

# An Awkward Situation: Men in Women's Studies—Part I

Margrit Eichler,  
Ontario Institute for Studies  
in Education,  
with the assistance of  
Louise Vandelac,  
Université du Québec  
à Montréal

*Interviewer: What do you think about the role of men teaching women's studies?*

*Male Professor: Very awkward at the moment. I think it's a very difficult issue, because I recognize that there are many people within the area who feel that only women should teach it.... I think men have a very delicate marginal position in the area.*

## Introduction

MEN PARTICIPATE IN WOMEN'S/FEMINIST STUDIES in at least four different roles: as teachers, as researchers/authors, as students, and as administrators. Their participation is likely to be evaluated differently by women and by men. This paper will empirically examine one of the aspects from one of the two relevant perspectives, namely, how men themselves experience and reflect upon their role as teachers in women's/feminist studies courses.<sup>1</sup> The analytical framework, however, is derived from the relevant feminist literature.

Looking over the feminist literature, one finds that it takes a uniformly negative view of men as teachers in women's/feminist studies courses.

[O]ne would be naive to the point of stupidity if one failed to question both the motives and the qualifications of a male instructor embarking on this enterprise. (Jaggar, 1977/78: 247)

The arguments against having men as teachers can be grouped together into several categories. The first could be called the *epistemological disadvantage* of men. Since men have not experienced being a woman in a sexist society, their relationship to the issues discussed is consequently, at best, a distant one rather than an immediate one. Without specifically addressing the issue of male instructors in women's/feminist courses, Code (1983) argues that women and men belong to different epistemic communities; hence women and men know differently. Jaggar (1977/78:249) argues that "... a male instructor, even a feminist one, will be severely disadvantaged in appreciating the significance of feminist claims." (See also Rowland, 1982: 493.)

A second argument is that *men teaching women's/feminist studies inadvertently reinforce the existing male-female authority differential*—even if they try to avoid this—by virtue of the fact that teachers exert authority in the classroom. A female

*This is Report #6 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project. It is called Part I because it only looks at half the issue.*

student in a women's/feminist class is "being invited to question the traditional sex stereotypes. However, covertly, through the very structure of the situation, those traditional sex stereotypes are being reinforced" (Jaggar, 1977/78: 250). This results in a contradiction between the form and the content of what is being taught.

C'est toujours d'une double position de dominance (dans la société globale et dans le monde académique) que ces féministes mâles prennent la parole. Et il apparaît que ces interventions visent souvent à définir notre mouvement. (Dagenais, 1989: 9)

A different version of this argument is that men "are part of the problem, whereas any woman is part of the solution," even if she is ghastly, unsisterly, and an anti-feminist "social male" (Klein, 1983: 419). Women's studies are meant to empower women and, even though that may not happen often, nevertheless, the presence of men in the classroom, particularly as teachers, may disempower and silence the very women for whom the course was designed. "It is like saying—we have told you everything else and shaped that information, now we'll explain your oppression to you" (Rowland, 1982: 493).

A third set of arguments centers around *the motivations of men who wish to teach women's/feminist studies*. Klein categorizes them as "the expert," "the ignoramus" and "the poor dear" and concludes that, whatever their guise, "there is no room for men in WS, none whatsoever" (Klein, 1983: 413, emphasized in the original).

Rowland (1982: 490), in a somewhat different context, adds a further type: the "Fairytale Brigade":

These are usually men who for some strange reason are attracted to the idea of involvement in women's studies. They tell you fairytales. They offer you many marvellous visions of how they can help you, which they never back up and which never come true. They want to 'help' you to design and run the course, but in discussions they aim to manipulate and control, and do not understand the basis of feminism.

The literature, then, is quite united: men have no place as teachers in women's/feminist studies. However, in our survey of women's/feminist teachers in Canada, we found that they are there. Indeed, men constitute 13% of the population of teachers<sup>2</sup> who currently teach or who have taught women's/feminist studies courses at Canadian universities—although they may have done so under a variety of labels. The basis on which respondents included themselves in our survey was a positive answer to the question:

Have you ever taught at least one credit course at a Canadian university or college (which offers at least a bachelor's degree) in women's studies or from a feminist perspective?

Given that men constitute a sizeable minority (certainly larger than we had expected to find at the outset of the project), it behooves us to look at these men empirically.

### The Study

The Canadian Women's Studies Project is a large scale study which examines professors who teach or have taught women's/feminist studies courses at Canadian universities.<sup>3</sup> The study was conducted in four phases: Phase 1 involved obtaining the official information on women's studies at all 166 Canadian universities as provided through the registrars' offices;<sup>4</sup> Phase 2 involved identifying and surveying, with a mailed questionnaire, all professors who had ever taught at least one credit course in the area of women's/feminist studies; Phase 3 involved open-ended telephone interviews with 100 of the women randomly selected from the larger group of 780 women and all of the men we could reach from Phase 2; and Phase 4 involved telephone interviews with those contemporary feminist thinkers/authors whose work had been identified as particularly useful by the Phase 2 population.<sup>5</sup>

Overall, we found 892 professors who had taught or were at the time teaching women's/feminist studies, of whom 112 or 13% were men. This was considerably higher than we had expected, and for that reason we changed our research design for

Phase 3. Initially, we had intended to take a random sample of *all* respondents for our telephone follow-up interviews. With 13% men, this would have reduced the number of women more than we wished without giving us sufficient numbers of men to draw any useful conclusions about them. Given that men constituted a more important minority than we had anticipated, it seemed appropriate to look at them in more detail. We therefore decided to take a random sample of 100 of the women plus all of the men (83 or 74% of the men were actually reached in this round).<sup>6</sup> This allows us to examine the role of the men in women's/feminist studies in some detail, particularly since we asked both the female and male professors what they thought about the role of men in women's/feminist studies.

In the following, I shall first examine the characteristics of these male professors as compared to the female professors in women's/feminist studies. In the second part of the paper, I shall look at the interview materials in which the male professors comment on their own reasons for teaching women's/feminist studies courses and reflect on the role of men in women's/feminist studies in general. The conclusion will look at the evidence in light of the analytical themes derived from the literature.

#### *The Employment Situation of Men in Women's/Feminist Studies*

We have considerable information on the men (as we do on the women) who teach women's/feminist studies. Looking at *when* both women and men first started teaching in the area, we find that women entered the field earlier, but as of 1975, men's entry into the field has remained proportionately relatively stable, hovering around 13%. (See Table 1.)

However, they did so from a considerably different basis than

**TABLE 1**  
Years in which Professors Taught Their First Women's Studies Courses<sup>a</sup>

YEARS	Females <i>n</i>	Males <i>n</i>	Males %
-1974	116	11	9.0
1975-1979	174	25	12.6
1980-1984	269	44	14.1
1985-1988	189	30	13.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	748	110	12.8
Missing	32	2	

(a) Based on full population of professors.

**TABLE 2**  
Rank at Time of Teaching First Women's Studies Course<sup>a</sup>

RANK	Females			Males		
	<i>n</i>	%	Cum %	<i>n</i>	%	Cum %
Undergraduate Student	3	.4	.4	0	.0	.0
Graduate Student	55	7.2	7.5	2	1.8	1.8
Part-Time Instructor	151	19.6	27.2	5	4.5	6.3
Sessional Lecturer	43	5.6	32.8	2	1.8	8.1
Lecturer	67	8.7	41.5	7	6.3	14.4
Assistant Professor	250	32.5	74.0	32	28.8	43.2
Associate Professor	115	15.0	88.9	39	35.1	78.4
Full Professor	19	2.5	91.4	21	18.9	97.3
Professor	28	3.6	95.1	2	1.8	99.1
Other Univ. Apptm.	27	3.5	98.6	1	.9	100.0
Other Position	11	1.4	100.0	0	.0	100.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	769	100.1	100.0	111	99.9	100.0
Missing	11			1		

(a) Based on total population who has ever taught women's studies courses.

**TABLE 3**  
**Position at Time of First Course<sup>a</sup>**

POSITION	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Hired on course basis	152	20.0	6	5.4
Contract, l'mted pos.	205	27.0	17	15.3
Tenure track	192	25.3	29	26.1
Tenured position	182	23.9	59	53.2
Visiting professor	12	1.6	0	.0
Other	17	2.2	0	.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Missing	20		1	

*(a) Based on the total population of professors who have taught women's studies courses.*

**TABLE 4**  
**Nature of Appointment at Time of First Course<sup>a</sup>**

APPOINTMENT	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Full-Time	496	65.4	101	91.0
Part-Time	262	34.6	10	9.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>758</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Missing	22		1	

*(a) Based on the total population of professors who have ever taught women's studies courses.*

women. While only 15.3% of the men were in a non-professorial rank at the time of their first course, fully 46.4% of the women were in some non-professorial rank.<sup>7</sup> (See Table 2.)

A similar image emerges if we examine women's and men's type of position. While 79.3% of the men were either tenured or in a tenure track position when they taught their first women's/feminist studies course, only 49.2% of the women had tenure or were in tenure track positions. (See Table 3.) Men were more than twice as likely to have tenure than were women. Indeed, more than half of the women were in a precarious position vis-à-vis job security as compared to only about 20% of the men.

Not surprisingly, then, men were also much more likely to have a full-time appointment (91%) than women (65.4%). (See Table 4.)

As a group, then, men were in a clearly advantaged position over women when they started teaching their first courses in the area of women's/feminist studies. The majority of men were in a professorial rank, had tenure, and held a full-time appointment. While almost half of the women were in a non-professorial rank, the majority did not have tenure and more than a third were on a part-time appointment.

The employment advantage of men over women has continued over time. At present, only 5% of the men hold a non-professorial rank, as compared to about a quarter (23.6%) of the women. (See Table 5.)

While now more than half (53.2%) of the women are tenured and almost three quarters (73.9%) of the women are either in a tenured or tenure stream position, this is true for the vast majority (90.8%) of the men. (See Table 6.)

Similarly, 16.1% of the women teaching in the field currently have a part-time appointment, as compared to only 6.1% of the men. (See Table 7.)

RANK	Females			Males		
	n	%	Cum %	n	%	Cum %
Undergraduate Student	0	.0	.0	0	.0	.0
Graduate Student	10	1.5	1.5	0	.0	.0
Part-Time Instructor	55	8.5	10.0	2	2.0	2.0
Sessional Lecturer	14	2.2	12.2	0	.0	2.0
Lecturer	20	3.1	15.3	1	1.0	3.0
Assistant Professor	148	22.9	38.2	12	12.0	15.0
Associate Professor	217	33.5	71.7	39	39.0	54.0
Full Professor	81	12.5	84.1	43	43.0	97.0
Professor	48	7.4	91.7	1	1.0	98.0
Other Univ. Apptm.	41	6.3	98.0	2	2.0	100.0
Other Position	13	2.0	100.0	0	.0	100.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>99.9</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Missing	64			8		

(a) Based on those professors who have ever taught women's studies courses and are currently still employed by a university.

POSITION	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Hired on course basis	57	9.0	3	3.1
Contract. l'mted pos.	84	13.2	5	5.1
Tenure track	131	20.7	10	10.2
Tenured position	337	53.2	79	80.6
Visiting professor	3	.4	1	1.0
Other	22	3.5	0	.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>634</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Missing	77		10	

(a) Based on professors who have ever taught women's studies courses and are currently still employed by a university.

APPOINTMENT	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Full-Time	527	83.9	93	93.9
Part-Time	101	16.1	6	6.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Missing	83		7	

(a) Based on population of professors who have taught women's studies courses and are still employed at a university.

**TABLE 8**  
**Discipline of all Full-Time Professors Still Employed by a University Who Have Taught Women's/Feminist Studies Courses**

DISCIPLINE *	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
	Education	32	6.2	3
Fine & Applied Arts	15	2.9	1	1.1
Humanities & related	188	36.5	54	58.1
Soc. Sciences & related	252	48.9	35	37.6
Agricult. & Biol. Sciences	7	1.4	0	.0
Engineer. & Appl. Sciences	0	.0	0	.0
Health Prf.s & Occ.s	7	1.4	0	.0
Math. & Physical Sciences	1	.2	0	.0
Other, including WS	13	2.5	0	.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	515	100.0	93	100.0
Missing	12			

*(a) In cases where respondents cited two disciplines, the following coding scheme was applied: (1) Women's Studies & other disciplines coded according to non-WS designation; (2) Remaining doubles coded to match with discipline of highest degree.*

Looking at the employment situation of women and men teaching in the area of women's/feminist studies over time, we can note a marked improvement for both sexes, but men have maintained a very significant advantage over the women, even in this preeminently female area. This is particularly gratifying given the fact that as a group, female full-time academics who teach women's/feminist courses do better in terms of their employment situation than all female full-time faculty at Canadian universities (see Eichler with the assistance of Tite, 1990).

When we consider the broad discipline groupings within which men who teach women's/feminist courses locate themselves, we find (as shown in Table 8) that, as compared to full-time women still

**TABLE 9**  
**Disciplines of Work for Women and Men\***

DISCIPLINE	Work		
	Women n=700	Men n=109	Men %
Anthropology	24	3	11.1
Education	38	4	9.5
History	72	16	18.2
Modern & medieval languages	106	15	12.4
Philosophy	25	14	35.9
Political Science	20	8	28.6
Religious Studies	38	12	24.0
Psychology	49	6	10.9
Social Work	33	0	.0
Sociology	138	24	14.8
Women's Studies	37	0	.0
Other Humanities	35	10	22.2
Other Soc. Sciences	60	3	4.8
Other	39	0	.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	714	115	13.9
Missing	80	3	

*(a) Respondents who gave a double discipline were coded twice. Amounts by which the totals exceed Ns indicate the amount of double coding. Based on total population of professors who have ever taught women's/feminist studies courses.*

employed by a university, full-time men are more likely to be in the humanities (58.1% versus 36.5%) and less likely to be in the social sciences (37.6% of the men versus 48.9% of the women).<sup>8</sup>

Looking at the individual disciplines within which women and men work, we find that there are proportionately more men in philosophy, political science, religious studies, and history (in declining

order of over-representation) while they are absent in social work and women's studies per se, and underrepresented (compared to their overall participation rate in teaching such courses) in anthropology, education, and psychology.<sup>9</sup> (See Table 9.)

Taking this as a general backdrop, we can now look at one of the most interesting—and arguably one of the most important—issues with respect to men in women's/feminist studies: their relationship to feminism.

### *Men in Women's/Feminist Studies and Feminism*

In our survey, we asked a number of questions which tap the self-perception of our respondents in terms of feminism, their actual participation in the women's movement, and their use of feminist resources. It is in this area that we find great differences between the women and men in our population.

We asked respondents whether they defined themselves as feminists or not.<sup>10</sup> (The results appear in Table 10.) Of the women, 91% defined themselves as feminist. Not surprisingly, the percentage of men who do so is considerably lower, namely 58%. Eleven percent of the men identify themselves as "other," as do 4% of the women.

The question of self-definition must be taken with a grain of salt. We deliberately did not impose a definition of what feminism means, knowing that there is a great diversity of meanings attached to the term<sup>11</sup> and not wishing to rule out any of them. However, given the variety of meanings, we cannot assume that people mean the same thing when they use the label for themselves. (The same is true for most other broad labels.) For women, it seems reasonable to assume that using the term for oneself expresses a basic self-identification with a broad social movement. For men, the issue is not so clear, given the nature of the movement. As Schwenger has noted in this context, the statement "'I do not define myself as a feminist' could mean two quite different things: (a) I have enough reservations about the movement to want to distance myself from it; (b) I am reluctant to coopt a title and a movement which rightfully belongs to women, and

**TABLE 10**  
**Self-Definition of Female and Male Respondents**

DEFINITION	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Feminist	697	90.9	64	57.7
Non-femin., but concerned	40	5.2	33	29.7
Non-femin., not concerned	1	.1	2	1.8
Anti-feminist	0	.0	0	.0
Other	29	3.8	12	10.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>767</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Missing	13		1	

**TABLE 11**  
**Regular Readership of Feminist Journals**

REGULAR READER	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	645	84.5	59	52.7
No	118	15.5	53	47.3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Missing	17			

therefore would describe my sexual politics by another term."<sup>12</sup> Given this fundamental ambiguity, it is hard to interpret this finding.

No such problems prevail, however, when looking at whether professors read journals which are relevant to their teaching and which keep them up-to-date on recent theoretical and empirical developments. We therefore asked our respondents whether they regularly read feminist journals.<sup>13</sup> Of the men, about 47% said they did not, as compared to about 16% of the women. (See Table 11.)

We further probed to what degree the professors' work is informed by a feminist perspective.<sup>14</sup> As Table 12 plainly shows, men are less than half as likely as women to always use a feminist perspective in their work.

Turning to the experiential and activist dimension of involvement in the women's movement, men obviously stand in a different relation to the women's movement than do women. We found in a previous paper that women's involvement in women's studies interacts positively with their involvement in the women's movement (see Eichler, 1990). This is a relationship from which men are much less likely to profit than women; however, we did find, as shown in Table 13, that a small minority of the men had been active in a women's group as a member (13.5%) or even held a coordinating position (5.4%).<sup>15</sup>

Overall, then, men are much less likely to define themselves as feminist than are the comparable women professors, as well as much less likely to read feminist journals on a regular basis, to have their work informed by a feminist perspective, or to have been active in a women's group.

#### *The Nature of the Teaching Experience and Career Effects*

If one's commitment to women's/feminist studies deepens with increasing involvement with the women's movement, we would expect that men would consider women's/feminist studies as less central for themselves than do women. This is indeed the case. (See Table 14.)

When asked about the centrality of women's/feminist studies for their overall work,<sup>16</sup> men are much less likely than women to define it as their primary interest. Both women and men show an increase in the centrality of the area from their first course to the most recent course, but even so, the difference is dramatic: at the time of their most recent course in the area, 54% of the women state that women's/feminist studies is their primary interest, as compared to 17% of the men.

	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Always feminist perspective	414	54.1	27	24.5
Some feminist perspective	325	42.5	72	65.5
Do not use feminist literature	15	2.0	8	7.3
There is no feminist literature	11	1.4	3	2.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	765	100.0	110	100.0
Missing	15		2	

	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Member	238	30.9	15	13.5
Coord. Position	399	51.8	6	5.4
Never Member	133	17.3	90	81.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	770	100.0	111	100.0
Missing	10		1	

Surprisingly, men are slightly more likely than women to describe their teaching experience<sup>17</sup> as very positive or in generally positive terms,<sup>18</sup> although the vast majority of female and male professors (around 90%) see the experience in positive terms. (See Table 15.)

There are at least two possible explanations for this finding. For one, more men than women might have genuinely enjoyed teaching these courses. Alternatively, men may simply tend to evaluate their



<i>INTEREST LEVEL</i>	<i>WOMEN</i>				<i>MEN</i>			
	<i>Ist Course</i>		<i>Most Recent</i>		<i>Ist Course</i>		<i>Most Recent</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Primary Interest	246	32.4	387	53.8	8	7.3	19	17.4
Major Secondary Interest	348	45.8	264	36.7	64	58.2	55	50.5
Minor Secondary Interest	133	17.5	54	7.5	29	26.4	28	25.7
Marginal Interest	29	3.8	13	1.8	8	7.3	6	5.5
No Interest at All	4	.5	2	.3	1	.9	1	.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	760	100.0	720	100.1	110	100.1	109	100.0
Missing	20		60		2		3	

<i>QUALITY</i>	<i>WOMEN</i>				<i>MEN</i>			
	<i>Ist Course</i>		<i>Most Recent</i>		<i>Ist Course</i>		<i>Most Recent</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Very Positive	447	59.0	461	64.4	72	64.9	74	69.2
Somewhat Positive	223	29.4	195	27.2	29	26.1	25	23.4
Very Mixed	54	7.1	40	5.6	5	4.5	2	1.9
Somewhat Negative	31	4.1	17	2.4	5	4.5	6	5.6
Very Negative	3	.4	3	.4	0	.0	0	.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	758	100.0	716	100.0	111	100.0	107	100.1
Missing	22		64		1		5	

entire teaching experience more positively than do the women. When looking at their responses to the comparative enjoyment of teaching women's/feminist studies courses with courses in general,<sup>19</sup> the latter explanation seems the more likely.

As Table 16 shows, women see a much larger positive differential between teaching women's/feminist studies courses and all other courses than do men. Perhaps women have lower expectations for enjoyment in teaching than do men, or perhaps female professors encounter more problems than do male professors, which leads to differential enjoyment.

Indeed, when we look at the problems experienced by men and women in teaching such courses, we do find a sharp difference. Women cite various problems significantly more often than men (between 2 or 3 times as often) with one exception: the lack of interest of male students, which is obviously seen to be of much greater importance by the men than by the women. (See Table 17.)

RELATIVE ENJOYMENT	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Much better	264	36.6	14	13.2
Somewhat better	210	29.1	35	33.0
The same	170	23.5	51	48.1
Somewhat worse	25	3.5	4	3.8
Much worse	1	.1	0	.0
No basis for comparison	52	7.2	2	1.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Missing	58		2	

(a) Based on all professors who have ever taught women's/feminist studies courses.

Given the negative assessment of men teaching women's/feminist studies courses in the literature, it would not have been unreasonable to expect that men would have problems both with female faculty colleagues and with female students. Such is not the case. Indeed, women cite more problems with female colleagues and students than do the men, but a lot more problems yet with male colleagues and students. If we combine the problems experienced by both male and female professors on the basis of sex, by combining the items that express problems generated by males<sup>20</sup> and those which

PROBLEMS	WOMEN n=711		MEN n=108	
	n	%	n	%
Lack of support from male faculty	225	33.1	14	13.2
Lack of support from female faculty	124	18.2	9	8.5
Resistance from male faculty	159	23.4	12	11.3
Resistance from female faculty	58	8.5	5	4.7
Lack of interest by male students	208	30.6	41	38.7
Lack of interest by female students	93	13.7	12	11.3
Resistance from male students	174	25.6	17	16.0
Resistance from female students	96	14.1	13	12.3
Lack of support from administration	126	18.5	5	4.7
Resistance from administration	52	7.6	2	1.9
Lack of relevant materials	293	43.1	25	23.6
Defined as not a serious scholar	211	29.7	8	7.5
Nobody cared	138	20.3	15	14.2
Other	64	9.4	6	5.7
Missing	31		2	

PROBLEMS	WOMEN (N=711)				MEN (N=108)			
	1st Course		Most Recent		1st Course		Most Recent	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
With Males	423	62.2	325	54.4	51	48.1	39	43.8
With Females	237	34.9	176	29.5	23	21.7	17	19.1

REASONS	WOMEN				MEN			
	1st Course		Most Recent		1st Course		Most Recent	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Subject area was of interest to me	628	89.6	526	88.1	102	94.4	83	90.2
+ influence of prof.s when I was a student	110	15.7	79	13.2	9	8.3	7	7.6
+ influence of colleagues working in area	213	30.4	199	33.4	32	29.6	27	29.3
Resp. to demand of students in department	229	32.7	251	42.3	41	38.0	44	47.8
Department needed someone to teach course	238	34.0	188	31.5	41	38.0	29	31.5
Administ. outside dept. was promoting area	81	11.6	74	12.4	11	10.2	10	10.9
Political motivations aimed at improving position of women	467	66.6	419	70.2	53	49.1	47	51.1
Desire to improve/challenge mainstream theories in discipline	451	64.3	434	72.7	57	52.8	47	51.1
Desire to develop area of women's/feminist studies	477	68.0	429	72.0	54	50.0	48	52.2
Was asked to teach course	257	36.7	157	26.3	30	27.8	20	21.7
Women's C-R group	153	21.8	81	13.6	8	7.4	7	7.6
Other	57	8.1	55	9.2	9	8.3	8	8.7

*Missing cases vary for each number. Percentages are always valid percentages.*

express problems generated by females,<sup>21</sup> it becomes clear that, first, men create problems for women *and* men much more than women create problems for women and men, and second, men create more problems for women than for men, even in women's/feminist studies. (See Table 18.)

The prevalence of problems experienced by female as compared to male instructors in women's/feminist studies courses is interesting in light of Hartung's recent essay (1990: 255), in which she documents that, at her university, "women's studies courses earn high evaluations but instructors of those courses are harshly and even cruelly assessed." She concludes that there exists a "selective rejection of women's studies faculty"—presumably all female in this case—that "is real and probably indiscriminate, that is, having little to do with the personal characteristics or teaching ability of the instructor" (Hartung, 1990: 262-263). Our data suggest that among women's/feminist studies faculty, men experience fewer problems than women.

Why do men teach such courses? For much the same reasons as do women, as Table 19 suggests. For both sexes, the most frequently named reason is that the subject area was of interest to them. For men, the three *least* frequently cited reasons are, first, a "women's consciousness raising group" (although surprisingly between 7% and 8% give this as a reason),<sup>22</sup> second, "the positive influence of professors while I was a student," and third, "the administration outside the department."<sup>23</sup> The latter two reasons were also listed least frequently by the women.

Finally, looking at the career effects of being involved in women's/feminist studies,<sup>24</sup> it appears that three quarters of the men do not see a definite effect of such involvement in their career as compared to only about one third of the women who do not cite a definite effect.<sup>25</sup> As shown in Table 20, fewer men (19%) than women (28%) see their involvement as beneficial to their careers, but far fewer men also see negative consequences from their involvement.

EFFECT	Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%
Promoted Career	195	28.0	21	19.4
Hindrance	30	4.3	1	.9
Help & Hindrance	251	36.0	12	11.1
Not Relevant	109	15.6	49	45.4
Unsure	112	16.1	25	23.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>99.9</b>
Missing	83		4	

To sum up this part of the paper, then, men enter the area for reasons similar to those of women, but experience significantly fewer problems. In general, men, as students and as faculty, create more problems for women than women create for men. Fewer men see a definite effect on their career than do women, who are more likely to perceive both positive and negative consequences. Men as a group start their involvement in teaching women's/feminist studies courses from a significantly better employment situation than women as a group, and this advantage remains for the present. As a group, men are less involved with a feminist perspective than are the women, and their work in this area is less central to them than it is for the women.

So far, we have looked at men as one uniform group and compared them to women—a reasonable approach for understanding the differences and similarities in the experience of both sexes, but not very well suited to identifying differences *between* men. In the following, we shall draw on the interview materials, which allows us to look at the experiences of the men as individuals and to listen to their own words as they describe their participation.

### *Motivations of Male Professors to Teach Women's/Feminist Studies Courses*

In our telephone interviews, we asked our respondents "What keeps you working in the area and what would it take for you to give up working in it?"<sup>26</sup> This question, more than any other we posed, revealed sharply the differences between the motivations of different men. The following types of motivations are therefore empirically derived from the answers to this question.

Looking at the responses, we can roughly distinguish between four types of motivations: (1) a strong, sometimes passionate, emotional commitment to the cause of women, however defined, which expresses itself, in the academic arena, through involvement in women's/feminist studies; (2) a generalized interest in and commitment to social justice, which includes an interest in women and/or sexual justice; (3) an intellectual interest which is stimulated by the quality of feminist scholarship; and (4) a pragmatic response to some opportunity for involvement that presented itself.

*Emotionally committed men* work in the area because they consider it the most important area within which one could possibly work at the present time, and which goes far beyond an activity that they do for pay within the confines of a job. As one of them said:

C'est tout le sens de ma vie, je crois que c'est très, très important et pour ma vie, elle-même, parce que toute ma vision de l'existence, c'est l'assertion des femmes dans la recherche et qui est très, très important—ça m'empêche de dormir, ça me crée une sorte d'enthousiasme extraordinaire et très motive. (#0740)

These men find the question as to what it would take for them to give up working in the area incomprehensible and meaningless.

I could lose my job. The university could close down. We could have a hydrogen bomb warfare. I could die. I think I don't understand that question. (#0110)

Or, as someone else said:

That's a weird question. ... So long as I am teaching, and as long [as] I think this is the way that one has to understand the world, I'm going to include this ... if I left the university, ... I'd still like to think that I would work in this area. (#1191)

Others say: "Oh, it couldn't be done" (#1649). "I don't think I'd ever give it up" (#0758). "Billions and billions of dollars—well, just maybe, a hundred million—gee—nothing!" (#0879). "I don't think anything" (#0483). "A nuclear holocaust" (#1323). "Nothing" (#1610). "You couldn't pay me to give it up" (#1297). Several of the men mention death, for example, "Il faudrait que je meurs!" (#0171) and, even in dying, some of them cannot foresee themselves as giving it up.

Il faudrait que je meurs et que je sois très malade, que j'aie un cancer, mais j'ai déjà un fantasme, que si je mourrais, que je travaillerais jusqu'au bout, je n'aurais pas d'opération, et je ne perdrais pas mon temps à l'hôpital, jusqu'au bout. Jusqu'au bout, je continuerais à travailler pour les femmes. (#0740)

It is not that these men find it easy to work in the area—they just think it is inconceivable for them not to do this type of work. As one emotionally committed man says:

It's the most difficult to do, it's the most contested, it's the most threatening, it's the one where the most denial exists. (#1191)

He sees the difficulties as a confirmation for the need to continue the struggle.

Overall, then, emotionally committed men experience their concern for women's issues not just as an intellectual or academic matter but as something that is part of their personality and a vital aspect of their entire life.<sup>27</sup>

*Social justice-oriented men* are interested in social justice in general and think of themselves as people who integrate such a perspective into their work, but their commitment is not necessarily primarily oriented to the position of women.

For me it isn't only feminism. It's any victim group, whether that be women or blacks or French Canadians or North American native people. What keeps me working is that the injustices have not been corrected. (#0126)

Men in this category may, however, point out why at this stage in history the position of women is of particular importance.

The whole revolution around women and women's roles is maybe the most important one we've ever had, and the twentieth century ... is the place to study that. (#1645)

Another man argues that what draws him into the area is:

My sense of it being a justice issue to a considerable extent—I just think there's got to be some major changes made and [it] can't be left entirely to women to make them. The male of the species has a role to play in turning a lot of things around here. (#1807)

Justice-oriented men can see themselves as doing other work—and indeed, many specify that the position of women, or sexual injustice, or a feminist approach is just one interest among several. They can see themselves giving up this particular interest if they lose their jobs, or if there are "practical considerations like the amount of time that I spend in teaching various things" (#0926). One man who has "a strong personal commitment to the value question" and who wants his kids to grow up androgynous—which puts him into the category of justice seeker—sees that "There are things that have a stronger pull for me. ... So if someone said here is a wonderful grant to pursue something else I would probably do it" (#1400).

Another man, for whom "inequality has always been an undercurrent in virtually everything" that he has done, finds himself uncomfortable with "particular strands of radical feminism as distinct from socialist feminism" (#1107) and could see himself dropping out of teaching in the area if "that particular analysis became ascendant, politically."

Overall, then, social justice-oriented men see the disadvantaged position of women in society as

a social justice issue that ranks at an equal level with other such issues, such as the position of blacks, natives, and so forth. However, they do not display any awareness that sex is a category that cross-cuts the other categories, so that one may be female *and* native, black, and so on, and that the issues for women and men within such disadvantaged groups are likely to be quite different. Concern with women's issues, then, is one of a series of concerns that are seen as important, but these concerns are thought about sequentially rather than as interlinked.

*Intellectually stimulated men* find the area exciting because of the quality and nature of the research conducted by feminist scholars. Consequently, their motivation remains largely at the intellectual level, and does not seem to carry over into their entire life, as it does for the emotionally committed men. They can foresee ceasing to work in the area, for instance, if the university dismisses them, or if they feel that they are intellectually stagnating: "si je ne me renouvelais pas assez" (#1139). They see themselves in the field "as long as it's interesting and as long as it's intellectually stimulating" (#0361). "If you have nothing new to say, to learn, or lose interest for one reason or another, then I'd probably stop teaching" (#0758).

Several people mention that this is the one area of scholarship within which ground-breaking work is being done, which they find intellectually stimulating, exciting, interesting, since constantly evolving. "One of the most attractive features of feminist scholarship is that it always points to some provisionality and the fact that there's a lot more to be done" (#1764). They note that "a lot of the most interesting and exciting work" (#0890) in their own field of specialization is being done by feminist scholars.

One man who describes feminist scholarship as "the most vigorous and exciting area ... methodologically refreshing ... it really did live up to that constantly used expression, breaking new ground" (#1600) had in fact stopped reading in the area in the last three or four years. He said he still incorporated the ideas in his teaching, since "any historian particularly interested in ... teaching and ... a

wider perspective will have to incorporate women's history consistently"—but he failed to notice that as he is not keeping himself up-to-date on the relevant scholarship, that this might, in fact, be problematic.

Intellectually stimulated men, then, are attracted to the area for reasons of academic curiosity. There is no personal and/or political commitment to any of the issues, and their academic involvement may be of a very temporary nature. Indeed, they clearly state that, should they cease to be intellectually stimulated, they would turn to other areas.

*The pragmatists* comprise a range of people. On the one end of the spectrum, they represent professors who are willing to provide a needed service, usually in response to a request from students, colleagues or others. At the other extreme, they insist on their right to participate in the area in any way they see fit because they find it ideologically unacceptable not to do so. They find the area interesting because it is fresh and new, but not more so than other areas in which they have been or are involved. Some of them have stopped teaching in the area, and others foresee that they could stop being involved for a variety of reasons, most of them pragmatic and structural: if students were no longer interested, if they could not receive any grants for their research, if someone else came along who wanted to teach the course. "I'd welcome someone else doing it ... just as a change in perspective, ... however, I'm happy to do it again" (#0432). Some explain that lack of student interest would lead them to abandoning this area.

I suppose being very pragmatic, if for two years in a row fewer than five students wanted to enrol in my course I would decide that that was a course that we couldn't justify giving any more. (#0457)

Several mention problems in terms of career effects for men who wish to work in this area, and provide this as a reason why they have shifted ground.

My political commitment is basically to men doing this kind of work. ... [But] it's really not feasible for a me or anyone else to ... develop a career in that area, and so I'll have to shift

ground to some extent, ... I'll have to develop other areas in order to get employed. (#0681)

One mentions that:

I've had women tell me I shouldn't be teaching it because I'm a man. ... I suppose it's a secondary area of research for me. ... I think I have enough grounding to keep me sort of reasonably up to date, but I'm not doing front line research. (#0961)

This attitude contrasts sharply with that of emotionally committed men who see the problems they experience as added reasons why they want to, need to, and must persevere.

Several pragmatically motivated men explained how a restructuring of their teaching tasks led them to abandon teaching courses in women's/feminist studies. Another recounts how he was challenged during the last year:

by a couple of more militant students who just think that everything that is different in the course from what they expected or what they would like is the direct byproduct of the fact that it's taught by a male. And/or that it's taught by a male who self-confessedly is not an expert in women's studies.

If I find, this sounds terribly patronising, but if the hand that is trying to do the work continually gets bitten, it will be both less pleasant and more stressful to be in the course. I enjoy teaching a lot and I get a lot of satisfaction from feeling appreciated and having my students like what I'm doing no matter what it is. So if there's considerable discontent and it continues to be a problem every year [he would stop teaching this class]. (#1454)

Overall, then, pragmatists respond to an existing opportunity in teaching, thesis supervision, or research to become involved to some modest degree in the area of women's/feminist studies. As they see the benefits of such involvement decrease, they are likely to cease their involvement in the area and turn towards some other opportunity. Their commitment is neither personal nor political nor intellectual; instead, it is either career- or service-oriented.

Clearly, then, the men who teach in this area do so for very different reasons and with very different approaches. What emotionally committed men see as another reason to continue their work, others—intellectually stimulated men, social justice-oriented men and pragmatists—see as reasons to cease their involvement. Social justice-oriented men and emotionally committed men are similar in that there is a combination of scholarly with political motivation which is reminiscent of what we find among women in terms of their commitment to the woman's movement and political action in general.<sup>28</sup> They differ sharply from each other in terms of the importance they attribute to the various types of injustices. While emotionally committed men see sexual injustice or the oppression of women as the single most important issue, social justice-oriented men rank women as one disadvantaged group among others, worthy of as much—but no more—concern than all the other groups which are oppressed, and without seeming to realize that women make up probably half or more of these other "victim" groups.

### *The Role of Men in Women's/Feminist Studies as Seen by Men*

In our telephone interviews, we posed the question in general terms, to both women and men who have taught women's/feminist studies courses, "What do you think of the role of men in women's studies?" I will turn to the answers to this question next.

As can be expected, answers to this question differ sharply. One group of men see no problem with men teaching women's/feminist courses at all. "If they know what they are doing, I don't see any problems in it" (#0364). "I don't think there is any problem with that, really. ... anybody who is ... fairly open-minded should be qualified to do that" (#1758). Some of the men elaborate on the non-problematic nature of their teaching women's studies courses.

I don't see anything problematical about that. At least I don't see anything problematical with myself doing it. We have a department where there is no woman permanently a member of the department, so if this course is to be taught

at all here, it has to be taught by a man and none of my colleagues would ever be interested in doing it anyway. Now I can see that from a certain point of view, some people might object to it, but I don't think you have to be a Marxist to teach Marxism ... I mean, it doesn't affect me. (#0443)

This quote goes to show that the insensitivity of this particular man is not restricted to feminism. His matter-of-fact acceptance that there is no qualified permanent woman member in his department is in sharp contrast to other men who have taught such courses and who link the question of their own role with affirmative action concerns for hiring women.

His attitude is similar to that of the man who personally thinks that:

that is fine. I have no problem with it, because it is something that I have done and I think that whatever reservations there might be might come from women. (#0939)

Apparently, reservations on the part of women are a very minor concern for him.

Among those who see no problem are a subgroup of men who go immediately to the defense of men teaching women's/feminist studies courses, and who point out all the benefits that women's studies derive from their presence. These benefits include a broadening of the scope of issues considered. For instance, one man who started his response with a sigh (and the statement, "I think that we have to insist on non-discrimination for men as for women" [#1301]), argues that feminist studies may exclude certain topics that unquestionably should be included under the rubric of women's studies, specifically the particular nature of women's and men's respective physiologies (in this case, male and female brain differences) and their relation to behaviour. The benefit that accrues to women's studies through people like himself, then, in his view is that:

Feminism might choose not to deal with an issue that would be regarded as inconsistent with certain political ... beliefs. But that's a killer issue, and it's one issue that makes me



reluctant to get very much into the politics and the caucus side of this. ... I am not part of the women's studies infrastructure here. (#1301)

Another benefit is that "you've basically got to have men teaching it to pull in male undergraduates. ... one of the biggest frustrations in my teaching was the lack of male undergraduates" (#0990). Men bring another "point of view, and I think the fact that men are interested in these issues has to be given a fairly prominent place" (#1443).

Several men talked about the danger of the ghettoization of women's studies. They saw their own role in legitimizing the field.

I think that I give credibility to the programme because it is not all women, and here is a man who is relatively normal and everything and likes this stuff, and I think that this helps a lot. (#1400)

If only women are teaching women's studies, then the ... threat of ... being not taken seriously would be [great].(#0752)

Je regretterais qu'on en fasse un ghetto absolument fermé, qu'on procède à l'inverse de la façon dont on a procédé autrefois, qu'on exclus maintenant le point de vue masculin, qui me paraît demeurer un point de vue important, lorsqu'il s'agit de rapport entre les femmes ... ça me paraîtrait de se priver d'un point de vue qui n'est peut-être pas le plus engagé, mais d'un point de vue, ... peut-être important. (#0620)

I think it's essential. My anxiety is that women's studies will go the route of black studies in the United States. ... that one has to establish credentials and have to defend one's ideological perspective and gender analysis and that kind of foolishness. Black studies went that way and I think is really quite moribund in the States for that reason. I fear that women's studies has the potential of that. I think it's really important that anybody be asked or allowed or encouraged to come do it. (#1600)

Men who think along these lines argue that unless men are involved in women's studies, "there isn't going to be much of a chance for change":

I am certainly not very sympathetic with feminist separatists ... I think that men are very important, crucially important. ... the more men ... who are involved in women's studies programmes, teaching, research, etc., the better, I think. (#1323)

They argue that the role of men in women's/feminist studies is particularly good for men, since some of the more militant feminists do not want to hear a male voice and find male behaviour off-putting. "I think it's good because it's good for the men ... it shouldn't just be left for women to be the only ones that are talking about it" (#0961).

The *majority* of men, by contrast, see their own role as "ambiguous" (#0846), "very awkward" (#0869), "problematic and challenging" (#1649), "uncomfortable" (#0963), "difficult" (#1356), "both essential and highly suspect" (#1454), "dangerous" (#0126). One says:

I have a lot of anxiety. I am torn because I personally would like to be very much involved ... But I still have an anxiety that it is very early in the development of women's studies, feminist perspectives ... for men to have too high a profile. ... I am quite divided. (#0926)

These men who are sensitive to the issues involved in having men teach women's/feminist courses are aware of and mention all three of the problems identified in the literature: their epistemological disadvantage; the paradoxical situation of men teaching women about their oppression; and, in the process, reinforcing the very patriarchal structure they are there to criticize, plus the dangers that certain things will remain unsaid, due to their very presence in the classroom. They also question the motives of some of their male colleagues.

How do they reconcile their own teaching of such courses with the problems identified? By stating repeatedly that men must remain a numerically small minority among women's/feminist studies faculty, by linking their own teaching role with affirmative action efforts geared to hiring women, and by stating that men must listen before they start talking.

There are lots of times when it's appropriate for us to be very careful to listen—not talk. But I think it can be done. I've certainly had a number of women students over the years who've said "Thank you for bringing that up and playing a part." So at least, those students, it's helped rather than offended. But I do think it's tricky. ... I think we have to listen to women a great deal. And if it's something that they are working [at] then it's important for us to listen first before we venture opinions. (#0795)

These men agree that the vast bulk of instruction should be done by women, not men.

At the moment, it should definitely be mainly done by women. About ninety percent of the staff and teaching on these issues should be done by women. We've been so much on the right side, now we need a left side to find equilibrium. (#1631)

I think it's important there be a numerical preponderance of women in the teaching of women's studies at the moment. (#0678)

This may mean that men may have to defer to women teaching such courses. One man recounts how he gave up teaching a course he enjoyed teaching.

[W]hen a woman came along, who really wanted to teach it, at least as strongly as I did, I felt that she really probably had the greater rights to it. So, I stepped back. (#1693)

Others agree in principle that:

politically, men should take second place. If there are two people who want to teach a particular course, unless there are very strong reasons ... I think that the woman should do it. (#1316)

These men are keenly aware that as men they are epistemologically disadvantaged compared to women teaching such courses.

Men don't have the experiences that women [have], and that's ... of critical importance. (#0681)

I've got to be very careful that I don't ... squelch ... the kind of appeal to women's experience to which I'm not privy... (#0757)

[Y]ou have the sort of epistemological question, ... if every aspect of knowledge is gendered ... I see that very much of an open question... (#1191)

I cannot really say I've lived some of these experiences ... for example, sexual harassment ... I've never lived being denigrated by a lot of the visual media, in offices or factories or whatever else. ... There are still some difficulties with students. For example, talking to some potentially sensitive areas that might include sexuality, that might include harassment, that might include the whole thing about women having their period. ... there is some uneasiness when they are sitting looking at a guy like me and they start talking about some of these things. You can feel it. (#1609)

Another problem that is identified by these men is that their very presence in the classroom as teachers who carry the authority of this role contradicts the message that is being delivered.

Being a teacher is a position of some prestige and some power, and if students take it via a man rather than a woman ... that's probably not too great. ... it's a contradiction of the basic issues that you're trying to get across or illustrate... (#1693)

There is concern that "men start homing in" (#1107). Concerned men who question their own motivations and roles provide examples of other men who fail to do so and who want—and do—teach such courses without being qualified or competent to do so.

They want to teach it because it gives them access to a particular course or a particular group of students, in some cases, they might not have the background and literature or necessarily the understanding of what the issues are ... In one particular case that I know, the person claims to be a feminist and is not within five hundred miles of being one. His assumptions, his whole approach is total[ly] non-sympathetic.

Q.: How did he get to teach?

He's the chair of the department and he simply says, "I'm teaching this course." I find a number of things he does quite objectionable, and there are several cases where that's happened. They are able to get the courses, because they are either senior enough or they are full-time or whatever. (#1560)

Given these concerns, some of the men have restricted their involvement to specific courses, such as courses on gender (rather than women) or courses on masculinity, or they integrate a feminist perspective into their regular courses without claiming that these form part of a women's studies programme or curriculum. It must be remembered that the way people identified themselves as belonging to our population was by answering affirmatively that they had taught at least one course in women's studies or from a feminist perspective. It was therefore not necessary to have taught in a formal women's studies programme or to have given a class that stated explicitly in the title "history of women," "psychology of women," "feminist approaches to theology," and so forth, in order to be included in our population of professors.

Some of the men *have* taught (and may continue to do so) within the framework of formal women's/feminist studies programmes. They tend to see their own role as not only numerically secondary, but also secondary in other ways.

It's not the sort of title you can claim as a man ... Basically there have to be other people, feminists, who tell me yes or no, and I would like to be in an environment with more ... of a conscious dialogue about what it means, how you qualify, if you qualify ... I would take it as a very serious criticism if somebody said to me that I was not serving in the interest of women in some fundamental way. (#0967)

This attitude—"to be pretty sensitive to the guidance from the women that are involved with it" (#1807)—creates a dilemma for the men, because they also think that "we need to go beyond just a supportive role and be pro-active ourselves"

(#1807). It may also conflict with their personal wishes.

I suppose that if I was a woman, I would not want to have men teaching women's studies, but being a man myself ... I'm so interested in the area, I think it's the most fascinating area there is, that I would resist men not teaching there, because that would mean I couldn't, so I am sort of mixed, but I would very strongly feel that men can be feminists. (#0396)

### Conclusion

Whatever preliminary conclusions we may reach here, they must be seen as very preliminary indeed. This paper examines only the roles of male teachers as experienced and seen by male teachers. We need to consider carefully the experiences and views of female teachers, and preferably those of students,<sup>29</sup> before we formulate any firmer conclusions. In addition, there is a great deal more information available in the overall data set on both male and female professors that should be analyzed before final conclusions are formulated.

With this caveat in mind, the first observation must be that men within this field are extraordinarily diverse in their attitudes, their sensitivities, their knowledge, their demands, and their willingness to be guided rather than to guide.

The literature cited at the beginning of this paper noted three problems with men in women's studies: first, that men suffer from an epistemological disadvantage compared to women; second, that men may inadvertently reinforce the existing power differential between women and men through their position in the classroom as teachers; third, it questioned their motivations. I will briefly reconsider each of these issues in the light of the foregoing discussion.

With respect to the epistemological disadvantage, several men very clearly made just this point, referring to "the epistemological question," the differences in the lived experience of women and men, and so on. On the other hand, there were other men who were blithely unaware that their

gender might have any relevance whatsoever to what and how they taught and how this would be received by their students.

With respect to the inadvertent reinforcement of the prevailing sex structure through male instructors in women's studies classes, we find a similar bifurcation in different men's attitudes. Some men are keenly aware of their paradoxical situation, reflect on it, and search for appropriate ways of behaving for themselves. This includes actively participating in improving the collective situation of women faculty in their own setting, arguing that men should remain a minority in women's/feminist studies, and, if necessary, ceding their place to a female colleague.

By contrast, there are men who argue that we need more men, many more men, in women's/feminist studies—the more the better—because of the various benefits that men bring to this field of study: legitimacy, more male students, social change, a male perspective (which is, by implication, sorely needed), credibility, a more neutral approach that is not as one-sided as that which the feminists bring to bear, a less strident style, and so on.

They do not perceive the irony of the situation that they may mute the voices that women's/feminist studies tries to make heard. They demand their rights—and reject any personal responsibility.

I don't take kindly to people trying to foist guilt on me. Which you get. You are supposed to feel guilty, let me see, for being—I'm middle-aged, fair, tall, male, Ph.D., middle class, tenured, Caucasian, and I'm Christian. Do you realize the number of strikes I've got against me? You are supposed to feel guilty for being white, for being middle class, for being western, for being male. If I followed all those cures I could just dissolve in guilt, right? ... there is definitely ... resentment against me on the part of radical feminists ... that is a natural deformation, I think, of sensibility. Any group which has been kicked around develops a lot of unattractive temptations, whether they are colonial people, whether it is racial, national, economic, sexual, anyone. I get that too. (#0110)

Some men make it clear that they do not struggle to improve the proportion of women in university faculties which is still pitifully low, or to improve the situation of women faculty which is significantly worse than that of men even in that most female of all fields, namely women's/feminist studies, as we have seen above. They are unlikely to be well informed about feminist issues and concerns because they do not keep themselves familiarized with the literature (see Table 11), and they seem unaware of the paradoxical situation engendered by their role.

Finally, with respect to men's motivations for entering the field, there is a great deal more information to analyze on this issue. However, by reflecting on the four different types identified above, we find a large variety of motivations which underlie their participation—from passionate commitment over intellectual curiosity to an opportunistic response—not all of which should be dismissed as cynical or inappropriate. Going back to Table 19, we find that many men cite student demand, departmental need or that they were asked to teach the course as reasons for teaching in the area. By responding positively to such demands, they may render a very important service to their students and colleagues, and may, in the process, even gain some other reasons for a continuing involvement.

On the other hand, men who argue for a *right* of men to teach women's studies courses seem like rather unpromising prospects for a positive class room experience for the students. Nor do they strike one as particularly supportive colleagues.

Ironically, then, men who are knowledgeable about the feminist literature, aware and sensitive to the particular dynamics they will generate and encounter, and who are actively supportive of feminist goals inside and outside academia, are also likely to be the most hesitant to take part precisely because they *are* aware of the pitfalls. By contrast, it is hard to imagine positive consequences of the involvement of men who discuss at length the great contributions that they are able to make to women's studies by virtue of being male (e.g., lending legitimacy to the area, bringing in topics that might

otherwise not be discussed, attracting male undergraduates), especially as they are also likely not to read the feminist literature, and not be sensitive to the needs of their female students.

Given the importance of the women's movement in contemporary society, and the extraordinary amount of intellectual work that has already been done and that is in progress, one would expect any true intellectual to take cognizance of these social and theoretical developments and integrate them into their thinking and teaching.

#### NOTES

1. We plan to examine how women experience and think about male teachers in women's/feminist studies courses in a separate paper. This as yet unwritten paper will, of course, be Part II. The mass of information that we have available is too large to compress into one paper without doing serious injustice to some of the viewpoints expressed.
2. The percentage varies by francophone/anglophone population: 13.9% of all anglophone professors are male (n=104) as compared to only 5.6% of the francophone population (n=8).
3. Various aspects of the overall project have been financially supported by the following grants: SSHRCC grants #482-86-0007 and #482-82-0016 (M. Eichler and R. Lenton), OISE SSHRCC grant #0920 (M. Eichler), grant #234.02 of the Ontario Women's Directorate (M. Eichler), a McMaster Arts Research Board grant (R. Lenton), grants from PAFACC and CAFACC UQAM (L. Vandelac). Other papers which have already been completed are Eichler with the assistance of Tite, 1990; Eichler 1990a, b, and in press; Lenton, 1990a and b; Tite with the assistance of Malone, 1990; and Vandelac, 1990.
4. See Tite with the assistance of Malone, 1990, for a description and discussion of the results of this effort.
5. Rhonda Lenton is currently working on a paper (as yet untitled) analyzing the data from Phase 4.
6. All of the men we could reach by telephone agreed to participate in the follow-up interviews, and in that sense our response rate was 100%; however, a fair proportion was unreachable because they were either on sabbatical and had not left a telephone number, or were away at conferences, or elsewhere. The telephone interviews were conducted in May 1988. At the tail-end of them, we ran into conflict with the Learned's. For logistical reasons, the interviewing could not be extended beyond this period, nor is it likely that that would have increased the response rate significantly, since it is notoriously difficult to get hold of academics in the summer months.
7. The figures are derived by adding up the non-professorial ranks with "other university appointment" and "other position" in Table 2.
8. The categories in this table replicate Statistics Canada's way of categorizing academic full-time employees. See Table 2 in Eichler with Tite, 1990, which presents a portion of the data in a different context. This is the only time in this paper that Statistics Canada groupings were used. Table 9 is based on discipline groupings which represent the numerically most important disciplines of respondents.
9. We tapped the discipline of work of our respondents in a variety of ways. These data are based on the first answer to the question:  
In what discipline(s) do you work? [If more than one, list all in order of importance.]
10. The exact wording of the question is:  
In relation to how you view yourself, which of the following statements is most appropriate?  
- I define myself as a feminist  
- I would define myself as a non-feminist but I am concerned about women's issues  
- I would define myself as a non-feminist who is not concerned about women's issues  
- I am an anti-feminist  
- Other, please specify:
11. See Offen, 1988, for a comprehensive review of the various meanings attached to the word "feminism."
12. From Schwenger's non-anonymous review of this article, quoted with his permission.
13. The exact wording of the question was:  
Do you read any feminist journals on a somewhat regular basis?
14. The exact wording of the question was:  
Do you use feminist literature in your own work? [Circle the one most appropriate response.]  
- All my work is informed by a feminist perspective  
- At least some of my work is informed by a feminist perspective  
- I do not incorporate feminist literature in my own work but I am aware of the available material in my subject area  
- There is no feminist literature in my subject areas; please list your subject areas.
15. The exact wording of the question was:  
Have you ever been a member or held an organizing/coordinating position in any women's organizations?  
- No, I have never been a member or held an office  
- Yes, I have been a member of a women's organization, but I have not held a coordinating position  
- Yes, I have held an organizing/coordinating position in a women's group or organization.  
We unfortunately did not include a comparable question on participation in a pro-feminist men's group since, at the time of the survey design, we did not expect to find that many men in our population.
16. The exact wording of the question was:  
At the time you taught your first course in women's/feminist studies, how would you describe the centrality of the area in relation to your entire

- (including teaching, research, as well as other activities)? How about now?
- Response categories were:
- Primary interest
  - Major secondary interest
  - Minor secondary interest
  - Marginal interest
  - No interest.
17. The exact wording of the question was:  
Overall, how would you rate your initial as well as your most recent experience in teaching in the area of women's/feminist studies? [Circle the one response which best reflects your experience.]
- Response categories were:
- Very positive experience
  - Somewhat positive experience
  - Somewhat negative
  - Very negative
  - Very mixed experience.
18. That is, adding together "very" and "somewhat" positive.
19. The exact wording of the question was:  
Overall, how would you rate teaching feminist/women's studies courses in comparison to teaching other courses?
- Response categories were:
- Much better
  - Somewhat better
  - The same
  - Somewhat worse
  - Much worse
  - I have no basis for comparison.
20. Lack of support and resistance of male faculty, lack of interest and resistance of male students.
21. Lack of support and resistance of female faculty, lack of interest and resistance of female students.
22. It is not clear whether these men have participated themselves in a women's consciousness raising group or whether a woman close to them did and they were affected through her by the process. A preliminary reading of other parts of the interview materials suggests that the latter interpretation may apply.
23. Ignoring "other."
24. The exact wording of the question was:  
How do you feel that your involvement in the area of women's/feminist studies has affected your career overall?
- The response categories were:
- It helped promote my career
  - It was a hindrance
  - It has both helped and hindered my career
  - It was not a relevant factor affecting my career
  - I am unsure about the effect.
25. This statement is based on adding up responses to "it has both helped and hindered my career," "it was not a relevant factor affecting my career" and "I am unsure about the effect." See Table 20.
26. These were open-ended structured interviews, so there are slight variations in the wording of the questions. In this question, the follow-up question "What would it take for you to give up working in the area?" was unfortunately sometimes omitted, probably because it seemed ludicrous to the interviewers given some of the responses to the first question.
27. Of course, as Schwenger notes in his review, "the emotion expressed by some of the respondents is so hyperbolic (devotion even beyond death) that it naturally raises the question of what *motivates* such emotion. It is at least possible that some of these motivations (no doubt hidden from the men themselves) are less than pure—liberal guilt, covert sexual come-on, an avoidance of male dynamics, etc."
28. See Eichler, in press, for a discussion of the connections between women's/feminist studies and the women's movement.
29. The Canadian Women's Studies Project unfortunately has no data on students as students (rather than on recollections of professors as former students or observations of professors about students). It would be highly desirable if some researchers were to study the experiences of students who take women's/feminist studies courses to provide some of this very important information.

## REFERENCES

- Code, L. (1983). Responsibility and the epistemic community: Woman's place. *Social Research*, 50(3), 537-555.
- Dagenais, H. (1989). Recherches féministes de la fin des années 1980: Des voix/voies multiples et convergentes. *Recherches Féministes*, 2(2), 1-14.
- Eichler, M., with the assistance of Tite, R. (1990). Women's studies professors in Canada: A collective self-portrait (Report #1 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project). *Atlantis*, 16(1), 6-24.
- Eichler, M. (1990a). What's in a name: Women's studies or feminist studies? (Report #3 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project). *Atlantis*, 16(1), 40-56.
- Eichler, M. (in press). Not always and easy alliance: The relationship between women's studies and the women's movement in Canada (Report #4 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project). In C. Backhouse & D.H. Flaherty (Eds.), *The Contemporary Women's Movement in Canada and the United States*.
- Eichler, M. (1990b). *The incomplete transformation: Women and feminist approaches in sociology and anthropology* (Report #8 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Hartung, B. (1990). Selective rejection: How students perceive women's studies teachers. *NWSA Journal*, 2(2), 254-263.
- Jaggar, A.M. (1977-78). Male instructors, feminism, and women's studies. *Teaching Philosophy*, 2(3&4), 247-256.
- Klein, R.D. (1983). The "men-problem" in women's studies: The expert, the ignoramus and the poor dear. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 6(4), 413-421.
- Lenton, R. (1990a). Academic feminists and the women's movement in Canada: Continuity or discontinuity? (Report #5 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project). *Atlantis*, 16(1), 57-68.
- Lenton, R. (1990b). Influential feminist thinkers for academics in Canadian women's studies (Report #9 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project). *Atlantis*, 16(1), 92-118.

- Offen, K. (1988). Defining feminism: A comparative historical approach. *Signs*, 14(1), 119-157.
- Rowland, R. (1982). Women's studies courses: Pragmatic and political issues concerning their establishment and design. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 5(3), 487-495.
- Tite, R., with the assistance of Malone, M. (1990). Our universities best-kept secret: Women's studies in Canada (Report #2 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project). *Atlantis*, 16(1), 25-39.
- Vandelac, Louise. (1990, septembre). Le profil des professeurs-d'études féministes dans les universités canadiennes—ou au choix ... Études féministes: le secret le mieux gardé des universités canadiennes. *Interface*.