



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Bromley, M. S. (2013). The 'new majority' and the academization of journalism. *Journalism*, 14(5), pp. 569-586. doi: 10.1177/1464884912453285

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/4864/>

Link to published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1464884912453285>

Copyright and reuse: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

The ‘new majority’ and the academization of journalism

Michael Bromley

The University of Queensland, Australia

Abstract

The academization of journalism is reliant on the development of the field founded in scholarship demonstrated through the publication of research in peer reviewed specialist journals. Given the profile of journalism faculty, this means inducting practitioners into a culture of critical research. In Australia at least, this cohort of neophytes is predominantly comprised of middle-aged women who were surveyed about their personal attitudes to research. They were mostly open to the idea of becoming researchers but were inclined to proceed cautiously without necessarily severing their ties with practice. There was evidence to suggest that a generally positive orientation to research was not capitalized on and that they remained uncertain about the role of research. On the other hand, they appeared not to have adopted the orthodoxy of implacable opposition to scholarly inquiry. The change in gender composition in the academy may provide, contrary to historical, but more in line with contemporary, evidence, a renewed impetus to the project of academizing the field.

Key words: academization attitudes faculty journalism research women

The academization of journalism – the process whereby vocational training in the workplace grounded in an apprenticeship learning model was supplanted by scholarly study in a critical, research-based higher education environment (Goedegebuure 1992: 58) – might have been expected to have facilitated an increase in the numbers of female practitioners as universities applied more equity- and merit-based admissions criteria than traditional employers at an increasingly important juncture in the labor supply chain (Bromley 2009: 55-6). In turn, given that globally around 85 per cent of journalism academics were recruited from among practitioners, that should have led to a commensurate growth in female faculty in journalism

schools (Bromley and Neal 2011: 56; Ghersetti and Weibull 2009: 196; Grenby et al 2009: 4; Salokangas 2009: 128; Ulmanu 2009: 485; Vatrál 2009: 497-8). To some extent, this has occurred. Starting in the USA in the 1970s, women began to constitute majorities of journalism students (Becker et al 2003: 3) until by the opening decade of the twenty-first century around the world they accounted for up to 95 per cent of enrolments (Avadani 2002: 124; Becker, Vlad and Desnoes 2010: 233; Grenby et al 2009: 6; Melki 2009: 678-9; Mfumbusa 2010: 164-5; North 2010: 104-5; Nyondo nd; Splichal and Sparks 1994: 110; Terzis 2009; Thawabteh 2010: 89).¹ Almost certainly as a consequence, and roughly coincidentally, the proportion of female journalists reached about 50 per cent in some countries (Pinto and Sousa 2003: 181; Strong 2007: 8). Nevertheless, on the whole, men still outnumbered women as journalists globally (Weaver 2005: 47), and almost everywhere – one notable exception by 2011 was Australia (Bromley, forthcoming) – women remained in the minority among faculty in journalism schools. Being a journalism academic was seen as the prerogative of older men (de Beer 1995: 9). Splichal and Sparks (1994: 109-111) noted that the academization of journalism had not transformed women's employment opportunities simply because journalism was an occupation which discriminated systemically against women (pp. 112-4). This attitude, it was argued, then pervaded the journalism academy (North 2009; North 2010: 111; Rush, Oukrop and Creedon 2004).

Outside the USA very little is known about journalism faculty. Most scholarly attention paid to journalism in the academy has concerned itself with students and graduates, syllabi and curricula, pedagogies and intellectual (non-)alignments (Bromley 2006; Josephi 2009; Phillips 2005; Willnat and Weaver 2006; Zelizer 2004; Zelizer 2009). Features inherent in academization – merit, institutionalization and bureaucratization, becoming more science-like, insisting on formal credentials, professionalization, theory building and critical research, which lay behind the production of new knowledge, new ideas and new skillsets – led to the (re)formation (modernization) of occupations such as medicine, marketing, nursing, social work, teaching, musicianship, business, librarianship, design, management, art, accountancy, politics, economics and pharmacy (Hodder and Hodder 2010: 899-900; Shipman and Shipman 2006: 7-9). However, they were addressed only partially and obliquely in journalism (see Medsger 2005), and journalism straddled the vocational-academic divide more uncomfortably (Bromley 2006: 64;

Tumber and Prentoulis 2005: 69-72), confounded by ‘challenges [to] old myths and shared ways of knowing’ (Nieminen 2008: 127). Journalism simultaneously embraced and rebuffed academization as a way of allowing ‘professionals to distinguish themselves from ... amateurs’; of validating qualifications as proof of ‘skill and analytical ability’, and of equipping its graduates with the capabilities to ‘assess wider problems, decide new courses of action and acquire new skills, rather than repeating narrowly defined actions that lost effectiveness when the situation changed’. Journalism had a parallel alternative (oppositional) identity as a craft which was best taught ‘by journalists for journalists’ (Shipman and Shipman 2006: 10; Wu 2006: 134-9; Zelizer 2004: 34-6). The role of universities was to provide faux newsrooms and to deliver ‘employability’ (Bromley 2009: 56). In many places, journalism as a field was shaped primarily by ‘editors and others with responsible positions’ in news organizations, and those with ‘skill and experience’ (Dodge and Viner 1963: 9; Kemsley 1952: viii). It was perhaps not surprising that many journalists assumed that the transfer from newsroom to the academy involved no fundamental re-orientation: ‘if you’re teaching journalism or mass communication, you’re still basically a journalist, right?’ (Joseph 2009).

For the most part the transition from professional education (training) to academic field (Wilson et al 2010: 247) was incomplete. Symbolically, journalism faculty were most routinely called ‘educators’, and O’Donnell (2001-2002) noted that in Australia at least, the bulk of journalism research interest focused on education. The process of conversion to an academic field promised destabilizing ‘new conflicts, orientations, and developments’ which challenged ‘the role, professional identity, and values’ of practitioners, and threatened to denigrate practice as ‘outdated’ and ‘antiquated’ (Nieminen 2008: 137-8). Journalist-academics (so-called ‘hackademics’²) who had re-located from practice to the academy were particularly reluctant participants in (sometimes cast themselves as victims of) the academization process (Bacon 1998: 80; Harcup 2011b: 169; Leung, Chu and Lee 2006: 192-3, 195-7, 199; Medsger 2005: 209ff) in terms of acknowledging a scientific evidence-based field (Turner 2011: 6) and the requirement for formal qualifications (Medsger 2005: 213). Markers of the maturation of the field as ‘a proper and autonomous ... discipline’, however, also included theory building (Lo 2006: 185; Wang 2006: 174); methodological development; shared and clustered research foci (Erman and Todorovski 2009: 13); the identification of research leaders (Hickman, Stacks and

Amsbary 1989); setting standards for rigor (Riffe and Freitag 1997: 880), and publication in specialist peer reviewed journals generating 'citation networks' (Meyer, Lorscheid and Troitzsch 2009: 3.5; Stephen 2009: 785; Tankard, Chang and Tsang 1982). This was in turn dependent on establishing a virtuous cycle of participation in, and production of, critical research (Bromley and Neal 2011: 58; Meyer, Lorscheid and Troitzsch 2009: 1.3) – or, as Hicks, Stacks and Amsbary (1989: 235) put it, research breeding research.

Critical research was arguably the least developed dimension of the academization of journalism (Wilson et al 2010: 256) and the most antithetical to established journalism practice (de Beer and Tomaselli 2000: 20-21; Hartley 1996: 36; Nieminen 2008: 138; Wilson et al 2010: 256), both of which were reflected in generally low levels of participation and productivity among journalism faculty (see Bromley and Neal 2011). However, most surveys of research performance among journalism academics did not address gender (Bodle et al 2011: 121-122). Yet being a woman was broadly negatively correlated with research activity (Bromley, forthcoming), and there has been much debate about whether and how certain factors might have contributed to women being less productive as researchers (Asmar 1999: 255-256). Getting started after a career change from journalism was important; holding the PhD correlated positively with a research career (Probert 2005: 56, 64), as did status, but participation and productivity in research were also highly dependent on 'a deep-seated personal commitment to research' (Cole and Bowers 1975: 643; Schweitzer 1989: 413). Female academics appeared to be less 'passionate' about research, however, (Asmar 1999: 263). Women were less likely to continue as students to a higher degree (Asmar 1999: 257), although by 2003, it was reported that in US journalism and mass communication programs they constituted 60 per cent of doctoral graduates (Lehrman nd) . They started their careers at lower levels than men and had fewer years of academic employment (Probert 2005: 55). They were less likely to have been given research skills development (Asmar 1999: 263). Those who did earn doctorates in the humanities received less assistance from supervisors' networks after graduating (p.265). Initially, women took on higher teaching and administration workloads (p.260). All the same, they remained more optimistic about doing research (Probert 2005: 54), and subsequently, over the course of a career, women were likely to increase their research productivity more than men did (Bonzi 1992: 114-115).

When Hickson, Stacks and Amsbary (1993: 227-228) compiled a list in the early 1990s of the hundred most productive active scholars in communication, it contained only twelve women. Overall, these top scholars had each published an average of 35.5 papers, whereas the figure for the top thirty-three women was 16.7 (Hickson, Stacks and Amsbary 1992: 353). Nevertheless, they found few substantive differences in the profiles of male and female researchers and the influences on them (Hickson, Stacks and Amsbary 1992: 354-355). Using *Journalism Quarterly* as an indicator, women appeared to be no less active and possibly more productive in publishing in the journalism field. A third of the thirty-three most prolific active female researchers had published in the journal (the same proportion as among the twenty-two most prolific male researchers), but more than twice as much of the women's total output (7.6 per cent) appeared there than the men's (3.4 per cent) (Hickson, Stacks and Amsbary 1993: 229; Hicks, Stacks and Amsbary 1992: 354). Almost a decade later it was suggested that women's output of critical research was accelerating ahead of their representation in the journalism academy (Applegate et al, 2011: 139, 149; Bodle et al 2011: 129), and that while this did not always translate into peer reviewed journal articles, the potential of women as critical researchers was evident (Applegate et al 2011: 152; Bodle et al 2011: 128; Bromley, forthcoming). A survey of two political communication journals found that although women published less frequently than men and comprised only a quarter of lead authors, they were publishing more often than in the past (Evans and Bucy 2010), and a survey of Australian journalist-academics indicated that, while women's participation in publishing was lower, those who did publish had higher productivity rates than men (Bromley, forthcoming). After auditing research publication in US journals in the field, Wooten (2004: 139) concluded that there had been 'a distinct influx' of women as researchers over 30 years, and predicted that 'the numbers will continue to rise over time', and Kramer, Hess and Reid (2007: 238) calculated that 'women have dramatically increased their presence in our field through increased publication now representing over 50 per cent of the current authors'.

A survey of journalist-academics in Australian universities was undertaken to explore the personal attitudes held by female faculty related to critical research. Data on career status, human capital, alternative commitments and critical research participation and productivity were also collected. The objective was to assess the influence of the feminization of the journalism faculty

on the academization of the field gauged through manifest rates of, and latent propensity for, participation and productivity in research (Bromley and Neal 2011: 59). Australia had particular salience because, as already noted, women were in the majority among journalism faculty. The issue was whether, in line with cross-disciplinary global evidence (Abramo, D'Angelo and Caprasecca, 2009, pp. 518-521; Padilla-Gonzalez et al, 2011, pp.653-654; Sax et al, 2002, p.424; Tower, Plummer and Ridgewell, 2007, pp.23-26), a greater presence of women in the journalism academy would further diminish an already poor research record.

Women and the journalism academy

The carry-over into journalism schools of a macho newsroom culture through appointments, paternalism and gender tokenism was well documented: diversification was 'an afterthought' and women had 'second-class status' (Beasley 2007: 25; Chambers, Steiner and Fleming 2004; de Uriate 2004: 16, 74-75; Weinberg 2008: 151). Critiques were mainly concerned with pay, status, the existence of a glass ceiling, and so on which identified women in the journalism academy as the objects of double discrimination – first in journalism (Bulkeley 2004: 184) and then in the academy (Bell 2010: 445). For example, in the US women were almost twice as likely as men to be at the lowest academic level (instructor). A large number of women staff were classified simply as 'other'. Becker et al (2003: 5) recognized that only 'modest' advances had been made in rectifying gender imbalance since the 1990s. Indeed, the relative situation of women with regard to academic status either changed slowly or not at all from the 1960s (Beasley 1987: 60; Kretzschmar 2007: 208, 212). In 2008, US journalism schools were still being urged to appoint more tenured female professors (Poindexter, Meraz and Weiss 2008: 348), and Bodle et al (2011: 128-129) conjectured that the entry of women into the journalism academy in the US remained reflected at the assistant professor rather than full professor level. Women comprised about a quarter of full professors and 28 per cent of departmental chairs. As well as being concentrated in lower ranks, they tended also to be located in less prestigious institutions (DeFleur et al 2010: 23). At the turn of the century only one in ten female academics were top level administrators (heads of schools, departments, etc.) in major US universities, and even fewer had reached those positions in public, flagship research institutions (Rush et al 2004: 117). A census of the membership of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC)

in the US identified that 44.6 per cent were women in 2010 (Bodle et al 2011: 118), although a year later, the organization reported that its membership consisted of 1,278 (40.8 per cent) women out of 3,131 whose gender was known. The 2002 figure was 40 per cent (Rush et al 2004: 115). In the UK and Ireland the Association for Journalism Education said that the gender of the 494 members whose gender was known, 142 (28.75 per cent) were women.³ The figures were more unbalanced elsewhere; for example, Okunna (1992: 51, 54) calculated that while the gender representation among journalism students in Nigeria was roughly equal, women accounted for only six out of 92 academic staff. In Austria, although women comprised between 51 per cent and 82 per cent of students, female staff made up between no more than 13 per cent and 30 per cent of academics (Dorer 2009: 88-89). Women remained a minority (48.1 per cent) among members of the Journalism Education Association of Australia (JEAA) to 2006 (Cokley, Patching and Scott 2006: 130). Although by 2011 that had increased to more than 50 per cent (Bromley, forthcoming), of 13 full professors of journalism in Australian universities only three were women.

Female students' career ambitions were shaped by 'the continued male dominance of the public world' (Splichal and Sparks 1994: 112-114). They were drawn to areas of journalism which were demonstrably more receptive to women (magazines, television), or likely to reject journalism as a career choice altogether (pp. 118-128). In the US, only a half of female journalism students aspired to daily newspaper jobs (Bulkeley 2004: 184). A more recent survey of journalism students in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden came to similar conclusions that women were markedly more attracted than men to work in magazines and much less inclined to seek jobs in national newspapers with minorities of up to 13 per cent intent on entering public relations or more generic communications roles. They exhibited 'stronger creative ideals ... but have less taste for investigative journalism' (Bjørnsen et al 2007: 12, 24). An Australian survey of more than 400 senior high school students in three states in 2008 also found significant gendered differences in attitudes to journalism. The researchers concluded that, on the whole, girls favoured the audio-visual media as offering more scope for creativity than newspapers, and more 'fun' as work. The dominant symbolic image all respondents had of journalists was the female television news presenter (Grenby et al 2009: 17). Kretzschmar (2007, 218-220) concluded that in the US and Europe women had little impact on journalism: they either adapted

to, or abandoned, the occupation. In Tanzania, 35 per cent of female journalism students said they were dissuaded by their newsroom experiences from entering the occupation, and 22 per cent felt that journalists were exploited as workers (Navuri 2011). This raised questions about socialization – whether journalism schools (and their staffs) reflected women’s values in relation to journalism, with impacts on ‘advising, mentoring, and role modeling, not to mention classroom climate and changes to the curriculum’ (Dorer 2003: 249; North 2010: 109-110; Rush et al 2004: 106, 114; Sarikakis 2004: 342-343). The survey responses of journalism graduates of two US schools in the 1980s and 1990s ‘showed a necessity for journalism education to meet the needs of a largely female workforce that will be employed in a wide variety of settings’, and included ‘a clear note of dismay’ with (mainly male) professors. The researchers argued that there was ‘a clear impression that journalism schools do not address the realities of women graduates ...’ (McAdams, Beasley and Zandberg 2004: 327), even though the presence of female faculty was influential in shaping women students’ study choices (Bettinger and Long 2005: 156).

There was no place for women in the official history of the first 50 years of the Australian Journalists’ Association (Sparrow 1960) – not even looking forward to the later twentieth century (Palmer 1960: 149). A quarter of a century later, they constituted not much more than a footnote (Lloyd 1985: 305-306), and although acknowledged as ‘the main beneficiaries’ of the development of journalism education, they did not appear at all as either educators or academics (pp.163-169). Learning to be a journalist was a very masculine affair (Hamilton 1999: 99-101). Australia was hardly unique in this regard. In the UK, while women comprised an increasing number of students and trainees, the system was under the control of men (Bromley 2009: 52, 55; Bundock 1957: 227-231). In the US, 81 per cent of journalism schools had one or no women academics in the 1970s: administrators complained of ‘a shortage of qualified women to teach journalism’ (Beasley 1987: 60, 64). Yet 30 years later 49 per cent still listed fewer than three female academic staff (Rush et al 2004: 118). At the beginning of the twenty-first century, women remained marginalized in discussions about journalism education: drawing on Esser’s integrative multilevel model of influences on journalism, Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha (2003: 308) nevertheless ignored the ‘subjective sphere’ (the level of individual influence) which included socio-demographics and biographical factors.

By the mid-1990s a shift had occurred, starting in the US, towards journalism faculty having academic rather than occupational qualifications: ‘the notion that expertise in journalism is not needed to teach journalism skills has become commonplace in [US] journalism-education programs’, it was reported, with the implication that the minimum ‘qualifying period’ as a journalist should be at least 10 years (Medsger 2005: 212-213). The evidence whether this favored or militated against women was mixed. On the one hand, female journalism academics were well qualified and highly experienced (Henry 2004: 17-18); on the other hand, they were inclined to leave journalism earlier than men did, and to remain in lower level positions (Aldridge 2001: 7.1; Fröhlich 2005). Even where credentials as a journalist were not required an ‘old boy’s network’ which excluded women was likely to operate (Henry 2004: 9). Women probably gained overall from increases in faculty positions as a result of the expansion of journalism programs in the late twentieth century (Albers 2004: 165, 170), from trends towards higher ratios of tenured (or continuing appointments for) faculty (Carrington and Pratt 2005: 5), and from a broader tendency to increase faculty numbers (Bromley, forthcoming).

Ross (2001: 542) cautioned against over-simplified, universal approaches to women’s encounters with journalism. Nevertheless, experiences of being a journalist – and, to a lesser extent, any continuing associations with external journalism practice – were likely to influence how journalist-academics executed their roles in universities (Stark, Lowther and Hargerty 1986: 27). Aldridge (2001) suggested that, broadly-speaking, women’s experiences of working in journalism were qualitatively different from those of men, in that the largest influx of women had occurred when the occupation was changing from one based on the continuous career model (bureaucracies, hierarchies, ranks, grades, formal qualifications, unionism, employment records) to a contingent career (characterized by work intensification, competition, performativity, flexibility, mobility). Some movement in this direction occurred also in higher education with universities being urged to become more managerialist, more entrepreneurial, more enterprising, more market-oriented and more performance-driven (Bryson 2004; Salaran 2010: 133-134; Schweitzer 1989: 410), although this may not always have worked in favor of women (Probert 2005: 69-70). In Australia, women were more than twice as likely to hold fractional faculty appointments than men (Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations,

2009). On the other hand, a Canadian survey found that although promotion to associate professor and full professor took significantly longer in journalism than in almost all other academic fields (nearly six years and 15.6 years respectively, compared to just over five years and 10 years), promotion for women came more quickly (just under 15 years to full professor compared to almost 17 years for men) (Ornstein, Stewart and Drakich 2007: 9-10, 15, 19).

As internalized pressures to produce research were formalized as external measures which ‘reward or punish universities and departments [or individuals]’ (Acker and Armenti 2004: 7), the principal method adopted by female staff for coping with what were perceived as the escalating demands of academic work was simply to work harder (p.16), a tactic they may have brought across from the newsroom (Aldridge 2001: 6.4-6.8).

Methodology

As part of a self-administered, online survey (reported in Bromley and Neal 2011), demographic data were collected between the end of 2010 and the beginning of 2011 from 61 respondents with posts associated with journalism programs in Australian universities, 53 of whom also provided information on their participation and productivity in critical research as measured by publication in peer reviewed journals relevant to the field. This was a pertinent population, given the suggestion that Australian female faculty were potentially pivotal to improving research performance in journalism (Bromley and Neal 2011: 65). All the respondents were former or current journalists, or what we term ‘journalist-academics’. Specific proxies were used for a set of variables (Porter and Umbach 2001: 172-174): career status (level of appointment and length of time in the academy), human capital (research training) and alternative commitments (type of appointment [research/teaching] and continuing to practise as a journalist).

The ‘vital importance of publication productivity’ was well established as the primary determinant of scholarship: ‘nothing beats publishing’ (De Fleur, 2007: 111; Stephen 2009: 784). Furthermore, Stephen (2009: 784-785) noted that ‘the foundational activity of scholarship ... [was] publication in the peer reviewed journal literature of one’s field’. National audits, such as Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA), privileged journal articles as the chief measure of

research output, and national grant awarding bodies, such as the Australian Research Council, have traditionally relied heavily on researchers' 'track records' based on publication achievements in assessing and awarding applications (Bazeley 1998; http://www.arc.gov.au/general/assessment_process.htm).⁴

Personal attitudes were garnered from 51 respondents through a number of questions which invited open-ended, qualitative responses related to the research experience (Bromley and Neal 2011: 59). Respondents were asked *inter alia* to identify any obstacles to, or opportunities for, research they had encountered, or which they felt existed in the academy.⁵ Responses were coded broadly as 'positive', 'negative' and 'neutral' by a single coder. Indicators of a positive personal attitude towards doing critical research included a belief that research built knowledge, improved journalism, informed teaching and inspired students, and that it had brought personal reward. Negative personal attitudes were illustrated by complaints of a lack of institutional and collegial support; problems with bureaucracy; unbalanced workloads; incompatibility with continuing to practise; irrelevance, and a lack of interest in the media industry. For example, one respondent commented, 'There are better things to do with one's time'. Where there was an equal mix of such comments, respondents were ambivalent, or it was unclear whether the respondent was generally positive or negative, responses were coded as neutral.

To enhance confidence in the data, a list of 151 faculty with associations with journalism programs was compiled from information posted by Australian universities on their web sites, and gender data for the 74 Australian faculty members of the JEAA in 2011 were accessed⁵ (Bromley, forthcoming). Women tended to be over-represented in responses to surveys of journalism faculty. For example, one cohort of international respondents, adjusted for those who did not reveal their gender, comprised 40.6 per cent women (Johnson and Yarnall 2005). Brunner, Yates and Adams (2008) counted 47 per cent women among their respondents. Harcup (2011a; 38) found 50.8 per cent women in his population of respondents in the UK and Ireland. In our survey, 52.5 per cent of respondents were women. However, the JEAA membership (51.35 per cent) and the data in the online biographies (58.3 per cent) both indicated similar gender representation in the Australian journalism academy. Furthermore, while the respondents not unexpectedly provided a range of opinions, they were not randomly distributed, and only

three, quite tight clusters of responses emerged, suggesting that the data were, in a non-scientific sense, reliable and valid enough to support tentative generalization. Finally, the data were used heuristically to provide an empirical basis for an interpretive, inductive analysis of the likely role of women in the academization of journalism as evidenced in actual and potential participation and productivity in critical research measured in terms of the publication of articles in peer reviewed journals in the field, and through personal attitudes towards this type of research activity.

Responses

Unsurprisingly, a shortage of time and the associated pressure of teaching workloads were seen as constituting obstacles to publishing. Two-fifths of responses identifying obstacles mentioned these factors. Continuing to practice journalism was also seen as a time-consuming barrier to establishing a research publication record and as preventing successful adaptation to academic work. As a corollary to this, the need for professional development (most commonly, training in research methodologies and processes), support, mentoring, academic leadership, guidance and collaboration with more experienced researchers were mentioned by nearly three-quarters of respondents. Fewer (less than a third) saw a lack of such things negatively as an obstacle to becoming academic researchers (a small number mentioned journalists' own inability or unwillingness to negotiate their transfer from one field to another) than positively as means of encouraging and enabling the development of critical research careers (56.6 per cent), and as ways of providing extra support for new entrants to the academy to convert to researchers (49 per cent). Twice as many women as men believed that mentoring and support were both an obstacle when absent, and needed for encouragement. A female lecturer with a publishing record after eight years in the academy wrote,

I have had no institutional support and only limited mentoring from one Australian academic. International journalism academics have been much more encouraging and collaborative. ... There is also a 'closed shop' approach to mentoring [in Australia] which has sexist overtones.

Marginally fewer women thought that providing mentoring and support was necessary to bolster newly appointed academic staff but they still constituted a majority (54 per cent). Another female lecturer in her first year in the academy and without any publications explained,

I have a lot of research interests but lack the skills to develop it [critical research] as part of my work ... I'd like to do some and have collected a small amount of data, but I would need to work with someone who could develop it academically. I'd love to do this so I could learn the process.

Four of the six professors also supported mentoring, professional development and training as aids to facilitating the development of critical researchers: one specifically mentioned the need for leadership from senior faculty. However, only one professor regarded an absence of mentoring as an obstacle. How then did faculty seek to negotiate through their personal orientations these conditions in which it was evident that they largely appreciated the benefits of research, were enthusiastic about doing research and looked for ways of overcoming (sometimes gendered and hierarchical) impediments to becoming active researchers?

Only one respondent directly said they had 'strong personal motivation' to undertake research. However, other comments were that research was 'rewarding and exciting' and 'fun and satisfying'. Overwhelmingly (50/51) respondents agreed that there was a point to academic research in journalism. Nevertheless, when personal attitudes to critical research were tested there emerged weak overall support (61 per cent) for research. More than a quarter of respondents were ambivalent (neutral). There was a big difference in attitude between published and unpublished academics: a positive orientation to research fell from 75 per cent to only 26.5 per cent. Twice as many unpublished respondents held negative attitudes towards research, and more than half were undecided. All teaching focused faculty, whether published or not, held low levels of positivity towards research (22.2 per cent). Conversely, the most positively oriented to research were professors (100 per cent), and published academics who had received research training (84 per cent); who still practised journalism (77 per cent), and were aged 46-55 (87 per cent) and 36-45 (80 per cent).

Gender

Women in the sample were concentrated in two of the lower levels of appointment (lecturer and senior lecturer – 56.25 per cent and 31.25 per cent respectively) and in the 36-45 year (40 per cent) and 46-55 year (43.75 per cent) age groups. Almost 90 per cent held teaching and research positions. Sixty per cent had completed training in research: respondents were not asked whether they held the PhD but close to 40 per cent of women volunteered that they did (Bromley and Neal 2011: 66). Most had been in the academy for fewer than ten years. They were fairly evenly split between those who were still practicing journalism (46 per cent) and those who were not. They averaged a prior seventeen or eighteen years as practitioners. Nearly 70 per cent were publishing. The profile of female faculty which emerged was of experienced, middle-aged journalists with historically high levels of research credentials for the field moving into the academy in first jobs, or having achieved first promotions, in teaching and research appointments. The majority of these elements were positively correlated with higher than average levels of participation in publishing, and participation increased in line with status (from lecturer to senior lecturer and associate professor). Only those who continued to practice journalism and those aged 46-55 (along with the small minority who held teaching focused appointments) reported poor participation rates.

Nevertheless, among this key cohort of lecturers and senior lecturers holding teaching and research appointments, women were under-represented among research active faculty. Whereas 78 per cent of all teaching and learning lecturers, and 82 per cent of senior lecturers, were publishing, only 55.5 per cent and 42 per cent, respectively, of women in these cohorts reported being research active. The figures fell to 28 per cent and 8 per cent for women aged 36-45, and 11 per cent and 33 per cent for women aged 46-55. These rates of participation were not directly reflected in levels of research productivity, however. The average output of lecturers and senior lecturers was, respectively, 0.73 and 0.72 journal articles per faculty member per year. Female lecturers (0.45) did not match the average, but senior lecturers (0.98) exceeded it by some margin. Women aged 36-45 at both levels of appointment were relatively and absolutely highly productive. Although the average output for lecturers in this age group was below the overall average (0.49), female lecturers exceeded it (0.51). The mean output among senior lecturers of

this age was higher than average (0.87) and women at that level of appointment were more than twice as productive (1.87). Productivity fell off among the older age group of senior lecturers (0.77) and especially among women in that category (0.69), but increased among 46-55 year-old lecturers as a whole (1) although not female lecturers (0.54). Female senior lecturers aged 36-45 with teaching and research appointments who were active researchers, while small in relative numbers, proved to be highly productive. On the other hand, senior lecturers in the older age group (46-55) and lecturers in both of these age cohorts with the same profile, while they were between more than twice and six times as likely to be active researchers, published far less.

Given that these women broadly shared demographic characteristics, career status and types of appointment, and acquisition of human capital, alternative explanations for these differences were explored. Continuing to practice journalism and length of time spent in the academy were both correlated with participation (whether a faculty member had published at all) but impacted less on productivity (how much they published once they had made the transition) (Bromley and Neal 2011: 62, 65). Therefore, it seemed possible that personal attitudes towards research may have held the key to why some journalism faculty appeared to embrace research – and the academization of journalism – more enthusiastically than others.

A positive orientation to research was strongly associated with holding a faculty position with a formal requirement to undertake research and being research active (79 per cent - compared to 17 per cent for unpublished teaching focused faculty). There was no detectable gender difference in these views. Positive attitudes to research tracked the status, age and levels of research participation – higher among senior lecturers and 46-55 year-olds than among lecturers and 36-45 year-olds. Negative views – and, by logical extension, neutral ones, too – were correspondingly aligned (the exception being unpublished senior lecturers of whom 50 per cent displayed a negative attitude towards research which we have conjectured over-represented the opinions of a group of men with low levels of research output [Bromley and Neal 2011: 65]). The situation among unpublished faculty was significantly different. A majority (53.5 per cent) held ambivalent (neutral) views about research. The figure was higher among women (62.5 per cent); lecturers (60 per cent); 36-45 year-olds (57 per cent); 46-55 year-olds (60 per cent), and even those who reported having completed research training (56 per cent). However, negative

views conformed less to this pattern. Women (nil) and lecturers (10 per cent) fell below the overall mean (13 per cent); 36-45 year-olds marginally above (14 per cent). Only the 46-55 age group (20 per cent) and those who said they had received research training (22 per cent) reported much higher than average negative attitudes. (Senior lecturers were again an exception as explained above).

Female faculty aged between 36 and 55 with teaching and research appointments as lecturers or and senior lecturers, who comprised between three-quarters and 80 per cent of all the women in our survey sample, reported relatively high levels of ambivalence – but either no, or not notably, negative attitudes – to research. That pattern was particularly evident among those who had not published in peer reviewed journals in the field (although the data were somewhat skewed by negative responses from unpublished senior lecturers). Having completed research training did not necessarily ameliorate this, and continuing to practice journalism seemed to act as a distraction. This suggested that Harcup (2011a: 47) was correct in arguing that journalists found making the transition from practice to the academy daunting, and they hesitated before forsaking their earlier career and enthusiastically embracing critical research as an academic activity. However, there was no evidence that they were particularly hostile to the idea. These female lecturers and senior lecturers represented not only almost a half of the sample population, but also about 40 per cent of all journalism academics in Australia (Bromley, forthcoming).

Discussion

The academization of journalism is reliant on the development of the field founded in scholarship as demonstrated through the publication of research in peer reviewed specialist journals. Given the profile of journalism faculty, this means inducting journalism practitioners into a culture of critical research. In Australia at least, this cohort of neophytes is predominantly comprised of middle-aged women. Respondents in this group reported that this process was only partially completed. For their part, they were mostly open to the idea of becoming critical researchers but were inclined to proceed cautiously, especially in their first academic appointments, and without always completely severing their ties to practice. Establishing a research career appeared to be a process of at least three distinctive steps. First, faculty had to be

favorably disposed to undertaking critical research, although this did not appear to lead automatically to actually producing any research output. Second, a first article had to be written, submitted and accepted. Third, given that more than 60 per cent of communication scholars historically have not gone on to publish anything-else, research productivity had to be sustained through further, regular publishing (Hickson, Stacks and Amsbary 1989: 233-235). Although no questions were asked directly about this, the steps did not always appear to be seamlessly connected. There was strong evidence to suggest that a generally positive orientation to research was not routinely capitalized on, and somewhat weaker evidence that a number of faculty started to publish, and then stopped or at least slowed down.

Women and lecturers (among respondents these groups largely overlapped) aged between 36 and 55, who had not yet begun publishing, showed high levels of ambivalence in their attitudes to research. This more than offset any negative attitudes they held. This probably echoed debates within the field about the value of research which have been exacerbated by a shift in the focus of funding from teaching to research in the Australian higher education sector with a lobby within journalism pressing the case for practice-based, as opposed to critical, research, which has divided the academy (Posetti 2011). At another level, it may also have reflected an absence of qualified senior scholars providing mentoring to less experienced colleagues. The formation of a Council of Journalism Professors in 2010 was intended to provide leadership in the field around issues raised by the ERA research audit (<http://jeaa.org.au/Newsletters/December%202010%20JEAA%20Newsletter.pdf>).⁶ Practitioners entering the academy, it appeared, were reserving judgment as an alternative to following the tradition of outright dismissal of critical research.

The halting progress of academization is not confined to Australia, of course (for example, see Pontes and Silva 2010: 171). Insofar as, by transferring into the academy the orientations of practice (Hartley 2000: 39-40), journalism has failed to academize as comprehensively or as rapidly as other, comparable (professional) fields, it would appear to be essential – and urgent, in the face of the trend to auditing – that the renewal of its faculty through the recruitment of journalists should lead to greater levels of participation and productivity in research. This survey suggests that this cohort (at least in Australia) is now mainly female, and that these experienced,

middle-aged practitioners have yet to be convinced of the value of academization, or of their role in it, but they appeared not (yet) to have adopted the orthodoxy of implacable opposition to scholarly inquiry. Given that the academization of journalism stalled when the faculty were all (or nearly all) men, the change in gender composition in the academy may provide, contrary to historical, but more in line with contemporary, evidence, a renewed impetus to the project. Lastly, and perhaps most crucially, we need to know more about this emerging cohort of women.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Regan Neal for research assistance, to Tony Harcup for permitting the replication of his survey, and to the two anonymous reviewers of this paper for their comments and suggestions.

Notes

1. Individual chapters in Terzis (2009) indicate that women made up at least 50 per cent of student bodies in Austria, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain and Sweden.
2. Thanks to Chris Frost (AJE) and Pamella Price (AEJMC) for this information.
3. The etymology of the word is explored in Bromley and Neal (2011: 68).
4. Respondents were not asked about research inputs (grants). Seventy-two per cent said they had published articles in peer reviewed journals relevant to the field. Of the others, fewer than 6 per cent had published books and chapters, and 3.75 per cent conference papers, which been peer reviewed (Bromley and Neal 2011: 61).
5. The questions were drawn from Harcup's survey.
6. Thanks to Angela Romano (JEAA) for this information.
7. In 2011 the JEAA introduced two grants to foster 'excellence in journalism research', plus a once-only additional grant for a female mid-career journalism scholar.

References

- Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C.A. and Caprasecca, A. (2009) 'Gender differences in research productivity: a bibliometric analysis of the Italian academic system', *Scientometrics* 79(3): 517-539.
- Acker, S. and Armenti, C. (2004) 'Sleepless in academia', *Gender and Education* 16(1): 3-24.
- Albers, J-A. H. (2004) 'The status of women in journalism and mass communication education administrations: no longer so lonely', in R.R. Rush, C.E. Oukrop and P.J. Creedon (eds) *Seeking equity for women in journalism and mass communication education: a 30-year update*, pp.161-179. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Aldridge, M. (2001). 'The paradigm contingent career? Women in regional newspaper journalism', *Sociological Research Online* 6(3). At <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/6/3/aldridge.html>: accessed 4 May 2011.
- Applegate, E., Bodle, J.T., Farwell, T.M. and Livingston, R. (2011) 'A fifteen-year census of gender-based convention research: scholarship rates by women within AEJMC divisions, interest groups, and commissions (1994 to 2008)', *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 66(2): 134-159.
- Asmar, C. (1999) 'Is there a gendered agenda in academia? The research experience of female and male PhD graduates in Australian universities', *Higher Education* 38: 255-273.
- Avadani, I. (2002) 'From fashion to profession: education of journalists in Romania', in T. Jusic and M. Dedovic (eds) *Education of journalists in southeast Europe: a step closer to professionalism*, pp.120-135. Sarajevo: Media Online.
- Bacon, W. (1998) 'Engaging theory and practice in journalism education', *Asia Pacific Media Educator* 4: 79-83.
- Bazeley, P. (1998) 'Peer review and panel decisions in the assessment of Australian Research Council project grant applications: what counts in a highly competitive context?' *Higher Education* 35(4): 435-452.
- Beasley, M.H. (1987) 'The gender shift in journalism education', in L.B. Nadler, M.K. Nadler and W.R. Todd-Mancillas (eds) *Advances in Gender and Communication Research*, pp.57-72. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Beasley, M.H. (2007) 'How to stir up a hornet's nest: studying the implication of women journalism majors', in P.J. Creedon and J. Cramer (eds) *Women in Mass Communication*, 3rd edn, pp.23-32. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Becker, L.B., Huh, J., Vlad, T. and Mace, N.R. (2003) 'Monitoring change in journalism and mass communication faculties 1989-2001: supplemental report to the annual survey of journalism & mass communication enrollments', James M. Cox Jr. Center for International Mass Communication Training and Research, Grady College of Journalism & Mass Communication University of Georgia.
- Becker, L.B., Vlad, T. and Desnoes, P. (2010) 'Enrollments decline slightly and the student body becomes more diverse', *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 65(3 and 4): 224-249.
- Bell, S. (2010) 'Women in science: lessons from Australia', *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology* 2(3): 437-52.
- Bettinger, E.P. and Long, B.T. (2005) 'Do faculty serve as role models? The impact of instructor gender on female students', *The American Economic Review* 95(2): 152-157.
- Bjørnsen, G., Hovden, J.F., Ottosen, R., Schultz, I. and Zilliacus-Tikkanen, H. (2007) 'The Nordic journalism student: a cross-national study', paper presented to the International Communication Association conference, San Francisco (24-28 May).
- Bodle, J.T., Burriss, L., Farwell, T., Hammaker, S. and Joshi, J. (2011) 'Gender and journal scholarship in mass communication: how well are women doing? A twenty-year content analysis', *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 66(2): 118-33.
- Bonzi, S. (1992) 'Trends in research productivity among senior faculty', *Information Processing & Management* 28(1): 111-120.
- Bromley, M. (2006) 'One journalism or many? Confronting the contradictions in the education and training of journalists in the United Kingdom', in K.W.Y. Leung, J. Kenny and P.S.N. Lee (eds) *Global Trends in Communication Education and Research*, pp.53-71. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Bromley, M. (2009) 'The United Kingdom journalism education landscape', in G. Terzis (ed.) *European journalism education*, pp.49-66. Bristol, UK: Intellect.
- Bromley, M. (forthcoming) 'The way we are: demographics and research in the journalism academy', *Media Australia International*.
- Bromley, M. and Neal, R. (2011) 'Publishing participation and productivity among journalist-academics in the era of ERA', *Australian Journalism Review* 33(1): 55-72.

- Brunner, B.R., Yates, B.L. and Adams, J.W. (2008) 'Mass communication and journalism faculty and their electronic communication with college students: a nationwide examination', *The Internet and Higher Education* 11(2): 106-111.
- Bryson, C. (2004) 'What about the workers? The expansion of higher education and the transformation of academic work', *Industrial Relations Journal* 35(1): 38-57.
- Bulkeley, C.C. (2004) 'Whose news? Progress and status of women in newspapers (mostly) and television news', in R.R. Rush, C.E. Oukrop and P.J. Creedon (eds) *Seeking equity for women in journalism and mass communication education: a 30-year update*, pp.183-204. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bundock, C.J. (1957) *The National Union of Journalists: a jubilee history, 1907-1957*. Oxford: The National Union of Journalists.
- Carrington, K. and Pratt, A. (2003) 'How far have we come? Gender disparities in the Australian higher education system', *Current Issues Brief No. 31*. Canberra, ACT: Department of the Parliamentary Library.
- Chambers, D., Steiner, L. and Fleming, C. (2004). *Women and Journalism*. London: Routledge.
- Cokley, J. Patching, R. and Scott, R. (2006) 'Gender preferences in journalism education: why sport misses out', *Australian Journalism Review* 28(2): 127-145.
- Cole, R.C. and Bowers, T.A. (1975) 'An exploration of factors related to journalism faculty productivity', *Journalism Quarterly* 52(4): 638-644.
- de Beer, A.S. (1995) 'The professional teaching of journalism as a science approach – an introduction', *Ecquid Novi* 16(1): 3-40.
- de Beer, A.S. and Tomaselli, K.G. (2000) 'South African journalism and mass communication scholarship: negotiating ideological schisms', *Journalism Studies* 1(1): 9-33.
- DeFleur, M.H., Kurpius, D.D., Osborne, A. and Hamilton, J.M. (2010) 'The masters: creating a new generation of leaders for mass communication education and beyond', *Communication Education* 59(1): 19-40.
- De Fleur, M.L. (2007) 'Raising the question #5: what is tenure and how do I get it?' *Communication Education* 56(1): 106-112.
- de Uriate, M.L. (2004) 'Good will in journalism education proves not to be enough', *The Diversity Factor* 12(1): 12-17.

- Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. (2009) *Staff 2008: selected higher education statistics*. At http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/publications_resources/profiles/Staff_2008_selected_higher_education_statistics.htm#publication: accessed 16 May 2011.
- Dorer, J. (2003) 'The historic development and present state of journalism education and training in Austria', in R. Fröhlich and C. Holtz-Bacha (eds) *Journalism education in Europe and North America: an international comparison*, pp237-253. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Dorer, J. (2009) 'The Austrian journalism landscape', in G. Terzis (ed.) *European Journalism Education*, pp.81-92. Bristol, UK: Intellect.
- Drain, D. (1965) 'Women in journalism', in L. Revill and C. Roderick (eds) *The Journalist's craft: A guide to modern practice*, pp.248-254. Sydney, NSW: Angus & Robertson.
- Erman, N. and Todorovski, L. (2009) 'Mapping the e-government research with social network analysis', *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 5693: 13-25.
- Evans, H.K. and Bucy, E.P. (2010) 'The representation of women in publication: an analysis of *Political Communication* and the *International Journal of Press/Politics*', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43(2): 295-301.
- Fröhlich, R. (2005) 'The "friendliness trap": feminine and feminist values as obstacles for women's future and career in journalism'. At <http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php>: accessed 4 May 2011.
- Gheresetti, M. and Weibull, L. (2009) 'The Swedish journalism education landscape', in G. Terzis (ed.) *European Journalism Education*, pp.193-209. Bristol, UK: Intellect.
- Goedegebuure, L.C.J. (1992) 'Grapes, grain and grey cats: binary dynamics in Dutch higher education', *European Journal of Education* 27(1/2): 57-68.
- Grenby, M., Kasinger, M., Patching R. and Pearson, M. (2009) 'Girls, girls, girls. A study of the popularity of journalism as a career among female teenagers and its corresponding lack of appeal to young males', *Australian Journalism Monographs* 11(1): 1-44.
- Hamilton, P. (1999) 'Journalists, gender and workplace culture', in A. Curthoys and J. Schultz (eds) *Journalism: print, politics and popular culture*, pp.97-116. St Lucia, Qld: University of Queensland Press.
- Harcup, T. (2011a) 'Hackademics at the chalkface', *Journalism Practice* 5(1): 34-50.
- Harcup, T. (2011b) 'Research and reflection', *Journalism Practice* 5(2): 161-176.

- Hartley, J. (2000) 'Communicative democracy in a redactional society: the future of journalism studies', *Journalism* 1(1): 39-48.
- Henry, S. (2004) "'But where are all the women?' Our history', in R.R. Rush, C.E. Oukrop and P.J. Creedon (eds) *Seeking equity for women in journalism and mass communication education: a 30-year update*, pp.3-32. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hickson, M., Stacks, D.W. and Amsbary, J.H. (1989) 'An analysis of prolific scholarship in speech communication, 1915-1985: toward a yardstick for measuring research productivity', *Communication Education* 38(3): 230-236.
- Hickson, M., Stacks, D.W. and Amsbary, J.H. (1992) 'Active prolific female scholars in communication: an analysis of research productivity, II', *Communication Quarterly* 40(4): 350-356.
- Hickson, M., Stacks, D.W. and Amsbary, J.H. (1993) 'Active prolific scholars in communication studies: analysis of research productivity, II', *Communication Education* 42: 224-233.
- Hodder, A.P.W. and Hodder, C. (2010) 'Research culture and New Zealand's performance-based research fund: some insights from bibliographic compilations of research outputs', *Scientometrics* 84(3): 887-901.
- Johnson, J.T. and Yarnall, L (2007) International journalism educators survey: quantitative and digital skills of international journalism and communications educators. At http://online.sfsu.edu/~jjohnson/IAJ/JourEduSurvey/Intl_Journalism_Educators_Survey_Public_Results.htm: accessed 7 April 2011.
- Joseph, B. (2009) 'Bleak adjunct prospects' *Quill* (August): 38.
- Joseph, B. (2009) 'Journalism education', in K. Wahl-Jorgensen and T. Hanitzsch (eds) *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* pp.42-56. New York: Routledge.
- Kemsley, Viscount (1952 edn) 'Introduction', in *The Kemsley Manual of Journalism*, pp.v-vii. London: Cassell.
- Kretschmar, S. (2007) 'Diverse journalists in a diverse Europe? Impulses for a discussion on media and integration', *European Studies* 24: 203-226.
- Lehrman, S. (nd) 'Journalism educators must leap diversity hurdles'. At <http://www.spj.org/rrr.asp?ref=9&t=diversity>: accessed 1 August 2011.

- Leung, K.W.Y., Chu, L. and Lee, P.S.N. (2006) 'Journalism and communication education and research in Hong Kong', in K.W.Y. Leung, J. Kenny and P.S.N. Lee (eds) *Global Trends in Communication Education and Research*, pp.189-209. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Lloyd, C. (1985). *Profession: journalist*. Marrickville, NSW: Hale & Iremonger.
- Lo, V-h. (2006) 'Communication research in Taiwan', in K.W.Y. Leung, J. Kenny and P.S.N. Lee (eds) *Global Trends in Communication Education and Research*, pp.177-187. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- McAdams, K.C., Beasley, M.H. and Zandberg, I. (2004) 'Women graduates (and men too) express reservations about journalism education', in R.R. Rush, C.E. Oukrop and P.J. Creedon (eds) *Seeking equity for women in journalism and mass communication education: a 30-year update*, pp.315-330. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Medsger, B. (2005) 'The evolution of journalism education in the United States', in H. de Burgh (ed.) *Making journalists* pp.205-226. London: Routledge.
- Melki, J. (2009) 'Journalism and media studies in Lebanon', *Journalism Studies* 10(5): 672-690.
- Meyer, M., Lorscheid, I. and Troitzsch, K.G. (2009) 'The development of social simulation as reflected in the first ten years of JASS: a citation and co-citation analysis', *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 12(4). At <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/12/4/12.html>: accessed 20 September 2011.
- Mfumbusa, B. (2010) 'Tanzania's journalism education at crossroads: western models, local realities', in B. Josephi (ed.) *Journalism education in countries with limited media freedom*, pp.155-172. New York: Peter Lang.
- Navuria, A. (2011) 'Discrimination against female journos should be discouraged', *Guardian on Sunday* (13 March). At www.ippmedia.com/frontend/index.php?1=26973: accessed 1 August 2011.
- Nieminen, P. (2008) 'Caught in the science trap? A case study of the relationship between nurses and "their" science', in J. Välimä and O-H. Ylijoki (eds) *Cultural Perspectives on Higher Education*, pp.127-141. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- North, L. (2009) 'Blokey newsroom culture', *Media International Australia* 132: 5-15.
- North, L. (2010) 'The gender "problem" in Australian journalism education', *Australian Journalism Review* 32(2): 103-115.

- Nygren, G., Degtereva, E. and Pavlikova, M. (2010) 'Tomorrow's journalists: trends in the development of the journalistic profession as seen by Swedish and Russian students', *Nordicom Review* 31(2): 113-133.
- O'Donnell, P. (2001-2002) 'The odd couple? Academic research and journalism education', *Australian Studies in Journalism* 10-11: 58-83.
- Ornstein, M., Stewart, P. and Drakich, J. (2007) 'Promotion at Canadian universities: the intersection of gender, discipline, and institution', *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 37(3): 1-25.
- Padilla-Gonzalez, L., Metcalfe, A.S., Galaz-Fontes, J.F., Fisher, D. & Snee, I. (2011) 'Gender gaps in north American research productivity: examining faculty publication rates in Mexico, Canada, and the US', *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 41(5): 649-668.
- Palmer, H. (1960) 'The future ...', in G. Sparrow (ed.) *Crusade for journalism: official history of the Australian Journalists' Association*, p.149. Melbourne, Vic: Federal Council of the AJA.
- Patching, R. (1996) 'Development of journalism courses in Australia: some preliminary findings', *Asia Pacific Media Educator* 1: 153-161.
- Phillips, A. (2005) 'Who's to make journalists?' in H. de Burgh (ed.) *Making Journalists*, pp.227-244. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Pinto, M. and Susa, H. (2003) 'Journalism education at universities and journalism schools in Portugal', in R. Fröhlich and C. Holtz-Bacha (eds) *Journalism education in Europe and North America: an international comparison*, pp.169-186. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Poindexter, P., Meraz, S. and Weiss, A.S. (2008) 'Strengthening the news connection with women and cultivating the next generation', in P. Poindexter, S., Meraz and A.S. Weiss (eds) *Women, Men, and News: Divided and Disconnected in the New Media Landscape*, pp.347-364. NYC: Routledge.
- Ponte, F.S. and Silva, G. (2010) 'Theoretical and methodological journeys in the history of journalism in theses at the postgraduate communication programs in Brazil', *Brazilian Journalism Research* 6(1): 171-186.
- Posetti, J. (2011) 'Aussie academic journal to publish peer-reviewed journalism', *MediaShift* (20 January). At <http://www.pbs.org/mediashift/2011/01/aussie-academic-journal-to-publish-peer-reviewed-journalism020.html>: accessed 21 September 2011.

- Probert, B. (2005) “‘I just couldn’t fit it in’”: gender and unequal outcomes in academic careers’, *Gender, Work and Organization* 12(1): 50-72.
- Riffe, D. and Freitag, A. (1997) ‘A content analysis of content analyses: twenty-five years of *Journalism Quarterly*’, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 74(4): 873-882.
- Ross, K. (2001) ‘Women at work: journalism as en-gendered practice’, *Journalism Studies* 2(4): 531-544.
- Rush, R.R., Oukrop, C.E., Bergen, L. and Andsager, J.L. (2004) “‘Where are all the old broads?’” Been there, done that ... 30 years ago. An update of the original study of women in journalism and mass communication education 1972 and 2002’, in R.R. Rush, C.E. Oukrop and P.J. Creedon (eds) *Seeking equity for women in journalism and mass communication education: a 30-year update*, pp.97-128. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rush, R.R., Oukrop, C.E., Sarikakis, K., Andsager, J., Wooten, B. and Daufin, E-K. (2005) ‘Junior scholars in search of equity for women and minorities’, *Journalism & Communication Monographs* 6(4): 152-209.
- Salaran, M. (2010) ‘Research productivity and social capital in Australian universities’, *Higher Education Quarterly* 64(2): 133-148.
- Salokangas, R. (2009) ‘The Finnish journalism education landscape’, in G. Terzis (ed.) *European Journalism Education*, pp.121-129. Bristol, UK: Intellect.
- Sarikakis, K. (2004) ‘Communications research students: tomorrow’s academics in obsolete worlds? An international perspective’, in R.R. Rush, C.E. Oukrop and P.J. Creedon (eds) *Seeking equity for women in journalism and mass communication education: a 30-year update*, pp.331-348. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sax, L.J., Hagedorn, L.S., Arredondo, M. and Dicrisi, F.A. (2002) ‘Faculty research productivity: exploring the role of gender and family-related factors’, *Research in Higher Education* 43(4): 423-446.
- Schweitzer, J.C. (1989) ‘Factors affecting scholarly research among mass communications faculty’, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 66(2): 410-417 and 452.
- Shipman, A. and Shipman, M. (2006) *Knowledge Monopolies: The Academisation of Society*. Exeter, UK: Societas.
- Sparrow, G. (ed.) (1960) *Crusade for journalism: official history of the Australian Journalists’ Association*. Melbourne, Vic: Federal Council of the AJA.

- Splichal, S. and Sparks, C. (1994) *Journalists for the 21st century*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Stark, J.S., Lowther, M.A. and Hargerty, B.M.K. (1986) 'Faculty roles and role preferences in ten fields of professional study', *Research in Higher Education* 25(1): 3-30.
- Stephen, T.D. (2009) 'Clustering research activity in communication doctoral programs: relationship of publication productivity and department size to disciplinary reputation and prestige', *Journal of Communication* 59(4): 768-787.
- Strong, C. (2007) 'Female journalists shun sports reporting: lack of opportunity versus lack of attractiveness', *Communication Journal of New Zealand* 8(2): 7-18.
- Tankard, J.W., Chang, T-K. and Tsang, K-J. (1982) 'Citation networks as indicators of journalism research activity'. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (25-28 July). Athens, OH.
- Thawabteh, N. (2010) 'Palestinian media map: production congestion and consumption dispersion', in B. Josephi (ed.) *Journalism education in countries with limited media freedom* pp.73-93. New York: Peter Lang.
- Tower, G., Plummer, J. and Ridgewell, B. (2007) 'A multidisciplinary study of gender-based research productivity in the world's best journals', *Journal of Diversity Management* 2(4): 23-32.
- Tumber, H. and Prentoulis, M. (2005) 'Journalism and the making of a profession', in H. de Burgh (ed.) *Making Journalists*, pp.58-74. London: Routledge.
- Turner, G. (2011) 'The ERA and journalism research', *Australian Journalism Review* 33(1): 5-7.
- Ulmanu, A-B. (2009) 'The Romanian journalism education landscape', in G. Terzis (ed.) *European Journalism Education*, pp.481-490. Bristol, UK: Intellect.
- Vatrál, J. (2009) 'The Slovakian journalism education landscape', in G. Terzis (ed.) *European Journalism Education*, pp.493-499. Bristol, UK: Intellect.
- Wang, S. S-h. (2006) 'Journalism and communication education in Taiwan: an observation in a transitional society', in K.W.Y. Leung, J. Kenny and P.S.N. Lee (eds) *Global Trends in Communication Education and Research*, pp.159-176. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Weaver, D.H. (2005) 'Who are journalists?' in H. de Burgh (ed.) *Making journalists*, pp.44-57. London: Routledge.
- Weinberg, S. (2008) *A Journalism of Humanity: A Candid History of the World's First Journalism School*. Columbia, MI: University of Missouri Press.

- Willnat, L. and Weaver, D.H. (2006) 'Journalism and mass communication education in the United States', in K.W.Y. Leung, J. Kenny and P.S.N. Lee (eds) *Global Trends in Communication Education and Research*, pp.37-52. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Wilson, C.S., Kennan, M.A., Willard, P. and Boell, S.K. (2010) 'Fifty years of LIS education in Australia: academization of LIS educators in higher education institutions', *Library & Information Science Research* 32: 246-257.
- Wooten, B. (2004) 'Peering through the glass ceiling of the boys' club: examining how masculinity affects journalism and mass communication education.', in R.R. Rush, C.E. Oukrop and P.J. Creedon (eds) *Seeking equity for women in journalism and mass communication education: a 30-year update*, pp.129-148. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wu, T. (2006) 'Journalism education in China: a historical perspective', in K.W.Y. Leung, J. Kenny and P.S.N. Lee (eds) *Global Trends in Communication Education and Research*, pp.133-157. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Zelizer, B. (2004) *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zelizer, B. (2009) 'Journalism and the academy', in K. Wahl-Jorgensen and T. Hanitzsch (eds) *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*, pp.29-41. New York: Routledge.

Biographical Note

Michael Bromley is head of the School of Journalism and Communication at The University of Queensland, Australia.

Email: m.bromley@uq.edu.au