

# *Gender Equalization Studies in American Education*

Jingyuan Xu<sup>1,a,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*East China University of Political Science and Law, Shanghai, China, 201600*

*a. 15144968889@163.com*

*\*corresponding author*

**Abstract:** Whether at home or abroad, the status of women is constantly rising, which is true that women's own efforts, but the affirmative action around the world has also played an important role. The affirmative action movement of higher education aims to ease the problem of discrimination in higher education, increase the number of vulnerable students, build a diverse student group, and realize equal rights in the field of education. However, in practice, the gender-based admission policy of higher education has been criticized, and the public has received mixed praise and criticism. In the face of these arguments and challenges, the Supreme Court's decision has also made different understandings and interpretations, which has aroused controversy and doubts among policy makers and scholars. Critics have noted that the preference policy deliberately lowers the demands for women, which creates reverse discrimination against male applicants with higher scores. Supporters argue that treatment is to achieve real gender equality. Therefore, it is necessary to reflect on the equality and justice of gender equality. This paper mainly describes the brief history of gender equality in American education, studies the criterion of gender. It also discusses the legitimacy of gender equality measures in higher education, and the effect of gender equality in American higher education, which promotes women's social status to weaken or eliminate gender discrimination. It is through the above historical narration, basic concept clarification, goal certification and effect proof that this paper shows a defense theory of the gender equality movement in the field of American education, which gives a strong defense to this important milestone in the history of the feminist movement. Through analysis, this paper finds that the gender equality movement in the field of education in the United States is of great significance for safeguarding women's rights and safeguarding the justice of the United States Constitution. In recent years, the status of women in the field of education has been significantly improved, but there are still many problems in the judicial practice of women's rights, and the conservative forces still occupy the mainstream position in the courts. There is still a long way to go for equal rights in female education, which needs to be further upheld and defended to promote the actual implementation of equity and justice.

**Keywords:** gender equality, equality, compensation theory, reverse discrimination, American education

## 1. Introduction

The gender equality movement in American higher education is aimed at safeguarding women's equal right to education. By taking gender as the admission standard and other preferential measures, it ensures the proportion of women in university admission, which is an important weapon in protecting women's rights. The idea of gender equality reflects the awakening of women's independent ideology. In the world, women's roles have long been subjected to unequal discrimination; people's stereotypes of the division of labor between men and women are deeply ingrained, and gender contradiction has long been a source of concern.

The gender equality movement in American education has experienced a long historical test. Early women were only allowed to receive domestic and religious education at home. In the early 17th century, the idea of co-education was put forward and gradually accepted. Since the 20th century, under the influence of immigration waves, co-education has been further developed [1]. Throughout the 20th century, the Supreme Court's views on sex discrimination have changed significantly. In the 21st century, the "Me Too" movement triggered a wide debate around the world, and many women joined it, demanding more fair treatment for higher education resources [2]. The accompanying conflicts between gender rights did not disappear with the strengthening of women's voices, but intensified. Where is the affirmative action movement in higher education going? It is worth observing and expecting. The focus of this paper is on the efficacy of gender equality policies in American higher education, including how they strengthen or do away with gender discrimination by advancing women's social position. This paper demonstrates a defense theory of the gender equality movement in the field of American education, which provides a strong defense to this significant turning point in the history of the feminist movement.

## 2. A Brief History of Gender Equity in American Education- on the development of women's right to education at Harvard University

### 2.1. Gender Equity in Education at Harvard University

In June 2021, Harvard University announced that it would welcome 1,962 new undergraduate students, or 52.6 percent of girls, and 47.4 percent of boys, respectively. Today, while gender imbalances on American college campuses are so common, just a few decades ago, some top American universities, including Harvard University, did not even have a place for women.

In the 17th century, there was widespread doubt about women's intelligence, even among presidents of Harvard. Charles Eliot, the Harvard President, more than a hundred years ago, once said, "Society knows very little about women's gifted intelligence." Lawrence Summers, the 27th president of Harvard University, has also expressed his views that the two sexes have innate differences in cognitive function. Despite their euphemisms, both expressed their distrust of women's abilities. It wasn't more than two centuries after Harvard that women's education was on the agenda. Despite his reservations about female intelligence, President Eliot promised that "on such a path, only one significant and biased issue is prudent and reasonable, and that is to conduct careful and well-planned experiments."

Under this principle, Harvard agreed to give talented girls the same but separate guidance as boys. In the early 1870s, Harvard opened a series of lectures to mature girls, but it soon ended. In 1879, the "Harvard Affiliated School" was established, and 27 women became the first freshmen. The name "attached school" symbolizes the attachment status of women to men.

The experiment of establishing female affiliated schools has achieved good results, and Harvard education is no longer unattainable for women. But when the annex tried to establish a more permanent relationship with Harvard, the university refused to accept the funds and opposed any

formal relationship. As a compromise, the annex was changed to a separate women's college, Radcliffe College, in 1894. The college is taught by Harvard teachers, and the degree is signed by Dean Agais and Harvard President Elliott to prove the same value of the girls' degree as the Harvard degree in all aspects.

Over the long years since, the Radcliffe women proved that they had sufficient mental potential. From 1890 to 1963, the girls' school awarded 750 doctorates and 3,000 master's degrees, and had 21,000 alumni.

But the next question is: what is the use of the developed brain power? At that time, it was widely believed that women were educated just to be an intellectually suitable partner for their husbands and to teach their husbands and children more wisely [3]. Early Harvard women, educated in this tradition, knew their status and were used to handling it calmly. Women's education has been accompanied by such a fundamental contradiction from the very beginning. Their education is designed for men to enter society, but they are expected to be a good wife and mother at home. This "male" education is not only inconsistent with the role of "female", but also hindering. In addition, intellectual women are often mocked. In many people's eyes, female knowledge is equivalent to non-feminization. Career women are often given a reputation as being cold, rigid and attractive. The proportion of highly educated women getting married was much lower than that of average women. In the history of the school, most women pursuing a career were not married for life. The popular saying is that emotion should be the biggest support in women's life.

Affected by the Second World War, a large number of soldiers returned, leading to labor market tension and a desire for a peaceful family life after the brutal war [4]. At the beginning of the 20th century, the new women gradually disappeared, and career women became a "derogatory term", both in school and at work just to find a husband. Society does not expect women to "make a significant contribution to their minds." Their role in the family remains basic, lacking in challenging work and thus being treated as attachments, whether intentionally or unintentionally. In this case, how are they asked to develop themselves? For highly educated women, being housewives is undoubtedly particularly boring and empty. They have seen the outside world, but now they have to stop their mental pursuits.

Under this repression, books calling for female awakening were constantly published, interacting among political, economic, cultural, and other factors [5]. Finally, in the 1970s, American women were mobilized to successfully launch a women's rights movement unprecedented in the scale of American history. In American history, feminist movements often followed the black liberation movement, and it was in helping blacks win equality that women not only realized their similar situation, but also learned ways to win their rights. Women, involved in the civil rights movement in the 1960s, found that they were given unequal treatment in organizations with a high goal of seeking equality, and they rebelled and fought for their human rights. If the history of discrimination against black Americans began on the day when they were trafficked, then the oppression of women began at the end of their matriarchal society. Once women become aware of this long history honored discrimination, their anger and frustration are as volcanic as black.

Harvard women promoted the women's rights movement through parade rallies, slogans at the Boston Women's Assembly in April 1971, "Control our Bodies," "Control our Lives," and "Female Radcliffe." In June of that year, the seniors participating in the protest wore armbands with the women's logo and the words "equal entry" printed on the center of the circle. In the spring of 1972, Radcliffe held a Women's Summit to discuss the divide and the role of women in a changing world. At the 1972 graduation ceremony, many male and female students wore two parallel lines with the big white slogan on their backs. The achievements of Harvard women in the 1970s were achieved against the background of the national feminist movement. They actively evolved it into a

revolution on campus, and finally broke through in just a few years and removed the obstacles left by history, prompting Harvard to implement co-education and win a completely equal status.

## 2.2. The History of the Merger of the Two Schools

In 1943, the agreement between boys and girls' schools was the most important agreement, stipulating that they would pay 85 percent of their tuition to Harvard instead of paying teachers alone. The money went to the Harvard payroll, preventing Harvard faculty when the department sent him to teach at girls' schools. Although the agreement does not require men and women to work together, but in fact that spring in addition to the freshmen, has implemented the same class, is a large number of boys left school to join the war after the emergency measures.

In 1947, the coshift became formalized as "Joint guidance".

In 1963, the Harvard degree was awarded to female graduates, and the Graduate School for Women merged with the Harvard College of Arts and Sciences. This was a great gain for the girls' schools, as they had received three times as much funding in less than two years.

In 1970, the two schools held a joint graduation ceremony together.

However, eventually leading to the formal merger of the two schools was the merger of the dormitories. In the fall of 1968, students at the Harvard and Girls' Schools began asking for consolidated dormitories. In February 1970, Harvard merged 150 students into three dormitory courtyards for trials, with boys and girls living not only in the same dormitory building, but also on the same floor. President Elliot was "worried about increasing the burden of supervision and management", but in fact, the dormitory merger eased the tension between the two sexes, and the dormitory became a self-controlled social organization, holding more organized activities. Boys who live in girls' schools care about the equal rights of girls, and girls are more happy, confident, and friendly. The life of the girls' school seems to have experienced a real revival, and there was a feeling that the suffering had finally been accepted into Harvard.

Since 1971, the merger of the dormitories was officially confirmed, and the two school institutions have been fully merged. But the Radcliffe alumni doubt whether Harvard can take women's education seriously, suggesting that the essence of girls' schools is a Harvard education, and that they do not want their Alma mater to be fully merged. Finally, in June 1970, the Commission recommended that the girls' school maintain its own independent entity, arguing that "it was a mistake to disintegrate Radcliffe at this time. The result of this positive self-examination led to a "1971" agreement with Harvard accepting all undergraduate tuition, donations and other funds to cover the main daily expenses of the girls' school. The Girls' School retains her school name, partial donations, capital, and construction, while continuing to manage and fund several institutions and projects of its own. This agreement provides a four-year trial period.

In 1977, the girls' School and Harvard established the relationship that continues to this day, and once again clarified that the girls' school was an independent institution with the right to conduct programs to promote women's higher education according to its characteristics. At this point, the century-old dream of the girls' school finally came true. The privileges once exclusive for men were completely open to women, and the girls' school gained equality, but it did not lose itself. Girls have full and equal access to the educational opportunities offered by Harvard, including libraries and laboratories, and girls also receive more school access and financial aid.

## 2.3. The Development Status of Women at Harvard

### 2.3.1. Creating Women's Organizations

To promote women's status and rights protection, many different women's organizations have emerged at Harvard, including the Radcliffe Student Union (RUS), which was founded in 1969 [6].

The organization was founded in November 1971, and by the 1980s, it had become a political forum, and was still an important economic resource. The RUS has broad influence in the school by forming programs that allocate funds to other women's groups to promote women's issues in schools. Then there is the "women's center", founded in the autumn of 1974, which is run by students and gets 500 dollars a year from RUS. Its first mission is to provide information about the feminist movement, then create a sense of group for different women's organizations on campus, as well as for women's organizations, for their lectures and other activities. The Harvard-Radcliffe Committee on Women, which aims to create a school-wide network of women and holds monthly meetings to discuss issues of interest to women both inside and outside the school, is another organization. Other organizations include "Radcliffe black women," "Radcliffe Asian women's organization," and so on. All of these groups, in various ways, adapt to the needs of Harvard women from curriculum to extracurricular, report women's problems in how they exist and are solved, greatly improve women's participation consciousness and degree, promote women's communication, and strive for women's rights and interests, all of which are extremely beneficial.

### **2.3.2. The Growth of Female Students**

For a long time in the 1960s, the ratio of male to female students at Harvard and Radcliffe was 4:1. In 1972, President Bock changed it to 2.5:1, and the next year 460 girls were enrolled, a net increase of 130. In 1975, the two schools reached an agreement on equal access, merging the administration and financial aid offices, and removing restrictions on the number of girls admitted. In 1976, equal enrolment was introduced for the first time, and the ratio of boys to girls reached 1.8:1, with 567 girls.

The percentage of women in graduate schools has also risen steadily, from 21.8 percent in 1979 to 24.3 percent in 1984 in the low-percentage business schools, from 31 percent to 33.2 percent in the mediocre liberal arts schools, and from 62.4 percent to 63.2 percent in the high-percentage education schools.

### **2.3.3. Women's Studies and Courses**

In addition to the change in the number of female teachers and students, new content has also been added to the teaching aspect. In the late 1970s, women's research developed rapidly across the United States as one of the most important emerging disciplines. Original history is usually only about what men do, and now women are aware that they are ignored by history, and are determined to make up for the course of history. Women's organizations nationwide are looking through history books for the role of women in history, and many major universities have set up courses in women's research.

One of the several related courses that Radcliffe opened in 1970 was one devoted to the role of women in social change. Two women-themed postgraduate seminars were opened for the 1976 – 1977 academic year. In early 1977, a new RUS unchaired committee was dedicated to creating a curriculum in women's research, allowing interested undergraduates to turn interdisciplinary research in examining women's experience into a professional direction [6]. From the 1979-1980 school year, women's studies were included in the income course catalog. The 1985 – 1986 academic year catalogue listed thirty such courses, seventeen of which were dedicated to women's studies, and thirteen were related. This is a big step compared to the two seminars in the 1976-1977 academic year. Many women study the changing relationships between individuals and countries from the current perspective of women, with a female perspective and a female voice.

#### **2.3.4. Women and a Career**

After the feminist movement, women had more confidence in their careers and success, and they understood that there was no fundamental conflict between knowledge and feminization [4]. In the past 20 years, many female school graduates, after taking care of their husbands and children, returned to school to continue their studies, in order to enter the academic field and find satisfactory jobs. Many prominent women emerged in different fields, especially those traditionally dominated by men. In 1972, Elizabeth Holtzmann became the youngest woman in congress, Mrs. Swanson is one of a dozen women directly appointed as a church minister, and female historians, treatment experts, journalists, scientists, not to mention the later female secretary of state, female presidential candidate, etc., very few career is now considered for women is not suitable or impossible.

### **3. Is gender suitable as a Standard of Differential Treatment?**

In the gender equality movement in American higher education, whether the gender discrimination standard is legal is a prerequisite question. Some opponents of affirmative action argue that gender should not be the standard of discrimination and that considering gender is itself unjust. This chapter is to fight back to the suspected nature of this premise.

#### **3.1. Criticism and its Response to Differential Treatment**

This criticism holds that differential treatment itself cannot be equal. Gender equality measures in college admissions treat different applicants differently based on gender, failing to achieve equality. In real life, we often treat people differently in the name of equality, but differential treatment is not the same as discrimination. Differential treatment is only the premise of differentiation, and it cannot be considered to violate equal rights just because of differential treatment. For example, treat different students by test scores, think that high grades can enter poor college scores should be eliminated; treat basketball players and ordinary people by height, think height is the appropriate screening criteria, because height is essential in the sport of basketball.

From these examples, it can be seen that equality does not mean "equal treatment", and equality sometimes requires differential treatment. The same is true in educational resources. "equal treatment" does not mean "equal treatment". Higher education resources are relatively few and not available to everyone. Therefore, university admission should take certain goals as the screening criteria and select the students that the university thinks most meet their requirements. Higher education is as a scarce resource, it in admission to each applicant are fully considered, did not directly refuse their application, just choose think more suitable people, so each admission applicant is the same care and consideration, just the university does not meet the requirements of the university did not damage their right to equal treatment [7]. Therefore, university applicants who participate in gender equality measures only enjoy equal rights and do not have the right to be treated equally. Differential treatment a just and equal behavior on the basis of guaranteeing equal rights.

#### **3.2. Criticism and Response to Gender as an Innate Standard**

Some opponents argue that innate standards, including gender, are not affected by individuals' acquired efforts, so that discrimination to treat people with innate qualities is itself against fairness. However, in real life, the backgrounds and situations of individuals can not be exactly the same. It is precisely because of these different innate qualities, different gray values can be created [8]. If these innate factors are not allowed to work and people are not treated differently, then these social values cannot be realized. It is precisely that innate quality can bring different social value, and



gender and other innate factors as standards can better allocate resources, realize the maximum utilization of resources, and create more social value, so it has its rationality. In the enrollment of higher education, there are many criteria that are congenital conditions, including the influence of the applicant's family environment and the parents in the society, which have nothing to do with the personal choice of the parties, and they often have nothing to do with the students' self-choice. For institutions of higher learning, if intelligence is an appropriate criterion for admission, gender should not be excluded, because intelligence is an uncontrolled innate criterion like gender [9]. Therefore, it is logically inconsistent to oppose gender considerations in enrollment, but to support an individual's innate ability. Innate qualities should not be suppressed, but the benefits generated by innate qualities should be redistributed, which is the appropriate requirement of equality.

### **3.3. Natural Discrimination of Gender Criteria and Their Response**

For the attack of the affirmative action movement, we have to mention the issue of "reverse discrimination" [10]. Since the implementation of the affirmative action movement in the field of higher education, there has been controversial and mixed. The most favorable attack of its opponents is "reverse discrimination", which questions the constitutionality of gender equality. The gender criteria in the college enrollment policy classifies applicants into different groups, which gives men and women different criteria. On equal terms, even before a student is admitted to a university, a certain number of places are set aside for women in advance, after which what appears to be preferential treatment for women actually places men in a discriminatory position, in violation of the equal protection principles of the US Constitution.

In fact, whether a certain discrimination is discriminatory should depend on the goal and the social significance of the measure. From the goal of the affirmative action to achieve, the gender differentiation in the affirmative action movement, is not, blame a certain gender is inferior to the malicious gender discrimination. Amendment 14 of the United States Constitution is a relevant provision for the protection of equal rights, which is intended to simply prohibit discrimination, but does not prohibit discrimination. Therefore, the good faith gender discrimination in the affirmative action movement does not violate the Constitution. The affirmative action action is a certain corrective action of female discrimination, an appropriate correction of the serious consequences of gender discrimination in the United States, and the ultimate purpose is for the realization of social fairness and justice. In the social sense of affirmative action, this measure does not show contempt for men, and therefore does not constitute discrimination. In the current social environment of the United States, gender discrimination towards women is more prevalent. In this environment, preferential treatment for women is difficult to be understood as a sign that women are more valuable and favored than men, but it is more likely to be understood as a compensation measure. Second, even if the unsuccessful male university applicants feel this contempt, then the radical approach is to more widely publicize the real purpose of gender equality, to break the feelings and perception of discrimination, rather than to pay institutional attention to such inappropriate feelings. As a result, affirmative measures do not convey discriminatory social significance.

## **4. The Reasonableness of Gender Equality**

### **4.1. Compensation Theory and Its Criticism**

#### **4.1.1. Compensation Theory**

In a long period of practice, the compensation theory for the compensation movement has occupied the mainstream among its supporters, but the compensation theory has great defects in fact. The compensation wheel is first discussed below:

Supporters of the affirmative action will gender affirmative action measures as female compensation, compensation reason because the long adverse influence in the history of the gender discrimination system, the structural discrimination in the society decided that even if legally cancel the institutional discrimination, but the real gender discrimination still exist, people's gender significance did not disappear [11]. Women do not have real equal rights to men after the law forbids gender discrimination, and there is still a shadow of gender discrimination in education. In order to solve the remaining problems of historical discrimination in real life, make up for the mistakes and harm of past gender discrimination, and improve the disadvantage of women, we adopt preferential policies to favor women and compensate them.

#### 4.1.2. Criticism of Compensation Theory

The compensation theory was widely supported in the early stage, but it also faced a series of doubts with the passage of time.

First, there is a dislocation of the compensation subject. Should the subject of compensation be compensated by individuals, or should the school be the subject of compensation? As individuals, do we have the alleged moral responsibility to compensate for the discrimination committed by the previous generation? Under American law, it is focused on the rights of the individual, emphasizing the rights of the individual to the individual. We assign rights, but as independent individuals we are also not obliged to bear the so-called adverse consequences of our so-called ancestors, we can only be responsible for what we do. Second, universities are not institutions for achieving social equality, but an academic institution. College education is not purely commercial, nor is it a reward for past success or efforts. The college should serve the overall goal of society more than a tool to compensate for achieving the so-called "fairness".

Secondly, there is a dislocation of the compensation content. Is gender equality in American education using educational resources as a means of compensation, or using economic conditions as a means of compensation? The long-term gender discrimination in history leads to most women being in an economically disadvantaged position. The injustice of educational resources is the derivative consequence of the economic situation, rather than the direct consequence of gender discrimination. But in reality, we are compensating them for their educational resources rather than for their direct financial conditions [12]. And the applicants to college are rarely poor women, but women with moderate financial ability. Poor women, who really suffer from gender discrimination, are rarely compensated by the preferential treatment measures, and no sexist middle-class women are the beneficiaries of the preferential treatment measures. It is difficult to distinguish gender standards from economic standards in compensation theory, which cannot explain why educational resources should be used as compensation content.

To summarize, the field of education affirmative action compensation theory cannot reasonably explain the goal of affirmative action; university preferential treatment is a forward-looking rather than a retrospective measure; the university is to cultivate more female students; diversification, allowing women to expand to every industry; and preferential treatment is to achieve gender equality in order to make American society more harmonious, rather than to compensate for the loss of opportunism.

#### 4.2. Sex Diversity, Broad Benefits

In the past ten years of judicial practice, the theory of compensation has become more and more beyond the test of the Supreme Court, and the theory of gender diversity has ascended to the stage of history, gradually replacing the compensation theory as the theoretical pillar of the implementation of the legitimacy of gender preference in American college enrollment. Unlike



compensation theory, gender diversity does not see admission as a reward for the recipient, but as a means of promoting desirable goals in society.

Supporters believe that the first gender-harmonious student group is worth pursuing, because it allows students to learn more knowledge and thinking skills than in all-same-sex environments. While student groups of the same sex are more likely to communicate, they can also limit their intellectual and cultural imagination. Society as a whole benefits from a diverse group where people of different genders bring complementary skills, thus collectively enriching the environment where people study and work. Student diversity is about enabling students of different genders, ethnicities and nationalities to have equal rights to education, so that people of different genders, different cultural backgrounds and different nationalities, can learn different skills from each other and realise that roles are greater than the simple sum of each part. With the efforts of all members, the knowledge and life skills of university students are greatly enriched and the overall learning capacity and quality of all students is improved [13].

Second, disadvantaged women have the potential to play an important role in the important public domain; successful women serve as role models for other disadvantaged women, helping to break the fixed type of mindset and providing an upward mobility model for socially disadvantaged groups, thereby reducing the contradiction between gender and social unrest [14]. American university education regards the elimination of gender discrimination as one of its educational goals, and it hopes to alleviate the gender discrimination in American society by achieving the goal of diversified student groups. At Harvard University, for example, it was all white men in the 1950s, and in the late 1970s, more than 40 percent were women. Therefore, American higher education has always been committed to the diversity of gender of students. They believe that students of different genders can get along well together to better serve society and contribute to a pluralistic democratic society.

## **5. The Effect of Gender Equality in Education**

### **5.1. Raising the Status of Women and Narrowed the Gender Gap**

Affirmative movement for women's preferential treatment measures, to provide women with equal employment opportunities and education opportunities, which is conducive to realize the real sense of equal rights between men and women, embodied in the field of education and employment is greatly increased the proportion of women in all members of society, promote the fair development of American society, steady progress.

### **5.2. Increasing the Number of Women in the Dominant Class**

Affirmative movement essential brought many positive effects to women, the implementation of preferential treatment measures increased the number of women in all social strata, let them can according to their own interests and action, selected can safeguard their interests of doctors, lawyers and government officials, improve their social status, economic ability and education level, higher education trained diverse groups of graduates, let them can work in different social classes, voice for different social classes, accelerate the gender discrimination in real society [15]. For example, greatly improving women's social status and expanding the proportion of women in various fields will help to correct the adverse effects of gender discrimination, and help women in the superior classes to play a leading role in leading the majority of women to realize equal rights.

### 5.3. Improving Women's Education Level

In fact, female students do not graduate, and they have very good grades but lower graduation rates than men. They just lack an admission letter to prove that they are no worse than anyone else, but they are so good. Opponents of affirmative action in higher education practice claim that women are not eligible for higher education. They do not meet college scores and get them into higher education. In fact, according to the statistics, the STA scores of the admitted women in law are very different from those of men, with less than 10 percent of the points. The STA scores cannot be used to identify women with lower natural intelligence than men. And women are not less qualified, and they are even stronger than men in some ways. Only ensuring the proportion of different gender students in colleges and universities, achieving campus student diversity, ensuring that the proportion of women in universities is roughly in line with the proportion of the total population, ensuring gender equality, and meeting the demand of women for higher education is directly related to the direction of social development.

### 5.4. Promoting Gender Harmony

Diversity of students, refers to gender diversity, race, talent, and activism requires that in higher education admissions, the application of gender criteria will increase the proportion of women. Student diversity, is for everyone to understand each other and break down misconceptions of sexism and can learn knowledge prior to gender differences with inclusive attitudes. Preferential treatment measures can help break the stereotypes and hostility between men and women, accelerate the communication between students is conducive to gender and sexuality, increase the mutual understanding between men and women, so that gender is no longer an insurmountable gap.

## 6. Conclusion

The gender equality movement in American higher education refers to the tilt of women in enrollment policies to weaken and eliminate gender discrimination. It will give female students more access to higher education opportunities, give women equal access to higher education opportunities, and promote the diversification of student groups in the field of education. The question of the affirmative action in the American higher education movement is whether the admission policy can be treated by gender difference. In practice, the Supreme Court constantly explains and explains it with the change of times, and the public's controversy is constantly increasing. Supporters of the affirmative action movement believe that it achieves gender diversity in education; that gender differentiation in admission policies does not violate the Constitution, and that the practice of preferential treatment measures can correct the adverse consequences of gender discrimination. Critics point out that gender discrimination is actually designed to treat women, and put men in a position of discrimination, which constitutes reverse discrimination against men.

From describing the development of female status in Harvard University, this paper explains the brief history of the affirmative action movement, making us intuitively feel the development and change of affirmative action movement. The affirmative movement is theoretically a practice of equality theory and a challenge to "inequality". Our study of the affirmative action movement in American higher education is not only designed to explore the theory of equality, but also to provide a reference for us to deal with gender issues. Due to the influence of the long-term feudal system, the low status of women is also an important problem that cannot be ignored in China. China also faces the inequality of women's educational resources in education. Research and analysis of the gender equality policy in American higher education can serve as a reference. To date, women have theoretically achieved equal political rights, legal rights and equal pay treatment as men. However, in the real society, sexist discrimination and gender oppression events still

emerge endlessly, and women do not really "turn over as the masters". Under China's compulsory education system, the boy preference will still make some girls lose the right to school; In enterprises and civil servants, there are still a large number of jobs only for men. These widespread phenomena in society show that women do not achieve a truly equal social status with men, and that women are still in a state of gender oppression. Education equality still needs to be further implemented.

In the course of undergraduate research, the author can refer to limited information about gender equality in education. In addition, due to the limitations of the epidemic, this paper failed to investigate the current situation of gender equality in education in the United States and the current situation of female education in China by means of visiting and survey data, a lack of questionnaire samples, and insufficient research on gender equality in the field of higher education. Further research in the future will pay more attention to the practical investigation and research, starting from the reality of the development, adopt the form of questionnaire survey, further make a deeper discussion on this issue. Equality and fairness are the problems faced by every society and the values we all pursue. However, there are certain difficulties in absolute equality and fairness. Women's education equality movement, not only has not completed its historical mission, but also has a long way to go and a long way to go.

## References

- [1] Tyack Hansot. *Learning together: A history of coeducation in American schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990, 9-11.
- [2] Sarah Midkiff, "#MeToo Creator Tarana Burke Will Help Ring in the New Year in Times Square", Online: <https://www.refinery29.com/en-us/2017/12/185830/metoo-creator-tarana-burke-ball-drop-times-square-nye>, [2020-01-03].
- [3] Linda Eisenmann. *Higher Education for Women in Postwar America, 1945-1965*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006, 165-174.
- [4] Qian Mansu. *The historical evolution of American liberalism*. Beijing: San Lian Bookstore, 2006, 154-159.
- [5] Coker, Angela D. African American female adult learners: motivations, challenges, and coping strategies. *Journal of Black Studies*, 2003, 33.
- [6] Orlans, Harold. Affirmative Action in Higher Education. *The ANNALS of the American Academy*, 1992, 523-525.
- [7] Ronald Dworkin, Letter Spring Eagle, translated by Wu Yuzhang. *Take rights seriously*. Beijing: Encyclopedia of China Publishing House, 1998, 300-302.
- [8] Honig, Lilli S. *Untenured and Tenuous: The Status of Women Faculty*. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1980, 448-450.
- [9] Jackson, Jerlando F.L. & O'Callaghan, Elizabeth M. What do we know about Glass Ceiling Effects? A taxonomy and critical review to inform higher education research. *Research in Higher Education*, 2009, 48-50.
- [10] Jones, Stacey. *Dynamic Social Norms and the Unexpected Transformation of Women's Higher Education, 1965-1980*. *Meeting of the Economic History Association*, 2004, 22-24.
- [11] Langdon, Emily A. *Women's Colleges Then and Now: Access Then, Equity Now*. *Journal of Education*, 2001, 5-7.
- [12] London, Rebecca A. *The role of postsecondary education in Welfare Recipients paths to self-sufficiency*. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 2006, 76-77.
- [13] McCombs, Harriet G. *The Dynamics and impact of Affirmative Action Processes on Higher Education, the curriculum, and black women*. *Sex Roles*, 1989, 21-23.
- [14] Mojisola Tiamiyu & Mitchell, Shelley. *Welfare reform: Can higher education reduce the feminization of poverty?* *The urban Review*, 2001, 30-33.
- [15] Peng, Samuel S. & Jaffe, Jay. *Women Who Enter Male-dominated Fields of Study in Higher Education*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1979, 16-17.