

Modern Educational Thought

# **GENDERED EDUCATION**

SANDRA ACKER



critical introduction by Miriam E. David

# Gendered Education

Sociological Reflections on  
Women, Teaching and Feminism

SANDRA ACKER

OPEN UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Buckingham • Philadelphia

Open University Press  
Celtic Court  
22 Ballmoor  
Buckingham  
MK18 1XW

and  
1900 Frost Road, Suite 101  
Bristol, PA 19007, USA

First Published 1994

Copyright © Sandra Acker 1994. Critical Introduction © Miriam E. David 1994

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purpose of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence from the Copyright Licensing Agency Limited. Details of such licences (for reprographic reproduction) may be obtained from the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd of 90 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1P 9HE.

A catalogue record of this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 335 19059 6 (pb)      0 335 19060 X (hb)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available

Typeset by Dorwyn Ltd, Rowlands Castle, Hants  
Printed in Great Britain by St Edmundsbury Press, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk

GENDERED EDUCATION



## MODERN EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT

Series Editor: Professor Andy Hargreaves,  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

This important series contains some of the very best of modern educational thought that will stimulate interest and controversy among teachers and educationalists alike.

It brings together writers of distinction and originality within educational studies who have made significant contributions to policy and practice. The writers are all scholars of international standing who are recognized authorities in their own particular field and who are still actively researching and advancing knowledge in that field.

The series represents some of their best and more distinctive writing as a set of provocative, interrelated essays addressing a specific theme of contemporary importance. A unique feature of the series is that each collection includes a critical introduction to the author's work written by another influential figure in the field.

### Current titles:

Sandra Acker: *Gendered Education*

Roger Dale: *The State and Education Policy*

Michael G. Fullan: *Successful School Improvement*

Jane Gaskell: *Gender Matters from School to Work*

Ivor F. Goodson: *Studying Curriculum*

Andy Hargreaves: *Curriculum and Assessment Reform*

Martyn Hammersley: *Classroom Ethnography*

Jean Rudduck: *Innovation and Change*

Barry Troyna: *Racism and Education*

*This book is dedicated to the memory of the women before me:  
my mother, Marjorie Mitshkun Acker, and my grandmothers,  
Dorothy Mitshkun and Anna Acker*

# Acknowledgements

Chapters 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are edited versions of work published earlier. The publishers and journal editors have all graciously given permission to use this material. Publishers and details of the original publications are as follows:

Chapter 2: Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, for 'No-woman's-land: British sociology of education 1960–79'. *Sociological Review*, 1981, 29(1): 77–104;

Chapter 3: UNESCO Institute for Education, Germany, for 'Feminist theory and the study of gender and education'. *International Review of Education*, 1987, 33: 419–35;

Chapter 5: Falmer Press (Taylor and Francis), London, for 'Women and teaching: A semi-detached sociology of a semi-profession'. In S. Walker and L. Barton (Eds), *Gender, Class and Education*. Lewes: Falmer Press, 1983.

Chapter 6: Carfax Publishers, Oxford, for 'Teachers, gender and resistance'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1988, 9(3): 307–322.

Chapter 7: Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, for 'Creating careers: Women teachers at work'. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 1992, 22(2): 141–63.

Chapter 8: Carfax Publishers, Oxford, for 'Women, the other academics'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1980, 1(1): 81–91.

Chapter 9: Falmer Press (Taylor and Francis), London, for 'Contradictions in terms: women academics in British universities'. In M. Arnot and K. Weiler (Eds), *Feminism and Social Justice in Education*. London: Falmer Press, 1993. Some extracts also appeared in 'New perspectives on an old problem: The position of women academics in British higher education'. *Higher Education*, 1992, 24: 57–75, and are reproduced here by permission of Kluwer Academic Publishers, the Netherlands.

As the chapters were written over a period of more than a decade, there are many colleagues and friends I could acknowledge here. I found my initial attempts to write this section beginning to look like an invitation list to a large party, and there was the danger of leaving out one or two people inadvertently. Therefore, I decided not to acknowledge all such individuals by name, but to give a general thank you to former colleagues at the University of Bristol;

current colleagues at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education; people in the wider circles of sociology, education and women's studies who have influenced and supported me; staff of the University of Bristol Education Library who patiently helped me track down references and statistics; students who have listened to my ideas and shared theirs; friends who have been steadfast.

Some of the chapters that follow contain acknowledgements to people who helped with or commented on the particular piece of work. There are also some individuals who must be mentioned by name. Andy Hargreaves, the Series Editor, persuaded me to write this book, continuing his always welcome encouragement for my work. B.J. Cook, Maureen Harvey, Guida Man, Brenda Mignardi, Kristine Pearson, Beth McAuley and the staff of the Open University Press all contributed to the technical production of this book or the manuscripts that preceded it. I owe special gratitude to Maureen Harvey, whose secretarial and caring skills helped me for many years in Bristol, to Beth McAuley, who did the index so capably, and to Kristine Pearson, who made the last stages of the book manageable with her calmness and word-processing ability.

Very special thanks go to David Satterly, whose friendship and wisdom have been invaluable, and to Miriam David, who shares so many of my interests and has always been a supportive friend. Above all I thank my family, especially my father and stepmother, Charles and Mercedes Acker, and my husband and daughter, Geoff and Dorie Millerson. Geoff has provided the domestic and intellectual support so necessary for my development as an academic. Dorie gives me hope for a feminist future.



# Contents

Acknowledgements	ix
Critical Introduction: Engendering Education – Feminism and the Sociology of Education <i>Miriam E. David</i>	1
1 Introduction: Finding a Path	12
<b>Part 1: Mapping the Field</b>	
2 No-Woman's-Land: British Sociology of Education 1960–79	27
3 Feminist Theory and the Study of Gender and Education	43
4 Is Research by a Feminist Always Feminist Research?	55
<b>Part 2: Women and Teaching</b>	
5 Women and Teaching: A Semi-detached Sociology of a Semi-profession	75
6 Teachers, Gender and Resistance	90
7 Creating Careers: Women Teachers at Work	105
<b>Part 3: Women Academics</b>	
8 Women, the Other Academics	125
9 Contradictions in Terms: Women Academics in British Universities	134
10 Conclusion: Continuity and Change	151
References	160
Name Index	181
Subject Index	188

approaches in the late 1970s when two important textbooks on gender and education were first published in Britain (Byrne 1978; Deem 1978). There has been little to replace these latter two textbooks, for we have all been largely preoccupied with developing our theories and/or approaches within specific areas, as indeed Sandra Acker has done. However, it is in drawing these areas together to provide such a comprehensive analysis that this new book represents a thorough statement of how education is gendered.

### **Feminism, gender and the sociology of education**

In the Introduction and Part 1 of this book entitled 'Mapping the Field', Acker sets out her approach to feminism and gender analysis in education. She does so in true feminist fashion by starting from where she began and from her own standpoint. She presents her own educational biography and through it we learn about her own understandings of an early feminist approach, drawn partly from involvement in the women's movement and partly from her own feelings of interest and ambivalence about women's roles as teachers and students in education. We hear about her American Jewish origins and her father's career as a teacher, as well as her own graduate studies in a high-status educational institution, though she still intended being a schoolteacher.

We learn about the importance of feelings of marginality in many contexts to the creative urge to comprehend the impact and effects of gender in education. It is important to understand that the driving force behind many feminist approaches is the desire to understand and to try to eradicate what are seen and experienced as injustices. Acker also provides us with a succinct history of the sociology of education in Britain and begins to map its recent demise in the cold political climate of the Right, while pinpointing its limited vision about gender issues in education.

It is this relative exclusion of gender from education or educational studies that leads Acker to explore a variety of possible feminist approaches and analyses as well as different conceptualizations. She pursues her quest with customary vigour and obsessiveness until she finds the suitable theory or method for the occasion.

In this early part of the book, but especially in the Introduction where she also justifies her choice of organization of the chapters of the book, I was often reminded of Acker's other passion – that of music and being a pianist. She does not herself draw the analogy, but the book to me has the feel of a piece of music, perhaps a suite of dances or a theme and variations. I have the sense that there are basic melodies and harmonies, varying in key, rhythm, tempo and dynamic. The two consistent refrains are feminism and gender analysis with an especial emphasis on women; they are played in varying forms and at different levels of intensity.

However, Acker does try, somewhat vainly in my view, to escape what she seems to feel is the growing yoke of being seen only as an academic feminist. There are hints in the book that feminism has become more rather than less

burdensome in some respects and in some quarters of academe in the late 1980s and early 1990s, given perhaps the wider political context. She demonstrates this explicitly in Chapter 4, and it is especially clear in her recent analysis of higher education and the position of women academics in Chapter 9. She herself has suffered a great deal from having had to take more responsibility – in true maternal fashion – for keeping alive the feminist credo than any one person in an academy can possibly do. And yet she has shouldered it and weathered it all with great dignity and finesse.

She is, therefore, right to point to the difficulties, blocks, exclusions and marginalizations that feminists experience and yet she perhaps underestimates our relative strengths and influences at least in the academic world and world of educational and sociological research. The backlash may be real – indeed, I am sure it is – but it is a response to a growing and serious influence in the world of educational scholarship to which this book bears witness.

Faludi's (1992) feminist analysis of popular and political cultures and the political 'backlash' against feminism in the USA, provides us with a crucial contextual account of the extent to which there is a dramatic reaction to feminist politics and theories. Coward (1992) also draws our attention to the need for feminists to revise their theories to take account of women's experiences and deeper feelings especially towards motherhood and partnerships with men. So indeed there are the stirrings of a deeper and more mature approach to gender analysis, like the one that Acker herself develops.

As Acker points out, one of her more recent studies, conducted with colleagues, of postgraduate research students, was commenced and carried out without an explicit feminist approach. It was one of her attempts to avoid the constant feminist label and to become more of a mainstream sociological or educational researcher. And to some extent it worked – the research is part of a broader, considered analysis of the state of postgraduate training in Britain today, out of which many conclusions and policy prescriptions have been drawn (Burgess, 1994).

However, she is forced also to acknowledge the importance of applying a feminist analysis to her research materials and evidence. Indeed, almost without explicit consideration the women students 'foreground' themselves, by giving different accounts of their lives, preoccupations and work concerns than the male students. Acker writes in Chapter 4:

What stood out were categories of family relationships, sense of mission and self-confidence. Interviews with women, especially those over age 25 or so, contained many references to their partners and their children, despite no direct questions being asked about families. For example, when reviewing their past higher education careers, women often integrated into their accounts references to when their children were born, or when they were pregnant, or when they moved because of a partner's job. Men did this very rarely . . .

. . . The most arresting theme was what we were calling self-confidence . . . At an extreme we read some transcripts where students appeared to feel they were strangers in the academy . . . More often women seemed to distance themselves from their achievements. (pp. 64–5)

This kind of self-evident gendering of experiences in education, including higher education, and its links with family and family-life experiences, is very powerful indeed. But it requires a sophisticated feminist researcher such as Acker to provide us with the materials and the gloss. It does, however, confirm the continuing salience and importance of feminist studies to ensure that we are constantly alert to such continuing injustices and vigilant in pointing them out.

It also adds to the growing evidence from several studies of the complexities of changing the nature and characteristics of the student population in higher education. I, too, have explored with others some of these thorny questions (David *et al.* 1993). So, too, have Edwards (1993) and Sperling (1991) separately. We have all looked at mature women students who are undergraduates in higher education and who are also mothers, and we have explored the continuities and contrasts between their lives and experiences and those who are not in higher education but may be mothers in adult education or involved in their children's schooling. What is particularly striking is the commonalities in their experiences whatever educational institution they may be attached to; women's experiences of family are more critical for them as preoccupations than are men's. The boundaries between family and education are drawn more tightly and women's experience of them is less easy to avoid.

However, what can and should be done about them remains a thorny problem, as Acker also makes clear in her conclusion. Coward, as I noted above, has also addressed this as a problematic issue and one that is not easily amenable to hasty solutions, such as merely trying to add more women to the academy. Indeed, quite clearly the academy is transformed in fact if not in effect by its gendered nature. Acker properly struggles with these questions for her own conclusion and for future considerations. And in a sense it takes her back to some of her early beginnings – to explore the content of academic curricula and texts and test them for their gender biases.

Chapter 2, 'No-woman's-land', was one of Acker's first contributions to feminist analysis in the sociology of education and still in its updated form it remains for me a *tour de force*. It had, in any event, an immediate and well-deserved reception in the sociology of education. It was taken up and cited not only by feminists but by non-feminists and indeed by antifeminists. It was an intuitively simple approach but, curiously perhaps, no-one had thought to do it before. Acker provided a neat content analysis of three of the journals published in sociology, looking at education articles and looking for gender issues or explicit references to gender and especially women within them. She paints this portrait:

I noted 184 articles. Of these, the great majority (143) report some kind of empirical work. Their samples were coded as mixed, all male or all female . . .

We might anticipate the details to follow by imagining a Martian coming to Britain and deriving some impressions of the society and its educational system from reading these articles. The Martian would conclude that numerous boys but few girls go to secondary modern schools;

that there are no girls' public schools; that there are almost no adult women influentials of any sort; that most students in higher education study science and engineering; that women rarely make a ritual transition called 'from school to work' and never go into further education colleges. Although some women go to university, most probably enter directly into motherhood, where they are of some interest as transmitters of language codes to their children. And except for a small number of teachers, social workers and nurses, there are almost no adult women workers in the labour market. (pp. 30–1)

The Martian's picture might now be somewhat modified both by the changes in educational organization and political context and by the burgeoning and more explicit gender studies in education. But, as Acker points out, these have not all had a lasting influence and 'malestream' sociology of education remains relatively impervious to such explicit gender analyses.

What is most significant about this chapter is its attention to detail and to very carefully crafted scholarship and content analysis of gender. This method clearly does remain extremely powerful and important to replicate. Perhaps what remains lacking in this approach is an account of why the sociology of education as a whole, then as now, has tended to be relatively impervious to feminist analyses or critiques. This question is not one that concerns Acker greatly, since she is more interested in the mapping of approaches and theories, truly engendering education. Yet for me, through this chapter and others, it remains something of a puzzle which may merit further exploration.

Acker's further exploration is to compare and contrast different feminist theories and explanations, which she tackles in some depth in the next chapter, entitled 'Feminist theory and the study of gender and education'. Originally published at the height of feminist theoretical influence in 1987, here she carefully maps a variety of different feminist theories and shows how they have been used in studies within the sociology of education. This is yet another vital paper for setting out the contextual and conceptual apparatus for a gender analysis. But again Acker fights shy of exploring the reasons for the diversity of approaches, preferring here to present a more pragmatic argument:

Are we moving towards a synthesis of feminist educational approaches? Deep conceptual divides remain. But it seems to me that, with a few exceptions, feminist theoretical writing about education manages to be constructively critical without the vitriol sometimes found in other spheres of feminist commentary. Possibly this can be traced to the tradition of pragmatism in much educational thought: the immediate goal of making conditions better overrides some of the theoretical disputes. Many writers work in educational institutions themselves and thus sustain some commitment to educational change through educational means (p. 53)

Although this chapter, too, has mapped out the diversity of theories from liberal feminist to socialist feminist to radical feminist, this conclusion is implicitly if not explicitly concerned with what I would call a liberal-humanist

approach. Acker implies that her own leanings, as those of most educational researchers, are towards the use of scholarship and writing as a means to change, whether social or intellectual.

As an academic and teacher educator – whether or not feminist – she remains throughout thoroughly imbued with her liberal-humanist approach to education and change, which is committed to the idea of scholarship and the development of knowledge. This may, in the end, be as much a weakness as a strength in trying to convince education *institutions* to take serious account of gender. Others have argued for different strategies and stronger solutions, such as transforming the academy through either feminist management and/or the recruitment of more women, particularly non-traditional women students, to study (Sperling 1991; Ruijs 1993).

These stronger political solutions of new styles of academic and educational management may, of course, contribute to the backlash to which I have already alluded against feminism in education and the academy (King 1993; Ozga 1993). Acker may well be right to counsel caution and proper scholarly approaches. On the other hand, she could be accused of being faint-hearted and insufficiently radical, in a political sense, in her solutions to engendering education.

However, she too was involved – and not just on the sidelines – when I published a personal account of becoming a feminist academic manager (David 1989). This essay was included in one of Acker's edited volumes entitled *Teachers, Gender and Careers* (1989). The essay provoked an enormous debate both internally in my educational institution and in print (Harrison and Lyon 1993; Ruijs 1993). To some extent, this debate could be seen as part of a backlash against any forms of unusual educational change or rather precipitate educational change, through feminist politics. It is not, though, dissimilar to the reactions to any kind of change, not only those in education (Marris 1974).

In any event, attempting educational change through feminist management strategies is, with the benefit of hindsight, hazardous and requires a delicate negotiating strategy and political balance. However, professional and senior management pressure groups such as 'Beyond The Glass Ceiling' have recently been formed to develop strategies for women senior academics and/or managers in higher education (King 1993). They may well provide sufficient collective strength to begin to chip away at little, local resistances and help the general processes of transforming management in a feminist direction. But all these solutions and strategies require enormous reserves of strength and energy to keep up the political fight, which may detract from more serious pursuit of knowledge. Researching and working with your students and women colleagues, wherever they are, may prove a far preferable alternative.

This appears to be what Acker has opted for and her passionate interest in their welfare is clearly demonstrated in several chapters, but especially the chapter based on a study of postgraduate research students conducted by Acker and colleagues. The chapter is entitled 'Is research by a feminist always feminist research?' The simple answer to her question appears to be 'yes' as we have already mentioned. However, this chapter sets out clearly and coherently the various approaches to feminist research, demonstrating that feminist research

does not necessarily need to be at the stage of conception but may well be equally valid during either gestation or the birth of the project. To take the maternity analogy further, feminist research may well derive from female or maternal 'ways of knowing', rather than more deliberate acts of intervention or involvement.

Interestingly, Acker does not refer to this as one approach to feminist research in this part of the chapter and yet, it seems to me, the idea of different ways of knowing has become an important paradigm in feminist research. Belenky *et al.* (1986) first coined the phrase but the method has been taken up by several researchers, most recently by Gilligan and Brown (1992). Gilligan and Brown explore teenage girls' development into womanhood through a series of in-depth unstructured interviews with girls from two very different locales and high schools in the USA. They concentrate in particular on their method as being crucial to gaining an understanding of how the girls learned relationships. The interviews with postgraduate research students that Acker writes about could merit further detailed analysis to clarify the different ways of knowing between the men and women students. It would add to her repertoire of feminist research and insights.

### **Feminism, gender and teachers**

In Parts 2 and 3 of the book, we are invited first to revisit a number of essays on women teachers at various levels in the educational system – teachers in schools and teachers in higher education – and then to learn more of them from more recent ethnographic or other in-depth research. This approach of setting the scene with her earlier contributions coupled with presenting mature and developing approaches to the subject matter in each of these two parts of the book, yet again leads me to the notion that this book is like a musical arrangement of prose rather than notes. The themes and refrains are here presented in dramatic variations. And Part 2 focuses our attention on the traditional subjects of educational research, whereas Part 3 brings us back to the origins of both the book and feminist research, using personal experience and place as the subject of academic research.

Chapter 5 was also one of Acker's original and exciting pieces of research and scholarship. In analysing 'a semi-detached sociology of a semi-profession', Acker challenged us, then as now, to share her feelings about the various marginalities of women and teaching as a profession. She shared with her audience her own feelings of distance from her subjects and yet, at the same time, her own personal involvements with this. It seems to me that this is a very neat way of conveying mixed feelings of marginality and yet conveying a flavour of their equally rich feelings and experiences. Her use of Etzioni's (1969) theories of 'semi-professions' is inspired, especially in view of his more recent and explicit anti-feminist leanings (Etzioni 1993). However, Acker, as is her wont, is only quietly critical of this theory by reference to a chapter in the book rather than the book's approach as a whole. I quote her:

Semi-professions are schoolteaching, social work, nursing, and librarianship. All are highly 'feminized'. The chapter in the collection that best represents the blame-the-woman approach is 'Women and bureaucracy in the semi-professions' by Richard Simpson and Ida Simpson. It is certainly a caricature and might almost be a parody. Simpson and Simpson (1969) see bureaucratic control . . . as a *consequence* of the presence of women . . . Several pages follow on the harm women do to the professional hopes of these occupations. (pp. 77–8)

In this chapter, she uses her usual method of critical evaluation of the literature on women and teachers to draw her conclusions. Her conclusions were, when this essay was first published, particularly strong for feminist research and its future in engendering education. She wrote:

While we cannot pursue, let alone resolve, all the methodological and epistemological questions that arise from an attempt to develop and apply fundamental and implementary theories, it should be clear that a rapprochement between certain feminist theories and the sociology of teaching could be promising and productive . . . Implementary approaches could result in empirical studies of schools, considering, for example, gender relationships among teachers. (p. 88)

True to her own agenda, she set out to conduct such research, some of which is produced in the following two chapters. In Chapter 6, she again provides us with a fulsome critique and evaluation of the research evidence and literature regarding teachers and gender, especially with respect to the imbalance between the burgeoning academic feminist research and the contrasting limited action on anti-sexist initiatives in schools. Her conclusion is similar to that found in much of the literature on implementing change, as we have already referred to. She does not, however, make much of this problem, preferring to try to convince through her own moral persuasion and intellectual arguments. This is now beginning to appear as her stock-in-trade solution. To quote her:

It could be said that teachers 'resist' such initiatives, in most cases simply by not recognizing or accepting that there is an educational issue involved . . . 'Resistance' appears double-edged, preventing progress but also protecting against illegitimate pressures and impossible demands . . . One gap (indeed, chasm) badly needing filling is the one between feminist and sociological scholarship on gender on the one hand, and teachers' everyday school experience on the other. (p. 103)

In fact, instead of trying to bridge that gap/chasm by action, she sets out, in Chapter 7, to present us with her own fascinatingly rich ethnographic study of two primary schools in England to pinpoint how women's teaching careers develop.

This chapter, which is drawn from her research in the late 1980s and early 1990s, brings out themes and refrains that have come before but in new variations. We are again invited to consider women's marginality, their feelings



about family, especially partners and children, their ambivalences to careers and occupational progress, and to feminism itself fraught with dangers as it appears to be. This chapter, however, provides us with rich empirical evidence of these women teachers' feelings, views and values. And as a 'semi-detached sociologist' still looking at a 'semi-profession', Acker enjoins us to sympathize with these dilemmas. She writes:

It could be argued that women primary school teachers are contributing to the reproduction of gender inequality by their acceptance, unwilling as it may be, of the inequalities in their own lives. My teachers weren't overtly fighting the *status quo* . . . A forcible feminism would have been counterproductive in the circumstances . . . A 'strategic fatalism' . . . seemed much better adapted to the realities of their lives. They remake definitions of careers and commitments to suit their preferences and their possibilities, strategizing for security and maximum flexibility within the particular 'patriarchal bargain' . . . offered by their circumstances. (p. 119–20)

And so in a sense we are back with the original theme, now played more quietly but also far more confidently and assertively – the difficulties and dangers of implementing a feminist analysis, however intuitively appealing it might be.

Now we are invited to return to the stronger rhythms and arguments of earlier feminist analysis, here with one of Acker's first and most powerful critiques. Chapter 8, 'Women, the other academics', in its original version, was published in the *British Journal of Sociology of Education* in its early days. Acker here is at her best with her trenchant critique of how academic life in Britain systematically marginalizes, excludes or discriminates against women but in subtle ways through the themes and operation of family and everyday life. She selects three key issues by which to analyse these processes, concluding with her now familiar but nevertheless strong refrain, expressed most assertively and assuredly:

What links all three problems . . . is the 'otherness' of women academics . . . Women are marginal to the academic enterprise, because full tribute to greedy institutions is only feasible for persons without competing claims from other greedy institutions; because token status results in invisibility, powerlessness and lack of opportunity; because dominant groups deny the contributions and distort the characteristics of subordinates. (p. 132)

She considers political action but concludes that 'asking feminist questions' is likely to have most impact, 'being in the knowledge business, so to speak'. Here we have an early example of how Acker is so rooted in a liberal-humanist scholarly approach, a truly academic approach.

And so we come full circle, to her academic approach to academic matters in the early 1990s. This is presented in Chapter 9, which is a thorough analysis of the situation of women academics in British universities, seeing the problem as a 'contradiction in terms'. First, we are provided again with a clear and succinct