

JH Jeni Hart

Women and Feminism in Higher Education Scholarship: An Analysis of Three Core Journals

Today, more women than ever before are active participants in higher education. For example, more than 50% of all undergraduate students are women and the numbers of women graduate, professional, and doctoral-degree recipients and faculty are increasing (“The nation,” 2003). In fact, for the first time, American women have earned more doctorates than American men have (Smallwood, 2003).¹ Given this shifting postsecondary climate, more scholarship by women and about women, as well as an increase in feminist scholarship from previous generations, should be part of the discourse. Thus, the purpose of this article is to investigate the academic literature in the field of higher education, using gender and feminism as lenses due, in part, to the increased presence of women in the academy. By analyzing data collected from three leading journals in higher education, *The Journal of Higher Education (JHE)*, *The Review of Higher Education (RHE)*, and *Research in Higher Education (ResHE)*, I hope to better understand how feminist scholarship and how women are treated in the scholarly work contained in these journals.

Theoretical Framework

To guide my analysis, I will use a feminist framework. I am interested in whether women as a subject of study and as scholars continue to be marginalized in academe because of gender. As a result, this perspective

Jeni Hart is Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 77, No. 1 (January/February 2006)
Copyright © 2006 by The Ohio State University

will shape how I view the data that emerge, for I see academe as entrenched in the power of patriarchy. By this, I mean that power is male-centered and, in many cases, women are oppressed in this system. Of course, not all women are equally marginalized in patriarchy. However, the fact that power is male-centered indicates that achievements by women are gained in spite of that male-centered power (i.e., patriarchy) (Johnson, 1997). In addition, since I will be looking at academic scholarship, which is critical to faculty work, I will use professionalization theory to frame my study further. Professionalization theory suggests that the reward structure and the status of the professorate are tightly coupled with producing research for juried publications. Thus, the nature of faculty work is constructed, in part, by the content of the leading journals (Silverman, 1987). The knowledge that is created and proliferated in the leading journals further shapes the subsequent creation of knowledge. Moreover, knowing who and what is published is important to understand better the value of feminism and the treatment of women in one aspect of academic work.

Background Literature

Research by DuBois, Kelly, Kennedy, Korsmeyer, and Robinson (1985) serves as a model for my study. In addition, I will expand upon work by Townsend (1993) to explore higher education scholarship in three core journals of this field. DuBois et al. examined the publication patterns in several disciplines from 1966 through 1980. Their study was intended to capture the nature of scholarly work during the height of Second Wave Feminism. While considerably narrower in scope, my study seeks to extend DuBois et al.'s work by looking at the extent to which feminism and women are featured in current higher education scholarship during the current generation of feminism (specifically, from 1990–2002). The temporal constraint for this analysis is significant because it provides the most recent perspective on the treatment of feminism and women in this field.

In addition, this work expands upon and updates a study by Townsend (1993) that explored the extent to which feminism and scholarship about women are included in higher education journals. Her study took a longitudinal sample of journal articles from the three core higher education journals in the late 1960s, the late 1970s, and the late 1980s. The current study used the journals identified in Townsend's study but analyzed the scholarship published after her data analysis. This study will also provide insight into the kinds or strands of feminism that shape scholarship, offering a perspective that has not been explored in the higher education literature.

Gender and Feminism in Higher Education Scholarship

The examination of gender and feminism in higher education scholarship is rather limited. However, three studies in particular (Townsend, 1993; Twombly, 1993; Ward & Grant, 1996) have provided a critical background for the current study. Townsend (1993) found through the review of journal article titles in her sample that only 3.9% focused on women or topics germane to women. Among these articles, women were the lead or only author of more than half. Townsend then applied feminist phase theory to categorize the nature of the woman-focused scholarship. Using this framework, she categorized only one article as feminist scholarship. Since Townsend (a) purposively sampled particular time periods for analysis rather than analyzed all articles from 1967 through the late 1980s, (b) only used article titles to determine whether gender is a salient category in higher education scholarship, (c) and only looked at women as authors in the articles she identified as about women, her analysis may underestimate the work about and by women as well as the extent to which higher education scholarship is feminist. However, her analysis gives us an important place to start to understand gender and feminism in the field of higher education, particularly as it relates to a time in history when the women's movement was active.

Twombly (1993) explored scholarship that focused on gender and community colleges from 1970 to 1989. She found that of the 174 articles identified in a variety of publication sources (although predominantly from community college journals), nearly two thirds of the articles were first or sole authored by women. She also found that there were fewer articles related to women in the last 5 years of her data, showing a decreasing interest in these topics as the Second Wave of feminism ebbed. Like Townsend, Twombly then applied feminist phase theory to the woman-centered articles. She classified only 8 articles as either feminist or multifocal scholarship; most articles that were able to be classified (150) fell into the lower stages of feminist phase theory.

Work by Ward and Grant (1996) echoed the findings of Townsend (1993) and Twombly (1993) that research about women is more often written by women. This research goes beyond previous work to explore academic publishing through three stages (prepublication, publication seeking, and postpublication). The authors showed that over time, some improvements have been made with regard to the numbers of women who publish and to the numbers of articles about women, but there may be gender biases that exist at various points in the publication process that negatively influence full participation of women (Ward & Grant, 1996).

Gender and Feminism in Other Disciplinary Discourse

Researchers in economics, community psychology, sociology, archeology, communication, family studies, and business have also conducted studies to understand better the impact of gender and feminism on discipline-based scholarship (Albelda, 1995; Angelique & Culley, 2003; Clemens, Powell, McIlwaine, & Okamoto, 1995; Hays-Gilpin, 2000; Stephen, 2000; Thompson & Walker, 1995; Walters, Fry, & Chaisson, 1990). Walters et al. focused their work on women as authors in business journals. They found that in business, the numbers of women authors have increased over time (1962–1984). When looking at gender as a variable, Clemens et al.'s data showed a relationship between the gender of an author and the author's methodology. Women in sociology tend to publish more qualitative work than men publish, while the quantitative work of men is published more frequently. In economics, community psychology, archeology, communication, and family studies, the researchers focused their studies on feminism in disciplinary scholarship. In all cases, feminist perspectives have slightly increased in the literatures over time. However, feminism is not considered part of the "mainstream" in these disciplines. Rather, feminist perspectives are relegated to separate publication spheres or subdisciplines (Albelda, 1995; Angelique & Culley, 2003; Hays-Gilpin, 2000; Stephen, 2000; Thompson & Walker, 1995).

Overall, the trends in a variety of disciplines and fields are consistent. Women are publishing more frequently in academic journals, and when work about women is conducted, it is more often written by a woman or women. However, according to the literature, the influence of feminism remains marginal. Further, with regard to higher education as a field of study, the work by and about women and the work written from a feminist perspective in the core journals has not been analyzed in 20 years, thus prompting the current investigation.

Scholarly work in higher education is multidisciplinary and includes a broad range of themes (Townsend, 1993). Women and feminism are just two of the many possible topics. However, given the increasing roles of women in higher education over the last 20 years, coupled with the effort of higher education scholars to include a diversity of voices, investigating academic work during the current wave of feminism may illustrate how higher education has responded to this changing landscape.

Methodology

For this 13-year period (1990–2002), I counted titles that indicated that an article concerned women or a subject especially associated with

women (DuBois et al., 1985). The titles were compiled by copying the title pages from *RHE* and *JHE*. For *ResHE*, the back cover was the data source, as it served as the table of contents for that publication. Since book reviews, presidential addresses, research or editorial notes, and review essays were not features in all the selected journals, I decided not to count those items; only research articles were included in my analysis.

To determine whether a title should be counted, I looked for specific code words. Titles that were considered to address women and/or feminism contained at least one of the following words: woman, women, girl(s), sister(s), sorority, wife, daughter, maternal, mother, she, her, female, lesbian, gender, sex, sexist, sexism, feminization, feminist, and feminism. Articles coded as feminist in the title contained the word *feminism* or *feminist*, which meant that those titles appeared in the totals for the categories of gender and feminism, as shown in the findings section of this paper.

After counting gendered titles, I used the same coding strategy to count abstracts. I did so because I assumed that, in some cases, abstracts might address women or feminism despite the fact that the title did not suggest it. It is important to mention that for *RHE* and *JHE*, abstracts followed the title of each article on the title pages (except for one issue of *RHE*), and those abstracts served as data sources. However, my coding process was slightly different for *ResHE*. Since abstracts did not accompany the article titles as in the other journals, I analyzed the abstracts that appeared at the beginning of each journal article. This method was employed for all articles in *ResHE*, except for two that did not include abstracts. For those articles, and for the articles in the anomalous issue of *RHE*, I used the abstract listed in the on-line Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) database.

I also counted all articles (not only those that were coded as gendered) that were written by women. Author names accompanied the titles of all journal articles under investigation. I used the first name to determine an author's gender. If a name was androgynous, initialed, or unfamiliar, I did not count it as female. Although less than 7% of the authors fit into this category, the number of women authors counted may err slightly on the low side. With the authors, I disaggregated them by counting single-authored papers; coauthored papers by women; and coauthored papers where at least one woman was listed but where men also contributed to the work. Through this analysis, I hoped to get a sense of whether the gender of the author has factored into publishing patterns.

Finally, since I am particularly interested in feminist scholarship, and not all gendered work is feminist (Townsend, 1993), I read the text of all articles that were coded as feminist from the title or abstract. Both Townsend (1993) and Twombly (1993) used feminist phase theory

(Tetrault, 1985) to understand better how women were conceptualized in higher education literature. In both cases, the authors noted limitations in using feminist phase theory for categorization purposes. Rather than replicating that methodology, I chose to explore the treatment of gender, and specifically feminism, using a different approach.

Townsend (1993) stated that “the intent of the researcher should probably be the determining factor” (p. 36) in determining whether scholarly work should be labeled as feminist. This statement by Townsend partially drove my decision to look only at the articles that were categorized because of the use of “feminism” or “feminist” in the title and/or abstract. While other articles may use a feminist theoretical frame, only those that explicitly foregrounded a feminist theoretical frame in a title and/or abstract were analyzed, assuming that it was the intent of the author(s) to consider the work as feminist. After identifying those articles using a foregrounded feminist frame, those articles were analyzed to understand what particular strand of feminism influenced the work.

This part of the analysis was conducted in two stages. First, I determined whether the articles that were coded as feminist from the title and/or abstract were written from a feminist perspective. Evidence of the words *feminist* or *feminism* did not imply that the work was grounded in feminist theory. To identify the work as feminist, I adapted a definition of feminism for this study from Stanley’s (1990) and Worell’s (1994) work on feminist research. This definition was used to categorize whether a particular article was written from a feminist perspective. To be identified as feminist, the work must challenge gender oppression (patriarchy) and include implications for social change. This means that the scholarship cannot solely seek to inform and raise awareness of gender oppression; it must also be proactive in suggesting remedies for inequity. For, to be true to the nature of feminism, feminist scholarship must be rooted in activism and social change. Indeed, Ropers-Huilman (2000) found that engaging in scholarship for social change contributes to the success of feminist academics.

While the methods scholars use in their research can support a feminist agenda, I did not rely on the methodology alone to categorize a particular article. Like Stanley (1990) and Martin (2000), I strongly believe that no one set of methods should be seen as distinctly feminist. Moreover, “feminists should use any and every means available for investigating the ‘condition of women in sexist society’” (Stanley, 1990, p. 12). Thus, the integrity of the research in toto must be considered in order to determine whether it is feminist in nature.

After categorizing an article as feminist, I further analyzed the language of the article and the supporting references to determine the particular strand, or in some cases, strands, of feminism that framed the text

(liberal, radical, left, or psychoanalytic). Evidence within the text of the article about the source of the problem discussed was important to my analysis. Whether the problem was identified as salient only for an individual or was a result of a patriarchal system influenced my categorization of the strand of feminism used. Further, since social change is fundamental to my definition of feminism, the implications and recommendations purported in the articles were significant in helping me determine the feminist strand that influenced the author or authors. Finally, the discourse used by the author or authors was critical. Is the purpose of the article to help correct stereotypes and false information, or is the purpose to confront the reasons why those beliefs are perpetuated (Johnson, 1997)? I selected liberal, radical, left, and psychoanalytic feminism not because they are the only strands of feminism, but because they are among those that are often included in discussions about feminism (Whelehan, 1995).² While all feminist stands are “founded upon the belief that women suffer from systematic social injustices because of their sex . . . [and are] committed to some form of reappraisal of the position of women in society” (Whelehan, p. 25), each strand differs in defining the source of oppression. It is important to explore briefly each strand in order to understand the nuances that led to an article’s identification as liberal, radical, left, or psychoanalytic feminism.

Liberal Feminism

Liberal feminism, as its name suggests, finds its roots in liberalism. Individual autonomy and the right to self-determination are primary values, and the burden is on the individual to redress inequity (Black, 1989; Calas & Smircich, 1996; Jaggar, 1983; Whelehan, 1995). This dominant strand of feminism adapts the arguments of rational structural/functional theories that have traditionally omitted women to guide attempts to ensure equal treatment in the labor force (Shelton & Agger, 1993). Liberal feminists believe that women should have equal access to a meritocracy and are reluctant to oppose the economic system that is in place (i.e., capitalism), for when the system is void of discrimination, it appropriately rewards the most productive (Whelehan, 1995).

Liberal feminists believe that equal treatment in the workplace is the ultimate goal. Unlike some of the other strands of contemporary feminism, liberal feminism is primarily concerned with women’s roles outside the home. Domestic labor, including childcare, are still considered part of the woman’s domain in liberal feminism; however, what occurs in the domestic sphere is not central to the concerns liberal feminists are trying to address (Whelehan, 1995).

Radical Feminism

Radical feminists differ from liberal feminists in that they seek cultural transformation, not just equity (Calas & Smircich, 1996; Whelehan, 1995). In addition, separatism, not assimilation, is a hallmark of this paradigm (Black, 1989) and is what makes “radical” feminism radical. However, radical feminism is difficult to define and trace to a particular theoretical influence or influences because its epistemology is diverse, created from the voices and experiences of different women (Jaggar, 1983; Whelehan, 1995). Furthermore, personal life is the focus, rather than social structures. Radical feminists coined the phrase “the personal is political” that many strands now endorse (Whelehan, 1995).

Radical feminism portrays alternate worlds outside of patriarchy. Through grassroots mobilization, radical feminists create “womanspace,” separatist enclaves to raise awareness about the oppression of patriarchy. This “consciousness raising” is a fundamental strategy for this strand of feminists; for, without understanding, one lives with false consciousness and cannot adequately question the dominant oppressive culture.

Jaggar (1983) states that radical feminists want evolutionary change. Through consciousness raising and developing a women’s culture through art, literature, and music, radical feminists seek to undermine rather than to overthrow patriarchy (Jaggar, 1983; Whelehan, 1995). In addition, oppression is focused on women as women, not as workers, directing change at institutions like marriage, sexuality, and love. These strategies and goals are rarely considered a part of the fabric of academe. Yet, radical feminism can influence academic activism.

Left Feminism

While maintaining the radical feminist mantra of the personal is political, left feminists describe dual sources of oppression. Not only does patriarchy oppress women but the capitalist labor economy also oppresses them (Shelton & Agger, 1993). Scholars label this strand of feminism as Marxist, social, socialist, or left (Black, 1989; Calas & Smircich, 1996; Jaggar, 1983; Shelton & Agger, 1993; Whelehan, 1995), although some make a slight distinction between Marxist and socialist feminism. For example, according to Calas and Smircich (1996) and Jaggar (1983), Marxist feminism focuses primarily on modes of production in the non-domestic economy. Socialist feminists, as described by these scholars, emphasize the domestic and external labor markets and include the influences of culture and politics. However, some scholars

do not make such a distinction. Because of the somewhat inconsistent ways this strand of feminism is described, I have chosen to adopt Shelton & Agger's moniker, left feminism. Left feminism, as I use it, is influenced by Marxism and the oppression of class struggle, but like Calas and Smircich's and Jaggar's theory of socialist feminism, it combines a multi-issue politics to explain that oppression is mutually influenced by capitalism, patriarchy, culture, and history. These feminists are critical of liberal feminists for lacking some understanding of the labor process (Calas & Smircich, 1996). Moreover, unlike radical feminists, left feminists encourage men to become involved in confronting the sources of oppression. Failure to include men will only continue to perpetuate patriarchy (Whelehan, 1995).

Psychoanalytic Feminism

As the name suggests, psychoanalytic feminism is rooted in psychology—specifically in the work of Freud but correcting his misogynist biases (Calas & Smircich, 1996). This perspective focuses on the differences in the ways of knowing, understanding, and perceiving the world created by patriarchy. While proponents of this strand of feminism tend to reject biological determinism, psychoanalytic feminism is often considered essentialist because it focuses on the unique female nature (Whelehan, 1995). This is to say that men and women are fundamentally different. Whether criticized as essentialist or not, this strand does not limit women to the sphere of work or of home. Rather, it emphasizes the emotional connections that evolve in all daily social interactions (Calas & Smircich, 1996; Whelehan, 1995).

Limitations

I made a methodological decision to analyze the content of articles that foregrounded the language of feminism in the titles and/or abstracts. This is a limitation, as some authors might approach their work from a feminist perspective but do not emphasize their theoretical underpinnings in their titles or abstracts. Due to the design of this study, such articles would be excluded from the analysis. To have a complete understanding of the extent to which feminism is incorporated in the scholarship of the journals under investigation, every article (N = 1065) would need to be analyzed. However, it is important to reinforce that this methodological decision does account for those studies that were most explicit about their feminist frame and provides an understanding of the extent to which feminism is central to the scholarly work in these publications.

Another limitation to this study is related to the analysis. Ward and Grant (1996) review academic literature through prepublication, publication seeking, and postpublication and articulate the challenges of fully exploring the prepublication and publication-seeking processes. The current study is limited by those challenges; this work focuses solely on the postpublication process in three journals (i.e., articles that were published in *RHE*, *JHE*, and *ResHE* from 1990–2002). No data were gathered regarding motivation of potential authors in the prepublication process, and the confidential nature of the blind review process makes data collection difficult, if not impossible, in the publication-seeking process for this study. Thus, many of the proposed explanations for the findings presented in this study are informed by previous scholarship about gender and feminism in the academy, but they are speculative in nature.

Research Questions

Given the multifaceted design and identified limitations of my study, the research questions I sought to answer are:

1. How many articles are about or concern women?
2. Are articles written from a feminist perspective?
3. If so, what strand of feminism is used as a conceptual framework?
4. How many articles are written by women?

Findings and Discussion

Articles about Women

Gender is most salient in *ResHE*, coded in 18.8% of the abstracts (see Table 3), and in *JHE*, coded in 18.2% of the abstracts (see Table 2), and least salient in *RHE*, coded in 14.1% of the abstracts (see Table 1). It is worth noting that from analyzing the content of the titles and abstracts, gender appeared to be used most often (and only) as a quantitative variable in *ResHE*, limiting the likelihood of a feminist framework for those particular articles. However, to make a definitive claim, an extensive document analysis of all the articles would be necessary.

This study shows that women and feminism are explicitly included in 186 (or 17.5%) of the articles (see Table 4). A similar study by Townsend (1993) looked at a sample of the titles and subtitles of articles in these same journals from 1969–1989. She found that, even in the height of Second Wave Feminism, few articles (3.9%) focused on women's experiences and concerns. Therefore, it appears that over time, the frequency in which women have been included in articles has improved. However,

the increase in Townsend's study from one article identified as feminist to six articles in my study is not revolutionary. This shows that the role of feminism and women has neither waxed nor waned. Thus, the marginal status of feminism in higher education scholarship that Townsend found has continued. A backlash against feminism is not evident, but a continued backgrounding of feminism is. This finding supports Martin's (2000) analysis of women in the academy as individuals who are contained. For Martin, containment suggests that women are not outsiders, evidenced by their increasing presence. Yet, their voices, and particularly feminist voices, are silenced to such a degree that the patriarchal culture is replicated rather than transformed. Thus, traditional disciplinary scholarly outlets remain consistent over time with regard to the inclusion of feminist voices and theoretical influences.

TABLE 1
Review of Higher Education (1990–2002)

	1990–1992		1993–1995		1996–1998		1999–2002		Totals	
Number of Articles	58		61		57		79		255	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Gender in Title	4	6.9	6	9.8	6	10.5	8	10.1	24	9.4
Feminism in Title	1	1.7	1	1.6	1	1.8	0	0	3	1.2
Gender in Abstract	8	13.7	7	11.5	12	21.1	9	11.4	36	14.1
Feminism in Abstract	1	1.7	1	1.6	1	1.8	0	0	3	1.2
Woman Author	8	13.7	14	23	9	15.8	14	17.7	45	17.6
Coauthors (all female)	5	8.6	7	11.5	8	14.0	5	6.3	25	9.8
Coauthors (female & male)	13	22.4	14	23	13	22.8	21	26.6	61	23.9
Coauthors (all male)	7	12.1	6	9.8	5	8.8	8	10.1	26	10.2
Unknown Author	0	0	2	3.3	1	1.8	5	6.3	8	3.1

TABLE 2
Journal in Higher Education (1990–2002)

	1990–1992		1993–1995		1996–1998		1999–2002		Totals	
Number of Articles	82		85		79		111		357	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Gender in Title	8	9.8	15	17.6	12	15.2	6	5.4	41	11.5
Feminism in Title	0	0	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	1	0.3
Gender in Abstract	12	14.6	18	21.2	19	24.1	16	14.4	65	18.2
Feminism in Abstract	0	0	2	2.4	0	0	0	0	2	0.6
Woman Author	16	19.5	15	17.6	14	17.7	16	14.4	61	17.1
Coauthors (all female)	8	9.8	6	7.1	4	5.1	7	6.3	25	7
Coauthors (female & male)	12	14.6	21	24.7	14	17.7	28	25.2	75	21
Coauthors (all male)	7	8.5	13	15.3	11	13.9	14	12.6	45	12.6
Unknown Author	6	7.3	1	1.2	6	7.6	5	4.5	18	5

TABLE 3
Research in Higher Education (1990–2002)

	1990–1992		1993–1995		1996–1998		1999–2002		Totals	
Number of Articles	117		108		98		130		453	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Gender in Title	9	7.7	4	3.7	11	11.2	15	11.5	39	8.6
Feminism in Title	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gender in Abstract	20	17.1	18	16.7	26	26.5	21	16.2	85	18.8
Feminism in Abstract	2	1.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.4
Woman Author	14	12	15	13.9	6	6.1	21	16.2	56	12.4
Coauthors (all female)	8	6.8	7	6.5	10	10.2	3	2.3	28	6.2
Coauthors (female & male)	25	21.4	23	21.3	30	30.6	38	29.2	116	25.6
Coauthors (all male)	17	14.5	26	24.1	25	25.5	21	16.2	89	19.6
Unknown Author	12	10.3	8	7.4	9	9.2	16	12.3	45	9.9

TABLE 4
Totals for Three Core Publications in Higher Education (1990–2002)

	#	%
Article Totals	1065	
Gender in title	104	9.8%
Gender in abstract	186	17.5%
Articles including feminism in title and/or abstract	7	0.66%
Single Female Author	162	15.2%
Coauthors (all female)	78	7.3%
Coauthors (female & male)	252	23.7%
Single Male Author	342	32.1%
Coauthors (all male)	160	15%

The data suggest that there is no consistent pattern over the 13 years under investigation with regard to the treatment of women. The numbers have fluctuated for all three journals (see Tables 1–3). What is clear is that feminism is rarely (seven articles, or 0.66% of all articles analyzed) mentioned in scholarly titles or abstracts from 1990–2002.

Articles Framed by Feminism

As previously mentioned, scholarly work in higher education is multidisciplinary and includes a broad range of themes (Townsend, 1993). Women and feminism are just two of the many possible topics. Therefore, given the broad range of social theories that could guide scholarly work, some may argue that 0.66% of all the articles over a 13-year period in three journals identifying feminism is understandable, particularly since the data are only an approximation because the findings

are predicated only on titles and abstracts, not on an in-depth discourse analysis of all 1065 articles. However, when those seven articles that explicitly referred to feminism in the title, abstract, or both were analyzed, one of the seven articles was not considered feminist by the researcher. The language of feminism in the article was used only to provide an example of a paradigm that might emerge from the data the researcher analyzed, not the paradigm that the researcher used to influence his work (Milam, 1991). Thus, the findings vis à vis feminism may be a slight underestimation, but with my additional analysis of articles where the intent of the researcher(s) appeared to be grounded in feminism, one can now only include 0.56% of the total in that category.

Of the remaining six articles that explicitly mention feminism in the title, abstract, or both, the strands of feminism employed were difficult to isolate. In all cases except one (Horn, Holzemer, & Meleis, 1990), I identified more than one strand that influenced the work of the scholars. Five of six articles showed elements of liberal feminism; four showed elements of radical feminism; two showed elements of psychoanalytic feminism; and one article was particularly complex with perspectives shaped by postmodern feminism and left feminism as well as by the aforementioned and radical perspectives.

Although it is impossible to determine the total number of articles that are framed by feminism using my design, there are 7 articles of the 1065 under investigation that “risk” explicitly mentioning feminism in either the title or abstract, and 6 that grounded themselves in feminist theory. The titles of those article are as follows:

1. “Feminists at work: Collaborative relationships among women faculty” (Dickens & Sagaria, 1997);
2. “E pluribus unum? Academic structure, culture, and the case of feminist scholarship” (Gumport, 1991);
3. “Doctoral advisement relationships between women: On friendship and betrayal” (Heinrich, 1995);
4. “A comparative study of Israeli female students in nontraditional (engineering) and traditional (humanities) fields of study” (Horn, Holzemer, & Meleis, 1990);
5. “Feminist scholarship in core higher education journals” (Townsend, 1993);
6. “What we know about women in community colleges: An examination of the literature using feminist phase theory” (Twombly, 1993).

As previously mentioned, nearly all of the articles employ elements of liberal feminism. For Twombly (1993) and Townsend (1993), they bring awareness to the paucity of women as scholars, but the very nature of the

articles (and certainly the very nature of this article as well) reinforces a system that may better include women by opening it to women and broader theoretical perspectives rather than creating a new system. In fact, in Townsend's concluding remarks, she recommends that methodological boundaries should be "pushed back," that "new visions" and "new insights" (p. 36) about governance and teaching and learning should be welcomed. This language enlarges the scope of institutional practices, consistent with a liberal feminist perspective.

Likewise, Dickens and Sagaria (1997) describe experiences of women who collaborate in their scholarship. While they indicate that some of the women in their study are concerned about the perception of collaborative work in the academic reward process, the authors do not put forth ideas about how to change the system to reward collaborative and feminist work. Thus, the underlying assumption is that the system may be adequate.

Heinrich (1995) sees advising as part of the social network that will help women doctoral students succeed in the academy. She challenges some of the ways that women faculty currently advise doctoral students and calls for a different way to socialize women rather than for drastically changing the system, again showing elements of a liberal feminist perspective informing her work.

Finally, Horn et al. (1990) call for the recruitment of women into engineering, socialization of teachers about sex role stereotypes, and the creation of networks of women to provide support to women in male-dominated disciplines. The essence of this article demonstrated the inequities and ultimately called for equal representation and a level playing field, values central to liberal feminism.

Using a liberal feminist lens as a theoretical framework is not entirely surprising, as liberal feminism is the least controversial of the many strands of feminism. The goal of liberal feminism is to work within the existing structure—consistent with the very process of academic scholarship itself—to reach equity. Further, it is likely the most palatable perspective for reviewers and editors, a factor that should not be minimized given the publishing demands implicit in the academic reward system.

Four articles included aspects that I considered elements of radical feminism. Gumport (1991) discusses the multiple loyalties some faculty have within one organizational context. Rather than just educating readers to become more sensitive to this perspective in the academy, she states: "The nature of academic organization needs to be reconceptualized because departmental units do not necessarily or inevitably determine behavior" (Gumport, p. 25). This is clearly a radical perspective, one that calls for a new system to be put in place rather than a liberal perspective that would more likely suggest that the current system take these multiple loyalties into account.

Twombly's (1993) radical influences come through in her critique of research and writing about women in community colleges. She argues that the portrayal of women as victims does not seek to challenge patriarchy. Women are too often positioned in the literature as individuals who need to fit within the existing system, and this approach is inadequate.

At the outset of her study, Townsend (1993) articulates the following: "feminist scholarship has the potential to generate a transformation of the academy" (p. 22). By seeing feminist work as transformative and her work as feminist, this inclusion in the body of knowledge intends, by its very nature, to be radical.

Dickens and Sagaria (1997) describe the collaboration of feminist scholars. They couch these relationships in the language of creating a "women's sphere" (p. 82). By creating spaces for women, separate from those with men or of men, these collaborative efforts seek to challenge the patriarchal norms rather than to discover ways to insert women into the existing male networks. Further, it is the women who are part of these radical feminist spheres who are the subjects of Dickens and Sagaria's study.

Like liberal feminism, psychoanalytic feminism tends to seek solutions by modifying, not by dismantling, the existing system. Furthermore, the language of growth and development, particularly when discussing students, is popular in this scholarship. As such, it is not surprising that psychoanalytic feminism appears to undergird some of the feminist articles identified in this study. Heinrich's (1995) study explores relationships between women advisors and their doctoral student advisees that are reminiscent of mother-daughter relationships. She conceptualizes connections between women as the cornerstone of graduate student development and hopes to encourage an academy that welcomes a "matrilineal line of initiation" (Estes, cited in Heinrich, p. 467). The focus on development, connection, and relationship are central to a psychoanalytic feminist perspective. Similarly, Dickens and Sagaria (1997) categorize some of their findings in language that reflects a psychoanalytic paradigm. For example, they categorize collaborative relationships that nurture and that are emotionally close.

Gumport's (1990) article includes a critique of problem-solving strategies based upon market forces, incorporating elements of Marxism or left feminism. Further, Gumport focuses on the subjective interpretations of institutions, and the lack of an overarching narrative for the academy demonstrates that her work is also influenced by a postmodern feminist perspective (as gender and improving the climate for women is also an underlying and recurrent theme throughout her work).

It is important to reiterate that nearly all of the feminist articles used a combination of strands, just as the previous analysis of Gumport's

(1990) work exemplifies. This suggests that feminism is a complex theoretical perspective. The diversity of theoretical and professional influences contributes to creating the foundation of one's intellectual agenda. Thus, the face of academic feminism, as identified in scholarship, is equally diverse. Amidst this diversity, however, is a powerful thread of liberal feminism. While it may be true that authors included elements of liberal feminism to intentionally "soften the feminist blow," I also believe that many academic feminists truly embrace liberal feminism. In fact, research conducted by Safarik (2003) supports this belief. Safarik indicates that liberal feminism is the prevailing feminist perspective among faculty. Moreover, feminism and one's profession are mutually shaping, and working in and studying the academy support the perspective that on some level, the system works. As academics, to some degree we have benefited by that system. Therefore, the presence of liberal feminist ideology in feminist scholarship is not surprising. Although the assumed safety of academic freedom should make room for more feminists representing different strands, the evidence from this study suggests otherwise. This is to say that while employing a theoretical frame that includes more than one strand of feminism increases the complexity and diversity of academic feminism, many strands of feminism do remain in the margins.

Women as Authors

Despite the smaller numbers of titles and abstracts dealing with gender and particularly with feminism, scholarship by women *is* included in the core higher education journals. However, like Townsend's (1993) and Twombly's (1993) findings, over two thirds of the articles about women, feminism, or both are written by at least one female author (75% in *RHE*, 65.9% in *ResHE*, and 70.8% in *JHE*) (see Tables 1–3). When one looks at the aggregate, female authors, whether a single author or coauthor and no matter what the content of their work, appeared in 51.3% of the articles in *RHE*, in 44.2% of the articles in *ResHE*, and in 45.1% of the articles in *JHE*. Male authors appeared in 69.5% of the articles in *RHE*, 71.5% of the articles in *ResHE*, and 70.9% of the articles in *JHE*. Moreover, despite the numbers of women who are successfully participating in the publication process in these core journals, in 7 of the 13 years under investigation for *RHE* and *ResHE*, single-authored articles by men were the most prevalent. For *JHE*, males as a single author were the most prevalent in 8 of the 13 years.

While it is encouraging that women are publishing at a reasonable rate in these journals, what is also peculiar is that women coauthor articles

with men more often than they serve as a single author or as a coauthor with other women. It is possible that since more men are tenured faculty, junior faculty, including women, are writing with senior men in order to initiate a publishing career. Or, perhaps, more men are writing from a feminist perspective and women are collaborating with them. It is also possible that this phenomenon (i.e., women coauthoring more often with men than with other women), like those previously described, is linked to a concern that women may not be embraced by the academic community and may face a backlash. This may mean that editors and reviewers are less likely to consider gendered or feminist work or that authors are less willing to submit gendered or feminist work (Townsend, 1993). Supporting and expanding on this, Glazer-Raymo (1999) posits that women in higher education “continue to be reticent about characterizing their research as feminist” (p.31). Therefore, the potential or fear of a backlash and/or marginalization from academic colleagues may be too large a price to pay for women (and men) to integrate feminist perspectives into their scholarship (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Kolodny, 1998). This is to suggest that some may be concerned that their work may be discounted or disregarded solely because they are women, feminists, or both.

As a result of the aforementioned concerns, women may look for other ways (e.g., publishing with men) to insert themselves into the academic discourse in the journals under investigation in this study. Judith Worell (1994) supports this fear by stating that many authors, because of their gender and minority status, are less likely to find publication outlets in major scholarly journals. Furthermore, women’s work is cited less than that of men, and women are listed less often as first author than men are (Worell, 1994). In addition, the data from this study show that women coauthor with other women less than they do with men. While choosing to write with other women is often considered a feminist strategy (Dickens & Sagaria, 1997), the very fact that it is a *feminist* strategy may make coauthorship with other women rare. Employing this strategy is risky when the likelihood of publication is perceived as being in jeopardy when women are coauthors rather than including a male voice.

Missing Voices

Although the findings of this research are limited by the fact that I only coded titles and abstracts, they do demonstrate that women and feminism are not dominant in higher education discourse. Even less dominant appear to be certain aspects of women’s lives. While the design of this study did not allow for empirical evidence related to those voices that are missing, some patterns did emerge while analyzing the

titles and abstracts in this study. Specifically, the data examined rarely focus on gender as it relates to race, class, sexual orientation, and age. This pattern supports Alemán's (2003) contention that race and gender are treated as separate phenomena in the academy; the intersection of gender with race, class, sexual orientation, age or other aspects of women's lives are rarely examined in the literature.

Also of little consequence in this survey of titles and abstracts are the large numbers of women in the academy other than faculty or students. By this, I mean that few articles focus on administrators and staff in the academy. Rather, the vast majority of articles about women address roles as students or faculty. Again, Alemán (2003) supports this trend by identifying that "in the decades since 1960, American post-secondary scholarship on race and gender reveals that the principal research concerns have been enrollment, persistence, and the participation patterns of women and minorities" (p. 188). Here, Alemán refers to aspects of students' lives, but as she continues in the same chapter, she also identifies the inclusion of scholarship related to women and minorities as it relates to faculty, primarily in their roles as mentors and teachers, further reinforcing the theme that emerged in my study. Finally, I noted that discussions about feminism as a multi-issue politics or even as some form of balkanized identity politics are also missing from the literature under investigation. These voids indicate that further research must be conducted and included in the literature in order to represent the broad range of women's and feminists' voices in academe.

Conclusion

Townsend (1993) found in her analysis of titles that only 3.9% of higher education scholarship in the three core journals included discourse about women. Since her study, the inclusion of women as a subject, reflected in the titles of higher education scholarship has increased to 9.8%. This is an improvement over time; however, when looking at the saliency of feminism, as found in both titles *and* abstracts during this same period, less than 1% of articles in the *Journal of Higher Education*, the *Review of Higher Education*, and *Research in Higher Education* includes the language of feminism. Women and, particularly feminism, are not prevalent themes in recent higher education scholarship, a reality that has not changed dramatically since 1969 (Townsend, 1993).

It is important to note that work that did not include the code words of *feminism* or *feminist* in the titles or abstracts does not mean that the work might not be feminist. Similarly, articles that do not include the gendered code words in their titles and abstracts may incorporate women as

a salient focus. To have a more complete understanding, discourse analysis of all 1065 articles would have to be conducted. However, this study did identify work where the authorial intent was most explicit in including the language of feminism in the discourse due to the foregrounding of feminism and feminist in the title, abstract, or both, which does provide meaningful evidence about the position of feminism in the scholarship under investigation.

Although the number of articles that are explicit in the inclusion of feminism is relatively small, analyses of those articles show that feminism as a theoretical frame is extremely complex. Evidence of liberal feminism appears in all but one of the articles under investigation, but rarely was liberalism the only influence in the feminist frames that guided the scholarship. Voices framed by radical, psychoanalytic, and left feminism were also included, reflecting the diversity of academic feminism.

Future Research

While this study expands upon the work done by Townsend (1993) and related work by Twombly (1993), it contributes new reflections of the theoretical underpinnings that shape the feminist work (albeit limited) that has been included in higher education scholarship over the last 13 years. Moreover, this study can serve as a springboard for other research. For example, similar studies that look at race, class, and sexual orientation can better inform the academic community about what scholarship is valued and what scholarship needs to be inserted into the academic discourse. It would also be meaningful to identify more specifically the topics about women that are in the literature. This study looked at women and feminism and identified some broader patterns about aspects of women's lives that are included in or missing from the literature in these journals. A richer understanding of issues significant to women's lives that are un- or under-studied needs to be established. In addition, it would be interesting to expand this study to include conference proceedings for the professional organizations related to these journals. Such a study could seek to answer whether journals mirror conference content and whether woman-related or feminist issues are more welcomed at professional meetings than in journals. Although prepublication research is very difficult to conduct, as work by Ward and Grant (1996) has found, it would be informative to explore the prepublication process to collect data on how many articles that use an explicit feminist framework are submitted to the journals under investigation in this paper. Finally, a call for feminist research from a variety of strands can

move the academy to a place where issues of gender, including feminist perspectives not only guided by liberalism, will be perceived as, and will be, welcomed.

Implications

Ultimately, the findings from this study support Martin's (2000) belief that while women are increasingly present in the academy (and in the academic literature as authors and coauthors), academic culture has changed very little. There is a paucity of explicitly feminist scholarship in the journals under investigation. Further, articles that do foreground feminism demonstrate a tendency toward liberal feminism, which relies on maintaining the existing academic structure, although making it more inclusive of women. Yet, the complexity of feminism cannot be disregarded; for although liberal feminism is the most evident in the findings in this study, multiple strands do inform the limited amount of scholarship. The diversity should not stop with the construction of academic feminism, however. Scholars should be encouraged to explore the intersectionality of women's lives—race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, and other aspects need to be included in the discourse, not as they relate to the majority populations but as they exist in and of themselves.

Scholars—women and men—should be encouraged to speak from a variety of theoretical perspectives and should not fear that their voices will be silenced. Feminism is often considered a marginal voice, and it, as with other voices from the margins, should be brought into the mainstream in the journals that are considered central to our field of study. Editors and reviewers should create opportunities for work by and about women in the academy and should seek out feminist scholars to serve in such roles in the near future. Special issues and sections about gender-related issues and feminism within the core journals do send a message that these issues are important, but I would encourage the incorporation of these topics and influences into the broader discourse, not their relegation to a separate (marginal) place in the journals. I believe that the findings from this study suggest that, in order to incorporate the missing voices and to increase the diversity of thought, including increasing the presence of explicitly feminist work, the higher education community must work together. It is not the sole responsibility of the feminist scholars to introduce feminist and gendered work into the academic journals, although those efforts must continue. To create a change, the climate must become one where there is no longer fear that gendered or feminist work will be devalued or disregarded. In our research, teaching, and service roles, we must purposefully change the climate so that a diver-

sity of voices will be welcomed in our core publications, in our classrooms, and in our professional organizations and committee work.

Notes

¹However, it should be noted that among faculty ranks, women make up only 20.8% of full professors and 35.3% of associate professors (“The nation,” 2003), which suggests that there is still considerable room for improvement.

²I was open to other perspectives in my analysis and anticipated additional explanations of feminist strands—e.g., postmodernism, lesbianism, womanism, and Black feminism—should they emerge from my data.

References

- Alemán, A. M. M. (2003). Gender, race, and millennial curiosity. In B. Ropers-Huilman (Ed.), *Gendered futures in higher education: Critical perspectives for change* (pp. 179–198). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Albelda, R. (1995, Summer). The impact of feminism in economics—beyond the pale? A discussion and survey results. *Journal of Economic Education*, 253–273.
- Angelique, H. L., & Culley, M. R. (2003). Feminism found: An examination of gender consciousness in community psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 31(3), 189–209.
- Black, N. (1989). *Social feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Calas, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1996). From “the woman’s” point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational studies* (pp. 218–257). London: Sage.
- Clemens, E. S., Powell, W. W., McIlwaine, K., & Okamoto, D. (1995). Careers in print: Books, journals, and scholarly reputations. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 101(2), 433–494.
- Dickens, C. S., & Sagaria, M. A. D. (1997). Feminists at work: Collaborative relationships among women faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(1), 79–101.
- DuBois, E. C., Kelly, G. P., Kennedy, E. L., Korsmeyer, C. W., & Robinson, L. S. (1985). *Feminist scholarship: Kindling in the groves of academe*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gumport, P. J. (1991). E pluribus unum? Academic structure, culture, and the case of feminist scholarship. *The Review of Higher Education*, 15(1), 9–29.
- Hays-Gilpin, K. (2000). Feminist scholarship in archaeology. *The Annals of the American Academy*, 571, 89–106.
- Heinrich, K. T. (1995). Doctoral advisement relationships between women: On friendship and betrayal. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(4), 447–469.
- Horn, H., Holzemer, W. L., & Meleis, A. I. (1990). A comparative study of Israeli female students in nontraditional (engineering) and traditional (humanities) fields of study. *Research in Higher Education*, 31(2), 177–192.
- Jaggard, A. M. (1983). *Feminist politics and human nature*. Sussex, England: Harvester Press.

- Johnson, A. G. (1997). *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kolodny, A. *Failing the future: A dean looks at higher education in the twenty-first century*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (2000). *Coming of age in academe: Rekindling women's hopes and reforming the academy*. New York: Routledge.
- Milam, Jr., J. H. (1991). The presence of paradigms in the core higher education journal literature. *Research in Higher Education*, 32(6), 651–668. The nation. (2003). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(1) [Almanac issue], 2–31.
- Ropers-Huilman, B. (2000, Spring). Aren't you satisfied yet? Women faculty members' interpretations of their academic work. In L. S. Hagedorn (Vol. Ed.), *What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff: Vol. 105. New directions for institutional research*, (pp. 21–32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Safarik, L. (2003). Feminist transformation in higher education: Discipline, structure, and institution. *Review of Higher Education*, 26(4), 419–445.
- Shelton, B. A., & Agger, B. (1993). Shotgun wedding, unhappy marriage, no-fault divorce? Rethinking the feminism-Marxism relationship. In P. England (Ed.), *Theory on gender: Feminism on theory* (pp. 25–42). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Silverman, R. J. (1987). How we know what we know: A study of higher education journal articles. *The Review of Higher Education*, 11(1), 39–59.
- Smallwood, S. (2003, December 5). Women take lead in number of U.S. doctorates awarded, as total falls again. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* [On-line]. Available: <http://chronicle.com/prm/daily/2003/12/2003120502n.htm>
- Stanley, L. (Ed.). (1990). *Feminist praxis: Research, theory, and epistemology in feminist sociology*. New York: Routledge.
- Stephen, T. (2000). Concept analysis of gender, feminist, and women's studies research in the communication literature. *Communication Monographs*, 67(2), 193–214.
- Tetrault, M. K. T. (1985). Feminist phase theory: An experience-driven evaluation model. *Journal of Higher Education*, 56(4), 363–384.
- Thompson, L., & Walker, A. J. (1995). The place of feminism in family studies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57(4), 847–865.
- Townsend, B. K. (1993). Feminist scholarship in core higher education journals. *The Review of Higher Education*, 17(1), 21–41.
- Twombly, S. B. (1993). What we know about women in community colleges: An examination of the literature using feminist phase theory. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(2), 186–210.
- Walters, C. G., Fry, E. H., & Chaisson, B. D. (1990). Women scholars: Closing the publication gap. *Research in Higher Education*, 31(4), 355–367.
- Ward, K. B., & Grant, L. (1996). Gender and academic publishing. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 11, 172–212). New York: Agathon.
- Whelehan, I. (1995). *Modern feminist thought: From the second wave to 'post-feminism.'* New York: New York University Press.
- Worell, J. (1994). Feminist journals: Academic empowerment or professional liability. In S. M. Deats & L. T. Lenker (Eds.), *Feminist pedagogy and politics* (pp. 207–216). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.