THOUGHTS ON FEMINIST MENTORING: EXPERIENCES OF FACULTY MEMBERS FROM TWO GENERATIONS IN THE ACADEMY

MEDA CHESNEY-LIND
University of Hawai'i at Manoa

SCOTT K. OKAMOTO
Hawai'i Pacific University

KATHERINE IRWIN
University of Hawai'i at Manoa

This chapter provides three perspectives on feminist mentoring from two generations of faculty. After a brief review of the traditional mentoring and feminist/multicultural mentoring literatures, Meda Chesney-Lind begins the discussion with some thoughts on survival strategies that she has gleaned from decades of work in the academy. Her reflections on teaching, research, and service in the academy suggest pathways to success for those who study and/or are within the social and academic "minority" (e.g., women and/or people of color). Scott Okamoto then illustrates how he has put some of these reflections into practice. He describes his own experiences and challenges in the academy, having just started a teaching career as a feminist man of color. Finally, Katherine (Katy) Irwin describes her own experiences as a woman faculty member who has also just begun her career. The chapter concludes with some joint reflections on what feminist mentoring has been and what it must become to assure that the academy is a workplace that genuinely permits an increasingly diverse faculty to not only survive but to thrive.

Traditional and Feminist/Multicultural Mentoring Literatures

Traditional models of mentorship have been described extensively in the research literature. Crosby (1999) outlines different definitions of

mentorship from 18 research studies from 1988–1996. While there is some variability, there are at least two commonalities in these definitions—(1) they describe a power differential between two individuals in a professional relationship within a professional setting, and (2) they focus on the best professional interests of the mentee. Early research identifies two primary functions related to mentoring—instrumental (or career) functions and psychosocial functions (Kram 1985, Benishek, Bieschke, Park, & Slattery, 2004). The former relates to functions such as giving feedback on work assignments or providing the mentee with exposure and visibility, while the latter relates to providing role modeling and friendship. The majority of the mentorship literature focuses on individuals working in corporate settings. There are substantially fewer studies of mentorship in academic settings (Crosby, 1999).

Recent literature has focused on infusing feminism and multiculturalism into traditional models of mentoring. This may have resulted from critiques that traditional mentoring models are hierarchical and paternalistic in nature, thereby reflecting the worldviews of white males rather than women and/or people of color in mentoring relationships (Colley, 2000). Benishek et al. (2004) describes a multicultural/feminist model of mentoring that combines the existing research on mentoring with the unique needs of women and/or people of color. In their model, the mentor recognizes the power differential between him/herself and the mentee, yet eschews hierarchies and uses their power to empower the mentee. Their model emphasizes the relational aspect of mentoring, where the relationship is built on honest and open communication. The mentoring relationship in their model is built on collaboration on joint projects. The mentor and mentee work side-by-side on projects, and the mentee is encouraged to bring his/her unique perspectives and contributions. Finally, their model posits that feminist/multicultural mentoring is political. As Benishek et al. state, "mentors challenge the status quo and accept the conflict that ensues" (p. 439).

The remainder of this paper illustrates aspects of the feminist/multicultural model of mentoring described by Benishek et al. (2004). Based on the experiences of three faculty members from two generations in the academy, this paper uses a conversational style to describe how the mentoring relationship can benefit those who work in the academic "periphery" (either based on their personal identity or chosen area of scholarship) in the fields of Criminology and its allied disciplines.

Surviving and Thriving in Academia: Meda's Initial Thoughts

On the Virtues of Marginality

I have lived and worked on the periphery of our field, both geograph-ically and intellectually, and I have always suggested to others that there is much virtue and considerable freedom in marginality. Being at the center of the field (whether at an elite institution or submitting to an elite journal) can be tough on women and minorities, since the privileges afforded to those within these venues brings a tendency to be quite conservative to non-mainstream views—the very ones we bring to the table. My interest in girls, in particular, was seen as decidedly odd when I first began doing research in criminology, but it was tolerated at my institution because no one was patrolling the intellectual boundaries all that vigorously.

What about the teaching/research/service balance? For me, teaching has always been about creating new colleagues—young women and men who, even if they did not seek an academic career, maybe felt a little differently about girl's and women's issues than they did before they took my courses. If they cultivated a particular career track out of the exposure to my lectures, all the better. But, the bottom line is that I never want them to watch a sexist advertisement on television without wincing. If I can enlist them on that long march that still seeks social justice for women—the one that started well before any of us were born—that is even better.

Teaching Smart

Teaching can be fraught with dangers, especially for a new scholar who can, during the first couple of semesters, face a slew of new prepara-tions. Here is some advice. First, use your students to help you teach the class. This is a component of "active learning," and it is a better way for them to learn. Active learning includes small group discussions, student presentations, and cooperative learning. You do not need to spend hours and hours perfecting a lecture that most students cannot remember five minutes after they walk out of the class. In other words, as one recent article stated, be "canny about class preparation" (McClain, 2003, p. C2). McClain noted that there is actually research to suggest that teachers who spend less time preparing (in order to write) end up with better teaching evaluations. Specifically, she noted, "when I had a class prepared to the minute, with a gorgeous PowerPoint

presentation, film clips, and carefully-orchestrated discussions, the students could be overwhelmed into passivity" (McClain, 2003, p. C2). Often, she found that she had to cut off even interesting class discussions "in order to get to the next planned event." When she was slightly less prepared, she found that her classes were more interesting and that she had more time to follow a discussion in the classroom to its conclusion.

McClain also noted that judicious use of films (and I would add videos) actually helps with this generation of visual learners, and my experience is that some of them provide a good opportunity for students to view the world almost as ethnographers (e.g. "Streetwise in Seattle" or "Hooker") or present powerful visual images and complex arguments that can spur discussion and critical assessment (e.g. "Tough Guise" or "Bowling for Columbine"). It is the creative and constructive use of video that makes powerful points about the worlds of marginalized and incarcerated folks in ways that no lecture can. In order to effectively use video, students must move past the "bubblegum of the mind" state to a place where they genuinely watch, analyze, and interpret the video. Candidly speaking, video also gives you a bit of a break in course preparation. McClain also noted that some apparent time savers (like guest speakers and field trips) are not necessarily time savers.

Also, if you are a woman or minority, understand that teaching and particularly teaching evaluations can be both sexist and racist, so do not take these entirely to heart. Having taught in both mainstream and Women's Studies courses, I have learned that students do not necessarily shed all prejudices when they walk through the classroom door. Some research has found that women are expected to be "nice," "friendly," and to put up with all sorts of comments about their appearance and attire (Burns-Glover & Veith, 1995; Martin, 1984). In fact, in order to overcome sexist stereotypes in student teaching evaluations, Martin factitiously writes that women faculty should "be sure to wear a feminine blouse with [their] skirted suit[s]" (p. 491). Women and minorities can expect questions about their competence, and can face downright hostility if they take on the "tough" subjects of racism and sexism, so do not wear your heart on your sleeve.

Finally, I heartily advise folks to seek out Women's Studies Programs where you are able to teach and cross-list as many courses as you can with them. Similarly, seek out Ethnic Studies Programs or African/ Asian American Studies Departments and do the same. In my experience, students in these programs or departments increasingly are there for a reason, and the reason is generally a laudable one. Having these

students in your classes is a gift. They also fire up the class and make it more fun.

Research Tips

What about research? I have always advised students and colleagues to only consider doing work that they can approach with passion, and if you are doing feminist research, do not be surprised if it is greeted with hostility (which is often carefully masked in reviews). Bowker (1988) did us all a terrific favor in his paper entitled "Publishing Feminist Research: A Personal Note from Lee Bowker." Bowker, whose publications number in the hundreds, made his name in many areas of criminology. But when he began doing work on wife abuse, he suddenly noticed problems with the peer review process that had never dogged him previously. In a table, he noted that when he submitted non-feminist article and book manuscripts, his acceptance rate was 85%. However, when he submitted what he labeled "feminist" publications, his acceptance rate fell to 54%. In reviews of his feminist work, he further noted that he was assumed to be female, and his work was generally rejected for poor methodology. He quipped, "From my experience with gatekeeper journals, I think I have found the answer to the question, 'What is the correct methodology for carrying out feminist research?' It is 'Whatever methodology you didn't use.'" (Bowker, 1998, p. 171). He even caught one editor shopping for a critical review through a slip-up in the editor's communication with him.

However, the reaction toward feminist scholarship could be changing. I just got an e-mail from a student was doing a paper on my research. She asked, "I was just wondering if you thought that your research was feminist and why and why you call yourself a feminist? Does it help you to get work recognized and read more quickly by labeling yourself a feminist? Just some curious questions that I would love to include in my paper." I admit, after years of getting my work rejected precisely because it was feminist, this comment made me laugh out loud. Still, the student makes a point. There may well be some folks in some fields who see research on gender and race as smart career moves, rather than the "career suicide" it once was. Still, as our paper will show, it remains tough to actually be a woman or a minority in higher education (even if one is not doing explicitly feminist stuff), and it is potentially even harder if you take opposition to racism and sexism seriously (and attempt to make both your campus and your profession safer places for minorities and women).

As far as I am concerned, working in isolation is extremely difficult. If you team up with someone else, and increasingly that person can be geographically distant, you are more productive, smarter, and have more fun doing the work. My most rewarding work has been done with my colleagues around the world, and I use the national and regional meetings to create new colleagues, linkages, and possibilities. It goes without saying that going to these meetings is far more than going to sessions—it is about creating and nourishing a network. The Division on Women and Crime was my intellectual and academic birthplace in so many ways, and it can be that for others as well. Other Divisions, like the Division on Critical Criminology and the Division of People of Color, also provide crucial support and encouragement to those who's research on gender, race, and class may put them out of the mainstream of the field. Likewise, consider journals like *Women and Criminal Justice, Feminist Criminology, and Critical Criminology* for your work. These outlets are an antidote to the publication bias that is so evident in virtually all aspects of our professional life. Finally, expect the unexpected in research, and do not be afraid to publish what you find. There will be some bumps in the road (well, actually a lot of bumps if you are doing feminist work), but I like to think that nothing worth doing comes easily.

What About Service? Leave the campus as often as possible (as traditional academics are a pretty self-absorbed, and often depressed bunch). Fortunately, early in my career, a mentor of mine made me go out and work with local agencies (some social service and some criminal justice). This got me in touch with folks then my age (and now a tad older) who were out in the real world doing some fairly powerful and important stuff. They sometimes took me out into that world, and got me talking to others. I learned that if you are going to evaluate a prison delinquency prevention program, it is not a bad idea to have taught in the prison before and to know many of the folks in the facility. If you are going to study gangs, it is not a bad idea to know the neighborhoods where gangs are everywhere and to know some of the folks who live and work there. Finally, I am fortunate to live in a place where most of the students, and many of my friends and colleagues, are culturally different from me. You learn an awful lot from difference, and you get some great meals out of the experience as well! Beyond this, you can gain trust and access to settings that might well provide you (and your students) with research opportunities.

Service to the community, to the campus, and to your profession can be a great source of moral and emotional support, but it can also be a

"time vampire." This is particularly true for minority and women scholars, who face multiple service commitments because their very status makes them "valuable" for committees that aspire to be "diverse." Additionally, women are seen as more approachable than men and have a harder time saying "no," according to Emily Toth, who writes on mentoring for the *Chronicle on Higher Education* (Fogg, 2003).

Finally, minority and women faculty are often sought out by students looking for a mentor who understands racism and sexism. These students are often experiencing marginalization on campus, and they see faculty who understand these pressures as essential to their survival on campus. Most women and minority faculty take this burden up willingly, but we also need to name the problem. Moreover, we need to get the traditional academy to recognize and reward this mentoring service (and reduce other demands accordingly). Finally, a personal bit of advice—use office hours and avoid making lots of specific "appointments" with students. Often students want to meet face to face when a five-minute phone call is all that is needed. If you are endlessly available to your students, you will not get the writing done that is critical to your survival.

How can faculty, particularly untenured, minority, and/or women faculty, survive the high departmental demands for academic service? First, learn that some administrative tasks are more important than others, pick carefully, and be sure not to over-work yourself. Whether at the departmental level or at the university level, try to select committee work that is meaningful to you. Learn enough about the social and political structure of your department and your college to spend your service hours wisely (and seek community work that could possibly lead to research opportunities). Learn to differentiate between critical tasks and "administrivia," (trivial administrative or bureaucratic activities) such as meetings to craft mission statements, departmental budget committees where the chair makes all the final decisions, or completely unnecessary meetings that take an hour when a phone call would suffice. Make sure that you are making shrewd use of your service time, and try to "double dip"—that is, use your service activities to further your research or teaching agendas (such as making contacts with agencies that might later provide you with data or provide guest speakers for your classes). Further, if you do not know if some work should be undertaken, ask a trusted senior professor (not necessarily in your department). This is where former dissertation chairs or mentors that emerge out of a campus mentoring program can help.

A Final Note About Time Management

I once saw an excellent article by Gmelch (1996) on the need for professors to manage their time carefully. Among other things, the article forces one to confront the many sources of "urgent" but unimportant work (like responding to many voice mails and e-mails) as opposed to non-urgent but important work such as publishing or revising an article. Academics are burdened by a system that does not provide us with a real screen between those who are contacting us (or want something from us) and ourselves. E-mail has only compounded this problem, turning our jobs into something that arguably could be a 24/7 workplace.

How should we manage our time? Gmelch argues that we need to spend some time every day planning. We need to establish our high priority areas, and we also need to be able to assess and intervene if the urgent, unimportant or, worse, the non-urgent, non-important activities interfere with these priority areas. Some things will simply fall off our "to do" list. Moreover, we may need to find a "hideout" or retreat where we can undertake these high priority activities without interruption (Gmelch, 1996). This can be a lab, a home office, research center, etc. Save the e-mail tasks until the time of day when you are least productive.

On Being a Feminist Mentee: Scott's Reflections

Feminist mentoring has shaped almost every aspect of my professional career. It has influenced the way in which I interpret and analyze experiences in academia, particularly those related to research and teaching. Regarding research, feminist mentoring has forced me to confront my gender-based biases, and has subsequently contributed to my understanding of how gender impacts youth in the criminal justice system. Much of my scholarship has been based on my practice experiences with children and adolescents. Prior to starting my doctoral education, I worked with children and adolescents in various institutional programs, such as residential treatment centers and homeless/runaway youth shelters. Many of these youth were diagnosed with Oppositional Defiant Disorder or Conduct Disorder and had extensive criminal histories. Throughout my practice experiences, I noticed not only gender differences in the problems and behaviors of these youth, but also differences in the reaction of practitioners toward their female

versus male youth clients. I thought this was a fascinating phenomenon, but did not care enough at the time to investigate the role that gender played in the manifestations of youth behaviors or its influence in the service delivery to youth.

After beginning my doctoral program, I began working with Meda Chesney-Lind on a state-funded grant focused on youth gangs in Hawai'i. At the time, I wanted what most eager graduate students wanted—the opportunity to do research and to potentially publish some articles with an established senior faculty member. What I did not anticipate was the extent to which my work with Dr. Chesney-Lind would influence my understanding of youth issues, such as criminal behaviors and service delivery. My work with her brought together my practice experiences with my academic experiences, in that I began to see how gender impacts how youth see themselves and how practitioners perceive their behaviors. Anecdotal (and arguably sexist) accounts from practitioners such as "girls [in the treatment setting] are overly emotional" or "girls [in the treatment setting] are manipulative" began to make more sense when I began to view them from the lens of gender-based power in society and its influence on programming for youth. In effect, gender-specific practice issues became one of the areas of my scholarship (e.g., Okamoto, 2002, 2004). In sum, I feel that feminist mentoring has broadened my intellectual horizons and has deepened my analysis of treatment and practice issues of youth.

Regarding teaching, my feminist mentors impressed upon me the challenges that women and/or people of color face in the classroom early in my career. It was not until I actually began teaching that I truly understood their words. In recent years, teaching has been increasingly been compared to a "performance," in which teachers are judged by students based on their classroom "persona" (Carroll, 2002, 2003). Some aspects of this "persona" are widely accepted characteristics of good teaching, such as the instructor's enthusiasm toward the material or a commitment to student learning. However, in what ways do physical characteristics, such as race and/or gender, impact the acceptance of a teaching "persona" and overall teaching "performance"? For example, the following written feedback was submitted from a graduate student as part of my teaching evaluations in Fall 2003.

> Sometimes it seems as though nothing pleases the instructor. His standards can be too high and his criticism is harsh. It seems as though he is not open-minded to other ideas.

On one hand, this student's feedback might be valid, and I may have set too high of a standard for my graduate students for this particular semester. On the other hand, I cannot help but to wonder if this student would have had the same feelings about the class had I been a White male. Instead of the standard being "too high," might the student have lauded over the academic "rigor" of the class and the thoughtful critiques of his/her work? In other words, what role did my perceived race play in the acceptance of my teaching "persona"? My feminist mentors have assisted me in adapting my pedagogical style to address issues of race in the classroom, which have been similar to how they have had to adapt their teaching to address gender issues and biases. The result of this has been a balance of student-focused teaching approaches, such as cooperative learning, coupled with an emphasis on academic rigor in the classroom.

While feminist mentoring has enriched my scholarship related to child and adolescent issues and my teaching practices, it has also influenced my values and beliefs related to race and gender. As an assistant professor in a large metropolitan research university,[1] I have begun to see firsthand why Ho (1999) describes academic institutions as "racist and sexist locations" (p. 25). Feminist mentoring has assisted me in understanding the commonalities between racism and sexism in the academy. In effect, I have continued to pursue mentoring from women faculty and/or faculty of color in order to navigate the terrain of being non-white and untenured. My feminist mentors have helped me to cope with issues such as the marginalization of scholarship that focuses on race and/or gender in terms of tenure and promotion decisions, and the overburdening of women faculty and/or faculty of color with service duties within the department that have little influence on tenure or promotion decisions. Some of these issues have been discussed throughout the literature (e.g., Turner & Myers, 2000), however, dealing with these types of issues were never taught to me in graduate school. They were taught to me through close personal and professional relationships with mentors throughout the academy.

Finally, through my academic experiences, I have begun to realize some of the commonalities shared by faculty in the racial and gender minority and the importance of allies in dealing with these issues. Most of my allies in the academy identify themselves as part of the social or academic "periphery." Most of them identify themselves as part of the gender, ethnic, and/or sexual minority and they center their scholarship on these populations. They have become valuable sources of

professional and personal support, and many of them have functioned as my mentors. They have demonstrated to me the importance of having integrity in your scholarship, and the importance of social justice. Thus, I have explored the manifestations of sexism in the criminal justice and mental health systems in my teaching and research, and have emphasized their impact in working with youth. Students are not only interested in this material, but they need it to function effectively as youth practitioners. Feminist mentoring has served as the foundation of my work as an academician, and has influenced my personal and professional values and ethics.

The Untenured Feminist Academic: Katy's Reflections on Being Marginal and a Minority

Within the first weeks of my assistant professorship at the University of Hawai'i, I received a lunch invitation from Meda Chesney-Lind, which, having read and admired her work for years, I accepted without hesitation or second thought to the mound of unfinished work on my desk. In addition to introducing me to what would become one of my favorite restaurants, Meda also acquainted me with the power and importance of feminist mentorship during the pre-tenure process. Although I didn't realize the full weight of her comment at the time, I remember being particularly intrigued by her argument that the center of academia is, for the most part, unexciting and that the margins are where the most provocative ideas develop and take hold.

This comment resonated with my own beliefs and experiences in graduate school where feminist research and analyses of interlocking systems of oppression were dynamic forces touching the work and lives of so many of my fellow graduate students. Although we understood that gender, race, and sexuality scholarship was not at the center of academic life, none of us cared. We were happy to conduct research against the grain of the system and viewed our debates with professors regarding the relevance of our research, the struggles attempting to publish our writing, and the sexist, racist, and homophobic comments we received in our teaching evaluations as moments that we could put our values and theoretical affinities to practical test.

Unfortunately, in the first few years of my professorship my excitement about working on the margins dimmed and I began to understand the difference between being marginal and being a minority. Where I was lucky to be surrounded by many other students working in the

areas of gender and inequalities in graduate school, as an assistant professor, I was one of four female faculty members in a department of 18 people and I was one of only two women in the department conducting research about women. In addition, in my first three years at the University, I met only one other untenured woman.

I quickly learned that being marginal, a minority, and untenured has many negative consequences that threaten to crush women and scholars of color in the academy. More specifically, it forces women and scholars of color to confront greater time demands, significant devaluation of their work, and a profound isolation. Regarding time constraints, within the first few months of my assistant professorship, I found myself grappling with time consuming "emotional labor" in my department. Students streamed into my office, knocked on my door during non-office hours, and called me at home to discuss their feelings and insecurities about their work, which, although important, were extremely time consuming and energy draining conversations. I have always felt strongly about working closely with female students who, given the male/female faculty ratio in my department, did not have many opportunities for female mentorship. I also advocated a particular kind of mentorship and believed that raising students' self esteem can contribute to their academic success. However, when a student dropped by my office to cry and talk about a difficult interaction she had with the chair of her dissertation committee (a committee of which I was not a member), I wondered if I was taking on more work than I should. My experiences were not in the least bit unusual. The mentorship literature consistently notes that female faculty members often take on heavy advising loads (Blakemore, Switzer, Dilorio, & Fairchild, 1997). This advising burden is especially troublesome for faculty of color who often find themselves with many mentees and no mentors to guide their own professional development (Phillip, 1993). These mentorship experiences also work to maintain inequalities in academia by associating female faculty members with a historically undervalued "ethic of care" stance (see Colley, 2002), thereby freeing more time for white male faculty members to conduct research and to publish.

I also played into traditional female expectations of being nice, kind, and considerate to my colleagues and soon found myself becoming a "yes" person in the department. When my male colleagues refused to take on service work, I was often called to the task, and on the few occasions that I gently turned down service opportunities, I was ignored and found myself on these committees. In addition, I was frequently the first person to be asked to perform "housekeeping" work such as

cleaning up and organizing research rooms and designing "attractive" looking posters. This was not only rather irksome to me, but indicated that others did not see that I was working closely with local schools to develop programs that were alternatives to zero tolerance policies, a local half-way house for youths transitioning out of our youth correctional facility, and a drug policy group that was busy crafting alternatives to incarceration for drug offenders in Hawai'i. Service work in general is something women and scholars of color are often called to do and value deeply. Criminologists who are focused on the effects of criminal justice policies on women and men of color in the U. S. are arguably unable to turn their backs on this type of community activism. It is important to note, however, that this service work is something the traditional academy tends to devalue in place of "pure" research (Fogg, 2003). The "invisibility" of my community activism forced me to take on a double service load, first, to do whatever I could to change inequalities within the criminal justice system and, second, to demonstrate that I could be a team player within my department.

What made my first few years especially troublesome was that much of the work that I took on was devalued. On more than one occasion, others noted that students who were having difficulty writing theoretical papers might enjoy working with me to conduct more hands-on and practical work. This was especially interesting given that I often received complaints that I "included too many readings" in my classes or pushed students to grapple with ideas that were "too abstract" and "too difficult to understand." In contrast, White male professors who covered the same material that I required were considered "brilliant," "rigorous," and "challenging". This pattern dovetails with the literature suggesting that virtually all members of the academy (including students) tend to evaluate male and female work differently. Work done by male faculty is frequently more valued than work done by female faculty, even when it is the same work (Goldberg, 1968).

By the second year of my professorship, I lost the excitement I experienced in graduate school and felt increasingly isolated. The isolation occurred for several reasons. First, there were few other women at the University to whom I could turn for support, problem solving, companionship, or just plain fun. Second, the many demands on my time meant that, even if there were numerous women on campus in which to confide, I had very little time to network. Meetings with students, reviewing students' work, preparing for classes, completing departmental projects, and certainly conducting my own

research and writing began to feel much more important than social-
izing with other women. Third, once I recognized that I was seen as
more practical and applied than rigorous and theoretical, I realized
that few around me understood or sympathized with my work. I,
therefore, stopped wanting to share ideas and retreated into my office
to toil away by myself.

The feminist mentorship that I received proved to be my lifeline out
of this devastating isolation. On a practical level, feminist mentorship is
designed to address everyday problems of being women and/or scholars
of color (Smith, 1991). Arguably, the most pressing facet of everyday
life for minority academics is that they confront enormous time
demands. Upon Meda's advice, I began to hold students to my office
hours, refused to let any task interfere with my writing, and scheduled
meetings and completed departmental work on Friday afternoons when
my research and writing productivity waned.

More than offering tangible advice to increase time and energy,
feminist mentors role model ways to survive in a system that frequently
devalues and marginalizes them. Watching tenured faculty members set
firm time boundaries with others while maintaining a generous spirit
with students and colleagues taught me volumes about how to say no to
projects without being labeled "bitchy" and "un-collegial". I also
watched the way that women practiced their work and especially noted
that tenured feminist scholars combined their community activism with
their research and writing projects. I copied them by finding research-
able topics within the community groups I participated. This had a
synergistic effect on my work. I had much more energy to rush to and
from meetings in town, increased my research productivity, and made
more significant contributions to the organizations in which I was
involved.

One of the key ways that feminist mentorship can mitigate the
isolating effects of being marginal and a minority is through the
longstanding feminist tradition of collaboration. As numerous feminist
researchers have argued (Acker, Barry, & Esseveld, 1996; Collins,
1986; Cook & Fonow, 1984; DeVault, 1990; hooks, 1984; Mies, 1993;
Smith, 1974, 1991; Stanley & Wise, 1990), discussing everyday prob-
lems among women and members of other marginalized groups,
sometimes referred to as "consciousness raising", can reveal the hid-
den oppressive relations resting below the surface of everyday inter-
actions. For example, after talking with my feminist mentors about the
interactions in my department, it became instantly clear that I was not
just taking on work as usual. A gender-based labor differentiation

seemed to be occurring where men were seen as serious scholars who needed time to devote to their research and women were viewed as less rigorous researchers who had time to tackle the administrative and organizational work in the department. Once we identified and named these processes, we crafted ways of conducting research and writing about the phenomenon we witnessed. Discussions over lunch and our co-authorship brought back the excitement and joy of working on the margins. In addition, it ended the isolation that threatened to drive me from the discipline.

Certainly there were many ways that I personally benefited from the feminist mentorship I received. By collaborating with well-established feminist researchers, learning time saving tips, and studying and imitating the example of successful female academics, I received considerable boosts in my scholarship, mood, teaching, research, activism, and energy. More than the individual benefits that I received, my narrative suggests that feminist mentorship has a significant role to play in changing and challenging the oppressive conditions within the academy. It does this specifically by maintaining the momentum and excitement of work at the margins, which in turn mitigates the devastating devaluation and isolation that keep members of minority groups from entering and remaining in academia.

The Personal is Still Political: Meda's Concluding Thoughts

Scott's and Katy's reflections suggest that while progress has been made to make the academy more diverse, there is much more that needs to be accomplished to make higher education welcoming to all scholars. Students continue to see minority faculty through gendered and racialized lenses. Oftentimes, this results in students challenging the power and authority of women and scholars of color in the classroom. Regarding this phenomenon, Burns-Glover and Veith (1995) state, "equal access into the classroom does not mean equal treatment within it" (p. 78). Unfortunately, many of our colleagues can be implicated in similar racist and sexist behaviors. Sexism and racism still haunt the society, and higher education (for good or ill) is a part of those structures. Both Scott's and Katy's sections speak to the many micro-inequalities that crop up in day-to-day life in the academy.

One specific type of gender inequality in the academy that has not been mentioned thus far relates to childbearing and childrearing. When

men become academics, they do not face the often painful childrearing and childbearing choices that women confront. Mason and Golden examined the childbearing patterns of individuals who received their doctorates between 1978 and 1984 and continued working in academia. They found that "overall, male professors were much more likely to marry and have a family than female professors. Only 44 percent of all the tenured women in the study were married and had children within 12 years of earning their Ph.D.'s. But 70 percent of tenured men married and became fathers during that time period" (Mason & Golden, cited in Wilson, 2003). Why? To those of us who know the academy, the answer is crystal clear, and it is a decidedly feminist issue—the academic career, complete with its lengthy training period and tenuring process, is a decidedly male model career (one that assumes a wife to assist with the heavy burdens of family life). Apparently, few males want to sign up for this role, so it is academic women, not men, who face the Hobson's choice between career and children. This is about gender and work, but the pressures are worse in academia than in other workplaces (Wilson, 2003).

Similarly, those who run higher education were likely the last cohort to have joined the institution before successive waves of declining revenues meant that higher education relies increasingly on fewer and fewer "full-time" faculty and more and more part-time or adjunct faculty. Hence, standards for "research" established by older and more powerful demographic cohorts were constructed in times when there were more faculty to shoulder service burdens. Those entering the academy now, like Scott and Katy, face far more institutional work with often fewer resources. The increasing pressure for research universities to become self-sustaining through grant monies further compounds the demands and expectations of untenured faculty. Moreover, their tenure packages will be judged by those who entered the academy during a different political and economic period.

What is the role of mentorship, particularly feminist mentorship? Well, certainly mentors provide survival skills. Feminist mentors go beyond this, by approaching this activity within the long history of feminist activism including a dedication to analyzing and fighting systems of oppression in every sphere, collaboration, non-exploitation, and, most importantly, understanding that the personal relationships that we form have enormous political potential. The political potential of our mentorship is reaped in our home courts and should make this activity even more compelling and prosperous for us all. Beyond this, though, it strikes me that mentoring must also have an "edge." For

those of us who have some power, this means taking on some of the institutional practices that marginalize and isolate (and lets face it, exhaust) minority and women faculty. Certainly, some of this activism is risky (particularly in such a hierarchical system), which is why it should be the task of the more senior mentors (or at least senior mentors should take the lead). We should also make sure that our institutions actively support mentorship programs for women and minority faculty, and provide both space and legitimacy to these important networks. While senior mentors can help with some dilemmas, the need for junior faculty to have colleagues their own age, with whom to share troubles and craft solutions, is also necessary

One final cautionary thought about mentoring: while this work has tried to stress the positive aspects of feminist mentoring, it is still in the final analysis *mentoring*. This is a relationship with an explicit power imbalance and, hence, it can fall prey to all the difficulties inherent in unequal relationships. Mentors need to be ever cognizant of this power differential, and recall that while establishing productive relationships is almost always pleasurable and (one hopes) enduring, such is not always the case. As noted earlier, a feminist mentor's role includes using power to empower their mentee, not exploit them.

Even in the most successful instances, for example, a part of healthy mentoring is knowing when to re-structure and/or to end the relationship. Other even more awkward transitions are also possible, such as the healthy movement of a mentee from one mentor to another, and might be more appropriate for the person's professional development. Candidly, we can all think of horror stories from mentorships that went badly off track. In our work, one goal would be to avoid adding to this long list.

Let's face it, the academy both relishes its caste system and pretends it does not exist, but those of us who study social structures must remember that we are very much shaped by these dark divides even when we like to pretend they are not present. What's the remedy? Well, in the words of one of my mentors, there are a couple of things. First, she always told me "candor was an over-rated virtue." Sometimes it is not a good idea to say everything you think, since we are, after all colleagues, not family. Second, practice eternal vigilance. Be distrustful of your own "virtue" and listen hard to those who remind us that we live in an imperfect world and, like that world, we too are not perfect. Finally, never be hesitant to say you are sorry. It really hurts far less than we imagine.

Feminist and Multicultural Mentorship as a Model for Criminology: Katy and Scott's Concluding Thoughts

What we have offered here is not just a personal exploration of feminist and multicultural mentorship for three academics, but an examination of the ways that feminist and multicultural mentoring offers an exciting and important alternative to traditional professional mentorship within criminology. In contrast to the ''masculine'' mentoring model, which has tended to advance the individual careers of professionals who, more often than not, are already members of powerful and privileged groups (see Colley, 2002), feminist and multicultural perspectives focus on empowering members of marginalized groups (Moss et al., 1999). This move, as our narratives suggest, has both individual and collective implications. Individually, each of us has benefited enormously by this type of mentorship. Meda is able to find and nurture partners equally excited about gender and race issues in the criminal justice system, while Scott and Katy learn methods to succeed in the academy. Collectively, this mentorship promises to increase the number of women and scholars of color with tenure in the academy. Not only can this change the face of our institutions, but because this type of mentorship does not demand that individuals succeed by conforming to dominant professional norms, it also changes colleges and universities into places inclusive of and welcoming to multiple perspectives and experiences. These are exactly the democratic ingredients necessary to make a discipline interesting to students, relevant to policy makers, and useful to practitioners.

Another uniquely feminist and multicultural theme woven throughout our narratives is the idea that our mentorship is relational and collaborative. This means that we strive for open dialogue that honors and places equal value on everyone's viewpoints and generally eschews the individualistic model of lone scholarship. Similar to McGuire and Reger (2003) who focused their co-mentorship on both personal and professional goals, our conversations began as personal explorations of our lives, and quickly turned into opportunities to collaborate with one another professionally by coauthoring this paper. This relational and collaborative spirit, as our narratives suggest, also took us out of the academy and into the very communities in which criminal justice issues are most relevant. For Meda, this brought her to prisons and neighborhoods to make linkages and new colleagues. For Scott, this meant working collaboratively with community-based gang prevention programs as part of a state-funded grant in Hawai'i. And for Katy, this

meant seeing her work with community groups not as a collection of "service demands," but as chances to interact with community members who were equally interested in creating social change. Although it is important to note that despite our best efforts to remain "non-hierarchical", power differences did and will always exist given our varied social locations.

Finally, one of the key components of the feminist and multicultural mentorship model described here is its political potential. Meda illustrated how the political is personal by noting that we must "name" the pressures that we feel in our everyday lives. This means locating the source of the problem not within individuals, but within a larger system of inequality. For untenured faculty like Scott and Katy, this allowed them to depersonalize critiques and expectations of them by linking their experiences to larger systems associating white men naturally with rigorous and serious scholarship, and everyone else with trivial, soft, and unimportant work. This also means "naming" the way that these very same processes touched the lives of our research participants. By doing this, it becomes immediately obvious that the everyday experiences of girls accused of being "manipulative" and "overly emotional" is fundamentally linked to the challenges we face in our own lives. The challenge to each of us is to do more than name and identify the causes of inequality, but to change it on all fronts.

This is where feminist and multicultural mentorship is most relevant to criminology. Once we accept that the same systems of oppression, exclusion, and injustice confronting our research participants also press down upon and threaten us, we feel that it is a matter of personal survival to create changes. In fact, contemporary criminology is a stormy field where many individuals, even the most privileged scholars, find it completely unthinkable to do nothing in the face of such problems as the massive expansion of our prison population, the staggering disproportionate incarceration of African Americans, the debilitating effects that mass incarceration has on individuals, families, and communities, and the very different consequences and services for and treatment of women and girls in the criminal justice system. Balancing teaching, publication, and social change demands is not an easy job, but add the burden of fighting justice on two fronts (i.e., the criminal justice system and the academy) and you find a nearly impossible task. This is where the personal is truly political. The everyday practice of feminist and multicultural mentorship outlined here identifies essential practical survival tips helpful for decreasing our workloads and time demands. At the same time, it also provides guidelines for collaborating efficiently

and effectively with a wide network of individuals interested in creating social change.

Note

1. Manuscript accepted for publication when Dr. Okamoto was an Assistant Professor at Arizona State University.

References

Acker, J. Barry, K. and Esseveld, J. (1996). Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research. In H. Gottfried (ed.), *Feminism and social change: Bridging theory and practice*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, pp. 60–87.

Benishek, L.A. Bieschke, K.J. Park, J. and Slattery, S.M. (2004). A multicultural feminist model of mentoring. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* 32(extra), 428–442.

Blakemore, J.E.O. Switzer, J.Y. Dilorio, J.A. and Fairchild, D.L. (1997). Exploring the campus climate for women faculty. In N.V. Benokraitis (ed.), *Subtle sexism: Current practice and prospects for change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 54–71.

Bowker, L. (1988). On the relationship between wife beating and child abuse. In K. Yllo and In M. Bograd (eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 158–175.

Burns-Glover, A.L. and Veith, D.J. (1995). Revisiting gender and teaching evaluations: Sex still makes a difference. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 10(6), 69–80.

Carroll J., (2002). Getting good teaching evaluations without stand-up comedy. Retrieved on December 27:2003 from The Chronicle of Higher Education [On-line]. Available internet: http://chronicle.com/jobs/2002/04/2002041501c.htm.

Carroll J., (2003). Constructing your in-class persona. Retrieved on December 27:2003 from The Chronicle of Higher Education [On-line]. Available internet: http://chronicle.com/jobs/2003/10/2003101401c.htm.

Colley, H. (2002). A 'rough guide' to the history of mentoring from a Marxist feminist perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 28(3), 257–273.

Collins, P.H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of black feminist thought. *Social Problems* 33, 14–32.

Cook, J.A. and Fonow, M.M. (1984). Am I my sister's gatekeeper? Cautionary tales from the academic hierarchy. *Humanity and Society* 8, 442–452.

Crosby, F.J. (1999). The developing literature on developmental relationships. In A.J. Murrel, In F.J. Crosby and In R.J. Ely (eds.), *Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 3–20.

DeVault, M.L. (1990). Talking and listening from women's standpoint: Feminist strategies for interviewing and analysis. *Social Problems* 37, 96–116.

Fogg P., (2003). So many committees, so little time. Retrieved on December 27:2003 from The Chronicle of Higher Education [On-line]. Available internet: http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i17/17a01401.htm.

Gmelch W., (1996). It's about time. Academe, September-October, 22–26.

Goldberg, P.A. (1968). Are women prejudiced against women?. *Transaction* 5, 28–30.

Ho, W. (2000). *In Her Mother's House: The Politics of Asian American Mother-Daughter Writing*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Hooks, B., (1984). *Feminist theory from margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.

Kram, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview IL: Scott, Foresman.

Martin, E. (1984). Power and authority in the classroom: Sexist stereotypes in teaching evaluations. *Signs* 9, 482–492.

McClain, L.T., (2003). Lessons in time management. Retrieved on December 27:2003 from The Chronicle of Higher Education [On-line]. Available internet: http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i17/17c00201.htm.

McGuire, G.M., and Reger, J. (2003). *Feminist co-mentoring: a model for academic professional development*. NWSA journal, 15, 54–72.

Mies, M. (1993). Towards a methodology for feminist research. In M. Hammersley (ed.), *Social research: Philosophy, politics and practice*. Newbury Park: Sage, pp. 64–82.

Moss, P. Debres, K.J. Cravey, A. Hyndman, J. Hirschboeck, K.K. and Masucci, M. (1999). Toward mentoring as feminist praxis: Strategies for ourselves and others. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 23(3), 413–427.

Okamoto, S.K. (2002). The challenges of male practitioners working with female youth clients. *Child & Youth Care Forum* 31(4), 257–268.

Okamoto, S.K. (2004). Relational aggression of girls in treatment: A challenge for male practitioners. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth* 21(3), 89–100.

Phillip, M.C. (1993). Tenure trap: Number of obstacles stand in the way of tenure for women. *Black Issues in Higher Education* 10(17), 42–43.

Smith, D. (1974). Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology. *Sociological Inquiry* 44, 7–13.

Smith, D.E. (1991). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stanley, L. and Wise, S. (1990). Method, methodology and epistemology in feminist research processes. In L. Stanley (ed.), *Feminist praxis: Research, theory and epistemology in feminist sociology*. New York: Routledge, pp. 20–60.

Turner, C.S. and Myers, S.L. (2000). *Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Wilson R., (2003). How Babies Alter Careers for Academics. Retrieved on January 12:2003 from The Chronicle of Higher Education [On-line]. Available internet: http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i15/15a00101.htm.