

A Place at the Table and A Voice in the Hall: "Third Wave" Feminists in the Canadian Academy¹

Michele Byers, Saint Mary's University, conducts research primarily on television and identity.

Diane Crocker, Saint Mary's University, conducts research on violence against women and restorative justice. She teaches courses in research methods and criminology.

Abstract

This article discusses the findings of a survey of junior female academics in Canadian universities designed to help describe a cohort we thought would be linked through self-identification or ideology as "third wave" feminists. This work is an exploration of some of the ways junior women academics situate themselves within particular feminist labels and debates about feminism.

Résumé

Cet article discute des résultats d'un sondage de jeunes femmes académiques dans les universités canadiennes conçu pour aider à décrire une cohorte que nous pensions serait reliée par l'entremise d'auto-identification ou d'idéologie comme féministes de la "troisième vague." Ce travail est une exploration de quelques unes des façons dont les jeunes femmes académiques se situent parmi les étiquettes féministes particulières et fait le débat sur le féminisme.

Introduction

In this article, we discuss the findings of a survey of junior female academics in Canadian universities. The impetus for this project was a desire to enter into debates about "third wave" feminisms and feminists in the academy. As new feminist faculty members, we were aware of anxieties around generational/ideological differences between feminists. While we experienced some of this generational split, we were also aware of marked differences in the way we - theoretically belonging to the same feminist "generation" - defined our feminist identities and practices, and how we understood terms like "second" and "third wave" feminism. Our intention has thus been to describe a cohort of university women that we imagined would be linked through either self-identification or ideology as "third wave" feminists. In this work we do not describe or critique feminist waves *per se*. Rather, our interest is rooted in understanding how junior women academics situate themselves within particular feminist labels and debates about feminism.

This research article draws from a survey of 200 relatively new Canadian female faculty members, which we distributed in the winter and spring of 2005. Generally, we were interested in their attitudes about feminism and Women's Studies, and linking these to the third wave feminist literature. We were interested in seeing how these women defined themselves within the varied nomenclature of feminism; how they felt positioned in relation to various university spaces and constituencies, and whether they worked with persons and in spaces sympathetic to their (feminist) views; if they experienced their positions within the university as equal to those of male

colleagues (if they felt empowered, which is not necessarily the same as being empowered); if they felt isolated or within a cohort of feminist peers; whether they felt feminist and/or women-centred work was supported by their colleagues/institutions; what they understood feminism and Women's Studies to mean; how they saw these as being constituted, and whether they identified their work/themselves as having a place within these spaces.

Many of the authors we read in preparation for this work focus on conflicts within feminism. Less attention has been paid to the reception of feminists and feminisms within the wider communities in which feminists find themselves and through and against which feminisms are constituted. Much of the third wave literature has focused on texts published by and about third wave feminists and feminisms, rather than on asking women about their views. Our survey is a step in the direction of giving a voice to academic women who may or may not be feminists, but who have entered the academy during a period increasingly described as a feminist third wave.

In what follows, we situate our work within debates about feminist generational conflict, discuss our data, and try to put it into a larger context. Based on our reading of a variety of feminist literatures, we expected to find distinct patterns that would differentiate our survey participants as belonging to identifiable waves/cohorts. However, our data analysis revealed patterns much more in line with the heterogeneity we recognized from our experiences than in our reading of the literature. Our understanding of the players within these debates has likely been based less on the attitudes of broadly situated groups of women (even if only within the academy) than on the views of a small number of women engaged in public/published dialogue about these issues. The suggestion that the wave metaphor is faulty, in academia at least, is interesting and has been noted elsewhere.²

Far from denying the existence of something called third wave feminism, we are

curious about the multiple and contradictory ways it exists in the literature and in "life." For example, the literature suggests that many who self-identify as such define their feminism as "open" and "fluid," which, contradictorily, sets certain parameters around who is or is not included as third wave. The recognition of this contradiction pushed us to problematize terms like "third wave," which is also reflected in the method used, in that our survey asked respondents about various categories of feminism without providing them with definitions. We were not testing a definition of third wave feminism. We wanted to see, first, how, given a number of choices, these women would self-identify; second, what statements - reflecting themes taken from third wave literatures - about Women's Studies and feminism they did or did not agree with; and third, the correlation between these two.

In retrospect, there are many questions we would have liked to have asked. But because no one else that we know of has asked a large group of women these types of questions, we did not have a lot to go on, except our curiosity. Our findings indicate a complexity in the way respondents self-identified with the terms offered, and this fits with the narrative about third wave identity described above. But what's interesting is that, given the opportunity to identify as third wave feminists, many of the respondents indicated a preference to identify as second wave feminists, despite their age, time of education, and their responses to statements about their socio-political views. This is something that we could not have anticipated or worked into the framing of our questions, and it points to the need for further research.

Method

In the winter and spring of 2005, we distributed upwards of 200 questionnaires to junior female faculty members across Canada. We targeted those hired in tenure track jobs since 1997. Our mailing list was compiled through our own professional networks and through Internet searches. Given that the sample is not representative in

any statistical sense, we view this survey only as a preliminary exploration. Being able to make generalizable claims was not part of the rationale for this research. We received 104 completed anonymous questionnaires, 80% of which were in English.³ Appendix A provides the distribution of responses for the survey questions reported here.

Literature: Women in Academia and the Third Wave Debates

While many people writing about third wave feminism are academics, the question of how issues of self-identification, conflict and alienation play out in academia are somewhat marginalized. There is a literature that addresses the experiences of academic women, including some empirically grounded qualitative studies that describe the experiences of women in specific academic and political spaces. Several volumes also engage the changing face of Women's Studies and feminism in the academy, acknowledging Women's Studies' place in academia, and the need to interrogate that place in relation to the changing nature of scholarly and popular debates about gender, sexuality, and feminist politics and activism (Aaron and Walby 1991; Braithwaite *et al.* 2005; Davies *et al.* 1994; Davis *et al.* 2006; Hinds *et al.* 1992; Kennedy and Beins 2005; Kennedy *et al.* 1993; Malina and Maslin-Prothero 1998; Morley 1999; Morley and Walsh 1995).

Journal articles have been a significant source of empirical data about Women's Studies and feminism. This work includes data collected from male and female Women's Studies students (Bulbeck 2001; Harris *et al.* 1999; Letherby and Marchbank 2001; Marchbank and Letherby 2006; Price and Owen 1998); studies comparing the experiences of male and female academics (Bell and Gordon 1999; Skelton 2005); studies of feminist academics (Acker and Armenti 2004; Malhotra and Perez 2005); studies of feminist women's experience of graduate school (Barata *et al.* 2005); and studies of older women academics (Bronstein 2001).

While few of these works specifically address third wave feminism, or generational cohorts, they reference a second literature focused on feminist generational cohortism. This work tends to be rooted in discussions of secondary sources and personal narrative accounts of women's experiences within feminism and Women's Studies. As far as we could ascertain, no work has been published which combines an examination of feminist cohortism with a survey of new women academics who can be considered a new cohort based on age or time of education.

Although the third wave is often seen as lacking any sense of coherence and unity, it is associated with some generally accepted key texts. Many believe that the canon begins with Rebecca Walker's essay "Becoming the Third Wave," originally published in *Ms.* in 1992 (Walker 1992). Walker also edited the key text *To Be Real: Telling the Truth and the Changing Face of Feminism* (Walker 1995). Walker's book sits among similar non-academic anthologies written mainly by writers who were or planned to be educated within post-secondary institutions (Baumgardner and Richards 2000; Findlen 1995; Hernandez and Rehman 2002; Karp and Stoller 1995; Ruttenberg 2001). Other, similar writing does emanate explicitly from the academy, including special issues of *Hypatia* and the *NWSA Journal* (Dicker and Piepmeier 2003; Gillis *et al.* 2004; Heywood 2005; Heywood and Drake 1997).

Much of this literature argues that "third wave" means different things to its different constituents/adherents, who may claim quite contradictory positions and trace the historical roots of these positions to different feminist histories. This multiplicity is well expressed by Stella Mars's slogan: "Redefine feminism so it includes you" (Drake 2002, 182), which is suggestive of what is often assumed to be the primary ideal of the third wave: the rejection of the second wave. But Mars also seems to suggest that feminism is malleable. Rather than rejecting particular forms of feminism, redefinition expresses a desire to maintain connection in

the face of radically changing historical and socio-cultural contexts.

This sense of constantly changing boundaries is part of the multi-faceted narrative of third wave development. As Catherine Orr (1997) notes, the historical emergence of the third wave is at least three-pronged:

- ▶ First, as the outgrowth of an American conference on race and sexuality (notably not age or generation) in the early 1980s meant to increase the recognition of voices and issues marginalized within the second wave mainstream (Alexander 1998).
- ▶ Second, as a social movement linked to the development of the Third Wave Foundation, an organization of young feminists that emerged in the aftermath of significant events relating to women's equality, particularly the Thomas Hill hearings (Orr 1997, 30).⁴
- ▶ Third, as a response to the critiques of feminism made by "first prong" feminists, and the taking up of "multiplicity and difference" found in the work of black and third world feminists of that period (Drake 2002; Heywood 2005). These are overlapping third wave genealogies, but writers connected to the second and third prongs have dominated discussions of third wave in both the popular and academic spheres.

The third wave literature is full of autobiographical accounts of young women trying to figure out, adapt to, and/or take on 1970s feminism (Orr 1997). As Rebecca Walker (1995) notes, some criticisms made by self-identified third wavers have been viewed as based on stereotypes that elide the diversity of second wave feminists and feminisms. Elizabeth Kelly, for example, insists that the "anger, gross overgeneralizations, and historical misrepresentations that pervade the Third

Wave literature can be off-putting" (2005, 234), suggesting third wave is a "rebellion against...a false, imaginary set of stereotypes forwarded by the popular media" (2005, 236). Some third wave adherents do rebel in this way, sometimes, but Kelly's polemic returns us to a hierarchical binary structure that not only positions "good" feminisms or feminists against "bad" ones, but that also insists that these neatly delineated, identifiable cohorts are "natural."

Many of the writers discussed here assume that categories of feminism are intrinsically meaningful and that their meaning derives, in part, from attitudes that are seen to be intrinsic (or natural) to cohort members. This cannot be entirely dismissed. As Jennifer Drake writes: "the feminist movement has always been informed by specific struggles and circumstances...third-wave feminists both dialogue with feminism's grassroots traditions and resist feminism as a master narrative" (2002, 193). The reality of growing up, or identifying with, a period "shaped by feminism but also saturated by backlash" (Dicker and Piepmeier 2003, 11), requires "feminisms that value contestation and an interweaving of strategies, old and new" (Purvis 2004, 109).

However, reductive readings on both "sides" have created "straw feminisms" that have been fine fodder for the news media (Purvis 2004). The assumption inherent here is that each cohort is identifiable and staged in opposition to the other. Members of each cohort are assumed to hold similar, pre-existing values, and few women outside of those writing explicitly about these issues - and sometimes not even them - ever asked what they actually think about these things.

Some see the third wave's ambiguity as being linked to its theoretical proximity to postmodernism (Alfonso and Trigilio 1997): its rejection of master narratives, its view of identity as fluid and multiple, its attempts to deconstruct ideas and to refuse "truths," and its insistence on the need for historical specificity. Taking a critical look at the third wave means recognizing the specific moment(s) it erupted onto the scene: a backlash against feminist gains, the rise of

neoconservative and liberal powers, the increasingly global reach of the mediated public sphere, and the widening divide between rich and poor (Aapola *et al.* 2005; Baumgardner and Richards 2003). When Elizabeth Kelly argues that "Third Wavers seem to have adopted the ethos of individual empowerment and evanescent identity construction" (2005, 241), this may be an easy way of dismissing a desire to "create identities that accommodate ambiguity and our multiple personalities" (Walker 1995, xxv), or to develop "modes of thinking that can come to terms with [the] multiple, constantly shifting bases of oppression in relation to [the] multiple, interpenetrating axes of identity" (Heywood and Drake 1997, 3).

The desire to make third wave feminism into something unified is the desire to, as Orr writes, "map a territory that is still forming" (1997, 29). Catherine Bailey (2002) suggests that the second wave saw itself building from the first and the third sees itself as breaking away from the second. But this elides conflicts between first and second wave feminisms and the indebtedness many third wavers express toward the second wave (Dicker and Piepmeier 2003; Findlen 1995; Heywood and Drake 1997). Within the literature that we surveyed, third wave feminists tended to insist that the voice of the third wave is a constellation of loosely connected ideas, organizations, and cultural producers. At the same time, these authors purport to speak about something identifiable and coherent. In an undoubtedly unintended paradox, the literature stresses that there is no defining feature of third wave and yet, in reacting to other forms of feminism these authors draw boundaries around third wave identity.

Cathryn Bailey offers a Foucauldian take on the rise of third wave feminism and the paradox described above. Third wave subjectivity has been constituted, at least in part, by the second wave. Bailey thus sees young women's critiques as "legitimate expressions of resistance" (2002, 195). Catherine Orr (1997) points out that we should not be surprised that feminism itself

has become a master narrative. Hence, we might read relationships between feminists as embodying one of the fundamental ruptures frequently associated with political torch-passing: in one's political development "you're free to decide, on condition that you make the right choice" (Zizek 2002).

Many questions remain: What assumptions about cohortism and its attendant attitudes are assumed in the discourses that currently circulate about third wave feminism? Who are the feminists assumed to fall within these categories? Which feminists have been invited to articulate their adherence to particular feminist cohorts and attitudes assumed to be held by them? That is, who is/has been involved in the discussion and development of this vision of third wave feminism? Going into this research with the literature to guide us, we expected that most of our respondents would identify primarily as third wave feminists. We imagined that they would have rather broad views about the potential openness of feminisms and Women's Studies, but might not feel comfortable within those spaces as they are currently configured. We thought, however, that they might feel relatively well supported within the academic community more broadly defined. Our findings paint a rather different picture.

A Survey of New Canadian Women

Academics: Findings

WORKING ENVIRONMENTS

Our survey participants did not feel that they were alone as feminists, especially among their colleagues. Although they tended to disagree that most others in their universities shared their views of feminism, they tended to agree that most of their colleagues did share their views. They also very strongly agreed that their colleagues supported their feminist and/or women-centred approaches to their academic work. That agreement was somewhat tempered when asked about the support of students and university administrators. Our survey participants rejected statements about being the only feminist and/or women-centred

scholar in their faculty, department or institution. These data do not paint a picture of junior female scholars as alienated and alone.

In terms of equity, survey participants were ambivalent about whether their access to teaching and research opportunities was the same as that of their male colleagues. More than half of survey participants (63%) agreed that they have the same teaching opportunities, although fewer (54%) felt that way about research opportunities. They were evenly split as to whether their colleagues and administrators (55% and 50%) treated them the same as male professors, but three-quarters felt that students did not. While this cohort of women generally felt institutionally supported, in certain relationships, particularly with students, they experienced feelings of inequity. This may suggest that certain kinds of feminist or women-centred work is generally accepted among faculty members and, to a lesser degree, administrators. The consistency of the survey responses suggests that institutional feelings of comfort, at least within departments and with colleagues, are not unusual for this cohort of women. On the other hand, their experiences with students suggest that the acceptance of women in the academy does not always mirror an acceptance in the wider communities from which students are drawn. These responses suggest ambivalence about gender equity and are worth looking at more closely.

SELF-IDENTIFICATION WITHIN CATEGORIES OF FEMINISM

We asked our survey participants to identify how strongly they agreed that their politics resembled the various types of feminism described in the literature. The sample was split between those who strongly associated with second or with third wave. Agreement with the first and second wave was positively correlated, meaning that agreement with one was associated with agreement with the other. Notably, agreement with second and third wave was negatively correlated. This suggests a progression from

first to second wave, with the third wave emerging, as suggested in the literature, in contrast to the second.

We also asked our survey participants to rate their level of agreement with three commonly used categories of feminist thought: socialist, radical and liberal.⁵ Socialist feminism received the highest level of support and radical feminism the least. These categories were positively correlated. Survey participants were evenly split on liberal feminism. Agreement with liberal forms of feminism was negatively correlated with socialist feminism. To some extent, these findings may reflect the historical specificity of these labels, which arose out of the second wave and were hotly debated. Radical feminism has always been on the fringe, critiqued as being essentialist, and is less adaptable to the "postmodern turn" during which our survey participants were educated. Socialist feminism, on the other hand, gestures more toward the possibilities of multiplicity and intersectionality associated with postmodernism. It is not surprising to see ambivalence around the category of liberal feminism, which has more modernist roots than the other categories.

The correlations among these categories reveal an interesting picture. The strongest positive correlations were those between second wave and liberal feminism ($r=.28$) and third wave and socialist feminism ($r=.31$). These correlations suggest that socialist feminism is the one being carried forward into the third wave. That none of the correlations between type of feminism and wave were negative suggests that the evolution of feminisms in academia is less a process involving the rejection of particular categories than a more positive process that involves building on preferences.

OPINIONS ABOUT WOMEN'S STUDIES AND FEMINISM

To add some depth to the self-identification questions, we included questions to measure our survey participants' perception of the breadth of feminism and Women's Studies. Along the few dimensions

that we measured, the women surveyed did tend to align with some of the tenets of third wave feminism. Almost all agreed (between 96% and 98%) that there was a place for Gender Studies within Women's Studies, a place for men within feminism and a place for queer theory within feminism. Their agreement was generally strong and was strongest for the question relating to queer theory. We interpreted these attitudes as reflecting the era in which our survey participants were educated. They are certainly also in line with arguments made within some third wave literatures that Women's Studies and feminism need to find ways of embracing men, queer theory and gender theory; that is, of embracing the complexities within which debates about what constitutes particular gender and sexual identities are increasingly framed.

Few survey participants felt that either Women's Studies or feminism was too narrow. Similarly, a large majority agreed that both feminism and Women's Studies were tolerant and accepting of diverse views. These attitudes may reflect the era in which our survey participants were educated. But these findings contradict a recurrent theme in the literature: a desire to "open up" feminism and/or Women's Studies to broader definitions and populations. We read the literature as suggesting that these spaces, as currently configured, are not yet fully open to the broad interests and identities which are central to the socio-politics of many self-identified third wavers. But, among the women we surveyed at least, this did not appear to be a concern.

The women who responded to our survey did not appear to feel the sense of alienation or marginalization from feminism and/or Women's Studies that is reflected in the literature. Less than a third felt that they had been marginalized by feminists or within Women's Studies and only about 10% felt excluded from either based on their appearance or lifestyle. Furthermore, at least four-fifths of these women felt they would be comfortable in Women's Studies

departments, feminist work environments, and women's-centred environments.

PARTICIPATION IN WOMEN'S STUDIES

Three-quarters of survey participants worked in an institution that had a Women's Studies faculty but, interestingly, they did not appear to be highly occupied with these programs: 56% were not involved at all, 26% were somewhat involved, and only 22% were involved or very involved.⁶ Those in Arts Faculties were most likely and those in Law were least likely to be involved. Older survey participants were more likely to be involved in Women's Studies than younger participants. Also interesting was the negative correlation between agreement with liberal feminist politics and level of involvement with Women's Studies. Agreement with radical and socialist feminist politics was positively associated with participating in Women's Studies. These findings reveal quite a lot about the face of Women's Studies in the "third wave," especially insofar as younger women, and those identifying themselves as third wave, are not heavily involved.

Conclusions

The findings of our survey challenge some of the recurrent themes found in the third wave literature and thus paint a more complex picture of new female faculty than we thought we'd find. Our own experiences suggested that the picture painted by much of the literature was skewed, but it was so internally consistent that we expected it to be borne out in the responses of the women we surveyed. This raises some questions that might offer starting points for future research. In particular, we might ask: who are the primary contributors to this dialogue? How might their social identities and personal narratives act to circumscribe and gatekeep the boundaries of the debates about emergent feminisms inside and outside of the academy?

We feel that we have been well served by our choice of method. The survey forced us to ask highly structured, but not very nuanced, questions. If we had been face to

face and sharing stories we might have unintentionally imposed boundaries on the narratives the participants could tell, based on our own beliefs or assumptions about the "truths" offered by the dominant accounts of cohortism in the literature. One of the most interesting things that we were able to see in stepping back was that there was no obvious pattern in the responses of the women we surveyed that fell into alignment with what the literature intimated should be the attitudes and experiences of women belonging to a feminist third wave.

Given our findings on working environments, it would be interesting to examine whether feminism is one of the critical discourses that university students are assimilated into during their educations, and if exposure to growing numbers of new female faculty members (in some faculties) will create a shift in the feelings of students and thus in the experiences of newer faculty members in relation to their students. The same might be said of their administrators. That is, new women faculty members may not feel that their administrations are truly supportive of women, feminism, and/or women-centred work, but growing numbers of women faculty may put pressure on administrators to change their attitudes. Clearly there is a palpable feminist presence on many campuses; equity has not been achieved, but this does not seem to have eradicated the feelings of support felt by the survey participants from their colleagues.

Our findings on how our participants self-identified in relation to the various categories and waves of feminism and their views on the breadth and scope of Women's Studies and feminism are difficult to reconcile. The fact that they chose second or third (and not both) suggests that on the one hand the literature may present an over-generalized view of feminist cohortism, while on the other that there is a split (although this may have little to do with the expected axes of affiliation as laid out in the literature). The implications of the choices made by the women who participated in this survey, along with their tendency to ideologically locate themselves

within what we saw as some kind of third wave agenda, are not clear. They do suggest the need for more in-depth work to be done that teases out women's relationships to feminist labels, relationships that are more complex than seems to be indicated in the literature. This data reminds us to be mindful of the assumptions laid out in the languages we use to formulate and ask research questions, which are the products of particular debates within the scholarly literatures.

Another interesting point revealed in our data relates to participants' involvement in Women's Studies. We might ask what a study of those who do work in these programs might tell us. Our findings suggest, broadly, some kind of locational politics related to Women's Studies which, although largely interdisciplinary, is strongly associated with the Social Sciences and Humanities. Our findings on the relationship between age and participation might fit into the discourse about cohortism, but this contradicts our other findings on comfort within and around Women's Studies among the women who answered this survey. Given that Women's Studies is often seen as a space created by and through second wave discourses, we thought participants might feel that their views or identities were not welcome in these spaces. But this was not the case. Despite this, less than half of the survey participants participate in the Women's Studies programs offered in Universities where they are employed. Further probing into this area might ask why, if many new female faculty feel comfortable in Women's Studies, so few of them are participating therein.

It is possible that the attitudes of our survey participants reflect the influence of postmodern and post-structural theory in the academy and we interpreted them as reflecting the era in which our survey participants were educated, regardless of age or self-identification. It may be that although self-identifying as "second wave" was most comfortable for some survey participants, the way they frame this type of feminism is informed by ideological positions the literature largely suggests are antithetical to second

wave thinking. It also points to the likelihood that second wave feminism has often been reductively rendered in the contemporary literature, as the parts of second wave feminism being critiqued are largely those published from the mainstream, institutionalized centre. Regardless, this ideological framing could have significant implications for the ways in which some forms of academic feminism, as well as Women's Studies departments, will be configured in the future.

These findings point to a need for in-depth work which examines the debates about contemporary feminisms in more complex ways that balance the views espoused in the literature with a turning of attention to women's experiences. The most exciting findings relate to the suggestion that we have a rather reductive understanding of the players within these debates, their ideological locatedness and group adherence. That there are women/feminists whose views fall into line with those delineated by and espoused within the dominant rhetoric of these public debates is assumed, but rarely have they been asked, nor have we seen a great deal of writing "against" these positions. We might ask: Do particular patterns related to cohortism and self-identification emerge from proximity to Women's Studies? Are these patterns dominant in the experiences of women who have chosen to write about these issues, and have their experiences become a meta-narrative that is difficult to write back to? The fact that so few of the participants in our survey actively participated in available Women's Studies programs and faculties in their places of employment is very suggestive in this regard.

What we are left with is a much more complicated picture of women and of feminisms within the academy today than we expected to find. We are left with even more questions than we started with, but we think we have found the most interesting questions that we hope others in turn will consider.

Endnotes

1. The authors of this essay are equal co-authors. This research was funded by the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research and approved by the Research Ethics Board of Saint Mary's University. We would like to thank our research assistants, Laure Lafrance and Melissa Tatlock.

2. As we were completing the first complete draft of this paper, one of the authors was asked to review an essay on this subject.

3. Just over half (57%) were in tenure-track jobs but did not have tenure. They had spent, on average, four years in their current positions.

4. The foundation's aim is: "...to combat inequalities that we ourselves face as a result of our age, gender, race, sexual orientation, economic status, or level of education. By empowering young women and transgender youth nationwide, Third Wave is building a lasting foundation for young women's activism around the country" (<http://thirdwavefoundation.org/about>).

5. We understand liberal feminism as desiring equity with men; socialist feminism as seeking women's emancipation through cultural and economic freedom; and radical feminism as seeking to free women from patriarchal oppression through the rejection of gender roles.

6. Just over half (52%) of our respondents were in Arts and 21% were in Law. This distribution probably reflects the nature of our own professional networks

Appendix A

SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

I. We are interested in how you feel your views fit in with others and how you are treated in the university setting. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	SD	Percentages		
		D	A	SA
Most others in my department share my views about feminism.	7	36	41	16
Most others in my faculty share my views of feminism.	18	40	31	10
Most others in my university share my views of feminism	19	57	13	11
Most feminist scholars in my discipline share my views of feminism.	6	17	58	19
I do not always have the same access to research opportunities as men.	21	33	26	20
I do not always have the same access to teaching opportunities as men.	22	41	23	15
My colleagues treat me the same as male colleagues.	11	38	28	22
My students treat me the same as their male instructors.	31	45	9	16
The university administrators treat me the same as male faculty.	9	36	34	21
There is a place for gender studies within women's studies.	1	0	46	53
There is a place for men within feminism.	1	3	48	48
There is a place for queer theory within feminism.	0	2	36	60
Feminism is mainly a political movement.	18	38	28	16
My politics most resembles first wave feminism.	38	51	8	3
My politics most resembles second wave feminism.	12	32	46	9
My politics most resembles third wave feminism.	5	29	41	25
My politics most resembles liberal feminism.	19	30	34	17
My politics most resembles radical feminism.	26	48	22	5
My politics most resembles socialist feminism	5	26	48	22

II. We would like to know about how you feel personally about women's studies, feminism and woman-centred work. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	SD	Percentages		
		D	A	SA
I find women's studies to be tolerant and accepting of diverse views.	1	23	46	31
I find feminism to be tolerant and accepting of diverse views.	3	26	51	20
I am/would be comfortable working in a women's studies.	4	18	43	35
I am/would be comfortable working in a feminist work environment.	3	11	34	52
I am/would be comfortable working in a woman-centred environment.	2	6	47	44
I have felt marginalized by women's studies.	33	40	20	7
I have felt marginalized by feminists.	36	35	24	5
My political views resemble most of those working in women's studies.	3	18	60	19
My political views resemble most feminists.	5	20	53	22
My lifestyle leaves me excluded from women's studies.	33	55	8	5
My lifestyle leaves me excluded from feminist groups.	32	56	11	1
My appearance leaves me excluded from women's studies.	44	49	4	4
Women's Studies is too narrow	24	44	24	8
Feminism is too narrow	29	48	16	7

III. If you would identify yourself as feminist or woman-centred in your work, please answer the following questions. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Percentages			
	SD	D	A	SA
I am the only feminist/woman-centred scholar in my department.	40	47	5	8
I am the only feminist/woman-centred scholar in my faculty	49	46	1	4
I am the only feminist/woman-centred scholar in my institution.	59	40	0	1
My colleagues (locally) support my feminist/woman-centred approach	6	47	70	7
My Canadian colleagues support my feminist woman-centred approach	2	11	76	12
My students support my feminist/woman-centred approach	7	34	56	3
The university supports my feminist/woman-centred approach	11	30	58	2

References

- Aapola, S., M. Gonick and A. Harris. *Young Femininity: Girlhood, Power and Social Change*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
- Aaron, J. and S. Walby. *Out of the Margins: Women's Studies in the Nineties*. London: Faimer Press, 1991.
- Acker, S. and C. Armenti. "Sleepless in Academia," *Gender and Education* 16.1 (2004): 3-24.
- Alexander, M. *The Third Wave: Feminist Perspectives on Racism*. New York: Kitchen Table-Women of Colour Press, 1998.
- Alfonso, R. and J. Trigilio. "Surfing the Third Wave: A Dialogue Between Two Third Wave Feminists," *Hypatia* 12.3 (1997): 7-16.
- Bailey, C. "Unpacking the Mother/Daughter Baggage: Reassessing Second- and Third-Wave Tensions," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 3&4 (2002):138-54.
- Barata, P., S. Hunjan and J. Leggatt. "Ivory Tower? Feminist Women's Experiences of Graduate School," *Women's Studies International Forum* 28.2-3 (2005): 232-46.
- Baumgardner, J. and A. Richards. *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and the Future*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2000.
- _____. "The Number One Question About Feminism," *Feminist Studies* 29.2 (2003): 448-52.
- Bell, S. and J. Gordon. "Scholarship - The New Dimension to Equity Issues for Academic Women," *Women's Studies International Forum* 22.6 (1999): 645-58.
- Braithwaite, A., S. Heald, S. Luhmann and S. Rosenberg. *Troubling Women's Studies: Pasts, Presents, and Possibilities*. Toronto: Sumach Press, 2005.
- Bronstein, P. "Older Women in Academia: Contemporary History and Issues," *Journal of Women's History* 12.4 (2001):184-201.
- Bulbeck, C. "Articulating Structure and Agency: How Women's Studies Students Express Their Relationship with Feminism," *Women's Studies International Forum* 24.2 (2001):141-56.
- Davies, S., C. Lubelska and J. Quinn. *Changing the Subject: Women in Higher Education*. Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis Inc, 1994.

- Davis, K., M. Evans and J. Lorber. *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies*. London: Sage, 2006.
- Dicker, R. and A. Piepmeier. *Catching a Wave: Reclaiming Feminism for the 21st Century*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2003.
- Drake, J. "The Mis/Education of Righteous Babes: Third Wave Feminism and Popular Culture," *Growing Up Postmodern*, edited by R. Strickland. Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002, pp. 181-204.
- Findlen, B. *Listen Up: Voices from the Next Feminist Generation*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press, 1995.
- Gillis, S., G. Howie and R. Munford. *Third Wave Feminism*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.
- Harris, K., K. Melaas and E. Rodacker. "The Impact of Women's Studies Courses on College Students of the 1990s," *Sex Roles* 40.11-12 (1999): 969-77.
- Hernandez, D. and B. Rehman. *Colonize This!: Young Women of Color on Today's Feminism*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press, 2002.
- Heywood, L. *The Women's Movement Today: An Encyclopedia of Third-Wave Feminism*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 2005.
- _____ and J. Drake. *Third Wave Agenda: Doing Feminism, Being Feminist*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1997.
- Hinds, H., A. Phoenix and J. Stacey. *Working Out: New Directions for Women's Studies*. London: Faliner Press, 1992.
- Karp, M. and D. Stoller. *Bust Guide to the New Girl Order*. New York: Penguin, 1995.
- Kelly, E. "Review Essay: A New Generation of Feminism? Reflections of the Third Wave," *New Political Science* 27.2 (2005): 233-43.
- Kennedy, E. and A. Beins. *Women's Studies for the Future*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005.
- Kennedy, M., C. Lubelska and V. Walsh. *Making Connections: Women's Studies, Women's Movements, Women's Lives*. London: Taylor and Francis, 1993.
- Letherby, G. and J. Marchbank. "Why Do Women's Studies? A Cross England Profile," *Women's Studies International Forum* 24.5 (2001): 587-603.
- Malhotra, S. and K. Perez. "Belonging, Bridges, and Bodies," *NWSA Journal* 17.2 (2005): 47-68.
- Malina, D. and S. Maslin-Prothero. *Surviving the Academy: Feminist Perspective*. London: Falmer Press, 1998.
- Marchbank, J. and G. Letherby. "Views and Perspectives of Women's Studies: A Survey of Women and Men Students," *Gender and Education* 18.2 (2006): 157-82.
- Morley, L. *Organizing Feminisms: The Micropolitics of the Academy*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- _____ and V. Walsh. *Feminist Academics: Creative Agents for Change*. Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis, 1995.
- Orr, C. "Charting the Currents of the Third Wave," *Hypatia* 12.3 (1997): 29-45.
- Price, M. and M. Owen. "Who Studies Women's Studies?" *Gender and Education* 10.2 (1998): 185-98.
- Purvis, J. "Grrrls and Women Together in the Third Wave: Embracing the Challenges of Intergenerational Feminism(S)," *National Women's Studies Association Journal* 16.3 (2004): 93-124.

Ruttenberg, D. *Yentl's Revenge: The Next Wave of Jewish Feminism*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press, 2001.

Skelton, C. "The "Individualized" (Woman) in the Academy: Ulrich Beck, Gender and Power," *Gender and Education* 17.3 (2005): 319-32.

Walker, R. "Becoming the Third Wave," *Ms* (January/February 1992): 39-41.

_____. *To Be Real: Telling the Truth and Changing the Face of Feminism*. New York: Anchor Books, 1995.

Zizek, S. *Welcome to the Desert of the Real*. London and New York: Verso, 2002.