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Abstract
This paper explores the concept of ‘engendered education’ in leisure, sport and tourism studies. Literature and models of gender scholarship in generic higher education provide a context for the evaluation of three further models of gender scholarship within leisure, sport and tourism studies. The efficacy of these models is then tested in relation to one site of engendered education, that of academic journals. The findings reveal that, whilst the models do provide insights into generalised trends towards gender scholarship, their structuralist approach masks nuances of gender-power relations in higher education. Cultural analyses, in addition to existing structuralist analyses, are therefore advocated as contributing to a more sophisticated theoretical approach towards developing a critique of engendered education in leisure, tourism and sport studies.

Keywords: gender research, feminist sociology of education, leisure, tourism and sport studies

Introduction
There is now an established body of feminist scholarship within the sociology of education which points to the complex nature of gender relations within the education system and its various related processes and practices (Acker, 1989, 1990, 1992, 1994; Acker and Warren Piper, 1984; Arnott and Weiner, 1987; Barton and Walker, 1983; David, 1989; Morley and Walsh, 1995; Walker and Barton, 1983; Weiner, 1985; Weiner and Arnott, 1987; Whyte et al., 1985). Acker (1994:19) has emphasised, however, that education has not been uniformly or consistently receptive to feminist analysis: ‘for some areas, like child development, women had always played a visible role, and ‘sex differences’ had long been a respectable subject of study. For others, such as the study of higher education, women were scarce and feminist influence minimal’. Thus, higher education has received less feminist attention than pre-school, primary, secondary or further education. Moreover, it has been argued...
previously that this disparity is emphasised further in relation to leisure, sport and tourism education where feminist and gender scholarship has developed later than in other disciplines and subject fields (Aitchison, 2001; 2003).

Acker has been described by David (1994:1) as ‘one of the foremost feminist writers in the field of the sociology of education’. This paper draws on Acker’s work, and what David (1994:1) has termed Acker’s ‘engendering of education’. The concept of engendered education is contextualised within the wider bodies of literature emanating from the sociology of education and more recent feminist sociologies of education. This literature, together with a discussion of two models of gender scholarship in curriculum development, then informs a review of feminist or gender scholarship in leisure, sport and tourism education and research. Three similar models of research and curriculum development in leisure, sport and tourism are discussed and their uni-linear approach to the development of gender scholarship evaluated. This discussion and evaluation subsequently informs the development of a composite model of stages of research and curriculum development in leisure, sport and tourism in higher education. Although the paper acknowledges that trends towards gender scholarship are discernable in leisure, sport and tourism education, a cautionary note warns against the wholesale acceptance of uniform and uni-linear developments towards gender scholarship in all subject areas at all times. In this respect, a poststructural analytical framework serves to render visible some of the more complex cultural relations that might mitigate the development of more progressive gender scholarship. Through rendering visible the sites and processes of knowledge construction, legitimation and reproduction, the aim of gender scholarship is to challenge existing inequalities, to develop more sophisticated research and to contribute to more inclusive higher education curricula.

**Theorising ‘engendered education’**

Within higher education, Acker (1994:125) points to three areas of challenge to women: ‘the conflicting demands of family and career’, examined under the heading ‘greedy institutions’; ‘the relative powerlessness of minorities’, examined under the heading ‘negotiating from weakness’; and ‘the male domination of knowledge and practice’, examined under the heading of ‘consciousness of women’. Acker stresses that her purpose is not to add to the burgeoning distributive research literature on employment status, pay and promotions, but to undertake relational research that examines ‘engendered education’.

This paper has a similar emphasis upon relational, rather than distributive, data. Although the major sources of empirical research demonstrating discrimination and segregation within higher education are acknowledged, the paper’s focus is upon the sites and processes related to the production, legitimisation and reproduction of knowledge and power within academia. (See Higher Education Statistics Agency Limited, 2002 and Wilson, 1997 for distributive data relating to male and female employees in higher education). So, whilst it is widely recognised that only ten years ago, men held over 95 per cent of all professorial positions in the UK (Acker, 1994), this paper attempts to go beyond these statistical data on inequality within organisations to examine the processes involved in the production and reproduction of gender-power relations within higher education.

Theory on gender in higher education has emanated both from the sub-discipline of the sociology of education and, later, from feminist sociology and then the feminist sociology of education. According to Acker:

“A discipline, or even a sub-discipline, has certain identifying symbols: a textbook, a journal, a professional association or other means of constructing an intellectual community. Lacking a comfortable home in either the professional associations of sociology or of education, British sociology of education needed a new network. Mainly through the efforts of Len Barton, then at Westhill College of Education and now at Sheffield University, the subdiscipline was given such a base, first in the annual International Sociology of Education Conference, which began in 1978 and
continue still, and second in the creation in 1980 of a new flagship journal in the field, the British Journal of the Sociology of Education (BJSE).” (Acker, 1994:15-16)

The sociology of education developed through the 1960s and 1970s to a point where the field could be characterised by two competing paradigms, loosely described as ‘neo-Marxist’ and ‘ethnographic’. The early neo-Marxist research concerned itself with the effects of social class and economic background on educational participation and performance. Like neo-Marxist research within leisure, sport and tourism studies, the neo-Marxist work in education can be criticised for its neglect of other social variables such as gender and race, and for its failure to examine the role of process, interaction and discourse in the production and reproduction of education, knowledge and power. Much of the neo-Marxist work was influenced by research from the United States, or what was termed the ‘new sociology’, and Acker has (1994:15) identified Schooling in Capitalist America (Bowles and Gintis, 1976) as a key publication from this paradigm and this era. Bowles and Gintis echoed the earlier work of Althusser (1971) who contended that education, as ‘a state apparatus’, mirrored the relations of capitalist production by serving the interests of the ruling class. In contrast, ethnographic research within the sociology of education drew upon symbolic interactionism and its emphasis on process, interaction and discourse in the construction of knowledge and the production and reproduction of education. Young’s Knowledge and Control, published in 1975, provided a key text for future discussion on the nature of the production and legitimisation of knowledge, and the relationship between power and knowledge. Similarly, Bourdieu (1973) argued that education reproduced the social relations of power and knowledge by defining both materialities and discourses that constituted ‘cultural capital’.

These two approaches, sometimes overlapping and sometimes polarised, were joined by a third approach in the late 1970s with the development of the feminist sociology of education. The publication of Deem’s Women and Schooling and Byrne’s Women and Education, both in 1978, helped set the agenda for the creation of a sub-field of the sub-discipline. In other words, a specialist area of research on gender and education was created within the already established sub-discipline of the sociology of education. Between the late 1970s and late 1980s, the area of gender and education then developed its own signifiers of academic status just as its parent sub-discipline, the sociology of education, had done a decade before:

“By the mid 1980s, the visibility of what Arnot (1985) has called the sociology of women’s education had increased still further. One of the sociology of education conferences was devoted to questions of race and gender and its papers were published (Barton and Walker 1983; Walker and Barton 1983). Other collections with sociological content included Acker et al. (1984), Weiner (1985), Whyte et al. (1985), Arnot and Weiner (1987) and Weiner and Arnot (1987). The culmination of many of these efforts to carve out a new scholarly field was the founding of the journal Gender and Education by June Purvis in 1989.” (Acker, 1994: 19)

More recently, and again mirroring developments in other disciplines, sub-disciplines and fields of study, the sub-discipline of the feminist sociology of education has encountered, though not fully embraced, poststructuralist theory so that at least some of the research now talks about gender and genders rather than the single homogenising category ‘women’. This recognition of diversity within the category ‘women’ has increased calls for ‘gender scholarship’ in preference to ‘feminist scholarship’ which is sometimes deemed to be homogenising and essentialist of women and invisibilising of men and the interrelationships between women and men. Poststructuralist acknowledgement of the importance of complex interrelationships, webs and networks of power has given further emphasis to the interconnections or interdependence of material and symbolic power, structures and cultures or, what has been termed elsewhere within the leisure and tourism studies literature as ‘the social-cultural nexus’ of power (Aitchison, 2000; 2003). The social-cultural nexus is explained here as both a site and process of construction, legitimisation, reproduction and reworking of gender and leisure relations. In relation to gender and leisure such a perspective demonstrates the
development of feminist leisure studies from what Henderson et al. (1989) described as a single *Feminist Perspective on Women’s Leisure* to a multiplicity of *Feminist Perspectives on Women’s Leisure* (Henderson et al., 1996) through to an approach that seeks to synthesise elements of these different perspectives by highlighting the significance of interrelations between the structural and the cultural. In this way, the social-cultural nexus engages with poststructural theory to explore the cultural workings and reworkings of gender and leisure relations in everyday life, whilst simultaneously acknowledging the value of structuralist analyses of patriarchy and capitalism, or patriarchal capitalism, in shaping the power relations that construct, legitimate and reproduce gender and leisure relations, including the relations of leisure education and research. Elshtain (1981) has described these grand global theories of structuralism as ‘narratives of closure’ and the concept of the social-cultural nexus seeks to open these narratives to cultural critiques of gender, leisure and difference in both structural relations and ‘experiential diversity’ (Brah, 1991).

Such developments serve to recognise the increasing complexity with which gender relations are viewed. Thus, Wallace and Hall (1994), in their research into secondary school management, identified a dual perspective or ‘power-culture metaphor’ as a means of exploring ‘the expression of both the shared values of a culture and the differential use of power to realise particular interests’ (Wallace and Hall, 1994:27). Their work combined Ball’s (1987) theory of political power within organisations and Nias’s (1989) theory of cultural power to demonstrate what Giddens (1984) had referred to previously as the ‘transformative capacity’ of power. In developing a transformative model of curriculum and research development, and drawing on poststructural analyses, this paper acknowledges the complexity and fluidity of education and research as both sites and processes of structural and cultural power. Instead of viewing power relations and inequality as immutable, however, such an approach offers scope for transformation by change agents that seek to enhance gender equity and inclusion in education and research, and in the areas addressed by such education and research.

**Curriculum development and engendered education**

Engendered education can be seen quite visibly in the structures of higher education where teaching, administration, research and management reflect structures of sex-segregation with men and women occupying different positions. Sex role stereotyping and sex role spillover maintain cultures, rather than structures, of engendered education with women and men concentrated in roles that are deemed to be feminised and masculinised respectively. There is ample distributive research pointing to the concentration of women in the lower grade posts in higher education, supplemented by relational data which demonstrates that women perform a disproportionate share of the unacknowledged administrative support work, even when employed on the same grade as men:

“In a recent diary-keeping exercise, it was shown that academics already work an average 53.5 hours per week, that administrative duties take up as much as 17-18 hours of this, and that the bulk of personal research, nearly 40 per cent, was being squeezed into evenings and weekends. It was also clear that women carried a greater administrative load than men. Furthermore, women at every level actually worked longer hours than men. The average working week of a woman professor was 64.5 hours compared with an average for male professors of 58.6 hours.” (Davies and Holloway, 1995:16)

Bagilhole (1993) defines women academics as ‘good campus citizens’ in that they are more inclined to undertake pastoral duties which can be seen as a form of sex role stereotyping, sex role spillover or what Parson and Bales’ (1955) functionalist theory would have identified as ‘expressive’ rather than ‘instrumental’ roles. The work of both Acker (1994) and Bagilhole (1993) contains numerous references, both explicit and implicit, to the social construction of gender roles and the influence of such constructions upon women as teachers and academics. Acker’s and Bagilhole’s work echoes that of many other feminist writers who have commented on the construction of women as ‘outsiders’ and ‘Others’ within ‘malestream’ environments (Butler, 1990). In chapters with titles that refer to ‘No-

Woman’s Land’ and ‘Women, the Other Academics’, Acker points to the marginalisation and isolation of women within academia with such Otherness explained, in part, as a product of the replication of the gender-power relations of society within the education system.

McDowell (1990:328) has drawn on both structural feminist and poststructural gender analyses to identify the gender division of labour in academia as both a material and cultural factor in contributing to women’s lower status in higher education. She has commented on the ways in which women actually support the advancement of men’s careers to the detriment of their own by focusing on teaching and administration whilst their male colleagues engage in research activities which she describes as the ‘paramount criterion for promotion’. Whilst McDowell was writing from the perspective of the ‘old universities’, the majority of teaching and research in leisure, tourism and sport studies is undertaken in ‘new universities’. However, over the last decade new universities have placed greater emphasis upon research as a promotion criterion and many research professors in new universities are now more highly paid than Heads of School or Department who have secured promotion through their focus on administration. The male domination of research and the production of knowledge have led a number of feminist sociologists of education to highlight the difficulties inherent in the gender transformation of the curriculum and research.

Progressive developments towards a more inclusive gender scholarship have been noted, however. Schuster and Van Dyne (1984), for example, have illustrated a possible transformative process within education and have identified six stages of curriculum development with each advancing stage demonstrating an increasing feminist commitment. Figure 1 combines Schuster and Van Dyne’s model with that of Packer (1995) who, in a similar critique, used the analogy of the closed, revolving, ajar, and open door to signify the increasing degree of receptiveness towards feminist scholarship afforded by a subject field or discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Incentives</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invisibility</td>
<td>Who are the great thinkers?</td>
<td>Maintaining standards of excellence</td>
<td>Back to basics</td>
<td>Fixed products Students as vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The closed door)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for missing women</td>
<td>Who are the great female Darwins, Shakespeares?</td>
<td>Affirmative action / compensatory</td>
<td>Add data within existing paradigms</td>
<td>‘Exceptional’ women and role models added to syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Door still closed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women as subordinate and oppressed</td>
<td>Why is women’s work marginal and devalued?</td>
<td>Anger / social justice</td>
<td>Protest existing paradigms but within perspective of dominant group</td>
<td>‘Images of Women’ courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The revolving door)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women studied on own terms</td>
<td>What was / is women’s experience?</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Outside existing paradigms</td>
<td>Inter-disciplinary courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Door continues to revolve)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New scholarship challenges discipline</td>
<td>How valid are current definitions of norms for behaviour?</td>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Testing the paradigms Gender as category of analysis</td>
<td>Beginnings of transformation Theory courses Student as collaborator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The door ajar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility; transformed curriculum experience</td>
<td>How can we account more fully for the diversity of human experience?</td>
<td>Inclusive vision of human experience based on differences and diversity not sameness and generalisation</td>
<td>Transforms the paradigms</td>
<td>Reconceptualised and inclusive core; dynamic process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The open door)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By combining these models, feminist research can be seen as moving from the study of what Acker (1994:13) termed a ‘deficit model of women’ to a model where knowledge is viewed as social power. This model is revisited towards the end of this paper where similar chronologies of ‘gender scholarship’ are presented from leisure studies, tourism studies and sport studies.

**Research and engendered education**

“Most of the knowledge produced in our society has been produced by men: they have usually generated the explanations and the schemata and have then checked with each other and vouched for the accuracy and adequacy of their view of the world. They have created men’s studies (the academic curriculum), for, by not acknowledging that they are presenting only the explanations of men, they have ‘passed off’ this knowledge as human knowledge. Women have been excluded as the producers of knowledge and as the subjects of knowledge, for men have often made their own knowledge and their own sex representative of humanity; they have, in Mary Daly’s terms, presented false knowledge by insisting that their partial view be accepted as the whole.” (Spender, 1981:2)

The literature reveals that research continues to be a male-dominated arena measurable in quantitative terms, but also identifiable in terms of research values, prestige, reward and promotion (Acker, 1994; Weiner, 1986). Morley (1995:118), drawing on the work of Cole (1979), states that even ‘when productivity is equal, rewards for women are smaller’. She goes on to say that this has been explained ‘by suggesting that women’s work is judged less favourably than men’s, particularly if it is from a feminist perspective as this is diminished as minor or self-serving by mainstream academics (Morley, 1995:118). Roberts (1981) emphasises the difficulty of developing feminist research within a male dominated academy:

“Feminists, in stressing the need for a reflexive sociology in which the sociologist takes her own experiences seriously and incorporates them into her work, expose themselves to the challenges of lack of objectivity from those of their male colleagues whose sociological insight does not enable them to see that their own work is affected in a similar way by their experience and views of the world as men.” (Roberts, 1981:16)

A number of authors have also pointed out that feminist researchers investigating the position of women within higher education, or the nature of feminist research itself, are open to even greater accusations of self-interest and subjective research. Acker (1994:137), for example, has stated that ‘the literature on academic women in Britain is rather sparse, probably reflecting a tendency to consider them members of an elite rather than a disadvantaged group worthy of feminist research’.

The intended outcome of the majority of research activity is publications and, as Spender (1981:188) notes: ‘when it is mostly men who are in the position to decide what gets published and what does not, there is a problem of male dominance, which demands feminist attention’. The ‘publish or perish’ mantra cannot be overstated in the current global academic climate. In North America, Australia, and New Zealand a track record of publications in international refereed journals is often required to secure tenure and receive promotion. In the United Kingdom, the Research Assessment Exercise demands that individuals publish to achieve or maintain respectable research ‘ratings’ for their institution which, in turn, influence research funding and graduate student recruitment. Publishing, and involvement with the gatekeeping institutions in publishing, is one of the most important factors in shaping academic discourse (Morley and Walsh, 1995). Power and control within academic publishing is vested in the hands of ‘gatekeepers’ who determine what is deemed to be social
knowledge (Smith, 1978:287). Spender (1981:187) identifies as gatekeepers editors of journals, referees, reviewers and advisors to publishers who, together, ‘set the parameters in which individuals are encouraged to work if they wish to be at the centre of issues in their discipline’ (Spender, 1981:186).

Previous research in leisure and tourism studies has sought to address the concerns voiced by Morley and Walsh (1995), Roberts (1981), Smith (1978) and Spender (1981) by undertaking an analysis of the ‘codification of knowledge’ in a sample of international refereed journals in leisure and tourism studies (Aitchison, 2001). Primary statistical analysis was developed from sex-segregation data in relation to six international refereed journals: Leisure Studies, Journal of Leisure Research, Managing Leisure, Tourism Management, Annals of Tourism Research and the Journal of Sustainable Tourism. The purpose of the research, however, was not to embrace or eschew Spender’s radical feminist critique. Rather, the research investigated the complexity of the interrelationships between gender, power and knowledge and recognised the contribution of poststructural and structural feminist analyses to our understanding of the ‘codification of knowledge’ in leisure studies. This perspective acknowledged that, in universities and other ‘modern professional organisations’ (Weber, 1922), power is used to maintain symbolic or cultural control as much, if not more than, material control (Etzioni, 1964). The distributive research on the authorship of journal articles and the composition of journal editorial boards was undertaken to complement previous relational research and to accommodate Acker’s (1994) call for a wide-ranging research programme related to gender, education and the production of knowledge. Although more usually associated with material analyses of gender relations, the quantitative data described in the study revealed that knowledge production is a product of both structural and cultural power and that both quantitative and qualitative data are required to theorise the social-cultural nexus of the gendered codification of knowledge.

The audit examining the authorship of all articles published by the six journals between 1982 and 1997 - a total of 1784 articles - revealed that the ratio of male to female authors was four to one, with men comprising 80.24 per cent of authors of refereed articles. Tourism journals demonstrated higher levels of sex-segregation than leisure journals and management journals displayed higher levels of sex-segregation than non-applied journals. The highest percentage of female authors (21.81) was found in the Journal of Leisure Research and the lowest percentage of female authors was found in Tourism Management (16.38). However, there was relatively little deviation from the averages outlined above and only a three per cent difference was recorded between the journal with the highest percentage of male authors (Tourism Management) and the journal with the lowest percentage of male authors (Journal of Leisure Research). Men were also far more likely to be co-authors of refereed articles than women, raising questions of women’s apparent isolation within the research environment, the more onerous task of achieving publication on one’s own, and the subsequent effect upon women’s research curriculum vitae and future career progression. The more informal process of book reviewing displayed even greater levels of male-dominance than the formal process of article refereeing, and men were authors of almost 90 per cent of all book reviews (Aitchison, 2001).

The composition of the editorial boards of the six leisure and tourism journals in 1997 showed that, in most cases, there was a close correlation between the percentage of men on the Editorial Board and the percentage of articles authored by men. For example, in the Journal of Sustainable Tourism both the percentage of men on the Editorial Board and the percentage of articles authored by men were identical at 81.8 per cent. In Annals of Tourism Research 89.5 per cent of the Editorial Board was made up of men in 1997, whilst 87.8 per cent of published articles were authored by men in that year. In Tourism Management, however, 22.3 per cent of articles published in 1997 were authored by women whilst only 2.7% of the Editorial Board were women. In the Journal of Leisure Research, which had the highest representation of women on an editorial board at 40.7 per cent, less than 30 per cent of articles were authored by women. Although these figures show varying patterns, there is a clearly discernable trend of journal authorship reflecting the gender composition of the Editorial Board. Further research would be required to discern whether this is a straightforward correlation or whether other factors, such as percentage of articles submitted by women, are just as significant.
Building a model of gender scholarship in leisure, tourism and sport education

Schuster and Van Dyne’s (1984) and Packer’s (1985) stages of gender scholarship, illustrated in Figure 1, are echoed within leisure, tourism and sport where Henderson (1994), Swain (1995) and Talbot (1996) have identified five-phase typologies charting the development of uni-linear chronologies of gender scholarship in leisure, tourism and sport research respectively. Each of these authors developed their chronology independently of the others, yet the similarities between the models and the stages of chronological development are clearly evident. Although poststructuralist interpretations might guard against the wholesale adoption of uni-linear chronologies as a means of encapsulating the complexities of historical change, such a ‘chronological classificatory framework’ does serve a purpose in contributing to an understanding of the changing nature of gender scholarship (McDowell, 1993:162).

Figure 2: Models of gender scholarship in leisure, sport and tourism education

Henderson’s (1994:122) typology was first presented in an article titled ‘Perspectives on analysing gender, women and leisure’ published in the Journal of Leisure Research. Her typology progresses from an initial phase of ‘Invisible (womanless) scholarship’ where ‘little was written about women, let alone gender, in the leisure literature in the United States from 1940 until the early 1980s’. The typology concludes with a final phase of ‘Gender scholarship’, denoting the shift from feminist scholarship and distributive research to gender scholarship informed by a relational approach.
Resonating critiques by Stanley and Wise (1990), Henderson’s second phase identifies ‘Compensatory (add women and stir) scholarship’. Phase three is identified by Henderson (1994:125) as ‘Dichotomous (sex) differences scholarship’ with an emphasis on biological determinism and essentialism and a neglect of culturally constructed difference. ‘Feminist (woman-centred) scholarship’ forms phase four of Henderson’s chronology and she attributes much of the 1980s socialist feminist leisure research to this phase (Deem, 1986; Green et al., 1987; Henderson and Bialeschki, 1991).

Swain’s (1995:254) typology also identifies five distinct phases of scholarship related to the increasing visibility of gender issues within *Annals of Tourism Research*. Swain’s typology mirrors Henderson’s, demonstrating that gender scholarship in tourism studies appears to reflect the changes being experienced simultaneously in leisure studies. Phase one, identified as being an era of ‘No women’, ran from the first issue of the journal in 1973 to 1977 when ‘the first articles on women in tourism appeared in volumes 4-8 (1977-1981)’. Phase two is then identified as ‘Add women’ and phase three as ‘Descriptive differences’. Phase four is seen as being ‘Women centred’ with phase five again reflecting ‘Gender scholarship’.

Talbot (1996) provides a further five-phase typology that follows a similar chronology to those presented by Henderson and Swain. Talbot’s sport education typology, however, reflects a more pragmatic outcome to a transformed curriculum and research agenda, in that she sees gender scholarship in sport education influencing gender equity in sport policy and practice. Her model illustrates progression from an initial ‘Catching up’ phase; a phrase used frequently in sport to reflect women’s increasing times and distances in relation to men’s. Here, the male benchmark is seen as the standard or the goal to be attained by women. The second phase identified, like Henderson’s and Swain’s, is that of ‘Add women and stir’ and again, like the previous two models, this is then followed by a third phase, which increases women’s ‘Visibility’ in their own right. The fourth phase of Talbot’s model is concerned with ‘Critique’ of both male norms and female compliance and this is then followed by a final phase of ‘Reconstruction’ of sport research and sport itself.

To assess the extent to which leisure and tourism journals have moved towards ‘gender scholarship’ and a more equitable research environment, as suggested by Henderson (1994), Swain (1995) and Talbot (1996), it is necessary to examine longitudinal change. Research conducted by Aitchison (2001) demonstrated that the percentage of female-authored papers published at five-year intervals in four leisure and tourism journals that spanned the period 1982-1997 did not follow a strictly linear progression. Whereas both *Tourism Management* and the *Journal of Leisure Research* demonstrated in excess of a 20 per cent increase in the number of published papers authored by women between 1982 and 1997, *Annals of Tourism Research* had only a four per cent rise and *Leisure Studies* actually recorded a six per cent fall.

This indicates that the inter-relationships between gender, power and knowledge in the construction of leisure, sport and tourism education and research are therefore more complex and more contested than previous uni-linear models and typologies of research and curriculum change might have suggested.

**Conclusion**

Whilst much of the research referred to in the feminist sociology of education literature is based on schools, and has been undertaken by researchers employed by universities, research into higher education is usually undertaken by those already employed within higher education. As feminists engaging in the sociology of higher education, we are locked within our own ‘insider outsider’ identity as we seek to critique the very world of which we are a part (Raymond, 1986:233).

The feminist sociology of higher education literature reveals that much of the research has been distributive rather than relational in nature and has focused on the employment and career progression patterns of women academics rather than the micro-structures or cultures that inform such patterns. Many of these research projects have resulted in recommendations for implementing equal opportunities policies, practices and procedures to encourage gender equity in staff recruitment,
retention and career progression (Acker, 1994). Whilst such distributive research is invaluable in demonstrating current inequality, and in focusing attention on strategies and targets for alleviating inequality, research addressing relational issues is also of importance in informing progress towards gender scholarship (Adler et al., 1993).

This paper has sought to review two models of gender scholarship in generic higher education and to contextualise three further models of gender scholarship within leisure, tourism and sport studies in relation to these broader feminist sociologies of education. The models were tested in relation to one site of engendered education: that of academic journals. The findings reveal that, whilst the models do provide a generalised trend towards gender scholarship, their rather structuralist approach masks the nuances of gender-power relations in higher education. Poststructuralist analysis, together with the acknowledgement of existing structuralist analyses, was therefore advocated as a more sophisticated approach towards developing a critique of engendered education in leisure, tourism and sport studies. Such an approach engaged with the concept of the social-cultural nexus as both a site and process of construction, legitimation, reproduction and reworking of gender and leisure relations. This more nuanced critique of gender-power relations in education enables a more sophisticated understanding of gender at work and thus affords greater possibilities for cultural change to supplement and complement the structural changes that have already taken place in relation to gender equity in the workplace.
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