To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Betty Anne Farmer entitled, "2000 TOGETHER: THE SITUATIONAL THEORY OF PUBLICS APPLIED TO THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION PROGRAMS." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Communications.

Susan Lucarelli

Dr. Susan Lucarelli, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Paul Alsdorf

C E Caudill

Ronald E. Taylor

Faye D. Julian

Accepted for the Council:

Lewis Mikel

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of the Graduate School

"2000 TOGETHER:"
THE SITUATIONAL THEORY OF PUBLICS
APPLIED TO THE STATUS OF WOMEN
IN JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION PROGRAMS

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Betty Anne Farmer

December, 1993

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother,

Mary Anne Lipps Farmer,

whose career was her family.

She was the world's greatest female administrator.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the following people:

Dr. Susan Lucarelli, my adviser, role model and mentor, for her commitment to me and this topic and for her continued guidance;

Dr. Paul Ashdown, committee member, for his faithful support and mentoring;

Dr. Ron Taylor, committee member, for opening my eyes to gender issues and critical research;

Dr. Ed Caudill, committee member, for getting me through the statistical analysis;

Dr. Jerry Morrow, committee member, for playing the devil's advocate and making this a stronger study;

Dr. Faye Julian, committee member, for her much needed support and expert editing advice;

Members of AEJMC's Commission on the Status of Women for their encouragement and helpful suggestions;

John Farmer, my brother, for funding this study and for his continued love, support, and guidance;

Jack Farmer, my brother, for his friendship, love and support;

Asa Farmer, my father, for being the world's greatest father;

Cheryl Hild, my friend, for always being there;

Pam Harris, my friend, for "holding my arms up;" and

Mildred Carmichael, my friend, for always listening.

ABSTRACT

This study applied the situational theory of publics to the issue of women's advancement in journalism and mass communication programs. The methodology was a telephone survey of a stratified, random sample of 402 members of The Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC).

As of 1993, women were underrepresented as faculty and administrators in journalism and mass communication programs, while females constituted the majority of students in these programs. In recognition of this situation, AEJMC passed a resolution in 1989 that encouraged its members and affiliates to have at least 50 percent of their faculties and administrations comprised of females and minorities by the year 2000.

The goal of this research was two-fold. The first objective was to make a contribution to the public relations body of knowledge by testing and refining the situational theory of publics. The situational theory uses the three variables of problem recognition, constraint recognition, and level of involvement to determine a public's level of communication activity. The combination of these variables can be used to predict communication behavior. A group that is high in problem recognition, low in constraint recognition, and high in level of involvement is most likely to exhibit higher levels of communication activity for a particular issue. High communication activity has been found to predict high levels of

activist behavior. This study sought to extend the situational theory in three key areas: demographics, channel use, and activism. The results suggested that the combination of specific demographic variables in conjunction with the situational theory variables could be used to further segment publics. There were significant differences in levels of activism when described by gender and age.

The second objective was to bridge the gap between theory and application in public relations campaign planning. The analysis considers how the results of this theoretical research could be used to develop programming for a communication campaign designed to improve the number and status of women in journalism and mass communication programs by the year 2000.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Reports on the status of women in academe in the late 1980s and at the start of the 1990s came to familiar conclusions: The environment for women in higher education was still "hostile" or "chilly" (Blum, 1991; Sandler, 1986). As students, faculty and administrators, women in higher education continued to be treated differently than their male counterparts in the last decade of the twentieth century. Blum (1991) quoted Bernice R. Sandler, a senior associate at the Center for Women Policy Studies in Washington, as stating that there were "tremendous similarities" between the reports released in the 1990s and the reports released in the 1970s (p. A1).

At the start of the 1990s, women were admitted into the formerly all-male institutions in significant numbers as students. In 1990, women made up 46 percent of the freshman class at Yale University. That compares to 13 percent of the freshman class when women were first admitted in 1969. And at Harvard University, women constituted 40 percent of the freshman class in 1990 (Collison, 1990, p. A23).

Although there had been an increase in the number of female students, there were complaints at the start of the 1990s that women had not been completely accepted at these more prestigious

institutions. Female students in the Ivy League complained that the curricula did not reflect women's contributions, that faculty did not treat women equally, that the health and safety needs of women were ignored, and that there were not enough female faculty and administrators (Collison, 1990, p. A23).

Female students at traditionally all-male institutions have suggested that their problems are "exacerbated by the small proportions of female faculty members" (Collison, 1990, p. A24). As of 1990, 9 percent of the tenured faculty at Yale were women; 22 percent of the tenured faculty at Dartmouth were women; and 9 percent of the faculty at Harvard were women (p. A24).

The hiring and promotion of women faculty and administrators at all higher education institutions has lagged behind the increasing enrollment of female undergraduate students. The total enrollment of female students at all four-year institutions doubled between the years 1965 and 1987, and at the start of the 1990s, women made up more than 50 percent of the undergraduate enrollment. The number of women in graduate programs also had greatly increased. By the mid 1980s, women received almost half of the master's degrees and about one-third of the doctorates (Hensel, p. 9). Touchton and Davis (1991) predicted that the proportion of women receiving doctoral degrees would increase to 46 percent of the annual total by 1998 (p. 67).

Although females constituted the majority of the undergraduate student population, women continued to be

underrepresented as faculty. At the beginning of the 1990s, studies still characterized the status of women faculty as unequal. Women were more likely to be found in the traditionally female-dominated disciplines, such as education and nursing, and on the lower levels of the professorial hierarchy. They were paid less than men, tenured less frequently, and they advanced more slowly than their male counterparts (Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989). According to the 1992-93 statistics, 71 percent of all faculty men held tenure, while 46 percent of all faculty women were tenured ("Treading Water:," 1993).

At the beginning of the 1990s, men and women faculty at the same ranks were not paid the same. According to the American Association of University Professors' annual report on salaries, "women faculty at colleges and universities in 1988-89 earned between 7.5 and 13.2 percent less than male faculty" (Luna & Cullen, 1990). The 1992-1993 statistics indicated that women professors earned 88.2 percent of what male professors earned; women associate professors earned 93 percent; women assistant professors earned 92.3 percent; women instructors earned 94.4 percent; and women lecturers earned 87.5 percent (Treading Water:, 1993).

These differences in pay could be quite large, particularly in the Ivy League schools, where women faculty have been described as "rare" (DePalma, 1993, p. 1). According to a 1993 report, women full professors at Harvard earned $79,000 annually, while men full professors earned $93,600. This is an average difference of $14,600 per professor, per year (DePalma, 1993).

Evidence of differential treatment could be found at all levels of the academic hierarchy at the start of the 1990s, perhaps no where more acutely than at the top. Of the total chief executive positions across academe, 10 percent were held by women. This figure included the leaders at women's and church-affiliated institutions. Of the publicly supported institutions, 6 percent of the top posts were held by women (Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989).

Women also were underrepresented at the middle level administrative positions. On average, a college or institution had 1.1 women senior officers at the level of dean or above. Having two or more women per institution in those positions "bust(s) the average" (Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989, p. 18).

"Old Issues Unresolved"

Many institutions have recognized that although there have been significant changes in the status of women in higher education since the 1970s, the issue of women's equality on campus was not resolved at the start of the 1990s. Blum (1991) quoted Marcia Boyle, president of Educational Consultant Services, as saying: "There is slightly more institutional lip service paid to women's issues now, but little in the way of concrete action is being undertaken" (p. A20).

Others would disagree with at least part of Boyle's assessment of the efforts to improve the status of women on the nation's campuses. Some issues have not been resolved, but specific

solutions have been formulated and concrete actions have been taken. The following section highlights some of the recommendations and changes various organizations and institutions have made in this area.

Institutional efforts

Some institutions, however have given this issue more than lip service. For example, the University of Kentucky conducted a review of the status of its women and found inequities in women's compensation. It then made adjustments in pay and pension contributions in the amount of $2.5 million for its women (Blum, 1991, p. A20).

In addition to equitable pay reviews, there were a number of other things institutions have done to improve the status of its women. Pennsylvania State University, for example, conducted comprehensive reviews of the status of women on its campus. As a result of this research, Pennsylvania State developed a set of recommendations, including:

1) Increase the number of women in executive and administrative leadership positions throughout the University by adopting a "serious search" strategy;

2) Increase the number of women senior faculty positions by improving the retention of well-qualified women;

3) Achieve a balanced representation of men and women in leadership positions throughout the University by increasing the

percentage of women to 50 percent in academic, administrative, and management positions by the year 2000 ("The Strategic Study," 1986).

The last decade of the twentieth century will be a critical period for faculty women, according to Chamberlain (1988). Expected faculty retirements and an increase in the college-aged population should produce more faculty openings. According to Chamberlain, 500,000 new faculty members will be needed by the end of the century. Chamberlain predicted that monitoring the hiring and promotion of women during this transition period will be a crucial activity (p. 369). According to Hensel (1991), this transition period should be viewed as a major opportunity for women's advancement in academe. Institutions will have the opportunity to change the composition of their faculty to achieve a more equitable representation of women (p. 7).

Fallon (1991) concluded: administrators "need to make a commitment that, by the year 2000, the imbalance in salaries will be addressed. By the end of this decade, women should hold higher ranks, be in more powerful positions, and be earning more competitive salaries" (p. 33).

The Status of Women in Journalism and Mass Communication Programs

The development of women faculty takes on increased significance in light of the projected faculty shortages across

academe, and faculty shortages in the communications field, specifically, may be particularly acute by the year 2000. The number of bachelor's degrees awarded in communications has increased 122 percent since 1975, while the number of master's and Ph.D. degrees conferred in communication have declined comparatively (Chesebro, 1991, p. 12). DeFleur (1993) estimated that by 1998, a total of 2,820 faculty positions will need to be filled in communications programs across the country (p. 15). Such predictions enhance the position of groups calling for a change in the composition of the faculties in journalism and mass communication programs to include a more balanced representation of women by the year 2000.

Resolutions that prescribe a more balanced representation and equitable treatment of women throughout academe by the year 2000 are not unique. The Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) passed a resolution in 1989 that encourages its affiliates to achieve at least 50 percent representation of women and minorities as faculty and administrators by the year 2000. Kaufman (1992) quoted AEJMC president Terry Hynes as saying that the organization was under a constitutional mandate to monitor the progress of women.

Like the status of women across academe, the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs is a topic that has received considerable attention since the early seventies. In their 1972 benchmark study, Rush, Oukrop, and Ernst concluded that there

was gender discrimination in journalism education, specifically in the areas of salary and promotion for faculty and administrators. Rush, Oukrop, and Ernst recommended that the Association for Education in Journalism (now AEJMC), appoint a Committee on the Status of Women in Journalism (now the Commission on the Status of Women).

More than a decade later, Sharp, Turk, Einsiedel, Schamber, and Hollenback (1985) reassessed the status of women in journalism and mass communication education. They reported that women's salaries were significantly lower than their male counterparts at all ranks, with the gap being widest at the full professor and instructor ranks. For example, at the full professor rank, women earned an average of $2,204 less than their male counterparts (p. 4). Compared to other disciplines, however, the differences in pay between men and women educators in journalism and mass communication programs in the early 1980s were less than the differences in pay for other educators across all ranks (p. 10).

The results of a census of the AEJMC membership conducted in the spring of 1992 indicated that, overall, women in journalism and mass communication continued to be paid less than men. When all ranks were combined, the average difference in salary was $6,600. When controlled for rank, the greatest difference, again, occurred at the full professor rank: Female full professors earned $5,492 less than their male counterparts. The difference between genders at the assistant professor level was $577; and $1,583 at the associate

professor level (Viswanath, Kosicki & Creedon, 1993). The authors indicated that the differences in salaries at the assistant and associate professor levels were not statistically significant.

In addition to the equal pay issue, scholars in journalism and mass communication have been concerned about the number of women on faculties and in administrative positions. Sharp et al. (1985) reported that although there were more women teaching in these programs, the programs continued to be "heavily dominated by men." According to their survey data, women made up one-sixth of the faculties; 83 percent of the women were found at the rank of assistant professor or below; 4 percent were full professors; and 10 percent were in administrative positions (p. 10).

A comparative analysis of the journalism and mass communication field to academe as a whole helps put the status of women in this field in better perspective. According to the Sharp et al. (1985) study, in all disciplines women made up 24 percent of the faculty and constituted almost 50 percent of the students. In journalism and mass communication programs, however, women made up approximately 18 percent of the faculty and constituted 56 percent of the students (p. 8). By 1988, according to Schamber (1989) women constituted abut 24 percent of the faculty. By 1992 the proportion of female faculty had increased to approximately one-third of the total faculty. Like the national statistics, women in journalism and mass communication programs were most often found in the lower academic ranks. In 1983, 4 percent of the women

in journalism and mass communication programs were full professors. In 1988, women represented 6 percent of all full professors (Schamber, 1989).

The percentage of female full professors in journalism and mass communication rose to 12.7 percent in 1992. This compares to 40 percent of the male faculty who were full professors. Viswanath, Kosicki and Creedon (1993) noted that this number was well below the national average of 17 percent of all women faculty who are full professors, as reported by the National Science Foundation. They also reported that male faculty in journalism and mass communication programs are "three times more likely to be full professors compared to female faculty" (p. 7).

The drive for a more balanced representation of men and women at all academic ranks is, in part, fueled by statistics that point to the preponderance or "new majority" (Beasley & Theus, 1988) of female students in journalism and mass communication programs.

Since 1972, the percentage of female students in journalism and mass communication has steadily increased, and as of 1977 women became the majority. According to 1991 census figures, women constituted 60.2 percent of undergraduate enrollments and 63.7 percent of master's enrollments (Kosicki & Becker, 1992, p. 61). The number of women earning Ph.Ds in mass communication also continued to increase. This proportion increased from 38.5 percent

in 1989 to 44.0 percent in 1990 to 49.3 percent in 1991 (Viswanath, Kosicki & Creedon, 1993).

Role models and mentors

In light of the new majority of female undergraduate students and the growing number of female graduate students in journalism and mass communication programs, many educators in the field have raised concerns about the absence of women in senior faculty and leadership positions. These concerns have centered on the need for positive role models and mentoring experiences. In addition to cross gender mentoring relationships, there should be more opportunities for same gender mentoring relationships, particularly among women. Beasley and Theus (1988) concluded that the "provision of role models for women students is essential if journalism education is to produce successful journalists. Educators must move immediately to ensure that women students are given positive examples of attainment" (p. 124).

Zoch and Russell (1991) provided evidence of a lack of female role models and mentors in journalism and mass communication. They reported that 79.1 percent of their survey of women in public relations departments did not have a mentor of their own.

L. Grunig (1989) called for an increased awareness among both faculty and students in journalism and mass communication about the benefits of mentoring for both the mentor and protege. She suggested that awareness and mentoring skills could be elevated

though the distribution of informative publications that detail the "how to" and "how not to" of mentoring activities.

Pratt (1989) stressed the importance of mentoring by making the connection between research productivity and mentoring. The most likely way women and minorities will be tenured and promoted will be as a result of their research productivity. The likelihood of achieving an impressive research record "depends, on large measure, on the provision of mentors for female and minority faculty members," Pratt argued (p. 31).

Advancement to administrative positions

How to advance women into leadership positions in journalism and mass communication is a topic that has received considerable attention. Many scholars in the journalism and mass communication field have specifically focused on the lack of women administrators and there are many explanations for the disproportionate representation of women in administrative positions in journalism and mass communication programs.

In a study based on a survey of ASJMC (The Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication) members, Turk (1991) concluded that the percentage of women administrators in journalism and mass communication rose from eight percent in 1985-86 to 13 percent in 1989-90 to 16 percent in 1991-92. According to a 1991 study, about 10 percent of the 187 institutions

affiliated with ASJMC were headed by women (Coleman and Williams).

The respondents in the Sharp et al. (1985) study characterized the lack of women in administrative positions as "a major problem." More than two-thirds of the respondents (68 percent) attributed the disproportionate representation of women in these positions to sex discrimination. They suggested that gender stereotypes kept women from seeking leadership positions and that such stereotypes made it difficult for women to be accepted in those roles. The respondents also indicated that time was a factor. Women had not been on the faculties long enough to advance, they suggested (p. 62).

To explain the lack of administrators, Turk (1991) reported: "It's the sacrifices administrators, particularly women administrators, have to make to meet the demands of their jobs...." The survey respondents indicated that women select themselves out of the process; have conflicts balancing career and family; are not prepared for the role; do not have role models to guide them, and are not perceived as wanting administrative responsibilities.

Turk (1991) reported that several women administrators in journalism education perceived differences in the expectations of men and women leaders. They suggested that men and women could exhibit the same leadership behaviors but would be interpreted in different ways. As one woman put it: "When I do it, I'm helter skelter; when he does it, he's being creative or flexible. When I do it, I'm a bitch; when he does it, he's a wonderful, hard-working

leader." Another suggested that a woman could not come across as "too aggressive" in her leadership style. This creates a challenge: "There's no way you can do the job without being aggressive, yet you have to be careful that nobody perceives you that way," one respondent said.

The perception that women do not want to be administrators is pervasive. Sharp et al. (1985) quoted a male administrator who announced the opening of an administrative position. Both the males and the females ran in horror at the thought of assuming an administrative position, the male administrator said, "[b]ut it seems that the women run slightly faster." Zoch and Russell (1991) reported that there are a number of reasons why women have not assumed leadership positions in public relations departments. About half of the women in this study reported that the administrative aspects of their jobs were the least satisfying of their duties. From this perspective, the lack of women in administrative positions might be explained as a matter of choice. That is, women simply do not want the responsibility.

Many argue that the advancement of women into administrative positions is a precursor to the advancement of women at all levels of the educational hierarchy. As L. Grunig (1989) contended, it is likely that if there are more women in positions of power (department heads, deans, or other administrators), these women will be able to make changes in discriminatory practices or offset institutional biases against women that could facilitate the

advancement of female faculty. L. Grunig wrote: "As long as men remain the gatekeepers to women's entry into positions of power and security, their futures are in jeopardy." Assuming administrative positions, then, would be one way for women to gain more influence in the decisions that affect their careers.

In an effort to facilitate the advancement of women into leadership positions in journalism and mass communication programs, Kaufman (1992) developed a conceptual model that identified and described five key variables that potentially serve as roadblocks to women's advancement into academic administration.

Kaufman developed the model by conducting an extensive review of relevant literature from a variety of disciplines, including business, communication, educational psychology, educational administration, and sociology. The five variables are: 1) isolation; 2) denial that problems persist; 3) lack of administrative training; 4) lack of mentors and role models; and 5) lack of a system by which to identify future leaders.

One of the most intriguing findings in Kaufman's research was related to the variable of denial. Kaufman surmised that, particularly among younger women, there was denial that inequities based on gender continued to persist.

Along the same vein, L. Grunig (1989) pondered why women and minorities in their inferior positions in academe continued to acquiesce. She concluded that many students seemed to have bought into "the myth of equality" (p. 139). L. Grunig (1989) also

recommended that students needed to be made aware of "the discrimination they may face." Quoting Segal, a sociology professor, L. Grunig reported: "Much of the problem of inequality is rooted in perceptions that there is no problem." L. Grunig added that many women were becoming more aware of the problems they faced in academe--even if they were not actively working to change the situation (p. 139).

Statement of the Problem

The foregoing research results and conclusions are thought-provoking. First, it has been suggested that part of the "problem" of women's inferior status in journalism and mass communication programs is related to a lack of awareness, or as the case may be, a reluctance to admit that there is a problem. Second, it has been suggested that there are many barriers that impede women's advancement into senior faculty and administrative positions. Third, it has been suggested that it will take the combined commitment of men and women, both at the personal and institutional levels, to affect change in this area.

A theory of communication exists that takes into accounts these preceding three points. J. Grunig's situational theory of publics has three independent variables that, when combined, predict communication behavior. (The situational theory has been tested repeatedly and the development of this theory will be detailed in the

third chapter of this dissertation. A brief overview, however, is necessary at this point.)

The first variable is problem recognition, or the degree to which people realize there is a problem. Previous research suggests that there is a lack of awareness that problems relating to the status of women in journalism and mass communication, specifically, and across academe, persist.

The second variable is constraint recognition, or the degree to which people believe they can make a difference in this area. Given the explication of the barriers women face in academe and the traditional, hierarchical structure of higher education, one might expect high levels of constraint recognition in this area.

The third variable is level of involvement, or the degree to which people believe this issue affects them personally. It is clear that this is not merely a "women's issue." Men have a major stake in this issue, too. As L. Grunig (1989) suggested: "Men in higher education must come to realize that what happens to their female colleagues in a sense happens to them. In other words, it is in the self-interest of men not to waste women's resources" (p. 140). L. Grunig added that these consciousness-raising activities, however, would "cost men some comfort in the short run" (p. 140).

When combined, these three independent variables predict communication behavior. Research suggests that people high in problem recognition (they are aware there is a problem), low in constraint recognition (they believe they can do something to change

the situation), and high in level of involvement (they believe the issue affects them personally) are more likely to be active in their communication behavior. These people are more likely to seek out information about the issue and are more likely to engage in activities to do something to improve the situation.

On the extreme end of the continuum are people who are low in problem recognition (they are not aware of the problem), high in constraint recognition (they do not believe they can change the situation) and low in involvement (they do not believe the issue affects them personally). This group or public is likely to be more passive in its communication behavior. These people might randomly process information that is presented to them, but they will make little effort to seek out information about the issue. The members of this public would rarely engage in activities to change the situation.

At the heart of the situational theory is the idea that there can be several types of publics in one audience and that these publics can be defined by their levels of communication activity (J. Grunig and Hunt, 1984). Once the audience is segmented into distinct publics, using the situational theory, a communication campaign planner can then determine and deliver the messages that would be most effective for each of the publics.

For example, if research using the situational theory showed that the majority of the audience were high in problem recognition, but also high in constraint recognition, then the campaign would

focus not on raising awareness about the problem, but on showing the public how to overcome its perceived constraints.

The importance of conducting formative research on an organization's publics is well documented (e.g. Pavlik, 1988 and J. Grunig, 1989). Scholars and practitioners agree that the ability to segment audiences and tailor messages accordingly is a prerequisite to effective campaign planning.

By passing the resolution to achieve parity by the year 2000, AEJMC acknowledged that disparities based on gender do indeed exist. In 1993, the strategy detailing how parity was to be achieved by the year 2000 was being formulated. Rush (1993) offered several suggestions. A public information campaign designed to address this issue could be one part of the strategy for making the resolution a reality (p. 78).

Research guided by the situational theory could provide the baseline information for such a campaign. Although the AEJMC leadership is aware of problems and committed to change, it is not known what perceptions AEJMC members hold about the issue of women's advancement in journalism and mass communication.

Are AEJMC members aware that there is a "problem?" Or, do they acknowledge a problem, but believe there is little they can do to change the situation? Or, do they believe this issue does not involve them personally? Do men and women view this issue differently? Are AEJMC members actively communicating about this issue? Are they willing to engage in activities to change the

situation? These are among the questions that can be answered by conducting research using the situational theory of publics as the guiding theoretical framework.

The goal of this research, however, is twofold. The first objective is to make a contribution to the public relations body of knowledge. The goal will be to further refine the situational theory of publics and to extend it in three key areas: media use/information sources, demographics and activism.

The second objective is an applied one. This research will provide the baseline data from which a communication campaign about the status of women in journalism and mass communication could be developed. This is the practical application and it would provide a much-needed bridge between theory and application.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following literature review is divided into three parts. The first part provides the historical context for the study. The historical narrative begins with the rationale that prevailed until the early nineteenth century for excluding women from higher education. Next, women's participation in higher education as students, faculty and administrators is chronicled during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Highlights in this chronicle include the effects of World War II and the Korean War; the admission of women as students to the all-male institutions in the late 1960s; the affirmative action successes of the 1970s; and the so called "backlash" that occurred in the 1980s under the Reagan Administration.

While the first part of this literature provides the historical foundation and context, the second part provides the sociological and psychological context. It is one thing to chronicle the status of academe through the years, citing statistics and describing significant developments. It is quite another to provide an explanation for women's status.

The second part of the literature review attempts to do just that. This section is devoted to explaining why women continue to be underrepresented in leadership positions in academe. Highlights

in this section include an assessment of the institutional and perceptual barriers (like gender stereotyping) that impede women's progress, the impact of the "good old boy" network, and women's leadership concerns. This section is a synthesis of the literature from many fields, including psychology, sociology, business, and education.

The third part of the literature review describes specific institutional and personal activities that scholars in the field have offered as solutions to "the problem." Highlights include the importance of role modeling and mentoring, individual commitments to activism, and specific guidelines institutions can adopt to improve the status of women on America's campuses.

Part 1: An Historical Overview of Women in Academe

From the very beginning, the university was a male establishment. Females were not admitted as students and women were not hired as faculty and administrators. Intellectual activity was simply deemed contrary to the feminine nature. Women were kept out of higher education based on biological and psychological arguments, which rationalized the inferiority of women. One myth posited that if a woman used her mental capacities the energy would be drained directly from her uterus and her reproductive abilities would be harmed. This "drain" would ultimately lead to the end of the human race (Chamberlain, 1988, p. 167).

In addition to the belief that women lacked the same mental capacities as men, there was the fear that women in the classroom would serve as a distraction to the serious scholarly efforts of the male students, and, consequently, lower the educational standards (Chamberlain, 1988).

The "reluctance to use brains attached to female forms" continued through the first third of the nineteenth century for the majority of the U.S. institutions, and longer for some. Women were first admitted as students in the United States in 1837 at Oberlin College, more than 200 years after Harvard was established to educate young men (Chamberlain, 1988). Women were not admitted as students at Yale and Princeton until 1969.

Opportunities for women as students in higher education were limited until after the Civil War, but enrollment increased rapidly during the latter part of the nineteenth century. By the turn of the twentieth century, about 70 percent of the colleges were coeducational and women made up about 30 percent of the student body (Chamberlain, 1988).

The majority of women attended college to become teachers. Teaching was considered an appropriate occupation for women because it was a natural extension of the nurturing role. In 1880, 57 percent of teachers in the U.S. were women. By 1918, that figure was 84 percent. The influx of women into the teaching profession, however, can be explained largely by economics. Chamberlain (1988) quoted Woody as saying that women were hired because they could

"afford to teach for one-half, or even less, the salary which men would ask" (p. 4).

Women's participation in higher education was seriously threatened after World War II and the Korean War. Veterans supported by the G.I. Bill entered colleges in large numbers. This influx of male students led to restrictions on the number of female students who could be admitted. "As priority was given to veterans, graduate women found that they had to be far better qualified than men to be admitted, and married women who wished to enroll part time found the doors closed...In short, women students were being treated openly as second-class citizens" (Chamberlain, 1988, p. 6).

The change in admission standards was evident in the number of degrees awarded. In 1940, 41 percent of the bachelor's and professional degrees were awarded to women. In 1950, that figure decreased to 24 percent. By 1960, the proportion of women earning bachelor's degrees had increased to 35 percent, but the prewar rate was not regained until 1970, according to Chamberlain.

Women as faculty

Not only did women lose ground as students during the 1950s and 1960s, they also lost status as college faculty members. At the turn of the twentieth century, women made up 20 percent of the faculty; by 1940, that figure had increased to 25 percent. During the post World War II era, however, the percentage of women on college faculties "declined to 23 percent in the 1950s and 22

percent in the 1960s. The prewar high of 25 percent was not regained until the 1970s" (Chamberlain, p. 10).

Not only were faculty women underrepresented in numbers, they were concentrated in the lower ranks, most often at the instructor and lecturer levels. Additionally, women faculty most often were found in the less prestigious institutions, primarily two-year institutions, and were concentrated in particular fields such as education, social work, home economics, and nursing (Chamberlain, p. 10).

This "second class" status of female faculty in higher education was challenged, largely as a result of the women's rights movement in the U.S. that began in the 1960s. "The widespread practice of sex discrimination" in higher education during the 1970s became a fertile topic of academic research, and two 1973 publications chronicled these early reform efforts, which sought to remedy the inequities in employment practices in higher education. Moreover, this drive toward equity was fueled by affirmative action programs (Chamberlain, 1988).

Faculty women across the United States during the 1970s documented sex discrimination in salary, promotion and treatment. During this time period, according to Chamberlain (1988):

> "academic women become more and more aware that a benign neutrality would not be enough to achieve equality on campus. Reasoned expositions of the facts apparently would not be enough to change the dismal hiring and promotion, and the many related phenomena which contributed to institutionalized, systemic discrimination against women. In

> fact, it became increasingly apparent that the first step was to establish unequivocally that a problem did exist. . . ." (p. 165).

During the 1970s, several federal laws were passed that prohibited sex discrimination in higher education. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 was extended to cover executive, administrative, and professional employment. Title IX prohibited sex discrimination in all federally assisted education programs. Exempt from Title IX, however, were the admissions policies of private undergraduate colleges. This exemption was a result of a strong lobby from the Ivy League schools, which had a quota on the number of women students allowed. That quota ensured that the most prestigious institutions would stay predominantly male (Davis, 1991, p. 212).

The Executive Order, which outlawed sex discrimination in all federally financed employment, was applied to higher education for the first time, largely as a result of the efforts of the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL). A class action lawsuit was filed in 1970, which charged "an industry-wide pattern of discrimination against academic women." This led to the additional filing of similar charges at approximately 250 other institutions across the country (Chamberlain, pp. 172 &173).

Although several pieces of legislation were passed, enforcement was spotty. Loopholes were found in Title IX that allowed institutions to maintain discriminatory practices, particularly in athletic programs. Very few complaints were processed and many were dismissed. Class action suits met with

limited success. And, perhaps more importantly, there were signs that the political climate in the 1980s was becoming less supportive of women's rights (Sharp et al., 1985).

According to Davis (1991), one of the first targets of the Reagan Administration was the Executive Order, which held federal contractors to affirmative action policies. Small companies and contractors were exempted under the original wording of the Executive Order. The Reagan Administration practically nullified the purpose of the Executive Order by extending the percentage of government contractors who were exempt from the Executive Order to more than 70 percent (p. 440).

In her best selling book, Backlash, Susan Faludi (1991) argued the Reagan Administration seriously threatened the Women's Educational Equity Act program (WEEA), which promoted equal education for females by providing grants to programs that fought sex discrimination in education. In 1982, the "New Right" coalition attacked and demoted WEEA's long-term director and replaced the program's staff of 150 field readers who were responsible for reviewing grant applications. Faludi contended that the new employees understood their job was to help Ronald Reagan curb "a feminist agency." The new employees were not qualified for the positions, did not understand the concepts of educational equity, and did not support the goals of the agency. Faludi reported that one new field reader had been quoted as asking: "What *is* Title IX?" (pp. 260-262).

Bernice Sandler, one of the original founders of WEEA, suggested that the Reagan Administration was simply closed on the issue of women's equality. Davis (1991) quoted Sandler as saying that the conservative atmosphere in the White House had greatly intensified. When Nixon was in the office, "The Republicans would meet with us...and you could convince them on political grounds that something was necessary. The Reagan Administration was not even interested in meeting with us," according to Sandler (p. 444).

Although the federal legislation passed during the 1970s had helped to increase the number of women on the faculties, women continued to be underrepresented in faculty numbers during the 1980s. Between 1960 and 1982, the percentage of women faculty increased from 22 percent to 29 percent of all faculty (Touchton and Davis, p. 88).

Women faculty continued to be concentrated in the lower ranks. In 1985, approximately 55 percent of all women holding ranked faculty positions were at the instructor or assistant professor level. In contrast, 70 percent of the men holding ranked faculty positions in 1985 were either professors or associate professors (Touchton and Davis, p. 89). From 1972 to 1982, the percentage of women at the full professor rank increased marginally, from 9.8 percent to 10.7 percent of all faculty (Chamberlain, p. 259).

Women faculty continued to be paid less than their male counterparts. In some instances, the disparities in pay actually

widened. In 1972-73, the average salary for women at the assistant professor rank was 94 percent that of men's. In 1986-1987, the percentage had fallen to 90 percent of men's. A female full professor in 1972-1973 earned 90 percent of what a male full professor earned. That statistic was unchanged in 1986-1987. In real dollars, the penalty for being a female at the full professor rank in the United States in 1986 amounted to $5,440 (Chamberlain, p. 259). In 1985-86, in all ranks combined, women faculty's salaries averaged 80 percent that of men's (Touchton and Davis, p. 97).

Disparities in the rate of tenure have also been documented. While 64 percent of the male faculty had tenure in 1975-1976, only 46 percent of the female faculty did. The gap in the tenure statistics widened for the 1985-86 assessment: 69 percent of the male faculty were tenured while 47 percent of the female faculty were tenured (Chamberlain, p. 262).

Chamberlain suggested that while affirmative action has been quite successful in getting women hired on as faculty, such efforts have been less effective in moving women through the ranks. "That is to say, during the second decade of women in academe, many departments were willing to hire women, but not necessarily to tenure them" (p. 178). The process of hiring women but refusing to tenure them has been named "the revolving door theory" (Chamberlain, p. 178).

Women in administration

Concerns about moving women through the academic ranks go beyond tenure and faculty promotion. Women had only begun to move into the top leadership positions in academe at the start of the 1990s.

Based on an historical analysis of women in educational administration, Ihle (1991) came to the "obvious conclusion" that women have had greater opportunities to excel in women's colleges and coordinate institutions than in co-educational ones. In academic administration, there has been a glass ceiling (p. 6). Women administrators have been underrepresented in high-level positions, especially at public co-educational institutions, and have been paid less than men (Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989). Etaugh (1985) reported that from 1972-1981, little change occurred in the percentage of women deans. In 1972 women comprised 13.7 percent of all deans; in 1981 that figure was virtually unchanged at 13.8 percent.

With regard to salary, women administrators have historically had lower median salaries than men in the same position. For example, in 1987, there was a 6 percent differential between the median salaries of men and women CEOs at four-year, public institutions (Touchton and Davis, p. 107).

Summary

This section has briefly chronicled the status of women across academe from an historical viewpoint and has described their

current position in the aggregate. As students, faculty, and administrators, women have had different experiences in academe than men.

Although female students constituted the majority of the undergraduate population, women were underrepresented as faculty and administrators at the start of the 1990s. They continued to be paid less than their male counterparts for comparable positions and were promoted and tenured disproportionately. Although affirmative action programs had made an impact and women had made progress in obtaining faculty positions and a limited number of administrative posts, inequities persisted.

Part 2: Explanations of the Barriers Impeding Women's Advancement in Academe

If one accepts that discrimination, both in subtle and not-so-subtle forms, exists in academe, then the next question is why has it persisted. Why had women not cracked the academic glass ceiling at the start of the 1990s?

The lack of women in leadership positions across academe is an area that has been singled out as particularly problematic. The literature is replete with information and concerns about women as leaders, as advocates and champions of women, and as role models and mentors. Forms of discrimination, barriers to progress, and the problems women experience trying to fit into the predominantly white male institutions are well documented. The following section

highlights some of the reasons offered in the literature to explain women's lack of advancement in academe. Although the focus is on advancing women to leadership positions, this material is relevant to academic women and men at all ranks because it gives insights into the potential climate they might experience.

Perceptual barriers

Questions continued to be raised about whether a woman fits or matches the administrative model of leadership. Both men and women may hold the perception that women and administration simply are not a good match. Several scholars (Sharp et al., 1985; Zoch & Russell, 1991; Dorhmann, 1982; Mark, 1986) have suggested that there has been an important socialization process at work that has kept women from aspiring to leadership positions. Women have not been expected, encouraged, and prepared to advance in academe.

The belief that men and women have different characteristics because of their gender is the result of socialization based on attitudes and beliefs, according to Dorhmann (1982). Dorhmann suggests that "there is only one barrier to women seeking administrative positions--sex-role stereotypical attitudes that lead to discriminatory behavior on the part of both men and women" (p. 43). Women internalize these stereotypical attitudes and project them in their behaviors.

Mark (1986) suggested that women have been socialized differently for the work world than men have. Primarily, such

socialization has produced women who view a career as secondary to their commitment to family. Both internal and external factors affect the socialization process. Internally, factors may include role conflict, whether to marry or not, the fear of not knowing how to handle success, and internalization of sex-role stereotypes. For example, women have been socialized to believe that they must choose between a family and a career if they expect to advance, whereas men may not not feel as strongly the pressure to make such a choice.

Subtle discrimination

Inquiries into whether a woman can balance both career and family and other inquiries into a woman's personal life is a subtle form of discrimination. When a woman assumes a leadership role, she is sometimes asked whether or not this is going to interfere with her home life. Men are not as likely to be asked what conflicts an administrative position might cause for their home life because the assumption is that men in these positions will have traditional wives.

Evidence of subtle examples of discriminatory behavior against women in academe has been documented. Women faculty, administrators, and graduate students are treated differently than men, according to Sandler (1986). Such discrimination is so subtle and commonplace that it may not even be perceived by many of the men and women involved as discrimination. "Unlike legal barriers,

these are barriers that laws alone cannot remedy; they are part of our usual ways of relating to one another as men and women, and are so 'normal' that we may not think about their implications or effects" (Sandler, p. 8).

An example of this type of discrimination would be focusing on the woman's appearance, introducing her as lovely, referring to her as sweetie, etc., and correlating her behavior with her monthly cycle. Another example would be descriptions that include reference to her gender as an exception, i.e., she is a qualified woman administrator or exceptional female student.

Institutional barriers

In addition to the socialization factor and the subtle instances, institutional barriers have been identified as delaying women's progress. Although several barriers in academe have fallen, "a host of barriers remain," Sandler (1986) suggested. Some things had not changed very much at all. Institutional barriers that impede women's advancement in academe include fewer resources (i.e., support staff); overlooking women for awards and grants; excluding women from informal interchanges; devaluing women's ideas and suggestions; and making disparaging comments about women.

Mark (1986) characterized the external barriers in terms of "the climate and culture of the education institutions" (p. 12). The extent to which the culture includes or bars women is the overriding concern. One important part of the culture is the success of the

institution's affirmative action programs. Another component is the administrators' levels of awareness of gender issues (pp. 15 and 16).

Another indicator of the institutional climate is whether a mentoring program, either formally or informally, exists for women. Mark concluded that the culture of the institution "produces experiences which may differ for groups of women compared to groups of men" (p. 23).

According to Dohrmann (1982) institutional barriers include the informal information networks, i.e., the "old boy network," a lack of female role models and mentors, and informal power networks (p. 3). Citing Kanter, Dorhmann reports three types of structural restraints: 1) the proportion of female managers in the organization; 2) the lack of access to power in the organization; and 3) limited opportunity in the organization due to the lack of access to informal networks. Solutions to the disproportionate number of women in administration depend on the willingness of the women currently in positions of power to serve as mentors and role models and to form informal networks and alliances.

Exclusion from old boy networks

The idea that women are excluded from the "old boy network" is prevalent in the literature on women in academe. According to Sandler, women may have a more difficult time fitting in because of a lack of access to the informal communication network. As a result, women work twice as hard because they are excluded from

these networks and important decision-making processes, according to Stokes (1984).

One of the reasons given for women's exclusion from the "old boy network" is that men simply are not comfortable around women or feel as though they need to change their behavior, perhaps clean up their language, in the presence of the "ladies."

A woman's ability to tap into the male networks and to create networks of her own are presented as crucial to success. In fact, when the institution is not supportive, an informal network of the female administrator's own making may be vital. Without such support, the feeling of isolation could become a barrier.

Leadership concerns

In view of the evidence that women do encounter barriers in academe, the next question that needs to be considered is what impact these barriers have had on women administrators.

Stokes (1984) suggested that the presence of barriers causes women to adjust in different ways. Often, such obstacles force a women to survive by adjusting her style of leadership. Those adjustments could include becoming less assertive, feminine, emotional, threatening, and perfect (p. 29).

Dohrmann (1982) concluded that one approach to answering the question of why women are underrepresented in administrative positions assumes that men and women are different and, therefore, will exude different leadership traits. This approach suggests that

leadership characteristics like dominance and assertiveness are generally associated with the male demeanor. Dohrmann (1982) quoted Moore and Rickel as saying that "women who aspire to and function in non-traditional occupational settings will be more accepting of "masculine" sex-role traits than women who aspire to traditional roles" (p. 11). The barriers to women's advancement, from this perspective, are seen as "intrapsychic." Women are often viewed as lacking self-esteem, aggressiveness and self-control. These differences are the result of powerful socialization forces. Researchers from this perspective believe that the solution to this gender issue is to train women to be more like men (p. 17).

According to Stokes (1984), the traditional wisdom has been that for a woman to succeed she must adopt masculine traits. One of the ways a woman changes is to emulate the male characteristics of leadership. Since leadership has traditionally been associated with men, women's leadership styles are often devalued, Sandler reported. A woman who has a collaborative, open leadership style may be perceived as weak, though the same would be applauded in a male leader (p. 7). Stokes theorizes, however, that organizations might benefit from traits that are more feminine. The result would be successful women who did not sacrifice that which is "uniquely female'" (p. 8).

Not everyone believes there are differences in male and female leadership styles, however. Mark (1986) reported that women and men do not significantly differ in terms of their leadership style.

However, it may be that women's leadership styles are subjected to greater scrutiny. One of the major problems for women in administrative positions is their visibility, according to Sandler. Since they are so rare, they may be perceived as tokens or anomalies. As tokens, they are treated as representatives of their class and as exceptions to their gender. If the woman administrator does not succeed it's because she's a woman and, therefore, this may "prove" all women are incapable. But if she does succeed, then she's an *exceptional* woman (emphasis added). It is possible that even a few women in powerful positions may be perceived as "too many," as "taking over," or both.

Summary

There is no single explanation for the disproportionate representation of women in academic administration and many variables are involved. The barriers impeding women's advancement in academe have been defined in terms of their perceptual, sociological, and institutional origins. One of the most common explanations is that women simply do not desire leadership responsibilities. Others, however, have pointed to the presence of discriminatory practices and barriers that may be either blatant or subtle. Others have suggested that women have been socialized not to assume leadership roles and that perceptions and adherence to traditional stereotypes are crucial factors. The explanations, like the issue, are multifaceted.

Part 3: Resolving the Issue

The final section describes some of the strategies for advancing women in academe. Both personal and institutional activities are discussed.

Mentoring

According to Bennett and Shayner (1988) many institutions have come to the realization that leaders are made, not born. Leadership is something that can be "encouraged, fostered, and taught," they suggested.

Mentoring is one of the most common strategies offered for advancing women. Mentoring "is a form of professional socialization whereby a more experienced (usually older) individual acts as guide, role model, teacher, and patron of a less experienced (often younger) protege. The goal is to facilitate the advancement of the protege and research suggests that mentoring hastens the protege's development (Moore & Amey, 1988, p. 45).

As a strategy for advancement, mentoring is used in both the professional world and in academe. Research suggests that there may be some differences between women's mentoring activities in the professions and in academe. Luna and Cullen (1990) reported that the lack of female role models in professional and high administrative positions across all organizations is "well documented" (p. 6). In exploring the differences in the mentoring activities of women in academe and business, they concluded that

women in academe were generally more nurturing and frequently promoted the psychosocial aspects of mentoring more so than their female business counterparts. The psychosocial aspects included role modeling, counseling, acceptance and friendship. Luna and Cullen also reported that same-sex role models were most important for women. One reason: "Female proteges may not be able to use male mentors as role models in the area of balancing family and work" (p. 13).

The increasing number of female students at all institutions nationwide has led to increased calls for female faculty to serve as role models and mentors for the female student population. Fallon (1991) characterized the opportunity for female students to develop mentoring relationships with female faculty as a "a crucial part of faculty development" (p. 35).

Whereas role modeling, to a large extent, is leadership by example, mentoring implies a more conscious, deliberate activity. Whether or not women consciously set the advancement of women on their agenda, in areas beyond role modeling and mentoring, is, some would argue, crucial to the advancement of all women. Whether or not women in administrative positions today are using their power to pave the way for other women is a topic of particular concern.

Today's leaders as activists?

What obligation do women in positions of power have to facilitate the advancement of other women? Kaplan and Helly

(1984) urged women in administrative positions to take an "activist approach" and to put the recruitment and advancement of women high on their professional agendas. "The best way to move an agenda for women within the university is to increase the number of women and minorities in important administrative positions" (p. 70).

Whether a woman serves as an advocate for other women or as guardian of the status quo presents a potential role conflict. The female administrator may wish to use her power to facilitate the advancement of other women, but feel she must be careful not to be seen as a champion of women or as discriminatory toward men. Women may be criticized if they commit too many resources to women's issues or hire too many women. Whatever their approach and effect, women administrators may be "on the line" in this area in ways men administrators simply are not (Sandler, 1991 p. 15).

The willingness, or unwillingness as the case may be, of women to support other women is a topic that has received considerable attention. References to the "queen bee" syndrome, of the lone woman who made it to the top and who refuses to share her throne with other women, are numerous. According to Simmons and Jarchow (1990), Brile reported in her book, Woman to Woman: From Sabotage to Support, that women were more likely than men to sabotage their female colleagues in the workplace (p. 174). Several scholars have suggested that women must support other women if significant changes in the status of women is to occur.

The individual commitment

Kaplan and Tinsley (1989) identified several things that must occur in order to achieve gender parity in academe. One of these is a call for women to take power into their own hands and to commit to their own advancement. The authors point to the necessity of holding the doctorate for advancement and the relatively small number of women who hold such a degree. Additionally, a strong commitment from chief executive officers and other powerful administrators to make affirmative action an "institutional imperative" is needed (p. 20). Finally, the number and influence of women's professional associations and coalitions needs to be increased.

Institutional activities

A "new agenda" to address the status of women on campus has been recommended by the American Council on Education. The Council issued a report in 1989 called, "The New Agenda of Women for Higher Education," that encouraged institutions to "rethink how their campus functions in relation to women" (McMillen, 1988, p. A18). The report suggested that colleges do fifteen things. Among the recommendations:

*Correct inequities in the hiring, promotion, tenure, and salaries of women;

*Be committed to both the development of talent and the fostering of women's leadership, including minority women;

*Prepare an annual status report and include data on all women on the campus and information on recruiting, salaries, and tenure;

*Create an inventory that assesses campus values toward men and women, and examine how those values affect efforts to improve the status of women (McMillen, 1989, p. A18).

McMillen (1989) quoted the Council as suggesting that colleges should consider the question, "if an institution were to commit itself fully to meeting the educational needs of women, what would it do?" (p. A18).

To encourage the growth and progress of women, the Association of American College's Project on the Status and Education of Women, as reported by Sandler (1986), recommended that institutions do the following:

*Make the advancement of women a clear priority.

*Include women in informal activities.

*Commit resources to support scholarship on women.

*Support formal and informal networks of women.

The drive for equitable treatment in academe has entered a new phase and the greatest threat to achieving equity is complacency, according to Chamberlain (p. 187). Although significant changes have been made, several scholars have concluded that there are still many areas, like salary and administrative representation, that need attention.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

Overview

This study used J. Grunig's situational theory of publics to assess AEJMC members' perceptions of the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs. More than 400 AEJMC members, both men and women at various organizational ranks, were asked to participate in a telephone survey conducted during the spring of 1993. The goal of the research was two-fold. Determining the members' level of communication activity, as predicted by the situational theory, would provide the baseline information for a communication campaign in this area. The second goal was to refine and extend the situational theory of publics in three key areas: media use, demographics, and activism.

The situational theory

Several studies (Hamilton, 1992; Slater, Chipman, Auld, Keefe, & Kendall 1992; Anderson 1986; J. Grunig 1989; J. Grunig & Ipes 1983) have confirmed the utility of the situational theory of publics. It is one of the most influential theories in the public relations field. J. Grunig's theory helps explain when and how people communicate about a particular issue and when communications

aimed at people are most likely to be effective (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984).

The situational theory allows the researcher to identify specific publics. J. Grunig's definition of publics is grounded in the ideas of Herbert Blumer and John Dewey, who defined a public as a group of people who have something in common because they are affected by a particular problem or issue (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984, p. 143). As J. Grunig argues, "consequences create the conditions needed for publics to form" (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984, p. 144).

But not all people who are affected by a particular issue will recognize the consequences of the particular issue; nor will they organize to resolve the issue. Around any issue, the publics that develop will differ in the degree to which they recognize a problem exists, and the degree to which they will act to counter the consequences of the problem.

First, the public must face a similar problem. One could infer that individuals who work in AEJMC-affiliated organizations "face" the issue of women's advancement in journalism and mass communication programs. However, if individuals do not recognize a problem exists in this area, then they form a latent public. It is only at the point that a group detects or recognizes that a problem exists that it becomes an aware public. A public becomes active when it organizes to do something about the problem. Publics "differ in the extent to which they have passed from the detect to the behave segment of the behavioral molecule" (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984). That

is, a public may recognize a problem exists, but it may not change its behavior to do something about the problem.

This understanding of the behavior of publics is at the heart of J. Grunig's situational theory of publics. According to the theory: "Communication behaviors of publics can be best understood by measuring how members of publics perceive situations in which they are affected by such organizational consequences as pollution, quality of products, hiring practices, or plant closings" (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984, p. 148).

The situational theory has three major independent variables: problem recognition, constraint recognition, and level of involvement. These variables are believed to explain people's communication behavior, which is defined in terms of information seeking and information processing.

Information seeking is active communication behavior. This occurs when a public looks for information and tries to understand the information. A public that seeks information is more likely to become an aware public, and the messages it receives are likely to have more of an effect.

Information processing is passive communication behavior. This occurs when members of a public do not look for information but process the information that comes to them without much effort. Because the public is not looking for this information, processed information is believed to have fewer communication effects than information that is sought.

Understanding the differences between information processing and information seeking has important implications for campaign planning, according to J. Grunig (1983). If a member of a public is actively seeking information, then specialized media, like brochures and newsletters, are likely to be most effective. If a person is simply processing the information, then the most effective media are the mass media that people use randomly when they have time. Appealing to people who are processing information is more of a challenge, since that information must be presented in such a way as to catch the person's attention and keep him/her interested. Creative strategy may be more important for the public that is simply processing information (p. 12).

The dependent variables of communication behavior, information seeking and information processing, are explained by the three independent variables.

Independent variable 1: Problem recognition is the idea that people do not stop to think about a situation unless they perceive that something needs to be done to improve the situation. When people detect a problem and stop to think what should be done about it, they become an aware public. J. Grunig suggests that determining whether a public detects the problem is a reliable way to determine whether it will communicate about the problem. Problem recognition increases the likelihood that the public will seek out information, will process information, and that the information will have an effect (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984, p. 151).

Independent variable 2: Constraint recognition is the degree to which people believe there are obstacles beyond their control that constrain or limit their ability to do something about a problem. If people believe there are a lot of constraints preventing them from solving a problem, then they will be less likely to seek out information about an organizational consequence or process information that comes to them randomly about the problem. The communication effect, then, for people who are high in constraint recognition would be limited.

Independent variable 3: Level of Involvement is the extent to which people connect themselves with the situation. At issue is whether the problem might have a personal effect on a member of the public. Research suggests that a person who has a strong personal involvement in an issue may also have a high level of problem recognition and low constraint recognition. An involved public will become the most active public and will actively seek and process communication.

According to J. Grunig and Hunt (1984): "Whereas problem recognition and constraint recognition increase the likelihood of both information seeking and processing, level of involvement helps to distinguish whether the person's communication behavior will be active or passive" (p. 152). As Pavlik (1987) puts it, "level of involvement predicts not only whether a person will communicate about a situation but also the way in which he or she will do so" (p. 78).

The variable of involvement is considered a key part of the persuasion process. High problem recognition, low constraint recognition, and high level of involvement increase information seeking. High problem recognition and low constraint recognition also increase information processing. Level of involvement, however, has a limited effect on information processing. As J. Grunig (1989) elaborated, "people seldom seek information about situations that do not involve them."

Involvement increases when problem recognition is high and constraint recognition is low. As people discern that their personal interests are at stake, their level of involvement increases. The stronger a connection the person feels to the situation, the more likely he/she is to communicate about the issue. It is at this point that people become activists. J. Grunig (1987) reported that people with high levels of involvement are more likely to seek and process information and to become activists. People who actively communicate about a particular issue are more likely to do something about the issue (J. Grunig, 1989, p. 6).

The situational theory makes no attempt to explain the persuasion process except to say that communication, either active or passive, is a necessary condition for persuasion to occur (J. Grunig, 1989, p. 6). The theory explains when and how people communicate about a particular issue and what effect communications about the issue might have (J. Grunig, 1989, p. 5). The theory does not predict what type of attitudes the public might

hold toward a particular issue. Rather, the theory allows the organization to determine whether its publics are latent, aware, or active.

Applying the situational theory

The situational theory of publics is one of the most obvious bridges between theory and application. J. Grunig defined research using the situational theory as "applied basic research." This is research that is "designed to test and improve a basic theory of communication while applying the theory to a practical problem of concern to professional communicators" (p. 17).

J. Grunig and Hunt (1984) suggest there are at least five implications of this theory for potential communication strategies. These are:

1) Do not waste your time on a public that has a low probability of information seeking and processing.

2) If the low-probability public is important, you might be able to reach the people in this public through information processing. Do not expect these people to actively seek out information.

3) When you communicate with a public that will process rather than seek information, you need a different (i.e., more creative and catchy) communication strategy.

4) When dealing with active publics, the organization should not maintain a low profile. The active public will get its information from somewhere.

5) Changes in attitude and behavior will only occur in the aware and active publics. "If your objective must be a change in attitude or behavior, then concentrate on those publics with the highest probability of having an attitude and engaging in a behavior. If, for example, you are in fund-raising, concentrate on the people who fit the high-involvement, problem-facing category" (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984, p. 159).

Once an organization determines where its publics fall on each of the variables, it should determine its communication strategy accordingly. As Pavlik (1988) puts it, if the audience analysis indicates that involvement and constraint recognition are low, then "campaign messages should be planned to influence these levels to achieve greater campaign success" (p. 12). Campaign objectives and messages should be tailored to each public and should be designed to increase low levels of involvement and decrease high levels of constraint recognition, according to Pavlik (p. 19).

To increase levels of involvement, according to Heath and Douglas (1990), campaign messages must "show the relevance of the product/service/issue to the receiver's personal interests. In such circumstances, message or issue relevant thought will likely occur; people are likely to devote effort to detailed understanding of an issue when it is relevant to their interests" (p. 195). Therefore, a communication campaign designed to increase a person's level of involvement should include messages that demonstrate how the

public's personal interest is affected by the policy issue (Heath & Douglas, 1990, p. 196).

Similarly, messages should be designed to reduce high levels of constraint recognition. J. Grunig and Ipes (1983) concluded that information in a campaign against drunken driving must show people how they can remove their constraints before the audience will do anything about the problem. Anderson (1986) concluded that removing behavioral constraints will increase the chances that people change their behavior after exposure to campaign information against drunk driving.

After summarizing the findings from studies using the situational theory, Pavlik (1987) concluded that a public will become active "when constraints are removed or when a group receives information that allows its members to act on their existing attitudes" (p. 79). Pavlik added that such information has been defined as "mobilizing information" by Lemert, Mitzman, Seither, Cook, & Hackett (1977).

The situational theory's practical implications are easily recognized. If the communicator determines the publics are well aware of the problem and highly involved, then they need not be made aware of the importance of the problem. They need information that will tell them what to do about the problem. This public could be expected to read specialized publications dealing with the particular issue. Since the active public is also low on constraint recognition and believes it can make a difference, this public needs information

that is "action-oriented." (p. 41). While the active public may seek out specialized information, the mass media may be the best way to reach the information processors or the latent public.

There are other practical implications. If an organization waits for a public to become active before it addresses the problem, then the organization is in a reactive, defensive state. If an organization identifies that a public is aware of a problem and takes a proactive stance, it might prevent the public from becoming active and rallying against an organization. And, it is quite possible that if the organization fails to communicate with the aware public, this public will seek out information from other sources, which may or may not be accurate. J. Grunig suggests that once a public has entered the active stage, it will only seek information that reinforces the decisions made earlier. Changing an active public's attitudes will be difficult.

Attitudes, clearly, are situational. The same group of people may hold different attitudes about different issues. Therefore, publics are situational. Different consequences may bring about different publics. Size is also a factor. J. Grunig suggests that a small, well-organized group of activists may be more effective in pushing its agenda than a public that is very large.

Conceptualizing the Current Study

The first task in the current study was to define what is meant by "the status of women in journalism and mass

communication programs." This concept could mean different things to different people. For the purposes of this study, the concept, "the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs" is tied directly to the resolution to achieve parity by the year 2000.

The resolution seeks to increase the number and status of women and minorities in journalism and mass communication programs. As a result, this study considers situations related to the number and status of women in journalism and mass communication programs. Those situations include equal pay, the number of female faculty compared to the number of female students, the number of female administrators compared to the number of male administrators, administrative training programs, formal mentoring programs, and efforts to monitor the climate for women after they are hired at AEJMC-affiliated institutions.

The first goal of this research was to determine the AEJMC members' levels of problem recognition, constraint recognition and involvement about the issue of the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs. This information would indicate the members' levels of communication activity and would provide the baseline information for a communication campaign on this topic.

The survey instrument

Science is a cumulative process and research should build upon the work of others. Previous methodologies should be replicated

where appropriate, but they also should be modified to meet different circumstances. This study combined parts of Grunig's (1989) and Hamilton's (1992) approaches. This study relied on the traditional wording provided by Grunig to measure each of the three independent variables. And, following Hamilton's example, several items (five) were developed to measure each variable.

In his study of Sierra Club activists, J. Grunig (1989) reported that the variables in the situational theory have been successfully measured using single Likert-type questions. These, he wrote, have been "developed and tested in several previous studies."

In the Sierra Club study, **problem recognition** was measured by asking the following:

How often do you stop to think about each of the following issues? Do you think about the issue often, sometimes, rarely, or never? A list of four environmental issues was then read to the respondent.

Constraint recognition was measured by the following:

Think of whether you could do anything that would make a difference in the way these issues are handled. If you wanted to do something, would your efforts make a great deal of difference, some difference, very little difference, or no difference?

Level of involvement was measured by asking:

Tell me to what extent you see a connection between yourself, personally, and each of these situations. There would be a connection if you believe the issue has affected or could affect you.

Tell me if the connection is strong, moderate, weak, or if you see no connection.

Instead of measuring each independent variable with only one question, other researchers have operationalized the three independent variables by defining each with two or three items or questions. For example, in Hamilton's (1992) study about voting behavior in the Kansas gubernatorial race, constraint recognition was defined as the sum of the following three items:

1) Do you feel voting takes too much of your time?

2) Is your voting location convenient for you to get to?

3) How important do you feel your vote will be in the election?

For the variable of constraint recognition, Hamilton used a reverse weighting with the high score representing low constraints; the low score indicating high constraints.

In this study, Grunig's and Hamilton's approaches were combined to measure each of the independent variables.

Problem Recognition was measured by asking the following:

First, I'm going to read you a list of situations. I want you to tell me how often you stop to think about each of these situations. Tell me if you stop to think about this situation frequently, sometimes, rarely, or never.

How often do you think about:

Whether female faculty and administrators in journalism and mass communication programs are paid the same as their male counterparts

Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

How often do you think about:

Whether women in journalism and mass communication programs have the same opportunities to advance as men

Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

How often do you think about:

Whether women are equally represented at all faculty ranks, including full professor, in journalism and mass communication programs

Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

How often do you think about:

The number of female administrators in journalism and mass communication programs compared to the number of male administrators

Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

How often do you think about:

The number of female students in journalism and mass communication programs compared to the number of female professors and administrators

Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

Constraint recognition was measured by asking:

Now, I would like for you to think of whether you could do anything personally that would make a difference in each of the following situations. If you wanted to do something, would your efforts make a great deal of difference, some difference, very little difference, or no difference?

If you wanted to do something about:

Equal pay for men and women in comparable positions in journalism and mass communication programs

How much difference would your efforts make?

A great deal Some Very little No difference

If you wanted to do something about:

Equal opportunities for advancement for both women and men in journalism and mass communication programs

How much difference would your efforts make?

A great deal Some Very little No difference

If you wanted to do something about:

The equal representation of female faculty at all ranks, including full professor, in journalism and mass communication programs

How much difference would your efforts make?

A great deal Some Very little No difference

If you wanted to do something about:

The number of female administrators in journalism and mass communication programs compared to the number of male administrators

How much difference would your efforts make?

A great deal Some Very little No difference

If you wanted to do something about:

The number of female students compared to the number of female faculty and administrators in journalism and mass communication programs

How much difference would your efforts make?

A great deal Some Very little No difference

Level of involvement was measured by the following:

To what extent do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and the following situations. There would be a connection if you believe the issue has affected

you or could affect you. Tell me if the connection is strong, moderate, weak, or if you see no connection:

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:
Policies calling for equal pay for women and men in comparable positions in journalism and mass communication programs
Is this connection:
Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:
Policies calling for equal opportunities for the advancement of both women and men in journalism and mass communication programs
Is this connection:
Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:
Policies calling for the equal representation of female faculty at all ranks, including full professor, in journalism and mass communication programs
Is this connection:
Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:
Policies calling for the increased representation of women in administrative positions in journalism and mass communication programs
Is this connection:
Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:
Policies calling for an increase in the number and status of female faculty so that they can serve as role models and mentors for the new majority of female students in journalism and mass communication programs
Is this connection:
Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Extending the theory

Based on the results of previous studies, the combination of the three independent variables was expected to predict the AEJMC's members' level of communication activity. Since the situational theory's ability to predict communication behavior has been repeatedly verified, future research should attempt to extend the theory. Following Hamilton's (1992) methodology, this study sought to extend the situational theory in three very promising areas: media use and information sources, demographics and activism. Items were developed to measure each of these variables and appropriate hypotheses were formulated.

Media use/information sources

A logical extension of the situational theory is in the area of media use and information sources. Research that determines the media consumption and preferred information sources of the various publics adds to the practical application of the theory. As Hamilton (1992) asserted, "Although the situational theory has been shown to be a powerful tool in identifying publics that will be active on given topics, it has not been shown to be practical in locating communication channels that can be used to reach the highly desired active publics" (p. 133).

Hamilton (1992) further extended the theory to consider whether the specific publics, for example, information seekers (high

communication activity group) versus information processors (low communication activity group), differed in their media use.

Hamilton suggested the following hypotheses regarding media use:

Hypothesis 1: High information-seeking individuals will display significantly higher levels of media use regarding the specific issue under consideration.

Hypothesis 2: High information seekers will use the print media significantly more than will information processors.

Hypothesis 3: High information seekers will interact with others about the governor's race significantly more than will information processors.

Hamilton measured media use by asking:

To what extent do you recall hearing/reading about the race for governor in Kansas from the following sources: TV news, news magazines, radio news, newspapers, editorials, specialized publications:

every day most days every other day seldom never

Hamilton conducted the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure on the communication activity groups' mean responses. The data supported his hypotheses, suggesting that the active public used media more than the other publics. There was limited support for hypothesis 2. The results showed that the active information seekers read more newspapers and editorials than the other publics,

but that they also turned to the TV more than the information processors (pp. 129-130).

There was also significant support for hypothesis 3. The active information seekers talked more with others.

This study adapted and extended Hamilton's procedures regarding information sources. The goal was to make even finer distinctions in the information channels being used for this issue. The following hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis 1: The respondents in the high communication activity group will report that they get more information about the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs from all of the information sources combined more frequently than the low communication activity group.

Hypothesis 2: The high communication activity group will report significantly higher levels of mass media use regarding this issue.

Hypothesis 3: The high communication activity group will use the print mass media significantly more than the low activity group.

Hypothesis 4: The high communication activity group will use the more specialized print media, i.e., higher education publications and AEJMC publications, significantly more than the low activity group.

Hypothesis 5: The high communication activity group will report that they get information about this issue from AEJMC

conventions and other professional meetings significantly more than the low activity group.

Hypothesis 6: The respondents in the high communication activity group will report that they interact with others more about this issue than the low activity group.

Information sources was measured by adapting Hamilton's model to read:

To what extent do you recall hearing/reading about the issue of women's advancement in journalism and mass communication from the following sources:
TV news, radio news, magazines, newspapers, higher education publications, AEJMC publications, AEJMC national convention, AEJMC regional convention, other professional meetings

Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]

The respondents also were asked to respond to an open-ended question about information sources. They were asked to specify any other sources from which they had received information about the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs.

Demographics

Marketing researchers have long segmented audiences by demographic variables. If demographic variables could be used in conjunction with the situational theory variables, the ability to segment publics might be even more precise. While recent research

(Hamilton 1992) has supported the feasibility of using demographic variables in conjunction with the independent variables, other research has provided mixed results. For example, J. Grunig (1983) was interested in determining if environmental publics could be identified from demographic variables, environmental activities, and broader attitude variables. He used discriminant analysis to try to differentiate between the two. He found limited support for using demographic variables as predictors of communication behavior. However, he conceded, "the fact that there are some demographic similarities among individuals in different publics means there is some value in examining the discriminant functions to make it easier for an environmental communicator to locate these publics" (p. 38).

He added: "Publics characterized by behavior similarities cannot be identified by demographic indicators and personal activities or attitudes, although these variables did help to describe each public and to tie them to previous environmental research" (p. 41).

Hamilton (1992), however, found "a strong relationship" between standard demographic characteristics and the situational variables. This suggested that researchers might be able to fine-tune the audience segmentation process to include a combination of demographic variables and the situational variables.

Hamilton (1992) considered whether the demographic variables of age, income and education could be used in conjunction with the

situational variables to identify which channels the different publics would prefer.

He posed the following research questions:

Question 1: Do publics defined by demographic characteristics differ in levels of communication activity as defined by situational theory?

Question 2: Do publics defined by demographic characteristics differ in their media use?

Hamilton (1992) used the chi-square procedure to analyze the distributions of respondents using the demographic variables in conjunction with the situational variables of communication activity. The results showed significant differences. Hamilton concluded that the demographic categories strongly overlapped the situational variables for this specific issue (the Kansas gubernatorial race).

Regarding the second question, Hamilton used the ANOVA procedure to compare the mean use of the various information sources by each demographic category. The results showed that media use did significantly differ by the three demographic categories. He found that the younger public reported lower levels of newspaper usage; and that media use increased as education level increased, with the exception of TV news. Television news was used regularly by all respondents. Additionally, media use increased with level of income.

Since support for the demographic variables has been mixed, further research was needed in this area. It was not known whether Hamilton's results are specific to the particular issue, a gubernatorial election, or if similar results would occur for other publics and other issues. Moreover, certain demographic variables are potentially very important for the issue of women's advancement in journalism and mass communication programs. The literature suggests that the demographic variables of gender, age, race, and rank in the organization may well influence the perceptions the AEJMC members hold about the issue of women's advancement.

Since Hamilton found support for his research questions, they were formulated in terms of hypotheses in this study.

Hypothesis 7: Publics defined by demographic characteristics differ in levels of communication activity as defined by situational theory.

Since there are a multitude of "demographic characteristics" to consider, it is necessary to specify the particular demographic variables considered in this study. The specific variables considered in this study are stated in terms of the following sub-hypotheses:

7a: Respondents in different age categories will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

7b: Respondents of different races will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

7c: Respondents at different organizational ranks will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

7d. Respondents who are tenured will report significantly different levels of communication activity than those who are not tenured.

7e. Female respondents will report significantly different levels of communication activity than male respondents.

Based on the literature review, the researcher believed that the combination of certain demographic variables might be particularly significant for this issue. Consequently, the demographic variables of gender and rank and gender and age were combined to test the following sub-hypotheses:

7f: Men and women at different organizational ranks will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

7g: Men and women of different ages will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

The next hypothesis was formulated to identify which channels the different publics, as defined by specific demographic characteristics, would prefer.

Hypothesis 8: Publics defined by demographic characteristics differ in their use of information sources. The four demographic variables of age, organizational rank, tenure, and gender were hypothesized to significantly influence the selection of information channels for this issue. These were cast as the following sub-hypotheses.

8a: Respondents in different age categories will differ significantly in their use of information sources.

8b: Respondents at different organizational ranks will differ significantly in their use of information sources.

8c. Respondents who are tenured will differ significantly in their use of information sources from those who are not tenured.

8d. Female respondents will differ significantly in their use of information sources from the male respondents.

To get the data needed to test these hypotheses, the AEJMC members were asked to respond to the following demographic information:

Please stop me when I get to the category for your age:

25-30 31-35 36-40 41-45 46-50 51-55

56-60 61-65 over 65

Please stop me when I get to the category for your race:

African American Asian Caucasian Hispanic Other

Please stop me when I get to the category for your academic rank:

Graduate Student Adjunct/Part-time Lecturer Instructor

Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor Administrator

Note: If you are, for example, an associate professor and a department head, you would be in the "administrator" category.

Are you tenured?	yes	no
Are you tenure track?	yes	no
The respondent is:	male	female

Activism

J. Grunig has led the effort to extend the situational theory to predict who will become activists. J. Grunig's research suggests that members of active publics are most likely to join activist groups. The Sierra Club study sought to extend the situational theory to predict whether members of some publics would be more likely to join activist groups than others. Grunig has measured activism by asking the respondent how willing he/she would be to support specific activities. One would expect a strong correlation between active publics and their willingness to organize to do something about the problem. These findings suggested the following hypotheses for this study:

Hypothesis 9: Members of the high communication activity public, as defined by situational theory, will report a greater willingness to support activities that would improve the number and status of women at their institution.

To test the hypothesis on activism, the survey respondents were asked to indicate how likely they would be to support (very

likely, likely, not very likely, or would not support) the following activities at their institution:

Filling faculty openings with qualified female candidates

Filling administrative positions with qualified female candidates

Incentive programs to promote women faculty

Administrative training programs for women

Formal mentoring programs for women

Organizational assessments evaluating the institution's commitment to affirmative action programs

Monitoring the climate for women after they are hired at the institution

These combined responses provided a measure of activism.

While hypothesis 9 served as a basic test of the situational theory's ability to predict activism, the final hypothesis explored the role of specific demographic variables in the communication and activism relationship.

Hypothesis 10: Publics defined by demographic characteristics will differ in their levels of activism on the issue of women's advancement in journalism and mass communication programs.

After the items designed to test the hypotheses were created, the survey was revised several times. A doctoral-level research

methods class served as the pretest for the study. The survey totaled four pages in its final form. (See Appendix A.)

The sample

Once the survey had been developed to measure the levels of communication activity and to test the hypotheses, the sample was drawn. The population for this study was the AEJMC membership, as listed in the 1992 AEJMC directory. According to AEJMC representative Pamella Dorn, the directory is the most comprehensive and timely list of organizational members available. A preliminary review of the directory indicated that the majority of the members' organizational rank (i.e., graduate student, adjunct, associate professor, etc.) and contact information (i.e., home and office telephone numbers) appears after the member's name.

The total AEJMC population is approximately 2800. Approximately 2400 of these are active, faculty (including adjuncts and part-time) and graduate students in the United States. The remaining are retired members and international members. This study did not include the retired members or the international members. Since the methodology was a telephone survey, the international members were not included because of the cost. However, calls were made to Hawaii and Alaska.

A stratified random sample was chosen for three reasons. First, gender is considered the problematic. One would expect significant differences between the responses of men and women.

Second, one might expect there to be different levels of involvement, constraint recognition, and problem recognition at different organizational levels. Third, one of the goals of this study was to confirm or reject the utility of using demographic variables in conjunction with the situational variables to segment specific publics.

One of the ways to draw the stratified random sample is to use a uniform sampling fraction. This means that the strata sample size is made proportional to the strata population size. This is called a proportionate stratification (Kalton, 1983). In order to achieve this, the 1992 AEJMC directory was coded according to organizational rank and gender and each member was assigned to one of the following categories:

Female graduate student; male graduate student; female lecturer; male lecturer; female instructor; male instructor; female assistant professor; male assistant professor; female associate professor; male associate professor; female professor; male professor; female administrator; male administrator

This was done by highlighting the 1991-92 AEJMC directory with different colors. Each color represented a different category. For example, female graduate students were highlighted in green; male graduate students in yellow, and so on. Once the entire directory had been coded and each member assigned to the appropriate category, the researcher counted the total number falling into each category.

The number falling into each category in the population was as follows: male administrators (279); female administrators (75); male professors (254); female professors (40); male associate professors (237); female associate professors (118); male assistant professors (226); female assistant professors (178); male instructors (44); female instructors (28); male lecturers (19); female lecturers (4); male adjuncts and part-time (14); female adjuncts and part-time (4); male graduate students (79); and female graduate students (60).

The researcher was able to account for approximately 75 of the survey population in this fashion. The remaining 25 percent was a problem. Falling into this 25 percent group were 1) names that could not be easily distinguished as male or female; 2) names that did not carry an accompanying organizational rank; and 3) names that did not carry a telephone number. Twenty-five percent of the population was deemed too important to simply throw out, so the decision was made to also sample proportionately from this group.

The sample was drawn proportional to each of the categories. Since the total number of completed surveys needed was 400, 300 completions were needed from the 75 percent of the sample that had all of the information given, and 100 completions were needed from the 25 percent of the survey that was a problem.

To draw the 300 names from the population that had been identified by gender, rank, and contact number, the following steps were taken:

1) The sum of men and women falling into each of the categories was calculated. For example, the total number of known men (279) and women (75) administrators was 354.

2) The sum for each category was then divided by the known population number (2221). This provided the proportional representation. For example, to get the number of administrators needed, 354 was divided by 2221. The percentage of administrators was approximately 16 percent. That meant that 16 percent of the sample should be administrators. The number of administrators in the known sample, then, should be approximately 64.

3) The next step was to determine the number of men and women needed in each category. To get the percentage of men to women, the number of women counted in each category was divided by the known population total. For example, there were 75 women identified as administrators. This was divided by the total number of administrators (354). The percentage of female administrators in the sample of administrators, then, should be approximately 21 percent. The percentage of women needed in the sample for each category was then multiplied by the total number needed in the sample. For example, to get the number of female and male administrators needed, the percentage of women (21.1) was multiplied by the total number needed (64). This yielded a figure of 13.59. This number was rounded up to include at least 14 women in administrative positions in the sample, while 50 men in administrative positions were included. This last figure was

arrived at by subtracting the number of women from the total needed in the sample (64-14=50).

These steps were calculated for each of the categories and 75 percent of the needed sample or 300 people were identified in this way. Seventy-five percent of the sample was composed of the following:

Male administrators (50); female administrators (14); male professors (45); female professors (7); male associate professors 43; female associate professors (21); male assistant professors (40); female assistant professors (32); male instructors (7); female instructors (5); male lecturers (5); female lecturers (3); male adjuncts and part-time (3); female adjuncts and part-time (1); male graduate students (14); and female graduate students (10).

A random sampling method was used to draw names from each of the categories. A table of random numbers was used to identify starting points and sampling intervals. For each category, the first person falling into the category desired who appeared on or after the starting page was selected. Then, the remaining number of people needed for each category was chosen based on the random interval selected. Lists of names and contact numbers were made for each category. To compensate for non-response, the number of names drawn for each category was doubled.

The remaining 25 percent of the population also was randomly sampled. This introduced an unknown element into the sampling technique because the researcher did not know how many people this

would add to each of the categories. In the case of ambiguous names, with regard to gender, the researcher did not know in which category the participant would fall. There was the same uncertainty for the names that did not carry the accompanying organizational rank.

The names that did not provide telephone numbers presented another problem. This introduced an extra step into the research process. Since the majority of the telephone calls were made during the evening, the participant's home telephone was needed. So, the telephone service information in the participant's home town was contacted. This proved to be quite successful because enough of the names were listed to make the needed completions in this category.

As with the known population, the table of random numbers was used to determine the starting point and sampling interval for this "unknown" group. A total of 100 completions were needed from this category. To compensate for non-response, approximately 200 names were drawn from this group.

The decision was made to make three attempts to contact each selected participant. If a selected respondent refused to participate or could not be reached after at least three attempts, a new participant's name from the same category was then substituted.

Conducting the survey

The telephone survey is the research technique most often used with Grunig's situational theory, and it was particularly well

suited for this study since the survey instrument was a relatively short one. Completion time was approximately ten minutes. Moreover, a telephone survey is often preferable because of the poor response rates associated with mail surveys. There are, of course, drawbacks to the telephone survey. Completing 400 telephone surveys was expensive, required volunteer support, and was time consuming.

Timeframe and volunteers

The first calls were made during the week of March 22, 1993. One of the researcher's family members arranged for two of his professional support staff to make telephone calls from his place of business. The support staff personnel were college graduates working at a medium-sized law firm in Norton, Virginia. The researcher trained the personnel and supervised the calling. Fifty interviews were completed during this week.

To complete the remaining 350 interviews, the researcher secured the telephone bank located in the office of development at the University of Tennessee, at Knoxville. The telephone bank has 26 phones. A fellow graduate student offered to have the students in her research methods class conduct the interviews as a class project. Since the total number of students in the class was 49, the students were divided into two groups. One group signed up to make calls on April 14; the second group made calls on April 15.

The researcher went into the research methods class on April 12 to talk with the students about the research. They were given copies of the survey instrument at that time and asked to familiarize themselves with the content of the survey. The researcher talked with the students about the background for the research and what led to this particular survey.

Each night a training session was held from 5:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. for the students. The researcher went over the survey with the students and answered any questions they had. Calls were made each night from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. On the first night, there were 141 completions. The second night there were 108 completions.

Since the goal of 400 completed surveys had not been reached, the researcher again secured the development office for the evening of April 27. This was the next available opening. Volunteers were then recruited out of the researcher's introduction to mass communication class. Seventeen students volunteered. Following the same procedure as before, the students were trained prior to data collection. Calls were made from 6 p.m. to 9:15 p.m. A total of 402 surveys were completed.

Data entry and statistical programming

The data were entered and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. The survey items were coded and assigned numerical values.

For each question on problem recognition a participant who responded "frequently" was given a value of 4; "sometimes," a 3; "rarely," a 2; and "never," a 1. (See Figure 1 for the set of questions on problem recognition.)*

Following Hamilton's (1992) methodology the five questions designed to measure problem recognition were then added together to provide a single measure of problem recognition. Once the sum of these items had been calculated, the mean and the standard deviation were computed. Respondents were ranked as high in problem recognition if they fell one standard deviation above the mean. The high group was assigned a value of 3. Respondents were categorized as moderate in problem recognition if they were within 1 standard deviation above or below the mean. The moderate group was assigned a value of 2. Respondents were ranked as low in problem recognition if they fell one standard deviation below the mean. The low group was assigned a value of 1.

For each question measuring constraint recognition, a participant who responded "a great deal" was given a value of 4; "some," a 3; "very little," a 2; and "no difference," a 1. (See Figure 2 for the set of questions on constraint recognition.)

These five items designed to measure constraint recognition were then added together to provide a single measure of constraint recognition. Then the mean and the standard deviation were

*All of the figures and tables are in the appendix.

computed. The variable of constraint recognition needed to be treated differently, since a high score indicated low constraints. That is, the people who said they could make a great deal of difference (4) or some difference (3) had high scores, but low constraint recognition. So, the ranking was reversed when these items were added together. Respondents were ranked as high in constraint recognition if they fell one standard deviation *below* the mean. They were assigned a value of 1. Respondents were ranked as moderate in constraint recognition if they were within 1 standard deviation above or below the mean. They were assigned a value of 2. Respondents were categorized as low in constraint recognition if they fell one standard deviation *above* the mean. They were assigned a value of 3.

For each question measuring involvement, a participant who responded "strong" was given a value of 4; "moderate," a 3; "weak," a 2; and "no connection" a 1. (See Figure 3 for the set of questions on level of involvement.)

These five items were then added together to provide a single measure of involvement. Then the mean and the standard deviation were computed. Respondents were ranked as high in involvement if they fell one standard deviation above the mean. This group was assigned a value of 3. Respondents were ranked as moderate in involvement if they were within 1 standard deviation above or below the mean. This group was assigned a value of 2. Respondents were

ranked as low in involvement if they fell one standard deviation below the mean. This group was assigned a value of 1.

According to the situational theory, the combination of the three independent variables predicts communication activity. Following Hamilton's methodology, the scores of each of the three independent variables were then added together to provide a total measure of communication activity. The minimum possible value was 3; the maximum possible value was 9. For example, the respondent who had been assigned a value of 3 on all three items had a total communication activity score of 9. That meant that this person was more than one standard deviation above the mean on problem recognition and had been assigned a value of 3; was less than one standard deviation below the mean on constraint recognition and had been assigned a value of 3; and was more than one standard deviation above the mean on involvement and had been assigned a value of 3. At the other end of the continuum, a person who received a total score of communication activity of 3 had been assigned a value of 1 for each of the three variables.

Once the total communication activity score was determined, a mean and standard deviation were again calculated and the respondents were assigned to one of three groups. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean were ranked as "high" in communication activity; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean were ranked as "moderate" in communication activity; and those falling one standard deviation below the mean were "low"

in communication activity. According to situational theory, the respondents falling in the high communication activity group are considered information seekers; those falling in the low communication activity group are considered information processors.

The groups were divided into three levels of communication activity based on Hamilton's 1989 and 1992 studies. The results of these studies suggested that a three-way split provided a more sensitive measure of the situational theory than did a median split (Hamilton, 1992, p. 128). The three-way split is a much more sensitive measure than the median split because it allows the researcher to say with much more certainty that there are high and low groups.

Once the situational theory variables had been computed to indicate communication activity, the hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis 1: The respondents in the high communication activity group will report that they get more information about the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs from all of the information sources combined more frequently than the low communication activity group.

To test the first hypothesis, an "overall information sources" score was calculated by combining the responses to each of the questions about information sources. (See Figure 4 for the list of

information sources.) The possible responses ranged, on a five point scale, from frequently to never. Then a mean and standard deviation were calculated. Those respondents falling one standard deviation above the mean were ranked as high in overall information sources; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean were ranked as moderate in overall information sources; those falling one standard deviation below the mean were ranked as low in overall information sources. The ANOVA procedure was conducted to test for differences in the groups' means.

Hypothesis 2: The high communication activity group will report significantly higher levels of mass media use regarding this issue.

To test the second hypothesis, a mass media variable was computed by combining the responses to the television, radio, magazine and newspaper items. Once the total mass media use was calculated, the mean and standard deviation were computed. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean were ranked as high in mass media use; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean were ranked as moderate in mass media use; those falling one standard deviation below the mean were ranked as low in mass media use. The ANOVA procedure was conducted to test for differences in the groups' means.

Hypothesis 3: The high communication activity group will use the print mass media significantly more than the low activity group.

To test the third hypothesis, the items constituting the print mass media, newspapers and magazines, were combined. Once a total score for print mass media was calculated, the mean and standard deviation were calculated. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean were ranked as high in print mass media use; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean were ranked as moderate in print mass media use; those falling one standard deviation below the mean were ranked as low in print mass media use. The ANOVA procedure was conducted to test for differences in the groups' means.

Hypothesis 4: The high communication activity group will use the more specialized print media, i.e., higher education publications and AEJMC publications, significantly more than the low activity group.

To test the fourth hypothesis, the specialized print media were broken out from the overall information sources group. The higher education publications and AEJMC publications items were combined. Then, the mean and standard deviation were calculated for this variable. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean were ranked as high in specialized print media use; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean were ranked as moderate in specialized print media use; those falling one standard deviation below the mean were ranked as low in specialized print media use. The ANOVA procedure was conducted to test for differences in the groups' means.

Hypothesis 5: The high communication activity group will report that they get information about this issue from AEJMC conventions and other professional meetings significantly more than the low activity group.

To test the fifth hypothesis, three items were combined. The AEJMC national and regional conventions and other professional meetings were combined to make a variable called professional meetings. Once summed, the mean and standard deviation were calculated for this variable. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean were ranked as high in the amount of information obtained at professional meetings; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean were ranked as moderate in the amount of information obtained at professional meetings; those falling one standard deviation below the mean were ranked as low in information obtained at professional meetings. The ANOVA procedure was conducted to test for differences in the groups' means.

Hypothesis 6: The respondents in the high communication activity group will report that they interact with others more about this issue than the low activity group.

The role of interpersonal communication in increasing communication activity, as defined by the situational theory, has not been fully explored. Hamilton (1992) asked the respondents in his survey about the Kansas gubernatorial race to indicate the extent to which they talked to others about the election.

This study took a different approach to assess the role of interpersonal communication. After the list of information sources was read to the respondents, they were asked to specify any other sources from which they had received information about the status of women in academe. These open-ended responses were then coded and an interpersonal communication item was defined as one of the coding categories. A response was coded as interpersonal if the participant said, for example, that s/he "talked with colleagues" or "heard about it from my wife."

The chi square procedure was run to see if the respondents in the high communication activity group reported that they used interpersonal sources more than the low communication activity group.

Hypothesis 7: Publics defined by demographic characteristics differ in levels of communication activity as defined by situational theory.

7a: Respondents in different age categories will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

7b: Respondents of different races will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

7c: Respondents at different organizational ranks will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

7d. Respondents who are tenured will report significantly different levels of communication activity than those who are not tenured.

7e. Female respondents will report significantly different levels of communication activity than male respondents.

7f: Men and women at different organizational ranks will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

7g: Men and women of different ages will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

To test hypothesis 7, the chi-square procedure was used to analyze the distribution of respondents falling in each demographic category by communication activity.

Hypothesis 8: Publics defined by demographic characteristics differ in their use of information sources.

8a: Respondents in different age categories will differ significantly in their use of information sources.

8b: Respondents at different organizational ranks will differ significantly in their use of information sources.

8c. Respondents who are tenured will differ significantly in their use of information sources from those who are not tenured.

8d. Female respondents will differ significantly in their use of information sources from the male respondents.

To test hypothesis 8, ANOVAs were run to compare the mean use of the various media channels by each demographic category.

The remaining hypotheses explored the situational theory's ability to predict who would be willing to support activities that would increase the number and status of women in journalism and mass communication programs. Previous studies have suggested

that, for a specific issue, the high communication activity group, as defined by the situational theory, would be more likely to engage in activist activities. Since a call to activism is at the heart of the resolution to achieve parity in journalism and mass communication programs by the year 2000, this study was particularly well suited to once again test the hypothesis that the situational theory can predict who will become activists.

The first hypothesis in this area tested the basic premise that the situational theory can predict which public would be more willing to support activities that would improve the number and status of women in journalism and mass communication programs.

Hypothesis 9: Members of the high communication activity public will report a greater willingness to support activities that would improve the number and status of women at their institution.

The first step in testing hypothesis 9 was to collapse the items on the survey designed to measure activism into one variable. This was done by adding the questions together. (See Figure 5 for the items measuring activism.) Then, to assign the respondents to the high, moderate or low categories of activism, the mean and standard deviation were computed. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean were put in the high group; those falling one standard deviation above or below the mean were put in the moderate group; and those falling one standard deviation below the mean were put in the low group. Then the ANOVA procedure was run to see if there were significant differences in the groups' means.

The final hypothesis considered the influence of specific demographic variables in the communication and activism relationship.

Hypothesis 10: Publics defined by demographic characteristics will differ in their levels of activism on the issue of women's advancement in journalism and mass communication programs.

To test this hypothesis, the chi square procedure was run to see if there were significant differences between the high and low activist groups, as defined by selected demographic variables. The results of these hypotheses tests and the frequency reports on the situational variables and levels of communication activity are presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The first step in analyzing this data was to combine each of the five items on the survey that were designed to provide a measure of each of the situational variables. For each question on problem recognition, a participant who responded "frequently" was given a value of 4; "sometimes," a 3; "rarely," a 2; and "never," a 1. The five questions designed to measure problem recognition were added together to provide a single measure of problem recognition. (See Figure 1.) Once the sum of these items had been calculated, the mean and the standard deviation were computed. The mean for problem recognition was 3.06; the standard deviation was .62

Respondents were ranked as high in problem recognition if their mean response to the questions on problem recognition was greater than 3.68. These people were assigned a value of 3. Respondents who were within 1 standard deviation above or below the mean were considered moderate in problem recognition. This group fell between 2.44 and 3.68. They were assigned a value of 2. Respondents who fell one standard deviation below the mean, or below 2.44, were considered low in problem recognition. They were assigned a value of 1. Approximately 18 percent of the sample fell into the high problem recognition category; 63 percent of the sample fell into the moderate group; and 18.4 percent of the sample

respondents were ranked as low in problem recognition. (See Table 1 for the percentage of people in each group for each of the situational variables.)

For each question measuring involvement, a participant who responded "strong" was given a value of 4; "moderate," a 3; "weak," a 2; and "no connection" a 1. (See Figure 3 for the questions measuring involvement.) These five items were then added together to provide a single measure of involvement. The mean was 2.89 and the standard deviation was .79. Respondents were ranked as high in involvement if they fell one standard deviation above the mean or greater than 3.68. This group was assigned a value of 3. Respondents were categorized as moderate in involvement if their mean scores were greater than or equal to 2.10 and less than or equal to 3.68. This group was assigned a value of 2. Respondents were categorized as low in involvement if they were less than 2.10. This group was assigned a value of 1. Approximately 20 percent of this sample were in the high involvement category; 64 percent were moderate in level of involvement; and 16 percent of the sample were in the low involvement category. (See Table 1 for the percentage of people in each group for each of the situational variables.)

For each question measuring constraint recognition, a participant who responded "a great deal" was given a value of 4; "some," a 3; "very little," a 2; and "no difference," a 1. The five items designed to measure constraint recognition were then added

together to provide a single measure of constraint recognition. (See Figure 2 for the items measuring constraint recognition.) Next, the mean and the standard deviation were computed. The mean for constraint recognition was 2.48; the standard deviation was .59. (See Table 1 for the percentage of people in each group for each of the situational variables.)

The variable of constraint recognition was treated differently, since a high score indicated low constraints. That is, the people who said they could make a difference had high scores, but low constraint recognition. So, the ranking was reversed when these items were added together. Respondents were ranked as high in constraint recognition (they did not think they could make a difference) if they fell one standard deviation below the mean or less than 1.89. These people were assigned a value of 1. The people who fell within 1 standard deviation above or below the mean, or between 1.89 and 3.07, were ranked as moderate in constraint recognition. They were given a value of 2. The people who fell one standard deviation above the mean, or greater than 3.07, were considered low in constraint recognition (they believed they could make a difference). They were assigned a value of 3. This yielded the following percentages: 13.2 percent of the respondents were high in constraint recognition; 74.9 percent were moderate in constraint recognition; and 11.9 percent had low constraint recognition.

Constraint recognition was coded in this way because the next step in the data analysis was to combine the three independent variables to create a measure of communication activity. Past studies suggested that people who were high in communication activity would be high in problem recognition, high in level of involvement, and low in constraint recognition. Therefore, it was necessary to assign high numerical values to people who were high in problem recognition and level of involvement, but low in constraint recognition.

The rankings of each of the three situational theory variables were then added together to provide a total measure of communication activity. The minimum possible value was 3; the maximum possible value was 9. The respondent who received a ranking of 3 on all three items had a total communication activity score of 9. That meant that this person was more than one standard deviation above the mean on problem recognition and was given a ranking of 3; was more than one standard deviation above the mean on constraint recognition and was given a ranking of 3; and was more than one standard deviation above the mean on involvement and was given a ranking of 3. A person who received a total score of 3 for communication activity had been assigned a value of 1 for each of the three variables.

Once the total communication activity score was determined, a mean and standard deviation were again calculated and the respondents were assigned to one of three groups. Those falling one

standard deviation above the mean or greater than 7.04 were ranked as "high" in communication activity; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean, or between 5.06 and 7.04, were ranked as "moderate" in communication activity; and those falling one standard deviation below the mean, or below 5.06, were "low" in communication activity. Approximately 12 percent of the respondents were defined as high in communication activity; 60 percent were moderate; and 29 percent were categorized as low in communication activity.

According to the situational theory, the respondents falling in the high communication activity group are considered information seekers. These people are high in problem recognition, low in constraint recognition, and high in involvement. Those falling in the low communication activity group are considered information processors.

Once the respondents had been assigned to the high and low communication activity groups, the hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis 1: The respondents in the high communication activity group will report that they get more information about the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs from all of the information sources combined more frequently than the low communication activity group.

The first hypothesis was tested by creating an "overall information sources" variable. This variable was created by combining the responses to each of the questions about information

sources. This question asked the survey participants to indicate how frequently they received information from a variety of sources, including television, radio, newspapers, magazines, higher education publications, AEJMC conventions, and other professional meetings. Once the items had been combined, the mean and standard deviation were calculated. The mean value for the overall information sources variable was 2.88; the standard deviation was .62. This enabled the researcher to categorize the respondents into one of three groups, high overall information sources, moderate information sources, and low information sources.

Those respondents falling one standard deviation above the mean, or greater than 3.50, were ranked as high in their use of overall information sources; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean, or between 2.26 and 3.50, were ranked as moderate in overall information sources; those falling one standard deviation below the mean, or less than 2.21, were ranked as low in overall information sources. As a result of this ranking procedure, 17.4 percent of the sample fell into the low overall information sources group; 67.4 percent were ranked as moderate in their use of overall information sources; and 15.2 percent were ranked as high in their use of overall information sources. (See Table 2 for the comparison of channel use by each level of communication activity.)

The ANOVA procedure was conducted to test for differences in the groups' means. The results were statistically significant. The p value was .003. Since the results of the ANOVA were significant,

the next step was to determine if the differences were indeed between the high and low groups as hypothesized. Scheffe's post hoc test was run. These results indicated that the difference was between the high and low groups and in the direction predicted.

Thus, it can be concluded that the respondents in the high communication activity group reported that their use of all the information sources combined on the status of women in academe was significantly greater than the low communication activity group.

Finding support for the situational theory in hypothesis 1 helped to verify the situational theory's predictive ability. The following hypotheses (2 through 6), however, were written with the goal of extending the situational theory by adapting Hamilton's (1992) methodology. As hypothesis 1 and other studies have confirmed, the situational theory can predict communication activity. However, which communication channels were preferred by the high communication activity group was unknown at the time of this study. These hypotheses were written with the goal of extending the theory by segmenting the high communication activity public by its media use.

Hypothesis 2: The high communication activity group will report significantly higher levels of mass media use regarding this issue.

To test the second hypothesis, a mass media variable was computed by combining the responses to the television, radio,

magazine and newspaper items. Once the total mass media use was calculated, the mean and standard deviation were computed. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean, or greater than 3.08, were ranked as high in mass media use; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean, or between 1.66 and 3.08, were ranked as moderate in mass media use; those falling one standard deviation below the mean, or below 1.66, were ranked as low in mass media use. As a result of this ranking, 14.2 percent of the respondents were in the low mass media group; 71.6 percent were in the moderate mass media group; and 14.2 percent were in the high mass media group. To test for differences in the groups' means. the ANOVA procedure was conducted. The results were not statistically significant at the .05 level. The p value was .123. (See Table 2 for the comparison of channel use by each level of communication activity.)

It can be concluded, then, that the high communication activity group did not use the mass media significantly more than the low communication activity group for this particular issue.

The third hypothesis sought to further refine the situational theory by segmenting the mass media variable by its print component. The assumption supporting the third hypothesis was that people in the high communication activity group would be more likely to read about the issue of women's advancement in academe in mass newspapers and magazines than the low communication activity group. The traditional assumption is that reading is a more

active endeavor than is watching TV or listening to the radio. This hypothesis read:

Hypothesis 3: The high communication activity group will use the print mass media significantly more than the low activity group.

To test the third hypothesis, the items constituting the print mass media, newspapers and magazines, were combined. Once a total score for print mass media was determined, the mean and standard deviation were calculated. The mean was 2.84; the standard deviation was .91. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean, or greater than 3.75, were ranked as high in print mass media use; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean, or between 1.93 and 3.75, were ranked as moderate in print mass media use; those falling one standard deviation below the mean, or less than 1.93 were ranked as low in print mass media use.

The ANOVA procedure was conducted to test for differences in the groups' means. The results were not significant at the .05 level. The p value was .135, which suggested that the high communication activity group did not use the print mass media significantly more than the low communication activity group for the issue of women's advancement in academe. (See Table 2 for the comparison of channel use by each level of communication activity.)

The fourth hypothesis tested the same assumption as the third, but considered the respondents' use of the more specialized print

media, like higher education publications and AEJMC publications. The fourth hypothesis read:

Hypothesis 4: The high communication activity group will use the more specialized print media, i.e., higher education publications and AEJMC publications, significantly more than the low activity group.

To test the fourth hypothesis, the specialized print media were broken out from the overall information sources group. The higher education publications and AEJMC publications items were combined to create the new variable. Then, the mean and standard deviation were calculated for this variable. The mean for the higher education publications was 3.77; the standard deviation was .92. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean, or greater than 4.69 were ranked as high in specialized print media use; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean, or between 2.85 and 4.69, were ranked as moderate in specialized print media use; those falling one standard deviation below the mean, or less than 2.85, were ranked as low in specialized print media use. The ANOVA procedure was conducted to test for differences in the groups' means. The results were not statistically significant. The p value was .89, which suggested that the high communication activity group did not use the specialized publications more frequently than the low communication activity group. (See Table 2 for the comparison of channel use by each level of communication activity.)

In considering the possible information sources for the issue of women's status in academe, it was clear that the mass media and specialized print channels were only part of the sources available. This issue has been on the agenda at AEJMC conventions for several years. So, it was quite possible that a member of AEJMC had received some information from this source. Other professional societies, like the Speech Communication Association (SCA), also have discussed this issue at their conventions. The question was whether the high communication activity group used this source more than the other groups. The following hypothesis was formulated to answer this question:

Hypothesis 5: The high communication activity group will report that they get information about this issue from AEJMC conventions and other professional meetings significantly more than the low activity group.

Three items on the survey were combined to test this hypothesis. The AEJMC national and regional conventions and other professional meetings were combined to make a variable called professional meetings. Once summed, the mean and standard deviation were calculated for this variable. The mean was 3.01; the standard deviation was .98. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean, or 3.99, were ranked as high in the amount of information obtained at professional meetings; those falling within one standard deviation of the mean, or between 2.03 and 3.99, were ranked as moderate in the amount of information obtained at

professional meetings; those falling one standard deviation below the mean, or less than 2.03, were ranked as low in information obtained at professional meetings. (See Table 2 for the comparison of channel use by each level of communication activity.)

The ANOVA procedure was conducted to test for differences in the groups' means. The results were statistically significant. The p value was .003. Scheffe's post hoc test was conducted to see if the differences were between the high and low groups. The results suggested that the differences were indeed between the high and low groups and in the direction predicted.

It can be concluded, then, that the respondents in the high communication activity group reported that they received more information about the issue of women's advancement in academe from professional meetings than the low communication activity group.

Hypothesis 6: The respondents in the high communication activity group will report that they interact with others more about this issue than the low activity group.

When asked to specify any other sources from which the respondents had received information about the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs, a total of 90 people volunteered that they had received information from interpersonal sources. The chi square procedure was run to see if the high communication activity group said interpersonal sources more frequently than the low communication activity group. The results

were not statistically significant. The p value was .399. While eleven people in the high communication activity group cited interpersonal sources, 36 people in the high communication activity group did not say interpersonal communication was a source for them. (See Table 3 for the results of the chi square procedure on the interpersonal responses.)

While hypotheses 2 through 6 were designed to refine the situational theory by differentiating the various communication channels, hypotheses 7 and 8 were proposed in order to extend the theory in the area of demographics. The results of previous research using the demographic variables in conjunction with the situational theory variables to define publics had been mixed.

Hypothesis 7: Publics defined by demographic characteristics differ in levels of communication activity, as defined by the situational theory.

To clarify which demographic variables were being tested, several sub-hypotheses were written. The chi-square procedure was used to analyze the distribution of respondents falling in each demographic category by communication activity. The results for each sub-hypothesis follow:

7a: Respondents in different age categories will report significantly different levels of communication activity, as defined by the situational theory.

When the data on age were collected, respondents were grouped into nine categories. The original age categories were 25-

30, 31-35, 36-40, 41-45, 46-50, 51-55, 56-60, 61-65, and over 65. When the chi square procedure was first run to test hypothesis 7a, there were more than five cells with fewer than five respondents in that cell. So the decision was made to collapse the age categories. The following categories were then created: 25-35, 36-45, 46-55, 56-65, and over 65. Approximately 11 percent of the respondents were between 25 and 35 years of age; 38 percent were between 36 and 45; 33 percent were between 46 and 55; and 17 percent were between 56 and 65. Approximately 2 percent were more than 65 years of age. The chi square procedure was again run. The results were not statistically significant at the .05 level. The p value was .898. It can be concluded, then, that respondents in different age categories did not report significantly different levels of communication activity on this issue. (See Table 4 for the distribution of communication activity by age of respondent.)

7b: Respondents of different races will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

Unlike the other demographic characteristics, the racial makeup of the sample was not known until the results were tabulated. It was virtually impossible to stratify the sample by race using the 1992 AEJMC directory as the population. The results showed that approximately 91 percent of the sample were Caucasian; 3.5 percent were African American; 2 percent were Asian; 1.3 percent were Hispanic; and 2.5 percent were other. The results were not statistically significant. When the chi square

procedure was run, 10 of the 15 cells had fewer than five frequencies. Given the low number of respondents who were other than Caucasian, the results should be interpreted with caution. The p value was .112. (See Table 5 for the distribution of communication activity by race of respondent.)

7c: Respondents at different organizational ranks will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

Eight different organizational ranks were originally considered in this study. Those were: administrators, professors, associate professors, instructors, lecturers, adjuncts and part-time people, and graduate students. When the chi square procedure was run, the problem with small numbers in too many cells occurred again. So, the ranks were collapsed and new categories were created. The small numbers were occurring in the lower ranks--probably because the number of graduate students, adjuncts and lecturers who belong to AEJMC is not great. As a result, the first groups to be combined were the respondents who held less than an instructor level position. This new group of people, defined as those members who held less than an instructor's level position, constituted approximately 11 percent of the sample. Then the instructors and assistant professors were combined. This group constituted approximately 31 percent of the population. Then the associate and full professors were combined. When combined, this group constituted 40 percent of the population. The administrators constituted the remaining group, and accounted for approximately 18

percent of the sample. When the chi square procedure was run with the new categories, the results were not statistically significant at the .05 level. The p value was .150. (See Table 6 for the distribution of communication activity by organizational rank of respondent.)

7d. Respondents who are tenured will report significantly different levels of communication activity than those who are not tenured.

Approximately 53 percent of the respondents in this sample were tenured; 47 percent were not. The results of the chi square procedure were not statistically significant at the .05 level. The p value was .139. (See Table 7 for the distribution of communication activity by tenure.)

7e. Female respondents will report significantly different levels of communication activity than male respondents.

Approximately 36 percent of the sample were women; 64 percent were men. The results of the chi square procedure were statistically significant. The p value was .001. It can be concluded, then, that men and women reported significantly different levels of communication activity for this issue. According to the chi square tables, approximately one third (34 percent) of the men were in the low communication activity group, whereas one fifth (20.3 percent) of the women were in the low communication activity group. And, while 17.5 percent of the women were in the high communication activity group, only 8.6 percent of the men were in the high

communication activity group. (See Table 8 for the distribution of communication activity by gender.)

While the only demographic variable by itself to be significant at the .05 level was gender, the researcher had hypothesized at the outset that the combination of the demographic variables of gender and rank, and gender and age, might be significant. Based on this assumption the following sub-hypotheses were tested:

7f: Men and women at different organizational ranks will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

To test this hypothesis, the researcher used the ranks created in hypothesis 7c and combined it with the variable of gender. This yielded the following results: 11.8 percent of the sample were male administrators; 6 percent were female administrators; 29.6 percent were male associate and full professors; 10.6 percent were female associate and full professors; 17.1 percent were male assistant professors and instructors; 13.6 percent were female assistant professors and instructors; 5.8 percent were males below the instructor level; and 5.5 percent were females below the instructor level.

When the chi square procedure was run, the results were statistically significant. The p value was .007. According to the chi square table, the most significant differences occurred between men and women at the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy.

The most striking differences were between the male and female assistant professors and instructors. Approximately 47

percent of the male assistant professors and instructors were in the low communication activity group. That is more than double the number of women assistant professors and instructors who were in the low communication activity group. Approximately 20 percent of the female assistant professors and instructors were in the low communication activity group.

The difference between the males and females who held less than an instructor level position also was striking. While 43.5 percent of the males in this category were in the low communication activity group, 18.2 percent of the females in this category were in the low communication activity group.

Additionally, there were differences between the male and female professors and associates who were in the low communication activity group. Approximately 32 percent of the male professors and associates were in the low communication activity group. This compares to 23.8 percent of the female professors and associates who were in the low communication activity group.

Only 8.5 percent of the male professors and associates were in the high communication activity group, compared to 21.4 percent of the female associate and full professors who were in the high communication activity group. While 13 percent of the women assistants and instructors were in the high communication activity group, only 5.9 percent of the male assistants and instructors were in the high communication activity group. And, finally, while 18.2

percent of the women who held less than an instructor's level position were in the high communication activity group, 8.7 of the males at this rank were high in communication activity.

It is interesting also to note that approximately 21 percent of the women administrators were in the high communication activity group, while approximately 13 percent of the male administrators were in the high communication activity group. (See Table 9 for the distribution of communication activity by gender and rank combined.)

While combining the demographic variables of gender and rank proved to be a useful way to further segment the AEJMC sample, the combination of gender and age was not statistically significant.

7g: Men and women of different ages will report significantly different levels of communication activity.

It was hypothesized that if there were differences in the groups based on age and gender combined, those differences would be at the extreme ends of the groups. Based on this assumption, four categories were created: younger women, older women, younger men, and older men. Younger women and men were defined as less than 40 years old; older women and men were 56 years and older. These categories were chosen for two reasons. First, the data appeared to cluster naturally along these lines. Second, 40 was chosen as an arbitrary dividing point because AEJMC has an "Under 40" award. Based on this categorization, there were 45 younger women, 20 older women, 61 younger men, and 58 older men in this

sample. The results of the chi square procedure showed that there were no significant differences between these groups. The p value was .510. (See Table 10 for the distribution of communication activity by gender and age combined.)

The next hypothesis was formulated to identify which channels the different publics, as defined by specific demographic characteristics, would prefer. The umbrella hypothesis was:

Hypothesis 8: Publics defined by demographic characteristics differ in their use of information sources.

The four demographic variables of age, organizational rank, tenure, and gender were hypothesized to significantly influence the selection of information channels for this issue. The information channels selected for analyses were the overall information sources variable and the professional meetings variable. These variables were selected because previous results indicated that the people in the high communication activity group reported that they received more information about the issue of women's advancement in academe from the overall information sources and from professional meetings. (See the conclusions for hypotheses 1 and 5.)

This hypothesis was cast in terms of four sub-hypotheses. To test each sub-hypothesis, the ANOVA procedure was used to compare the mean use of each of the selected information channels by each demographic category. The results of the ANOVA analyses follow for the two information sources by each demographic variable:

8a: Respondents in different age categories will differ significantly in their use of information sources.

The results of the ANOVA on overall information sources by age were not statistically significant. The p value was .429. The results of the ANOVA on professional meetings by age were not significant. The p value was .554. These results suggest that the mean value for the respondents' use of these information sources across all age categories was not significantly different. (See Table 11 for the comparison of information sources by age.)

8b: Respondents at different organizational ranks will differ significantly in their use of information sources.

The results of the ANOVA on overall information sources by rank were not statistically significant. The p value was .98. The results of the ANOVA on professional meetings by rank were not significant. The p value was .693. These results suggest that the mean value for the respondents' use of these information sources at each of the organizational ranks is not significantly different. (See Table 12 for the comparison of information sources by organizational rank.)

8c. Respondents who are tenured will differ significantly in their use of information sources from those who are not tenured.

The results of the ANOVA on overall information sources by tenure were not statistically significant. The p value was .759. The results of the ANOVA on professional meetings by tenure were not significant. The p value was .913. These results suggest that the

tenured respondents' mean use of these information sources combined is not significantly different than the non-tenured respondents. (See Table 13 for the comparison of information sources by tenure.)

8d. Female respondents will differ significantly in their use of information sources from the male respondents.

The results of the ANOVA on overall information sources by gender were not statistically significant at the .05 level. The p value was .109. The results of the ANOVA on professional meetings by gender were not significant. The p value was .187. (See Table 14 for the comparison of information sources by gender.)

The final hypotheses consider the relationship between communication activity, as defined by the situational theory, and activism.

Hypothesis 9: Members of the high communication activity public will report a greater willingness to support activities that would improve the number and status of women at their institution.

The first step in testing hypothesis 9 was to collapse the items on the survey designed to measure activism into one variable (See Figure 5). This was done by adding the questions together. Then, to determine whether the respondents were high, moderate or low in levels of activism, the mean and standard deviation were computed. The mean was 3.47; the standard deviation was. 52. Those falling one standard deviation above the mean, or above 3.99, were put in the high group; those falling one standard deviation

above or below the mean, or between 2.95 and 3.99, were put in the moderate group; and those falling one standard deviation below the mean, or below 2.95, were put in the low group. As a result of this ranking, 13.2 percent of the sample were in the low activism group; 63.9 percent were in the moderate activism; and 22.9 percent were in the high activism group.

The ANOVA procedure was run to see if there were significant differences in the groups' means. The results were statistically significant. The p value was .000. To see where the differences were between the groups, Scheffe's post hoc test was run. The results indicated that there were significant differences not only between the high and low communication activity groups, but also between the high and moderate communication activity groups, and between the moderate and low communication groups. (See Table 15 for the analysis of activism at each level of communication activity.)

It can be concluded, then, that both the high and moderate communication activity groups reported a greater willingness to support activities that would improve the number and status of women at their institutions than did the low communication activity group.

The next hypothesis was designed to extend the situational theory and its ability to predict activism by exploring the demographic characteristics of the people who were in the high and low activism groups. This study had already attempted to further

describe the high and low communication activity groups, as defined by the situational theory, by their demographic characteristics.

Recall that the hypotheses on the situational theory and the demographics variables were partially supported. The results indicated that there were differences between men and women at the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy, particularly between male and female assistant professors and instructors. The male assistant professors and instructors were much lower in communication activity than were the female assistant professors and instructors.

If the situational theory is a sensitive measure of activism, an analysis of the people in the high activism group by their demographic characteristics should produce similar results. That is, there should be similar results for the activism measure by demographics, as there was for the communication activity measure by demographics. For example, one would expect that since the male assistant professors and instructors were low in communication activity they would also be significantly lower in activism.

A comparison of the results of the high and low communication activity groups by their demographic characteristics with the results of the high and low activism groups by their demographic characteristics would provide insight into the situational theory's ability to predict who will become activists on a specific issue. In order to compare the results of the activism measure by demographics to the communication activity measure by

demographics, the demographic characteristics that were combined for the hypothesis on communication activity (hypothesis 7) were combined for this final hypothesis on activism.

Hypothesis 10: Publics defined by demographic characteristics will differ in their levels of activism.

Since the previous results had suggested that combining demographic variables could be a potentially powerful tool for further segmenting the publics, the following sub-hypotheses explored the relationship between gender and rank and gender and age in predicting which publics would be most willing to support activist policies at their institutions.

The first sub-hypothesis considered the relationship between gender and age combined and the respondents' willingness to support activities that would improve the number and status of women at their institutions.

10a: Men and women of different ages will report significantly different levels of activism.

This sub-hypothesis tested the four categories created for hypothesis 7g. The four categories were younger women (less than 40), older women (older than 56), younger men (less than 40), and older men (older than 56). The results of the chi square procedure showed that there were significant differences between these groups. The p value was .034. The significant differences were between the younger men and women. While only 6.6 percent of the

young men were high in activism, 31.4 percent of the younger women were high in activism.

The difference between the percentage of older men and women who were high in activism was insignificant. While 23.7 percent of the older men were high in activism, 20 percent of the older women were high in activism. There were more older men in the low activism category, however, than there were older women. Approximately 15 percent of the older men were low in activism; 10 percent of the older women were low in activism. (See Table 16 for the distribution of level of activism by gender and age combined.)

Recall that the results of the chi square procedure for communication activity by gender and age (hypothesis 7g) combined were not significant. One can conclude, then, that there are significant differences in levels of activism when described by gender and age, but not for communication activity.

A comparison of the results of the communication activity measure by gender and age to the results of the activism measure by gender and age suggests that these measures do produce different results. While 13.1 percent of the younger men were high in communication activity, 6.6 percent were high in activism. While 6.9 percent of the older men were high in communication activity, 23.7 percent were high in activism. While 15.6 percent of the younger women were high in communication activity, 31.1 percent of the younger women were high in activism. And while 15 percent of

the older women were high in communication activity, 20 percent of the older women were high in activism. This comparison suggests that all groups, with the exception of the younger men, were higher in activism than they were in communication activity. (See Table 17 for the comparison of communication activity to activism by gender and age combined.)

10b: Men and women at different organizational ranks will report significantly different levels of activism.

The chi square procedure for this hypothesis produced statistically significant results. The p value was .002. The most striking difference was between the male assistant professors and instructors and the women assistant professors and instructors. While 42.6 percent of the women in this category were in the high activism group, only 4.4 percent of the male assistant professors and instructors were in the high activism group. (See Table 18 for the distribution of level of activism by gender and rank combined.)

A comparison of these results to the communication activity measure by gender and rank combined (see hypothesis 7f) shows that there are some similarities. A similar number of male assistant professors were in the high communication and high activism groups. While 5.9 percent of the male assistant professors and instructors were high in communication activity, 4.4 percent of the male assistant professors and instructors were in the high activism group. However, there were other differences between the two chi square tables. While only 12.8 percent of the male administrators

were high in communication activity, 27.7 percent of the male administrators were high in activism. Another notable difference occurred for the women assistant professors and instructors. While 13 percent of the women assistant professors were high in communication activity, 42.6 percent of the women assistant professors and instructors were in the high activism group. (See Table 19 for the comparison of communication activity to activism by gender and rank combined.)

The comparison of the results of the communication activity measure by demographics to the results of the activism measure by demographics suggested that there are some differences between these two measures.

The research findings and results of these hypotheses will be discussed in the final chapter of this dissertation. The discussion will consider the extent to which the goals of the research, as specified in the opening chapter, have been achieved.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Evaluation of the Research

This research was conducted with two objectives in mind. The first objective was to make a contribution to the public relations body of knowledge by testing and refining J. Grunig's situational theory of publics. Three key areas were considered in this study: media use or information sources, demographics, and activism.

The second objective was to build the bridge between theory and application. The applied goal of this study was to use the results of the theoretical research to suggest programming for a communication campaign that could help improve the number and status of women in journalism and mass communication programs. The following discussion evaluates the degree to which this research has met these objectives.

The theoretical contribution

J. Grunig's original methodology considered communication activity, as predicted by the situational theory variables of problem recognition, constraint recognition, and level of involvement, in terms of a high group and a low group. This two-way split, however, has been improved. One of Hamilton's contributions to the development of the situational theory has been to measure the

situational theory variables using the mean and standard deviation to produce a three-way split. This study adopted Hamilton's methodology, and future researchers who use the situational theory are encouraged to do the same because using the three-way split is an improvement over the original methodology.

Using the median split does not identify a target group necessarily. Respondents might be placed in the high group, for example, at .51 and in the low group at .49. This is not a rigorous difference in high and low groups. Using the mean and standard deviation to define higher (one standard deviation above the mean), moderate (within one standard deviation of the mean), or low (one standard deviation below the mean) groups provides a more rigorous definition of groups. Although the mean and standard deviation is a more conservative measure, it still produced significant results and the researcher has greater confidence that the people in the group labeled high in communication activity, for example, were truly high in this activity, while those who were grouped in the low groups were truly low in those attributes. But most importantly, a group of moderates is produced, and traditionally it is this group that is considered to be the prime target for persuasive messages--those minds can be changed theoretically. Those high in the attributes under study probably are the converted. To preach to them is to preach to the converted, although a communication campaign aimed at maintaining their commitment might be wise. Those low in the desired attributes have been generally considered difficult to

persuade, so time and resources might be better directed to those in the moderate group.

There is one potential concern about this categorization scheme that must be addressed. With this more conservative measure, the probability of committing a type I error increases. Making a type I error means the researcher possibly excluded individuals who should have been included in the high and low groups. People who could be considered high or low in communication activity or activism by other standards were excluded from those categories in this research. The researcher believes that making a type I error is preferable to making a type II error. A type II error means that the researcher may have included people who should have been excluded. The error in this research, then, is one of caution. Given this intentional error, the significant results that were found in this study can be interpreted with much greater confidence.

Using the three-way split to define publics further refines the situational theory and its ability to predict communication activity and activist publics. It also provides a new group of people, the moderate communication activity group, that we must now consider. Previous research has concentrated on the differences between the high and low groups. Communication activity is not an either or kind of phenomenon. The addition of the moderate group more accurately reflects a continuum of communication activity. Future research should consider which of the situational theory variables or

combination of variables is/are involved in moving people from the low to moderate to high groups.

This research built on the methodology that Hamilton used in his 1992 study about the Kansas gubernatorial election. To a large degree, Hamilton was successful in further differentiating the respondents in the high communication activity group by their preferred communication channels, their demographic characteristics, and their activist orientations. This study considered the same areas, but carried Hamilton's methodology one step further.

Since the three-way split is a superior method for distinguishing between high and low groups, this approach was used wherever possible throughout the study. To segment the respondents by their use of information sources and by their levels of activism, the respondents were placed in high, moderate and low groups by calculating the mean and the standard deviation. So, when hypotheses were tested to describe the high communication group's level of media use or activism, the high communication group was compared to a high media use and a high activism group that were defined in the same way. This approach was used both for consistency and for sensitivity. The people who were defined as high in communication activity, as high in their use of various information sources, and as high in activism, were truly high in these activities compared to the rest of the sample. One can say

with greater certainty, then, that any significant results achieved using this method have greater validity.

Perhaps the use of the three-way split for all of the variables (wherever possible), partially explains the differences in results produced in this study. Whereas Hamilton found much stronger support for the hypotheses on information sources, this study found limited support for further differentiating the high communication activity group by their preferred communication channels for this particular issue.

The first hypothesis dealing with information sources was supported in this study. This is consistent with Hamilton's results. These results lend further support for the efficacy of the situational theory.

Recall that hypothesis one predicted that the high communication activity group would report that it got more of their information about the status of women in academe from all of the information sources combined more frequently than the low communication activity group. Hypothesis one was written not to extend the theory, but to help verify its predictive ability. The situational theory variables, when combined, were expected to predict higher levels of communication activity. The significant results in this study lend further support for the situational theory and its ability to predict high levels of communication activity. The high problem recognition, low constraint recognition, and high involvement group reported significantly higher levels of

information seeking and communication activity for the issue of the status of women in academe.

Specific information sources

Hypotheses two through six were designed to describe the respondents in the high communication activity group by their use of specific communication channels. The second hypothesis considered the respondents' use of all the mass media for this issue. Hamilton had found that the high communication activity group used the mass media more frequently than the low communication activity group for the issue of the Kansas gubernatorial election. This study did not find that the AEJMC members in the high communication activity group in this sample used the mass media more for the issue of women's advancement in academe.

Why these studies produced different results also might be partially explained by the type of issue each study considers. For a political election, the mass media is a primary source for the majority of Americans. There was a specific timeframe for the election and media coverage increased in intensity as election day neared. A political election is much different than an issue like the status of women in academe. Although stories appear occasionally in the mass media about the status of women in academe, it would be difficult for any respondent to report that he or she got information from the mass media on a frequent basis when this actually occurs on an infrequent basis. However, the question is not

about the amount of information available for a particular issue. The question is whether the high communication activity group would report that if gets whatever information is available from the mass media more frequently than the low communication activity group.

If one of the tests of a "good" theory in the quantitative paradigm is its ability to apply across various situations, then it is plausible to expect that the high communication activity group in this study would report that they recall hearing or reading about the issue of the status of women in academe from mass media sources more often than the low communication activity group. This was not the case in this study.

The next hypothesis broke out the print media component from the mass media. The assumption guiding this hypothesis was that people who were higher in communication activity would use the print media significantly more than the low communication activity group because reading is a more active endeavor than listening to the radio or watching television. This hypothesis was not supported at the .05 significance level.

The fourth hypothesis considered the relationship between the specialized print media, the higher education publications and AEJMC publications, and the high communication activity group. The p value was .890, which suggested that the high communication activity group did not use this source more than the low communication activity group. The explanation for why there was no difference

between the high and low groups' use of the higher education publications appears to be that this is the primary source of information for most respondents. The mean use for the specialized print media was 3.77, which was the highest mean use of all the individual information sources offered. There were no significant differences in the high and low communication activity groups' use of the specialized media because publications like ACADEME, The Chronicle of Higher Education, and AEJMC newsletters were primary sources of information for respondents at all communication activity levels.

The results thus far have suggested that the mass media and the specialized print media have not provided significantly more information about the issue of women's advancement in academe for the high communication activity public in the AEJMC organization than they have for the low communication activity group.

While the mass media, print media and the specialized print media were not statistically significant at the .05 level, the programming at professional meetings was. In fact, the professional meetings channel was the only information source to be significant at the .05 level. The mean for the professional meetings was 3.01, which indicates that professional meetings were cited as the second most frequently used source of information for the AEJMC members on this issue.

That the high communication activity group gets more of its information about the status of women in academe from

professional meetings than the low communication activity group is not surprising. People who are more inclined to be information processors would not be expected to attend a presentation on this subject. Attending workshops or hearing presentations on this issue requires conscious decision-making and effort. That information seekers get more of their information from professional meetings than do information processors supports the basic tenets of the situational theory.

The final information source considered in this study was interpersonal communication. Respondents were not specifically asked to report how frequently they received information about the status of women in academe from interpersonal sources. Rather, they were asked to specify additional sources from which they had received information about this issue. The interpersonal communication variable was created by coding these open-ended responses.

The hypothesis on interpersonal communication predicted that the respondents in the high communication activity group would name interpersonal sources more frequently than the respondents in the low communication activity group. This hypothesis was not supported. In fact, just the opposite occurred. Almost twice as many people who were in the low communication activity group cited interpersonal sources. While 21 people who were in the low communication activity group said they had received information about the status of women in academe from interpersonal sources,

only 11 people in the high communication activity group cited interpersonal sources. Since the number of people who were coded into these categories is relatively small, the findings should be interpreted with caution. It is worth noting, however, that nearly one fourth of the respondents (90 people) cited interpersonal sources of their own accord. One possible interpretation for these findings is that interpersonal communication is a potentially important information source for respondents at all communication activity levels.

Since this study used a different approach to assess the role of interpersonal communication for this issue, it is not possible to compare the results of these findings to Hamilton's findings. Hamilton specifically asked respondents about the degree to which they talked with others about the election. Specifically asking the respondents about interpersonal sources provides a more comparable measure to the other information sources. Future studies that try to determine the communication channels associated with the high communication activity group should specifically ask respondents to report on the frequency with which interpersonal communication is a source of information for them for the particular issue under study. Such findings could be interpreted with more confidence.

The results of the hypotheses on information sources provided mixed support for extending the situational theory in the area of media use and information sources. That the situational theory predicts that the high communication activity group will report

more frequent use of all of the information sources combined provides additional verification for the theory. The finding that the high communication activity group cited the professional meetings more frequently than the low communication activity also supports the basic premise of the theory and extends the theory in the area of information sources to a limited degree.

Demographics

This research was particularly well suited to test the theory in the area of demographics. Based on the research reported in the introduction and the literature review, there was reason to believe that the demographic variables of age, gender, race, and organizational rank could influence the respondent's level of communication activity for this issue.

Perhaps one of the most important findings in this study was that the only demographic variable to produce significant results by itself was gender. That the issue of the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs is indeed a gender issue is a given. But does this also mean that communication activity can be explained solely along the male/female dichotomy? Is gender really the only demographic variable that matters in this study? The answer to these questions is no. The other demographic variable that influences communication activity is rank. When combined with gender, rank proved to be an important demographic variable. Even when combined with gender, age did not appear to

significantly influence the levels of communication activity; but when combined with gender, rank did significantly influence the levels of communication activity. Future research should test for interaction among these variables.

When considering levels of communication activity by gender and rank, it is not surprising that the most striking differences were between the male and female assistant professors and instructors. These are the people who are struggling to get tenure and to advance through the academic hierarchy. But if the situational theory is taken to its full logical extension, one might expect that a larger percentage of the male assistant professors and instructors also could be high in communication activity. Since many men at this level could feel as though their futures are threatened when their female colleagues advance, they could conceivably have very high levels of involvement, which, according to the situational theory, would increase this group's level of communication activity.

These findings raised more questions than they answered. Why was this group of men so low in communication activity? Was it low problem recognition, low constraint recognition and/or low levels of involvement? And why was this group of women so high in communication activity? Previous research had suggested that younger women may not be willing to admit that problems persisted. Were these women actually high in problem recognition? It would

not be surprising to find that they were high in involvement, but were these women also low in their level of constraint recognition?

In order to explain these findings and answer these questions, the variable of gender and rank combined was analyzed by each of the individual situational theory variables, using the chi square procedure, to see where the differences were.

The results of gender and rank combined by problem recognition were significant. The p value was .001. While approximately 30 percent of the women assistant professors and instructors were high in problem recognition, only 8.8 percent of the male assistant professors and instructors were high in problem recognition. One can conclude, then, that at least one of the reasons the male assistant professors and instructors were low in communication activity was that they were low in problem recognition.

There were also significant differences for gender and rank combined by constraint recognition. The p value was .005. The difference between the male assistant professors and instructors and the female assistant professors and instructors on the variable of constraint recognition, however, was not as large. In fact, there was a larger percentage of the male assistant professors and instructors in the low constraint category than there were females. While 13.2 percent of the male assistant professors and instructors were in the low constraint category, 5.6 percent of the women assistant professors and instructors were in the low constraint

category. However, there was a slightly larger percentage of the male assistant professors and instructors in the high constraint category (17.6) than there were female assistant professors and instructors (14.8) in this category. Given these results, the difference in the levels of communication activity for these two groups cannot be explained by these relatively small differences in their levels of constraint recognition.

The final variable to be explored was level of involvement. The p value for the chi square procedure on gender and rank combined by level of involvement was .086. Approximately 24 percent of the female assistant professors and instructors were in the high involvement category. This compares to only 7.4 percent of the male assistant professors and instructors. At the other end of the involvement scale, approximately 28 percent of the male assistant professors were low in involvement. This compares to 13 percent of the female assistant professors and instructors who were in this category.

Breaking the communication activity measure down by the three situational theory variables helped to answer the questions that were previously posed. The male assistant professors and instructors were lower in communication activity than the female assistant professors and instructors because of the variables of problem recognition and involvement. Significantly more of the male assistant professors and instructors in this sample reported that they did not stop to think about the issues related to the status

of women in journalism and mass communication programs; nor did they see a personal connection between the items related to this issue and themselves.

A final comment on the differences between the male and female assistant professors on the variable of constraint recognition is warranted. Less than six percent of the women assistant professors and instructors were in the low constraint category. These results suggested that these untenured women felt as though they could make little difference in this area. One can only speculate on the extent to which the barriers discussed in the literature review affect these women's attitudes about their ability to do something to change their situation.

The attempt to further segment the AEJMC audience by combining the situational theory variables with demographic variables in this study has been, at least, partially successful. Combining the demographic variables of gender and rank proved to be a highly useful tool for identifying more precisely who in the AEJMC audience was high and low in communication activity. Furthermore, breaking down the overall communication activity variable by its individual situational theory components proved to be highly insightful.

Using the demographic variables to determine which communication channels the high and low communication groups preferred, however, did not prove to be as useful an approach for this particular issue. None of the hypotheses (8a through 8d)

produced statistically significant results. The mean use for the two overall information sources and the professional meetings by the demographic categories were not significantly different.

Activism

The final hypotheses explored the relationship between communication activity and activism and the relationship between activism and the demographic variables considered in this study. Based on the results of hypothesis 9, the situational theory can be used successfully to predict that the people in the high communication activity group are more likely to support activist activities. However, a comparison of the percentage of the men and women who were high in activism to the people who were high in communication activity across all ranks and ages showed that there were consistently more people in the activism category than there were in the high communication activity group. The only exception to this were the male assistant professors and instructors. While 4.4 percent of the male assistant professors and instructors were in the high activism group, 5.9 percent were high in communication activity.

Since there were more respondents in the high activism group at all ranks and ages (except for the male assistant professors and instructors) than there were respondents in the high communication activity group, this meanstthat people other than or in addition to

those people who were high in communication activity group were also activist oriented.

A comparison of the results of the communication activity measure by gender and age to the results of the activism measure by gender and age suggests that these measures do produce different results. While 13.1 percent of the younger men were high in communication activity, 6.6 percent were high in activism. While 6.9 percent of the older men were high in communication activity, 23.7 percent were high in activism. While 15.6 percent of the younger women were high in communication activity, 31.1 percent of the younger women were high in activism. And while 15 percent of the older women were high in communication activity, 20 percent of the older women were high in activism. This comparison suggests that all groups were higher in activism than they were in communication activity--with the exception of the younger men and the men at the assistant professor and instructor ranks. (One would expect that these groups would overlap).

One possible explanation for this is that the younger men in the untenured positions feel as though their futures are threatened by activities that would advance women, and therefore would not be willing to support such activities at their institution. This interpretation, however, is inconsistent with the findings on the level of involvement for the men at the assistant professor and instructor ranks. If these men were not willing to support these activities because they felt as though they were going to be

personally affected by the advancement of women, then their level of involvement should also be higher. Perhaps the better explanation of why these men are not more supportive of activities that would advance women lies in their low levels of problem recognition. If they do not perceive that the current status of women is a "problem," then they would be unlikely to support activities designed to advance women. They may be merely operating under the assumption that women "have made it" and that such activities simply are not needed. Future research is needed to determine these younger men's attitudes toward the status of women in journalism and mass communication programs and their willingness to support activities that would advance women through the academic hierarchy. Qualitative research, which could provide insight into *why* these men hold the attitudes they do, could be particularly useful in this area.

One possible interpretation for why all groups except the younger male assistant professors and instructors were higher in activism than they were in communication activity is that the situational theory variables of problem recognition, constraint recognition, and levels of involvement are adequate at predicting a portion of who will be willing to support activist activities for a particular issue, but fails to predict all or the majority of the people who will support those activities. Or, perhaps a more plausible explanation is that the people who were moderate in communication activity were also high in activism. Recall that the

results of the communication activity measure by activism (hypothesis 9) indicated that there were significant differences not only between the high and low communication activity groups, but also between the high and moderate communication activity groups, and between the moderate and low communication activity groups.

Since this methodology uses a three-way split to define communication activity and activism instead of the high and low split, the analysis must now take into consideration the differences between not only the high and low groups, but also the differences between the high and moderate groups. It may be that, when it comes to activism, a moderate communication level can also predict higher levels of activism. If this is supported in future studies then the theory would need to be refined to indicate that both high and moderate levels of communication activity can predict high levels of activism. Future studies should consider which of the situational variables or combination of variables explains people's movement from low to moderate to high levels of activism.

Interpreted in this light, the hypotheses on activism provided further support for the situational theory's ability to predict who would be willing to support activities designed to improve the number and status of women in journalism and mass communication programs. The addition of the demographic variables to the situational theory variables to describe activism provided additional insight for this study. This approach is promising because it holds the potential for even finer audience segmentation.

Another interpretation of these results, however, focuses on this somewhat puzzling finding that more people were consistently higher in activism than they were in communication activity. This is puzzling because high communication activity is supposed to *precede* high activism. The question of whether the situational theory is adequate at *predicting* activist publics now must be considered. According to the situational theory, communication activity precedes activist behavior, i.e., the theory can be used to predict who will become activists. From this vantage point, the cause and effect relationship occurs along the traditional attitude/cognition precedes behavior model. The results of this study, however, could be interpreted to suggest that activist behavior may precede high communication activity, as defined by the three situational theory variables, for this issue. For example, there were twice as many male administrators in the high activism group than there were in the high communication activity group. Almost 28 percent of the male administrators were in the high activism group, while approximately 13 percent of the male administrators were in the high communication activity group. This suggests that the male administrators are willing to behave in ways that the situational theory would not predict. If this study had only used the situational theory variables to predict activist behavior, the conclusion would have been that the male administrators would not be very likely to support activities that would advance women. The

results of the questions designed to measure activism, however, suggested otherwise.

Why there is a greater number of male administrators in the high activism group than would be predicted by the situational theory is open to interpretation. One possible explanation is that this group is bound by legal and social pressures to demonstrate a commitment to the advancement of women. This simply has become a part of their job; they don't think about it, they just do it. Or, another phenomenon may be at work in this situation. In this era of political correctness, the acceptable response is to voice support for policies that call for equality. How much of these administrator's expressed commitment to activist policies is lip service is unknowable.

Whatever the interpretations and possible explanations, the comparison of the number of people who are high in activism to the number of people who are high in communication activity was a useful endeavor. Future research should explore the relationship between activism and communication activity and consider situations where an expressed commitment to activist behavior may actually precede high communication activity.

Summary

The basic tenets of the situational theory were largely supported in this study. The attempt to determine the preferred information sources of the high communication activity group was

successful to a limited degree. The professional meetings were used significantly more by the high communication activity group than the low communication activity group. Further research is warranted on the AEJMC members' use of the higher education publications and interpersonal communication for this issue. The attempt to describe the selection of information sources by demographics, however, did not prove as successful in this study. The attempts to extend the theory in the areas of demographics and communication activity and demographics and activism, however, were partially successful. The combination of demographic variables, particularly of gender and rank, proved to be a highly useful tool for further segmenting and describing the AEJMC membership on this issue. Breaking the overall communication activity measure down by each of the situational theory variables also proved to be a highly useful method for explaining the differences in communication activity among the various demographic groups. And, the attempt to describe the high activism group by their demographic characteristics also produced promising results. Future research should explore *why* the younger, untenured men are not supportive of activities that would advance women. Is it really a matter of problem recognition or is it actually a matter of involvement? Future studies should also explore the temporal relationship between high communication activity and high levels of activism.

Applying the situational theory

One of the most pressing needs in the mass communication field is to bridge the gap between theory and practice. In the public relations field, specifically, one of the weakest theoretical links is in the area of campaign planning, according to Van Leuven (1986). The second objective of this research was to use the data collected in this study as the baseline information from which a communication campaign could be developed. The goal of the communication campaign would coincide with AEJMC's resolution to improve the number and status of women working in AEJMC-affiliated organizations by the year 2000. The following discussion suggests ways in which the results of this study could be incorporated into a communication campaign designed to coincide with the goals of the resolution to achieve parity by the year 2000.

As the findings in this research have confirmed, the high communication activity group is more likely to support activities that would improve the number and status of women in journalism and mass communication programs. This means that one of the ways to increase the number of people who are supportive of activities designed to advance women would be to increase the number of people who are high in communication activity. Since communication activity has been defined as the combination of the three situational variables of problem recognition, constraint recognition, and level of involvement, the effort to increase AEJMC

members' levels of communication activity should focus on each individual variable in the situational theory.

The first step in developing a communication campaign based on the situational theory would be to raise levels of problem recognition. An analysis of the demographic variables by problem recognition suggests that the public that most needs to be targeted in this area is the men at the assistant professor and instructor level ranks. This group has the largest percentage of its members in the low problem recognition category.

Knowing which public needs to be targeted, however, is not enough. The next consideration is what type of information needs to be relayed to the members of this public. Since the variable under consideration is problem recognition, the messages in this area should be designed to increase the frequency with which the male assistant professors and instructors stop to think about this issue. This means that the messages should be informational and focus on the facts. The goal at this stage of the campaign would be to increase this group's awareness that there are problems in this area. The statistical information that was presented in the introduction and literature review sections of this study could provide the foundation for an informational campaign on this subject. This information could be compiled on simple fact sheets at nominal cost and with little effort.

How to deliver this information to the male assistant professors and instructors is a more complex issue. Since their

problem recognition and communication activity is so low, it would be unrealistic to expect the male assistant professors and instructors to seek out information about this topic. AEJMC, in conjunction with the Commission on the Status of Women, should consider the feasibility of a direct mail campaign to this public. An additional measure that could help increase the level of problem recognition for the large number of new faculty members that are expected to be hired before the year 2000 in journalism and mass communication programs would be to include an informational flier in each new faculty member's orientation package.

Since the low communication activity group is not likely to seek out information about this issue, an interpersonal approach is probably also needed in this area. Since the female assistant professors and instructors are high in problem recognition, they are in a position to reach out to their male colleagues. The women at the AEJMC-affiliated institutions should be encouraged to communicate with their male colleagues and to discuss the goals of the resolution with them.

The next variable to be considered is involvement. The group that has the highest percentage of its members in the low involvement category is the male assistant professors and instructors. Almost 28 percent of this group of men were low in involvement. Less than 8 percent were in the high involvement category. This means that these men reported that they did not feel "a connection" between themselves and issues related to the

advancement of women. That is, they reported that they did not feel as though these issues affected them or could affect them. If the explanation for this attitude is that these men do not feel the status of women is "their" problem, then L. Grunig's earlier comments take on much greater significance. L. Grunig suggested that men need to realize that men and women's futures are intertwined: What happens to women, in a sense, happens to men. L. Grunig further added that it is in men's own best interest not to waste women's resources.

Messages designed to increase levels of involvement for men, then, should demonstrate how the advancement of women is connected to the advancement of both men and women. The need to reach the men on the lower levels of the academic hierarchy should not be underestimated. These men will be the leaders of the twenty first century. The effort to achieve and maintain gender equality in journalism and mass communication programs will require the concerted efforts of both women and men.

The strategy for delivering this message is to reach out to this group of men and seek their participation and cooperation. Since the findings of this study showed that the programming at professional meetings was cited as a frequent source of information for this issue, the Commission and AEJMC should consider ways to capitalize on this important channel. The Commission should make a conscious effort to involve more men in the programming at the conventions and professional meetings. More men also should be invited to attend the Commission presentations. The Commission could set a

goal of increasing the number of men who are members and doubling the attendance of men at the conference presentations. One strategy for achieving this would be to encourage each woman to invite a male colleague to a Commission presentation with her. This outreach campaign could be called, "2000 Together." This would mean that the goals of the resolution would be achieved by men and women working together. Such an outreach campaign could go a long way toward getting men involved and making them feel as though they are a part of the solution. Perhaps the "2000 Together" slogan could be adopted as the theme for a national or regional convention in the coming years.

The final variable that needs to be considered is constraint recognition. According to the situational theory, the high communication activity public is going to believe that it can do something to change the situation, whereas the low communication activity group is more likely to believe that their efforts make little difference. The question, then, is how to reduce the members' constraints and persuade them that their individual efforts could indeed make a difference in this area.

The analysis of the gender and rank variable by constraint recognition suggested that almost 17 percent of the female full professors were in the high constraint category, and only 7 percent of the female full professors were in the low constraint category. This means that only 3 of the 42 women full professors who were surveyed believed that their efforts could make a great deal of

difference in this area. These results are surprising since it is the tenured, senior women who are in a one of the better positions to do something about this issue.

One can only speculate as to why these women who have "made it" feel their efforts would make so little difference. To reduce levels of constraint recognition among this public, AEJMC, in conjunction with the Commission, should develop specific activities to include the senior women in the movement to achieve the goals of the resolution. Appointing a senior woman to spearhead an educational effort at each institution is an example of the kind of activities that could help these women see how their efforts could make a difference. At each AEJMC-affiliated institution, a senior woman could be designated as the spokesperson for the resolution. This woman would be responsible for coordinating the campaign at her institution.

In order to reduce constraints among other organizational members, AEJMC, in conjunction with the Commission, should develop a list of activities that organizational members at all levels could do to ensure that the resolution to achieve parity is reached by the year 2000. Since the goal of these messages is empowerment, the focus should be on the individual difference each person could make and the effect these activities would have. It would not be enough, for example, to encourage the female full professors to begin talking with their male colleagues about the problems that persist. The messages must demonstrate to the publics how their

efforts would make a difference. Case studies of past success stories in this area could be a possible strategy.

The foregoing discussion has demonstrated how the data collected using the situational theory, as refined in this study, can be used to generate possible programming for a communication campaign on the issue of women's advancement in journalism and mass communication programs. The data that have been collected provide the baseline information and the activities suggested are but possibilities. Members of the Commission on the Status of Women and AEJMC are encouraged to consider ways in which these results could be applied to their fullest potential.

Directions for future research

Designing, implementing, and evaluating a communication campaign on the issue of the status of women in journalism and mass communication, using this data as the baseline research, would constitute a significant development in public relations research. To date, no organization has used the situational theory to collect data, develop programming based on the findings, implement a campaign, and then evaluate the extent to which campaign programming based on the situational theory could be used to increase levels of communication activity. This could be a project that could be designed and implemented during the remaining years of this century.

The publics that were identified as low in problem recognition, high in constraint recognition, and low in levels of involvement should be invited to participate in a qualitative research project that would consider why these groups hold the attitudes they do. Such information could be used to develop messages that would more precisely address the particular variables under consideration.

The issue of the status of women in journalism and mass communication provides an opportunity to develop a communication campaign that would combine theory and practice in public relations. Such an effort also provides a mechanism through which the goals of the resolution could be achieved. If such a project could be pursued, the field of public relations would be enriched; the AEJMC organization would be enriched; and women in journalism and mass communication programs would reap the greatest riches of all.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Anderson, D. S. (1992). Identifying and responding to activist republics: A case study. Journal of Public Relations Research, 4(3), 151-165.

Anderson, R. T. & Ramey, P. (1990). Women in higher education: development through administrative mentoring. In L. B. Welch (Ed.), Women in Higher Education, (pp. 183-190).

Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). Women of Influence, Women of Vision. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Beasley, M. , & Theus, K. (1988). The New Majority . Lanham: University Press of America.

Bennett, S. M. , & Shayner, J. A. (1988). The role of senior administrators in women's leadership development. In Sagaria, M. A. (Ed.), Empowering Women: Leadership Development Strategies on Campus, (pp. 27-38). San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Blum, D. E. (1991). Environment still hostile to women in academe, new evidence indicates. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 38,(7), pp. A1, A20.

Botan, C. H., & Hazelton, V. (Eds.) (1989). Public Relations Theory Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bowker, J. E. T. (1981). A comparison of university faculty men's and women's aspirations for administrative positions. Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EDS 296 680).

Cameron, G. T. (1992). Memory for investor relations messages: An information-processing study of Grunig's situational theory. Journal of Public Relations Research, 4 (1), 45-60.

Chamberlain, M. K. (Ed.). (1988). Women in Academe. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chesebro, J. W. (1991, April). Preparing for the future: faculty development issues in the year 2000. ACA Bulletin, pp. 11-24.

Collison, M. (1990, December 12). 20 years later, women on formerly all-male campuses fight to change their institutions' 'old boy' images. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A23-A24.

Davis, F. (1991). Moving the Mountain. New York: Simon & Schuster.

DeFleur, M. F. (1993). The forthcoming shortage of communications Ph.D.s. (Working Paper). New York: The Freedom Forum Media Studies Center at Columbia University in the City of New York.

DePalma, A. (1993, January 24). Rare in Ivy League: Women who work as full professors. The New York Times, pp. 1, 23.

Dohrmann, M. (1982). Why women are underrepresented in administrative positions: A review of the research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 868).

Etaugh, C. (1985). Changes in the status of women faculty and administrators in higher education since 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254 181).

Fallon, J. (1991, April). Planning for the year 2000: women in academe. ACA Bulletin, pp. 32-37.

Faludi, S. (1991). Backlash. New York: Crown Publishers.

Grunig, J. E. (1983). Communication behaviors and attitudes of environmental publics: two studies. Journalism Monograph, (Whole No. 81).

Grunig, J. E. (1989). Publics, audiences, and market segments: Segmentation principles for campaigns. In C. T. Salmon (Ed.), Information Campaigns: Balancing Social Values and Social Change, (pp. 239-252). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Grunig, J. E. (1989). Sierra club study shows who become activists. Public Relations Review, 15(3), 3-24.

Grunig, J. E. , & Hunt, T. (1984). Managing Public Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Grunig, J. E. , & Ipes, D. A. (1983). The anatomy of a campaign against drunken driving. Public Relations Review, 9(2), 36-52.

Grunig, L. S. (1989). The "glass ceiling" effect on mass communication students. In P. J. Creedon (Ed.), Women in Mass Communication, (pp. 125-147). Newbury Park: Sage.

Hamilton, P. K. (1992). Grunig's situational theory: a replication, application, and extension. Journal of Public Relations Research, 4(3), 123-149.

Haring-Hidore, M. (1988). A career advancement program for women administrators. Journal of Career Development, 14(4), 279-286.

Heath, R. L. , & Douglas, W. (1990). Involvement: A key variable in people's reaction to public policy issues. Public Relations Research Annual, 2, 193-204.

Hensel, N. (1991). Realizing gender equality in higher education: the need to integrate work/family issues. Washington D. C.: The George Washington University, School of Education & Human Development.

Ihle, E. (1991). Historical perspectives on women's advancement in higher educational administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 381).

Kaplan, S. , & Helly, D. (1984). An agenda for senior women administrators. In A. Tinsley, C. Secor, & S. Kaplan (Eds.), Women in Higher Education Administration, (pp. 67-76). San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Kaplan, S. , Secor, C. , & Tinsley, A. (1984). Getting the best: conclusions, recommendations and selected resources. In A. Tinsley, C. Secor, & S. Kaplan (Eds.), Women in Higher Education Administration, (pp. 85-91). San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Kaplan, S. , & Tinsley, A. (1989, January-February). The unfinished agenda: women in higher education administration. Academe, 18-22.

Katz, M. & Veland, V. (1988). Get Smart! New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York.

Kaufman, S. J. (1992). Developing administrative leadership among women in journalism and mass communication education programs: A conceptual model. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, Terre Haute.

Luna, G. , & Cullen, D. (1990). An ethnographic comparison of mentoring functions for women in academe and business. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 817).

Mark, S. F. (1986). Gender differences among mid-level administrators. Paper presented at the Symposium on Mid-level Administrators in Academe. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 268 877).

McMillen, L. (1989). Council asks colleges to adopt 'new agenda' on women's issues. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 34(20), A1, A18.

Moore, K. (1984). "Careers in college and university administration: How are women affected?" New Directions for Higher Education, 45. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Moore, K. M. & Amey, M. J. (1988). Some faculty leaders are born women. In Sagaria, M. A. (Ed.), Empowering Women: Leadership Development Strategies on Campus, (pp. 39-40). San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Pavlik, J. V. (1988). Audience complexity as a component of campaign planning. Public Relations Review, 14(2), 12-21.

Pavlik, J. V. (1987). Public Relations: What research tells us. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Pratt, C. (1989). Female and minority PR educators: where is the hope for career advancement. Public Relations Quarterly, Fall, 29-31.

Rush, R. (1993). A systematic commitment to women in the academy. Journalism Educator, 48(1), 71-79.

Sandler, B. R. (1986). The campus climate revisited: chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 282 462).

Sandler, B.R. (1991, January). Women faculty at work in the classroom, or, why it still hurts to be a woman in labor. Communication Education, 6-15

Schamber, L. (1989). Women in mass communication education: who is teaching tomorrow's communicators? In P. J. Creedon (Ed.), Women in Mass Communication, (pp. 148-159). Newbury Park: Sage.

Sharpe, N. , VanSlyke Turk, J. , Einsiedel, E. , Schamber, L. , & Hollenback, S. (1985). Faculty Women in Journalism and Mass Communication: Problems and Progress. Syracuse: Gannett.

Shavlik, D. L. , Touchton, J. G. , & Pearson, C. S. (1989). The new agenda of women for higher education. In C. S. Pearson, D. L. Shavlik, & J. G. Touchton, (Eds.), Educating the Majority: Women Challenge Tradition in Higher Education, (pp. 441-458). New York: Collier MacMillan.

Simmons, B. & Jarchow, E. (1990). Women administrators: benefits & costs. In L. B. Welch (Ed.), Women in Higher Education, (pp. 173-179).

Slader, M. D. , Chipman, H. , Auld, G. , Keefe, T. , & Kendall, P. (1992). Information processing and situational theory. Journal of Public Relations Research, 4 (4), 189-203.

Slimmer, V. M. (April 1984). Advancement factors of women in administration: Patterns and perspectives. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 836).

Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1990). Method, methodology and epistemology in feminist research process. In Stanley (Ed.), Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory and epistemology in Feminist Sociology, (pp. 20-60). London and New York: Routledge.

Stokes, J. M. (1984). Organizational barriers and their impact on women in higher education. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. EDS 264 747).

The strategic study group on the status of women: Report to the president and the commission for women. (1988). (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 319 304).

Touchton, J. G. , & Davis, L. (1991). Fact Book on Women in Higher Education. New York: Macmillan.

Treading water: The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 1992-93. (1993). Academe, 79(2), 8-90.

Turk, J. (1991, Winter). Women administrators: ASJMC roundtable no. 2. Insights: Journal of the Association of Journalism and Mass Communication, 32-38.

Viswanath, K. , Kosicki, G. M. & Creedon, P. J. (1993). Women in mass communication education: progress, problems and prospects. Manuscript prepared for P. J. Creedon (Ed.) Women in Mass Communication. Sage.

Weiss, L. (Ed.) (1988). Class, Race & Gender in American Education. Albany: State University of New York.

Witt, S. L. (1990). The Pursuit of Gender Equity in American Academe. New York: Praeger.

York, R. , Henly, C. , & Gamble, D. N. (1988). The power of positive mentors: variables associated with women's interest in social work administration. Journal of Social Work Education, No. 3, 242-250.

Zoch, L. , & Russell, M. (1991). Women in PR education: an 'academic velvet ghetto'? Journalism Educator, 46(3), 25-35.

APPENDIX

First, I'm going to read you a list of situations. I want you to tell me how often you stop to think about each of these situations. Tell me if you stop to think about this situation frequently, sometimes, rarely, or never.

How often do you think about:
Whether female faculty and administrators in journalism and mass communication programs are paid the same as their male counterparts
Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

How often do you think about:
Whether women in journalism and mass communication programs have the same opportunities to advance as men
Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

How often do you think about:
Whether women are equally represented at all faculty ranks, including full professor, in journalism and mass communication programs
Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

How often do you think about:
The number of female administrators in journalism and mass communication programs compared to the number of male administrators
Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

How often do you think about:
The number of female students in journalism and mass communication programs compared to the number of female professors and administrators
Frequently Sometimes Rarely Never

Figure 1. Problem Recognition

Now, I would like for you to think of whether you could do anything personally that would make a difference in each of the following situations. If you wanted to do something, would your efforts make a great deal of difference, some difference, very little difference, or no difference?

If you wanted to do something about:
Equal pay for men and women in comparable positions in journalism and mass communication programs
How much difference would your efforts make?
A great deal Some Very little No difference

If you wanted to do something about:
Equal opportunities for advancement for both women and men in journalism and mass communication programs
How much difference would your efforts make?
A great deal Some Very little No difference

If you wanted to do something about:
The equal representation of female faculty at all ranks, including full professor, in journalism and mass communication programs
How much difference would your efforts make?
A great deal Some Very little No difference

If you wanted to do something about:
The number of female administrators in journalism and mass communication programs compared to the number of male administrators
How much difference would your efforts make?
A great deal Some Very little No difference

If you wanted to do something about:
The number of female students compared to the number of female faculty and administrators in journalism and mass communication programs
How much difference would your efforts make?
A great deal Some Very little No difference

Figure 2. Constraint Recognition

To what extent do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and the following situations. There would be a connection if you believe the issue has affected you or could affect you. Tell me if the connection is strong, moderate, weak, or if you see no connection:

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:

Policies calling for equal pay for women and men in comparable positions in journalism and mass communication programs

Is this connection:

Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:

Policies calling for equal opportunities for the advancement of both women and men in journalism and mass communication programs

Is this connection:

Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:

Policies calling for the equal representation of female faculty at all ranks, including full professor, in journalism and mass communication programs

Is this connection:

Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:

Policies calling for the increased representation of women in administrative positions in journalism and mass communication programs

Is this connection:

Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Do you see a connection between yourself, personally, and:

Policies calling for an increase in the number and status of female faculty so that they can serve as role models and mentors for the new majority of female students in journalism and mass communication programs

Is this connection:

Strong Moderate Weak No connection

Figure 3. Level of Involvement

To what extent do you recall hearing/reading about the issue of women's advancement in higher education from the following sources:

TV News	Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]
Radio news	Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]
Magazines	Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]
Newspapers	Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]
Higher ed pubs	Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]
AEJMC pubs	Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]
AEJMC Nat. Con.	Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]
AEJMC Reg. Con.	Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]
Other prof. mtgs.	Frequently [5], often [4], sometimes [3], rarely [2], never [1]

Please specify any other sources from which you have received information about the topic of women's advancement in higher education:

Figure 4. Information Sources

Now I want you to tell me how likely you would you be to support the following activities at your institution. Tell me if you would be very likely to support, likely to support, not very likely to support, or if you would not support the activity.

How likely would you be to support:
Filling faculty openings with qualified female candidates
Very likely Likely Not very likely Not support

How likely would you be to support:
Filling administrative positions with qualified female candidates

Very likely Likely Not very likely Not support

How likely would you be to support:
Incentive programs to promote women faculty
Very likely Likely Not very likely Not support

How likely would you be to support:
Administrative training programs for women
Very likely Likely Not very likely Not support

How likely would you be to support:
Formal mentoring programs for women
Very likely Likely Not very likely Not support

How likely would you be to support:
An organizational assessment evaluating your institution's commitment to affirmative action
Very likely Likely Not very likely Not support

How likely would you be to support:
Policies that call for the monitoring of the climate for women after they are hired at your institution
Very likely Likely Not very likely Not support

Figure 5. Activism

TABLE 1: Percentage of people in each group for each of the situational theory variables.

Variable	Group		
	Low	Mod	High
Problem recognition	18%	63%	18%
Constraint recognition	12	75	13
Involvement	16	64	20

N=402

TABLE 2: The distribution of activity levels for each of the information sources.

Channel Activity level	Percentage
Overall Information Sources	
High	15.2%
Moderate	67.4
Low	17.4
N=402	
Mass Media	
High	14.2%
Moderate	71.6
Low	14.2
N=402	
Print Mass Media	
High	11.4%
Moderate	73.1
Low	15.4
N=402	
Higher Education Publications	
High	21.2%
Moderate	67.1
Low	11.7
N=402	
Professional Meetings	
High	20.1%
Moderate	56.5
Low	22.1
N=397	

TABLE 3: Percentage of people at each communication activity level who said interpersonal sources

Response	Communication Activity Level Low	Mod	High	N
Said Interpersonal	23.3%	64.4%	12.2%	9
Did not say interpersonal	30.6	57.7	11.6	310

Total N=400
Chi square=1.83, 2DF, p<.399

TABLE 4: Distribution of communication activity by age.

Age	Communication Activity Level			N
	Low	Mod	High	
25-35	23.8%	66.7%	9.5%	42
36-45	27.7	58.1	14.2	148
46-55	31.5	56.9	11.5	130
56-65	30.3	59.1	10.6	66
65+	33.3	66.7	0	9

Total N=402
Row percentages are reported.
Chi square=3.50, 8DF, p.<.898.

TABLE 5: Distribution of communication activity by race.

Race	Communication Activity Level Low	Mod	High	N
African American	35.7%	35.7%	28.6%	14
Asian	25.0	62.5	12.5	8
Caucasian	29.6	59.3	11.1	361
Hispanic	20.0	40.0	40.0	5
Other	10.0	90.0	0	10

Total N=402
Row percentages are reported.
Chi square=12.96, 8DF, p<.112.
Note: 10 of 15 cells had fewer than 5 frequencies.

TABLE 6: Distribution of communication activity by rank.

Rank	Communication Activity Level			N
	Low	Mod	High	
Less than instructor	31.1%	55.6%	13.3%	45
Instructor and assistant	35.2	55.7	9.0	122
Associate and Full	30.0	58.1	11.9	160
Administrator	15.5	69.0	15.5	71

Total N=398
Row percentages are reported.
Chi square=9.44, 6DF, $p < .150$.

TABLE 7: Distribution of communication activity by tenure.

Tenure Status	Communication Activity Level			N
	Low	Mod	High	
Tenured	25.7%	60.0%	14.3%	210
Not Tenured	32.6	58.3	9.1	187

Total N=397.
Row percentages are reported.
Chi square=3.93, 2DF, p. <.139.

TABLE 8: Distribution of communication activity by gender.

Gender	Communication Activity Level			N
	Low	Mod	High	
Female	20.3%	62.2%	17.5%	143
Male	34.0	57.4	8.6	256

Total N=399
Row percentages are reported.
Chi square=12.44, 2df, p< .001**
**Denotes significance at the .01 level.

TABLE 9: Distribution of communication activity by rank and gender combined.

Gender and Rank	Communication Activity Level			N
	Low	Mod	High	
Female Administrators	16.7%	62.5%	20.8%	24
Male Administrators	14.9	72.3	12.8	47
Female Full & Associate	23.8	54.8	21.4	42
Male Full & Associate	32.2	59.3	8.5	118
Female Assist. & Instructor	20.4	66.7	13.0	54
Male Assist. & Instructor	47.1	47.1	5.9	68
Female < Instructor	18.2	63.6	18.2	22
Male < Instructor	43.5	47.8	8.7	23

Total N=398.
Row percentages are reported.
Chi square=30.25, 14DF, p. <.007**
**Denotes significance at the .01 level.

TABLE 10: Distribution of communication activity by age and gender combined.

Age & Gender	Communication Activity Level Low	Mod	High	N
Younger women	15.6%	68.9%	15.6%	45
Younger men	29.5	57.4	13.1	61
Older women	25.0	60.0	15.0	20
Older Men	31.0	62.1	6.9	58

Total N=184.
Row percentages are reported.
Chi square=5.26, 6df, $p < .510$.

TABLE 11: Comparison of mean use of information sources by age.

Source	Age				
	25-35 (N=42)	36-45 (N=149)	46-55 (N=130)	56-65 (N=67)	65+ (N=9)
All combined F=.961 (4DF) p < .429	1.98	1.95	1.98	2.00	2.33
Meetings F=.756 (4DF) p < .554	1.85	1.99	2.03	1.94	2.13
Higher ed pubs F= .2.21 (4DF) p < .066	1.62	1.58	1.74	1.72	1.75

Total N=402.

TABLE 12: Comparison of mean use of information sources by rank.

Source	Rank							
	G. St. (N=30)	Ad./pt (N=6)	Lect. (N=9)	Instr. (N=20)	Asst. (N=102)	Assoc. (N=84)	Full (N=77)	Admin. (N=71)
All combined	2.03	2.00	2.00	1.95	1.95	1.94	2.03	1.99
F=.209 (7DF) p < .983								
Meetings	1.86	1.50	2.00	1.90	2.03	1.96	2.04	1.96
F=.675 (7DF) p< .693								
Higher ed pubs	1.63	1.80	1.67	1.70	1.62	1.64	1.71	1.72
F=.529 (7DF) p < .819								

Total N=400

TABLE 13: Comparison of mean use of information sources by tenure status.

Source	Status	
	Tenured (N=210)	Not tenured (N=187)
All combined F=.095 (1DF) p < .759	1.99	1.97
Meetings F=.012 (1DF) p < . 913	1.98	1.98
Higher ed pubs F=2.84 (1DF) p < .093	1.71	1.63

Total N=397.

TABLE 14: Comparison of mean use of information sources by gender.

Source	Gender	
	Female	Male
All combined F=2.57 (1DF) p < .109	1.92	2.01
Meetings F=1.74 (1DF) p < .187	1.98	1.98
Specialized pubs F=13.6 (1DF) p < .000**	1.55	1.73

Total N=399.
**Denotes significance at the .01 level.

TABLE 15: The mean level of overall activism at each communication activity level.

Variable	Communication Activity Level		
	Low (N=116)	Mod (N=237)	High (N=47)
Overall Activism	1.80	2.16	2.51
F=31.06 (2DF) $p < .000$**			

N=400
**Denotes significance at the .01 level.

TABLE 16: Distribution of level of activism by age and gender combined.

Age & Gender	Level of Activism			N
	Low%	Mod%	High%	
Younger women	4.4	64.4	31.1	45
Younger men	14.8	78.7	6.6	61
Older women	10.0	70.0	20.0	20
Older Men	15.3	61.0	23.7	59

Total N=185.
Row percentages are reported.
Chi square=13.57, 6DF, p< .034*
*Denotes significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 17: Comparison of level of activism to level of communication by age and gender combined.

	Level of activism and communication activity						
Age and Gender	**LA**	**LC**	**MA**	**MC**	**HA**	**HC**	**N**
Younger Women	4.4%	15.6%	64.4%	68.9%	31.1%	15.6%	45
Younger Men	14.8	29.5	78.7	57.4	6.6	13.1	61
Older Women	10.0	25.0	70.0	60.0	20.0	15.0	20
Older Men	15.3	31.0	61.0	62.1	23.7	6.9	59

LA=Low level of activism
LC=Low level of communication activity
MA=Moderate level of activism
MC=Moderate level of communication activity
HA=High level of activism
HC=High level of communication activity

Total N=185
Row percentages are reported.

TABLE 18: Distribution of level of activism by rank and gender combined.

Gender and Rank	Level of Activism Low	Mod	High	N
Female Administrators	4.2%	70.8%	25.0%	24
Male Administrators	8.5	63.8	27.7	47
Female Full & Associate	11.9	59.5	28.6	42
Male Full & Associate	16.7	62.5	20.8	120
Female Assist. & Instructor	5.6	51.9	42.6	54
Male Assist. & Instructor	20.6	75.0	4.4	68
Female < Instructor	9.1	63.6	27.3	22
Male < Instructor	17.4	65.2	17.4	23

Total N=400.
Row percentages are reported.
Chi square=33.07, 14 DF, $p < .002$**
**Denotes significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 19: Comparison of level of activism to level of communication by rank and gender combined.

Rank and Gender	Level of activism and communication activity						N
	LA	LC	MA	MC	HA	HC	
Female Administ.	4.2%	16.7%	70.8%	62.5%	25.0%	20.8%	24
Male Administ.	8.5	14.9	63.8	72.3	27.7	12.8	47
Female Full & Assoc.	11.9	23.8	59.5	54.8	28.6	21.4	42
Male Full & Assoc.	16.7	32.2	62.5	59.3	20.8	8.5	120
Female Asst. & Inst.	5.6	20.4	51.9	66.7	42.6	13.0	54
Male Asst. & Inst.	20.6	47.1	75.0	47.1	4.4	5.9	68
Female Inst.	9.1	18.2	63.6	63.6	27.3	18.2	22
Male Inst.	17.4	43.5	65.2	47.8	17.4	8.7	23

LA=Low level of activism
LC=Low level of communication activity
MA=Moderate level of activism
MC=Moderate level of communication activity
HA=High level of activism
HC=High level of communication activity

N=400
Row percentages are reported.

VITA

Betty Anne Farmer, a native of Clintwood, Virginia, graduated cum laude from Clinch Valley College of the University of Virginia in May, 1986. While pursuing the bachelor's degree in English, she edited the student newspaper and college literary magazine. She was twice named to Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities and received Clinch Valley College's Journalism Award two consecutive years. After receiving the bachelor's degree, she worked as a meetings and conventions coordinator for A.L. Williams Insurance Company in Atlanta, Georgia. In September, 1987, she entered the University of Tennessee, at Knoxville to pursue a Master of Science Degree in Communications. While completing the Master's, she conducted communication audits for two Tennessee municipalities. She received the Master's in December, 1988. After receiving the Master's degree, she served as a district program coordinator for the Muscular Dystrophy Association and as the community services coordinator for the Helen Ross McNabb Center in Knoxville, Tennessee. She began work full time on the Ph.D. in Communications in August, 1990. During her doctoral career, she served as a graduate teaching associate and taught mass communication and public relations courses. She also served as a Bickel Research Scholar. She was named the Outstanding Doctoral Student (1992-93) and the Outstanding Graduate Teaching Associate (1992-93) in the College of Communications. She was

also awarded a university-wide Chancellor's Citation for Professional Promise (1992-93). She joined the faculty at Western Carolina University in Cullowhee, North Carolina, in August, 1993 as an Instructor in the College of Communication & Theatre Arts.