

Influential Feminist Thinkers for Academics in Canadian Women's Studies

Rhonda L. Lenton
McMaster University

Introduction

IN A RECENT OVERVIEW OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF Science, Harriet Zuckerman (1989 [1988]) argues that specialties and disciplines¹ are the chief social mechanisms involved in the growth of scientific knowledge. Understanding their emergence and decline thus sheds light on the growth of new lines of inquiry and the connections between social context and the development of scientific knowledge. Not just knowledge, however; when one talks about science, one refers also to a set of *procedures or techniques* for advancing knowledge and to a set of *social arrangements* for developing, certifying and communicating knowledge (Zuckerman, 1989 [1988]: 513). The technical set of procedures or cognitive domain defines what should be studied and how. The social arrangements that promote scientific growth include, *inter alia*, the "thickening" of communication networks. Kuhn (1970 [1962]: xxi) has argued, therefore, that the social aspects of scientific communities "must be discovered by examining patterns of education and

communication before asking which particular research problems engage each group."

Citation analysis has been used extensively for assessing the intellectual influence of large numbers of scientists, and determining the boundaries of and interactions between specialties and disciplines (Zuckerman, 1987). Follow-up research has then been conducted to question scholars who are clearly identified with a certain specialty or discipline and who appear to have been influential in its development. In that manner, additional information has been gathered about the socio-cognitive infrastructure, including such issues as the extent to which established group members agree on what research should be done and by what means.

Women's/feminist studies is one of the major specialties that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s. The field is now firmly institutionalized in most Canadian universities as an interdisciplinary area of inquiry. As part of a national study to trace the development of women's/feminist studies in

This is Report # 9 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project.

Canada, a questionnaire was mailed to all professors who had ever taught a credit course in women's studies or from a feminist perspective in a Canadian university or college offering at least a B.A.² The survey was a unique opportunity to ask the population of scholars in women's/feminist studies whom they found most important for their own work.³ This paper analyzes the results of that survey.

In much the same way as citations have been employed, I use the names that were listed by respondents to explore the network of communication among scholars who teach women's/feminist studies. How many names were mentioned? What is the total number of nominations? Who finds whose work influential? Are there well-established lines of communication or are members off in separate corners working from divergent points of view? How well established is the social infrastructure and how has it been influenced by francophone versus anglophone culture; language; discipline; time; and the sex and age composition of the professors? These are among the chief questions that the survey results allow me to answer.

I feel I can speak with some authority about communication networks in Canadian women's/feminist studies because a wide variety of techniques was used to ensure that virtually all professors who had ever taught a course in the area were sampled⁴ and the response rate was 81.7 percent.⁵ Moreover, I consider the respondents' nominations more valid than simple citation counts because, in the survey, respondents stated explicitly that certain authors/thinkers were most useful in developing their own thinking.⁶ In citation analysis, by contrast, one must infer that frequency of citation is associated with intellectual influence—which is not always the case, since authors may be inclined to cite their own work or the work of scholars whose ideas they are criticizing.

In the following analysis, I also explore the extent to which the most influential thinkers/authors agree on the key issues in women's/feminist studies and how best to address them. We conducted telephone interviews with the 20 thinkers/authors most

frequently listed by the anglophone professors, the francophone professors and the two groups combined.⁷ Since there was some overlap, the actual number of thinkers/authors was 34 (see Appendix B). Germaine Greer, Adrienne Rich and Elaine Showalter were not able to participate in the study, and Simone de Beauvoir and Virginia Woolf are both deceased, leaving a total of 29 interviews.⁸ Two questions in the interview are particularly pertinent here: "What do you see as the five most important issues for feminist thought at the present time?" and "What strategies do you think are most promising for addressing these issues?"

Establishing the Networks

The 892 professors who responded to the questionnaire in Phase Two of the Canadian Women's Studies Project listed a total of 1,565 different thinkers/authors.⁹ The 780 female academics listed 1,304 different thinkers/authors and the 112 male professors provided 358 different names.

As several of the 1,565 thinkers/authors were named by only one faculty member, we decided to generate a short list of thinkers/authors who were named by at least five different respondents.¹⁰ This procedure ensured that the thinkers/authors were involved in more than just one line of communication—that is, there is at least some consensus that these thinkers/authors are identified with women's/feminist studies. The resulting list included 236 authors who were listed a total of 6,320 times. The names of these authors are provided in alphabetical order in Appendix A. The most frequently listed author was Simone de Beauvoir, who was mentioned by fully one-quarter of the respondents.

Kuhn (1970 [1962]) and others (Crane, 1972; Mullins, 1973; Mulkay, Gilbert and Woolgar, 1975) have suggested that the most rapid growth in a new specialty is associated with the point in its development when the communication network is most dense. Thus it is useful to consider (1) the sheer numbers of professors teaching women's/feminist studies since its inception circa 1970 and (2) the complexity of influential ties characterizing different time periods. Table 1 shows the number of professors who taught their first course prior to

1975, between 1975 and 1979, and after 1979. The number of people teaching in the field has escalated from 127 prior to 1975 to 524 after 1979. The complexity of influential ties has also increased as a result of the greater number of people in the area. For the moment, there does not appear to be any significant evidence of "paradigm decline" (see Kuhn, 1970 [1962]). The specialty is still in the process of expanding as it is applied to new subject areas and disciplines such as law and business. For that matter, major contributions are still being made in those disciplines in which women's/feminist studies initially emerged, such as sociology. Moreover, unlike some other specialties which simply die out, women's/feminist studies continues to be institutionalized as a separate field of study not only within universities but in professional meetings, academic journals and granting institutions.

NUMBER OF PROFESSORS WHO...	Year First Course		
	Prior to 1975	1975-1979	After 1979
Listed at least one thinker/author	116	172	464
Do not list any thinker/author	11	27	60
Total nominations	691	998	2655

In order to better describe the nature of the infrastructure in women's/feminist studies, we wanted some basic information about the 236 thinkers/authors that were listed as important by at least five professors.¹¹ We limited our investigation to four variables: primary language, field of work, country of residence and university affiliation. Table 2 lists the language in which the authors work. Most of the authors work primarily in English, which is hardly surprising given that most of the respondents also work in English. In order to appreciate the extent to which the feminist community has been influenced by anglophone authors, it is useful to look at the percentages based on the

LANGUAGE	Frequency	Percentage
English	5584	88.7
French	622	9.9
Both	89	1.4
Total responses	6295	100.0
Number of respondents: 801		Missing Cases: 91

total number of responses (as opposed to the number of thinkers/authors).¹² We see that by far the majority of professors who teach women's/feminist studies draw upon anglophone scholarship. Some 88.7 percent of the 6,295¹³ references write only in English.

Professors teaching women's/feminist studies are also more likely to draw on other academics as opposed to writers who are only partly affiliated with the university (i.e., they may have been invited to teach a course but have never held a full-time position in a university) or are not affiliated at all. In Table 3, we see that the majority of the respondents nominate mainly full-time academics—78.6 percent of the 6,134 references to these thinkers/authors have university positions. Less than 10 percent of all responses refer to thinkers/authors with no university connection.¹⁴ These findings have broad implications for our understanding of the structure of communication among feminists because they suggest a strong internal infrastructure with relatively weak connections to extra-university

AFFILIATION	Frequency	Percentage
Full-Time position	4823	78.6
Partly Affiliated	743	12.1
No university connection	568	9.3
Total responses	6134	100.0
Number of respondents: 799		Missing Cases: 93

personnel. Some feminists have expressed concern that academics are involved with abstract theorizing that does not necessarily address the same questions posed by feminist activists working outside academia.¹⁵ A heavier reliance on influential thinkers/authors inside the university provides corroborative circumstantial evidence for this point of view.

Table 4 lists the field of work for the thinkers/authors. If we look at the total number of responses, we see that feminist academics are most likely to list writers as the most important for the development of their own thought (39.4 percent of the 6,320 responses are writers).¹⁶ Writers included Simone de Beauvoir, Betty Friedan, Margaret Atwood, Louky Bersianik, Angela Davis, Margaret Drabble, Andrea Dworkin, Barbara Ehrenreich, Marilyn French, Germaine Greer, Benoîte Groulx, Bell Hooks, Margaret Laurence, Alice Walker and Virginia Woolf (see Appendix A for other references). It is evident, moreover, that the infrastructure of women's/feminist studies bridges many disciplines including those from the humanities, the social sciences and natural sciences. Nevertheless, 16 percent of all the nominations involved sociologists compared to the next highest category which was psychology at 7 percent. These data support other sources which suggest that sociologists have been key innovators in articulating problems in women's/feminist studies, developing relevant theories and research strategies, and either incorporating the specialty into the parent discipline of sociology or promoting women's/feminist studies as a separate interdisciplinary science (Eichler, 1985; 1990b). Sociologists, therefore, appear to be among the most influential cognitive leaders in terms of stimulating others to work in the new area and influencing the research agenda, and organizational leaders in terms of providing both formal and informal communication among the members of women's/feminist studies through personal contacts, publications, professional meetings, and so forth. It might be useful to make a case study of sociology in order to better understand the development of the socio-cognitive infrastructure of women's/feminist studies and to determine what factors facilitated the growth of this specialty within this discipline (Eichler, 1990b).

<i>FIELD OF WORK</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Law	146	2.3
Sociology	1003	15.9
History	334	5.3
Sociology & History	6	.1
Education	157	2.5
Writer	2488	39.4
Writer & Univ. Admin.	6	.1
Philosophy	366	5.8
Psychology	441	7.0
Science or Technology	62	1.0
Political Science	63	1.0
Poet or Novelist	176	2.8
Journalist	72	1.1
Artist	111	1.8
Art Critic	14	.2
Art Historian	34	.5
Religious Studies	264	4.2
Minister	8	.1
Literature	304	4.8
Linguistics	14	.2
French	26	.4
English	20	.3
Anthropology	150	2.4
Economist	27	.4
Social Work	16	.3
Geography	6	.1
Editor	6	.1
TOTAL	6320	100.0
<i>Number of respondents: 801</i>		<i>Missing Cases: 91</i>

Finally, Table 5 provides an indication of the extent to which the communication network extends beyond the borders of Canada. Professors teaching women's/feminist studies appear to be most influenced by Canadian and American thinkers/authors. Almost 49 percent of all the responses involved thinkers/authors who work in Canada (only 2 percent of which are specifically associated with Quebec) and another 36 percent involve Americans.¹⁷ Only 15 percent of the nominations were for thinkers/authors outside of North America, primarily from France and England.

<i>COUNTRY</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Canada (exclu. Quebec)	2970	47.0
Quebec	119	1.9
United States	2275	36.0
France	416	6.6
England	515	8.2
Italy	8	.1
Germany	9	.1
Switzerland	7	.1
TOTAL	6319	100.0

Number of respondents: 801 *Missing Cases: 91*

In general, then, our respondents were most likely to draw on thinkers/authors who write in English, who are themselves academics, who reside in Canada, and who are either writers or sociologists. Important differences emerge, however, when we examine subgroups of the academics teaching women's/feminist studies.

The Impact of Social Context on the Network

In this section, I examine the association between (1) who a respondent considered to be influential and (2) the respondent's cultural context, disciplines, sex, age, and year she or he taught her or his first course in women's/feminist studies. The data clarify some of the factors which influence the

socio-cognitive domain of the field and the nature of its development.

Looking first at the association between the respondent's language¹⁸ and the language of the thinkers/authors, we see that anglophone members are much more likely to rely exclusively on thinkers/authors who publish in English. Over 93 percent of all their responses involve thinkers/authors who work only in English (see Table 6). Francophone members are much more likely to draw on thinkers/authors who work exclusively in French (29.6 percent of their responses involved

<i>LANGUAGE OF THINKERS/AUTHORS</i>	<i>Professors English (percent)</i>	<i>Professors French (percent)</i>
English	93.1	67.2
French	5.9	29.6
Both	1.0	3.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(5234)	(1061)
Number of respondents	(669)	(132)

(a) If professors taught in both English and French, they were recorded according to whatever language in which they primarily work.

thinkers/authors who publish only in French compared to 5.9 percent of the anglophone responses).

Table 7 demonstrates the relationship between the language in which respondents teach and the countries of the thinkers/authors they listed as influential. We see that anglophone professors are much more likely to have been influenced by thinkers/authors in Canada (other than Quebec), the United States and England. Francophone professors are more likely to have listed thinkers/authors who work in Quebec as well as the rest of Canada, the United States and France.

In addition to the fact that exchange of information is operating along different avenues for women's/feminist studies in anglophone versus

<i>COUNTRY OF THINKERS/AUTHORS</i>	<i>Professors English (percent)</i>	<i>Professors French (percent)</i>
Canada (exclu. Quebec)	48.8	38.2
Quebec	.5	8.9
United States	38.1	26.0
France	3.6	21.1
England	8.8	5.0
Italy	.0	.7
Germany	.2	.0
Switzerland	.1	.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(5243)	(1076)
Number of respondents	(669)	(132)
<i>Missing cases: 91</i>		

francophone Canada, these data have implications for the sociology of knowledge more generally. While Zuckerman (1989 [1988]: 518–9) acknowledges that scientists do not always conform to social norms,¹⁹ she maintains that they agree in principle to the ethos of universalism (or evaluation according to achievement rather than ascription) and communism (or the requirement of sharing knowledge with the scientific community). Maintaining these norms is, however, a more complex affair than Zuckerman acknowledges—cases of outright discrimination and selective observation aside. Language is first of all a barrier to the exchange of knowledge. In the Canadian context, this means, in the first instance, that anglophones do not have access to francophone thinkers/authors whose work is not translated into English. However, since several of the francophone thinkers/authors who were listed by the francophone respondents have had work translated into English, there seems to be a more subtle cultural influence in terms of whose work gets judged as important. The assessment of the work is influenced by the interests and personal biases of the judge notwith-

standing the ethos of disinterestedness. Therefore, differences in anglophone/francophone cultures may well influence not only who respondents are able to read but who they choose to read and how they interpret what they read. The process of peer review (part of the institutional mandate of organized skepticism) may enhance the possibilities for universalistic standards, but we must not overlook the boundaries of scientific norms. More work needs to be done to compare the circumstances of internationally recognized members of any specialty or discipline versus those who are influential for members within certain geographic areas or groups, in order to better understand the limitations that exist for the ethos of science and the exchange of knowledge. In the case of francophone/anglophone cultures, one possible avenue of investigation might be degree of professionalization. Some evidence suggests that anglophone respondents were more likely than francophone respondents to be influenced by thinkers/authors who are themselves academics, while francophone respondents were more likely to name writers unaffiliated with the university as influential (see Tables 8 and 9).²⁰

It is also revealing to examine the impact of discipline on selection of influential thinkers/authors. Table 10 indicates that professors who are in the humanities are somewhat more likely than professors in the social sciences or other sciences (with the possible exception of education) to find thinkers/authors from France and Quebec important for their own work. This finding may well be related to the popularity of postmodernism and poststructuralism in France. Moreover, prior to the 1960s at any rate, Quebec was generally considered to be stronger in the humanities than in the other areas. It may be useful to consider, therefore, the relationship between the socio-cognitive infrastructure of parent disciplines at different universities and the emergence of new specialties. For example, better-established disciplines or sciences with large memberships may facilitate the rise of new specialties and provide an opportunity for potentially influential scientists to make notable contributions.

What about the effects of the respondents' discipline on their choice of influential thinkers/authors? Table 11 examines whether or not pro-

TABLE 8
Thinkers/Authors' Field of Work by
Respondents' Language

<i>THINKERS/ AUTHORS' FIELD OF WORK</i>	<i>Professors English (percent)</i>	<i>Professors French (percent)</i>
Law	2.5	1.6
Sociology	16.7	12.1
History	5.6	3.8
Sociology & History	.1	.0
Education	2.9	.6
Writer ^a	37.9	47.1
Philosophy	5.2	8.8
Psychology	7.0	7.1
Science or Technology	1.1	.2
Political Science	1.1	.7
Poet or Novelist	3.0	1.9
Journalist	1.3	.6
Artist ^b	1.8	3.1
Art Historian	.6	.5
Religious Studies ^c	4.5	3.3
Literature ^d	5.7	3.7
French	.4	.7
Anthropology	1.9	4.6
Economist	.5	.0
Social Work	.3	.1
Geography	.1	.2
Editor	.1	.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(5252)	(1063)
Number of respondents	(669)	(132)

Missing Cases: 91
 (a) Includes nominations regarding a writer who is also a university administrator.
 (b) Includes nominations of art critics.
 (c) Includes theology and nominations regarding a minister.
 (d) Includes literature, linguistics and English.

TABLE 9
University Affiliation of Thinkers/Authors by
Language of Professors Who Have Taught
Women's/Feminist Studies

<i>AFFILIATION</i>	<i>Professors English (percent)</i>	<i>Professors French (percent)</i>
Full-time position	79.5	74.5
Partly affiliated	12.3	11.0
No university connection	8.2	14.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(5097)	(1037)

Number of respondents: 799 *Missing cases: 93*

fessors find thinkers/authors from their own field of work primarily important. Respondents found writers to be the most important for their own work in 12 of 14 different disciplines. Only sociologists and theologians are more likely or at least as likely to list thinkers/authors who work in their own field as opposed to writers. Anthropologists, philosophers, historians, psychologists and professors who teach in languages, linguistics, other humanities and other social sciences list thinkers/authors in their own field with the greatest frequency following writers. Respondents who do not tend to list influential thinkers/authors in their same field of work include professors in education, women's studies, social work and political science. These respondents, along with professors in "other disciplines," name sociologists with the second highest frequency. These results can probably be explained, in part, by the slower development of women's/feminist studies in some of these disciplines and also, in part, by the pre-existing interconnectedness of some of the disciplines. The small number of influential thinkers/authors identified specifically as working in the area of women's studies is simply due to the fact that it is a new specialty which did not exist as an independent field of study until recently.

Although there are only 101 male respondents for whom we have information, sex is a potentially important variable influencing the social infrastructure of women's/feminist studies. Men and women obviously do not have the same relationship to this specialty, and there have been some debates about

TABLE 10
Country of Thinkers/Authors by Discipline of Respondents^a

RESPONDENTS' DISCIPLINE ^b	THINKERS/AUTHORS' COUNTRY						Total
	Canada	Quebec	USA	France	U.K.	Other	
Anthropology	102 52.3	0 .0	73 37.4	6 3.1	13 6.7	1 .5	195 100.0
Education	139 44.3	9 2.9	112 35.7	28 8.9	23 7.3	3 1.0	314 100.0
History	308 53.2	4 .7	184 31.8	30 5.2	53 9.2	0 .0	579 100.0
Modern & Medieval Languages	320 34.9	32 3.5	408 44.5	96 10.5	60 6.6	0 .0	916 100.0
Philosophy	103 37.7	0 .4	120 47.2	20 7.3	20 7.3	0 .0	273 99.9
Political Science	78 47.6	5 3.0	44 26.8	14 8.5	22 13.4	1 .6	164 99.9
Psychology	161 47.1	2 .6	161 44.4	15 4.1	13 3.6	1 .3	363 100.0
Religious Studies	171 45.1	7 1.8	170 44.9	24 6.3	7 1.8	0 .0	379 99.9
Social Work	119 43.9	8 3.0	108 39.9	12 4.4	23 8.5	1 .4	271 100.0
Sociology	621 55.2	21 1.9	298 26.5	64 5.7	109 9.7	11 1.0	1124 100.0
Women's Studies	140 43.5	2 .6	133 41.3	15 4.7	30 9.3	2 .6	322 100.0
Other Humanities	100 35.3	18 6.4	104 36.7	39 13.8	22 7.8	0 .0	283 100.0
Other Social Sciences	207 51.8	6 1.5	122 30.5	23 5.8	41 10.3	0 .0	400 100.0
Other	161 54.4	3 1.0	91 30.7	17 5.7	23 7.8	1 .3	296 100.0

(a) This table has been percentaged across on the basis of number of responses. Comparisons should be made downward.
 (b) These responses were provided by 728 respondents, as 164 cases are missing. Some respondents listed more than one discipline. These people are counted twice.

TABLE 11 (Part A)
Field of Work of Thinkers/Authors by Respondents' Discipline (percent)

THINKERS/AUTHORS FIELD OF WORK	RESPONDENTS' DISCIPLINE				
	Anthropology	Education	History	Language/ Literature	Philosophy
Law	0.0	1.6	.4	.2	4.0
Sociology	16.9	15.2	8.3	3.0	7.6
Education	4.1	6.6	2.0	.8	2.4
Writer ^a	44.6	36.6	42.6	45.7	33.7
Philosophy	1.5	4.9	4.1	4.2	25.7
Psychology	3.6	11.1	5.0	5.2	5.2
Science or Technology ^d	2.6	.0	.9	.2	2.0
Political Science	.5	.0	.7	.1	.4
Poet or Novelist	1.0	4.5	1.1	4.3	4.4
Journalist	.0	1.2	1.1	.6	1.2
Artist/Art Critic	.5	2.5	3.1	3.4	1.2
Religious Studies ^b	.5	4.5	1.6	2.2	3.6
Language & Literature ^c	.5	3.2	1.6	26.0	1.2
History ^d	3.1	6.6	26.2	1.9	1.6
Anthropology	20.0	.8	.9	.6	4.4
Economist	.5	.4	.5	.0	.4
Social Work	.0	.0	.2	.0	.0
Editor	.0	.0	.0	.0	.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N of responses ^e	(195)	(243)	(564)	(891)	(249)
N of respondents	24	28	77	108	34
Missing cases	3	5	7	10	1

(a) Includes nominations regarding a writer who is also a university administrator.
(b) Includes theology and nominations regarding a minister.
(c) Includes literature, linguistics, English, and French.
(d) Includes nominations of art historians.
(e) Respondents who listed two disciplines are counted twice.
(f) Includes a total of 6 nominations in geography.

TABLE 11 (Part B)
Field of Work of Thinkers/Authors by Respondents' Discipline (percent)

THINKERS/AUTHORS FIELD OF WORK	RESPONDENTS' DISCIPLINE				
	Political Science	Psychology	Religious Studies	Social Work	Sociology
Law	1.8	.6	.6	1.9	3.5
Sociology	19.5	11.7	4.0	23.0	34.8
Education	1.8	2.1	1.2	3.0	2.5
Writer ^a	36.6	44.1	38.7	29.6	33.1
Philosophy	8.5	3.5	2.5	5.6	5.3
Psychology	4.9	23.8	4.3	17.0	3.7
Science or Technology ^f	1.2	.9	.3	.7	.8
Political Science	7.9	.3	.0	2.2	1.7
Poet or Novelist	1.8	2.1	3.4	4.1	1.6
Journalist	.0	2.7	.3	1.1	1.4
Artist/Art Critic	1.2	2.4	.3	.7	1.1
Religious Studies ^b	.6	1.8	38.3	1.9	1.8
Language & Literature ^c	2.4	1.2	2.1	.4	.9
History ^d	8.5	1.2	2.1	3.3	4.0
Anthropology	3.0	1.2	1.5	1.1	3.2
Economist	.0	.0	.0	.7	.8
Social Work	.0	.6	.0	3.7	.0
Editor	.0	.0	.3	.0	.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
N of responses ^e	(164)	(340)	(326)	(270)	(1104)
N of respondents	23	45	41	31	136
Missing cases	4	7	2	2	23

(a) Includes nominations regarding a writer who is also a university administrator.

(b) Includes theology and nominations regarding a minister.

(c) Includes literature, linguistics, English, and French.

(d) Includes nominations of art historians.

(e) Respondents who listed two disciplines are counted twice.

(f) Includes a total of 6 nominations in geography.

TABLE 11 (Part C)
Field of Work of Thinkers/Authors by Respondents' Discipline (percent)

THINKERS/AUTHORS FIELD OF WORK	RESPONDENTS' DISCIPLINE			
	Women's Studies	Other Humanities	Other Social Sciences	Other
Law	1.8	.7	12.3	.3
Sociology	14.5	3.9	18.8	15.3
Education	3.6	3.5	2.3	2.4
Writer ^a	37.3	48.6	37.5	49.5
Philosophy	8.3	6.0	6.5	4.7
Psychology	6.9	6.7	4.5	8.5
Science or Technology ^d	1.4	.4	2.3	3.1
Political Science	1.4	.4	1.0	.7
Poet or Novelist	2.9	5.3	2.8	1.7
Journalist	.7	1.1	1.3	2.4
Artist/Art Critic	2.5	1.4	1.3	3.4
Religious Studies ^b	2.5	5.3	1.5	1.4
Language & Literature ^c	6.2	12.7	.8	2.3
History ^d	7.3	2.8	4.8	4.4
Anthropology	1.8	1.1	1.8	.0
Economist	.4	.4	1.0	.0
Social Work	.0	.0	.0	.0
Editor	.4	.0	.0	.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N of responses ^e	(276)	(284)	(400)	(295)
N of respondents	29	41	56	38
Missing cases	2	4	7	1

(a) Includes nominations regarding a writer who is also a university administrator.
(b) Includes theology and nominations regarding a minister.
(c) Includes literature, linguistics, English, and French.
(d) Includes nominations of art historians.
(e) Respondents who listed two disciplines are counted twice.
(f) Includes a total of 6 nominations in geography.

whether or not men should be teaching women's/feminist studies at all. Many of the respondents in the Phase Two survey, for example, had very ambivalent feelings about the role of men.²¹

One consideration is how a male versus a female perspective influences who comes to be defined as important, and how that might affect the way in which women's/feminist studies develops. The starkest observation, however, is that there is very little substantive difference between the thinkers/authors that are named by male and female professors, at least in terms of university affiliation, country of residence, field of work and language. Female respondents are slightly more likely than males to list thinkers/authors from Quebec, France and the United States whereas males find thinkers/authors from Canada and England more important (see Table I in Appendix C). Related to this observation is the fact that male respondents are somewhat less likely to list as important thinkers/authors who work in French and slightly more often to find useful those people who work exclusively in English (see Table II in Appendix C). Female professors also name with somewhat greater frequency thinkers/authors who have no university connection as opposed to the men who rely more on thinkers/authors who hold full-time university positions (83.3 percent of men versus 78 percent of female faculty name thinkers/authors who hold full-time positions, whereas 4.3 percent of the male faculty versus 9.9 percent of the females list thinkers/authors who are not affiliated with the university [see Table III, Appendix C]). There is virtually no difference in the frequencies of the disciplines of the thinkers/authors aside from the fact that female faculty made a total of 56 nominations involving fields of work not mentioned by any of the male faculty, including social

work, linguistics, editing, university administration and art criticism (see Table IV, Appendix C). Nevertheless, using general categories to compare influential thinkers/authors named by male and female faculty may disguise important differences between, for example, the theoretical positions of specific thinkers/authors. In the next section, I examine more closely the dis/similarities in the most frequently listed thinkers/authors by male and female faculty.

Age might also influence the selection of influential thinkers/authors. It is sometimes asserted that younger scientists are more receptive to new ideas than older scientists, although much of the evidence is, in fact, contradictory (Zuckerman, 1989 [1988]: 534-5). Professors teaching women's/feminist studies in Canada do not fully support this hypothesis. There is not a significant difference in the median age between professors who taught their first course in women's/feminist studies prior to 1975 and those who taught in the late 1980s (see

TABLE 12
Thinkers/Authors' Country by Age of Professors Teaching
Women's/Feminist Studies

THINKERS/ AUTHORS' COUNTRY	Age of Professors				
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69
Canada (excluding Quebec)	36.8	48.3	45.8	50.4	46.0
Quebec	.9	1.5	1.9	2.6	1.7
USA	41.2	35.4	36.9	33.3	36.2
France	7.0	4.9	7.0	7.8	8.0
England	14.0	9.5	8.1	5.6	7.7
Italy	.0	.2	.1	.1	.0
Germany	.0	.2	.2	.0	.0
Switzerland	.0	.0	.1	.2	.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Column	(114)	(1787)	(3038)	(1025)	(287)

Missing Cases: 101

TABLE 13
Thinkers/Authors' Field of Work by Respondents' Age (responses and percent)

WORK	Age of Professors				
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69
Law	5 4.4	58 3.2	71 2.3	8 .8	3 1.0
Sociology	16 14.0	350 19.6	471 15.5	117 11.4	44 15.3
Education	2 1.8	47 2.6	69 2.3	27 2.6	10 3.5
Writer	30 26.3	644 36.1	1193 39.3	483 47.0	110 38.3
Philosophy	18 15.8	80 4.5	178 5.9	60 5.8	24 8.4
Psychology	4 3.5	114 6.4	230 7.6	69 6.7	22 7.7
Science or Technology	1 .9	17 1.0	24 .8	14 1.4	5 1.7
Political Science	0 .0	29 1.6	22 .7	9 .9	3 1.0
Poet or Novelist	8 7.0	56 3.1	83 2.7	25 2.4	4 1.4
Journalist	0 .0	21 1.2	36 1.2	10 1.0	3 1.0
Artist	1 .9	33 1.8	57 1.9	10 1.0	8 2.8
Theology or Religious Studies	8 7.0	53 3.0	130 4.3	45 4.4	19 6.6
Literature	9 7.9	74 4.1	140 4.6	66 6.4	11 3.8
History	8 7.0	99 5.5	166 5.5	48 4.7	11 3.8
Anthropology	2 1.8	52 2.9	77 2.5	13 1.3	5 1.7
Economist	1 .9	11 .6	12 .4	3 .3	0 .0

THIS TABLE RESUMES ON FOLLOWING PAGE...

TABLE 13
Thinkers/Authors' Field of Work by Respondents' Age (responses and percent)

WORK	Age of Professors				
	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69
Social Work	0 .0	7 .4	7 .2	2 .2	0 .0
Linguistics	0 .0	2 .1	8 .3	3 .3	1 .3
Geography	0 .0	3 .2	3 .1	0 .0	0 .0
Editor	0 .0	1 .1	4 .1	1 .1	0 .0
Writer and University Administrator	0 .0	1 .1	5 .2	0 .0	0 .0
Art Critic	0 .0	4 .2	9 .3	1 .1	0 .0
Art Historian	1 .9	8 .4	20 .7	3 .3	2 .7
Minister	0 .0	2 .1	2 .1	1 .1	1 .3
French	0 .0	9 .5	12 .4	4 .4	0 .0
English	0 .0	8 .4	6 .2	5 .5	1 .3
Sociology and History	0 .0	2 .1	4 .1	0 .0	0 .0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(114)	(1785)	(3039)	(1027)	(287)
<i>Respondents: 791</i>		<i>Missing cases: 101</i>			

Lenton in this volume). Nevertheless, I thought that age might influence the socio-cognitive structure in other ways. One hypothesis was that older scientists are less inclined to draw on thinkers/authors outside of Canada. In Table 12, we see that older scientists do list thinkers/authors from Canada more frequently. Respondents who are in their twenties appear to be more strongly influenced by thinkers/authors from England and the United States. The

percentage point differences are not great, however; we are also dealing with a relatively small number of responses in the case of the youngest group of respondents. This relationship, therefore, requires further examination.

I also thought that younger scholars would be more likely than the older scholars to find thinkers/authors within their own disciplines most influential

given the greater opportunities to make professional contacts. Table 13 shows that younger writers are in fact somewhat less likely to select writers. They are also somewhat more likely to select thinkers/authors who are poets or novelists, or in law, philosophy, literature and history. These data may reflect new interests on the part of scholars who have more recently become involved in women's/feminist studies and may therefore indicate areas of future expansion. Examining the relationship between the year that respondents taught their first course in women's/feminist studies and the selection of important thinkers/authors may clarify changes that have taken place in the socio-cognitive domain of women's/feminist studies since its inception in the early 1970s.

Table 14 concerns the relationship between the year that respondents taught their first course in women's/feminist studies and the field of work of the thinkers/authors that the respondents named. There is no substantial difference throughout the last 20 years. Respondents who entered women's/feminist studies in the 1980s, compared to those respondents who taught the very first university courses in this area (i.e., prior to 1974) tend to find thinkers/authors in the same two fields of work most important: writers and sociologists. There are only slight declines in the percentage point differences over the four time periods for both fields of work, no doubt resulting from the expansion of women's/feminist studies into other disciplines, and the rise of influential members in those new disciplines. We see, for example, slight increases in education, theology or religion, literature, linguistics and English, and perhaps the beginnings of newly emerging socio-cognitive leaders in economics, geography and French. The data thus suggest that, at present, the social infrastructure of women's/feminist studies is still predominantly influenced by writers and sociologists, but that the field is expanding both its domain and its list of influential members.

There does not appear to be any noticeable change in the extent to which professors teaching

women's/feminist studies rely on thinkers/authors outside of North America, except for a small increase in the case of Quebec after 1974 (see Table 15). This may be due to the expansion of the social sciences in Quebec over the last 20 years or to the greater availability of English translations of works by Québécois feminists. Table 16 provides somewhat contradictory information about the relationship between year in which first women's/feminist studies course was taught and language of influential thinkers/authors. There appears to be an increase in the number of responses involving thinkers/authors who work in French for the first three time periods, but professors who taught their first course between 1985 and 1988 are the least likely to name thinkers/authors who work only in French. Further analysis is needed in order to determine whether these data indicate commitment to a Canadian intellectual elite or cultural barriers to the international exchange of knowledge. The evidence appears to suggest, however, that there are far stronger intellectual ties to the United States than to Europe.

There is, finally, no evidence to suggest that professors teaching their first course in women's/feminist studies in the 1980s are more likely to draw on influential thinkers/authors who hold university positions. Approximately 8.4 percent of respondents who taught their first course prior to 1975 named thinkers/authors who are not affiliated with the university, compared to 9.5 percent of the professors teaching their first course after 1984 (see Table 17). This finding is somewhat contradictory to other evidence which suggests that later generations of professors in women's/feminist studies are becoming increasingly professional (see Lenton in this volume).

Let us now examine the top 20 influential thinkers/authors named by various subgroups of respondents in order to provide more detailed information about the socio-cognitive infrastructure of women's/feminist studies than is possible with aggregate data.

TABLE 14
Thinkers/Authors' Field of Work by Year that Respondents Taught
First Course in Women's/Feminist Studies (percent)

<i>THINKERS/AUTHORS'</i> <i>FIELD OF WORK</i>	<i>Years Course Taught</i>			
	<i>Before 1975</i>	<i>1975-1979</i>	<i>1980-1984</i>	<i>1985-1988</i>
Law	3.4	2.3	1.5	2.9
Sociology	18.7	16.4	14.9	15.3
History	6.1	5.6	5.4	4.4
Sociology & History	.0	.1	.1	.0
Education	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.7
Writer ^a	40.5	40.6	39.6	37.4
Philosophy	6.6	5.5	5.7	5.6
Psychology	6.9	6.8	7.4	6.6
Science or Technology	1.4	.9	1.0	.9
Political Science	.9	1.0	1.0	1.0
Poet or Novelist	2.2	2.4	2.7	3.5
Journalist	1.1	1.5	.9	1.2
Artist ^b	2.4	1.9	2.7	2.7
Religious Studies ^c	2.7	3.6	5.0	5.1
Literature ^d	2.4	5.3	4.7	7.8
French	.2	.3	.5	.6
Anthropology	1.9	2.5	3.1	1.3
Economist	.3	.4	.5	.5
Social Work	.0	.1	.4	.3
Geography	.0	.0	.1	.2
Editor	.0	.4	.0	.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(951)	(1388)	(1570)	(6114)
Number of respondents	(120)	(176)	(280)	(199)

Missing cases: 117

(a) Includes nominations regarding a writer who is also a university administrator.
(b) Includes nominations of art critics and art historians.
(c) Includes theology and nominations regarding a minister.
(d) Includes literature, linguistics and English.

COUNTRY OF THINKERS/AUTHORS	Years Course Taught			
	Before 1975	1975-1979	1980-1984	1985-1988
Canada (exclu. Quebec)	49.0	46.5	46.2	47.9
Quebec	.8	2.1	2.5	1.5
United States	35.5	36.8	35.0	37.0
France	5.7	6.3	7.9	5.1
England	8.6	7.9	8.0	8.2
Italy	.0	.1	.2	.1
Germany	.2	.1	.0	.3
Switzerland	.1	.2	.1	.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(951)	(1388)	(2206)	(6113)
Number of respondents	(120)	(176)	(280)	(199)
<i>Missing cases: 117</i>				

THINKERS/AUTHORS' LANGUAGE	Years Course Taught			
	Before 1975	1975-1979	1980-1984	1985-1988
English	90.7	89.3	86.5	90.4
French	8.1	9.6	12.0	7.8
Both	1.2	1.1	1.5	1.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(945)	(1379)	(2199)	(1566)
Number of respondents	(120)	(176)	(280)	(199)
<i>Missing cases: 117</i>				

A Closer Look at the Most Frequently Named Thinkers/Authors

In order to understand the socio-cognitive infrastructure of women's/feminist studies in Canada, it is useful to examine first some characteristics of the 34 thinkers/authors who were listed either by the entire population, the anglophone respondents only or the francophone respondents only; and, second, to draw out relevant differences between the anglophone and francophone domains.

The majority of the most frequently listed thinkers/authors are either sociologists (10) or writers (9) (see Appendix B for the actual names).²² Four of them are in psychology or psychoanalysis and there are two in each of the following categories: philosophy, political science/law, theology, and literature.²³ Finally, Sheila Rowbotham is a historian and Dale Spender is in education.

Future research might consider the theoretical and methodological debates that have predominated in women's/feminist studies in light of the relationship between this specialty and various parent disciplines. For example, conflict over appropriate methodologies for studying women is very much influenced by sociological issues pertaining to quantitative versus qualitative methods and the various assumptions underlying them.

In any case, nine of the same thinkers/authors appear in both the francophone and anglophone lists and, as a consequence, the differences between the infrastructures of these two cultures overlap considerably. Nevertheless, it is also clear that separate lines of communication have been established. In terms of field of work, the francophone professors are somewhat more likely to list writers and psychoanalysts as most important for their own work whereas anglophone professors are especially likely

TABLE 17
University Affiliation of Thinkers/Authors
by Year Professors Taught First Course

THINKERS/AUTHORS' UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION	Years Course Taught			
	Before 1975	1975- 1979	1980- 1984	1985- 1988
Full-Time position	76.6	77.6	79.4	80.2
Partly affiliated	15.0	13.2	11.2	10.3
No affiliation	8.4	9.2	9.4	9.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(939)	(1351)	(2127)	(1519)
Number of respondents	(120)	(175)	(279)	(199)
<i>Missing cases: 119</i>				

to list sociologists. The implications of these findings are related to the countries with which the thinkers/authors are associated.

Twelve of the 34 most influential thinkers/authors are from the United States, seven are from France, six from Canada (excluding Quebec), five from England, three from Quebec and one from Australia. While these data support my earlier contention that the United States has a strong influence on the development of women's/feminist studies in Canada, there are differences by culture. Both the francophone and anglophone professors list eight thinkers/authors from the United States, but not exactly the same ones. Francophone professors, however, are almost as likely to find thinkers/authors from France important (i.e., 7 or 31.8 percent compared to 1 or 5 percent of thinkers/authors on the anglophone list). Anglophone professors, on the other hand, are more likely to be influenced by thinkers/authors who reside in Canada or the U.K. These differences have contributed to the emergence of two distinct women's/feminist studies with a greater emphasis on humanities in francophone culture and on social sciences in anglophone culture.²⁴

It is also revealing to examine the date of respondents' first involvement in women's/feminist studies—that is, the point at which these thinkers/authors joined the new specialty. Levin and Stephen (1986, cited in Zuckerman, 1989 [1988]: 534) have linked cognitive structure to age. They argue that entire groups of scientists who happen to be trained at a time when a science or specialty is just emerging may benefit from unusual opportunities for major contributions. Over half the 34 influential thinkers/authors identified in our study became formally involved with women's concerns in the 1960s, often through various social movements.²⁵ It was during the 1960s that the women's movement was gaining momentum, and by 1970 the first courses in women's/feminist studies were being organized. Although academics were faced with a variety of obstacles such as recalcitrant administrators, peer resistance, and so forth,

there were tremendous opportunities for the committed few. There was a burst of publications dealing with women's issues, sex relations, and so on, during this period. Twenty-one of the 28 thinkers/authors for whom I have accurate information published their first article in women's/feminist studies prior to 1975 and another four of them in the late 1970s. Simone de Beauvoir and Virginia Woolf were obviously writing about women and their concerns far earlier. Marilyn French also points out that she was writing about being female by the age of nine and Betty Friedan published *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963.

The claim has also been made that younger scholars are more likely to become involved in a new speciality, that is, to accept new ideas. While we do not yet know the ages of all the thinkers/authors at the time they first became involved in women's/feminist studies, the ages of those for whom we do have information range from the early twenties to the early forties.

It is also possible to examine the extent to which these thinkers/authors agree on the important challenges facing women's/feminist studies, and the

best strategies for dealing with them. There is a fair amount of consensus. The 27 thinkers/authors that were interviewed (including the interview responses that were formulated by Somer Brodribb for Simone de Beauvoir) identified ten major issues. The most pressing of these is a concern with the transmission of knowledge. Eleven thinkers/authors argued that we need to extend feminism to one or more of the following groups: women of colour, professors in the natural sciences, poor women and, especially, younger women. There was a shared sentiment that the women's movement needs revitalization, that women are being silenced, and that we are not making vital connections with the next generation of scholars. The need to establish better contacts between anglophone and francophone feminists was mentioned by one author. The other issues in order of the frequency with which they were mentioned are the following.

- (1) Theoretical disputes, especially in relation to psychoanalysis, conservatism and culture. One thinker/author also suggested that we needed a blueprint of patriarchy.
- (2) Work relating to women's bodies, especially as it pertains to maintaining control over our bodies. Specific topics in this category include pro-choice, new reproductive technologies and the impact of the environment.
- (3) Race issues. Six of the eight women who mentioned race argued that we should acknowledge racial differences and make interracial liaisons in order to advance the position of all women. The remaining two thinkers/authors were equally concerned but argued that we needed to unify feminism.
- (4) A variety of issues revolving around the role of the state relative to women. Specific problems that were mentioned include prison violence against women, the judicial system, imperialism, politics, militarism and freedom.
- (5) Problems surrounding motherhood, including the so-called maternal instinct, conflicts that mothers experience between children, work and daycare.
- (6) Matters pertaining to sexuality, especially in regard to gay liberation and pornography.
- (7) Class, stratification and poverty, mentioned by five thinkers/authors.
- (8) Ecological concerns, such as the Greenhouse Effect, mentioned by four thinkers/authors.
- (9) Aging or the mystique of age is a major concern according to Betty Friedan and Benoîte Groulx.

There does not appear to be any noticeable differences in the categories of problems listed by the thinkers/authors in the francophone and anglophone groups, although the specific theories of concern may differ.

The thinkers/authors are even more consistent in the strategies they recommend for addressing the problems listed above. Since most of them came to women's studies as political activists, they tend to argue consistently that women must become more politically active. Moreover, they urge political activism at both institutional and grassroots levels. Five of the thinkers/authors also specify that more research is needed. Three of them, however, are themselves not politically active apart from their intellectual contributions: Badinter and Cixous state that they are unable to be poets and political activists simultaneously, while Spender argues that conferences and other mechanisms should be used to advance feminism. They add, however, that the women's movement inspires them.

Although we did not use the respondents' sex or time of entry into women's/feminist studies as criteria for selecting the most frequently referenced thinkers/authors to be interviewed in the final phase of the Canadian Women's Studies Project, I have included this information in order to continue the discussion from the beginning of this paper about the stages through which women's/feminist studies has been going. While some thinkers/authors have been influential for the general population of professors in women's/feminist studies, it is important to note that thinkers/authors vary by different subgroups and also over time, partly reflecting shifting societal concerns and pressures. For example, male and female faculty do not find

exactly the same feminist thinkers/authors important (although Simone de Beauvoir was listed most frequently by both groups). It would be interesting to pursue the potential associations between various subgroups such as male/female faculty and the theoretical perspective and degree of radicalism on the part of the thinkers/authors.

The lists of influential thinkers/authors by groups of professors according to the year in which they taught their first course in women's studies or from a feminist perspective shows that there are also shifts in whose work is found to be important at any particular time. Twenty-nine women are included in the top 20 influential thinkers/authors listed by at least one of the three cohorts, but only 14 of the 29 are named by all three groups.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have presented some preliminary findings about the thinkers/authors that have been listed as important by professors who teach women's/feminist studies in Canada. Although these data represent only a snapshot in time, they nevertheless shed light on the development of women's/feminist studies. Specifically, they demonstrate the relationship between the social and cognitive domains of science. It is evident, for example, that variables such as sex, language, field of work, university affiliation, country of residence and time of initial involvement in women's/feminist studies are relevant for explaining who is likely to know about whose work and judge it to be important. These data help to account not only for which members become cognitive leaders but for differences in the development and direction that women's/feminist studies take, for example, in anglophone versus francophone cultures. Finally, I examined the work of influential thinkers/authors in order to assess the extent to which respondents agreed on key issues, methods, and so forth. Overall, the data suggest that there is an established body of knowledge associated with women's/feminist studies but that the development of the field is still expanding into new areas. The data also suggest that more attention needs to be paid to the complementary and contradictory infrastructures of francophone versus anglophone women's/feminist studies in Canada.

NOTES

1. Zuckerman (1989 [1988]: 561, fn. 53) points out that the distinction between specialties and disciplines is more a matter of degree than kind. "Both are loose groupings of scientists working on similar problems who identify themselves and are identified by others as working in the smaller division, socially and cognitively defined and labelled as a specialty, or in the larger division, similarly defined as a science or discipline."
2. This survey was Phase Two of the Canadian Women's Studies Project, conducted during 1987-90. The research team was comprised of Margrit Eichler and myself (principal investigators), Louise Vandelac (francophone collaborator), Rosonna Tite (research officer) and Nicole Groten (secretary). The contributions of other people have been instrumental at various stages of the project and they are mentioned where relevant. For further details about the various stages of the project, see Eichler with the assistance of Tite (in this volume).
3. The actual question was: "Keeping in mind your own personal work, please list up to ten contemporary feminist authors/thinkers whose work you personally have found the most useful in developing your own thinking. (These authors may be either within or outside of Canada as the case may be.)"
4. We started developing a list of everyone that we personally knew to be eligible. We then sought the expertise of knowledgeable and well-connected members to extend our list. We also checked university calendars and mailing lists of relevant organizations. We then went to professional meetings and canvassed for eligible members. Finally, we asked every respondent to whom a questionnaire was mailed if they would list the names of anyone that they knew to be eligible. It is, of course, probable that we missed some eligible professors. Nevertheless, we estimate that the number of omissions is likely to be small given the large duplication of names in the latter stages of the search for respondents.
5. See fn. 14 in Eichler with the assistance of Tite (1990a).
6. It is important to remember, however, that this survey was conducted in 1987. Specialties and even disciplines are fluid; members come and go. There are new people teaching women's/feminist studies today and therefore some changes in the people regarded as influential thinkers/authors may have also occurred.
7. Originally, we planned to interview only those 20 thinkers/authors most frequently cited by the entire population of professors teaching women's/feminist studies. However, we realized that this list was almost identical to the list generated by the anglophone respondents alone, but varied substantively from the list generated by the francophone respondents alone. This is a function of the distribution of anglophone/francophone respondents. Just over 81 percent of our respondents taught in English only, almost 15 percent in French only and the other 4 percent in both languages. These interviews comprise Phase Four of the national study. See Eichler with the assistance of Tite (in this volume) for more information on this phase of the research.
8. Most of these interviews took place between November 1988 and November 1989, although a few were done in

1990 and the interviews with Irigaray, Oakley and Chessler are yet to be completed. The time span is due in large part to the difficulties involved in tracking down and conducting interviews with respondents who are extremely busy, in high demand, and who travel a great deal. The most extreme example: it took over 30 telephone calls spread over 18 months to confirm the time and place of the interview with Betty Friedan. The interview took place as I followed Friedan around a hotel at the Pen Conference held in Toronto in 1989. We were also delayed by the necessity of applying and securing funds for interviewing the additional influential thinkers listed by the francophone respondents.

I completed all the interviews except for eight (possibly nine if Luce Irigaray is interviewed) which had to be conducted in French. Irene Demczuk and Christiane Bernier, two graduate students at the Université du Québec à Montréal, were hired to conduct the interviews with Bandler, Bersianik, Brossard, Cixous, Delphy, Groulx, Guillaumin and Vandelac. In addition, Somer Brodribb was hired to complete an "interview" with Simone de Beauvoir—that is, she provided a history of de Beauvoir's involvement in women's issues and outlined her major contributions, and so on, by drawing extensively on her work.

9. Ninety-one respondents (80 women and 11 men) declined to answer this question. Most of them simply did not have the time to answer, but there were some professors who objected to the nature of the question. For example, respondent #174 said: "I don't identify authors/thinkers on a feminist/non-feminist perspective." Respondent #905 reported: "I am an educator, not a groupie. Many authors, etc., have influenced me—not necessarily all feminists either. I merely apply their theories to feminism." These comments appear to be related to some mistaken notion about how we intended to use the question; unfortunately, it is difficult in survey research to explicate the motivations behind each question.
10. The cutoff point of five votes was chosen because it reflected a statistical break between having at least several votes and only one.
11. We managed to secure enough funds to hire a graduate student for that purpose but the task proved to be quite difficult and required the assistance of Margrit Eichler, Rosonna Tite and myself. We started by identifying those thinkers/authors known by a member of the research team. Then Rosonna Tite and Lori Smith used university calendars and affiliation lists, library references, bibliographies, publications and personal contacts in various departments to complete the missing information. Despite these efforts, we were not able to locate all the necessary information for a few of the authors.
12. Since each respondent listed up to 10 thinkers/authors in no particular order of importance, it only makes sense to talk about all the responses that they gave. Thus all remaining tables are percentage on the basis of the number of responses.
13. The *N* or total number of responses is less than 6,320 because we were not able to determine the primary language of 25 thinkers/authors.
14. We were unable to determine the university affiliation of 21 thinkers/authors who received a total of 186 nominations. I suspect that a substantial number of these missing cases do not hold university positions simply because it is generally easier to track down faculty members through university calendars, and so on. Even if all 186 nominations referred to thinkers/authors not affiliated with the university, however, the percentage of responses in this category would increase by only 2.6 percent (11.9 percent in total).
15. See Rhonda Lenton (in this volume).
16. Field of work is often difficult to label. We decided, for example, to categorize Simone de Beauvoir as a writer even though she could reasonably be defined as a philosopher. Margrit Eichler was left as a sociologist although she is also a writer. In order to arrive at what we thought was the most representative description of a thinker's field of work, we considered a number of factors, including the discipline with which a thinker/author was generally identified (if applicable); how they spent the majority of their time; and how they made their living.
17. In some cases, the author's country of birth was not the same as the country of residence. We chose the country in which the author has resided and done the bulk of her work. A brief review of these authors' works reveal that they are more oriented toward their country of residence.
18. Measured in terms of the language(s) in which she or he has taught course(s) in women's/feminist studies.
19. For example, she points out that having a degree from a less than distinguished university and being female are disadvantageous for having one's work judged as scholarly and for gaining appointments to tenured positions in major universities.
20. I thought at first that francophone professors might have found writers more important than anglophone professors because francophones were more likely to teach in the humanities. The data show that professors who have taught in both English and French are most likely to be in Modern and Medieval languages as well as other humanities, although this is not particularly true for professors who have taught only in French. Nevertheless, it may be worth exploring whether certain conditions about the humanities in Quebec versus the rest of Canada make them conducive to the introduction of a new speciality.
21. For an analysis of how men define their own role, see Margrit Eichler with the assistance of Louise Vandelac in this volume. A future article will examine how the female professors view the men who teach women's/feminist studies.
22. There are actually 22 thinkers/authors on the list generated by the entire population and on the francophone list. The numbers exceed 20 in these two cases because of ties in the number of nominations for the thinkers/authors in the twentieth position.
23. This categorization includes Simone de Beauvoir as a writer, Mary Daly as a theologian, Mary O'Brien as a sociologist, and Hélène Cixous and Kate Millett in literature. Although their interests cross disciplinary lines, these areas seem to best reflect their work and departmental affiliations.

24. The greater development of the humanities in Quebec no doubt swayed the initial selection of thinkers/authors in this direction which, in turn, establishes a bias towards the humanities in the women's/feminist studies' infrastructure.
25. In many cases, however, they developed feminist sympathies even as children.

REFERENCES

- Crane, D. (1972). *Invisible colleges: Diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Eichler, M. (1985, December). And the work never ends: Feminist contributions to Canadian anglophone sociology. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*.
- Eichler, M. (1990a [in press]). Not always an 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 #7 of the Canadian Women's Studies Project). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Eichler, M. with the assistance of Tite, R. (1990). Women's studies professors in Canada: A collective self-portrait. *Atlantis*, 16(1), 6-24.
- Eichler, M. with the assistance of Vandelac, L. (1990). An awkward situation: Men in women's studies—Part one. *Atlantis*, 16(1), 69-91.
- Kuhn, T. (1970 [1962]). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lenton, R. (1990). Academic feminists and the women's movement in Canada: Continuity or discontinuity? *Atlantis*, 16(1), 57-68.
- Merton, R. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Merton, R. (1973 [1942]). The normative structure of science. *The sociology of science: An episodic memoir* (rev. ed.; chapter 13). Carbonale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Merton, R. (1973 [1957]). Priorities in scientific discovery. *The sociology of science: An episodic memoir* (rev. ed.; chapter 14). Carbonale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Merton, R. (1977). *The sociology of science: An episodic memoir* (rev. ed.). Carbonale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Mulkay, M.J. & Woolgar, S. (1975). Problem areas and research networks in science. *Sociology*, 9, 187-203.
- Mullins, N. (1973). *Theories and theory groups in contemporary American sociology*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Shapin, S. (1982). History of science and its sociological reconstructions. *History of Science*, 20, 157-211.
- Smelser, N. (Ed.). (1989 [1988]). *Handbook of sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zuckerman, H. (1987). Persistence and change in the careers of American men and women scientists and engineers: A review of current research. In L.S. Dix (Ed.), *Women: Their Underrepresentation and Career Differentials in Science and Engineering* (pp. 123-156). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Zuckerman, H. (1989 [1988]). The sociology of science. In N. Smelser (Ed.), *Handbook of sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Robert Brym and Margrit Eichler for helpful comments on a draft of this paper.

APPENDIX A

List of 236 Thinkers/Authors Named at Least Five Times as Being Important to Their Work
by the Population of Professors Teaching Women's/Feminist Studies

- ABELLA, Rosalie
 AMBERT, Anne Marie
 ARMSTRONG, Hugh
 ARMSTRONG, Pat
 ARNOT, Madeleine
 ATKINSON, Ti-Grace
 ATWOOD, Margaret
 BADINTER, Elizabeth
 BARDWICK, Judith
 BARRETT, Michelle
 BART, Pauline
 BARTKE, Sandra
 BEECHEY, Veronica
 BELENKY, Mary
 BELLOTI, Elena
 BELSEY, Catherine
 BEM, Sandra
 BENERIA, Lourdes
 BENSTON, Margaret
 BERNARD, Jessie
 BERSIANIK, Louky
 BLEIER, Ruth
 BOSERUP, Ester
 BOYLE, Christine
 BRODIE, Janine
 BROSSARD, Nicole
 BROWN, Judith
 BROWNMILLER, Susan
 BUNCH, Charlotte
 BURSTYN, Varda
 CAMERON, Anne
 CAPLAN, Paula
 CARDINAL, Marie
 CARRIER, Micheline
 CHESSLER, Phyllis
 CHICAGO, Judy
 CHODOROW, Nancy
 CHRIST, Carol
 CIXOUS, Hélène
 CLARK, Lorene
 COCKBURN, Cynthia
 CONNELLY, Pat
 COREA, Gena
 COWARD, Rosalind
 DALY, Mary
 DAVIDOFF, Lenore
 DAVIS, Angela
 DAVIS, Natalie Zemon
 DE BEAUVOIR, Simone
 DE LAURETIS, Teresa
 DE SÈVE, Micheline
 DEAUX, Katherine
 DELPHY, Christine
 DESCARRIES-BÉLANGER, Francine
 DHAVERNAS, Odile
 DINNERSTEIN, Dorothy
 DRABBLE, Margaret
 DUMONT, Micheline
 DWORKIN, Andrea
 EBERTS, Mary
 EHRENREICH, Barbara
 EICHENBAUM, Luise
 EICHLER, Margrit
 EISENSTEIN, Zilla
 ELLMAN, Mary
 ELSHTAIN, Jean
 ENGLISH, Dierdre
 FINCH, Janet
 FINN, Geraldine
 FIRESTONE, Shulamith
 FRANKLIN, Ursula
 FREEMAN, Jo
 FRENCH, Marilyn
 FRIEDAN, Betty
 FRYE, Marilyn
 GADOL, Joan Kelly
 GAGNON, Madeleine
 GALLOP, Jane
 GAVIGAN, Shelley
 GILBERT, Sandra
 GILLIGAN, Carol
 GOLDENBERG, Naomi
 GOLDMAN, Emma
 GORDON, Linda
 GREENGLASS, Esther
 GREENSPAN, Miriam
 GREER, Germaine
 GRIFFIN, Susan
 GROULX, Benoîte
 GUBAR, Susan
 GUILLAUMIN, Collette
 HALL, Ann
 HAMILTON, Roberta
 HARDING, Sandra
 HARRISON, Beverly
 HARTMANN, Heidi
 HARTSOCK, Nancy
 HAYDEN, Dolores
 HAYWARD, Carter
 HEILBRUNN, Carolyn
 HENLEY, Nancy
 HOMANS, Margaret
 HOOKS, Bell
 HOUSTON, Barbara
 HUBBARD, Ruth
 IRIGARAY, Luce
 JACOBUS, Mary
 JAGGAR, Alison
 JANEWAY, Elizabeth
 JUTEAU, Danielle
 KANTER, Rosabeth
 KEALEY, Linda
 KELLER, Evelyn Fox
 KELLY, Mary
 KESSLER-HARRIS, Alice
 KOLODNY, Annette
 KRISTEVA, Julia
 KUHN, Annette
 LACELLE, Elizabeth
 LAHEY, Kathleen
 LAKOFF, Robin
 LAMY, Suzanne
 LANDSBERG, Michelle
 LAURENCE, Margaret
 LAURIN, Nicole
 LEACOCK, Eleanor Burke
 LECLERC, Annie
 LERNER, Gerda
 LESSING, Doris
 LEVINE, Helene
 LEWIS, Jane
 LIPPARD, Lucy
 LLOYD, Genevieve
 LORDE, Audre
 LUXTON, Meg
 MACCOBY, Eleanor
 MACKENZIE, Suzanne
 MACKIE, Marlene
 MARCHESSAULT, Jovette
 MARLATT, Daphne
 MARTIN, Jane Rowland
 MATHIEU, Nicole Claude
 MCCORMACK, Thelma
 McDONALD, Lynne
 MCINTOSH, Mary
 MACKINNON, Catharine
 MEAD, Margaret
 MERCHANT, Carolyn
 MICHEL, Andrée
 MIES, Maria
 MILES, Angela
 MILLER, Jean Baker
 MILLETT, Kate
 MITCHELL, Juliet
 MOERS, Ellen
 MOI, Toril
 MORGAN, Kathryn
 MORGAN, Robyn
 MOSSMAN, Mary Jane
 MUNRO, Alice
 NOCHLIN, Linda
 NODDINGS, Nel
 O'BRIEN, Mary
 OAKLEY, Ann
 OLSEN, Tilly
 ORBACH, Susie
 ORTNER, Sherry
 OUELLETTE-MICHALSKA, M.
 PARKER, Roszika
 PARR, Joy
 FERROT, Michelle
 PETCHESKY, Rosalind
 PIERCY, Marge
 PIERSON, Ruth
 PLASKOW, Judith
 POLLOCK, Griselda
 POMEROY, Sarah
 POOVEY, Mary
 PRATT, Annis
 PRENTICE, Alison
 PYKE, Sandra
 RANDALL, Margaret
 RAPP, Rayne Reiter
 REED, Evelyne
 REUTHER, Rosemary Radford
 RICH, Adrienne
 RICHARDS, Janet Radcliffe
 ROSALDA, Michelle
 ROSENBERG, Carol
 ROSSI, Alice
 ROWBOTHAM, Sheila
 RUBIN, Gayle
 RUBIN, Lillian
 RUDDICK, Sara
 RULE, Jane
 RUSSELL, Diana
 RUSSELL, Letty
 SACKS, Karen
 SANDAY, Peggy
 SCHUSSLER-FIORENZA, Elizabeth
 SCOTT, Joan
 SEGAL, Lyn
 SHAEF, Anne Wilson
 SHOWALTER, Elaine
 SILVERMAN, Kaja
 SIMARD, R.
 SMART, Carol
 SMITH, Dorothy
 SPACKS, Patricia Meyer
 SPENDER, Dale
 SPIVAK, Gayatri
 STARHAWK
 STEINEM, Gloria
 STONE, Merlin
 STRAHERN, Marilyn
 STRONG-BOAG, Veronica
 SULLEROT, Eveline
 TAYLOR, Barbara
 TILLY, Louise
 TRIBLE, Phyllis
 TROFIMENKOFF, Susan Mann
 VALVERDE, Marianna
 VAN KIRK, Sylvia
 VANDELAC, Louise
 VICINUS, Martha
 VICKERS, Jill McCalla
 WALKER, Alice
 WALKERDINE, Valerie
 WALKOWITZ, Judith
 WEITZMAN, Lenore
 WEKERLE, Gerda
 WILSON, Elizabeth
 WITTIG, Monique
 WOOLF, Virginia
 YAGUELLO, Marina
 YOUNG, Kate

APPENDIX B The 20 Most Frequently Listed Influential Thinkers/Authors by the Entire Population of Professors By Anglophone Respondents Only and By Francophone Respondents Only*			
THINKERS/AUTHORS	Total Population N=892	Anglophone Respondents Only N=748	Francophone Respondents Only N=143
Armstrong, Pat	X	X	
Badinter, Elizabeth			X
Barrett, Michelle	X	X	
Bersianik, Louky			X
Brossard, Nicole			X
Chessler, Phyllis			X
Cixous, H�el�ene			X
Daly, Mary	X	X	X
de Beauvoir, Simone	X	X	X
Delphy, Christine			X
Ehrenreich, Barbara	X		
Eichler, Margrit	X	X	X
French, Marilyn			X
Friedan, Betty	X	X	X
Gilligan, Carol	X	X	X
Greer, Germaine	X	X	X
Groulx, Beno�te			X
Guillaumin, Collette			X
Irigaray, Luce	X		X
Jaggar, Alison	X	X	
Luxton, Meg	X	X	
MacKinnon, Catharine	X	X	
Millett, Kate	X	X	X
Mitchell, Juliet	X		X
Oakley, Ann		X	
O'Brien, Mary	X	X	X
Reuther, Rosemary R.	X	X	
Rich, Adrienne	X	X	X
Rowbotham, Sheila	X	X	
Showalter, Elaine	X	X	
Smith, Dorothy	X	X	
Spender, Dale	X	X	
Vandelac, Louise			X
Woolf, Virginia			X

(a) Because of ties, more than 20 thinkers/authors are listed in some cases.

APPENDIX C
Bivariate Crosstabulations

<i>COUNTRY OF THINKERS/AUTHORS</i>	<i>Professors' Sex</i>	
	Male	Female
Canada (exclu. Quebec)	54.5	46.1
Quebec	.4	2.1
United States	31.5	36.6
France	4.2	6.9
England	9.1	8.0
Italy	.0	.1
Germany	.3	.1
Switzerland	.0	.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(683)	(6319)

<i>LANGUAGE OF THINKERS/AUTHORS</i>	<i>Professors' Sex</i>	
	Male	Female
English	92.8	88.2
French	6.3	10.3
Both	.9	1.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(683)	(5612)
Number of respondents	(101)	(700)

<i>UNIVERSITY AFFILIATION OF THINKERS/AUTHORS</i>	<i>Professors' Sex</i>	
	Male	Female
Full-time position	83.3	78.0
Partly affiliated	12.3	12.1
No affiliation	4.3	9.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(672)	(5462)
Number of respondents	(101)	(698)

APPENDIX C (continued)
Bivariate Crosstabulations

TABLE IV		
Field of Work of Thinkers/Authors by the Sex of the Professors Teaching Women's/Feminist Studies		
<i>THINKERS/AUTHORS'</i> <i>FIELD OF WORK</i>	<i>Professors' Sex</i>	
	Male	Female
Law	1.7	2.4
Sociology	16.0	15.8
History	5.2	5.3
Sociology & History	.1	.1
Education	2.8	2.4
Writer	42.3	38.9
Writer/Univ. Administrator	.0	.1
Philosophy	6.0	5.8
Psychology	6.0	7.1
Science or Technology	.6	1.0
Political Science	1.0	1.0
Poet or Novelist	1.6	2.9
Journalist	.9	1.2
Artist	1.2	1.8
Art Critic	.0	.2
Art Historian	.1	.6
Religious Studies	6.1	3.9
Minister	.3	.1
Literature	4.4	4.9
Linguistics	.0	.2
French	.4	.4
English	.4	.3
Anthropology	2.0	2.4
Economist	.1	.5
Social Work	.0	.3
Geography	.3	.1
Editor	.0	.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0
TOTAL NOMINATIONS	(688)	(5638)

APPENDIX D The 20 Most Frequently Listed Influential Thinkers/Authors by Sex of Respondents and Year That First Course in Women's/Feminist Studies Was Taught ^a					
THINKERS/AUTHORS	Males Only	Females Only	Professors Teaching Prior to 1975	Professors Teaching Between 1975-79	Professors Teaching After 1979
Armstrong, Pat	X	X	X	X	X
Atwood, Margaret			X	X	
Barrett, Michelle		X	X		X
Bernard, Jessie			X		
Chodorow, Nancy	X			X	
Daly, Mary	X	X	X	X	X
de Beauvoir, Simone	X	X	X	X	X
De Lauretis, Teresa	X				
Ehrenreich, Barbara		X			X
Eichler, Margrit	X	X	X	X	X
Firestone, Shulamith	X				
Friedan, Betty	X	X	X	X	
Gilligan, Carol	X	X	X	X	X
Greer, Germaine	X	X	X	X	X
Irigaray, Luce		X			X
Jaggar, Alison	X			X	
Laurence, Margaret				X	
Luxton, Meg	X	X	X		X
MacKinnon, Catharine		X	X	X	X
Millett, Kate	X	X	X	X	X
Mitchell, Juliet	X		X	X	
Oakley, Ann		X	X	X	
O'Brien, Mary	X	X	X	X	X
Pomeroy, Sarah	X				
Reuther, Rosemary R.	X	X	X	X	X
Rich, Adrienne	X	X	X	X	X
Rowbotham, Sheila	X	X	X	X	X
Schussler-Fiorenza, E.	X				X
Showalter, Elaine		X			X
Smith, Dorothy	X	X	X	X	X
Spender, Dale		X	X	X	X
Woolf, Virginia				X	

(a) These are the top 20 thinkers/authors listed by at least one of these five subgroups. Because of ties, more than 20 thinkers/authors are listed in some cases.