



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *A Global Hypothesis for Women in Journalism and Mass Communications: The Ratio of Recurrent and Reinforced Residuum* .

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/464/>

Article:

Rush, R.R., Oukrop, C.E. and Sarikakis, K. (2005) *A Global Hypothesis for Women in Journalism and Mass Communications: The Ratio of Recurrent and Reinforced Residuum*. Gazette, 67 (3). pp. 239-253. ISSN 0016-5492

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016549205052226>

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



White Rose
university consortium
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield & York

White Rose Consortium ePrints Repository

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

This is an author produced version of an article published in Gazette:

Rush, R.R. and Oukrop, C.E. and Sarikakis, K. (2005) *A Global Hypothesis for Women in Journalism and Mass Communications: The Ratio of Recurrent and Reinforced Residuum*. Gazette, 67 (3). pp. 239-253.

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/archive/00000464/>

(7-1-04)

A Global Hypothesis for Women in Journalism and Mass Communications: The Ratio of Recurrent and Reinforced Residuum

by

Ramona R. Rush
University of Kentucky
3194 Pimlico Parkway
Lexington, KY 40517-4041, United States
FAX 859-257-4103
Email: rrrush@uky.edu

Carol E. Oukrop
Kansas State University
1858 Platt St.
Manhattan, KS 66502-3616, United States
FAX 785-532-5484
Email: ceo@ksu.edu

Katharine Sarikakis
Communication Media and Culture
Coventry University
Priory Street
Coventry CV1 5FB
Email: k.sarikakis@coventry.ac.uk

This paper has been submitted in an earlier form to the 3rd Annual Hawaii International Conference on Arts & Humanities

Ramona R. Rush is a professor/dean emerita of communications at the University of Kentucky in Lexington. She has served as an administrator, professor and researcher in mass and international communications at several universities, including the University of Kentucky where she was founding dean of the College of Communications in 1977. Carol Oukrop, director/professor emerita, taught journalism and mass communications at Kansas State University in Manhattan for 33 years, serving as director of the A.Q. Miller School of Journalism and Mass Communications 1986-1997. She was also on the Women's Studies faculty at Kansas State. Both authors retired from their universities in 2002. Katharine Sarikakis is a Senior Lecturer at Coventry University in England. Her research interests are in the field of global communications and policy, gender and citizenship as well as issues of equality in doctoral education.

Key words: Global, Hypothesis, Inequality, Women, Communication, Media, Education

Abstract

This paper examines the status of women in communications industries and on university faculties. It specifically tests the Ratio of Recurrent and Reinforced Residuum or R^3 hypothesis, as developed by Rush in the early 1980s [Rush, Buck & Ogan, 1982]. The R^3 hypothesis predicts that the percentage of women in the communications industries and on university faculties will follow the ratio residing around 1/4:3/4 or 1/3:2/3 proportion females to males. This paper presents data from a nationwide U.S. survey and compares them to data from global surveys and United Nations reports. The evidence is overwhelming and shows the relevance and validity of the R^3 hypothesis across different socio-economic and cultural contexts. The paper argues that the ratio is the outcome of systemic discrimination that operates at multiple levels. The obstacles to achieving equality in the academy as well as media industries are discussed and suggestions for breaking out of the R^3 ratio are included.

Introduction

‘Although in most countries more women are entering the media professions than ever before, it would be unreasonable to imagine that this will result in a radical transformation of media content. It is certainly possible to see the mark made by individual media women, as women, on certain types of output. *But the fundamental patterns of media representation that preoccupied the women’s movement of the 1970s remain relatively intact thirty years later*’ (Italics added)

Margaret Gallagher, (2001 p. 4) Gender Setting.

‘Thus the conclusion must be, based on the data from our twin studies, that for the effort, time and scholarship that have gone into diversity for more than 30 years, a career lifetime for some of us, the expected results are coming too late with too little at a very high health and wealth cost for many of the journalism and mass communications faculty in these United States, especially women and minorities. ...Discrimination can no longer be explained away as it was 30 years ago because of talent pool availability, ignorance, indifference or lack of information. We are aware, we know now, that *inequality stares us in the face today nearly as starkly as it has always done*’. (Italics added.)

Ramona Rush, Carol Oukrop, Lori Bergen & Julie

Andsager, in Rush, Oukrop, & Creedon,, (2004) Seeking Equity for Women in Journalism and Mass Communication Education: A 30-Year Update.

A hypothesis that crosses national boundaries and holds up across cultures should be considered noteworthy. In the instance of the Ratio of Recurrent and Reinforced Residuum or R^3 , however, there is little cause for celebration. In this paper, we are addressing the R^3 hypothesis and argue that women's position in communications industries and on university faculties will maintain a minority character, despite the changes achieved in the course of the last three decades. Based on data from a unique nationwide USA study of women in mass communications academic units and the industry, we seek to locate the phenomenon of R^3 as observed at the national level within an international context. We draw upon second level sources and testimonies to argue that the phenomenon currently observed in the United States is firmly located within the global context of a gender based discriminatory system.

Baseline data established in the late 1960s (Rush, Oukrop & Ernst, 1972) in the first known study of the role and status of women and journalism in the United States has made it possible to keep track of women's status in this field over time. In the early 1980s, while updating the work from the 1972 study for the Latin American communication research journal, *Chasqui*, Rush noticed that women in the U.S. mass media were not moving beyond a certain limitation in numbers in employment, image and status, a phenomenon that she called the 'Ratio of Recurrent and Reinforced Residuum' (R^3). This effectively reveals that women's participation in the business and academic world of communications has been determined by an unwritten rule that keeps them either in low status positions not desired by men and/or in a minority percentage across the ranks. For women in journalism and mass communications, it was a ratio of concentration of women in symbolic representation, occupational status, and/or salary

levels. The ratio resided around a 1/4:3/4 to a maximum 1/3:2/3 proportion of females and males (Rush 1982, 1989) with women disproportionately concentrated in the lesser-status positions. A careful examination of available sources about women's full participation and progress in communication education and the profession directs us to consider the systemic impact upon women in society in its entirety, rather than partially in a specific sector. In this paper, we seek to identify the parameters that seem more persistent in hindering gender justice and to discuss a short and long-term recommendations for change.

It is worth noting that it is difficult to draw upon international data for a comprehensive comparative analysis, not only because in most cases there are no data collected but also because the data available are not always comparable. This very fact is an indication of the limited attention given to women as a historically politically marginalized group. Despite these limitations, a synthesis of world trends in women's education and occupation in the field of communications reveals a rather worrying picture. In this paper, we refer to broadcasting and press education and industry, and we draw upon data from other communications sectors where available. And although our purpose is not to provide a comparative analysis of the status of women in different countries, we will seek to identify and analyze this status in the currently most powerful country in the world within the context of a globally observed stagnation of women's progression in professions and education.

International data: the academy...

Gender inequality, especially in education, is a difficult issue to address. To the 'common' people, the world of education is surrounded by the aura of fairness and merit,

progress and reason and therefore cannot be easily comprehended as a system with structures that disadvantage and discriminate against certain groups of students and teachers. Furthermore, gender discrimination is so deeply engrained into our everyday lives that it operates at multiple levels, subconsciously when making gender based judgments, therefore affecting behavior, and consciously when gender becomes the criterion for rewards and merit. The complex codes of discrimination – in particular subtle and therefore difficult to tackle – have been analyzed by many studies (for example, see Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14 and 17 in Rush, Oukrop & Creedon, 2004) and they point to the prevalence of a culture that uses gender as its own stratification measure; the academy is part of broader social organization and therefore reflects and reinforces patriarchal norms.

Recognizing that cultural and therefore ideological change is a long-term project and difficult to achieve, the focus of this study is limited to the empirical and predominantly quantitative data of discrimination, data related to the proportion of females in faculty and industry and in terms of salary, as areas that are relatively more ‘straightforward’ to address. Furthermore, presence of women and salary equality are issues that are being addressed at some level in many countries and especially in those where the model of western democracy is used as the milestone of achievement of one of the ideals of enlightenment: equality.

As examples from three decades ago show, the presence of women in the professions was one quarter or 25 percent of officials and managers in television stations in the United States. At the time, women represented about 36-38 percent of the U.S. daily press workforce, while in the computer industry, women earned about 74 cents for

every dollar earned by their male peers. Men still outnumbered women by a factor of three to one except in the lowest pay operative area where 63 percent were women (Rush, 2004, p. 264).

To what extent does different research in different locations around the world continue to find indication of the R³ effect? Again, systematic, longitudinal data are very hard to find. More data exist about the status of women in the academic world. In Canada, the average participation of women in the Canadian Universities was 13 percent in 1994 (Robbins et al 2001). The same story can be told for a number of European academies: in 1994 in Germany women constituted 29 percent of all academics, in Greece 25 percent in 1998, reaching 38 percent – all in lower ranks - and no female full professors in the communications departments (NSSG 1998). In Italy this is 28.8 percent (Giacometti 2002). In the UK, women were 12 percent of all full professors (THES 2003). In Canada the proportion of women academics has not even reached one third, with 26 percent in 1999 (Robbins et al 2001). Other studies have also indirectly provided evidence about the stagnation of women's participation in the academy at one third of total faculty in communications (Sarikakis 2004, 2003).

Women occupy the lower ranks in the academy with very few reaching full professorship and decision-making positions. Women are also reserve and cheap labour, as they tend to be employed part-time and fixed-term contracts. In the UK, the professional associations Association of University Teachers (AUT) and National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE) have produced compelling reports about the casualization of labour in Higher Education noting not only that women are 30 percent more likely than men to be employed in fixed-term contracts

but also that women's salary is at best 85 percent of that of males. These figures have hardly changed since 1994 (AUT 2001). The Equal Pay Task Force set up by the Equal Opportunities Commission in the UK stated that 'discrimination in pay, occupational segregation and unequal impact of women's family responsibilities' are the three main factors responsible for the gender pay gap (Equal Pay Task Force 2001). The implications of the salary gap are felt throughout the life of a woman, during the years of service, where demoralization in the work place and economic disadvantage and increased family responsibilities force women and their dependents to live on less money, become everyday experiences. The gender pay gap has immense effects for retirement, when women will receive fewer benefits than men receive. The pension gap in Canada is currently at around 56 percent (Robbins et al 2001).

...and the professions

Independent scholar Margaret Gallagher has made important contributions to information and research about women in international communications, from her 1981 Unequal opportunities: The case of women and the media, to recent works such as Women Empowering Communication (with Lillia Quindoza-Santiago, 1994) and An Unfinished Story: Gender Patterns in Media Employment (UNESCO 1995). Her recent work, Gender Setting: New Agendas for Media Monitoring and Advocacy (Zed 2001), provides guides for local action to promote diversity in media content, especially media portrayals of gender.

Gallagher has dedicated her independent scholarly life to capturing the elusive demographics of women in the media on a global basis. Unfinished Story is noted as one of the first reports to treat the issue of gender in media employment on a global scale and

with comparative gender-differentiated statistics across regions (p. iii). If one looks through the last two works mentioned above, it is not a pretty sight, cite after cite. With some interesting and hard-earned exceptions, R³ still holds three decades later on an international level, and the hypothesis' ratios are depressingly better than most country averages, across media and across media positions. The demographics are most telling and discouraging when senior positions are considered.

A fast glance through the tables about Women's Employment in the Media, 1990-1995, which comprise nearly the last half of the report on specially conducted studies of 239 organizations in 43 countries, it is apparent that the hypothesis largely holds, and, sadly, there is little challenge when women's share of senior management positions are noted. Interestingly, the challenges to the R³ come from the Baltic States, Nordic countries, Central and Eastern Europe. One might question if capitalistic democracy isn't an oxymoron when it comes to the equality of women in the media, especially in leadership roles.

One of the more recent works about a particular profession, journalism, reports on the status of journalists around the world. Endorsed by the International Association for Media and Communication Research, it is The Global Journalist: News People Around the World (1998). Edited by Indiana University mass communication professor David H. Weaver, with the assistance of Wei Wu of the National University of Singapore, the 23 chapters are about survey results from 21 different countries and territories (p.1).

Gender was included among the variables that comprised the studies modeled after three major surveys of U.S. journalists noted by the editor (p. 1). 'The major assumption is that journalists' backgrounds and ideas have some relationship to what is

reported (and how it is covered) in the various news media round the world, in spite of various societal and organizational constraints, and that this news coverage matters in terms of world public opinion and policies' (p.2).

Despite the shortcomings of the work in sampling procedures and the limitations in detail, particularly as they relate to gender and women, it can be observed that the R³ hypothesis is a reasonable fit for the percentage of women employed from Australia to China to Hong Kong and from Hungary to the United States, where only about 33% of the journalistic workforce is women.

Also grouped around this gendered 1/3:2/3 ratio are journalists in the Pacific Islands (45-25%), and Germany (36-25%, East to West). Women journalists are more evenly balanced with their male counterparts in Finland and New Zealand, 49% and 45%, respectively, followed by Taiwan (38%). Female journalists in Spain (28%), Canada (28%), Britain (25%), Algeria (25%), France (20%), and Korea (14%) occupy the downside of the ratio. In South and Central America, female journalists interviewed ranged in percentage from 42% (Brazil) and 40% (Chile) to 25% (Mexico and Ecuador).

Although the mostly-male authors of the studies generally sounded enthusiastic about the *future* of women journalists because of their increased presence in the workforce in recent years – ‘data allow us to say that in Spain journalism will no longer be a male profession (p. 301)’ -- the salary and executive position differentials reported in some of the studies do predict a long-term gender gap problem. These problems and in particular that of unequal pay are major and persistent obstacles to equality in financial rewards for women around the world. In the UK, all professions, without exception, were found to regenerate unequal pay with women receiving 89% of male salaries in further

and higher education combined constituting the academy as one of the worst places to work after business professionals (67%). Women constitute 31 percent in the category of *'transport and communication'* in the UK (EOC 2001).

It would have been interesting and perhaps enlightening if the decision had been made, where possible, for the country investigators to analyze their respective data sets controlling for gender differences rather than reporting only demographic differentials. Robinson and Saint-Jean added this refinement, noting: 'Our Canadian survey adopted Weaver and Wilhoit's methodology to respond to this challenge and furthermore added gender as an important variable to find out whether female and male professionals construct different role and attitude conceptions toward their profession (p. 361).' They point out that the data do confirm some differences based on gender.

Weaver and Wilhoit point to 'stalled growth in U.S. media employment' (p. 411) as affecting the likewise stalled representation of women since the 1980s (34%). Weaver notes in the book's conclusion that although 'the findings from the studies in this book suggest that the typical journalist is still primarily a young college-educated man who studied something other than journalism in college and who came from the established and dominant cultural groups in his country... it seems very likely that women will become as common as men in journalism in the early years of the next century, given their numbers in journalism schools' (p. 478).

Two broad and perhaps dangerous assumptions in this study overall are that (1) young women from their often-majority numbers in journalism schools will bound effortlessly into the journalistic workforce and that (2) when there, they can crack the R³ 'glass ceilings' for entry into common and uncommon positions, the latter of which

generally have eluded women in any number beyond tokenism for at least three decades and likely beyond.

Perhaps the chapter conclusion by Robinson and Saint-Jean in the same book is more realistic:

Whether the noble ideals that Canadian journalists seem to value in 1995 will continue to prevail in the face of the media's growing race for efficiency, profits and ratings remains an open question that awaits further investigation in the 21st century. We are certain, however, that continued integration of women will depend on the commitment of employers to equal opportunity and of the federal government to antidiscrimination policies. Only well established, nationally mandated policies will counterbalance the unequal manner in which economic “downsizing” has traditionally affected female workers in the workplace (pp. 370-71).

It appears the U. S.-generated hypothesis of three decades ago still fits more often than not women employed in the global journalistic workforce in the countries represented in this research, including the United States.

The contexts of inequality

The UNDP 1998 Human Development Report with a theme of changing today's consumption patterns for tomorrow's human development has tables and facts about the world's inequalities. For example, the new human poverty index (HPI-2)' shows that some

7-17% of the populations in industrial countries is poor. Sweden has the least poverty with 7%, though ranked only thirteenth in average income. The United States, with the highest average income of the countries ranked, has the highest population share experiencing human poverty' (p. 2). The 1997 Human Development Report emphasizes eradicating poverty. Its **Women and political and economic participation** (Table 29, p. 206) gives the nod to the Nordic Countries for the highest percentage of women in government at the ministerial level, 39.5%. It is perhaps a keystone criterion for women's progress. The Nordic countries also hold the highest values for the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) rank which is built from seats held in parliament, administrators and managers, professional and technical workers, and earned income share, all in % to women (Table 3, p.152).

The regional aggregates of the human development indicator, which are counted by seats in parliament held by women, female administrators and managers, female professional and technical workers, and women's share of earned income to introduce the **Gender Empowerment Measure**, would fit easily within the R³ umbrella (p. 47, Table 3). Ranging from 23% for the Arab States to 37% for South Asia, the world's composite score is 33%, right on formula for the R³. In 13 countries there were no women in ministerial or other governmental positions, in 16 countries women occupied the highest 25+ percent of parliamentary positions in 1999 (UN 2000: 165). The world average of 9 percent of women in political decision-making in 1987 increased by a mere 2 percent in twelve years.

Similarly, **Women's access to education** on a world regional basis for female tertiary natural and applied science students (p. 207, Table 10) fits comfortably within the

hypothesis. The percentages for females range from 18% each for South and East Asia, to 33% for Eastern Europe and CIS, with an average of 27% for the industrialized countries. The 1990 World Declaration for Education for All and the Beijing Platform for Action called for an end of the gender gap in primary and secondary education by the year 2005 and end of illiteracy for girls through universal access to education by 2000. However, as the World's Women 2000 states "it is unlikely that the gender gap in education will be fully closed by the target year 2005" (p.xiv) Two thirds of the world's illiterates are women and the gap in some cases is exacerbated especially in sub-Saharan Africa and Southern Asia and according to the UNESCO there will be no decline until at least 2025.

A look through the Status of selected international rights instruments to the **Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, 1979**, shows some countries conspicuous by their absences of approval: Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Cook Islands, Djibouti, the Holy See, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Federal States of Micronesia, Monaco, Nauru, Niger, Niue, Oman, Palau, Qatar, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, Tuvalu, and the United Arab Emirates. Countries whose signatures have not yet been followed by ratification include Afghanistan, Sao Tome and Principe, and the United States. Of those 31 countries not signing the Convention, eight are classified as least developed countries (p. 226), and one is considered an industrial country. **The richest nation of the world, the United States of America, has not ratified the Convention.**

Women in Journalism Education in the United States

According to an unpublished study conducted by doctoral students in communications at the University of Kentucky during 1998, women's role in the traditional mass media could still comfortably fit under that umbrella of R³ (Brescoach, DiGuglielmo, & Thornberry, 1998). With all of the rewards that the 'stealth' passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 in the USA seems to have created for the media industries, these authors point to the possible problems of closing doors for smaller media operators, especially women and minorities (p.71). They do note, however, that 'progress being made in the cable industry was shown to closely overlap with better opportunities for women in film, as many of the women independent filmmakers are producing movies for cable networks.' However, this does not necessarily mean that women will enjoy equal chances in the commercial media, as home decorating or lifestyle programmes are not considered 'serious' opinion making.

Weaver and Wilhoit note that 'One thing that did not change much in U.S. journalism from 1982 to 1992, *to our surprise* [italics are added], was the percentage of women working for all different news media combined. In spite of rapidly increasing enrollments of women in U. S. journalism schools during the 1980s and the emphasis on hiring women since the late 1970s [which Robinson and Saint Jean in their book chapter attribute to affirmative action, p. 354], the overall percentage of women in 1992 remained the same as in 1982 -- 34.' (p. 400) Weaver also notes in his concluding chapter that 'the average proportion of women journalists across these 19 countries and territories was one third (33%), almost exactly the proportion in the United States (34%)' (p. 456).

The status of women in the communication industries in the United States is no better. According to Diversity Best Practices collection of several surveys, women account for less than 25 percent of the directors of the most important media conglomerates (such as USA Networks and Walt Disney), while they score a low 7% at AOL Time Warner and 0 at AMC Entertainment and Clear Channel. Moreover, in the 20 media trade associations, women make 19 percent of directors (The Annenberg Public Policy Centre of the University of Pennsylvania 2002). In the telecommunications and cable industry, the best score is noted at SBC with 29 percent of women directors, while there is a general average 12 percent of women directors across 23 largest companies that include AT&T, NTL and Bellsouth. Slightly better is the situation in publishing houses with 17 percent of female directors, while the e-companies have also a low 8 percent of female directors. As far as the optimistic predictions of scholars are concerned that women will achieve equality in the newsroom, the Media Report to Women (2002) states that the 37 percent of women in the newsroom employees is falling. Down are also the jobs of women on the radio: 32.5 percent in 2002 a decrease of 5 percent from 2001 (37.4) and slightly less in television (38.6 in 2002 and 39.7 in 2001) (Eggerton, J., 2002).

Meanwhile, two of the journalism/mass communication educators who conducted the 1972 study of the status of women in journalism education conducted a 30 year later follow-up, reported out in 2002¹. The subjects in the 1972 study were members of what was then AEJ, the Association for Education in Journalism. There were responses from 101 women, or 74%. When the study was replicated, updated, and expanded in 2000

¹ [(Rush and Oukrop). The dates, 1972 and 2002, represent report-out dates; in both cases research was started two years earlier.]

there were responses from 606 (55%) of 1,100 female members of AEJMC, the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

The official March 2000 membership in AEJMC was 3,123, and of these, 1,158 (37%) were women. In 1970-71, 131 women belonged to AEJ, which at that time had a total membership of 1,200; women made up just under 11 percent (10.9%) of the organization's membership. While the 37% is a notable improvement over the 11% of 30 years ago, it comes close to fitting under the R^3 hypothesis, and it is still far from the balance required to furnish adequate role modeling and mentoring for the majority of the current students.

Women in the 1972 study regarded promotion and tenure as the major areas of discrimination; in the 2002 study it was salary regardless of the demographic group affiliation - race, tenure, age or rank. Salary holds in the top three categories; 84 percent ranked it among their top three. This was surprising at first. However, a review of the AEJMC directory for 1999-2000, showed that men (mostly white) accounted for 75% of the top administrators, 70% of the secondary administrators, and 82% of the full professors. It seems safe to speculate, and other studies indicate, that salaries are a part of the reward system contained within the leadership and scholarship positions held predominantly by men. (Kelly, 1989; Kosicki, Viswanath & Creedon, 1994; and Leigh & Anderson, 1992, for example).

Another major finding is that of racialization. One obvious indication is that 83% of the 2000 sample is white. In 1972, race was not even included as a variable: the idea that there might be a difference in the sexes was startling then, and the norm of the dominant paradigm was white. In 2002, race is included as a variable and the differences

between white women and women of color are stark across nearly every variable of discrimination. Women of color register discrimination more deeply. Indeed, it is a separate world for women in academe, bound together by gender, and distinguished by race.

Age is a third leading variable in this study. The women of 1972 crested the second wave in the tide away from discrimination, and they have paid a big price for it, as they noted in many items of discrimination, and in many open-ended comments about such behavior. That only 18% of the full professors in the field of journalism and mass communications were women in 2000, according to a content analysis of the 1999-2000 AEJMC directory gives further credence to the strength of R³ in journalism education in the United States.

While these three leading areas of discrimination – salary, racial differences, and age -- comprise the skeleton of our study, the bone marrow is the extent of discrimination across several items, including a 12-point battery of items in which salary rose to the top consistently and across all demographic groups. Thirty years later, more than one out of two women members still perceive discriminatory behavior. Only 15% of the women surveyed in the 2000 survey responded that ‘no problems exist today in sex discrimination,’ and only eight respondents ranked ‘no problems exist’ at the top of the list of options. Sex discrimination was perceived as a reason there are so few women administrators by 64% in 2000; in 1972 it was 50%. Sex discrimination was also seen as a cause for the ‘more effort’ it takes to get respect from faculty colleagues (58% in 2000, $N = 307$; 57% in 1972); and the ‘more effort’ it takes to get respect from administrators

(57% in 2000, $N = 298$; 71% in 1972). Other research results from the 2000 study are discussed elsewhere (Rush, Oukrop, Bergen & Andsager, 2004).

The 2000 study was prompted in part by an AEJMC resolution passed in 1989: ‘therefore, be it resolved that the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication encourages its members and affiliates to have at least 50 percent of their faculties and administrations comprised of females and minorities by the year 2000.’ Surrounding the individual perceptions of discrimination in the 2002 research report are the directory/publication analyses that speak to the traditional, status-quo system and the well-entrenched systematic or institutional discrimination.

Although in the organizational structures of AEJMC and ASJMC, white women have seen progress through the election of women officers and leadership parity, and while minority women and men are also beginning to prevail, back home in the individual academic units things have not changed much in 30 years. There are more women and minorities, but they are still confined in the same structures of inequality that have existed since the field started.

The membership and leadership structure of AEJMC in the 1999-2000 AEJMC Directory and the 2000 convention program show about 50% participation for women: 47% of the 19 presidents since 1983; 43% women on the AEJMC executive committee, 54% women on the ASJMC executive committee; 58% of the division chairs and vice chairs are women; 49% of the convention moderators and presiders are women. In much the same way, minorities had 15% of the presidents; 21 and 35%, respectively, of the executive committees were minorities; and 13% of the convention leaders were minorities. In May of 2001, women made up 38% of the AEJMC membership, and 7.7%

were self-reported minorities. In these showcase organizations, it would appear that R³ is a thing of the past.

Consigning R³ to the past does not hold, however, back home in the academic workplace. Only 31% of the 4,511 faculty in the 1999-2000 JMC directory were female with 9% minorities; 25% of the 443 top administrators were women, 4.5% were minorities; 30% of the secondary administrators were women, 7% were minorities. Within faculty ranks, 41% of the assistant professors were women, 15% were minorities; 34% of the associate professors were women, 9% were minorities; 18% of the full professors were women, 4% were minorities.

Of the 422 U.S. schools listed in the 1999-2000 directory, 208 (49%) were listed with fewer than three faculty members. Because these schools were not ASJMC members, they were sent the non-member short form, thus listing only the administrator and/or the journalism chair. For the schools listing fewer than three faculty members, 208 administrators were reported; 56 (27%) of them were women. Looking at the directory figures as a whole, 25% of the top administrators were women. Thus the smaller, non-ASJMC member schools were as likely as the member schools to have women administrators, with both groups fitting under the R³ umbrella.

Yet, only 42 of the remaining 201 academic programs appear to meet the 1989 AEJMC resolution of having 50% or more women and minority faculty members and administrators by the year 2000. That's about 21 % of the schools meeting the criteria. About 35 more schools (17%) have between 40 and 49% women and minorities. That leaves the majority, about 124 schools, roughly 62%, falling into the group with 39% or fewer women and minorities. In other words, rather than meeting or even approaching

the 50% goal, *about 62 per cent, nearly two-thirds of the U.S. schools, have failed to meet this official standard of their scholarly/professional organization.*

Hypothesis-busting: What's it going to take for the 21st Century?

What is it going to take after 30 years and many generations to remove for women in the media industry and in JMC education the ‘flooring’ effect known as the Ratio of Recurrent and Reinforced Residuum in which a ratio of about 1/3:2/3 keeps women contained/ restricted/concentrated in the lower-paying, lower-titled positions?

We will not repeat the rich body of literature that looks into the systemic and systematic discrimination against women. It is obvious to us that the workings of the academy and the communications industry reveal inequality and discrimination in the more general and deeper structures of patriarchy, regardless of local cultures and traditions. The findings show that very few societies have managed to support and maintain some progress towards women’s equality and that is not irrelevant from or independent of the general position of women in these societies. Therefore, any proposed course of action should be made with the understanding that subject and issue-specific policies should be accompanied by more intensive efforts for the promotion of gender justice on all fronts. They include political organization of societies, education of people and training of decision-makers, outreach programs and media content policies that promote the ideals of gender justice, as well as programs and agencies that can offer support to marginalized women and act as advocates for those most likely to be silenced through actions of symbolic or physical violence.

In the conclusion of their 2002 study Rush and Oukrop recommended an active role of the national professional organization in advising universities to have readings on the search for equity available and required of faculty, administrators, upper-level undergraduates, and graduate students. The same recommendation can be made for any national professional organization. It is also important that women create and maintain their own networks not only within the academy but also at a national and international level and within their professional organizations and unions. As Lorde said, ‘without community there is no liberation, only the most vulnerable and temporary armistice between an individual and her oppression.’

However, it should not be understood as being only women’s responsibility to advocate for equality. Those in the decision-making or advocacy and representation positions have a moral responsibility to pursue the project of equality for all.

The monitoring of data regarding gender and race is imperative given the difficulty in maintaining a databank of reliable data and the lack of funding for women’s and feminist research.

The 2002 report makes specific and detailed recommendations regarding establishment of family care facilities on campuses and rewarding academic units that care to act and alerting those that don’t act. It proposed sex and race equity in AEJMC member academic units as established in the 1989 resolution, a rotation system for administrators to break the hold that (mostly white) males have on senior scholarship and leadership positions, and a salary gap compression process to alleviate the differences between faculty and administration².

² The details of the recommendations cannot be included here, but are available in Chapter 5 of a Seeking Equity for Women in Journalism and Mass Communication: A 30-Year Update, Erlbaum, 2004.

In the concluding section of Unequal Opportunities: The Case of Women and the Media (1981), Gallagher asked, 'What Remains to Be Done?' She discussed setting the agenda: some lessons in politics, redefinition and revitalization of the issue, and developing new structures. And these were important for women to become participants in the larger world: UN Decade for Women and subsequent policy and actions, alternative media including feminist publications, news networks, women's media organizations; and rejecting unquestioned assumptions in the male model. The women's movement also had to question itself as it grew and became more inclusive, including understanding what was to be called the Superwoman Syndrome.

Lots of ground was gained for the articulation and inclusion of women's global issues. Male leaders in any field seldom took seriously women in their quest for individualized and collective empowerment, and educational and financial security

So how do we bust this horrible conundrum? We might have to rely on transcendentalist Ralph Waldo Emerson's observation that when the half-gods go, the gods arrive. Quite likely it is time for the rebirth of labor movements and unions, especially in institutions of higher education where our future leaders are. Not in their old form of graft and corruption but in coalitions and movements of concerned citizens who are literally sick and tired of what is being done to them, for them, and about them.

Even in universities, cutting-edge societal observations are increasingly bought by the government and corporations in exchange for well-endowed research titles (with little or no responsibility for undergraduate education and only enough with graduate students to assure that the best are picked as research assistants). On the capitalistic side of the

political equation, corporate names appear on school buildings, buses, and even television channels to pimp children with the latest commercially-defined news

The new collectivities need to draw memberships from women, ethnic and sexually diverse groups, minorities, children, specially challenged, and all people who seem to have no group protection for their human rights. Where better to start than in universities and in the media, two of the most important educators in today's global, cultural mixes? Journalism and mass communication educators need to join with media workers to have important societal actions and impacts in the next century -- this will happen when these groups finally understand and wisely use the power they hold by distributing it in ways that enhance enlightened, spiritual democracy in the living, interactive system known as the earth.

It is time to organize such coalition efforts.

References

AUT (2001) Association of University Teachers UK Academic Staff Casualisation 1994-95 to 2000-01 on <http://www.aut.org.uk/media/html/academiccasual94to011.html> accessed on 21/05/2004

Brescoach, W., T. DiGuglielmo, and J. Thornberry, (1998, August). Is the Playing Field Level Yet? A Comparative Study of Women in Mass Media: 1970s-1990s. Paper prepared for partial requirements in CJT 780: Independent study on women in mass media, Dr. Ramona R. Rush, Instructor. College of Communications and Information Studies, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506.

Diversity Best Practices (no publication date) WOW Facts, Communications and Women <http://www.diversitybestpractices.com> accessed on 15/05/2004

Equal Pay Task Force (2001) Just Pay, Summary, EOC, February 2001 London

Eggerton, J. 2002. Not much news for women, minorities. broadcastingcable.com/index.asp?layout=story-stock&articleId in Diversity Best Practices

EOC (2001) Equal Opportunities Commission Women and Men in Britain series, HMSO
www.eco.org.uk

Gallagher, M. (2001). Gender Setting: New Agendas for Media Monitoring and Advocacy. London and New York: Zed Books.

Gallagher, M. (1995). An Unfinished Story: Gender Patterns in Media Employment. Reports and Papers on Mass Communication: 110. Paris: UNESCO,

Gallagher, M. (1981). Unequal Opportunities: The Case of Women and the Media. Paris: UNESCO.

Gallagher, M. & Quindoza-Santiago, L. (1994). Women Empowering Communication: A Resource Book on Women and the Globalisation of Media. London: World Association for Christian Communication, Manila: Isis International, and New York: International Women's Tribune Centre.

Giacometti, M (2002) "Women in Italian Universities" *Industry & Higher Education* February:43-48

Human development report, 1997. United Nation Development Program (UNDP). New York: Oxford University Press.

Human development report, 1998. United Nation Development Program (UNDP). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kelly, J. (1989). 'Gender, Pay and Job Satisfaction of Faculty in Journalism', *Journalism Quarterly*, 66: 446--452.

Kosicki, G., K. Viswanath, and P. Creedon, (1994). 'The 1992 Census of AEJMC: A Report to the Membership', *Journalism Educator*, 49,103-108.

Leigh, F., and D. Anderson (1992). 'A Balance of Study and Teaching in Tenure and Promotion Cases'. *Journalism Educator*, 47, 74-79.

Media Report to Women (2004) <http://www.mediaporttowomen.com/statistics.htm>
National Committee on Pay Equity (2002). 'Highlights of Women's Earnings in 2001'. Retrieved August 10, 2003, from <http://www.feminist.com/fairpay/highlights.htm>

NSSG (1998) National Statistical Services of Greece, Statistical Service of Education - Data processing: Centre for Research into Equality (KETHI) Greece (unpublished data)

Robbins W, Stanley J, Morgan R (2001) Ivory Towers – Feminist Audits. Selected Indicators of the Status of Women in Canada in <http://www.caut.ca/english/women/Tables.asp>

Robinson, G., and A. Saint-Jean, (1998). 'Canadian Women Journalists: The "Other Half" of the Equation', pp. 351-372 in D. Weaver, D. (Ed.). The Global Journalist: News People Around the World. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Rush, R. (1989). 'Communications at the crossroads: The gender gap connection', pp. 3-19 in R. Rush and D. Allen (eds.). Communications at the Crossroads: The Gender Gap Connection. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rush, R. (1996). Preface, pp. ix-xi and xii-xvii in D. Allen, R. Rush, and S.Kaufman (eds), pp. Women Transforming Communications: Global Intersections, Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

Rush, R. (1996). 'Ten Tenets for Deeper Communications: Transforming Communications Theory and Research', pp. 3-18 in D. Allen, R. Rush, and S.Kaufman, (eds). Women Transforming Communications: Global Intersections, Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage

Rush, R.R. (1996). 'Websters and spinsters', pp. xii-xvii in D. Allen, R. Rush, and S. Kaufman, (eds). Women Transforming Communications: Global Intersections, Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

Rush, R.R. (2004). 'Three decades of women and mass communications research: The ratio of recurrent and reinforced residuum hypothesis revisited,' pp. 263-273, in R. Rush, C. Oukrop & P. Creedon (eds), Seeking Equity for Women in Journalism and Mass Communication Education: A 30-Year Update, Mahway, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rush, R., E. Buck and C.Ogan, (1982, July-September). 'Women and the Communications Revolution: Can we Get There from Here?' Chasqui (publication of the Control Internacional de Estudios Superiores de la Comunicacion para American Latina, CIESPAL, Quito, Ecuador.

Rush, R., C. Oukrop, and P. Creedon,(eds) (2004). Seeking Equity for Women in Journalism and Mass Communication Education: A 30-Year Update, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rush, R., C. Oukrop, and S. Ernst, (1972). (More than you ever wanted to know) about women and journalism education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.

Rush, R., C. Oukrop, L. Bergen, and J. Andsager, (2004) 'Where are the old broads?' been there, done that ... 30 years ago: An update of the original study of women in journalism and mass communication education, 1972 and 2002', Chapter 5 in Rush, R., C. Oukrop, and P. Creedon (eds), Seeking Equity for Women in Journalism and Mass Communication Education: A 30-Year Update, Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Sarikakis, K (2004) *Future Faculty: doctorate education in Communication, Culture and Media studies in the UK- project report* <http://www.brighton.ac.uk/adcltsn/html/projects/report-FutureFac.htm>

Sarikakis, K (2003) In the land of becoming: the gendered experience of communication doctoral students. *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education* 2(1&2) pp29-48

United Nations (2000) *The World's Women. Trend and Statistics*, UN Social Statistics and Indicators: New York

Weaver, D. (Ed.). (1998). The Global Journalist: News People Around the World. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Weaver, D. and C. Wilhoit (1998). 'Journalists in the United States'. In Weaver, D. (Ed.). The Global Journalist: News People Around the World. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, pp. 395-414.

ANNEX

- AEJMC presidents since 1983: 47% women
15% minority
- AEJMC Executive Committee 1999-2000: 43% women
21% minority
- ASJMC Executive Committee 1999-2000: 54% women
35% minority
- AEJMC Division Chairs and Vice Chairs: 58% women
13% minority

These are the national organization showcase statistics (AEJMC and ASJMC), but back home in the trenches (the individual academic units):

- JMC faculty members in 1999-2000: 31% women
9% minority
- Of 201 academic programs, 42 (21 percent) appear to meet the 1989 resolution of having 50 percent or more women and minority faculty members and administrators.
- Top administrators 1999-2000: 25% women
4.5% minority

- Secondary administrators 1999-2000: 30% women
7% minority
- Assistant professors 1999-2000: 41% women
15% minority
- Associate professors 1999-2000: 34% women
9% minority
- Full professors 1999-2000: 18% women
4% minority