



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Citation:

Topic, M and Cunha, M.J. and Reigstad, A. and Jelen-Sanchez, A. and Moreno, Á. (2020) Women in Public Relations (1982-2019). Journal of Communication Management. ISSN 1363-254X DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-11-2019-0143>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<http://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/6511/>

Document Version:

Article

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Introduction and Rationale

Women in public relations is a topic that has started drawing scholarly attention in 1986 with the Velvet Ghetto study. Amongst other findings, the study argued that women see themselves as technical staff, thus expecting to get paid less than men (Cline et al, 1986, see also Grunig, 1991; 1999; Toth and Grunig, 1993; Aldoory and Toth, 2002; Grunig, 2006; Dozier et al, 2007; Creedon, 2009; Beurer-Zuellig et al, 2009; Pulido Polo, 2012). The research on the position of women in public relations has continued since the Velvet Ghetto study, and some of the issues that are often identified include the glass ceiling, pay gap, lack of mentorship opportunities and stereotyped expectations of leadership style, where leadership is usually seen as a masculine trait (Tench et al, 2017). While the research on women in public relations has originated in the US, this research has also been conducted in other countries. In its annual research on public relations trends, the European Communication Monitor project has also been monitoring the position of women in public relations in Europe¹. Data show that the position of women has improved since the Velvet Ghetto study; however, the issues with a pay gap, glass ceiling and mentoring persist (see e.g. Dubrowski et al, 2019; CIPR, 2018a; 2017; Place and Vanderman Winter, 2018). Research analysing data collected by the European Communication Monitor established that when one issue gets resolved, new issues tend to emerge (Tench et al, 2017). In other words, an analysis of annual results from European Communication Monitor from 2009 to 2015 disclosed that “while practitioners firstly reported male dominance on higher positions, in subsequent years they reported glass ceiling when it comes to progressing to higher positions, then the lack of influence in departments, then better job security for men and finally, mentoring opportunities that then have a potential impact on leadership” (p. 18). Thus, this analysis has shown a negative trend in the position of women in public relations in Europe over a period of seven years.

Therefore, in this paper, an extensive literature review of works written on women in public relations was conducted to get a comprehensive picture of the situation, to deconstruct the main trends in current research and to identify research gaps. The research question set for the literature analysis was, what are the main trends on women in public relations in the current literature? With this, the paper identified main trends in the literature and the thematic analysis provided an overview of problems women working in public relations face. Since the majority of research is conducted on practitioners, through surveys and interviews, this paper, therefore, provides a good grasp of issues in the industry as documented in the academic research in a period from 1982 until 2019.

Method

The literature was analysed by searching public relations journals and journals in the field of corporate communications, which have traditionally published public relations work. The journals have been identified using the list provided by the British Chartered Institute of Public Relations (CIPR). The analysed journals were *Public Relations Review*, *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *Journal of*

¹ All European Communication Monitor's report can be found at this link: <http://www.communicationmonitor.eu/european-communication-monitor-all-reports/>

Communication Management, Corporate Reputation Review and *Journal of Brand Management*. The *Public Relations Inquiry* journal was also searched, as this journal provides a critical view of the public relations industry and some articles tackle the position of women.

The keyword used for searching articles was 'women public relations'. In addition, Springer's database was also searched using the same keyword as above. Following the completion of the initial search, Google Scholar was searched using the same keyword, and after completion of the initial reading and analysis of the literature, a snowball method of finding articles using reference lists in reviewed articles was used. The latter provided articles in the *Asia Pacific Public Relations Journal* and *Prism* journals, which were then also searched on its own, using the same keyword as above.

After completion of the searches, websites of authors that appeared at least three times in previous searches were individually searched to identify further articles. These authors were Kate Fitch, Liz Yeomans, Donnalyin Pompper, Katie Place, Heather Yaxley, Lee Edwards, Elisabeth Toth, Larissa Grunig and Lynda Aldoor. In addition, works published by the authors of this paper were added, some of which did not show up in searches. The latter presents a limitation of this research, as it is possible that some other works also failed to appear in searches, albeit they have been published. The limitation is also the fact it was only possible to analyse works published in languages from authors of the paper (besides English, in Portuguese, Spanish, French, Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian, Dutch, and Georgian using the same procedure as described above) while the number of works available on women in public relations is likely higher. However, due to the lack of articles in the majority of countries, the analysis remains predominantly focused on works published in the English language. In other words, the analysis and the findings on the position of women in public relations largely present a Western perspective².

The total number of analysed articles is 223. The initial search was performed on 15 December 2018 and the last literature search was conducted in June 2019, which also included articles published in 2019. The analysis of the position of women in public relations intensified in the period of 1980s, however, the highest number of articles has been published in the period from 2010 to 2019 (figure 1). What is relevant to emphasize is that while the number of articles on women in public relations has increased, this does not necessarily mean that there is an increased interest in the field. The number of public relations scholars has increased since the 1980s; however, women and gender in public relations remain a marginal topic in academic journal articles predominantly focused on crisis and risk communication, digital media, public

² While it was possible to find all literature identified through the above-explained process, there were four works that were identified through snowballing but it was not possible to find them and use them for the analysis. These works were published in 1968, 1975, 1983 and 1989. Every effort was made to find these journals in databases and second-hand book stores, and emails were also sent to professional organisations (e.g. to IABC Research Foundation), however, to no avail. Therefore, the report remains incomplete in regards to these four publications: Smith, R. W. (1968). Women in Public Relations. *Public Relations Journal* 24(10), 26-29; Gorney, S. K. (1975). Status of Women in Public Relations. *Public Relations Journal* 31(5), 10-13; Bates, D. (1983). Will Women Inherit the Profession? *Public Relations Journal* 39(7), 6; Lance Toth, E. and Cline, C. (1989). *Beyond the velvet ghetto*. San Francisco: IABC Research Foundation.

relations practice, relationships, strategic communication and strategic management and media relations (Jelen-Sanchez, 2018).

FIGURE 1 HERE

The main research question for the literature review analysis was,

- What are the main trends on women in public relations in the current literature?

All literature has been analysed by reading every unit of the analysis and writing notes, then reading again and summarising themes that were constantly compared within each decade (the 1980s, 1990s, 2000-2009, 2010-2019) and amongst decades to identify recurring themes and topics of articles that were subject to the analysis. In analysing data, Braun and Clarke's (2006) approach to thematic analysis was adopted, as well as Strauss and Corbin's (1990) approach to coding strategy, both of which was deemed as particularly suitable given the purpose of research and a large number of articles analysed.

Thematic analysis can be defined as “a systematic approach to the analysis of qualitative data that involves identifying themes or patterns of cultural meaning; coding and classifying data (...) according to themes; and interpreting the resulting thematic structures by seeking commonalities, relationships, overarching patterns, theoretical constructs, or explanatory principles” (Lapadat 2010, p. 926). In other words, thematic analysis is mostly centred on identifying where further research is necessary rather than building a new theory, which was particularly relevant for this paper.

In the thematic analysis, coding is a basic tool that helps in identifying recurrent themes. A method from Strauss and Corbin (1990) was deployed, which outlines a constant comparison of analysed data, and the focus is on coding the data throughout (Morse and Richards, 2002). The coding process consisted of,

- Open coding that identified themes emerging from each decade, to compare, conceptualise and categorise the data.
- Axial coding that interrogated the interaction/comparison of themes in each decade and throughout decades.
- Selective coding that identified the most important themes and related them across decades in order to validate findings and provide the general thematic analysis of all decades of research.

Findings

The 1980s

The 1980s are the period when scholars increasingly started to research women in public relations. Majority of studies from that period come from American scholars researching the position of women in the US public relations industry, and the concerns expressed in articles centre on the two main themes, **work discrimination** (with subthemes of glass ceiling, pay gap, technician positions for women and educational differences) and **bias against women**

(with subthemes of covert discrimination in promotions, chauvinism, stereotypes against women, and feminization) (table 1).

TABLE 1 HERE

What emerged during this period is that women seem to be locked up in the so-called pink ghetto (Cline et al, 1986) with no real power even when organisations do hire them. Women were reported to face numerous issues such as being paid substantially less than men (VanSlyke, 1983; Cline et al, 1986; Miller, 1988; Lance Toth, 1988; Dozier, 1988; Singh and Smyth, 1988) and facing a glass ceiling (Broom, 1982; VanSlyke, 1983; Scrimger, 1985; Cline et al, 1986; Pratt, 1986; Dozier, 1988). Some practitioners boldly linked their professional status with their private life. For example, one female practitioner said, “why should my husband earn double my salary with roughly comparable education/experience/talent?” (Scrimger, 1985, p. 45).

Women also found themselves predominantly in technician rather than managerial positions. For example, in a study by Broom (1982), the number of women in the industry has reported being increased but when practitioners, male and female, were asked to explain their role women identified their work duties as communication technician rather than managerial. Broom (1982) also reported that women tend to stay in a technician role longer than men even though both women and men were initially hired because of their journalistic skills. This finding was echoed in the report ‘The Velvet Ghetto’ released in 1986, which explored this dichotomy of technician versus manager further (Cline et al, 1986).

According to the largely cited the Velvet ghetto report, women have suffered from bias in regards to their intentions to get married and have children as well as move away if husband’s career takes him elsewhere, which were then impeding their career progress, thus enforcing the patriarchal view that all women desire to be mothers and concentrate on their husband’s careers. In addition, women were seen as problematic when they do have children due to childcare, and traditional biases against women were present, such as not suitable to be good managers, too emotional, lacking corporate spirit, not being good team members and simply not part of the gang (Cline et al, 1986). Researchers also reported covert discrimination such as creating new job titles for men and hiring them at a higher level (Cline et al, 1986, p. I-6).

The relevance of the Velvet ghetto report is in identifying that women are confined to ghettos with little impact “on company’s policy, offering little access to top management” (Cline et al, 1986, p. III-2) and with many empty job titles without meaning. In addition, even when women have been promoted these promotions were smaller “and leave them in the lower positions in the corporate hierarchy” (Cline et al, 1986, p. III-7). This notion has also been recognized in a study conducted in Canada, which showed that women feel they have insufficient influence in the department (Scrimger, 1985) and that their predominant work duty is secretarial or clerical whereas only 9.1 per cent reported doing public relations work as their first job (ibid). The question of power is thus inextricably linked with masculine organisational culture, and early studies reported male networking and bias against women. For example, in a study by Scrimger (1985) one interviewee said “there is male chauvinism aplenty in the upper echelons of corporations and especially in the profession itself. In the CPRS, the term “senior practitioner”

is synonymous with the word male” (p. 45). This chauvinism is also visible in lack of access to networking, mentorship, and exclusion from events. In the Velvet ghetto study, study participants revealed they are excluded “from after-work drinks, from lunches, from golf games. Women are not ‘one of the boys’, not eligible for membership in the old-boy network; men do not take women seriously; women are not tough enough for management; women are not breadwinners, so will not take work as seriously; women will get pregnant, her kids will get sick, her husband will be transferred; women have never developed the skills to be a “‘team player’ in management” (Cline et al, 1986, p. III-12, emphasis in the original). Some studies also reported that women do not have opportunities to network and access support work, but instead of forming their own networks they tend to wait to be accepted to existing ones (Mathews, 1988).

However, men were not the only ones seen as impeding the progress of women. The Velvet ghetto study recognized that older women tend to be the problem sometimes, by expressing the ‘Queen Bee’ syndrome, or “refusing to help other women achieve the same success they worked so hard to achieve” (Cline et al, 1986, p. III-13). These prejudices were not present just amongst US practitioners. In a Nigerian study, Pratt (1986) echoed these views by reporting on findings that indicate that the number of women in the industry has increased but women were still seen as unfit for good executives. However, some scholars noted that when some did not hold this derogatory view of women then they often held a view of a superwoman or a woman who can do it all; have a career, marry and have children and look after a home (Lance Toth, 1988), thus imposing unrealistic expectations on women.

The period of the 1980s was also dominated with several studies on education, for example, educational qualifications of male and female practitioners, skills that public relations education should promote as well as whether scholars researching women will be promoted in predominantly male faculties. When debating education, scholars reported that men often come with journalism degrees whereas women come with public relations degrees to the industry (Theus, 1985) and the fact the public relations were starting to attract more women, led towards scholarly debates as to whether feminization of the industry would depress salaries given that men go where the money is and normally professions with lots of females do not bring high financial rewards (Theus, 1985; Cline et al, 1986; Lance Toth, 1988). The study by Theus (1985) also pointed out that women are more likely to hire other women and that women who graduate with public relations degrees have to compete for jobs with other female public relations graduates, as well as men with degrees from journalism.

However, the most interesting aspect of educational debates during the 1980s is centred on women’s research skills and the educational levels of public relations practitioners. For example, a comparative study analysing the US and the UK showed that formal education of practitioners was similar but practical job learning whilst in the position was more present among British practitioners than the American ones (VanSlyke, 1988). Following this, Dozier (1988) proposed for all public relations courses to have modules in research and planning because the research was recognised as a key skill for progressing to managerial roles. This came in response to studies arguing that women are predominantly in technician roles rather than managerial. Dozier (1988) argued that organisational politics preserve male dominance

and male's power and called for female practitioners to incorporate research into their daily practice to overcome the concentration of power among men. Dozier (1988) also argued that women are more inclined to use scientific methods and should use this as their advantage to break the glass ceiling and get out of technician roles (see also DeRosa and Wilcox, 1989).

The 1990s

While scholars in the 1980s established women in public relations as a legitimate point of enquiry and expressed concerns over unequal position of women in the industry, as well as of women in public relations higher education departments, during the 1990s scholars engaged in more complex scholarly enquiries, particularly in terms of engaging with theory development and establishing women's studies in public relations as a sub-discipline of public relations scholarship. Research during the 1990s was thus linked with organisational theory and feminist theory and debated how women's position in public relations should be analysed. Thus, two main themes in this period are a) **development of feminist theory of public relations** (with subthemes of radical feminist perspective, women as symmetrical communicators, and criticism of liberal feminism); b) **organisational theory in public relations** (with subthemes of glass ceiling and the pay gap, work experiences and satisfaction, and power) (table 2).

TABLE 2 HERE

In regards to the first theme, feminist theory of public relations, some studies theorised that women are more inclined to use symmetrical communication than men and that women would practice a "more cooperative, negotiation style of public relations than would men if women saw themselves in a managerial-rather than technical-role" (Grunig, 1991, p. 85-86; Grunig, 1999). This is a clear link with radical feminist theory, which traditionally argues that men and women are different and that women's distinctiveness has to be praised rather than used to undermine women's prospects (Daly, 1973; Rakow and Nastasia, 2009). Grunig (1991) argued that women and feminized men are more likely to use two-way, balanced communication, and thus praised female distinctiveness, which has always been an argument inherent to radical feminism. This view has also been popularised in the work of Tannen (1990) who argued that men speak the language of competitiveness, independence and status while women speak the language that creates intimacy and builds relationships. In the same way, Aldoory (1998) looked at the leadership skills of female public relations practitioners. While leadership in the industry can be seen as part of liberal feminist inquiry this research also has elements of radical feminist inquiry because it assessed women's distinctiveness. Aldoory (1998) thus found that women tend to use "participative management, attempts to energize staff, and empathy" (p. 97).

Some scholars also engaged with theory criticism. For example, Creedon (1993) criticised systems theory of public relations from a radical and socialist feminist point of view (albeit different forms of feminism are not openly mentioned in her work). In other words, she stated that systems theory perpetuates class differences and creates a view according to which women need to seek to be like men to succeed, which is thus undermining desired recognition of diversity and femininity as an asset, the latter being a point frequently argued by radical feminists. Liberal and socialist feminism is however discussed in the work by Weaver-Lariscy,

Cameron and Sweep (1994) who argued that majority of works on women in public relations come from a liberal feminist perspective and thus concentrate on equal pay and employment rights, particularly visible in an argument on technical versus managerial roles. The authors critique liberal feminist research on women in public relations for its over-focus on individual progress rather than collective, feminine progress and call for socialist feminism in public relations scholarship, which has a greater potential to address the oppression of women. Socialist feminism, for example, still addresses pay inequality but from a more collective perspective of looking into oppression by race, class and sex. The authors conclude that “for the liberal feminists, the route to change is through the individual, with issues like equal pay and job status. For socialist feminists, it is more important to change the structure and its underlying assumptions for all women” (ibid, p. 135-136).

Some scholars also engaged with organisational theory and public relations industry, with a focus on how organisational culture affects the position of women (Grunig, 1995) and their work satisfaction (Serini et al., 1997) while the others also engaged with debating feminist methodology and advocated for a qualitative interviewing method, which would explore experiences of women in-depth and provide good recommendations on how to improve their position (Childers Hon, 1995). On top of that, a field of women’s public relations history started to develop with some studies analysing work of female public relations practitioners such as, for example, Jane Stewart (Miller, 1997) and Doris Fleischman (Henry, 1998) or career routes for women in post-WWII Britain (L’Etang, 2015).

In addition, some studies engaged in analysing the notion of power and which gender holds power in organisations. In a study by Grunig (1990), a view that women mostly hold technician roles is re-enforced, and thus women still reported they did traditional journalistic jobs such as writing press releases, speeches, newsletters and continued to remain “outside the door” (p. 115) when it comes to decision-making process within organisation. The notion of power was also found in studies on higher education where women have reported ‘old boys networks’ as the main reason for not succeeding as much as they could have otherwise (Zoch and Russell, 1991). For example, female faculty had less power and visibility in mentorship positions. Instead, female staff members were assigned large introductory modules instead of more prestigious, specialist classes. This brought to the situation that women “spend more time in preparation as well as in the classroom; to be overloaded with committee assignments; and to more likely teach in practitioner-oriented disciplines, than in purely academic ones” (Zoch and Russell, 1991, p. 30-31; see also Yin Tam et al, 1995).

2000-2009

The period between 2000 and 2009 presents a continuation with theory development. Several studies interlinked the position of women with the position of the public relations industry and its recognition, as well as feminist theory and thus questioned whether liberal feminism helped women. Therefore, two main themes in this period are **professionalism** (with subthemes of the position of women and the position of public relations and technical versus managerial positions) and **feminist theory** (with subthemes of criticism of liberal feminism, feminist values and PR excellence, power, women more inclined to conduct research and radical feminist perspective) (table 3).

TABLE 3 HERE

In a study by Grunig, Toth and Childers Hon (2000), authors invited for further research on feminism and feminist values, arguing that feminist values can contribute to excellent public relations practice. Authors additionally argued that we would need to look at issues such as gender, but also race, class and sexuality and see how these elements influence the position of women. With this, public relations scholarship started with research on intersectionality in women's treatment (albeit this is not always explicitly mentioned), which originally started with the work of Black feminist and Law Professor Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw (1989). These were then complemented with studies on diversity in public relations where authors argued that public relations industry must diversify its workforce (Childers Hon and Brunner, 2000; Pompper, 2004). Aldoory (2005) also argued that all data showing feminization of public relations has opened up a question on the effectiveness of feminist theory in addressing "gender and power and the impact of classism and racism on the discipline" (p. 668). While feminist research has helped in establishing the position of women in public relations and while awareness has been raised, Aldoory (2005) argued that future research needs to look at notions of power and difference. Many studies in this period indeed looked at these issues and analysed the notion of power. In that, the authors argued that power comes from several factors, such as managerial role enactment, inclusion in the dominant coalition, reporting relationship, employee support and department structure (O'Neill, 2003a). Some authors also directly questioned liberal feminism by arguing it did not work because once the number of women in public relations increased it did not help women obtaining power and higher rated positions (Aldoory and Toth, 2002).

This criticism is linked with women still occupying predominantly technical roles, which was the cornerstone of research in previous decades and from the early days of public relations research on women. The fact that women are in technical position then naturally leads to the situation that they earn less than men (Aldoory and Toth, 2002; Grunig, 2006; Dozier et al, 2007; Creedon, 2009; Beurer-Zuellig et al, 2009) and generally have less power (Grunig, 2006; Fröhlich and Peters, 2007; Aldoory et al, 2008; Edwards, 2009). Nevertheless, even when women are put in a higher position, they have less power than male managers. For example, in a study by O'Neill (2003a) women reported exclusion from power structures, particularly from formal and relationship power and this put them in a situation to have less influence in the organisation. The latter particularly applies to structural power, due to women's traditional exclusion from old networks. However, research also reported that when women work in a women-only environment they still embrace masculine methods of competition and there does not seem to be harmony but power struggle again (Fröhlich and Peters, 2007).

Some scholars also continued with studying women's inclination toward research. For example, Grunig (2006) argued that women express more interest in research than men and generally they do it more. Thus, any real difference in performance between men and women predominantly comes from socialisation in the organisation rather than biology. Similarly, in a study by Mendoza (2007) research was emphasized as a key skill for public relations practitioners. However, the most meaningful finding can be found in a study by Sha and Toth (2005) where authors interviewed young professionals only to realise that male young

professionals express less agreement with discrimination of women in the industry, thus effectively undermining the view that the problem is in old white men. The problem exists at all levels and that many men lack the ability to understand the position of women and how the system is designed to predominantly benefit men.

2010-2019

In the last analysed period, the two main themes identified are **work discrimination** (with subthemes of technical versus managerial positions, glass ceiling and the pay gap, masculine work culture, and diversity) and **bias against women** (with subthemes of stereotypes about women's organisational skills, power, stereotypes on communication skills and intersectionality and criticism of liberal feminism) (table 4).

TABLE 4 HERE

While it is clear that in the first two analysed periods liberal feminism perspective dominated, with some works coming from radical and socialist feminism, in the last period scholars turned towards analysing work discrimination from both liberal (technical versus managerial positions, glass ceiling and the pay gap) and radical feminist perspectives (masculine work culture and diversity).

According to scholars' observations, between 2010 and 2019 women were still underrepresented in leadership positions (Place and Varderman Winter, 2018; Aleman et al, 2018; CIPR, 2018a; Tench et al, 2017; Soria and Gomez, 2017; Yeomans, 2014; CIPR, 2014b; Fitch and Third, 2010) and some data showed that number to be up to 80 per cent (Dubrowski et al, 2019). In addition, studies showed that pay gap is a persistent problem and that both pay gap and the glass ceiling issues are still linked to the fact women primarily occupy technical roles (Moreno et al, 2018a; Moreno et al, 2017; Moreno et al, 2015; CIPR, 2018a; Tench et al, 2017; Varderman-Winer and Place, 2017; CIPR, 2017; CIPR, 2017a; CIPR, 2016b; CIPR, 2014a; Andrade and Sobreira, 2013; Pulido Polo, 2012).

Stereotypes against women followed the feminization of the public relations professionalism debate. For example, some studies showed that men are still believed to have more organisational power while women are believed to have strong media and communication skills (Lee et al., 2018). Nevertheless, some scholars also recognised that "gender socialization may play a role in women practitioners' power-control and use of alpha and omega practices. It is possible that women use alpha practices most often because they have been socialized to act less aggressively when they employ omega strategies" (Place, 2012, p. 447).

Stereotypes also include seeing women as more inclined to have good communication skills and to be more dedicated to personal communication that builds relationships. However, some studies argued that this is not necessarily the case. For example, in a study by Verhoeven and Aarts (2010) women expressed more appreciation towards social media communication and correctly predicted its relevance, whilst in a study by Tench, Moreno and Topić (2017) women have shown to be more inclined towards emails and social media communication with men expressing more inclination towards the phone and face-to-face communication, thus going against the usual stereotype of women preferring relationship-building form of communication.

However, the biggest issue with stereotypes came from media and popular culture. In a study by Fitch (2015a), it appeared that practitioners are always portrayed as male, white and untrustworthy or unhelpful while female practitioners are portrayed as love interest and white, middle class, young, desirable and single. Public relations scholarship dismisses these stereotypes as inaccurate and not representative of the industry, however, Fitch (2015a) also argues that the popular culture representation of public relations is gendered because women are often portrayed as trivial while men are portrayed as important (see also Johnston, 2010).

In the last decade, more studies tackling diversity appeared arguing that public relations are still dominated by white men (in leadership positions) and white women (in technical positions). For example, Varderman-Winter and Place (2017) argued that a lack of diversity still remains a problem in the public relations industry with most of the research being anecdotal. They also argued that intersectional identities have a link with the pay gap and this presents a historical problem because “historically, women and white practitioners have dominated the public relations field” (p. 326). In other words, women of colour face dual discrimination and are generally paid less than white women in the same position. In this way, women of colour are discriminated as women (because women generally get paid less than men) and then also as women of colour because they are paid less than white women too.

Other scholars also argued that since women already constitute the majority in the field, there is a need to move away from comparing women with men and actually compare women with women “and approach practice in context so that its daily logic and dynamic can be observed” (Edwards, 2009, p. 253, cited in Pompper, 2012, p. 89). In addition, it has been recognised that we must understand different groups and the value they bring to the society so that the work produced characterizes the society and its wider social norms (Edwards, 2011).

A General Thematic Analysis: Literature Trends in the Period between 1982 and 2019

When looking at all identified themes, during analysed periods (the 1980s, 1990s, 2000-2009, 2010-2019) it appears that the majority of work would fit into three general themes,

- a) **Liberal feminist perspectives** where scholars have analysed issues such as glass ceiling and pay gap, work discrimination (such as the fact that women can mostly be found in technical positions, lack of mentorship opportunities, etc.) and the power that women simply do not hold due to their low status within organisations.
- b) **Radical feminist perspectives** where scholars have started to analyse diversity in public relations, intersectionality, a lack of opportunities for women, women’s distinctiveness (e.g. such as women being seen as more inclined to do research and having different ways of doing things) and criticism of liberal feminism that did not solve problems for women.
- c) **Theory development** where scholars engaged with developing an organisational theory of public relations and thus analysing the position of women in the organisational setting. This has a clear link with liberal feminist perspectives as this line of research is also concerned predominantly with women advancing in their careers. In addition, scholars engaged with developing feminist public relations theory and

professionalization of the field, which was in some cases linked to the position of women (table 5).

TABLE 5 HERE

While there are some differences in the framework under which the same issue was sometimes analysed, the concerns persist through time. The issue of pay gap and glass ceiling, for example, has been analysed as part of work discrimination studies in the 1980s while this same issue belongs under the organisational theory of public relations in the 1990s. In a period between 2000 and 2009, this issue has been analysed under professionalism debates, and in the final period (2010-2019) it returned to work discrimination concerns. Thus, the debate on discrimination of women has reached a full circle in four decades of research and returned to the discriminatory work environment. Even though the position of women has significantly improved since the early days, the reality is that many women still cannot progress in their careers.

While bias against women has been recognised in the 1980s in the form of chauvinism, covert discrimination and stereotypes and biases against women (e.g. women not being good team players), in the last analysed period (2010-2019) this issue returned to the agenda with women being recognised through stereotypical communication skills, which naturally leads them to technical positions. Recent research, however, recognised the issue of masculinity in preventing some women from obtaining leadership positions due to lack of recognition of diversity in leadership styles.

In summary, the majority of research conducted on women in public relations comes from a liberal feminist perspective and thus heavily concentrates on the glass ceiling, pay gap, career opportunities and career hurdles for women. However, as some scholars critique, these considerations and activism did not help women significantly and, in a way, it seems feasible to argue that liberal feminism in itself is somewhat positivist and only identifies a problem without being able to tackle the root of the issue.

Conclusion

The analysis of the literature indicates that if four decades of academic research continually show prejudices and discrimination towards women, there is something to say about the system that prevents women from meeting their full potential and, for example, occupy leadership positions. The findings from this paper are clearly linked with the analysis of European Communication Monitor surveys conducted on women in public relations in Europe, where Tench and Topić (2017) reported that new forms of inequality emerge as one issue gets close to resolving, which then causes negative trends in the equality of women in the public relations industry. The future research should look at these trends more closely and explore why is there a constant inequality of women in the public relations industry.

In this respect, criticism of liberal feminism seems in place, and calls from authors with radical feminist perspectives seem appealing. Future research, therefore, needs to look at the position of women in public relations through radical lenses and investigate the organisational and social structures. Radical feminism argues that women and men are fundamentally different

and these differences then translate to, for example, differences in communication style, leadership style, and also affect interactions in organisations (Rakow and Nastasia, 2009).

The radical feminist framework can, thus, be particularly useful for analysing the position of women in public relations because it enables going forward from mere analysis of the pay gap and glass ceiling (which is usually done from the liberal feminist perspective according to which women and men are to be seen as individuals with the same potential to achievement, see Nes, 1989). This enables us to move forward and analyse issues such as the impact of masculinity and masculine organisational structures on women, power struggle within organisations, the issue of Queen Bee syndrome and women embracing masculine patterns to succeed because organisations still operate under masculine patterns. Similar research, for example, has already been done in journalism studies where some authors argued that the newsroom culture is so masculine that women have to be bloke-ified to succeed, which is not possible for the majority of women. This then also leads to the situation that younger women cannot identify with masculine women and see them as role models (Mills, 2014; Topić, 2018). In the same way, the future research on women in public relations should look at the work culture in the public relations industry and explore whether the work culture is masculine to the point that women cannot succeed unless they embrace masculine ways of working and communicating.

References

Aldoory, L., Jiang, H., Toth, E. L. and Sha, B. L. (2008), “Is it Still Just a Women’s Issue? A Study of Work-Life Balance Among Men and Women in Public Relations?”, *Public Relations Journal* Vol 2 No 4, pp. 1-20.

Aldoory, L. A. (2005), “A (re) conceived feminist paradigm for public relations: A case for substantial improvement”, *Journal of Communication* Vol. 55 No. 4, pp. 668-684.

Aldoory, L. and Toth, E. (2002), “Gender Discrepancies in a Gendered Profession: A Developing Theory for Public Relations”, *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 103-126.

Aldoory, L. (1998), “The Language of Leadership for Female Public Relations Professionals”. *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 73-101.

Alemán, I. I., Lazo, C. M. and del Olmo, F. J. R. (2018). La influencia del género en el management de la comunicación corporativa: Estudio de caso en Aragón (España), *Prisma Social: revista de investigación social* 20, 273-286.

Andrade, C. and Sobreira, R. (2013), “Igualdade de género na profissão de relações públicas: estudo exploratório com estudantes de comunicação organizacional” (Gender equity in the PR profession: exploratory study with organizational communication students), *EXEDRA Journal* 7, pp. 41-50.

Beurer-Zuellig, B.; Fieseler, C. and Meckel, M. (2009), "A descriptive inquiry into the corporate communication profession in Europe", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 270-279.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), "Using thematic analysis in psychology", *Qualitative Research in Psychology* Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 77–101.

Broom, G. M. (1982), "A comparison of sex roles in public relations", *Public Relations Review* Vol 8 No. 3, pp. 17-22.

Childers Hon, L. and Brunner, B. (2000), "Diversity Issues and Public Relations", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 309-340.

Childers Hon, L. (1995), Toward a Feminist Theory of Public Relations, *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 27-88.

CIPR (2018a), *The State of the Profession Report* available from <https://www.slideshare.net/CIPRPaul/cipr-state-of-the-profession-2018> (accessed 15 December 2019)

CIPR (2017), *PR and Pay Equality Report*, available from https://www.cipr.co.uk/sites/default/files/10932_PR&PAY_Equality_Report.pdf (accessed 15 December 2019)

CIPR (2017a), *The State of the Profession Report 2016/2017*, available from https://www.cipr.co.uk/sites/default/files/10911_State%20of%20PR%202017_f1.pdf (accessed 15 December 2019)

CIPR(2016b), *PR and Pay Equality: A qualitative study into challenges and perspectives on gender pay*, available from https://www.cipr.co.uk/sites/default/files/10932_PR&PAY_Equality_Report.pdf (accessed 15 December 2019)

CIPR (2014a), *CIPR launches nine recommendations for enabling flexible working in public relations*, available from <https://newsroom.cipr.co.uk/cipr-launches-nine-recommendations-for-enabling-flexible-working-in-public-relations/> (accessed 15 December 2019)

CIPR (2014b), *CIPR issues commitment to tackle equal pay and gender balance in Public Relations*, available from <https://newsroom.cipr.co.uk/cipr-issues-commitment-to-tackle-equal-pay-and-gender-balance-in-public-relations/> (accessed 15 December 2019)

Cline, C., Toth, E., Turk, J., Walters, L., Johnson, N. and Smith, H. (1986), *The velvet ghetto: The impact of the increasing percentage of women in public relations and business communication, USA*, IABC Foundation.

Crenshaw, K. (1989), "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics", *University of Chicago Legal Forum* Vol. 1 No. 8, available from <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8> (accessed 13 May 2019)

Creedon, P. J. (2009), "Public Relations and "Women's Work": Toward a Feminist Analysis of Public Relations Roles", *Public Relations Research Annual* Vol. 3 No. 1-4, pp. 67-84.

Creedon, P. J. (1993), "Acknowledging the infrasystem: A critical feminist analysis of systems theory", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 157-166.

Daly, M. (1973), *Beyond god the father: Toward a philosophy of women's liberation*, Boston, Beacon Press.

DeRosa, D. A. and Wilcox, D. L. (1989), "Gaps are narrowing between female and male students", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 80-90.

Dozier, D., Sha, Bey-Ling and Okura, M. (2007), "How Much Does My Baby Cost? An Analysis of Gender Differences in Income, Career Interruption, and Child-Bearing", *Public Relations Journal* Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 1-6.

Dozier, D. M. (1988), "Breaking Public Relations Glass Ceiling", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 6-14.

Dubrowski, M., McCorkindale and Rickert, R. (2019), *Mind the gap: Women's leadership in public relations*, available from <https://instituteforpr.org/wp-content/uploads/IPR.KPMG-WIL-Study-FINAL041219-compressed.pdf> (accessed 17 May 2019)

Edwards, L. (2011), "Diversity in public relations", Edwards, L. and Hodges, C. E. M. (eds) *Public Relations, Society and Culture: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations*, pp. 75-89, Abingdon, Oxon, Routledge.

Edwards, L. (2009), "Symbolic Power and Public Relations Practice: Locating Individual Practitioners in Their Social Context", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 251-272.

Fitch, K. (2015a), "Promoting the Vampire Rights Amendment: Public relations, postfeminism and True Blood", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 41 No. 5, pp. 607-614.

Fitch, K. and Third, A. (2014), "Ex-Journos and promo girls: Feminization and professionalization in the Australian public relations industry", Daymon, C. and Demetriou, K. (eds.) *Gender and Public Relations: Critical Perspectives on Voice, Image and Identity*, pp. 247-268, London, Routledge.

Fröhlich, R. and Peters, S. B. (2007), "PR Bunnies Caught in the Agency Ghetto? Gender Stereotypes, Organizational Factors, and Women's Careers in PR Agencies", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 229-254.

Grunig, L. A. (2006), "Feminist Phase Analysis in Public Relations: Where Have We Been? Where Do We Need to Be?" *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 115-140.

Grunig, L. A. (1995), "The Consequences of Culture for Public Relations: The Case of Women in the Foreign Service", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 139-161.

Grunig, L. A. (1991), "Court-Ordered Relief from Sex Discrimination in the Foreign Service: Implications for Women Working in Development Communication", *Public Relations Research Annual* Vol. 3 No. 1-4, pp. 85-113.

Grunig, L. A. (1990), "Power in the Public Relations Department", *Public Relations Research Annual, Volume* Vol. 2 No. 1-4, pp. 115-155.

Henry, S. (1998), "Dissonant Notes of a Retiring Feminist: Doris E. Fleischman's Later Years", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 1-33.

Johnston, J. (2010), "Girls on screen: How film and television depict women in public relations", *PRism* Vol. 7 No. 4, available from <http://www.prismjournal.org/fileadmin/Praxis/Files/Gender/Johnston.pdf> (13 December 2018)

Lance Toth, E. (1988), "Making peace with gender issues in public relations", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 36-47.

Lapadat, J. (2010), "Thematic analysis", Mills, A. J.; Durepos, G. and Wiebe, E. (eds) *Encyclopedia of case study research*, pp. 926-928, Thousand Oaks, Sage.

L'Etang, J. (2015), "It's always been a sexless trade"; "It's clean work"; "There's very little velvet curtain": Gender and public relations in post-Second World War Britain, *Journal of Communication Management* Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 354-370.

Lee, H., Place, K. R. and Smith, B. G. (2018), "Revisiting gendered assumptions of practitioner power: An exploratory study examining the role of social media expertise", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 44 No. 2, pp. 191-200.

Mathews, W. (1988), "Women in PR: Progression or retrogression?" *Public Relations Review*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 24-28.

Mendoza, S. M. (2007), "En torno a la investigación en relaciones públicas", *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social* Vol. 62, pp. 102 - 116.

Miller, K. S. (1997), "Woman, man, lady, horse: Jane Stewart, public relations executive", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 249-269.

Miller, D. A. (1988), "Women in public relations graduate study", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 29-35.

Mills, E. (2014). "Why do the best jobs go to men?", *British Journalism Review* Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 1-5.

Moreno, A., Fuentes, C. and Khalil, N. (2018a), *Gendercoms. Brechas y oportunidades de género en la profesión de Gestión de la Comunicación en España*, Madrid, Asociación de Directivos de Comunicación.

Moreno, A., Molleda, J. C., Athaydes, A., Suárez, A. M., Herrera, M. and Álvarez Nobell, A. (2017), *Latin American Communication Monitor 2016-2017. Tendencias en comunicación estratégica: big data, automatización, engagement, influencers, couching y competencias. Resultados de una encuesta en 17 países*, Madrid, España, DIRCOM/EUPRERA.

Moreno, A., Molleda, J.C., Athaydes, A. and Suárez, A.M. (2015), *Latin American Communication Monitor 2014- 2015: Excelencia en comunicación estratégica, trabajo en la era digital, social media y profesionalismo - Resultados de una encuesta en 18 países*, Brussels, Belgium, EUPRERA.

Morse, J. M. and Richards, L. (2002), *Readme First for a User's Guide to Qualitative Methods*, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, Sage.

Nes, J. A. (1989), "Toward a Definition of Feminist Social Work: A Comparison of Liberal, Radical, and Socialist Models", *Social Work* Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 12-21.

O'Neil, J. (2003a), "An Analysis of the Relationships Among Structure, Influence, and Gender: Helping to Build a Feminist Theory of Public Relations", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 151-179.

Place, K. R. and Vardeman-Winter, J. (2018), "Where are the women? An examination of research on women and leadership in public relations", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 165-173.

Place, K. R. (2015), "Binaries, continuums, and intersections: Women public relations professionals' understandings of gender", *Public Relations Inquiry* Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 61-78.

Place, K. R. (2012), "Power-Control or Empowerment? How Women Public Relations Practitioners Make Meaning of Power", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 435-450.

Pompper, D. (2012), "On Social Capital and Diversity in a Feminized Industry: Further Developing a Theory of Internal Public Relations", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 86-103.

Pompper, D. (2004), "Linking Ethnic Diversity & Two-Way Symmetry: Modeling Female African American Practitioners' Roles", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 269-299.

Pratt, C. (1986), "Professionalism in Nigerian public relations", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 27-40.

Pulido Polo, M. (2012), "Comunicación en igualdad: la gestión de la comunicación organizacional desde una perspectiva de género", *Más igualdad, redes para la igualdad: Comunicación presentada al Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Universitaria de Estudios de las Mujeres*, pp. 519-529, Sevilla, Alciber.

Rakow, L. F. and Nastasia, D. I. (2009), "Feminist Theory of Public Relations: An Example from Dorothy E. Smith", Oyvind, I.; van Ruler, B. and Frederiksoon, M. (eds.) *Public Relations and Social Theory*, London, Routledge.

Jelen-Sanchez, A (2018), "Experiencing public relations as an academic discipline: What do scholarly views and published research tell us?", Bridgen, E. and Verčič, D. (eds.) *Experiencing Public Relations: International Voices*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 6-25.

Scrimger, J. (1985), "Profile: Women in Canadian public relations", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 40-46.

Sha, B.-L. and Toth, E. L. (2005), "Future professionals' perceptions of work, life, and gender issues in public relations", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 93-99.

Serini, S. A., Toth, E., Wright, D. K. and Emig, A. G. (1997), "Watch for Falling Glass... Women, Men, and Job Satisfaction in Public Relations: A Preliminary Analysis", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 99-118.

Singh, R. and Smyth, R. (1988), "Australian public relations: status at the turn of the 21st century", *Public Relations Review* Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 387-401.

Soria, M. and Gómez, B. (2017), “Análisis del rol profesional de mujeres y hombres en las agencias de publicidad españolas. Percepciones e integración de igualdad de oportunidades”, (Analysis of professional role of women and men in Spanish advertising agencies: perception and integration of equal opportunities), *Sphera Publica* Vol. 2 No. 17, pp. 167-193.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. M. (1990), *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*, Thousand Oaks, CA, US, Sage.

Tannen, D. (1990), *You Just Don't Understand*, New York, Penguin Random House.

Tench, R. and Topić, M. (2017), One Step Forward, Two Steps Back? An Analysis of Public Relations Practitioners' Views on the Position of Women in the PR Industry (2009-2015), *Current Politics and Economics of Europe* Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 83-105.

Theus, K. T. (1985), “Gender shifts in journalism and public relations”, *Public Relations Review* Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 42-50.

Topić, M. (2018), “Not Bloke-ified enough? Women Journalists, Supermarket Industry and the Debate on Sugar in the British Press (2010-2015)”, *Newspaper Research Journal* Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 433-442.

Toth, E. L., Serini, S. A., Wright, D. K. and Emig, A. G. (1998), “Trends in public relations roles: 1990–1995”, *Public Relations Review* Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 145-163.

Toth, E. L. and Grunig, L. A. (1993), “The Missing Story of Women in Public Relations”, *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 153-175.

VanSlyke, J. K. (1983), “On the job: Corporate communicators in the United States and the United Kingdom”, *Public Relations Review* Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 55.

Verhoeven, P. and Aarts, N. (2010), “How European public relations men and women perceive the impact of their professional activities”, *PRism* Vol. 7 No. 4, available from http://www.prismjournal.org/fileadmin/Praxis/Files/Gender/Verhoeven_Aarts.pdf (accessed 15 December 2018)

Yeomans, L. (2014), “Gendered performance and identity work in PR consulting relationships: A UK perspective”, Daymon, C. and Demetrious, K. (eds) *Gender and Public Relations: Critical perspectives on voice, image and identity*, pp. 87-107, USA and Canada, Routledge.

Yin Tam, S., Dozier, D. M., Lauzen, M. M. and Real, M. R. (1995), “The Impact of Superior-Subordinate Gender on the Career Advancement of Public Relations Practitioners”, *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 259-272.

Zoch, L. M. and Russell, M.P. (1991), "Women in PR Education: An Academic 'Velvet Ghetto'?" *The Journalism Educator* Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 25–35.

Weaver-Lariscy, R. A.; Cameron, G. T. and Sweep, D. D. (1994), "Women in Higher Education Public Relations: An Inkling of Change?", *Journal of Public Relations Research* Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 125-140.