere concept of the Experimental Dorm – that certain high achieving women be granted additional liberties, still far inferior to those granted to *all* students of the men’s college – is a reflection of the University’s patriarchal power structure and the subsequent attitude towards female students. Katharine Banham’s involvement in the Experimental Dorm reveals her desire to slowly reshape this destructive frame of mind, by empowering first certain deserving women.

Not Your Average Nursery School

It was her passion for psychology that inspired Katharine Banham to co-found the Duke University Nursery School with Wally Reichenberg-Fackett, her only female colleague in the psychology department. In her personal notes, K. Banham refers to the

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

“Nursery School” as the “Duke University Preschool Laboratory.”⁵⁶ This shows not only her effective implementation of euphemisms, but also that “the purpose of the program [was] to provide a child study laboratory for university teaching and research activities.”⁵⁷ Banham exposes its additional functions as she elaborates, “Instruction about and study of young children requires a program that fosters their growth and sense of well being. Only when the child is well served can the laboratory fulfill its function.”⁵⁸ Like many projects of which K. Banham was involved, The Nursery School was all encompassing. It simultaneously benefited psychology students, working parents, and the forty five children enrolled in any given quarter. The “progressive” Nursery School had such a positive effect on children that apparently doctors “prescribed” it for children who were “under par” in some way. According to a 1946 issue of the Durham Morning Herald, “The object of the school was...to give the children of working mothers good training, improved health, to provide ‘a good start to life’ during the greatest habit-forming period of a lifetime, the years from two to six.”⁵⁹

In addition to providing this child rearing service for working mothers, “Parents’ meetings” were held as part of the “Preschool Laboratory” project. The subject of a December 14, 1964 meeting was appropriately themed “The Modern Mother in and out of the Home.” Books discussed included The Employed Mother in America, Women’s

⁵⁶ Minutes from Parent’s Meeting of the Duke University Preschool Laboratory, Katharine M. Banham, December 14, 1964.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Duke Preschool: Forms, Correspondence, and “Notes” Newsletter 1963-1965.

⁵⁷ General Information, Duke University Preschool Program, Katharine M. Banham.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Duke Preschool: Forms, Correspondence, and “Notes” Newsletter 1963-1965.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Kepler, Hazel. “Durham Nursery School Gives Vital Service and Training to Children.” Durham Morning Herald 29 Sept. 1946.

Two Roles, and most notably The Feminine Mystique. From Betty Freidan's bible, Banham emphasized that in response to WWII, women are buying into the idea of "the woman in the home," a concept perpetuated by advertising and commerce. As a psychologist, she facilitated discussion on the subject of Freud and Mead as they appear in The Feminine Mystique. At such a time, when women felt alone in their discontent with being just a housewife, encouragement to read The Feminine Mystique and subsequent facilitated discussion seemed to be the ideal solution. It was like Katharine Banham to sense a need and take proper measures to fill it. A recommendation was noted that each woman do something to seek her own fulfillment – not merely a "recreational diversion" but a commitment. Likewise, she documented an experiment by which housewives were called and asked to identify themselves. The majority of these women responded to the question, "Who are you?" as their husband's wife. As part of a national phenomenon, these women were suddenly tired of being John's wife, and Timmy's mom. It was time for them to have a sense of purpose outside their home. Potential future topics of discussion included "The Oldest Child [which she was], Value Judgments to be Fostered in our Children, The Position of the Child in the Family" and How the Child is Affected by its Sex. These are all issues which concern parents, particularly working parents who are most likely to fear they are neglecting their children. As a psychologist, Katharine Banham was equipped with knowledge of such behavior tendencies among parents and acted accordingly.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ Minutes from Parent's Meeting of the Duke University Preschool Laboratory, Katharine M. Banham, December 14, 1964.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Duke Preschool: Forms, Correspondence, and "Notes" Newsletter 1963-1965.

Baby Einsteins or Just Plain Babies?

From her experiences as a psychologist observing children, both in clinics of Child Welfare Agencies and in the previously discussed Nursery school, Katharine Banham identified a need for more comprehensive tests to measure cognitive processes in infants to six year olds. Hence, she developed the Ring and Peg Tests of Behavior Development for which she has received much recognition in the field of psychology. According to the Ring and Peg Tests manual, published by K. Banham in 1975, the tests “include items attempting to measure social cooperation, personal independence, interest, drive and purpose.”⁶¹ Not surprisingly, these are the very qualities fostered by the Duke University Nursery School. As indicated moreover by the manual, test items are arranged in five categories of behavior: Ambulative, Manipulative, Communicative, Social Adaptive, and Emotive. The first grouping, dubbed Ambulative, measures posture, balance, and “locomotion.” The Manipulative category measures skills involving form perception, eye-hand coordination, and material combination. More predictably the Communicative group is for sound and time perception, speech and language. The final two behavioral categories – Social Adaptive and Emotive – measure sociability, independence and cooperation, as well as emotion interest, drive and motivation, respectively. Familiarity with the Ring and Peg Test enables one to identify the direct correlation between activities conducted at the Duke University Preschool Laboratory, as K. Banham called it, and her inspiration for developing the specific behavioral groups for testing. Activities for the preschool were organized monthly based on the concept to be developed. Elaboration of how each concept would be introduced

⁶¹ Manual for the Ring and Peg Tests of Behavior Development, Katharine M. Banham, 1975.
In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University.

and specific games, songs, and crafts which would provide a basis of measurement were also enumerated. For instance, one of the concepts assigned for the Morning Group in May of 1965 included that of time, specifically the meaning of the hour of the hand on the clock and the minute hand. In order to develop this notion of time the group made paper plate clocks and played a game in which children extended their arms out to a certain “time.” They also sang a song which began, “What Do You Do at...insert time...?” to which the child responds what is done at that time. Lastly, for each day during the last week of school children added a new train car to the engine hanging on a string across the room. The caboose was added on the last day.⁶² K. Banham was a genius. The children learned and had fun while the clinical psychologists whom she played a key role in training, measured their “Communicative” development whether or not she identified the category as such at the time.

The True University...Is a Collection of Books

Katharine Banham’s role as psychologist was, furthermore, what inspired her active involvement in the Library Committee. While some disciplines spent very little of their allotted money for reference materials, as the library representative for the psychology department she utilized every penny, occasionally even exceeding the budget – significantly. As per the records of the Women’s College Library Committee from 1958-1964, an *appropriation* of \$566.00 was made *to* the Psychology Department and an *expenditure* of \$2434.46 was made *by* the Psychology Department, rendering a deficit of \$1868.46.⁶³ This was not, however, the problem it appears to be given other disciplines

⁶² Preschool Notes, Duke University Preschool Lab Program. May, 1965.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Duke Preschool: Forms, Correspondence, and “Notes” Newsletter 1963-1965.

⁶³ Financial Report, June 30, 1958.

failed to utilize hardly any of their allotted funds. It was documented that out of a total of 347 books purchased by all the disciplines in a particular academic year, the psychology department bought 212.⁶⁴ This indicates that the University did not place the emphasis it perhaps should have, on acquire books for one's department. Evidently, Katharine Banham did not need the administrations emphasis, or lack there of. K. Banham, actively fulfilling her role as the Psychology Department's library representative, is clearly responsible for the acquisition of the majority of psychology books in our University libraries. Upon the suggestion of Dr. Greg Kimble, she also played a pivotal role in establishing the Faculty Collection of Books in Psychology from 1965 to 1967. Along with her dedication to her own goals, K. Banham ought to be recognized for her approachability, open-mindedness, and dedication to service for others.⁶⁵

Perhaps There Are TWO Dr. Banham's in the Psychology Department

Katharine Banham was a professor. Because she came to Duke to *train* clinical psychologists rather than specifically to teach general psychology, I here broadened my archival exploration from the Katharine Banham Papers to sources which reflected students' opinions. A valid perspective from which to analyze Katharine Banham's effectiveness as a professor seems to be from that of the undergraduate student body. In doing so, one must beware of succumbing to the widely accepted myth of a singular "college experience." Ultimate rejection of the unitary, universal "Duke experience," will reveal more than the mere fact that different students like different teachers.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Women's College Library Committee 1958.

⁶⁴Letter, Dr. Greg Kimble to Dr. Katharine M. Banham, 1965.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Faculty Collection of Books on Psychology Project, 1965-1967.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

It is interesting to note the shift in the nature of literature directed *towards* students *about* faculty. In the 50s students received booklets entitled “*Meet Your Faculty*.” The aim of this annual text was precisely that: to give students an opportunity to get to know better their professors.⁶⁶ By the mid 60s, however, students were encouraged not simply to *meet* their faculty, but further to *evaluate* their faculty. The purpose of the Annual Duke Teacher-Course Evaluation was two-fold. Primarily, it served as “a guide for student selection of professors and courses.”⁶⁷ At the same time, it sought to “give faculty members a reliable mirror in which to view themselves as teachers.”⁶⁸ Interesting is the alleged assertion that “the opinions of the undergraduate student body provide the *only* means by which a professor can judge the effectiveness of *his* classroom performance.”⁶⁹ Irv Cohen, editor-in-chief, is here implying that this resource accurately portrays the opinions of the undergraduate student body.

As a Duke University student matriculating in 1965, from this Teacher-Course Evaluation we would read of K. Banham, “Dr. Banham has been teaching for a long time and knows her subject. Her lectures are definitely not exciting and there is no class discussion. She is open to students after class, however. The material is rather uninteresting. She grades fairly easily.”⁷⁰ It seems difficult to fathom that this “Dr. Banham” to whom the TCE refers, is the same venerated Katharine Banham to whom this intellectual inquiry is devoted. If one were to base one’s teacher-course selection on this source alone, she would be less than eager to take Psychology 130 with Professor

⁶⁶ Meet Your Faculty, 1956.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University.

⁶⁷ Second Annual Duke Teacher Course Evaluation, Duke University, November 1966.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ First Annual Duke Teacher Course Evaluation, Duke University, 1965. P. 55-57.

Banham. Furthermore, regarding the latter aim of this book, if she were to interpret this as an accurate assessment of “[*her*] classroom performance,” perhaps she too would begin to question herself both as a professor and as a leading scholar in her field.

Although K. Banham was undoubtedly a strong, confident, accomplished woman, with minority status comes inevitable vulnerability.

Luckily for K. Banham and all whom she inspired and who benefited from her work, this was not the sole source of student feedback to which she was privy at the time. In fact, the overwhelming majority of the personal letters she received from students are in direct opposition to the sentiments reflected in the “reliable mirror” provided by the Teacher-Course Evaluation.

What then can account for this gross discrepancy? Perhaps those who wrote kind things about her simply did so in hopes of obtaining a favorable letter-of-recommendation. She *did* receive literally hundreds of requests, all of which she seemed to fulfill – honestly and without complaint. Yet, if this were, indeed, the case, how can we explain why some of the most touching letters of correspondence were composed with no apparent agenda. Doug Norton, for example, felt compelled to “drop [Dr. Banham] a note to tell [her] how much [he] enjoyed” her class that semester. He went on to express, “the experience we gained was indispensable.”⁷¹ Rather than closing with the expected, “I would be of the utmost gratitude if you would complete the attached evaluation form,” he concluded, “many thanks for your efforts and patience with us. You in no small way contributed to a most pleasant semester.”⁷² According to the

⁷¹ Letter, Doug Norton to Katharine M. Banham, May 24, 1958.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Spring, Summer, Fall 1958 Correspondence.

⁷² *Ibid.*

knowledgeable Irv Cohen, Dr. Banham should have taken the “adverse comments” in his Evaluation book as motivation to “improve [her] rapport with students.”⁷³ Doug Norton, among myriad others, would unquestionably disagree.

This discrepancy does not appear to be a mere subjective disagreement among individual students. Rather, there is a clear distinction between individual and collective experience. Regarding the former experience, there is tangible evidence of these individual sentiments. The sum of these attitudes, however, appears to be grossly dissimilar from the individual inputs. With no self-evident justification, it seems valid to turn to the source of the representation of “the opinions of the undergraduate student body.”⁷⁴ The Method of obtaining data, as outlined by the introduction to the first edition, consisted of sending a poll sheet to “1,800 undergraduate students selected at random from both Trinity and the Woman’s College...Of those sent, 1,400 or 77% were returned.”⁷⁵ While numbers do not lie, experimenter bias does. First, by random is it meant that an equal *proportion* of students from the two coordinate colleges were selected, or an equal *number*? Moreover, because only 77% were returned, non-response bias is also an issue. Skewed data aside, assuming women’s opinions were counted equally in calculations, one must not overlook the fact that the publication was financed by the Men’s Student Government Association, that the Faculty Advisory Board was all male, as was the Editor in Chief. While a few token women appear on the editorial board and the writing staff, as members of the extreme minority, it is likely these women “learned silence.”

⁷³ Second Annual Duke Teacher-Course Evaluation, Duke University, November 1966.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ First Annual Duke Teacher-Course Evaluation, April 1966. 1.

Without even considering her unparalleled contributions to the field of psychology, to Duke, and to Durham, or even the positive personal reflections, one is flawed in accepting that most students simply did not like Katharine Banham. Attention to the language employed to summarize evaluations of male professors compared to that of their female counterparts, reveals an obvious bias. Without selecting an exceptionally favorable passage, we turn to the professor directly following Dr. Banham. “‘Superior’ is the word used most often to describe Dr. Carson’s lectures. They are very interesting, very clear, and ‘very good.’ The professor has a very good knowledge of his material, and seems fairly interested in teaching. The structure of the course, with definite required reading that many found dull, the multiple-choice quizzes, the bell-shaped curve, and class size were severely criticized. These factors contributed to the fact that no class discussion was used, and, for some, Dr. Carson appeared ‘unapproachable.’ A typical comment, however, is that ‘Dr. Carson makes the very most of a limited situation- an introductory course set up on a lecture basis. He puts life into course material that offers little possibility.’”⁷⁶ While there were clearly numerous negative comments expressed about Dr. Carson, they are overshadowed by the strong introduction and closing and at times are even excused. The deterministic approach to justifying his downfalls – the fact that he cannot help the fact that the material “offers little possibility,” is blatant. Conversely, in Dr. Banham’s case, “there is no class discussion” and “the material is rather uninteresting,” and on both counts she apparently is held accountable.⁷⁷ Additionally, her approachability is marginalized as, “she is open to students after class,

⁷⁶ First Annual Duke Teacher Course Evaluation, Duke University, 1965. 57.

⁷⁷ Ibid. 56-57.

however.”⁷⁸ As a paramount quality of a “good professor,” approachability should have been at the forefront of K. Banham’s evaluation. The bias, whether conscious or not, becomes apparent as we consider the following potential re-write, “‘Approachable’ is the adjective used most often in describing Dr. Banham. In addition to making herself available outside of class, she has an unparalleled command of her subject matter matched only by her passion for teaching.”

Bringing to light the sources of discrepancies in experience and biases in narration renders a more valid consensus of student opinion of Katharine Banham. That is, a positive one. It additionally exposes the patriarchy which marked Duke organizations on campus, and the detrimental effects this male dominant leadership had on students and faculty alike. In an even broader sense, it reveals more than the patriarchy of Duke *organizations*, it reveals the aforementioned patriarchal nature of Duke *University* as a whole.

More Than a Teacher – A Friend

Katharine Banham functioned as a resource and confidant for her students, in both academic and personal contexts. The openness which marks students’ correspondence with Katharine Banham simultaneously illuminates aspects of her character as well as obstacles certain students encountered at Duke and even in higher education as a whole at this time. In her letter dated June 19, 1958, Mary revealed, without hesitation, how overwhelmed she felt towards the end of the semester between the stress of exams and that of moving. She goes on to express her excitement at staying with her uncle and his family in Vancouver for the summer before thanking Dr. Banham “for always being ready to help [her] when she was planning [her] courses.” Whether K. Banham was in

⁷⁸ First Annual Duke Teacher Course Evaluation, Duke University, 1965. p 57.

fact, Mary's actual Faculty Advisor is uncertain. It is, however, highly likely. Katharine Banham was instrumental in the establishment of The Freshman-Sophomore Faculty Advisory System and as an advisor she fostered numerous relationships resembling the nature of her apparent bond with Mary. In addition to meeting with groups of students to inform them of "the many rich opportunities for academic and cultural development at Duke," K. Banham encouraged her advisees to speak with her on an individual basis after these group sessions. She felt "contacts and discussions with individual students were most valuable" and found that "talking over their course work with them sometimes led to discussion of other kinds of problems that the students encountered at college."⁷⁹ Clearly Mary felt comfortable discussing said, "other kinds of problems" with Katharine Banham. Her letter is so telling of the nature of student faculty relationships. The mere fact that a first year student wrote such a personal letter to Dr. Banham without apologizing in the least for taking up her time shows the closeness of this bond. Actually, Mary did apologize once – for not calling Dr. Banham before school ended. This mentor and confidant position which K. Banham assumed, seems consistent with the *in loco parentis* approach adopted by the University. With the absence of a mother to turn to for guidance, female students like Mary relied on professors like Katharine Banham. Though administrators like Alice Baldwin previously filled this role of mentor, her successor was not of this personality. As a result, this confidant position was filled by professors like K. Banham.

Before There Was Oprah...

⁷⁹ Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Dr. J.N. Truesdale, July 1, 1960.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Freshman-Sophomore Advisory Committee, 1958-1961.

Katharine Banham was a philanthropist. She engaged in the majority of her philanthropic efforts as Chairman of the Community Service Committee for the Altrusa Club. Founded in 1934, the Altrusa Club was the first all women's philanthropic organization. Like the Duke University Nursery School, the Altrusa Club was not solely for the benefit of the University. In fact, it engaged and united Duke and Durham in ways one would be hard to find today. As we are desperately seeking to assuage the tensions of contemporary town-gown relations, we could undoubtedly learn from the model laid out by K. Banham. With the motto "patriotism, efficiency, service" the Altrusa Club rendered assistance to countless groups and varied demographics, from Girl Scouts to Senior Citizens. Particularly impressive was the manner in which Katharine Banham organized a dinner program hosted by the Altrusa Club on January 16, 1969. In a letter to members of the Community Services Committee she simply wrote, "Arrangements have been made" and outlines an evening with guest speaker Mrs. Alice Suggs, Supervisor of the Homemakers Service of the Durham County Welfare Department.⁸⁰ In addition to the other Homemakers of the service, members of the school crossing guard were set to be dinner guests that same evening. She genuinely invited them, "in recognition of the valuable contribution they make to the safety of children in the Durham community."⁸¹ Once again, what is more important is what is *not* said in this neatly outlined memo. When K. Banham writes, "arrangements have been made" she does not mention the involved correspondence exchanges both with Alice

⁸⁰ Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Community Services Committee, Altrusa Club of Durham, January 2, 1969.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Altrusa Club, Community Services Committee 1968-70.

⁸¹ Ibid.

Suggs and the school crossing guards. Her proposal to Mrs. Suggs was complete with leading questions, providing her with potential direction for her speech.⁸² Once the targeted speaker and guests agreed, she mailed invitations to the twenty-one members of the school crossing guard, kept track of how many were attending, and wrote to members of her committee to keep them informed.

Even more impressive is what lies behind her selection of the speaker. Two months prior to this dinner meeting, Banham played a pivotal role in the establishment of the Homemaker Service provided by The Durham County Welfare Department. Its purpose was “to provide guidance in homemaking activities to families in which children may be unattended or neglected, or to the aged who may be enabled to remain in their own homes through the availability of this service.”⁸³ At the time the service was only available to residents on Welfare, however, Katharine Banham highlighted the unmet need for Homemakers among the middle class and took measures, such as inviting the program’s supervisor to speak, to see that it was met. She even contacted the Durham Sun, which secured a picture of Alice Suggs, the president of Altrusa and K. Banham in the paper, along with an article publicizing “Service Project Explained to Club.”⁸⁴ Still, she thought beyond, suggesting an estimate be prepared of the social benefit – how much money the community would save as a result –of the Homemaker Service. Subsequently, by making the estimate “available to the public news media, and [presenting] it to the

⁸² Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Mrs. Alice Suggs, December 9, 1968.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Altrusa Club, Community Services Committee 1968-70.

⁸³ Description of purpose and needs of the Homemaker Service, Katharine M. Banham, November 20, 1968.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Altrusa Club, Community Services Committee 1968-70.

⁸⁴ “Service Project Explained to Club.” Durham Sun. January 17, 1969.

Board of Public Welfare and the Durham County Commissioners at their next budget hearing,”⁸⁵ she planned to accrue additional funds for the Service.

It is here necessary to note that in looking through the files of the Durham Branch of the America Association for University Women, one will likely find a document from the Social Studies Group identifying “The Domestic Help Problem, The Local Situation” as the suggested topic for study. So what, right? This topic calls for “a study of the provision and needs in the Durham Community for domestic help,” with particular emphasis on the needs and capabilities of older people⁸⁶. By replacing “domestic help” with “homemaking,” the inferred association with the Homemaker Service gains validity. One such program suggested by the Social Studies Group of the AAUW is for “recommendations for action to remedy discrepancies in the local situation, filling the needs of all sections of the community both for work offered and service received.”⁸⁷ Katharine Banham’s pursuit of extending the Homemaker Service to the middle class reflects a similar aim to the above stated recommendations. The “kinds of service needed in Durham” furthermore mirror those of the Homemaker Service, including but not limited to “old folks companion,” practical nursing, and babysitting. Finally, in reading a speech delivered to the Durham AAUW branch, one will find mention that co-chairmen of the AAUW Social Studies group, K. Banham and Mrs. Walter Seeley, studied the problem of maid service in Durham. Though they sent an outline of the resulting plan to

⁸⁵ Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Mrs. Alice Suggs, January 18, 1969.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Altrusa Club, Community Services Committee 1968-70.

⁸⁶ Report, Social Studies Group, Durham Branch A.A.U.W., 1953-1954.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. A.A.U.W. Social Studies Committee Activities, 1952-57.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

AAUW headquarters for endorsement, it was met with “cold reception.”⁸⁸ Hence, one can conclude the Durham AAUW study of “The Domestic Help Problem, The Local Situation,” while conducted in 1953-54, ultimately formed the foundation of the Homemaker Service in 1969. This reflects K. Banham’s remarkable ability to foresee needs, in this case sixteen years before the necessity was widely recognized. Concurrently, it is a tribute to her persistence and dedication to providing indispensable services.

Katharine Banham’s ability to unite organizations with common goals or even similar core values, to accomplish – well, anything – is what makes her more than a Renaissance woman. She is indeed the epitome of a woman who with widespread interests and is expertise in several areas, but what truly enabled her to render such an extensive influence was her ability to identify potential needs and mobilize all of the organizations and agencies of which she was a part to see that such needs were met. She provided the link between these resources, which in turn rendered services to those in need.

[Less Than] Six Degrees of Separation

Katharine Banham was a philanthropist. It is important to acknowledge that she was a contributing member of the AAUW and that she founded the Golden Age Society; but what is of particular value is how the former incited the latter. One is likely inspired as she learns of K. Banham’s extensive involvement and accomplishments. In regarding them as independent feats, however, we are omitting the most impressive and effective

⁸⁸ Speech, Katharine M. Banham to AAUW Durham Branch (Final Meeting), May 3, 1976.
In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. A.A.U.W. Durham Branch, Notices, Final Meeting w/ Speech by KMB, 1976.

aspect of her leadership style. In 1948, K. Banham served as co-chairman of the Social Studies group for the AAUW with Frances Jeffers. Each year the National Association suggests a theme to be addressed. Although the national theme in 1948 was “juvenile delinquency,” K. Banham felt the problem was receiving sufficient attention from other groups. Rather than acknowledge a need, as she had done so many times, Banham here identified a fulfilled need and allotted her resources elsewhere. The two consequently shifted their focus to the problems of older people as Banham was studying the psychological affects of aging and Frances’ mother was ailing. Banham disseminated bibliographies of books and journal articles on aging, much like the one she put together for the Freshman Counselling Committee. Meanwhile, Frances Jeffers brought together members of Altrusa, Executive Director of the YWCA, and members of the Red Cross and the AAUW, to create a committee on Successful Aging. What began as Christmas parties for older people at the YWCA, inspired the formation of Neighborhood groups where older people met two afternoons a month. Such events and gatherings at recreation centers were eventually referred to as Golden Age Clubs. The organizing committee consequently changed its name from the committee on Successful Aging to the Golden Age Society, and in 1951 became a United Fund agency. The agency eventually established its own headquarters, changed its name to the Coordinating Council for Senior Citizens, and expanded its services to include meals, “craft training, house repairing, and training for home aids caring for the infirm elderly.” What is rarely included in acknowledgement of K. Banham’s involvement in the AAUW and her founding the Golden Age Club, is that everything from the first Christmas party in 1949 to the Coordinating Council for Senior Citizens was “the eventual outcome of careful

studies made by members of the AAUW Social Studies group on the local needs.” In other words, this was all a product of the foresight, ambition, and dedication of K. Banham and Francis Jeffers.⁸⁹

French Culture Fosters Women’s Network

Katharine Banham was a cultured individual. She thus founded the French Club in 1956 and served as its president for several years. Without knowledge of her educational history, the French Club seems an outlier in her plots of influence. Knowing, however, that she earned her doctorate in Montreal where all classes and the final oral exam were conducted in French, this contribution makes sense. For many years the French Club membership exceeded twenty women, brought together by their interest in French language and culture and by the network the club produced. Because Banham did not find this network of cultured women at Duke, she turned to the broader Durham community to fill this need. By the mid 1960’s, however, club membership dropped significantly. K. Banham’s agenda in September of 1965 revealed her concern for the future of the club, calling for a revision of the list of members, asking whether meetings should be reduced to just once a month, inquiring how to remind members of meetings, possible alternatives, and calling members for recommendations concerning the program. This reveals her inclination as a successful leader to recognize a problem, identify specifically what is not working, and take subsequent measures to attempt to solve them. Unfortunately, despite her valiant effort, by October she was receiving letters of condolence at the passing of the French Club, thanking her for all she had done for the

⁸⁹ Speech, Katharine M. Banham to AAUW Durham Branch (Final Meeting), May 3, 1976.
In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. A.A.U.W. Durham Branch, Notices, Final Meeting w/ Speech by KMB, 1976.

club, and noting that while it filled a real need at the time, now there are so many more French oriented cultural opportunities at “both colleges.” These sentiments do not come as a surprise. In establishing and running the French Club, Katharine Banham provided such cultural opportunities at a time when there was a real need not yet recognized by other organizations.

Tribeca, Sundance, Duke...

Katharine Banham was a supporter of the arts. Like those of the French Club, the aims of the Duke Film Society were both educational and cultural. Katharine Banham founded the organization in November of 1949, promoting, among other goals, studying film as an Art. The Society exhibited and evaluated films based on cultural, artistic, educational, and technical merit, rather than box office appeal. They also showed and supported foreign films, experimental films, and films of the past. An additional fundamental function of the Film Society was to encourage amateur film making and to provide a setting in which such films could be shown, studied, and constructively criticized. Once again blurring lines, membership was open to Duke Faculty, students, and “friends (over 16 years)...interested in the film as an art, as a cultural recreation, or as an aid in teaching.”⁹⁰ Perhaps the Duke Film Society was such a success due to the fact that so few resources were demanded of the administration. K. Banham was responsible for all correspondence with film distributors and for member recruitment. Duke merely provided the venue – that is, Branson Hall on the Women’s College Campus.

⁹⁰ Constitution, Duke Film Society, November 23, 1949.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Duke Film Society, 1949-53.

Women as Leaders

Katharine Banham was a benefactor of women's scholarship – in fact she was the *first* to take on this role at Duke University. She not only led by example, she provided resources to enable female students to continue their education and positively impact society. In a letter to Dean Friedl concerning an endowment for Women's Studies at Duke she expressed, "I feel very strongly that women should be encouraged to continue their education. The world has need of them in leadership roles, as well as those of a supportive nature. Further education of various kinds is necessary to fit them to carry out such tasks."⁹¹ Just as she accurately foresaw the need for clinical psychologists and took measures to meet it, she here identifies the value of women as leaders (yet to be recognized by Duke) and does what she can to encourage them to rise to the challenge. One likely could not imagine a more appropriate culmination of Katharine Banham's contributions, ideals, and character than her establishment of the Anne McDougall Memorial Award for Women in 1985. Breaking down the purpose, eligibility, basis of selection, and even the name and funding of the award simulates breaking down various aspects of what made Katharine Banham who she was and what she wished to foster in the women matriculating through Duke University. As she outlined in a letter to Dr. Jean O'Barr, Director of the Women's Studies Program, "the purpose of the award is [fittingly] four-fold."⁹² It seems that nothing K. Banham did was one dimensional. Even if the initial aim of a program, organization, or study, was supposedly singular, it soon

⁹¹ Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Dr. Ernestone Friedl, June 5, 1985.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. The Anne McDougall Memorial Award For Women, 1985-86.

⁹² Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Dr. Jean O' Barr, April 15, 1985.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. The Anne McDougall Memorial Award For Women, 1985-86.

incorporated multiple demographics, interests, and functions ultimately rendering a more profound impact than ever expected. First, her contribution intended to enable women to continue their college education, assuming they had begun their college experience, but for some reason – be it financial, health related, or otherwise – were halted. Secondly, it is for women who seek to shift the focus of their studies and explore additional areas of inquiry. Third, it is to provide an opportunity for women who never before had the opportunity to pursue a college education and “are now ready to make a beginning.”⁹³ It is evident that Banham viewed education as an indispensable element to success – the “beginning” of a future, the “beginning” of a sense of purpose and limitless opportunities. Perhaps it is this intellectual preparation that incites the frustration articulated by Betty Friedan and ameliorated by K. Banham in the days of the Duke Nursery School Parents Meetings. However, it is undoubtedly this preparation which provides the necessary tools to escape the confines of the kitchen and redefine one’s self not as John’s wife or Timmy’s mom, but rather as just that – one’s self. The final purpose of the award is for exhibited “active and efficient participation...in some form of human service for which knowledge of psychology would be useful.”⁹⁴ In recounting her role as Acting Director of the Division of Psychological Services for the North Carolina Board of Public Welfare, Banham recalls, “the clinical work made me feel useful. I was doing something with psychology, not just talking about it.”⁹⁵ Throughout her life she *did* something with psychology, in fact almost *everything* she did was actively employing psychology in some form. It is therefore appropriate that she established the award in part as recognition of and incentive for human service through utilizing aspects of psychology.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ MODELS OF ACHIEVEMENT

It is this previously demonstrated interest and ability in service ranging from child care and camp counseling to faculty assistance and clerical work, which provides the basis of selection for the award recipient.

Equally important is the expectation that the award winner, like its benefactor, “[has] shown integrity of character, kind consideration for others, and dependability in work and social relationships.”⁹⁶ One would be hard pressed to find a trace of evidence calling into question Katharine Banham’s embodiment of these highly respected character traits. Financial need is additionally a primary consideration in determining the award winner. Recall that when it came time to apply for college, Banham’s father, the physician, was serving in World War I, and hence could not afford the steep tuition of Cambridge, Oxford, or London. Had it not been for her being accepted into the less financially demanding University of Manchester and, more importantly receiving the “educational bursary” from the National Board of Education, perhaps Katharine Banham would have been one of the “women who...lacked opportunity for college education...because of financial difficulties” for whom this award is intended. She earlier emphasizes meeting financial needs in her service on the Women’s College Scholarship Committee. Twenty years prior to endowing this award, regarding the 1966 Alice Baldwin Scholarship, a fellow committee member posed the question, “Would it be feasible to award two or three honorary Alice Baldwin Scholarships when outstanding girls did not need money, and give substantial amount where merit and need coincide?”⁹⁷

⁹⁶ Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Dr. Jean O’ Barr, April 15, 1985.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. The Anne McDougall Memorial Award For Women, 1985-86.

⁹⁷ Letter, Anne F. Scott to Members of The Women’s College Scholarship Committee, 1966.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. Women’s College Scholarships Committee, 1965-1966.

On her own copy, K. Banham penciled in, “There are other prizes for accomplishment. A scholarship is established to help those in need – dependent on relative accomplishment each year.”⁹⁸ Helping those in need was one of the chief motivators in Katharine Banham’s life.

The final stipulation regarding selection is that, older women be given preference, as opportunities are limited for them. As a member of the AAUW Social Studies group on local needs, K. Banham investigated opportunities for employment of older people. Her findings were appalling as there was only housework for older women and a few semi-skilled jobs in the local hospitals. Factories, she reported, refused to hire employees older than thirty five years old.⁹⁹ It should be said that out of the disadvantaged, Katharine Banham seemed to focus her energies on those who were not as capable of improving their own lot and to whom resources were scarce. This is evident in the assistance she rendered to the elderly and the mentally ill, and is similarly displayed in the preference she here specified to older women.

Regarding the courses to which the scholarship may be applied, the recipient “would be free to make her own choice of study courses in the area of psychology, its affiliations and applications, interpreted in a very broad sense.”¹⁰⁰ Examples ranging from human development to computer science and religion, confirm this “broad” interpretation. The freedom with which the award winner may select courses, is consistent with Banham’s philosophy on restriction. As was exemplified in her

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Speech, Katharine M. Banham to AAUW Durham Branch (Final Meeting), May 3, 1976.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. A.A.U.W. Durham Branch, Notices, Final Meeting w/ Speech by KMB, 1976.

¹⁰⁰ Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Dr. Jean O’ Barr, April 15, 1985.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. The Anne McDougall Memorial Award For Women, 1985-86.

endorsement of the Experimental Dormitory from 1961-1964, she believed, contrary to the University's policies at the time, that under the right circumstances granting female students additional freedom produced advances in the students maturity, individuality, responsibility, and overall growth.

The funding for and naming of the Anne McDougall Memorial Award for Women reveal similar aspects of Katharine Banham's highly regarded character, despite Duke's failure to appropriately acknowledge her contributions. In her letter to Dr. O'Barr K. Banham she merely stipulates the first private contribution would be hers of "\$10,000.00 to be invested by Duke University, and an additional \$1,000.00 to initiate the award in 1985."¹⁰¹ While this is evident of her unparalleled generosity and selflessness, what is truly telling is how she concludes the aforementioned letter to Dean Friedl regarding this contribution. Rather than boast of becoming the first benefactor to Women's Studies in the history of Duke University, she modestly qualifies, "my initial gift is smaller than I would like it to be, but, if I can avoid heavy medical expenses, I may be able to add a little to the endowment at a later date."¹⁰² Katharine Banham's ability to maintain this heir of humility – in spite of becoming one of the most eminent (female) psychologists in her field and one of the most influential members of the Duke community, of Durham, and of society at large – is, to me, utterly astounding. This modesty is further manifested in the name of the award itself. She could have dubbed her contribution the Katharine M. Banham Award for Women, ensuring that her name and legacy endure, but that was not who Katharine Banham was. She did not do good things

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Letter, Katharine M. Banham to Dr. Ernestone Friedl, June 5, 1985.

In: Katharine M. Banham Papers, University Archives, Duke University. The Anne McDougall Memorail Award For Women, 1985-86.

for the recognition; she did them because she genuinely wanted to help people and because she often identified such needs or potential needs before her contemporaries and before Duke's administration. In character, she instead named the award "in memory of Mrs. Anne McDougall, the wife and wise help-mate of Professor William McDougall, the first chairman of the Department of Psychology at Duke University." She additionally dedicated it to "all the unsung women who have contributed in various ways to the efficiency of the university departments, especially the Department of Psychology. These include wives and secretaries." Although K. Banham shattered stereotypes and assumed leadership positions often reserved for men, she never demeaned those who did not hold such positions of authority. Rather, she consistently recognized the importance of these roles "of a supportive nature."

Conclusion(s):

Katharine Banham was a truly remarkable woman who had a profound impact on Duke University, Durham, the field of psychology, and the future of women in higher education. She exhibited the qualities of a true leader and through the numerous obstacles she overcame and the ways in which she accomplished such impressive feats, we can learn a great deal and ought to be inspired. She was instrumental in the establishment and functioning of so many organizations all the while teaching psychology, training clinical psychologists, and developing more advanced tests and methods with which to conduct her research. How she had time to do all this *and* document her life so meticulously is truly baffling.

This realization, in fact, brought to light the broader conclusions I sought to make as a result of my extensive archival investigation of Duke through the eyes of Katharine Banham. Because she undertook so many responsibilities and sought to fill every void she perceived, and because she did it all to the best of her ability with little support from the administration, something had to give. As was true in analyzing K. Banham's resume, and, later, her correspondence with fellow members of the Altrusa Club, what is important here is not what is present, but rather what is not. That is, as significant as the roles that K. Banham filled are in revealing the revolutionary woman whom she was and the patriarchal institution which Duke was, what is *more* significant are the roles she did not carry out.

She was not a wife. She was not a mother. Because of all that was expected of her, or perhaps because of all that she expected of *herself*, it would have been impossible for K. Banham to accomplish what she did had she filled the traditional role which the majority of her peers found themselves during this period of a return to normalcy. While she enjoyed membership of many clubs, the cult of domesticity was not one of them.

Perhaps more revealing is the fact that Katharine Banham never filled the role of *Full* Professor. Throughout her twenty year tenure, despite her myriad accomplishments, Katharine Banham was never granted Full Professorship. My instinctual response is that Duke is wholly at fault for marginalizing the feats of this pioneering woman. The administration failed to provide her with the resources necessary to reach her goals within the confines of the university. She consequently turned to the Durham community for the support with which she could achieve her lofty objectives.

The more I ruminated, however, the more I realized Katharine Banham was, perhaps, likewise responsible for the marginalization of her efforts and the impact they rendered. I consistently regarded such qualities as modesty, flexibility, and an extremely composed temperament as positive attributes. As I noted, these characteristics enabled her to turn the other cheek in the face of blatant gender discrimination and push on in pursuit of her goals. As it turns out, such qualities function as double edged swords. These same characteristics enabled her to do excessive amounts of work without credit and to justify losing out to a man in a given competitive situation was always based on additional factors irrespective of gender.

If Katharine Banham had been just a little less modest, less flexible, less composed, perhaps she would have filled that role of Full Professor. If she had been a little less modest, taking credit for things that she conceptualized, wrote, edited, organized, lead, etc., perhaps one would not have to go as far as the dusty stacks or the alleged “Archives,” in order to dig up her inspirational story. In the introduction I wrote of K. Banham essentially leaving future brave women with a roadmap through this male dominated structure of academia – as unknown to most women as, say, the clubhouse of Augusta National. Had she demanded acknowledgment where the administration failed to, had she made her impact on the Durham Community and Duke more palpable three decades after her retirement, K. Banham’s manual would be as accessible as the Women’s Handbook.

K. Banham’s presence was once visible and extremely influential on the Women’s College and Trinity College campuses as well as in the Durham community. Because – three decades later – her name has vanished into oblivion, I have discovered

one last role she now fills – that is, the unsung hero. Just as she dedicated the Anne McDougall Memorial Award for Women to “all the unsung women who have contributed in various ways to the efficiency of the university departments, especially the Department of Psychology,” perhaps one day I will be able to do the same for her. This investigation has truly made Katharine Banham come alive, and I, in turn, hope to revive her legacy and see that *this time* it endures as she so clearly merits. There may not be a K. Banham Tower *today*, but should I achieve the success I hope to and “can avoid heavy medical expenses”... do not be surprised.