

CHANGING THE CLIMATE OF THE UNIVERSITY CLASSROOM:
PERSPECTIVES FROM FACULTY USING FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP

by

HOLLY A. COLE

B.A. Honours, University of Guelph, 1979

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Department of Educational Studies

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

March 1996

© Holly Arden Cole, 1996

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Educational Studies

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date Mar 28/96

ABSTRACT

The university campus has dramatically changed with the increased enrolment and visibility of women. Women now clearly represent the majority of postsecondary full and part-time enrolments. The current challenge to the traditions of higher education involves ensuring that the values and perspectives of women are fully represented in the academy. One of those areas requiring attention is the curriculum.

A plethora of feminist perspectives capture and express the experiences of women and provide an understanding of their diverse social and political realities. This thesis examined how feminist scholarship has added a critical and constructive voice to existing curricula and the development of new knowledge.

Using semi-structured interviews, ten women university faculty were interviewed about their experiences of building a gender inclusive curriculum using feminist scholarship. Women spoke about the tension between feminism and academia and the conflicts they experienced both as women and feminist faculty. For the feminist faculty, working outside masculinist norms had both personal and professional costs and benefits.

This study confirmed current research that maintains women have not yet been accepted as agents of knowledge and authority in their fields. This thesis found that feminist scholarship still resides, for the most part, in the margins of the disciplines. The curriculum revealed itself as a restricted model of discourse, its design and creation influenced by the personal and subjective emotions and intellect of its owner, whether that person was a feminist or a conservatist. This research concluded that curriculum is socially constructed, implying that curriculum is related to gender, and when partnered with feminism, it is closely tied to the politics of inclusion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CHAPTER ONE	INTRODUCTION
	Background 1
	Personal Ground 2
	The Research 4
	Significance of the Research 5
CHAPTER TWO	LITERATURE REVIEW
	Feminism and Feminist Scholarship 6
	Diversity 11
	Women in Education 13
	Curriculum 15
	Implications for the Present Research 22
CHAPTER THREE	METHODOLOGY
	Research Design 24
	Feminist Interview Research 24
	Selection of Interviewees 25
	Data Collection and Analysis Strategies 27
	Voice 31
CHAPTER FOUR	FEMINISM
	Meaning 32
	Feminism and Teaching 33
	Feminist as Part of the Faculty 39
CHAPTER FIVE	CURRICULUM
	Feminist Scholarship 46
	Reviewing the Curriculum 53
	Resistance 61
	Personal and Professional Costs 71
CHAPTER SIX	REFLECTIONS
	Summary of Themes 80
	Implications for Theory and Practice 88
	Implications for Future Research 93
	Looking Back to What Got Me Here 95

REFERENCES	99
APPENDIX A	106
APPENDIX B	107
APPENDIX C	109

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the people who encouraged me, supported me, assisted me, and maybe even gently pushed me to complete this thesis. I would like to thank Dr. Allison Tom for always demonstrating the spirit of feminism. It was her contributions as my graduate supervisor that kept my spirit alive throughout this journey. Dr. Shauna Butterwick also deserves many thanks. When I lost a member of my thesis committee due to illness, she stepped in and guided me with intelligence and heart. Her tremendous support will always be remembered. I would like to thank Dr. Rita Irwin and Dr. Tom Sork for serving as members of my thesis committee. They were extremely generous with both their support and their advice. I also would like to extend my appreciation to Professor Susan Boyd for agreeing to be my external examiner.

Without the time and interest of the ten women I interviewed for this thesis, I would not have finished this journey feeling more settled and satisfied. I thank them all for the privilege and honour of listening and recording their stories.

Many friends and colleagues pushed and prodded me to keep going through these past years. I would like to thank Carol Nielsen, Jean Cockell, Shari Nystrom, Marion Lay and all my coworkers at VCC who provided me with constant support and encouragement. I would like to thank Carey Stoneberg for typing hours of transcripts for little pay (but lots of appreciation).

It was the strong support of my family that carried me through the triumphs and challenges of thesis research. My life partner, Jami Nystrom, knew only how to be my number one fan. She took over many of my responsibilities at home so I could have peace and quiet to work. Her mom, Jacqueline, always let me know how proud she was of me. My sister Shelley cheered me on from her home in Ontario. My dog Sunny laid at me feet, a constant companion while I typed away. Thank you everyone.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

The university campus environment has dramatically changed in the last two decades with the increased enrolment and visibility of women. With their presence has come a change in the fundamental nature of higher education. Increasingly powerful and diverse in their profile, some female students are vocal advocates for change to institutional policies and practices that will acknowledge their experience and meet their needs. Instituting changes to traditional curricula which, for the most part, have been shaped and influenced by white men, is part of the reshaping being sought. The profound underrepresentation of women in the language and content of curriculum leaves students believing that women have not contributed to the formation or development of the disciplines and by their absence, female students are not encouraged to actively participate in the advancement of knowledge in their fields.

Pressure to address gender issues has come from a variety of scholars and practitioners in higher education. Over the past decades feminist scholars have added a critical and constructive voice to existing curricula and the development of new knowledge. The challenge now is the reconstruction of curricula wherein women, and other marginalized groups, are recognized and accepted as agents of knowledge and authority.

The abundance of information on the individual topics of diversity, feminist scholarship and curriculum revision is astounding. Little, however, has been documented about the personal experiences of faculty during the process of building a gender inclusive curriculum. Most models of curricular revision are guided by faculty and there appears to be an absence of faculty/student partnerships in the process. Much of the literature alludes to resistance to

feminist scholarship but research has not included, to a great extent, an exploration of the deep personal and professional benefits or consequences to those involved in providing a gender balanced curriculum.

The purpose of this research was to document the work, struggles, shifts, acceptance and resistance experienced by women faculty who were utilizing feminist scholarship in the curriculum. The research involved interviewing women faculty, within personal, political and professional frames, about the sanction and opposition they experienced when integrating feminist thought into their curriculum. The research provides stories and accounts of individual efforts to include feminist scholarship in the curriculum and looks ahead to the prospects for future curriculum transformation.

But first, an introduction to myself and what led me to this research.

Personal Ground

This research project was a journey of sorts. It was an opportunity to discover who I was as a learner and what I needed in a learning environment to provide me with the safety and vitality to make learning meaningful. The research does not come without bias. I am a woman. I am a feminist woman, if I can take some latitude here and use "feminist" as a descriptor. I am a lesbian feminist woman. I continue to be attracted to and comfortable with a radical feminist viewpoint. My current employment in a formal educational institution, however, has compelled me to examine how I express my radicalism and feminism. Past experience with being viewed as unreasonable has led me to temper my radicalism with moderation and a lot more patience. I am middle class, white and was raised Christian. I have been disappointed more than pleased in many of my recent learning situations in higher education. As a graduate student, I was appalled at the invisibility and exclusion of women's scholarship from the curriculum. I yearned for

education to take up the banner for social change. I yearned for an education that believed developing our souls was as important as developing our minds.

In this journey to learn about myself, I learned about others. Almost every description of myself as woman and feminist can truly, at its best, only have meaning for myself. There is no universal woman. We are as different as we are the same. Feminism is not a monolith inscribed with a new rendition of the ten commandments. It is as eclectic as a moving kaleidoscope. As feminism becomes more sensitive to the multiplicity of women's experience it also becomes more aware that every woman carries with her both an individual and cultural world view.

I was a part-time adult education graduate student. I almost quit school after my first two courses because I could not find myself, any hint of my womanhood, my lesbianism, or my feminism in my studies. Attending church and university seemed to have a lot in common.

From that dissatisfaction came a desire to participate in a movement for change. I spoke up. I wrote down. As Howe (1982) has noted "a male-centered curriculum that continues to forward a misogynist view of achieving men and domestic or invisible women will clash with or confuse the visions of half, or a bit more than half, the student body" (p.14). I was more than confused. I was angry. As a result, I was drawn to research issues concerning the provision of an inclusive curriculum, particularly curriculum that involved bringing feminist scholarship into the classroom. I wanted to understand how curriculum was decided, designed, and whether I could have hope for a future where professors, program areas, departments, universities and disciplines were ready and willing to educate for diversity. This research was an attempt to provide a story, in the form of several case studies, about the process experienced by faculty who were changing the climate of their classrooms by injecting feminist scholarship in their curriculum.

The Research

This thesis explored whether feminist scholarship provides a critical and constructive voice vis-à-vis existing curricula and the development of new knowledge. Many questions were raised in this research endeavour. How do the participants define feminist scholarship? What do they believe students learn from feminist scholarship? How have students and other faculty responded to feminist pedagogy and research? How are decisions made about curriculum in these ten program areas? What are the forces of change in curricular revision in relation to gender? What are the forces of resistance? Are women viewed as contributors and authorities of knowledge?

The research study detailed here examined the development and evolution of individual course curricula that included feminist scholarship, and the process experienced by women faculty in providing a gender balanced curriculum. The primary goal of the research was to chronicle and subsequently analyze the experiences of ten female faculty as they brought feminism and a focus on gender to their curriculum. Taken a step further, the research focussed on how female faculty were providing curricula that, in the words of Andersen (1987), would "build knowledge and a curriculum in which women are agents of knowledge and in which knowledge of women transforms the male-centred curriculum of traditional institutions" (p.224).

Research of the past decade, some of which is reviewed in this paper, supports the present study. Faculty members in many universities in North America are presently striving to revise traditional curricula. Faculty and students have identified and discussed principles, values and beliefs which they feel strongly guide curricular revision. The time is ripe to provide faculty with case studies, examples and resources so course content may be reconstructed to include a diversity of scholarship and experience. This study involved interviewing faculty in order to

document and validate their experiences with the goal of identifying strategies and solutions for improving the gender balance in their curriculum.

Significance of the Research

This research provided a safe forum for female university faculty to have their voices heard and to share their experiences about being a feminist, about being a feminist professor, and about being a teacher who provides a focus on gender in the curriculum. This research attaches real people to real experiences. It moves the issue of feminism in the academy and in the curriculum from something that is talked about in theory to real stories and recollections that deal with actual practice. This research may be significant for other women faculty who read this study and concur, decreasing isolation for some, building on incentive for change for others. It is my hope that any university professor, female or male, who reads this study, will gain a better understanding of the needs of a diverse student population and, in reading my experiences and the insight of these ten women, will examine those factors that may make them resistant to curricular change. Members of the university's administration who read this thesis may acquire a clearer understanding of how feminist faculty approach teaching and how they design curriculum and will be sensitized to the need to create a more inclusive university. This research may inspire other students to speak up about the need for inclusion in the curriculum. It may start students thinking about whether what they learn is as close to a human rights issue as is their protection from harassment and discrimination. This research will contribute to the knowledge of how women continue to challenge the traditions in higher education.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Feminism and Feminist Scholarship

Feminism has not only expanded discourse on inequality and oppression, it has also demanded change. To enact change, feminists have determined and formulated their own ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies. Through analyses, different positions and perspectives have surfaced with respective goals and varied plans of action and strategies for change. Until recently, among a broad range of perspectives, three main feminist positions existed in North America: the liberal tradition and its desire for women's equality; socialist feminism and its focus on economic and class systems; and radical feminism and its assault on patriarchy and desire to provide a woman-centred ideology. Simply put, liberals chose to work within present systems, socialists wanted to overthrow capitalism and radical feminists wished to vanquish the patriarchy. All theories agreed that women were dominated by men but chose different tactics in eliminating that control.

The evolution of feminism has been dynamic and often unstable. In the past decade, feminist theory has been criticized for oversimplifying or distorting women's experiences, for categorizing women into homogenous groups to make large scale generalizations, for not acknowledging its racial bias, and within an atmosphere of exclusion, attempting comprehensive social analyses. Consequently, there have been shifts in feminist paradigms and an expansion of feminist theoretical perspectives. Much of the evolution and redefinition that feminism has experienced can be attributed to the voices and perspectives of women marginalized by previous theories. Women of colour, for example, were critical of traditional feminist frameworks which made universal generalizations about women, did not recognize that some women hold power

over other women (and men), and that different women, such as black women, experience subordination in different ways. Recently McLaughlin (1993), reminded us that not all black women are of African descent and consequently, putting black women into the social category of "Black" ignores the diversity of these women and dismisses how culture and history have influenced their life experiences (p.274). Among a myriad of changes, today's feminist theorizing attempts not to "essentialize" women's experiences (see Bannerji, 1991) and to let women, individually and collectively, claim their own experience and speak for themselves within feminist discourse.

Jaggar and Rothenberg (1993) use the metaphor of "lenses" to "identify multiple perspectives incorporated in the various feminist frameworks" (p.xv). They provide seven views of women's subordination: conservatism, liberalism, classical Marxism, radical feminism, socialist feminism, multicultural feminism (with its view that class, race, and sexuality are equally intertwined in women's subordination), and global feminism (its view of the world influenced by imperialism and postcolonialism). By using several lenses to understand and express women's subordination, Jaggar and Rothenberg believe that they avoid "monovision", that they are not restricted to the analysis of one theoretical framework and that they are able to make more accurate interpretations of the multiplicity of women's experiences (p.xvii).

Now, be it continued evolution or expansion, postmodern feminism has joined the ranks of feminist theory. Trying to understand postmodern feminism may be compared to the act of catching flying Jello. Postmodernism, of itself, defies definition by describing more of "what it is not" than "what it is" (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993, p.309). However, proponents of feminist postmodernism state that although the theory does ground itself in female experience, it explores gender as a source of power and hierarchy. Power becomes a major theme in this analysis.

Epistemological questions about how to define "woman" and how to ground feminism in women's experiences become less significant than questions about how to resist power and enhance freedom. Postmodern feminists question whose "female experience" and whose "truth" theory is grounded in. As a result, postmodern feminist theorists oppose analyses that focus exclusively on gender and resist formulating generalizations about women based on the experiences of white, middle class women. Postmodern feminists are more concerned with what "woman" means than what she is, attempting to avoid essentialism.

Although it may be a common practice to delineate feminism into categories, we must be cautious. Constructing categories can be useful in providing a sense of the diversity in feminist theory and for clarifying points of view, but these categories do not reflect the reality of feminist practice. Many women may consider themselves radical feminists but work within large educational institutions where their energy is channelled into gender issues within an often male dominated hierarchy. Women new to feminism often approach social change with a liberal philosophy and practice because it is safer and more acceptable, and later, evolve to a more radical desire for change. Postmodernists have moved away from modernist feminist thought to attend to an agenda that seeks to interpret and redescribe women, departing from the notion of a unified subject or identity. Feminist theories discuss gender, oppression, power, hierarchy, and freedom. Some share common concerns. Some share core concepts. All share important differences in bases for critique.

Feminist writers draw upon the diversity of feminist theory. Many bring their personal experiences to their work. Many build upon each other's achievements. Many bring new insights to an exciting but complex new language. A plethora of feminist perspectives capture and express the experiences of women and provide an understanding of their diverse social and

political realities. Feminists have spoken out against a unified theory of feminism as neither feasible or desirable as women's experiences cross class, racial and cultural lines.

That feminism is many and not one is to be expected because women are many and not one. The more feminist thoughts we have, the better. By refusing to centre, congeal and cement their separate thoughts into a unified truth too inflexible to change, feminists resist patriarchal dogma. (Tong, 1989, p.7)

The increased diversity of students entering postsecondary institutions has challenged the educational process (Pearson, Shavlik & Touchton, 1989; Smith, 1989). Included among those challenges has been a call to redesign curriculum to make it more culturally sensitive and inclusive in nature. Feminist pedagogy and scholarship has, to some extent, answered that call (see Briskin, 1990; Shrewsbury, 1987). Stasiulis (1995) provides an overview of the goals of feminist pedagogy. She states that "progressive (critical and feminist) pedagogy seeks to undermine the 'objectivity' and 'universality' of traditional curriculum or 'the canon', where these terms have become smoke-screens for the perspectives of the privileged, white, European, male authors." (p.165). She continues that in addition to democratizing and increasing the 'inclusiveness' of the curriculum, progressive pedagogies struggle against oppression and empower those students who have traditionally been excluded or marginalized. Rothenberg (1992) suggests that such pedagogies include "examining the comprehensive and interconnected nature of racism, sexism and class privilege" (p.263).

Gumport (1991) asserts that feminist scholarship came about without forethought or conscious planning (p. 284). In the 1960s, women, who were "in academia, but not of it", began to experience tension between political and academic interests. This tension had the effect of generating "new scholarly questions that derived from their political, personal, emotional and intellectual sensibilities" (p.284). Kelly & Korsmeyer (1991), in their article about the

development of feminist scholarship, echoed this sentiment and described early feminist scholarship as "angry scholarship" as women shared their sense of betrayal in open critique (p.270). They offer this history of feminist scholarship:

Feminist scholarship began as a part of a political movement. It, in large part, challenged the academy from without, questioning higher education's pretence to neutrality and to detachment from social systems which oppress women. Feminist scholarship adopted the agenda of the women's movement as its research agenda. Scholarship not only focused on women, but on issues of concern to women. (p.280)

Kelly & Korsmeyer believe "feminist scholarship has matured" and that it will continue to be characterized by political tensions because of its political origins and its links to political movements (p. 280).

DuBois, Kelly, Kennedy, Korsmeyer and Robinson (1985) make a clear distinction between "feminist scholarship"--that is, scholarship with a recognizably feminist analytical perspective on the oppression and liberation of women--and work "just on the subject of women" (p.7). Although they believe that "the connection to a political movement is the lifeblood of feminist scholarship" (p.8) they caution any further definition because "the concepts guiding feminist work vary so importantly from subject to subject that there is no useful way to use the term [feminist scholarship] in a restricted sense while discussing scholarship as a whole" (p.7). Acker, Barry and Esseveld (1991) see feminist research as "intimately connected with the political aims of the women's movement" (p.135). Acker et al. provide three principles of feminist research: research that contributes to women's liberation through producing knowledge that can be used by women themselves; research that uses methods of gaining knowledge that are not oppressive; and, research that continually develops a feminist critical perspective that questions dominant traditions and can reflect on its own development (p.133). DuBois et al. conclude:

the persistence, strength, and steady growth of this new scholarship has established the study of women as a focus for academic inquiry, and the critiques of disciplinary bias have rendered problematic much of what was previously assumed to be true in academic fields, the ways that research had long been interpreted, and the assumptions and methodologies guiding its conduct. (p.157)

In the words of McIntosh (1989), research on women "both challenges the definition of what is 'best' and asks who defined what is best, whom the definitions benefited most, and why the student must be called upon to look 'up' rather than 'down', around, and within in being taught about the world" (p.405).

Diversity

There are many changes taking place in institutions of higher education in North America. Once an academic sanctuary for white middle class males, institutions of higher learning are now, to some extent, reflections of the global village in which we live. As a result of changing demographics and shifts in societal attitudes towards minority populations, educational institutions are examining issues presented by an increasingly diverse student body. Represented by female faces; a variety of cultural dress and expression; multiple shades of skin colour; physical, sensory and learning disabilities; colourful histories and traditions; and lifestyles which embrace same sex relationships, these groups seek academic and social inclusion. Although women are not a minority in terms of numbers they are included here as a minority in terms of a group that traditionally has been relatively powerless in hierarchies of power and authority.

An abundance of literature exists on the topic of diversity (Galis, 1993; Richardson & Bender, 1987; Richardson & Skinner, 1991; Talbot, 1993). Smith (1989) provides a lengthy reference section of research in the area of organizing for diversity in higher education in the U.S. Feminists have filled the academic arena with considerable research and documentation of

gender issues and women's scholarship in higher education (Andersen, 1987; Antler & Biklen, 1990; DuBois, Kelly, Kennedy, Korsmeyer, & Robinson, 1985; Fennema & Ayer, 1984; Fonow & Cook, 1991; Kirby, Daniels, McKenna, Pujol & Valiquette, 1991; Lasser, 1987; Parsons, 1990; Spender, 1981).

The principal thrust in achieving educational equity in past years has been that of access. An important first step, improved access has provided opportunities for higher education to women and other marginalized groups. Various approaches have been developed to accommodate our needs and let us inside the door. According to Wilkerson (1987), a panel of educators found that with the introduction of large numbers of women and minorities in higher education, colleges were being moved to reexamine their missions, revise curricula, initiate new program development, examine evaluation methods and make changes to the institution's workforce. In examining the issue of access through the lens of class, gender and race, Wilkerson argues that the goal of equal education is not met by simple generalizations or quick fixes. Equal education says to others with privilege, "move over, make room for women, minorities and the poor." In response, backlash in the form of racism and sexism have had a great impact upon these students.

Wilkerson is critical of higher education's "add-and-stir" notion of equal education. She states that when there is such a narrow approach to achieving equity, there is great pressure on minority students.

The recipe for equal education apparently has been to add minorities, women, and other excluded groups and to continue to stir as usual. Now we find that it is not so simple, that the presence of these students raises fundamental questions which challenge the assumptions upon which our society and consequently our educational institutions are built. (p.135)

Wilkerson calls for a change in the total learning environment, and in addition to other points,

calls for "opportunities to learn about the multicultural heritage of this country (U.S.); and many other elements that contribute to the intellectual development not only of the minority or woman student, but to the entire student population" (p.139). Wilkerson makes an important point here. Inclusion in the learning environment benefits not only the student who typically has been invisible. Other students learn about the struggles of marginalized groups and are introduced to the valuable contributions diverse groups have made to the knowledge base of their discipline.

Women in Education

Only within the past century have women begun to claim education as a way to enhance their options and independence. Stewart (1990) states that women in the first part of the twentieth century had been required to defend their reasons for obtaining a postsecondary education. In a study conducted by Bellamy and Guppy (1991), the enrolment patterns of women in postsecondary education since the 1920s were dramatically illustrated. The most intense period of full-time university enrolment for women began in the 1960s, approached 49 per cent of all enrolments in 1985 and surpassed the enrolment of men in 1988. Figures support similar progression for community colleges and distance education.

Women now represent the majority of all postsecondary full-time and part-time enrolments at universities, community colleges and distance education institutions in Canada (Bellamy and Guppy, 1991, p. 170). Full-time female students attained 53% of undergraduate degrees in the period of 1991-1992 and obtained 42% of graduate degrees in the same period (Statistics Canada, 1993, p.51). Women attending university on a part-time basis attained an overwhelming 64% of undergraduate degrees in 1991-1992 and 51% of graduates degrees (p.55). Between 1981 and 1991, the number of women obtaining graduate and doctoral degrees increased 68% and 52%, respectively. Education was the leading specialization for women

attaining undergraduate degrees. At the master's level, women received 32% of their degrees in social sciences, 31% in education and 20% in humanities. At the doctoral level, women received degrees in these top three fields: social sciences (25%), education (17%), and humanities (17%) (pp. 146-147).

Educating the Majority

New developments in research have identified how women may think and learn differently and how their experiences in formal education leaves them feeling alienated and undervalued (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule, 1986; Gilligan, 1982). Steinem (1992) looks at what women learn, how we learn it, and how we must often un-learn what we have been taught. She uses recent research to describe how women learn to undervalue themselves, how adolescent girls lose their confidence, how girls and women are treated differently in the classroom and how the self-esteem of women is fragile and fleeting. "It makes sense, then, that more education and even good grades could add up to lower self-esteem; the lesson these students were so conscientiously learning was their 'place'" (p.125). Steinem calls upon historian Gerda Lerner to express the damage performed on women's minds, "We have long known that rape has been a way of terrorizing us and keeping us in subjection. Now we also know that we have participated, although unwittingly, in the rape of our minds" (p.125).

According to Rich (1979) there is a great need for women to claim an education. What women learn at colleges and universities is "how men have perceived and organized their experience, their history, their ideas of social relationship, good and evil, sickness and health, etc." (p. 232). As women we are learning mainstream Western thought which is primarily about men, particularly white men, and what they have decided is important. Rich urges women to take responsibility for themselves. She encourages women not to let others do their thinking,

talking and naming for them but to respect and utilize their own minds.

Men's treatment of women's experience and intellect is often reflected in how women are dismissed as contributing little of any importance to the field of education. Although women dominate the field of education in terms of numbers, most are not in positions of power or able to yield power. A 1987 study found that during the 1980s, the Canadian Journal of Education published fewer articles by women than leading journals in other fields where women were not so strongly represented (in Miles, p.259). Adult education, like all other sectors of education, is often challenged by feminist practice. By demanding visibility and voice for women, feminists are opening the education mandate of half of society which has historically been restricted to a subordinate role. They expand and change the critical agenda and throw most everything into question, including all that has been accepted as natural and important. Feminism adds a unique dimension to established analyses and world views.

Curriculum

Curriculum theory and development have only actually flourished as fields of study within educational research and development since the 1960s (Hargreaves, 1994). During the early years, development, deliberation and decision making were the primary concerns while the questions of who constructed the curriculum, "within what kinds of political and epistemological parameters and for whose benefit, were largely neglected" (p.3). Even after the curriculum reform years of the 1960s, Goodson (1994) posits that the "high ground was completely untouched. This high ground is the written curriculum, how it is constructed and sustained, who are its guardians and who its beneficiaries" (p.17). It was Bernstein in 1971 who first stated: "How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits, and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social

control" (p.47).

Curriculum is politically and socially defined. According to Hargreaves (1994), "the contents and categories of curriculum are a powerful device of social selection and social control: in terms of gender and race, certainly, and in terms of social class" (p.7) As a result, most existing curricula reveals itself as alien to the interests and experiences of women (although not all women experience it that way), and other marginalized groups. Goodson (1994) suggests that curriculum is a "social artifact", with the written curriculum being treated as a "given" and "neutral" (p.16).

In the past two decades radical curriculum critique has grown, revealing many characteristics of curriculum. According to Hargreaves (1994), critique has:

illustrated how much curriculum sustains dominant interests and helps reproduce the social structures from which dominant groups benefit; exposed the gaps and silences within existing curriculum discourse and the radical questions and concerns that are placed off teachers' and students' agendas because of this; and theorized the strategies and alliances that are required to construct radical curriculum reform of a more just and democratic nature. (p. 6)

During the same two decades, universities have begun to evaluate the climate needed in order to sustain diversity. One particular discussion has centred around the role of curriculum. Smith (1989) suggests that many institutions are "beginning to articulate a commitment to educate students for living in a pluralistic world and to create environments that embrace diversity (p.62). As academic institutions move to address the needs of their new student communities, curriculum transformation moves to address the voids in the curriculum and embrace the pluralism of perspectives in the fields.

The curriculum is a prominent element of education that requires attention when building inclusiveness. The movement to integrate the research and divergent values of women into the

curriculum is a relatively new one (Fritzsche, 1985). Fritzsche suggests that a "renaissance" within and outside the academy is calling for the inclusion of diversity into the disciplines and that feminist scholars are change-makers in this movement:

Academic scholars have revealed that the social sciences, the sciences, professional fields, and the humanities are androcentric. The methodologies and values underlying the traditional curriculum are neither objective nor humanistic; they are generally male-centered. They assume that men are the norm and women the "other". (p.3)

Lasser (1987) cited research that found that women fare better in single-sex educational institutions. So why not advance the growth of separate institutions for women? Lasser responds that although such research on women's achievement sheds light on the ability of women to obtain prominence, it does not bring us any closer to solving the issues of promoting women's education in coeducational settings. Women should be able to assert themselves and obtain distinction outside segregated settings. Lasser asserts that the curriculum of higher education has been a "gendered curriculum, created by men to serve men, and reinforcing the gender assumptions and gender biases of society" (p.5). She continues with her commentary on the content of the education women have gained access to:

The invisibility of the past achievements of women--as individuals and as a group--create for the female student a sense of her status as outsider. The absence of both the study of women and a woman's perspective on the broad range of academic studies has impoverished the content as well as the orientation of scholarship. Such omissions are more glaring and yet also more subtle in a coeducational context where women are invited to participate in the academic life "just like" men. (p.5)

Lasser concludes that because increased access has been greatly achieved, for at least some women, it is now time to turn to the task of exploring change in the content, structure and values of educational programs. She states that it will not be without its problems. Many opponents will insist that politics and pedagogy must be separate. There will be a great deal of controversy over the content of higher education and the desire for equality in education for

women. As with much of the research, Lasser only indicates to us that resistance will be part and parcel of any initiative. Considering its importance in the process of curricular change, little room is given to an explication of resistance or how resistance is acted out and responded to.

According to McIntosh (1985), there were more than 480 women's studies programs in colleges and universities in the United States in 1985. She reported thousands of scholarly works by women had been published and that more than one hundred campus-based faculty development projects had occurred, their primary focus being that of changing undergraduate curriculum to include perspectives from women's studies (p.ix).

In her book Toward Excellence and Equity, Fritsche (1985) offers strategies and approaches that involve working collaboratively with faculty and administrators to make curricula inclusive of women and of women's research perspectives. The strategies presented in her book were developed and tested through two projects in eight colleges and universities in the U.S. Fritsche states that her approaches consider size of the institution, the budgetary health of the institution, whether it is public or private and whether the institution currently possesses resources and expertise in women's studies. An extremely valuable section of this book includes short narratives by five faculty members in the curriculum projects. It relates, albeit briefly, some of their experiences as male and female faculty members working to include feminist scholarship in their teaching and curricula. Fritsche's summaries provide insight into faculty struggles and victories and how both the gender of the faculty member and the gender of the student are significant factors when examining the process of curriculum revision activities. Also useful is the discussion on faculty perceptions of curricular revisions. The research reported in this thesis will augment the documentation of the personal experiences of faculty in curricular revision.

Pearlman (1985) expands on earlier work and highlights four phases of curricular change

which emphasizes how faculty respond to curricular revision involving feminist perspectives. Schmitz (1985) also offers a book which deals with the process of designing, organizing, initiating and sustaining projects in a variety of educational settings. It provides the reader with tips on how to increase success and the pitfalls that others have experienced in similar projects. Schmitz gives advice on dealing with faculty resistance. Although this section is only a few pages in length it does highlight feedback from faculty as to their difficulties in participating in a curriculum revision project. Schmitz's study has been used to explore and examine similarities and differences in the experiences of faculty and students in this research. Spanier, Bloom and Boroviak (1984) also provide a sourcebook of institutional models used for curriculum revision and gender integration projects.

Talbot (1992) examined the status and quality of diversity training in eight of the largest master's degree programs in the U.S. mid-west. Diversity was defined as issues relating to women, people of colour, gays, lesbians and bisexuals. Talbot assessed the backgrounds, behaviours, skills, knowledge and comfort levels of faculty and students in regards to diversity. Students were also given another diversity questionnaire and an attitude scale. Faculty and student response, by supplying completed questionnaires, was 87.5% and 70.2% respectively. Talbot found that most faculty and students had little knowledge of issues regarding diversity with the lowest scores pertaining to issues of sexuality. Curriculum was evaluated by expert raters in three courses. Talbot noted a trend where faculty who were the least comfortable with diversity issues tended to have the least diverse student body with the least knowledge, skills and comfort with diversity issues. The opposite was true of classrooms with faculty comfortable with diversity. Higher levels of curriculum transformation were apparent in programs where faculty were comfortable and knowledgeable about diversity.

Talbot's research is key in highlighting the importance of faculty involvement in determining how and whether issues pertaining to diversity will be addressed in programs. Talbot also looked to faculty to increase their knowledge and comfort levels and to be role models of persons who are personally and professionally struggling with aspects of diversity.

Curricular Re-vision

The current challenge to the traditions of higher education is to, in the words of Drakich, Taylor and Bankier (1995), ensure that "the differing values, perspectives, and insights of women, and other marginalized groups are fully represented in the academy" (p.118). According to McIntosh (1989), women students in the U.S. still learn from a curriculum in which they are a marginal majority (p.400). She points to a "cultural pluralism" on campuses today that is crying out for "new and innovative thinking about pluralistic pedagogy and inclusive politics in the classroom" (p.401). McIntosh argues that:

...a curriculum that lacks women's studies suffers from gross scholarly inaccuracy. Likewise, a curriculum for future citizens and voters is dysfunctional if it teaches students to overlook half the population of the nation and the world. Further, a university cannot claim to benefit students' development if its curriculum jeopardizes the mental health of half the students by implying they are not fully real, while inflating the egos of the other half by implying that they are larger than life. (p.402)

She continues by positing that a gender balanced curriculum, a term defined by Fritzsche (1984) to mean "a curriculum that focuses equally on the contributions, values, and perspectives of women and men" (p.xxix), would diminish the notions of "'power', 'importance', or 'excellence' as we have been taught to define it" (p. 403). McIntosh suggests that the new research by and on women is not "simply summer reading" and when introduced to this scholarship, "most white faculty members of both sexes receive bad blows to the ego" as it makes them take a second look at their teaching styles (p.407). She states that the further exclusion of women from the "core" is

"conscious misogyny" (p.411).

Drakich, Taylor and Bankier (1995) provide a history of the debates of academic freedom. Initially, academic freedom meant both freedom of the teacher and of the student (p.119), but recently academic freedom has primarily profiled the rights of the teacher. An ambiguous concept, academic freedom today represents more about opposition than freedom. However, its basic premise is that faculty have the "unfettered right to research, teach and publish"(p.120).

Richer and Weir (1995) allege that 'political correctness' has lately been "transformed into a weapon of neoconservatism" (introduction). They posit that neoconservatists are using academic freedom to discredit anti-racist and anti-sexist initiatives within universities. Puffing their chests in opposition to (their version of) "political correctness," these neoconservatives, in the words of Richer and Weir, have "targeted anti-racist and feminist initiatives within universities, casting these as forms of tyranny that destroyed academic freedom and merit" (p.3). As they make "political correctness" the enemy, the neoconservatists "campaign against what has come to be known as 'the inclusive university'" (p.4).

Pearson, Shavlik & Touchton (1989) recognize that academic culture and policies may not be hospitable to any major rethinking of current practices. Models and strategies are offered by feminist scholars for transforming the institution and for curricular revision, for educating the majority (women) and creating a new agenda for women in higher education. Many faculty are responding to and challenging the resistance and backlash against the inclusion of feminist thought in the curriculum. These faculty believe the inclusive university symbolizes academic freedom. Drakich et al (1995) suggest:

Expanding the precept of academic freedom to the practice of academic freedom requires a shared culture of academic freedom that will encourage a variety of intellectual ideas growing out of differences and welcoming both individuals and groups who represent these differences. (p.121)

Injecting scholarship that addresses the experiences of marginalized groups into curriculum is not a simple task. Feminist scholarship, unlike most scholarship that is specific to a certain discipline, is involved in all academic disciplines therefore making it difficult to assimilate into existing curricula. Feminist scholarship is multidisciplinary rather than unidisciplinary (Pearlman, 1985). For some faculty, the interdisciplinary aspect of feminist scholarship presents a challenge in how to incorporate broad based scholarship into narrowly defined subfields. For others, borrowing scholarship from other disciplines increases an understanding of the subject at hand by offering analyzes, insights and critique from a different perspective.

Nonetheless, one kind of scholarship that does address gender and diversity is feminist scholarship. Furthermore, feminist scholarship brings with it new and modified methods of obtaining knowledge and imparting that knowledge. Often these factors complicate the inclusion of feminist scholarship into curriculum. Simply making it an addition to existing curricula ignores its impact and commentary on traditional scholarship. Weaving it into existing curricula could mean a transformation of what has always been hailed as the core curricula or the traditions of the disciplines.

Implications for the Present Research

Women are now occupying the majority of seats in university classrooms that only three decades ago were most often occupied by men. Nonetheless, the image of women participating as full and equal contributors of knowledge in their fields is weak and fragmented. The

continued underrepresentation of women in the curriculum stands as evidence of implicit male authority. Feminist scholarship, in its attempts to address diversity, has not received strong scholarly recognition. Curricular shifts toward inclusiveness have been met with resistance. How do feminist faculty exist within the sometimes oppositional and often times powerful traditions of teaching and research in their program areas and disciplines? This research attempts to shed more light on the experiences of these women faculty as they address issues pertaining to gender in their curriculum.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to document the work, struggles, shifts, strategies, acceptance and resistance experienced by women faculty who are including feminist scholarship in their curriculum. Curriculum, for the purposes of this study, was defined as both the spoken and written knowledge presented to students in their learning in the university classroom.

This study was conducted with female faculty working at a large university in western Canada. Face to face interview was the research method used to gain information about faculty experiences. I attempted to design an interview format that put participants at ease and allowed them to talk freely about their experiences while at the same time addressing issues that I was particularly interested in.

Feminist Interview Research

According to Harding (1987), feminists differ from other researchers in the theories they use, in the way they apply theory to specific problems and also in their general beliefs about how knowledge is to be constructed (their epistemologies). For example, feminists challenge certain assumptions underlying traditional science epistemology that suggests researchers should be objective, detached and value-free (Reinharz, 1992). Methods themselves are not inherently feminist (Harding, 1987). Instead, feminist research:

implies a perspective, rather than any specific methodologies, in which women's experiences, ideas, and needs are reviewed as valid in their own right, and in which androcentricity--and its theoretical and empirical constructions--no longer serves as the "objective" frame of reference against which all humans experience is compared. (Cook and Fonow, 1986)

As a result, feminists have pressed for a decrease in the reliance on experimentation and an

increase in the use and acceptance of descriptive methods and the creation of new methodologies.

Interviewing offers "access to people's ideas, thoughts, and memories in their own words rather than in the words of the researcher" (Reinharz, 1992, p.19). Interviewing, as a method, comes in several formats but the use of semi-structured interviews "has become the principal means by which feminists have sought to achieve the active involvement of their respondents in the construction of data about their lives" (Graham, 1994, 112). Semi-structured interviewing refers to the approach used by researchers whereby questions on a certain topic are planned in advance and are brought to the interview. The interviewer balances the need to direct some of the interview with preserving the interviewees' freedom to digress and be actively involved in the interview process. Semi-structured interviews were used in this research.

Selection of Interviewees

Anonymity and confidentiality of the interviewees was of prime importance. As faculty were asked to discuss their personal and professional experiences of acceptance and resistance to feminist scholarship in their classrooms and their program areas, much care was required in ensuring that interviewees could speak freely about their experiences and safely assume that their identities would be kept confidential. It was decided to keep interviewee selection within the more homogenous social and human sciences where women faculty were stronger in number therefore making participant selection easier. In addition, having program areas with larger pools of women from which to choose participants from meant increasing the level of anonymity of the participants as they could not easily be singled out. Confining the study to the human and social sciences was also done in an attempt to reduce the possibility of extreme circumstances and experiences turning up in accounts from women working in disciplines that often are acknowledged as oppressive and heavily influenced by a history of male hegemony, such as the

physical sciences and engineering.

I could not use my supervisor or my committee as resources to assist me in selecting participants because providing names of individuals who were using feminist scholarship in their curriculum or classroom would allow them knowledge as to the identities of my participants. It was suggested that I speak with an influential and visible feminist (faculty) at the university where I would perform my research who would be able to identify other feminists on campus.

This woman was extremely helpful. She offered many ideas to assist me in my research and suggested the names of several women whom she knew had reputations for using feminist scholarship in their curriculum or were publishing research that was either feminist in its objective or methodology.

I took from her suggestions and resources the names of 19 women in the social and human science areas. A letter was sent to each of these women (see Appendix A) explaining the objective of my research and asking them to consider a request for an interview that would take approximately two hours. A follow-up call within two weeks was made to ascertain whether any of the women would agree to an interview. I attempted to obtain as much of a cross-section of participants from all of the program areas in the social and human sciences.

Twelve women agreed to an interview. Eleven women were interviewed after one woman was excluded because of her extreme fear of being identified in the research. One interview was not used as the faculty member was concentrating her efforts on developing a specific culturally-based curriculum which addressed the current curriculum needs of her program area and students.

Individual profiles of the ten women faculty in this study were not possible without breaching the commitment to confidentiality given to all of the women. As a result, data from

the interviews could not be placed and analyzed in categories such as age of participant or rank and seniority. What may have been lost in my ability to be specific about the conduct of one individual or program area or to make comparisons between individuals and program areas may have been balanced by the serendipitous outcome of documenting a strong, collective voice.

The ten women faculty came from Sociology/Anthropology, Education, English, Geography, Political Science, and Psychology. At the time they were contacted for an interview, 3 of the 10 women were assistant professors, 4 were associate professors and 3 were full professors. Together they shared 121 years of teaching at the university. The average length of time teaching was approximately 12 years while the median was 8.5 years. The percentage of women faculty in each program area ranged from 8% to 40%. All the participants were white women. Although religious affiliation was not asked, one participant mentioned she was a Jew. The women ranged in ages from early thirties to mid-fifties. Participants were not asked to identify their sexual orientation.

Data Collection and Analysis Strategies

When I called women to set up their interviews, two of the 10 women asked me to meet them away from their campus. For personal and professional reasons these two women did not want to share their thoughts and feelings about the issues surrounding inclusive curriculum and their experiences in their program areas where people could overhear our conversation. In addition, being seen with me on campus would reduce their ability to be anonymous in my data. I met with these two women at locations convenient to them. The other 8 women did not express any difficulty with being interviewed on their campus or being identified through my research.

As two women did not want their names used in connection with this study I protected their identities by using pseudonyms for all of the interviewees. In addition, to mask the identity

of the university, the words "department", "program" and "program area" were all used to describe how the university organized its faculty even though any of these terms may not have been used at this particular university. Finally, the term "administrator" was used to refer to a person or position with supervisory responsibilities immediately above that of teaching faculty whereas "senior administrator" was used to refer to a person or position in the higher echelons of the university hierarchy.

It was important to me that participants felt at ease and could speak freely about their experiences. At the same time, I wanted to be able to ask some similar questions of all participants so I could extract general thoughts and feelings on a variety of issues relating to inclusive curriculum and feminist scholarship. I opted to draw up a list of 13 questions (see Appendix C) to guide my interviews. These questions were sent to the applicants ahead of time when I confirmed the date, time and place of the interview.

The interviews lasted between one hour for one interviewee and three hours for another. On the average, most interviews were approximately two hours. Each woman was asked to sign a consent form (see Appendix B). I reiterated that I would take care to reduce and at best, eliminate, the possibility that any participant would be identified in my research. Some women shared their experiences in a matter of fact tone of voice, one woman cried several times in her interview, often times women were indignant and angry in relating stories of discrimination or poor treatment. Nonetheless, many women expressed excitement and satisfaction about their work and the paths they had chosen. I was often astounded at the amount of information that was entrusted to me. I felt honoured to be the recipient of stories not often told. For many women it appeared the interviews were an opportunity to share with me experiences they had not often shared with an outsider and in that sense, the interviews were sometimes almost therapeutic

in nature. Many asked to be kept informed of the progress and the completion of my thesis.

The interviews elicited information and stories in the following areas: subjects taught; number of years at the university; student mix and student voice in their classrooms and program areas; curriculum transformation for themselves, their program area and their discipline; their perspectives on feminism and feminist scholarship; the climate of acceptance or resistance to feminist scholarship in their classrooms, departments and disciplines; and the personal and professional costs and benefits they experienced in their attempt to provide an inclusive curriculum that brought feminist scholarship into their classrooms.

All interviews were taped. The tapes were sent to a professional transcriber. Upon return of the transcriptions I sat down with each taped interview and went over the transcriptions to ensure accuracy. In three of the taped interviews the interviewee's voice was almost impossible to hear. I realized that my taping equipment had not picked up enough of the speaker's voice. I contacted these three women again and reinterviewed them. Their first interview was discarded.

All participants received a copy of their transcript along with a request to peruse the transcript for any errors, additions or text they did not wish used as quotes. All women except for one provided written feedback. All transcripts were revised according to the instructions of the interviewees and a copy of the revised version was sent back to them.

Data analysis was an ongoing and recurrent process. I used inductive analysis techniques to analyze the data. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1993), inductive analysis refers to categories and patterns which emerge from the data rather than being imposed on data prior to data collection. "Inductive processes generate a more abstract descriptive synthesis of the data" (p. 480). This process of qualitative analysis categorizes and orders the data and seeks tentative patterns and themes.

To increase my familiarity with the data I reread all my transcripts. My data analysis started with reading each transcript carefully and identifying different themes as I read through them. I used colours and titles to delineate portions of my data. With each new category or theme I identified I assigned it a colour and title and began the process of coding my data. I coded the interviews using the interviewees' own words as well as terms such as scholarship, feminism, learning, benefits, and resistance. When all 10 interviewees were coded I had 23 categories that included approximately 90% of the information from the transcripts.

I took the coded data and put all information that was coded, for example, as "decisions regarding curriculum" or "what is feminist scholarship?" into my computer in 23 respective files, identifying the interviewee and the page where the information could be found in the original transcript. When I had printed all these files I read them all, highlighting information highly relevant to my research or responses from interviewees that could be used as quotes in my study.

I assigned each of these 23 information files to one of two chapters (Chapters 4 and 5). I made pen notes in the margins to cluster and categorize information into general themes. I then extracted this information and brought these general themes to my writing.

Upon writing the first draft of my research, I sent chapters three and four (methodology and analysis) to the 10 interviewees. In the accompanying letter I informed each participant what pseudonym had been assigned to her and asked her to let me know, by a certain date, whether she agreed that her anonymity had been maintained in the research. The letter also indicated that if I did not hear from her that I would assume she was comfortable with how I presented the information from her interview. Five of the ten women faculty responded that they were comfortable with my approach and were reassured that their confidentiality had been maintained. With no response from the others, I assumed they felt comfortable also.

Voice

It was important to me that I speak in the first person in my research. I did not stand outside of this work, observing it as a neutral bystander. I came to this research loaded with negative experiences and strong feelings that learning from an exclusive curriculum was somewhere on the same level as experiencing sexual harassment. My own visceral reactions to the exclusion of women in my course work prompted me to become knowledgeable of the traditions and processes of curriculum production. I wanted to stay present in this research by writing in the first person.

Most importantly to me, however, is that whenever I could, I used the actual words of the women I interviewed. Although I paraphrased now and then, I did not wish to lose the authenticity of their words. Their words often revealed and expressed much emotion, attachment, sensitivity, commitment, and strength that I did not wish to omit or gloss over. It was their stories and their experiences that provided me grist for the mill. One participant reminded me that I would write my thesis and then go on my way whereas she would stay at the university and continue working in the conditions in which she worked. Therefore I hope I have taken great care in providing the women I interviewed with a space and place to talk about their experiences of being visibly feminist in their curriculum, classrooms and program area.

CHAPTER FOUR

FEMINISM

In this chapter I have attempted to provide a context for the later discussion of issues relating to feminist scholarship and curriculum by allowing the women interviewed in this study to provide their definitions of feminism, to characterize their sense of feminist pedagogy and to portray their experiences as faculty in the environments they were currently working in.

Meaning

All the women in this study referred to themselves as feminists. Most women focussed their definition of feminism around the issue of equality. Glenda responded that feminism meant "equality for women and struggling for equality for women." Penny stated, "it means making women count, it means the presence of women, and in seeking out and incorporating women's rights, that potentially is what it has done, to try and make sure that women's writings and ideas are valued and heard." Hilda claimed that "feminism is definitely a political goal, advancement of better choices for women and definitely women's choices, not a framework to be imposed on them as what is good for them." Kate called herself a feminist because it meant that she perceived injustices that should be righted.

Times have changed. Within the past decades there have been shifts in the theory, politics and practice of feminism. Gwen suggested, "what has in the past been homogeneously viewed as feminism and was really a kind of light intellectual middle class movement in North America, has been dissolved, has been critiqued from within, critiqued from without, and has changed significantly". When asked what feminism or feminisms meant to them, many responded that they saw feminism as "plural, changing, growing". "Feminisms is what we have to talk about", responded Wilma.

I guess the key kind of issue is around equality and the many dimensions of equality, equality not just in terms of female and male but equality in terms of everything else with regard to human beings as well. In other words, I do feel strongly that commitment to and insistence upon equality is kind of a driving force and that isn't just about gender, but it is about every other aspect of human beings. The perspectives related to race, class, culture, sexual orientation, disability, whatever, all the ways in which equality can be an issue seems central to feminism.

Two of the respondents offered definitions of feminism derived from beliefs about the social constructions of gender. Patricia stated, " I know it is not [just] one thing...Well, it does have something to do with women and fighting for equality and looking at the injustices through gendered lens." Carla put it this way:

Feminism is about seeing the world through binary lenses and recognizing that there is little that is as fundamental as the way that we are gendered from before the time we are born...It is the stepping back and trying to refocus the world so that you can see those different dimensions of gender, both femininity and masculinity, and how that gets constructed on a daily basis and how that construction of gender certainly changes historically, culturally, etc. Certainly in all cases that we know about in the contemporary world it is invariably to the disadvantage of women and just looking at the ways that is so and trying to figure out how do we change that, how do we change that in our own worlds. That is what feminism is all about for me and that is why the connecting of gender with other dimensions of privilege and power is also a central part of any feminist enterprise.

Feminism and Teaching

For all the women participating in the study, feminism permeated their whole existence, both personally and professionally. Christine declared that "it [feminism] is my whole existence". Often participants referred to ways that feminism affected their teaching or how their teaching was affected by their feminism. Glenda exemplified this connection by saying, "Whenever I teach anything I include feminist scholarship as part of my teaching. And also in terms of some sense of the classroom pedagogy, what it means to work with students, that there is a feminist way of doing things".

Penny saw part of her role as teacher as making research more accessible and "becoming

more of a mediator of text. Women see themselves as being more of an interpreter of text, making it more accessible, translating and demystifying." Hilda commented that she could not separate curriculum and teaching:

You can't say here is a book by a great man and this is what he said. You can't paraphrase, you have to talk about it, get at it in various ways, talk about the ideology but mostly about how it is structured and get students to see that language is actually an analysis of text and analysis of text is a feminist act. If you can do that you can teach whatever text, they are not neutral, they have things in them, you analyze it, decode it, whether it has anything to do with feminism or not, you are finally giving them the tools.

Many women stated their desire to talk about ideology in the classroom and to challenge their students by providing theoretical pluralism. Kate explained it as, "What I like to do in my courses is start out by making sure that students know that there are different ideologies, to make them aware of the biases and assumptions." Three of the participants voiced the importance of having students get out of their "huge attachment to the way they view the world". They wanted to encourage students to think of exposing themselves to new ideas, new ways of looking at things, suggesting that attendance at university was not about validating their preformed opinions.

It was important that as teachers these women found ways to have students be receptive to new ways or new information. Christine designed her approach to teaching as one where she developed a pedagogy that "gets away from emphasizing the students necessarily feeling comfortable all the time." She illustrated this approach by thinking back to a time, as a teacher, when she believed that students had to feel comfortable about what they were learning and "everybody had to be really happy about validating the way students feel about this or that". She stopped teaching in this fashion when she became:

more attuned to the exclusionary nature of constructing a protected world view that really emphasizes that people have to feel good, it is the kind of stuff that black women write

about. It is a therapeutic model that white, middle class women want to sit around all the time and talk about racism and the white women want to talk about how bad they feel about being racist, which is an appropriation of putting themselves back into the centre.

Kate remarked that many of her students were not aware that they had a particular view of the world and that they looked for courses where that world view was reinforced. Her response was to challenge their particular view of the world. She admitted that it was easier to do this with graduate students as they realized that at that level "they were there to clarify and sharpen their skills."

It was also important to many of the participants that students learn, form and articulate good arguments for their beliefs. And this included having good arguments even when students were voicing a conservative ideology. Important as it was that students be opened to a diversity of knowledge and opinion, it was equally as important that whatever ideology they espoused or supported that they developed arguments and gave "good sound reasons for their beliefs". As Erin put it:

I don't know in other people's classes, but in my classes they are taught and do critical analysis and are taught how to, sometimes, follow their intuition when something doesn't sound right to them, why, and to understand what good argument is and what is not good argument, to give reasons for a position and that it is not just a matter of opinion, to methodologically understand arguments and be able to tell them apart.

Being Feminist in The Classroom

Teaching as either a vocal feminist, applying feminist pedagogical principles or utilizing feminist scholarship in the classroom had an impact on the participants in this study, their students or other faculty in their program area. Undoubtedly, the women in this study had reputations as being feminist professors in their program areas, a fact shared by students, other faculty in their discipline, and most probably, the university administration. It appeared that, teaching as a feminist created many challenges in the classroom. Teaching students in the

undergraduate levels seemed to be the most difficult and where the interviewees felt the most challenge to their teaching. Classes were large and did not offer an environment where sensitive debate could take place. In smaller classes, Carla explained that she would turn openly hostile commentary over for class discussion:

You defuse the challenge to you as a woman or as a feminist by turning it over to the class. You can't do that in an introductory class because a) you don't have enough students who know the material well enough and b) have the life experiences or the political sense well enough to do that.

Carla commented that in the course evaluations of the undergraduate and lower levels she could get statements that made her look like she only talked about gender when she knew she hadn't.

She continued by suggesting that:

Male students are much more confrontational. The authority and relations in the classroom are completely different, you know, women have no credibility until you demonstrate competence. Men don't have to demonstrate anything, they just walk in, they have credibility by the very fact that they are male.

Wilma reported she experienced a wide variety of responses:

Some of them find that it [feminist scholarship] is very exciting, some of them find that it is threatening, so when you incorporate that material in your courses you get a real range of responses and that is part of what makes teaching those courses challenging.

Like the saying suggests, you can't satisfy all of the people all of the time. Teaching is not exempt from this assertion. Gwen said she was not sure that other factors such as being inaccessible because she was so busy and did not have enough time for students affected her reputation any more than being a vocal feminist. However, she declared, if she was being criticized on the basis of her feminism, "she wouldn't care a whole lot anyway." For some of interviewees, students commented that their courses weren't feminist enough, while for others, feminism is all students said they heard.

Gwen, Wilma and Penny believed that students learned quickly the reputations of

professors and chose their courses accordingly. Wilma observed that there is:

At least a word of mouth and maybe amongst undergraduates, some kind of check off as to whether the profs are supportive...There is a reputation out there and students will come and sometimes will say things to me like, this is the first course that I ever had at university in which the prof acknowledged even gay or lesbian perspectives or issues or whatever.

Wilma remarked that in the first couple of weeks of classes students became aware of her feminist perspective and some students left, some students stayed. Wilma also suggested that students who were anti-feminist discounted feminist perspectives as "unacademic."

Glenda questioned whether doing feminist scholarship made a professor a better teacher. She asserted that being a feminist teacher may suggest that the professor is interested in experience, personal relations and respect in the classroom but you can "do it well or you can do it badly." When Wilma thought of the women who identified themselves as feminist she remarked that all of them have very strong reputations as teachers. But she too was not sure that being a feminist and being a good teacher were related. She maintained, that on the whole, students would evaluate a feminist professor as a good teacher, regardless of her feminist perspectives.

Several of the interviewees talked about being overworked on thesis committees because when students wanted to do feminist or gender related research there were few faculty available working within feminist perspectives to address the need. Interviewees suggested that being a feminist and using feminist scholarship attracted many students interested in gender issues. As a result the few women in the program area who were familiar with feminist issues and research methodologies were overworked. Carla remarked that although there was a limit to the number of theses she could actually supervise, she was a member of many other thesis committees, a commitment that demanded a large part of her time. She commented that with the small number

of women teaching in the program, and of those a smaller number of women doing feminist work or research, that it did "make it rather difficult" to spread herself around to the number of students who want professors working closely with feminist issues.

Patricia believed that she and another woman in her program area who identified as a feminist were generally well-liked. Both had won teaching awards from their undergraduate students.

Finally, it was the impression of nine of these women that they were attracting mostly women to their courses, whether the course was required, an elective, a special topic course or one that was required by or open to students from other disciplines. Erin felt her courses were attended by both male and female students equally. Seven of the participants taught in disciplines where women students traditionally outnumbered male students at all levels of education. Several themes emerged from the discussions on the student profile of their classes, in regards to gender. When a course held the word "woman" or "gender" in the title, those courses were almost entirely attended by women or a strong majority were women. Sometimes when the participants were teaching a certain section of a core or required course, many female students gravitated toward a section taught by one of the women faculty. Research methods courses that provided information on qualitative or alternative research methodologies often attracted more women. As Gwen put it "there is more of a shift to the women coming into my sections, the women's courses, than the men going into the women's courses." Some women commented that the split between male and female students went from being more equal in the first two years of undergraduate courses, to increasingly higher number of women in senior undergraduate courses and graduate courses they taught. Hilda, who was extremely isolated in her department, commented that male faculty in her program area aided in attracting more male

students to their classes and encouraging female students to take her course:

...they tell the students, well, she teaches the women so we can teach just men and that is the kind of state of affairs here and the students in my women's studies courses tell me that in other [courses] they will give women as one week of the syllabus, but the variant in [our area] is that we keep the course neutral, i.e., just male, and if you want to learn about the women, then take this [Hilda's] course.

Feminists as Part of the Faculty

Of the ten women interviewed, only one woman was hired to teach the "gender stuff".

The remaining nine women were hired as specialists in teaching and research in subfields of their disciplines and brought to that work feminist analysis and feminist practice. Women included feminist material from the beginning of their teaching careers or were introduced to feminism through role models in their disciplines.

Both Penny and Patricia commented that they often played the role of token feminist in their program areas. Erin mentioned that when she joined her department a few years ago, she had never taught any women's studies courses or had a reputation as a feminist. Soon she realized that students from other courses were coming to see her, asking her for information for a paper they were doing. Most often the papers would have a common theme, "that it was about women." Erin also found herself the recipient of "misogynist tales" of events taking place in other classrooms and she found herself in the role of "personal psychotherapist". Unhappy in this role, and angry with male faculty sending their students to her for information about women, she asked them to stop doing that. As with other faculty in her program area, her research did not focus exclusively on gender issues. She could think of no reason except for her gender that made the men of the department believe that she was the expert on information about women in their discipline. The flip side to these events was that Erin felt she was more important to her program area because she was "introducing new blood" through her feminism.

When asked whether it was easy to be a feminist in her program area, Wilma, who had seen over 23 years at the university, replied that it wasn't easy but that it was "a hell of a lot easier than it used to be". She commented that she felt "somewhat branded" in her reputation as a feminist and that this reputation "carries with a certain amount of baggage in people's minds that goes along with it which I don't think is actually accurate". Wilma believed she was perceived to be much more outspoken and radical than she actually was. She suggested that there seemed to be more support for feminist perspectives now and "well, maybe I just have a more cynical attitude." Glenda, another faculty member with many years experience at the university, remarked that the support of many feminists in her faculty had made it much more comfortable than it was 20 years ago. She concluded that although her faculty felt much more collegial and supportive, there were certainly some resisters.

Carla thought that some of the men in her program area, especially men older in age, just didn't know how to be around or respond to feminist women faculty. She asserted that these men tended to put all feminists together in one camp and say, 'oh, those are the feminists'. She explained that these men were not overtly hostile, but they treated the women with much suspicion and treated them differently: "they make jokes about nobody letting them say anything and how they feel uncomfortable. It is more subtle and it isn't that really awful backlash stuff but it is still there." Carla observed that she clearly felt that these men in her program area did not hold her in the same esteem that they did some of her male colleagues, although she had a high profile on campus and in her department. "There really are these very clear differences and a part of that is just the nature of gendered relationships in our society." Clearly, age played a role here. Older men, unsure of how, or reluctant to make women their peers, were making these comments. As Carla finished a story about how she and a colleague were treated during a dinner

meeting she commented that most of what she experienced was very low level kinds of stuff, what "Paula Caplan calls a ton of feathers."

Getting Hired, Staying Hired

Although Kate commented that "compared to engineering women, we have many [women in senior administrative positions], we have made many strides in hiring", many of the women interviewed relayed stories of discrimination and battles to improve hiring procedures in their program areas. Patricia commented that in the past ten years, only one woman faculty had been hired in her department. "In the last decade there was this opportunity to totally change the gender makeup of [the program area] and that opportunity was not taken". She continued by relaying a story about reaction to a movement in the department to encourage search committees to consider gender as a factor. With the help of some "supportive" men in her program area, six members wrote to the search committee saying they hoped that gender would be a consideration and that at least one person on the short list would be a woman. Patricia finished this story with, "I got this incredibly snarky note back saying, and do we have to look for a disabled Native person as well?"

Christine, hired in the late 1980s, was resentful of the hoops new applicants to the university had to go through:

There were a lot of people recruited during a very comfortable period of time. I am always shocked when I hear things like colleagues who aren't even much more senior than me, laughing and saying, I didn't even have to give a job seminar when I got hired. Now when we hire people, they have to come in and give seminars, meet the students, give all these interviews for two days, performing, you know, all this sort of stuff. And then you find out that the people who are sitting there, hearing them talk about the so called intellectual potential of different candidates, are people who never even went through the process themselves. They never even met the criteria that they are now applying. That really irks me a lot.

Criteria for hiring, promotion and tenure mean a lot to women faculty, and they often

mean something different for women than men. Not surprisingly, many of the women who had been at the university for many years had rough starts. Over twenty years ago Glenda came to the university, openly declaring herself a feminist. "It was one of the controversies when I was hired. Some people didn't like it at all, they didn't want to hire me because I was a feminist, but others did like it. It was contentious." Hilda experienced being fired at a university in the U.S. in the late 1970s after she returned from maternity leave:

Other women were fired too, there was no such thing as maternity leave. It was really the final age of discrimination, it was just at the turning point when it began to have a name for what was happening, the first feminist writings appeared and we realized that we weren't alone. At that time we were all brought up to be very good girls and even that didn't work.

Denial of tenure and promotion were great struggles for three of the women. Often their feminist brand of scholarship was used against them as it was not seen as constituting valid research in the field. Gwen, who came up for promotion (at a time within the last ten years), expressed it as: "When I came up for promotion for full professor, it was blocked, I was resisted tooth and nail with heels dug in." When asked why her promotion was blocked, she asserted:

I was a woman, it was quite simple. I don't know what other reason that they would have...there is a view amongst many people in this [program area] that if you are not doing [authors], then you are not doing serious [academic] work. That has been very, very slow to change and you still find that. That may have been part of the problem...My opinion is they despised me, they had a strong female, strong in scholarship, strong in teaching, mouthy, I would never cower to them and they just didn't want that.

Christine suggested that having a publication record that includes many or mostly feminist journals can cause problems when being reviewed for tenure or promotion.

They have a very narrow definition of what constitutes a scholarly journal and you would immediately recognize that a lot of women studies stuff tries to consciously operate in a different way, write things in an accessible rather than esoteric sort of style, have a format that might include types of arguments and analyses like poems in a journal. That then becomes seen as not being a scholarly kind of journal.

The system for promotion has been and continues to be, for some of the women interviewed, a system that has clear leanings toward judging the value of research by the value of the journal in which it is published. Alternative or feminist journals that have lower rates of rejection and allow for alternative types of research and writing are often not as respected or seen as prestigious as mainstream journals. Wilma talked about past years when there weren't journals in which to publish feminist research:

A whole slew of feminist journals didn't exist then and then people doing research on women, particularly from a feminist perspective weren't getting their stuff accepted in traditional journals. There was a real problem at that point which simply does not exist now because there are feminist journals in existence."

However, feminist journals, she continued, are not as highly regarded and do not have the high rejection rates. As a result, she suggested, "that this is the kind of evidence that might be used in decision making to argue that work isn't of high calibre or whatever."

At this university, when someone is up for promotion, faculty who have that rank or higher are allowed to vote on whether the junior faculty person gets the promotion. A recommendation is made to a senior administrator and follows through a system within the university's administration. For women doing feminist research, often the consideration is whether their work is as valued as someone else's. In most cases this comparison is made with their senior colleagues' ideas of what constitutes valuable research and most of their senior colleagues are men not involved in feminist types of research. Support for feminist research varies from program to program, discipline to discipline. Invariably though, if feminist faculty do not have support for their promotion, and inevitably, support for the type of research they do, from their department, then their promotion may be blocked.

Two of the women interviewed had not reached a position where they were eligible for

tenure. Three of the 10 women interviewed had their tenure or promotion blocked by other faculty in their program area. For all three women who had their departments vote against their promotion, all had their department's decisions overturned at a higher level in the administration of the university. For all three it was a bitter fight that left them feeling tired and alienated from their program areas. When I remarked to Gwen that it was a good thing that she had a senior administrator that took so much interest in her promotion, her retort was:

You have got Daddy looking after you, this is no way for women to succeed. I had a nice Daddy looking after me, but, thank you very much, I don't want to have to rely on Daddy, and no woman should ever have to.

When I asked Hilda why she continued to stay in such a hostile workplace she responded as a matter of fact:

It is hard at my age to get a job, there isn't much out there and the other problem too is that they are not really hiring feminists a whole lot, except as very young women, pleasant with a nice personality who they can keep down until they get tenure.

Christine, the third woman denied promotion talked about how fighting the system can drain some of their commitment and energy:

I think people are slowly ruined because of the systems, increasing lengths of tenure is another very bad example, going from five to seven years. After a little while people start recognizing, but they don't necessarily articulate it, but there are these kinds of contradictions between what the rhetoric of what the university stands for, academic freedom, as long as you do good work it doesn't matter if it is feminist, it doesn't matter as long as it can stand on its own. Part of the reason is people recognize that it is rhetoric and is not reality. My belief is that a lot of people, especially, maybe feminists, struggle with it the most. They end up feeling that they have to compromise too much if they want to stay. I don't know what the rates or figures are of people that end up leaving. I think it cools people out, so that is part of the people's resentment.

Some of the participants commented on the impact that senior administrators had on their visibility and comfort as a feminist working in their area. Of the nine program areas women originated from for this study, five had never had a woman head or coordinator. Feelings about

whether it was better to have a woman or a man in these roles varied. Some women felt their male administrators were well-meaning but uninformed as far as feminist research and pedagogy. Some of the interviewees felt if they weren't getting overt support for their efforts they too were not experiencing any administrator trying to block their feminist activities or research. Most of the participants worked under one of two female senior administrators and believed these women made a difference to their comfort level of being a feminist on campus and their ability to be visible and vocal.

For Kate, having a feminist woman in a senior administrative position made a "crucial difference" and was "incredibly supportive". Wilma, who had been with the university for over twenty years, commented on the changes in the administration over a period of a few years and the corresponding changes to the university environment that came with the change in the faces of administration.

In a fairly short time, I mean, literally a period of a very few years, it went from being perfectly acceptable at the high levels of the Administration of the university to be sexist, it went from being bad to be feminist and okay to be sexist and misogynist at the high levels of the Administration to being not at all acceptable to be the latter and to be good to be a feminist in a reasonably public way...I remember realizing that it had become way more comfortable to be a feminist identified in the university in general though that didn't mean there weren't battles still to be fought in my own [program area] but the battles within my own [program area] were not happening with the support of the people higher up. The people higher up were in fact opposed to those, arguing the opposite point of view.

Feminist faculty were conscious of both their strength and vulnerability as teachers and researchers. The next chapter will look at the how these women experienced that strength and vulnerability when they brought feminist scholarship into their classroom.

CHAPTER FIVE

CURRICULUM

This chapter connects feminist scholarship with building an inclusive curriculum that enriches the learning of both female and male students. By bringing feminist research out of the closet, feminist scholarship challenged male ownership of knowledge. The curriculum revealed itself as a restricted model of discourse, its design and creation influenced by the personal and subjective emotions and intellect of its owner, whether that person was a feminist or a conservatist. For the feminist faculty, working outside the masculinist norms had both costs and benefits.

Feminist Scholarship

All the women interviewed for this study utilized feminist scholarship in the courses they taught either as examples of new research in their field or as critique to the existing canons of their discipline. When asked to provide their personal definitions of feminist scholarship, Glenda responded, "feminist scholarship is scholarship that explores and struggles toward and in some sense is scholarship that is trying to promote and explore the meaning of equality for women."

Christine gave it a more broader appeal:

I would say that it is about the analyses of power relations, that would be the shortest thing that I could say that I would be comfortable with. It is not about women, it is not even just about gender, so called gender relations. Until we get to the point where we say gender and we automatically conjure up all the other kinds of things like race, class, sexual identity, which the term gender does not, I would say then, an analysis of power relations...however, they have to include gender because you have a lot of literature on class, relations or even racialization that doesn't look at women. I would say, analysis of power relations as they play through specifically gender issues.

For Hilda, feminist scholarship provided "alternative lives that we may have never read."

For Penny, bringing feminist scholarship into her curriculum meant "bringing women of our past

to life". She commented on the "restorative work" that has to be done to bring women who have always been working in her field, but have been absent in mainstream publications, to the forefront.

You have to unearth these people as they have gone into the marginal journals, you have to dig them out, you have to bring them into the tradition. I mean women have been there it is just they have been hidden. I think then that it is in that whole context that feminist scholarship would offer...just making women present as the voices in the texts.

Several women commented on the way feminist scholarship valued people's experiences, valued diverse viewpoints and valued different perspectives and voices. The different types of research methodologies embraced by feminist scholarship, particularly qualitative models such as ethnography, phenomenology and action research, made possible more opportunities for women scholars to pursue research that was highly relevant to them and other women. As Penny put it, "I think young women scholars tend to gravitate toward qualitative research and feminist scholarship has tended to be there." Wilma acknowledged that there was a variable concerning methodology that made scholarship feminist:

...there are some other equality issues that come into feminist scholarship which I still think are in a way fundamentally equality issues which have to do with a methodology and implications of that, so issues around who has the knowledge, the researcher or the people being researched? Which kind of methodologies would be most important for finding about that issue? It is the whole realm of methodological issues related to that which feminist researchers and scholars concern themselves.

Or as Carla explained it, "It is different methods. You don't just drag out the same old tired quantitative methods. It has something to do with reframing questions so that they are not asked the same way...there is a stronger commitment to social change." For many of the participants, feminist scholarship appeared to provide different kinds of interactions with the material and the people that were being affected by the research. By providing researchers with these unique types of interactions, feminist scholarship claimed an interest in creating future change as a

critical part of its role.

Participants expressed sentiments that there was a difference between women's scholarship and feminist scholarship. Feminist scholarship brought a sense of the political to its revelations. Kate exemplified it as:

There is a sense that the world is a place where conflict is inherent and that certain groups are privileged and there is a sense of politics, whereas you might discuss an article about pioneer women and there is no sense of politics.

Feminist scholarship also meant presenting gender as a variable, a political act in and of itself outside mainstream research. It meant presenting, along with gender, issues of class, race, and sexuality as variables. It meant looking further than what IS to what ARE the processes going on "behind that variable". It meant looking beyond personal and individual ideas or rationales about research findings. Erin said:

I think of feminist scholarship as being a scholarship that attempts to scrutinize the oppression of women, examine the causes for and the incidence of the oppression of women as a whole and there is an element that attempts to define ways of counteracting that oppression. I would make a distinction between a feminist scholarship and gender scholarship.

Christine was even more adamant about differentiating feminist and women's scholarship:

...that is why I don't like the term 'women's studies'. I really would prefer the term 'feminist studies'. I would believe that the difference would be feminist and would be driven by the questions about the way power relations work themselves through, particularly in a gendered sort of way, not separate.

Patricia, however, had difficulty distinguishing between women's scholarship and feminist scholarship and was reluctant to place feminist scholarship in its own pigeon hole:

I have trouble, I can't distinguish between what research is feminist because that is a kind of cliché in our discipline. We don't just add women and stir. But I think that it has something to do with the reframing of questions and moving through subdisciplines in a different way and it is also a commitment to a totally different way of teaching and this

kind of nonhierarchal politics.

Although participants sang the praises of feminist scholarship, they too expressed caveats and were cautious about proclaiming all feminist scholarship as good scholarship. This was exemplified by Gwen: "I treat feminist discourse, rhetoric, scholarship, positioning with a great deal of caution because I personally resist for other kinds of philosophical reasons, anything that begins to sound to me like an essentialist argument." Or as Hilda put it, "That doesn't mean that every piece of feminist scholarship I agree with sometimes. One jumps the gun and puts what one would like to it be ahead of what it is maybe, unearthing a lot of what is fact or fiction." Penny was dismayed by the inaccessibility of some types of feminist scholarship that were extremely jargon laden.

Bringing Change, Experiencing Change

For many of the interviewees, feminist scholarship was on the cutting edge of their discipline. As Hilda explained it:

I think it offers, definitely, an exciting perspective that has brought us out from the 1970s, that has really revolutionized every single field, even cold hard science, every field in the social sciences and humanities has been completely redefined at great threat to the research that preceded it.

Another way feminist scholarship was an important perspective for these women was its ability to be interdisciplinary and to cross boundaries of traditional disciplines. Feminism was always evolving and changing and many women expressed a desire to keep attuned to what those changes were. Staying current and abreast of changes in both feminist theory and the subfield of their discipline profoundly influenced what they wanted to accomplish in their teaching.

Feminist scholarship played a major role in the courses taught by the women participants, some having placed it in their curriculum from the start of their teaching careers, some coming to

it later. Being a feminist often meant struggling with finding a balance between tradition and new approaches. Penny recognized her own struggles and expressed it as: "...we can identify ourselves as feminists, and then, how does that change what we do and how we teach? I mean, I think that is sort of where you begin." Penny struggled more with trying to find ways to make her courses "gender sensitive" or "gender balanced". By using feminist scholarship she tried to "fiddle with it to make it more balanced". Two of the participants were new to feminism and feminist scholarship. Erin declared:

In fact, in [program area], up until last year no one even had a background in feminist [subject] including myself for that matter. It is only actually since I came here that I started looking at feminist scholarship and I didn't do that before because I was also at a university with a [program area] that had no one who taught it.

Erin explained that as she learned more about feminist research in her own discipline she learned how the works of well-known feminists could cross discipline boundaries. Using Margaret Mead's work as an example, she explained that she would add this new knowledge to her course reading list next year. By becoming involved in "exciting networks", by watching as feminism grew in her discipline, by taking advantage of feminist interdisciplinary work and from support within her campus, Patricia was also bringing feminism to her courses:

When I started teaching it five years ago there was maybe one reading around gender. I brought it in slowly and cautiously through lecture notes and added readings and now half of the reading list is not even [the subject area], it comes out of a women's studies tradition which says some really interesting stuff about my subject area. It is a stronger voice, much stronger voice, my feminist voice in the [program area] now than it was five years ago.

For Wilma and Gwen, who had taught for many years at the university, their years of experience with teaching, their rank and tenure, and the security that often comes with age, left them feeling indifferent to the backlash and less defensive about being feminists and placing feminist materials in their curriculum. Wilma talked about how careful she was when she first

began to inject feminist scholarship into her classroom: "I felt as if I had to bend over backwards to be sure that this was strongly academic because it would likely be subjected to scrutiny or questioned or whatever...I had to be sure I could defend this academically." Both women no longer felt they had to listen to the "bullshit" and were no longer willing to deal with the "unpleasant fallouts" around them.

The ability of students to have a strong enough voice to evoke change in the curriculum was not the same in every department. It appeared that in those programs that had either a better representation of women faculty or where women faculty were visibly and vocally feminist, students had a better chance of being heard and not suffering repercussions for speaking out in favour of inclusion.

Sometimes students used teaching evaluation forms to make their comments and wants known. This process allowed for anonymity. Silently but not invisibly, students voted with their feet and indicated they wanted something more than old research traditions by attending qualitative methods courses in great numbers. In some classrooms, there existed the problem of students silencing each other. Both Gwen and Wilma believed that although students had representation on certain committees and program area meetings, they did not "carry the day".

Wilma stated that:

By and large, students know that they are powerless and the profs have a lot of power over them and they will have in the future in terms of letters of recommendation and ability to make phone calls that could be damaging to their career. etc., and they are pretty aware of that. I am not surprised, it is incredibly unequal as far as power goes kind of system, the whole university is, so I am not surprised about that.

Gwen suggested that the time and financial pressures for students also made it difficult for them to consistently attend meetings enough to make a difference.

Separate or integrated?

A question arose about whether feminist research should be concentrated in specialized women's studies courses or integrated throughout regular courses. Good arguments were made for both strategies. Glenda spoke well of having both formats available:

I think that you should do both. I don't think that you can do one or the other and I think you need separate courses because I think that is a place where you can bring together people who are all feminist and who are all trying to explore these ideas in a consensual kind of way, at least where the premises are clear and where people are reasonably well-educated in that kind of knowledge. I think that it is important to do courses billed as courses in feminist theory or practice, but, I think it is also important to have it put in other courses so that if you are teaching a sociology of education course, it would be important that feminist sociology of education be part of what is seen as the field, so, you wouldn't want just one or the other.

Carla also liked having both models available to her in her teaching. She enjoyed bringing feminist scholarship into her courses as research that was part of the field or as theory that critiqued other various point of view. In her department students had made it clear that they wanted specialized courses dealing primarily with gender and feminism. For Carla, both formats allowed her to work "from inside and outside."

Gwen wanted to see major changes in the curriculum of her program area and wanted to see "not women's studies as such, but women's issues just integrated naturally without anybody saying anything special about it." Erin feared that by providing separate courses there was a possibility of marginalization when one course dealt solely with gender. Although her preference was to integrate feminist scholarship throughout her department's courses, she also believed that in terms of politics, having a gender course made her program area look and feel more "friendly" and "comfortable". The major drawback to the model of integration, she continued, was the possibility that other faculty would "sluff off their responsibility" and feminist scholarship would rarely get mentioned. Erin also mentioned that the curriculum

committee of her department, in an effort to find ways to make the curriculum gender balanced, surveyed undergraduate students and found "an interesting split" where the majority of male students wanted separate courses whereas women wanted integration of gender issues in all courses.

Reviewing the Curriculum

Program and course curriculum reviews appeared to be a kind of hit and miss endeavour. Many women discussed external and internal program reviews that included such activities as examination of programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, faculty, and research projects. When I asked if these reviews made recommendations regarding curriculum, Carla responded "it was not likely to". The external review that Carla spoke of involved looking at the requirements and prerequisites of program offerings, comprehensive exams, requirements for degrees, etc. When asked whether an external review would look closely at curriculum, examine the differences and commonalities between sections, check whether faculty made references to gender, race, class, etc., her answer was, "I doubt it, but it is always possible." She did mention, however, that external reviewers were given copies of all course evaluations, course syllabi and would know how students were evaluating courses from the evaluations.

Curriculum review committees seemed to be the responsibility of individual program areas. Some departments appeared to have committees that met formally while others were more "ad hoc" or nonexistent. Clearly being overworked by teaching and research precluded many faculty from having even the space in their schedules to discuss curriculum issues. As Gwen put it:

There has been...very, very, little change over the last 17 or 18 years. Surprisingly enough, there has never been a major overhaul of the curriculum. It has been bits and pieces here and there or a course suggested here and there.

Christine painted this picture after being asked about whether her department had a curriculum review committee: "No. People can go off and do whatever they want, pretty well....we don't have any way that we assess each other's curriculum."

Discussions concerning diversity and inclusion in the curriculum amongst program faculty were rare, even in program areas where there was a high feminist profile both in numbers and in voice, within the faculty. Coordination between professors regarding curriculum was not a common occurrence. Patricia, who team taught an introductory course in her department and had the responsibility of teaching the feminist portion of the course commented that "the course has been very ad hoc. It hasn't been planned...The instructors have just been told: choose a book and organize your part around a book. And there has been no planning, no planning." Carla stated that discussions took place around ensuring that the basics of her discipline were covered in introductory courses and attempts were made to pass on course outlines:

I think that there is a lot of resistance, probably in most [program areas], to actually talking about the real content of what you do, so, I may talk to my colleagues who teach the same course, pass on my course outline. When I am not teaching it next year, someone else is, get the course outline of the person who is teaching it the year before I start teaching it again. Certainly we do that, talk about the courses and what books did you use, what kind of material did you cover, things like that, but that is pretty informal. We certainly have never done it in a formal way that says that it is absolutely essential to cover this in all curriculum, we haven't done that. I think that there is much more of a disciplinary sense, you have to cover these kinds of theories and feminism isn't one of the so called founding theories. The recognition that it has to be included too, along side the other mainstream theories, is something that is taking place slowly.

Women talked about most changes taking place "unofficially". Officially, it emerged, any change in the curriculum that was formal, that occurred at the level of the calendar description, or a new course proposal, had to be sent to the program's curriculum committee, who then had to make recommendations and a proposal to the program area as a whole. But, as Wilma put it, "Our [program area] has to vote on anything that happens but most of what happens with regard

to curriculum is unexamined by them or by anybody, that is nobody." This was exemplified by Glenda who remarked, "I mean, nobody goes in and checks the curriculum once it is approved on the books." After leaving the program level, women indicated that any official changes to curriculum would eventually land in the Senate Curriculum Committee and later be brought to the floor of the Senate. Gwen expressed her disillusionment with such a long drawn out process:

So to do anything official with the curriculum, it is a very long, very wearing process and at every step of the way, because of the demographics of the university, you may have many, many, many, more male professors who get to vote on the course description than you do female professors. Some of these male professors are very open to different forms of scholarship, some of the female professors will resist it to the death. Still, even allowing for that kind of individual variance you have a great majority of male opinion at every step of the way and that is the history of this institution. We are far from making a critical mass that could affect such a fundamental process at each step of the way. We are far, far from it. It is like pulling teeth to get them (women) to sit on some of those major committees because they are overworked. That is the official story, institutionally.

This sentiment was echoed by Christine who tried, unsuccessfully, to include the word 'feminist' in the title of her graduate course:

To tell you the truth, the thing I hate about academia, and what makes it very conservative, is doing unnecessary busy work and I was so pissed off at the time, I thought, I'm not going to get into that track, you know, having more meetings to write more documents. I'm just going to teach special topics.

Even after making changes to curriculum through the official process, it did not mean that other faculty teaching sections of the same course would have to adhere to the new changes. One program area seemed to have a good handle on consultation and coordination of readings for reading lists and bringing in gender issues into the curriculum. Ultimately, however, whether professors actually taught it in their classrooms was another question. In the two program areas where women numbered only a small percentage of the faculty, both of these women carried the load, as one woman put it, "the token feminist", for providing the feminist scholarship in the sections or courses they taught in their field. Wilma maintained she was the only person in her

program area who had ever offered a graduate level course dealing with gender or women. She was quick to say that didn't mean that gender issues weren't being discussed in other graduate courses but that she was the only person in over twenty years who had ever taught a course where the main focus was on gender.

It appeared that most changes to curriculum, in effect, injecting feminist scholarship into courses that did not fall under the rubric of "women's studies", were arranged by "unofficial" means. Women admitted to a variety of means to bring new scholarship into the curriculum. They did not revel in having to use alternate or less formal ways to bring feminism and feminist scholarship into their classrooms but were aware that, for some of the participants in more conservative departments, it was better than living by restrictive and inhibitive strict rules. Gwen put it into succinct terms:

Try to make it official and the experience that I have had in this [program area] suggests that anything with the word 'feminism' in it, feminist in it, or anything that is left wing will be scrutinized with anything from virulent opposition to vigilance. Whereas things that make no overt claim to having anything to do with the baggage is seen as being nonpolitical. So, vested interests work systematically on curriculum exactly the way they do with everything else.

From discussions with the women in this study, it appeared that once a faculty member had been assigned to teach a course, the curriculum became the affair of that faculty member and their own area of expertise. Christine explained it this way:

We are never told that we have to follow a specific curriculum. All we get told is that our teaching mode is so many credits and you have an opportunity to say, why I have a strong preference for teaching these courses and once you get assigned those courses, they don't really interfere in any specific way in what you do in those courses. You develop all the topics that you want to cover, you cover them how you want to. The only thing limitation is the course is scheduled to meet at a certain time and a certain room and the title.

Value of Feminist Scholarship

Knowledge has been mainly defined in male terms. Even though women represent the majority of students in Canadian colleges and universities, they still learn, for the most part, from a curriculum that hails the works of white Anglo-European men and teaches them to defer to white Western male intellect and scholarship as authority in their discipline. The women participants in this study talked about difficulties centering research and teaching around feminist scholarship. Penny discussed how women have been admitted to academia, that women have been encouraged to enter nontraditional disciplines, like sciences, but at the same time there has been "this incredible reassertion of very old traditional values in certain kinds of knowledge". She lamented that women's experiences had not been sufficiently brought into many of the well-established disciplines. She was also of the opinion that it was difficult to build your academic career with feminist scholarship. She commented:

I think as an academic, as a professional you can't just do feminist scholarship, I don't think that I could build my career only on feminist scholarship. It is like you are constantly in tension between all of this stuff, the standard stuff that you have to master, all the men's stuff as well as this.

Penny continued by relaying a story about moving to the U.S. within the past decade to assume a teaching position in an American university. An official from the university she was going to informed her that anything that was feminist on her CV, which she had to provide to apply for residency in the U.S., would be pulled out. For Penny it was confirmation that "you can't put all your eggs in one basket and you can't build your total reputation on feminist scholarship."

Penny was not the only interviewee to voice such an opinion. When Hilda was asked about how feminist scholarship was treated in her discipline she replied, "it is accepted, but it is not the most popular way to do your career still." Christine opined that, in her discipline,

"people still feel it is questionable in terms of its scholarship." Gwen agreed that feminist writings were still seen as "different" and not part of the hierarchy of knowledge in her program area, or "to a considerable degree, true in this profession." Patricia mentioned that she was recently at a conference where she bumped into a graduate student of hers who had finished his PhD last year on AIDS activism in Vancouver. He commented to her that "he was getting the word at this conference that he had better put this stuff around sexuality far behind him and do some very mainstream stuff if he wanted to get a job." Patricia continued by saying that in her program area, along with departments in two other universities in Canada, "you could make your name as a feminist...but, I would have a very strong feeling that most of my discipline is much more conservative than this place."

Kate talked about her struggles with getting her students to value feminist scholarship. She commented that when discussing feminist scholarship in her classroom, "students still don't value it as much. I try to get them to see that we are all coming from a particular perspective. If they think something is feminist or anti-racist, that's seen as biased and not scientific and less valuable."

Carla and Wilma pointed to changes in their disciplines. Carla, who worked in a program where there were several openly feminist women faculty members, stated that changes can be seen in the textbooks where material on gender is no longer relegated to sections on the family but now in sections that discuss politics, work, poverty. She noted that, "all over the place you will have feminist contributions in the text. Some of them will be more feminist oriented than others, for sure, but, it is always there." Wilma explained that her professional association had an "institute on feminist stuff" the day before their annual conference where:

It is very clear if you have gone to that over the years, that the respect for that and acknowledgement of the importance of that section and its work and the people associated with it has gone up significantly over the years.

Learning from Feminist Scholarship

Several words or phrases came up numerous times when interviewees were expressing what they believed students learned from feminist scholarship. Words and phrases such as "political", "contextual", "understanding injustices", "how the world is structured", "questioning", and "thinking critically" were often found in the interviewees' responses. Most importantly, feminist scholarship seemed to ask students to question literature and relate the literature they were reading to their lives in ways that conventional research may not. Gwen exemplified by this by stating that:

Feminism helps me, amongst other things, to place what we write and what we read in the context of our lives, in social and political issues, to see how information reinforces stereotypes, prejudices, exclusion and marginalization...I would deploy all those things together for all sort of reasons and hope that what my students are seeing is that a poem isn't something that is irrelevant, that it doesn't affect nobody, but it is something that in its own small way is contributing to this or that.

Christine believed her students were learning not just content and facts but a different way of looking at things, and in addition, "maybe even a different way of being able to be in a community, like a role model."

Erin suggested her students were learning to question how the world was structured and how their beliefs were structured by political and social forces. Carla proposed that feminist scholarship gave her students "a more plausible interpretation of the way the word actually works." By giving her students the tools to analyze the world in clearer ways in terms of the events that confronted them personally, women did not have to internalize as personal failures the kinds of defeats and problems they experience as women.

Kate explained, that by learning inequality as structured and institutionalized, her students received a framework from feminist scholarship "for analyzing their experience and seeing things in a different way." By quashing "biology is destiny" arguments or showing students that behaviour is "just not ingrained", Kate felt she was able to give her students some hope for change. It was that inspiration to do something, to work for positive change, that Kate believed some feminist scholarship offered her students.

It was the opening the minds and lives of women students that excited some of the interviewees and was seen as a direct result of bringing in scholarship that addressed the experiences of women. Several of the interviewees spoke about the impact of feminist scholarship on the lives of women students. Penny talked about how, when she teaches only women students:

It does things to their self-esteem, they like things that are relevant in their learning, they do have some space and place in history, in education. I think for many women students, it is very positive, I mean, they tell me that, I hear that.

As a professor who attempted to demystify knowledge for students, Penny believed that men sometimes teach in ways that are exclusive and tend to mystify instead of demystify. She quoted students who come to her who are confused about what their male professors were teaching them, and in an attempt to make them understand, Penny said she ended up "sort of counter teaching." Later students told her that was the first time they had heard something said or explained that way. Erin also relayed the experience of students coming up to her and telling her that they had "never heard that stuff before". Gwen described how wonderful it felt to make a difference and to open doors for her women students.

Carla mentioned the benefits of learning from feminist scholarship for her male students. She believed that if feminist scholarship speaks to gender then it not speaking only to women,

but to men also. She asserted:

We are talking about gender and the construction of gender and I think men have a lot to learn. Women have a lot to learn too about the construction of masculinity, about what it is that we are doing in our societies, what masculinity comes to view, how that has quite negative impacts on men and at the same time, that it empowers and privileges it also has negative impacts as well. So I think that there is a lot for men to learn which doesn't mean that they aren't going to have to give up things but they also potentially will have a lot of things that they can gain as well.

Feminist scholarship also made it clear to students that the formation of knowledge is not neutral. Students learned from feminist scholarship about the political basis of scholarship, that scholarship is not neutral. Glenda pointed to how scholars make choices about what to focus on, how to focus on it, how to frame questions, and how knowledge is constructed and is all political. She believed students learned from feminist scholarship that there is no universal set of assumptions from which you start to look at anything, just "new ways of understanding." Patricia believed students learned a "certain politics" and how to think critically about the world. Wilma echoed the belief that students were learning to "question a lot of the stuff they are taught as the only or sole or single way in other courses" and were becoming aware of the omissions that were true for much of the traditions of her discipline. Feminist scholarship gave students licence to question, to take a critical stance and question what was being taught.

Resistance to Curriculum Change

Many reasons were cited for faculty not familiarizing themselves with feminism, feminist scholarship or providing a gender balanced curriculum. Most interviewees speculated that the uncertain future of postsecondary education and fear of what changes the future might bring were real incentives for people to cling to the status quo. As Gwen put it, "with change comes a threat to losing our identity." Faculty, working under the strain of a lack of resources, lack of appreciation and an uncertain future, were clinging to their ways of conducting research and

teaching. Gwen exemplified the situation by saying this:

...you are dealing with sincere beliefs and commitment here and not dealing with cynical attitudes and it is much harder to work with people when they really genuinely believe something and are putting their time on the line. You can circle the wagons ever more tightly in this kind of situation or you can embrace change and say, alright, this is an opportunity, we will change ourselves rather than have somebody else do it for us, and before somebody else gets a chance to do it to us.

Now I'm not a psychologist or a sociologists but my impression is, from talking to people, that the percentage of any human population who welcomes, embraces, and work well with change is minute in comparison with the proportion that circles the wagons.

So extrapolate from there and you are going to end up with a [program area] with a few people who are anxious to change and the majority who want and are anxious to circle the wagons ever more tightly. And when they are circling those wagons around a core of things that their own personal identity is deeply invested, about which they have what I'd almost describe as a missionary zeal, they really, genuinely, passionately, believe that it is important that they do what they do, if they don't do it nobody else will, if it isn't done chaos will occur--what are you going to do? It is awfully hard to move these people. If they are the majority, you cannot, in an institution.

Penny also felt resistance to change in her program area. She commented that there were a variety of scholarships produced by such minorities as lesbians, black Americans, and Native Americans. All of these were marginal movements within her discipline. She opined that "the mainstream would really not be bothered, maybe if we can form alliances we may overturn the canons but there is incredible pressure to not change." Penny too believed that people do not want change, or to change, and that resistance originated in strong desire and hope from these people that the others would simply go away and stop bothering them and disturbing their comfort:

I think that is why the backlash is always there, just beneath the surface because they don't really want to be bothered. 'We are all quite right, we have got our lives and ways of operating together and don't really want to be bothered'.

Gwen expressed similar thoughts in her interview. She referred to the lack of interest displayed by some other faculty in her department as "systemic" and she too revealed that often

people in her program area did not want to know about new policies, read long documents, for example, on sexual harassment, or read reports from which they could become informed on current issues facing the university. She described her program area as "a very conservative [program], it is a [program] that doesn't like change." Erin discussed the fact that there were faculty in her department who were of a "more conservative mind set" and these people either wanted to stay uninvolved in the process or were confused as to what the problems were:

They don't know square one where to start and don't really have...I mean, they are far more conservative in the sense that they are far more not willing to venture from their little projects and how things have gone in the past.

Christine talked about how times have changed and how it was a very different time now compared to a "very secure period of time" during which many people were hired. Seeing a big difference between the world view and style of people who came during this period, she suggested that some professors were now "marginally incompetent" which made them cling to the security they have now.

Wilma observed in her program area a mind-set or attitude to remain nonpolitical, a belief she suggested carried over into teaching where there was a strong desire for many other faculty to keep any element of a political perspective, which discussions of gender and feminism provide, out of the classroom. This almost visceral response to anything 'political' was visibly displayed in other aspects of the university. When I suggested that the act of teaching itself can be political, she responded this way:

They [other faculty in her program] would argue that it is not, I mean there are certainly as you are I am sure aware, many people who believe that the status quo point of view is completely apolitical, unpolitical, totally objective, not subjective at all and therefore they resist vehemently any change to the status quo because they consider any change to be political. Some people have argued vehemently against anything that they consider to be what they would call politically correct, so they were opposed to the inclusion in evaluation of teaching of items dealing with whether the instructor treats students with

equal respect regardless of their race or cultural background or whether they treat the students with equal respect regardless of gender and they have refused to use those items in their teaching evaluations.

Christine suggested that some of the changes facing universities were legitimate in arousing fear for those people involved in constructing knowledge that was alternative or outside the mainstream, such as feminist scholarship. She asserted that the future image of the institution would be one borrowed from the corporate model where the focus would be on making education more relevant to the work force and more technical. Christine expressed concern that we were moving into a time where there would not be much tolerance for criticism, but instead a backlash against any movement or progression left of centre. "That is not a climate under which feminists are going to do very well", she concluded.

It was suggested by some of the participants that resistance to feminist scholarship also appeared to stem from a belief by faculty, especially male professors, that they had to be experts in all they taught and there were great risks in teaching outside their research or particular theories that were extremely familiar with. Glenda stated that there were men in her department who were very excited and interested in feminist scholarship but at the same time a lack of confidence dealing with feminist theory and feminist scholarship led some to be fearful of teaching it: "There is a lot of resistance, a lot of sense that they as male professors would never, somehow, be experts in that and would be at risk in teaching it in some ways, which I think is a legitimate concern." Christine believed faculty had identified areas of expertise and they were not "open to surveillance." Erin, who maintained that people were very confused as why there is a chilly climate on the university campus, asserted that people were also confused as to how they could improve their course to be more inclusive "without becoming experts in the field."

Christine also believed that faculty had a large investment in seeing themselves as expert

in a particular field. She suggested that faculty mainly interact with students who put faculty in the category of being the expert. She labelled this relationship as an "occupational hazard" where "instead of seeing it as a structural relationship, they mistake it as a personal quality. This can end up making them resistant to the idea [of change]." This threat to one's existence as expert can also come when a student with a different perspective comes into the classroom and challenges the scope of knowledge, and therefore, the competency of the professor. I know this event only too well as I often was the student who said "what about the women?" Depending on the professor, one of the responses would be to regain control over the class, and essentially me. Not having the language to discuss feminism and not being comfortable and familiar with feminist scholarship diminished their role as expert. As a result, some professors felt threatened when discussing feminist theory or scholarship as they were not 'experts' in the current research.

Hilda did not buy into the rationale that one needed to be an expert in all areas to be able to teach them. As a Jewish woman she replied that although she did not support certain Christian philosophies she could dramatize them for her students, just as she would dramatize Marxism and she was not a Marxist. She was emphatic in her belief that:

You should be able to do that because that's your job. You don't leave it to the 'ladies'. I think it's an absolute obligation to dramatize the pedagogical, be able to establish a bibliography for the students. It's your field, it's your field. You're absolutely responsible to it, as it is, not as you would wish it to remain.

Christine also judged a number of systems in academia that contributed to an adversarial model where professors worked competitively, where they were vulnerable to "being trashed" about their work. As a consequence, people became reluctant to be open minded about constructive criticism. If being an expert in the field was so important and being open to criticism was so threatening, people were reticent to share ideas or try new things.

For many of the interviewees, the impetus to welcome feminist scholarship into the classroom came from passionate feelings and the personal relevancy of issues found in feminist scholarship. They felt that, for many men, and for some women faculty, resistance to feminist scholarship came from an inability to find anything that was relevant to them personally or professionally. Penny put it eloquently by noting that there is "a certain blindness with privilege." Erin talked about how there is not a great understanding of how gender interacts with her discipline and as a result, often times faculty and students do not understand the linkages or the relevancy of a gender component. When asked what had been the impetus to bring feminist scholarship to her classroom, Hilda responded, "because you think it and live it." Carla talked about feeling the passion and had long felt herself to be a feminist. As a woman she also felt the injustices which also fed her passion to focus on feminism. She commented, "I just felt the injustice. I was motivated and if you haven't felt the injustice, I don't think you are motivated." When I asked Glenda why men may not see issues important to women as their issues also, she responded:

I think that it is still seen as by some people as threatening and marginal, there is no question about that and you would do it if you were a woman because then you have that particular concern to understand. That you're gendered as a male is not as easy to understand as you are gendered as a female because masculinity has been taken to be the norm and therefore, not to exist, just like whiteness is the norm and therefore we don't have to think about ethnicity or culture. It is seen as being a problem for the others generally and that's what's going on.

Resistance to feminist scholarship also stemmed from a general resistance to feminism and feminist theory. Kate mentioned the fact that one man in her program area had suggested that feminism was a fad. Christine felt very simply that she worked in a "very anti-feminist climate." Patricia expressed surprise at the resistance or "just the lack of understanding of what the basic concepts of feminism are." Wilma stated that an "effectively anti-feminist kind of

point of view" had been expressed in her department during one particular discussion on nonbiological contributions to gender. She suggested that even the women in her program area who would identify themselves as feminists would be more "quietly supportive than speak up and use that word. That is partly because they have observed the negative kind of consequences."

Students also offered their own brand of resistance which they revealed in class discussions or on teaching evaluation forms. Glenda referred to times where there had been incidents in her program area where male undergraduate students had ended up having to take compulsory courses with feminist professors and struggles ensued. Carla believed the more senior the student, the more open they would be to learning feminism. "But, at the lower levels," she continued, "there is no question that I am sure many of the men in my class and some of them have even told my TA they just bristle as 'women again, women again'." But Carla mentioned that she witnessed hostility and resistance from female students as well. Hilda asserted that basically there was this perception by male students in her department that "if there's more than a week [of lectures on women from the reading list], it's too much." Patricia commented that in the past she had received evaluations from particular men in one course who had alleged that she had discriminated against them and "one or two thought I was biased." Kate remembered having a group of men in one of her classes that were "quite disruptive" as they were quite resistant to the issues she was raising and they had "a poisoning effect" on the classroom atmosphere. Kate stated that she usually got a handful of quite resistant students that preoccupied her, usually male, but she did have women disagreeing with such things as affirmative action. She commented that she found it emotionally demanding when challenging student's basic assumptions, particularly about feminism. Erin echoed this experience of students

retreating to an "inner realm of privacy" where no one can convince or persuade them to look at the world in a different way. Erin also talked about how the classroom dynamics had changed over the years, and although students were not agreeing to be spoon fed like she was in school, they were experimenting with power relations which resulted in "far less respect for instructors".

As professors often specialize in one area or subfield of their discipline, it was remarked that there wasn't the time to pursue curriculum outside the areas that were their specialities. Kate mentioned that it "was an investment of time" to pursue and discover feminist research, that everybody has to come together to restructure a program because no one individual had enough hours in the day. Erin agreed. She lamented that faculty do not have the time to "go off on a tangent and change their course syllabus" because people just don't have the time to review new scholarship. Wilma stated the simple fact that teaching is secondary to research. She commented that good teachers do make teaching a priority but a "lesser priority." She informed me that in questions of merit, poor teaching evaluations may result in approval for merit pay being denied. Carla also mentioned that she was unaware of any financial incentives to conduct inclusive curriculum projects.

Glenda offered an interesting response to the issue of not having enough time. She asserted that feminist scholarship isn't something that is running parallel or outside the discipline but is part of the field. When she used the term "responsibility" she enjoined in that the responsibility to incorporate feminist approaches that were current in one's field. She replied:

You can't teach a Shakespeare course [responsibly] without teaching feminist interpretations and understanding, so, it is not over here, it is not something that is not part of the canons. It is an integral part of scholarship in whatever field it is that you do.

Wilma wasn't sure that she was experiencing a great increase in acceptance to feminism but the resistance was changing and lessening in its overt and public form. Overt and openly

hostile resistance to feminism appeared to have been channelled into more subtle forms of backlash and opposition. Kate, who worked in a program area with other visible feminists, commented that in her department it was not acceptable to challenge her because she engaged in feminist research. She found relations in her program area, "for the most part, quite respectful and collegial." Christine stated that although there were individuals in her program area who resented feminism, her discipline was very accepting of feminism and feminist research. Glenda, who had been at the university for over twenty years, had this to say:

They [resisters] have a presence, they have a presence. I think that they realize that they don't have the kind of unquestioned power that they used to have, so, sometimes that makes them angry and a little sort of behind the scenes, and at the same time it is good because they do realize that they somehow, that an anti-feminist voice is not allowed in public spaces anymore. It has to be cloaked. Sometimes it is irritating because you are not clear what you are fighting with anymore, but, sometimes that is often much better because we don't get public anti-feminist sentiment.

Finally, Penny saw resistance not only to be external but sometimes internal to the self. She asserted that running against external resistance could be difficult because "we have some internal resistances that we have to deal with that and feeling and owning our own and just asserting ourselves and intellectually trusting ourselves, intellectually trusting our own perceptions, trusting our own experiences." Whether a person was a graduate student or faculty, there were risks in speaking out as a feminist and one could reduce those risks by seeking out alliances.

Academic Freedom

When discussions of academic freedom arose in my interviews I was met with responses that included terms and phrases such as "professional autonomy", "collegiality" and "competency." These seemed to be the main ingredients of academic freedom. Glenda clearly believed in the concept of professional autonomy. She believed faculty were hired under the

assumption they were competent in their field and the university would rely "on their judgements in terms of what that field looks like."

Glenda posited that through collegiality, faculty discover and share their research and collegiality is very important "because the whole system of professional autonomy and judgement depends on some sense of collegiality." Glenda believed academic freedom should be balanced with responsibility, the responsibilities of both research and teaching as a university professor:

It is part of why professional autonomy and collegiality is the basis of the governance at a university, because we assume that people do know their fields, do keep up with them and do incorporate them into their teachings as well as into their scholarship.

She knew that there had to be checks and balances in place to ensure this responsibility was fulfilled but she was careful to say that the system should not "breed a certain distrust on faculty members on the part of administrators. That would be totally dysfunctional."

Wilma also echoed the point that if she proposed to teach a course it would be assumed that she was competent to teach it, she would have the right to choose the text for it, prepare a course outline, and choose what to say in class. That was the benefit of academic freedom. However, she criticized others in her department who used academic freedom as an excuse to say whatever they wanted in meetings or in the classroom. Intense arguments about wordage used on evaluation forms about treating students with respect and dignity were met with allegations of "political correctness". She concluded, "they really view it as their right to say whatever they wish to say, in whatever way they wish to say it and that it is okay." Gwen made it clear that there were no ways to critique someone's curriculum. "You can critique whether the professor is any good," she posited, "whether he or she is clear, on time, helpful, interesting, informative, but the substance of the curriculum itself is not up for scrutiny."

Penny confessed she had not paid much attention to the academic freedom debates. She did say that academic freedom meant to her "that you can teach whatever you want to teach" and that academic freedom was used as a response when people were asked to look at things differently. Hilda did not believe academic freedom was good for the university and that once people got tenure there was no room for "correcting." Although Patricia strongly pushed her colleagues on hiring and appointments she stated that in terms of teaching, she had not pushed her colleagues to look at inclusive curriculum issues.

Christine had been unsuccessful in her attempts to build coordination between the different levels in her program area. She believed she was stifled by academic freedom:

This thing, academic freedom, comes from...it is very problematic because when I first came here I basically wanted to argue for coordination between different levels of the program, for example. If we were going to have an introductory course we would follow that by the next stage, then the third year, and the fourth year, that it would be really important to have some kind of coordination, an agreement that everybody has taken the introductory course, there would be certain things that we can assume that they are familiar with. But we couldn't even get that started. People are very protective about what they have identified and I think it is because they have identified it as their expertise and it is not open to surveillance.

Interestingly enough, academic freedom was also a benefit to these women. Without it, many said, they would not have been able to introduce feminism and scholarship into their courses and classrooms. Wilma pointed out that the pay off for her was that although other professors got to do what they wish, she too got to do what she wanted, when, in the past, she hadn't always got to do that. If academic freedom meant the classroom was a territory ruled by the professors, then feminist faculty had used that opening to bring feminism in the academy.

Personal and Professional Costs

Although women had seen and could point to changes in their institution, often they made reference to the conservative element which thrived on their campus. In relaying their

experiences or processes used in their program areas or the university they often wondered whether they were making any changes in an institution that was extremely "hierarchical and undemocratic." Penny talked about how she could hardly say the 'F' word (feminist) when she first came to the university and still felt that the institution was strongly conservative and was getting more conservative.

For many of the women I interviewed there had been or currently were emotional costs which added great stress to their personal and professional lives. Penny, who cried during parts of her interview, spent much time trying to ensure her courses were gender balanced and were dealing with social inequities because she knew her students would not get this type of education in many of their other courses. She confessed to allowing "some of it [fights] slide by" because she was tired and wanted to make sure that she chose her battles where she could make a difference. She sometimes wondered if she was making any real change. She commented that one of the reasons change may be difficult is because the institution "does something to us". She exemplified this with the following:

There is another tension of identifying yourself as being feminist and trying to operate in an institution, because, as a younger academic you feel that you want to make a difference, you want to do things differently. You make a change and yet you have to live within a system. I don't even know the language to describe what the experience is and the pressure of scholarship. As a young academic you are caught in the tenure and promotion process. How you survive that, some just say you have to go along until you get tenure and then you do what you really want. But by that time you are so caught up in the system that, what you do, you know, it is that tension between any of us who work in institutions--how do you bring your ideals into action? how do you live without selling your soul?

Penny also believed that a professor could not devote all of his or her energy to feminist scholarship as the cost would be diminished reputation and credibility. She asserted that only a few people have been able to build their career in feminist research. She talked about how she

perches herself between paradigms of research in her discipline, one of those being feminist scholarship. As a result, she termed herself "bilingual", unable to speak in one voice [feminist], having to live in two worlds, the marginal and the mainstream. For her, it was a "peculiar existence".

Christine was also blunt in her feelings that people were ruined by the university's systems. She cited, as an example, the change of eligibility for tenure from five to seven years. Like Penny, Christine believed many young or new academics, particularly feminists, come to the institution highly energized and productive and soon realize that they have to make many compromises if they want to stay:

After a little while people start recognizing, but they don't necessarily articulate it, but there are these kinds of contradictions between the rhetoric of what university stands for, academic freedom, as long as you do good work, it doesn't matter whether it is feminist, it doesn't matter as long as it can stand on its own, part of the reason is recognizing that is the rhetoric and it is not reality.

For Christine, one of the negatives was the tenure and promotion process and how it did not acknowledge the contributions and interdisciplinary aspects of feminist scholarship. For her, a severe emotional cost had been her initial denial of tenure and promotion. She believed that people still questioned the quality and value of feminist scholarship. She attributed her struggle with tenure to a view that her research had not been published in mainstream or international journals.

Carla discussed the emotional costs and stress of being a vocal and visible feminist on campus. She told me that the stresses came not only from hostile and negative student reactions in the classroom but in various ways in her relations in the university. She pondered the emotional costs, as a high profile feminist on campus, of being a target for people who were opposed to feminism. She was distressed that no one was making an attempt to sanction these

people: "they just get away with it, by saying what ever they want, the most outrageous things, and people stand there and say nothing."

Staying Alive

Although my interviews were tinted with many anecdotes and stories of struggles and discrimination, all the interviews ended with women confirming their commitment to feminism in the academy and stating the benefits of being a feminist and using feminist scholarship in their classrooms. Gwen talked about how feminist scholarship had kept her "alive" with all the new information, new questions and new research projects. She appreciated how feminism had allowed her to become more interdisciplinary and move out of the "strait jacket of very conventional [subject] teaching". She remarked that feminism had "revolutionized my thinking, my teaching", and she found putting on a course, "exciting, interesting and stimulating". For Gwen, the benefits reached both the classroom and her research.

Kate looked forward to those moments in her classroom when just one student had looked at something in a different way, if she could "change one person's mind". She hoped that by offering a different world view and providing them with a different theoretical framework, that some of her students would find something that could be meaningful in their lives. It was those moments when she saw students reconsider an issue or she read about their transformation in their written work that made it worthwhile. In addition, an active feminist scholar herself, she satisfied that part of herself that needed to be political "when you are trying hard to survive in academia". By being involved in feminist research she placed herself out in the community and had built "some community action" into her research.

Carla knew no other way to belong in academia. Regardless of the emotional stresses, being a feminist in her classroom meant that she was not pretending that knowledge was neutral.

"I could never teach that way" she said. "At least this way I am trying to expose students to different ways of thinking and if they reject it, they reject it, but at least some of them won't, some of them will go on to learn about these kinds of issues." She enjoyed participating in the "feminist network" on campus and commented on how it had grown since she arrived at the university. She told me of an association of academic women which she described as having an "outspoken feminist side." The interdisciplinary aspect of feminism allowed her to meet and share both personal and professional knowledge with women outside her discipline. She commented that "the feminist network is wonderful. It is a real source of support and interests. It is very interesting. I get to meet and know wonderful women that I wouldn't otherwise outside the [program area]."

Patricia enjoyed working in her program area because she believed that in the other "98% of [subject] departments in North America" she would be miserable as a feminist because she would have little or no support. She enjoyed the liveliness of feminist scholarship and was intellectually stimulated by it. She pointed to a collegiality and a level of emotional support that she received from working with feminist graduate students and other feminist scholars throughout the campus. She too believed the collegiality from "a wonderful network of feminist scholars" was a great plus to working as a feminist at the university.

Glenda also received much satisfaction and enjoyment from some of the students she had worked with. She asserted that feminist scholarship provided "a kind of collegiality" and put faculty, such as herself, on the cutting edge of many disciplines and intellectual approaches. By staying current, it kept her revived, so she "felt very enriched by both the feminist movement and by the kind of scholarship and collegiality that feminism has brought to my life as a teacher and as an academic."

Christine enjoyed the interdisciplinary flavour of feminist scholarship and therefore enjoyed having feminist colleagues within her department and throughout the university. She was attracted to and satisfied by the cutting edge nature of feminism, enjoyed being able to make what she described as a "modest contribution to a body of literature", and replied she wouldn't do her subject area without feminism. Christine could not separate the personal from the professional. The benefits for her were very strong because she had a total commitment to feminism: "I work in a feminist style, I try to get more collaborative work, I am co-teaching a course that is more experimental, I can only do what I am doing, I couldn't do it any other way."

Wilma echoed the sentiments of many of the other women:

What makes it easy is being part of a wonderful community of feminist scholars. I feel as if the kinds of people that I most respect myself, and this isn't the clone thing, this is having to do with what kind of human beings they are and smart and a whole bunch of things...it is really wonderful to be part of that community, to be acknowledged as part of that community...it is wonderful, in many ways including intellectually stimulating, including warm, including just a whole gamut of stuff.

Hilda talked about the benefits being "infinite" and that there were infinite perspectives for research. She conceded that engaging in feminist research may not get one a job but she believed that "you have to do feminist writing, you can't ignore it."

For Penny, the benefit was aligning herself with people who were doing similar work. She strongly believed that the "marginal can see and can hear" and she felt the satisfaction of working closely with people who were in similar struggles.

Strategies

Even though the teaching evaluation form currently being used in these program areas was not designed to allow students to evaluate curriculum, Gwen saw this form as an excellent tool for students to have input about curriculum. By laying claim to an extremely critical part of

their learning, student evaluations could urge or pressure professors to reexamine their curriculum to make it gender balanced or more inclusive. Carla also believed that teaching evaluation forms could look at curriculum and that such things as merit pay could be closely linked to whether a teacher was bringing issues of gender, class, racism, etc., into the classroom. She did not wish to see those who did not teach from an inclusive curriculum punished but instead, a reward system that acknowledged people "for that kind of change."

Ordinarily faculty did not receive release time to develop courses. However, Glenda pointed to a women's studies centre, one of the interdisciplinary centres on campus, as an avenue for release time from teaching to pursue feminist scholarship. She commented that feminists were one of the few groups that had a centre on campus. "It is a building, it is a network", she told me, and provided many things to bring people together and provided release time, especially for junior scholars "who are trying to get themselves established."

Penny, who knew there was much restorative work to do to bring women's research and work to the forefront, gave her students assignments where they could do such things as interview local women or dig for information in archives and gain some historical perspectives of the field, as far as women's involvement. Penny concluded that such exercises were good learning experiences for her students and others benefitted from this unearthing of new knowledge and history. Some of her students' findings had been published and had gained recognition and for Penny, this was part of the restorative work.

Penny also mentioned that when she first came to the university as a feminist one of her first strategies was to identify and meet other people who were supportive of feminism. She also brought together her graduate students for small group discussions and brown bag lunches to increase her and their level of support on campus.

Kate, who had coordination duties within her program, took the time to circulate articles as a way of increasing the knowledge of other professors in the areas of gender, race, class, etc. For example, she often circulated new articles by tagging them 'for your information'. Once she tentatively circulated an article that focussed on sexual orientation. As a result of reading the article, some professors were moved to discuss sexual orientation in their classes. Kate believed it was important to reach out to people and "make it easy" by making the research accessible and available. As people became more familiar with the article and subject area it was formally put on the reading list for the course. She felt very proud of the reception the article received and the resulting process to formalize it as part of the course. But as she said, "I have no way of monitoring what they are doing but it is an example of how you can model change and not mandate it and over a time period, people can come around."

Getting more women hired who were feminists was also critical to the goal of building the numbers of women in order to form a "critical mass" and to decrease the problems with tokenism. With strength in numbers came a force and visibility that had to be contended with. As more feminists were hired, Kate believed, more students would be attracted to a program that shared their same views which would in turn create a demand for a more inclusive or gender balanced curriculum. If students could act collectively on issues, many interviewees suggested, there were possibilities and opportunities for change. In addition, hiring more profeminist women as faculty meant that, over time, there could be more women available for promotion to senior administrative positions.

Erin informed me that in her department, her colleagues, mostly male, as a result of a survey of faculty and students, were being asked to integrate scholarship dealing with gender into their courses. Faculty had been asked to meet in their subfields and to look collectively at what

they teach and what texts they are using to see whether "at least somebody is covering gender issues as well as other areas concerned that they might not be covering, as we [curriculum committee] think they are."

Erin also pointed to some money at the university that was earmarked for renewing teaching and learning materials. She described it as a program where faculty could apply for up to \$50,000 to enhance their curriculum. Although she was unsure of the criteria for applying for funds, she pointed to a law professor who had successfully submitted a proposal to hire students to assist the school in integrating gender and culture into the curriculum.

Many of the interviewees used informal or unofficial means to bring feminism and feminist scholarship to their classrooms. Of the ten women I interviewed only one taught a course that used the word "feminist" in its title. Other women, instead of going through a long and arduous curriculum review or new course proposal process, would work under the heading of "special topics" and find the flexibility they desired there.

Strangely enough, several women mentioned that one strategy was to simply wait until many of the older, conservative men in the institution retired and hopefully were replaced by women who were feminists or by younger men who were profeminist. Although it was acknowledged that some of the older men had educated themselves and had made changes, many younger men and women were often put off or embarrassed by, what Wilma described as, "the misogyny of some of these older guys."

The women in this study worked for change, hoped for change, and waited patiently for change.

CHAPTER SIX

REFLECTIONS

Summary of Themes

Most of the interviewees offered definitions of feminism that, although they recognized the growing plurality of feminism, still used language and description common to the second wave of feminism that revolved around issues of "inequality", "choice" and the "social construction of gender". These women practised feminism in both their personal and professional identities. They saw in their role as teacher the responsibility of making knowledge more accessible and exposing students to new world views that examined and posited as critical, the polarity of power and privilege between men and women and between other marginalized groups and their oppressors. Interestingly enough, these women were not looking to convert their heathen students to the righteousness of feminism. Most important was the desire to open students' minds and place good argument ahead of preformed opinion or anti-feminist indoctrination.

It is with some caution that I comment on the link between these women's definitions of feminism and their respective practice of feminism within higher education. For most of these women, my exploration into and subsequent understanding of their politics and practice was limited to our two hour interview. Within those interviews, however, I witnessed a range of feminist advocacy, juxtaposed by the realities of working within a conservative, hierarchical and male dominated environment. Evidence procured through body language, voice tone, visible emotional struggle, willingness or reluctance to be critical or resigned, and from proffered personal meanings of feminism, suggested that these women had varied expectations of feminism and of its role in academia. For some, feminism profoundly impacted and directed

their thoughts and actions, while for others, feminism held more of a guiding or supportive role in their personal and professional lives. Although I would venture to say that all these women were well aware of the contradictions between feminism and academia, most worked diligently to try and find their own credible niche, as a professional, within the currently established systems within the university. For example, most of the participants were critical of exclusionary practices within feminism yet worked within systems that were highly exclusionary in their practice.

The experiences of these women indicated to me that, to a large degree, the university had not acknowledged and fully accepted the complex nature and images of women faculty, particularly feminist faculty. Consequently, these feminist faculty (as are feminist students?) were somewhat the misfits of the university. By making the work of education involve a critical consciousness, these women, as feminists, were calling into question the meaning and value of what had long been considered natural, historical, scientific and the truth. The women in this study encountered resistance because they either cast themselves as protagonists, or were cast by others in that light, and as a result often found themselves in oppositional plots; feminist versus academic. It is my opinion that many of these women felt constrained, both personally and professionally, by the university and struggled with the reality that there was still much more to do to widen the scope of agency and power for academic feminists. Empowering students was one way they appeared to replicate the desire for personal empowerment. But, as Hartman (1991) suggests, "systems are not changed by those who ironically accept their constrained agency (p.18)." Though none of these women would have willingly accepted any restriction to their autonomy or to their roles as conveyers and makers of knowledge, the value systems of the university and the conservative mind-set of a territory still primarily belonging to men appeared

to maintain a strong stranglehold on radical demonstrations or challenges to the status quo.

By taking feminism into the classroom and utilizing feminist scholarship in the curriculum, these women faced many challenges. Some suffered initial internal self-doubt as to the academic strength of feminist scholarship. Others were faced with a type of double jeopardy as they faced challenges from students as to their authority and competence in the classroom as feminists and as women. Even though some female students voiced anti-feminist sentiments, incidents involving male students were the ones that provoked the most vivid memories. Female students, who were for the most part the majority of students in these women's classes, learned new knowledge and heard knowledge interpreted in a way that reflected the social construction of gender. The result, particularly for students in higher level courses, was a better understanding of feminist perspectives and of what feminist research offered their discipline.

It appeared that these women, metaphorically speaking, worked within disciplines that were fenced on the one side by the mainstream, and by the marginal on the other, with aging white men (and a few white women) acting as the legitimate gatekeepers, clinging desperately to their conservative ideologies in an attempt to keep the "riff raff" out. Much of the collegiality these women experienced may have come from a pressures on others to be politically correct and to be careful airing overt anti-feminist sentiment in public. Women in high level administrative positions appeared to make a difference to the comfort level of being a visible and vocal feminist on campus. It also emerged from talking with these women that those that oppose feminism have acknowledged, through their behaviour, that outward and overt hostility toward feminism and feminists is unpopular and unsupported. As a result, these women now struggled against other subtle and systemic forms of oppression and discrimination that attempted to erode any power base they were forming on the academic terrain.

Women faculty made up an average of 28% of faculty in the eight program areas in this study. Without the strong representation of women faculty in one program area in education, this number would have dropped to 25%. These figures were similar to those reported by Statistics Canada (1993). For the years 1991-92, 20% of full-time university professors were women (p.210). Not only did women constitute a relatively small segment of full-time faculty, a meagre 9% of all full professors were women during the same time that over 50% of full-time university women teachers were in ranks below assistant professor (p.213). Five of the program areas in this study had never had a female administrative head. Standards for tenure and promotion appeared to be much higher today than there were in past years. Caplan (1994) shares the concerns of some of the interviewees that "many senior people who make these decisions [tenure and promotion] have records that would not qualify them for tenure or promotion today" (p.15). Tenure and promotion reviews can give less merit to (feminist) research that is published in alternative forms and journals and consequently, some women in this study were evaluated negatively. Many women found it distasteful to have to play the game and as they grew older and became more secure in their positions, they refused to continue to play. Age afforded privilege for some women.

Feminist scholarship was one of the tools these women used to introduce and reinforce different experiences, methodologies, values, viewpoints, perspectives and voices. Feminist scholarship provided both analyses and hope for change. Within the classroom it offered both an intellectual framework and a political agenda. Utilizing feminist scholarship meant situating themselves at the cutting edge of their discipline, crossing boundaries between disciplines and increasing the inclusiveness of the curriculum, particularly in its sensitivity to gender. The curriculum review process used by program areas did not possess the mandate to direct

faculty to address gender or diversity in their curriculum. Some departments spent more time on curriculum review than others. Coordination between faculty regarding curriculum was not a common occurrence. Ironically, most curriculum review processes had little to do with the content of the curriculum. Content was left to the individual faculty teaching the course or section of the course. For the most part female faculty were responsible for teaching women's issues and the courses involving or focussing on feminist perspectives in the discipline.

The women in this study, for the most part, steered away from making official changes to the curriculum or course planning. They opted instead to use other less official routes, to use academic freedom to their benefit and to teach their courses in the way they thought they should be taught, with feminist scholarship, within an inclusive curriculum. These women's stories together with the literature and my experiences confirms for me that feminism is still vying for a secure place in the hierarchy of knowledge in these disciplines, its reputation trampled by years of misconception and abuse by traditional scholars and the media. Most often feminist theories and critique were still relegated to the margins of the discipline, making teaching difficult and scholarship subordinate to the powerful canons of the discipline. However, regardless of the risks and stresses these women experienced as feminists in their classrooms, opening the minds (and hearts) of some of their students, female and male, was what made teaching with feminist scholarship worthwhile. Importantly, it provided different world views by including perspectives from women, people of colour, people with disabilities, working class people and gays and lesbians.

Finally, even though women provided me with many disturbing stories of tension and resistance, they were fully committed to feminism and teaching with feminist scholarship. They were inspired by their feminist colleagues and received their strength and nutrition from an

eclectic, interdisciplinary network within and outside the university. They could not ignore the feminist in themselves or the gender, race, class, or sexual orientation of the students who sat in front of them in the classroom. Their strength was this commitment.

Uncertainty and Insecurity

The women in this study perceived fear, induced by an uncertain future for the university, to be part of the rationale for faculty resistance to change. People appeared to be clinging desperately to the old ways and the old days. Coupled with internal shifts, universities were facing external changes that compounded the fear and uncertainty.

Next year universities across Canada will face more unrest as federal transfer payments to postsecondary education are cut. New models of running postsecondary educational institutions bring us dismally close to an existence where student is customer and the university is a business. At the same time, there is a great demand to keep up with the abundance of fresh knowledge, research and technologies that are introduced to us daily. The future looks radically changed and clouded by insecurity.

The increased diversity of students entering universities has continually challenged the institution to make teaching and curriculum more representative of both the students who fill those classroom seats and of society at large. With the advent of progressive pedagogies, particularly those based in critical and feminist theories, comes a redefinition of the role, power and authority of the teacher. Many faculty, however, have an established history of teaching that relies heavily on their role as experts. Consequently, not everyone has rid themselves of the guise of expert and embraced the perspective of shared power and authority in the classroom. Furthermore, some faculty are expressing difficulty situating feminist principles and practices into their curriculum and appear unsure of how feminism interacts with their discipline, and in

particular, their speciality area. As Smith (1989) explains, "faculty trained in traditional pedagogy and in traditional methodologies often find it difficult to fundamentally change courses and curricula" (p. 57). Whether female or male, feminist or nonfeminist, faculty are struggling with addressing diversity and the inclusion of gender and feminist scholarship in course curriculum.

Researchers agree with the premise that change can be difficult and threatening. Weir (1995) asserts that contemporary social movements have challenged people's daily practices. She concludes, "small wonder there should be ambivalence and resistance to change, quite apart from questions of social power in everyday life" (p.54). Drakich et al (1995) agree that "few people are open to new ideas that contravene their traditional perspectives" (p.126).

Propelled by How it Feels

Support for feminist scholarship in the curriculum may be stronger for some faculty and students because they feel strongly about the issues tackled by feminist scholarship, they may find personal relevance in those issues, the experiences relayed within the research may reflect their own experiences, or they may find analyses in feminist research that helps them to explain phenomena in their own lives. Whether feminist scholarship has relevancy or brings relevant information to one's life may have some bearing on both the teacher and learner. It was unclear, in this study, how personal relevancy influenced either the acceptance of or resistance to feminist thought. It appears that if people have experienced injustices based on gender, race, class, sexual orientation or disability, then they may have learned that they are both vulnerable to and disconnected from power and privilege. It doesn't mean that every member of these groups has felt the injustice, or at least personalized it enough to feel it, understand it, or analyze it. It may mean that learning and teaching stop existing as benign affairs when one sees the world through

a different lens. Many of the women I interviewed had experienced injustices and discrimination as women. Feminism came in the form of passion for some. Richer (1995), a professor, who in his teaching has emerged as a "profeminist male", may help to support this theory. Richer reveals his "concern with subordinate groups" comes from his own experiences as being an "overweight kid with glasses" and "one of only two Jewish kids on a block" (p.195).

Students both responded to and contributed to the tensions between feminism and academia. Feminist pedagogy, in many ways, violates academic norms and students respond to this new approach with either excitement or hostility. Either way, the feminist classroom is a challenge for the feminist teacher. It is emotionally demanding and often stressful. As Lewis (1990) and Ng (1991) have expressed it, there are many complexities in the power relations between student and teacher and opportunities to share power may become opportunities for provocation against feminist teaching.

Us vs. them

Academic freedom exists as a double-edged sword. Academic freedom has paved the way for feminism and feminist scholarship to enter higher education. McCormack (1991) asserts that women's studies owes its very existence to the principle of academic freedom. She cautions, however, that if the academy is to respond adequately to the new realities of diversity, then academic freedom requires an expanded interpretation. Nonetheless, battles rage over preserving the equation that academic freedom means unrestricted free speech. It appears that the academic freedom battle is poised in an either/or confrontation. From my interviews, several dichotomies or dualities emerged: professional autonomy versus accountability, collegiality versus mistrust, competency versus scrutiny.

Caplan (1994) advances that collegiality and cooperation are myths of academia.

Certainly the women in this study reported wonderful collegial relationships with other feminist or profeminist faculty but the isolation or intolerance most experienced in their own program areas cannot be ignored. If through collegiality faculty discover and share their research then many feminist faculty appear to be in a circle of their own. Professional autonomy may mean academic freedom for some faculty but it translates into "academic freezing" for students like myself who experience exclusionary practices and curriculum. Clearly, as the women in this study reported, the content of the curriculum is not up for scrutiny.

Implications for Theory and Practice

This research strongly suggests women faculty are both defying the traditions of higher education and are being challenged by them as they continue to articulate their interests and values that stem from feminism and feminist pedagogy. This research may help university faculty better recognize those tensions between feminism and academia. Adult educators may understand more fully feminist pedagogical principles not as they appear in theory, but in practice. By providing a curriculum that heralds the works of a diverse group of scholars, women and minority students feel empowered in the learning process and are reassured that they too have potential for success.

Schmitz (1985) suggested that faculty response to feminist scholarship could be divided into three categories: the unreachable, the sympathetic but unknowledgeable, and the already committed and knowledgeable (p.51). The women in this study fall into the latter category. Schmitz posits that the "unreachables" have no desire to change and when faced with pressure to do so, "will raise issues of academic freedom, the place of ideology in the classroom and their right to determine what is to be taught in their classes" (p.52).

Schmitz believes that efforts to transform curriculum should be concentrated on the

second group, the sympathetic yet unknowledgeable. She suggests that resistance to feminist scholarship may radically alter the images professors have of themselves, both personally and professionally. As McIntosh (1982) put it, "It calls into question not only what we thought we knew, but also we as professors thought we were....basically intelligent, fair minded, knowledgeable, alert to politics in the curriculum, and unique in our intellectual and pedagogical styles" (p.29).

The women in this study echoed the concern that professors may have difficulty engaging with feminist scholarship because they perceive involvement as a personal and professional risk. Some may be afraid of losing credibility with their colleagues. Men may feel isolated from other males in their program area. Some may be inhibited by the sheer size and scope of the new body of scholarship. No longer is it just a case of "brushing up"; it may be difficult for faculty to make the commitment to spend the time reading feminist research and critique that is relevant to their field.

One strategy that promotes curricular reform in an effort to incorporate feminist scholarship throughout the curriculum was missing from this study and that is the implementation of formalized curriculum integration projects. If faculty are overworked, resistant, entrenched in traditional views of pedagogy and scholarship, feeling isolated, and distressed by rapid change, then formalized curriculum integration projects may be an important relief measure. Whether real or perceived, fears expressed by faculty must be acknowledged and resolved before any commitment to curricular reform or transformation can take place. Formalized curriculum projects may legitimize curricular reform, allow much of the control to stay in the hands of the faculty member(s), provide moral support in an effort to eliminate isolation and fear, and allow time release and financial incentive to faculty to increase the

visibility and recognition of scholarship on women. As a result, fresh perspectives and new knowledge benefits individual faculty, other faculty in the program area, students, the university, and finally, the discipline.

MacCorquodale and Lensink (1991) reported that upon completion of a curriculum integration project at the University of Arizona, one half of the participants were affected positively. Of this half, one-quarter of the faculty "experienced profound changes in their personal or professional orientation which markedly altered their teaching, research and politics" (p.305). The other quarter of this half ended up incorporating new materials into their courses. The other half of the participants in the study were "relatively unchanged". The curriculum transformation projects achieved more than fulfilling the primary goal of increasing feminist materials in the curriculum. Many faculty became interested in feminist pedagogy, some gained a better understanding and appreciation for the difficulties women experience in academia, and some faculty found new colleagues across disciplines.

The present research may also help adult educators acknowledge that they live in a time of rapid change. It may encourage them to reflect on the changes they have observed or have been affected by and move them to think in terms of benefits and opportunities, instead of losses and uncertainties, when they face change. By breaking down the image of teacher as expert, faculty may be able to recognize that learners too are creators of knowledge and may seek partnerships to enhance awareness and increase knowledge about the new scholarship on women.

Schmitz (1985) also found student resistance to feminist scholarship in the form of hostility, negativity, or defensive reactions (p.54). Similar to the reports from women in this study, Schmitz found that students resented feminist scholarship when it threatened their world view by questioning students' traditional assumptions of society and culture (p.54). In some

cases, students, including female students, did not respond positively when they believed the material did not "meet their immediate needs and further challenge their sense of self and their conception of what their lives will be like" (p.54). These students did not believe that feminism was relevant to their lives and therefore rebelled against any threat to their present comfort, or future vision for themselves. As with other studies on student reactions to feminist scholarship (MacCorquodale and Lensink, 1991), female students in the present research were mostly attracted to courses with material on women. Men were often extremely uncomfortable, revealing their discomfort by being openly hostile, anxious, silent, or noticeably absent. Like MacCorquodale and Lensink (1991), this study reinforces the notion that "men's discomfort in confronting sexism, women's desire for and positive reaction to this material, and increasingly female enrolments on university campuses validate and reaffirm (our) belief in the necessity of curriculum integration" (p.310).

Discussions regarding the relevance and need for feminism in the academy and feminist scholarship in the curriculum are moot until academic policy and practice recognize and acknowledge feminist scholarship to be strong, credible and informed research. The present study found that career development is still based predominately on male definitions of professional knowledge and that feminist scholarship continues to receive negative and limited reception in the academy and its respective disciplines. Some women faculty still experience difficulty with promotion and tenure when they publish primarily in alternative or feminist journals. Scholarship continues to have a very narrow definition. Bronstein (1993), reporting on the experiences of feminist and ethnic minority scholars, found that the administration of one university referred to ethnic and women's studies as "ghetto disciplines" and viewed ethnically oriented journals "as inferior publication outlets" (p.63). If universities place a lower value on

feminist scholarship then it is unlikely that they would promote curricular reform that moves toward curricula that is inclusive of the scholarship of feminists. This research suggests strongly that universities must value, as important, the contributions of feminist research and perspectives and consequently, recognize and reward feminist endeavours as essential to the development of the discipline and to the integrity of the academic environment.

Finally, one theme that cannot go without mention is one which relates to power. As proponents of feminist education and consumers of feminist research, the women in this study experienced backlash fuelled by fear. As Nemiroff (1989) put it, "women teaching Women's Studies in the university often do so at their own peril" (p.1). Feminist scholarship contradicts and challenges traditional male hegemony and replaces it with new definitions of knowledge, news definition of scholarship, a diverse knowledge base, a new role for teachers, and a new role for students. Women in this study threatened the status quo and they found, more often than not, that advancing new and disturbing perspectives was opposed more than welcomed. Except for a short few decades, the academy has been a homogenous white male environment, controlled by white men for the benefit of the next ruling class of white men. Drakich, Taylor and Bankier (1995), suggest in today's society, "the participants in the university no longer reflect the monolithic demographic of the white male academy" (p.123). The power passed down from one male generation of scholars to another, to socially define and legitimize truth and knowledge, is slowly being eroded. After years of free flowing privilege and power, some male faculty (and students) may be feeling disempowered and disenfranchised. The present research suggests that the struggle to maintain autonomy and power has taken form in the dialogue of academic freedom and has revealed itself through the practice of sexism and exclusion.

Implications for Further Research

This research has confirmed that, in many ways, the climate at this university campus has remained a chilly one for most feminist faculty. Although the temperature has appeared to have warmed, there are still subtle and systemic forms of discrimination and oppression.

Further research might look at the experiences of male professors who are profeminist or who are utilizing feminist scholarship in their classrooms. It would be interesting to obtain their perspective of teaching as a male about gender issues. How are their teaching and research reputations affected? How do students react to a man teaching feminist perspectives? Conversely, it would be interesting also to speak with men who teach and research from a conservatist point of view who eschew any form of feminist scholarship and resist any movement to build an inclusive curriculum. What is their explanation and rationale for how they offer their curriculum? How strong is the role of academic freedom in curricular politics?

This study interviewed faculty from the social and human sciences. Further research regarding curricular change might involve the physical sciences where feminist pedagogy and scholarship have traditionally been rejected and resisted.

When I began my research into this area I was very interested in what students thought about inclusive curriculum issues and in particular, how did women and students from other marginalized groups feel about what they were learning. Can we equate what we learn to a human rights issue? It is very important that research that furthers the discussion of inclusive curricula have a strong student voice. Except for a couple of incidents relayed to me in my interviews, it appeared there was little partnership between faculty and students in regard to curriculum revision or transformation. The only mention of a formal faculty/student partnership was Patricia's idea of giving students the opportunity to perform some of the restorative work and

receive the recognition for such work. Perhaps if students were given more authority and responsibility to create partnerships with faculty to build inclusive curricula, students would experience more ownership in what they were learning, would feel confident that their ideas and needs were important, would not fear repercussions from tackling sensitive issues (and egos), and professors would be freed from the bondage that categorizes them as experts.

Talbot's (1992) doctoral dissertation, cited in this research, examined graduate faculty's experiences with diversity. In her study she pointed to a lack of instrumentation for evaluating and measuring attitudes, behaviour and knowledge of faculty regarding diversity. It would be interesting to see if similar patterns would be found if the Diversity Survey she developed was administered to faculty in another university. Similar results may indicate a need for diversity training for university professors.

This study focussed only on bringing "gender" (women's) issues into the curriculum. Designing and implementing an inclusive curriculum involves more than just including gender. It entails recognizing the diversity of race, class, disability and sexual orientation. Although I tried not to lump women into one category, talking about "gender" or "women's issues" may have diminished the importance of scholarship that speaks to women (and men) of colour, to working class women, to women with disabilities and to lesbian women. Women (and men) of colour, women that identify as working class or women who are disabled may offer different perspectives of what defines inclusion in the curriculum. As a lesbian, I let that part of me remain almost invisible in this research. In addition, I am a white woman, as were all my interviewees. At this university there were almost no women of colour on faculty and I would suggest, very few "out" lesbian faculty members.

We know from research and statistics that the student body on North American campuses

is increasingly diverse. The greatest change has been in the number of women. Women's experiences and intellect have not secured legitimate space in the curricula of many disciplines. A strong feminist voice is calling for the inclusion of women's scholarship in the curriculum. As a result many curriculum projects, mainly in the U.S., have been established with the goal of building gender inclusion. We know that curriculum transformation involves the exchange of values and philosophies that frequently clash, especially when feminist theory attempts to shift mainstream academic theory. Further research may examine the values and beliefs that are so firmly entrenched in academic tradition and freedom. It appears that the inclusion of feminism and feminist scholarship provokes a deep visceral response and what could be an exciting new dialogue is perceived as a threat to the male dominated hegemony of higher education. Further research may shed some light on instances of symbiosis in curricular reform or where resistance to change holds steadfast.

This research shows that curriculum is socially constructed, therefore implying that curriculum is clearly related to gender, as it may be with race, class and sexual orientation, and when partnered with feminism, curriculum is closely tied to the politics of inclusion. Further research may wish to examine the ways in which curriculum is politically and socially defined. Perhaps if we can understand what surrounds praxis we may be able to negotiate traditional definitions of power and expertise without fear of professional disenfranchisement or loss of autonomy.

Looking Back to What Got me Here

The purpose of this study was to document the work, struggles, shifts, strategies, acceptance and resistance experienced by women faculty who were addressing feminist scholarship in the curriculum. The research involved interviewing ten women faculty in the

social and human sciences about the sanction and opposition they experienced when integrating feminist thought into their teaching and curriculum. The research was about recognizing women as agents of knowledge and challenging male-centred curricula.

The experiences voiced by women in this study resonated similar concerns and issues raised by other faculty and scholars who have researched and documented the experiences of women faculty in North American universities. By bringing the human element to the forefront, these women's experiences added a critical dimension of understanding to previous research. The stories these women shared with me further illuminated and substantiated research in the areas of chilly climate and curricular reform, particularly research about the status of women and the support for feminist scholarship in the academy.

I learned that the university is a very political environment. Although change is taking place slowly, it appears that the systems of power and authority are, for the most part, embedded in past practice and entrenched in conservatism. If higher education was a play and myself a critic, I would suggest that plot is old, the actors, tired. When I started this thesis, I was naive and unaware of the turmoil that existed behind the scenes. It appears to me now that what is at issue, is that feminists want a hand in rewriting the play.

Feminist education and scholarship attempt to erode the male monopoly on knowledge and revise the roles of power and authority in research and teaching. As a result, the reconstruction of the curriculum to include women and members of other marginalized groups is a political hot potato. I also learned that education is not sexless. In higher education, for the most part, maleness is a positive attribute, femaleness, a liability. Exclusionary practices create oppressive realities. My experience as a student and the experiences of the women in this study strongly suggest that the contributions of women are painfully minimized and marginalized. I

applaud the women in this study as they construct new educational forms that reflect opportunities for inclusion and empowerment.

This thesis, in its initial form, began as a contemporary study of the development of inclusive curricula. It became apparent soon after I began speaking with women faculty that I would not be writing a thesis purely about curriculum development or inclusion in the curriculum. I learned early in my interviews that to get to the issue of curriculum I first had to heed and understand the conflicts these women experienced both as women and feminist faculty. I could not pluck curriculum cleanly out of the domains of teaching and research or separate curriculum issues from feminism and feminist pedagogy.

This study was both personal and political. I brought to the research personal feelings that pulled and pushed me to understand why women's voices, experiences and scholarship was, as Carty (1991) describes it, "outside knowledge" (p.22). Instead of feeling comfortable and powerful in my privileged role as a student in higher education, I often felt vulnerable, disconnected and different. In contrast, by speaking up and out I felt extremely exposed and sometimes, downright dogmatic, often adopting an adamant style of rebellion that resisted learning anything written by white, middle class males. Here I was in my classrooms, surrounded by mostly female faces, except, of course for the faculty, and it was assumed we would be willing recipients of an androcentric, ethnocentric and heterocentric curriculum. Patriarchy was the theory. Exclusion was the practice.

The personal also came to life in the voices of the women I spoke with. These women spoke of academic discrimination that was often subtle and systemic. Often living as strangers in a strange land these ten women spoke with voices filled with anger and sometimes tears, indignant in their devaluation, triumphant in the realization that times were changing, albeit

slowly. They thrived on the connection they had with other feminists and collectively shared a passion to have their students experience a change in their world view. They told me their truths, and in many cases, the truths revealed a tension between academia and feminism.

I say this study is political because it confronted male privilege and hegemony in higher education through individual and collective resistance. It criticized and challenged assumptions and practices of a university that historically and currently marginalizes the participation of women at all levels of the institution. This study confirmed the need to re-envision the structures, values and assumptions of the masculinist model of discourse and pedagogy.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J., Barry, K., Esseveld, J., (1983) Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research. Women's Studies International Forum, 6(4), 423-435.
- Andersen, M. L. (1987). Changing the curriculum in higher education. Signs, 12(2), 222-254.
- Antler, J. & Biklen, S. K. (Eds.). (1990). Changing education: Women as radicals and conservators. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Bannerji, H. (1991). But who speaks for us? Experience and agency in conventional feminist paradigms. In H. Bannerji et al (Eds.), Unsettling Relations: The university as a site of feminist struggle. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R. & Tarule, J. M. (1986) Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Bellamy, L. A. & Guppy, N. (1991). Opportunities and obstacles for women in Canadian higher education. In J. Gaskell & A. McLaren (Eds.), Women and Education (2nd ed.) (pp. 163-192). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M.F.D. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and Control. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Briskin, L. (1990). Feminist pedagogy: Teaching and learning liberation. Ottawa: Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women.
- Bronstein, P. (1993). Challenges, rewards, and costs for feminist and ethnic minority scholars. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 53, 61-70.
- Caplan, P. J. (1994). Lifting a ton of feathers: A woman's guide to surviving in the academic world. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Carty, L. (1991). Black Women in Academia. In H. Bannerji et al (Eds.), Unsettling Relations: The university as a site of feminist struggle. Toronto: Women's Press.

Cook, J. A. & Fonow, M. M. (1986). Knowledge and women's interests: Feminist methodology in the field of sociology. Sociological Inquiry. 56.

Drakich, J., Taylor, M., & Bankier, J. (1995). Academic freedom *is* the inclusive university. In S. Richer & L. Weir (Eds.), Beyond political correctness: Toward the inclusive university. (pp. 118-135). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

DuBois, E. E., Kelly, G. P., Kennedy, E. L., Korsmeyer, C. W., & Robinson, L. S. (1985). Feminist scholarship: Kindling in the groves of academe. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Fennema, E. & Ayer, J. M. (1984), Women and education: Equity or equality? Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing.

Fonow, M. M. & Cook, J. A. (1991). Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Fritzsche, J. M. (Ed.). (1984). Toward excellence and equity: The scholarship of women as a catalyst for change in the university. Orono: University of Maine.

Galis, L. (1993). Merely academic diversity. Journal of Higher Education, 64(1), 93-101.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goodson, I. F. (1994). Studying curriculum. Toronto: OISE Press.

Graham, H. (1984). Surveying through stories. In C. Bell & H. Roberts (Eds.), Social researching: Politics, problems, practice. (pp. 112-115). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Gumport, P. J. (1991). Feminist scholarship as a vocation. In G. P. Kelly & S. Slaughter (Eds.), Women's higher education in comparative perspective. (pp.269-282). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Harding, S. (1987). Introduction. Is there a feminist method? In S. Harding (Ed.), Feminism and methodology. (pp. 1-14). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Critical Introduction. In I. F. Goodson, Studying curriculum. (pp. 1-11). Toronto: OISE Press.

Hartman, J. E. & Messer-Davidow. (1991). (En)Gendering knowledge: Feminists in academe. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Howe, F. (1982). Feminist scholarship: The extent of the revolution. Change: The magazine of higher learning, 14, 12-20.

Jaggar, A. M. & Rothenberg, P. S. (Eds.). (1993). Feminist frameworks: Alternative theoretical accounts of the relations between women and men. (3rd ed.) McGraw-Hill: New York.

Kelly, G. P. & Korsmeyer, C. (1991) Feminist scholarship and the American Academy. In G. P. Kelly & S. Slaughter (Eds.), Women's higher education in comparative perspective. (pp.269-282). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kirby, S., Daniels, D., McKenna, K., Pujol, M., & Valiquette, M.(1991). Women changing academe: The proceedings of the 1990 Canadian Women's Studies Association conference. Winnipeg: Sororal Publishing.

Lasser, C. (Ed.). (1987). Educating men and women together: Coeducation in a changing world. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Lewis, M. (1990). Interrupting patriarchy: Politics, resistance, and transformation in the Feminist Classroom. Harvard Educational Review, 60(4), 467-488.

MacCorquodale, P. & Lensink, J. (1991). Integrating women into the curriculum: Multiple motives and mixed emotions. In G. P. Kelly and S. Slaughter (Eds.), Women's higher education in comparative perspective. (pp.297-314). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

McIntosh, P. (1982). Warning: The new scholarship on women may be hazardous to your ego. Women's Studies Quarterly, 10(1), 29-31.

McIntosh, P. (1989). Curricular re-vision. In C. S. Pearson, D. L. Shavlik & J. G. Touchton (Eds.), Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education. (pp. 400-412). New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

McCormack, T. (1991). Politically Correct. Canadian Forum. (Sept.): 8-10.

McLaughlin, A. N. (1993). Black women, identity, and the quest for humanhood and wholeness: Wild women in the whirlwind. In A. M. Jaggar & P. S. Rothenberg (Eds.), Feminist frameworks: Alternative theoretical accounts of the relations between women and men, (3rd edition), (pp. 271-280). New York: McGraw-Hill.

McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. (1993). Research in education: A conceptual introduction. (3rd ed.) New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Miles, A. (1989). Women's challenge to adult education. The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education. 3(1), 1-18.

Nemiroff, G. H. (1989). Beyond "talking heads": Towards an empowering pedagogy of women's studies. Atlantis, 15(1), 1-17.

Ng, R. (1991). Teaching against the grain: Contradictions for minority teachers. In J. Gaskell & A. R. McLaren (Eds.), Women and education: 2nd edition, (pp. 99-116). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Parsons, S. (1990). Feminist challenges to curriculum design. Studies in the Education of Adults, 22(1), 49-58.

Pearlman, D. (1985). The challenge of academia: Bringing feminist scholarship into our universities and colleges. In J. M. Fritzsche (Ed.), Toward excellence & equity: The scholarship on women as a catalyst for change in the university (pp. 282-305). Orono: University of Maine.

Pearson, C. S., Shavlik, D. L., & Touchton, J. G. (Eds.). (1989). Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Rich, A. (1979). On lies, secrets, and silence: Selected prose 1966-1978. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Richardson, R. C. & Bender, L. W. (1987). Fostering minority access and achievement in higher education: The role of urban community colleges and universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Richardson, R. C. & Skinner, E. F. (1991). Achieving quality and diversity: universities in a multicultural society. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Richer, S. (1995). Reaching the men: Inclusion and exclusion in feminist teaching. In S. Richer & L. Weir (Eds.), Beyond political correctness: Toward the inclusive university. (pp. 194-219). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Reinharz, S. (1992). Feminist methods in social research. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rothenberg, P. (1992). Critics of attempts to democratize the curriculum are waging a campaign to misrepresent the work of responsible professors. In P. Berman (Ed.), Debating P.C. (pp.262-268). New York: Laurel.

Schmitz, B. (1985). Integrating women's studies into the curriculum. New York: The Feminist Press.

Shrewsbury, C. M. (1987). What is feminist pedagogy? Women's Studies Quarterly, 15(3 & 4), 6-14.

Smith, D. (1989). The Challenge of Diversity: Involvement or Alienation in the Academy? ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 5.

Smith, D. (1975) An analysis of ideological structures and how women are excluded: Considerations for women's studies. In J. Gaskell & A. R. McLaren (Eds.), Women and Education: 2nd edition, (pp. 233-256). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Spanier, B., Bloom, A., & Boroviak, D. (1984). Toward a balanced curriculum: A sourcebook for initiating gender integration projects. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing.

Spender, D. (1981). Men's studies modified: The impact of feminism on the academic disciplines. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Stasiulis, D. K. (1995). Diversity, power, and voice: the antinomies of progressive education. In S. Richer & L. Weir (Eds.), Beyond political correctness: Toward the inclusive university. (pp. 165-193). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Statistics Canada. (1993). Education in Canada: A statistical review for 1991-92. (Catalogue No. 81-229). Ottawa: Minister of Industry, Science and Technology.

Steinem, G. (1992). Revolution from within: A book of self-esteem. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

Stewart, L. (1990). It's up to you: Women at UBC in the early years. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Talbot, D. M. (1992). A multimethod study of the diversity emphasis in master's degree programs in college student affairs. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland College Park, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53/07, 2198.

Weir, L. (1995). Resignifying political correctness. In S. Richer & L. Weir (Eds.), Beyond political correctness: Toward the inclusive university. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wilkerson, M. B. (1987). How equal is equal education? Race, class and gender. In C. Lasser (Ed.), Educating men and women together: Coeducation in a changing world (pp.132-141). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

APPENDIX A

Initial Contact to Faculty

Date

Name

Address

Dear

I am investigating the experiences of faculty who are attempting to build a gender inclusive curriculum through a thesis titled "Feminist Scholarship in the Curriculum: Understanding Faculty Acceptance and Resistance". This project is part of the requirements for a M.A. in Adult Education from the University of British Columbia. Dr. Allison Tom of the Department of Educational Studies is my Research Supervisor.

The purpose of the research will be to document the work, struggles, shifts, strategies, acceptance and resistance experienced by faculty in the social and human sciences who are addressing feminist scholarship in their curriculum. The research will involve interviewing faculty in personal, political and professional frames about the sanction and opposition they experience integrating feminist thought into their curriculum.

Dr. XXXXXXXX suggested you as a possible participant in this research. Specifically, I would like to interview you about your attempt to address diversity by including feminist scholarship in your curriculum. This interview would take approximately two hours and could be arranged at any site convenient to you and at a time convenient to you. In this interview I would not be asking you to represent your department or program area. Rather, I would be trying to understand your experiences and the way you feel about them.

Anonymity and confidentiality will be strictly guarded and adhered to. Faculty members or program areas will not be identified in any conversation or written document. Individual circumstances or characteristics that may identify you will be examined as to their worth and will be withheld unless you agree to their use. No member of my research committee will know that you were interviewed. I will change your name for discussion purposes. I will use characteristics of age, educational background, rank and teaching background, gender and ethnicity to describe all my subjects.

Please consider this request for an interview. I believe this research is vital to the understanding of the acceptance and resistance to feminist scholarship in the academy. I will be calling you in the coming week to answer any questions you might have about the project and to see if we can arrange a time for an interview. If you like, you can contact me at XXX-XXXX (day) or XXX-XXXX (evening) or Dr. Tom may be reached at XXX-XXXX. I look forward to talking to you soon.

Yours truly,
Holly Cole

page 1 of 1

APPENDIX B

Interview/Consent Letter for Faculty

Name

Address

Dear

I am investigating the experiences of faculty who are attempting to build a gender inclusive curriculum through a thesis titled "Feminist Scholarship in the Curriculum: Understanding Faculty Acceptance and Resistance". Dr. Allison Tom of the Department of Educational Studies is my Research Supervisor.

The purpose of the research will be to document the work, struggles, shifts, strategies, acceptance and resistance experienced by faculty in the social and human sciences who are addressing feminist scholarship in their curriculum. The research will involve interviewing faculty in personal, political and professional frames about the sanction and opposition they experienced integrating feminist thought into their curriculum.

Specifically, I would like to interview you about your experiences in addressing diversity by including feminist scholarship in your curriculum. This interview would take approximately two hours and could be arranged at any site convenient to you at a time convenient to you. In this interview I would not be asking you to represent your department or program area. Rather, I would be trying to understand your experiences and the way you feel about them.

Anonymity and confidentiality will be strictly guarded and adhered to. Faculty members or program areas will not be identified in any conversation or written document. Individual circumstances or characteristics that may identify you will be examined as to their worth and will be withheld unless you agree to their use. No member of my research committee will know that you were interviewed. I will change your name for discussion purposes. I will use characteristics of age, educational background, rank and teaching background, gender and ethnicity to describe all my subjects.

I want to make it very clear that you are under no obligation to participate in this interview or to continue the interview if you change your mind while I am carrying it out. If at any point (even after I have finished) you decide that you do not want this interview to continue, or you do not want the interview data to be used, please tell me. I will destroy the tape recording and whatever transcripts I have made of the interview at your request.

If you have any questions about this research please feel free to call me at XXX-XXXX (day) or XXX-XXXX (evening) or Dr. Allison Tom at XXX-XXXX. We will be glad to discuss them with you. If you agree to participate in this research, please sign this letter in the space provided on the next page. Thank you.

Holly Cole

page 1 of 2

I, _____, give my permission to Holly Cole to interview me for the research project "Feminist Scholarship in the Curriculum: Understanding Faculty Resistance and Acceptance", as described above. I have received a copy of both pages of this letter.

I DO/DO NOT (cross out that which does not apply) want my name to be used in connection with this interview and excerpts taken from it.

Signature

Date

page 2 of 2

APPENDIX C

Sample Questions to Faculty

1. What subjects do you teach?
2. Are your classes predominantly female or male?
3. What did your curriculum look like five years ago?
4. How would you define feminism?
5. How would you define feminist scholarship?
6. When and why did you make the decision to include feminist scholarship in your curriculum?
7. What have you done to inject feminist scholarship into the curriculum?
8. What do you think students learn from feminist scholarship?
9. How have your students responded?
10. How have other faculty responded?
11. Do you think your teaching reputation changes when you involve feminist scholarship?
12. Do you think there is a climate of acceptance or resistance to feminist scholarship in your discipline?
13. Do you think there are personal or professional benefits and costs to including feminist scholarship in your teaching?