

AUTHOR Hon, Linda Childers; And Others
 TITLE Dimensions of Diversity: Ideology and Group Membership as Predictors of Diversity Implications.
 PUB DATE Aug 96
 NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (79th, Anaheim, CA, August 10-13, 1996).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; *College Faculty; *Diversity (Institutional); Full Time Faculty; *Group Membership; *Higher Education; *Ideology; Journalism; Mass Media; Occupational Surveys; Prediction; School Surveys
 IDENTIFIERS *Diversity (Faculty); *Faculty Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to examine whether an underlying structure existed among items related to the practice of diversity, particularly practices related to diversity as an institutional process versus diversity as an assured outcome. The survey also examined whether a structure existed among items related to attitudes and beliefs about the outcomes of diversity, and sought to discover the utility of treating the practice measures as predictors of the outcomes measures. Respondents were 6 female and 4 male faculty members (8 were Caucasian and 2 were African-American) from a large southeastern college of journalism and communications with 59 full-time faculty (68% male/32% female with 12% racial minorities). Findings suggest a single dimension underlying responses to the policy items, and five dimensions underlying responses to the diversity outcome measures. Analysis of the five outcome measures showed ideology as a significant predictor of subjects' beliefs about diversity implications while group membership was not. It was concluded that ideology may be a strong yet relatively unexplored variable in understanding faculty's attitudes about the effects of diversity policies. What was uncovered in this research was a clear dichotomy in ideology and at least two different views of the world. Further research is needed to explore the multidimensional issues uncovered in this research. (Contains 5 tables of data and 38 references.) (Author/CR)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Dimensions of Diversity: Ideology and Group Membership as Predictors of Diversity Implications

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Hon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

by

Linda Childers Hon
Assistant Professor
Department of Public Relations
College of Journalism and Communications
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611
Lhon@jou.ufl.edu

Michael Weigold
Associate Professor
Department of Advertising
College of Journalism and Communications
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611
Mweigold@jou.ufl.edu

Sandra Chance
Assistant Professor
Department of Journalism
College of Journalism and Communications
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611
schance@jou.ufl.edu

Paper presented to the Commission on the Status of Women
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
Anaheim, CA
August 1996

©Copyright 1996 University of Florida

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

CS 509345

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Dimensions of Diversity: Ideology and Group Membership as Predictors of Diversity Implications

by

Linda Childers Hon

Michael Weigold

Sandra Chance

University of Florida

A survey of faculty in a large college of journalism and communications revealed a single underlying dimension that reflected attitudes about diversity policy items and five underlying dimensions for diversity outcome measures. Analysis of the five outcome measures showed ideology as a significant predictor of subjects' beliefs about diversity implications while group membership was not. The researchers concluded that ideology may be a strong yet relatively unexplored variable in understanding faculty's attitudes about the effects of diversity policies.

Introduction

Demographic changes in the United States in large part are fueling the urgency of diversity issues. In 1989, the U.S. Census Bureau projected that from 1990 to 2030, the white population of the United States will grow by about 25 percent. However, the African-American population will increase by 68 percent, the Asian-American, Pacific Island-American, and American Indian populations will grow by 79 percent, and the Latino population will leap by 187 percent (Cortes, 1991; see also Cheng, 1990).

In the middle of this evolving demography, universities have faced questions about equity for women and minorities. Extensive research has documented systematic gender- and race-based discrimination in salary and promotion (Chertos, 1983; Lattin, 1983; Sandler & Hall, 1986; Staples, 1984; Theodore, 1986).

More insidious has been the pattern of subtle marginalization that many women and minorities experience. Problems here have to do with tokenism, alienation, lingering negative stereotypes, and an overall campus climate where women's and minorities' contributions are devalued (Blum, 1991; McKay, 1983; Palmer, 1983; Sandler & Hall, 1986; Rosser, 1990).

Bourguignon, Blanshan, Chiteji, MacLean, Meckling, Sagaria, Shuman, and Taris (1987) uncovered all of these problems while exploring gender and race issues among junior faculty at Ohio State. They discovered that, especially during the socialization process, women and minority faculty feel cut off from vital information networks and are often treated as marginal members of their departments. One African-American man

commented on the isolation he experiences: "You feel a sense of alienation, loneliness by being the only [African-American]" (quoted in Bourguignon et al., p. 35).

Bourguignon et al. also reported that these junior faculty feel that research on women and minorities is discredited or trivialized. This scholarship is "criticized as nonsignificant or nonacademic" because the work may not appear in mainstream journals and typically is geared toward social change (quoted in Bourguignon et al., p. 43; see also Blum, 1988; Nieves-Squires, 1991; Reyes & Halcon, 1988).

Perhaps the most troublesome dilemma for these faculty was academic "games and rules" (p. 39). Bourguignon et al. explained that respondents felt "white men generally wind their way through the game without having the rules articulated or made explicit because they are white male rules" (p. 40).

Women and minorities, though, often may work under the wrong assumptions about how to succeed. Or, they may have different assumptions. As one Asian man said, "If you play the game by the rules that people establish, you will do well at the game. . . I think a lot of discrimination arises because you want to play by different rules" (quoted in Bourguignon et al., p. 39).

Efforts to increase the number of women and minorities on campus have resulted in a backlash movement that argues campuses have gone too far. Critics of diversity maintain that universities have enclaves where the politically correct impose their radical dogma and are intolerant of anyone who does not share their worldview (Daniels, 1991; Gamson, 1991; Scott, 1991; Wong, 1991).

Complicating this scenario is the multicultural education issue. As universities have become more diverse, they have faced mounting pressure to make the curriculum more inclusive of the experiences and perspectives of women and minorities (Hill, 1991; Keohane, 1986). Debate over transforming the curriculum has cut to the core of the philosophy of knowledge (Hill, 1991; see also Auletta & Jones, 1990). What and whose experiences are valid and should be taught?

Diversity in Mass Communication Education

Within this larger context, mass communication education has confronted diversity concerns. In 1972, Rush, Oukrop, and Ernst presented a paper about the status of women in journalism higher education to the Division of Minorities and Communication of the Association for Education in Journalism. They discovered that the majority of their research participants believed that discrimination against women and minorities exists, particularly in salary and promotion. From this research came AEJ's Commission on the Status of Women, which is still active today (now as the Commission on the Status of Women, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication).

As a follow-up, Sharp, Turk, Einsiedel, Schamber, and Hollenback (1985) conducted an extensive survey of female faculty members' status in journalism education. The survey was augmented by a content analysis of leading communication journals (to gauge women's scholarly activities) and interviews with communication educators.

These researchers concluded that women's status had improved since the 1972 benchmark. However, in 1983, only one in six faculty members was a woman, and only

17 percent of these women had been promoted to associate or full professor. Even fewer served as administrators. At the same time, 58 percent of students in mass communication were women.

Sharp et al.'s 1983-1984 salary statistics indicated that women earned less than men, especially at the full professor and instructor levels (\$2,204 and \$2,199 less, respectively). However, women did have lower levels of experience and education than men. Sharp et al. pointed out, though, that since women were clustered in the lower ranks, it would be expected that women would have lower levels of experience and education.

The content analysis of scholarly journals that Sharp et al. performed showed that female faculty were as productive, if not more productive, than male faculty (see also Dupagne, 1993). However, women represented a small proportion of those invited to write book reviews or serve on editorial boards.

Despite these disparities, Sharp et al.'s interviewees tended to believe that salary levels were not discriminatory. They recognized that women were more likely to be junior faculty. And, some pointed out that women often could command higher salaries than comparable men.

However, Stuart's (1988) salary figures documented that the average salary for women in mass communication was 85 percent that of men (\$29,676 and \$35,049, respectively). Administrative salaries showed less disparity; the average salary for women (\$59,952) was 97 percent of men's average salary (\$61,784). Fewer women, though, had achieved administrative rank.

In 1989, Schamber published an update of Sharp et al.'s study. She documented that in 1988, women made up about 24 percent of communication faculties (up from 18 percent in 1985 and seven-eight percent in 1972). The number of female administrators grew from one to 62 (17 percent).

Schamber also found that the proportion of women at the top three ranks was nearly the same after 16 years, but the proportion of instructors dropped 10 percentage points, while others (part-time instructors, full- and part-time lecturers, adjuncts, and visiting professors) rose seven points. Obviously, more women were entering ranks from which there is little chance for promotion.

Since the landmark 1985 study, the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication has developed a minority and female representation plan as part of its standards. However, Morton (1993) asserted that since the standard went into effect, progress for women and minorities has been slow. She noted that according to 1986-1988 figures, students in accredited schools were 11 percent minority and 62 percent female. Faculties for schools accredited during 1988 were eight percent minority and 26 percent female. Figures from 1989-1990 suggested an increase of 11 percent minority students and one percent female students. However, in 1991, little improvement was reported: Minority faculty increased by one percent (nine percent) and female faculty decreased by six percent (20 percent).

In 1992, Viswanath, Kosicki, and Creedon administered an extensive survey to AEJMC members, examining many of the same variables as earlier efforts. They found

that the proportion of women in the association had increased slightly since Schamber's study--from 24 percent to a little less than one third (Viswanath et al., 1993).

Women's rank showed some improvement as well. In 1992, 12.7 percent of women, or 39, were full professors (up from four percent in 1983). Among male faculty in 1992, 40 percent, or 316, were full professors.

Viswanath et al. also documented progress in other ranks: Forty-one percent (145) of the assistant professors and 31 percent (102) of the associate professors in the census were female, up from 26 to 32 percent and 14 to 18 percent, respectively (Sharp et al., 1985; Weaver & Wilhoit, 1988; Schamber, 1989).

Salary figures from Viswanath et al. showed that overall women earned about \$6,600 less than men. When rank is controlled for, the gap diminishes, particularly at the assistant professor level (\$577). For associate professors, the difference was \$1,583. Among full professors, men earned \$5,492 more than women. The latter figure was the only one statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Looking beyond numbers, L. Grunig (1989a) examined the discriminatory climate faced by female faculty in journalism higher education. She described indirect obstacles such as men's perceptions that women "didn't fit in," the impostor syndrome (feelings of self-doubt created by having to exist in a workplace designed for men), and the disproportionate teaching and service demands heaped upon women (see also "Why women don't publish more," 1990).

Rush (1993) too addressed institutional discrimination in mass communication education. She focused on behind-the-scenes barriers such as sexual harassment and

"political power harassment" (p. 72). She described the latter as structural inequities that inhibit women's achievement and acknowledgment. Rush also indicted discriminatory practices that she termed "scholargate." The schemes she outlined (such as withholding information about grants and awards) are particularly vexing for women and minorities because they are less likely to have the power to wield these maneuvers, and conversely, more likely to be the targets.

Bartlow, Escalante, and Vasquez (1993) looked at the indirect obstacles that women of color in particular face in mass communication higher education. They noted that women (and men) of color continue to battle the assumption that they are tokens, hired without the appropriate qualifications. Thus, people of color find themselves struggling to overcome stereotypes and prove that they are just as intellectually competent as their Anglo peers. On this point, Nieves-Squires (quoted in Bartlow et al., 1993) argued that Latinas are confronted with the message that they are "Mother Earth sorts. . . women who are 'powerless, pathological, prayerful, and dutiful family members (p. 272).'"

Diversity and Students in Mass Communication

Liebler (1993) studied patterns of diversity among students in mass communication and concluded that the field was not doing enough to attract minority students. She found that mass communication has a smaller representation of minorities than in the general population. And, other disciplines, such as social science and psychology, generally have been more successful at integration than mass communication has been.

Liebler's findings suggested, though, that accredited mass communication programs were making a difference. She discovered that minority students choose these programs second only to social sciences. And, among the accredited programs she examined (communication, letters, social sciences, and psychology), 31.4 percent of African-American graduates came from communication. Among non-accredited programs the figure dropped to 27.5 percent.

L. Grunig (1989b) discussed how the glass ceiling in mass communication education penalizes female and minority students. She noted that female students encounter too few female role models and mentors--especially those who are powerful and well-connected.

Minorities students find even fewer supportive faculty. As L. Grunig explained, senior professors--who tend to be white males--may be uncomfortable working with students so unlike themselves (see also Miller, 1989). And, these professors can be reluctant to mentor minority students whose research interests may fall outside of the mainstream either because the faculty worry that the topic is risky or they just are uninterested. Further, senior professors who are women or minorities may be so overloaded with committee and other responsibilities that they are hesitant to take on more advisees.

Adding to the Confusion: Different Meanings of Diversity

One important difficulty in the response of universities to the need for a diverse faculty has been the lack of precision over the meaning of diversity. In an earlier paper, we addressed this issue by suggesting that the criteria and dimensions of diversity vary

substantially for the faculty of one large program in mass communication. In this paper we tackle a separate issue, the differing hopes, dreams, and fears that exist among faculty in response to specific diversity policies. It seems clear (although it is not well documented) that some of the disagreements among faculty on this issue relate to different perspectives on how procedures for building a more diverse faculty will impact on other important policies and outcomes in higher education. The purpose of this study is to document the nature of such hopes and fears, and to examine how beliefs in the benefits and costs of diversity may be affected by the symbolic issues that surround affirmative action policies designed to diversify the academy.

Method

Overview

The analysis was designed to answer several questions. First, we sought to determine whether an underlying structure existed among items related to the practice of diversity, particularly practices related to diversity as an institutional process versus diversity as an assured outcome. Second, we sought to determine whether a structure existed among items related to attitudes and beliefs about the outcomes of diversity. Finally, we were interested in discovering the utility of treating the practice measures as predictors of the outcomes measures.

Participants came from a large, southeastern college of journalism and communications. The College employs 59 full-time faculty members, 34 (68 percent) of whom are males and 16 (32 percent) of whom are females. A total of six (12 percent) of

the sample are racial minorities. Although these percentages do not yet approach the distribution of these groups in the population, the college is one of the most diverse in the country.

The research team itself was diverse. Ultimately, six women and four men participated.¹ Eight are Caucasian; two of the men are African-American. The group included faculty at the assistant, associate, and full professor ranks. One of the women was the College's AA/EEOC Officer at the time of the study.

Data Collection

The group administered a two-part, anonymous survey to all of the College faculty. The first part involved an open-ended series of items concerning hopes and fears for diversity. Responses were coded and then used to generate a structured, self-administered questionnaire that was distributed to the 59 full-time College faculty (full-time radio and television station employees who teach were included). The College's Dean wrote a cover letter for the survey stressing her commitment to diversity and encouraging the faculty to respond. The self-administered survey included questions about characteristics thought relevant to diversity, general beliefs about practices appropriate to increase diversity, personal beliefs about the role of diversity versus its role as defined by the university, the acceptability of differing policies to bring about diversity, perceived costs and benefits of diversity, and perceived usefulness of workshops dealing with diversity issues mentioned in the open-ended questionnaire. A total of 43 faculty (73 percent) returned completed questionnaires.

¹ The authors wish to express appreciation to others members of the group--Helen Aller, Lester Carson, Mary Ann Ferguson, Michael Leslie, Jon Roosenraad, Debbie Treise, and Kim Walsh-Childers.

The Diversity Ideology Measure

A set of items dealing with policies for diversity was generated. Some items came directly from the open-ended responses that were obtained from the faculty. Others came from the members of the diversity group. The items, each accompanied by a seven-point Likert scale (1=very strongly agree, 7=very strongly disagree), were as follows (items with an asterisk are reverse coded):

- Diversity policies are meant to provide **procedures** that treat members of underrepresented groups in a fair and equitable manner.
- Diversity policies should ensure that the **outcomes** of decisions and policies reflect gender and ethnic diversity.
- When hiring for a new position, diversity policies are meant to ensure that qualified women and minorities are informed about the availability of positions and are **encouraged to apply**.
- Diversity policies are meant to ensure that qualified women and minorities are **hired**.
- Diversity policies are meant to ensure that qualified women and minorities are **retained and tenured**.
- Diversity policies are meant to **change attitudes and opinions** toward members of underrepresented groups.
- Diversity policies are meant to ensure that **criteria for hiring and promotion** do not limit representation of minorities and women.
- Diversity ought not to be a consideration in hiring decisions for the college.*
- Only if two people are equally well qualified in other important respects should diversity become a consideration.*
- Diversity considerations make it possible that in some cases an individual who appears somewhat less qualified should be hired.

- In some cases our hiring should be restricted to only applicants from underrepresented groups.
- The college should establish quotas for representation of women and/or minorities and restrict hiring to these underrepresented groups until the hiring goals are met.

A final item concerning policy began with the phrase “My beliefs about diversity are best exemplified by:” and offered as possible responses:

- Diversity ought not to be a consideration in hiring decisions for college positions.
- Only if two people are equally well qualified according to objective criteria listed in a job announcement should diversity become a consideration.
- Diversity considerations make it possible that in some cases an individual who appears somewhat less qualified should be hired.
- In some cases our hiring should be restricted only to applicants from underrepresented groups.
- The College should establish quotas for representation of women and/or minorities and restrict hiring to these underrepresented groups until the hiring goals are met.

Responses to this item were reverse coded such that endorsement of the last choice received a “1,” the next to last item a “2,” and so forth.

The items were subjected to a principal components factor analysis to examine the underlying structure of responses. The initial factor analysis revealed three factors with eigenvalues greater than one. However, the first factor accounted for a preponderant

share of common variability in the items (44%), with the second and third factors accounting for just 16 and nine percent respectively. In particular, the third factor had loadings for just two items. A closer examination of these items (“Diversity policies are meant to provide procedures that treat members of underrepresented groups in a fair and equitable manner,” and “When hiring for a new position, diversity policies are meant to ensure that qualified women and minorities are informed about the availability of positions and encouraged to apply”) suggested that there was very little variability in the responses to each, due to the near universal agreement across all respondents (complete agreement for the second item, and only two respondents indicating disagreement with the first). Of course, this finding is not insignificant. It suggests that even on an issue as contentious as diversity, some consensus has emerged in recent years regarding an appropriate function for policies designed to ensure greater representation of women and minorities. However, that lack of variability suggests that these two items do not help distinguish underlying ideological differences with respect to diversity policies, and thus they were deleted from the policy scale.

The remaining items were summed (with reverse coding where appropriate) to create a single diversity ideology measure. Conceptually, this measure was assumed to distinguish individuals who largely favor aggressive, proactive diversity policies from individuals who largely oppose such policies. In our sample, low scores on the measure indicate a more proactive stance with respect to diversity policies (i.e., a greater likelihood of endorsing aggressive diversity policies), while higher scores reflect greater conservatism on diversity.

The eleven-item scale had a mean of 39.09, and a variance of 171.29.

Reliability analyses of the scale suggested that we were justified in treating the items as a single measure. The mean inter-item correlation was .45, with a range of .15 to .80. The Cronbach's α for the scale was .90.

Diversity Outcome Measures

Another set of measures assessed respondents' perceptions of benefits and costs of diversity. These outcomes items were generated both from responses to the open-ended questionnaire and from items suggested by members of the diversity group. This resulted in a large pool of items (a total of 23), each representing statements followed by a Likert scale which ranged from 1 (very strongly agree) to 7 (very strongly disagree). Responses to the items were factor analyzed for purposes of reducing the set to a smaller group of dimensions. The principal components analysis revealed five factors with eigenvalues greater than one, accounting for over 75 percent of the variance. A varimax rotation revealed the following outcomes factors (reverse codings are indicated with an asterisk):

Factor 1: Diversity concerns can improve social relationships

- The policy of having a more diverse faculty will help underrepresented groups to overcome discrimination in academic life.
- The policy of having a more diverse faculty helps us to serve better students from underrepresented groups.
- The policy of having a more diverse faculty helps majority students to understand perspectives different from their own.
- I find it distasteful to categorize people along racial and gender lines, even when this is done in service of what people consider to be noble goals.*

- The policy of having a more diverse faculty uncovers unconscious racial and/or sexist attitudes held by some faculty.
- The best way to help advance diversity is to make gender and race irrelevant to hiring and promotion decisions, not to place greater emphasis on those factors.*
- The policy of having a more diverse faculty prepares this college to effectively deal with the needs of all members of our society in the 21st century.

Factor 2: Diversity concerns can harm social relationships

- The policy of having a more diverse faculty leads to less cohesion and collegiality among our faculty.
- The policy of having a more diverse faculty leads to a curtailment of people's willingness to speak freely and honestly.
- The policy of having a more diverse faculty results in discrimination against whites and/or males.
- The policy of having a more diverse faculty represents a naive attempt at social engineering that will result in more harm than good.

Factor 3: Diversity will improve the College work environment

- Increased diversity of faculty has made the College a better place to work.
- The policy of having a more diverse faculty empowers people to speak more openly, freely, and honestly about what must be done to attain it.
- The policy of having a more diverse faculty is used by people as a cover for other agendas.*
- The policy of having a more diverse faculty gives female and minority students a greater opportunity for positive role models.

Factor 4: Diversity ought to be a greater concern in the College

- In my opinion, diversity is something about which we should talk to one another more.
- I am uncomfortable when I hear that members of our faculty meet in groups or socialize along gender or ethnic lines.*

- In my opinion diversity is something about which we should be more concerned.
- My perception is that some members of our faculty do not fully understand the prejudice and obstacles that are faced by women and minority faculty in our college.
- Nothing good can come from discussing differences that separate people of different ethnic backgrounds or genders.*

Factor 5: Diversity concerns lead to problems.

- Emphasizing diversity seems to result in concern with “politically correct” speech and actions.
- My perception is that women and minority faculty are often too quick to see prejudice in speech or actions that have nothing to do with bigotry or discrimination.
- Diversity policies have the effect of harming people they were designed to help because some people believe the standards are lower for the affected groups.

Items for each factor were averaged to create five scales. The alphas and inter-item correlations for each scale were quite good: alphas ranged from .79 to .91, while the average inter-item correlations ranged from .49 to .61. To summarize then, our analysis identified five distinct factors related to the perceived outcomes of diversity. These factors represented both positive outcomes (improving social relationships, improving the work environment), negative outcomes (harming social relationships, harming affected groups), and one factor related to hoping for greater concern about diversity.

Primary Analyses: Predicting Diversity Outcome Responses Using the Ideology Measure

The final set of analyses was designed to determine whether the ideology measure would be useful in predicting responses to the outcome factors. Of course, we had every reason to expect that it would, so our larger concern was to determine whether ideology would be a better predictor of outcome beliefs than would simple membership in one of

two groups: individuals who are members of actively recruited groups (African-Americans, women, other ethnic minorities), or individuals who are not members of such groups (i.e., white males). Such an analysis is similar to research in political science that compares the role of self-interest as a predictor of voting and issue policy support with what Sears and Funk (1991) have labeled “sociotropic” concerns.

Self-interest concerns suggest that the primary factor in determining diversity outcomes may be whether or not one is a member of a group expected to benefit from diversity. In practice, this would lead to the expectation that members of actively recruited groups generally would express greater agreement with items suggesting positive outcomes of diversity, and express greater disagreement with items suggesting negative outcomes.

One alternative to the self-interest perspective is the “sociotropic” perspective. This approach suggests that people “acquire learned affective responses to particular symbols relatively early in life” (Sears and Funk, p. 13). The activation of responses to these symbols in adulthood has been observed to be a more potent predictor than self-interest of attitudes toward issues as diverse as busing, welfare, and economic policies. The sociotropic approach is consistent with the notion that ideology may be a more potent predictor of diversity outcomes than group membership.

We examined the five outcome measures using ideology and membership as between-subjects independent variables. An analysis of variance was conducted using a regression approach in which the effects of each independent variable are calculated after controlling for the effect of the other independent variable and for the interaction term.

The effect of the interaction term was calculated after controlling for the two main effects, a procedure that is common to both the regression approach and the normal “ANOVA” approach.

The first analysis was a MANOVA conducted on all five dependent measures, with measure treated as a within-subjects variable. A main effect of the within-subjects scale measure was significant ($F, 4, 128 = 18.71, p < .001$). More importantly, a significant ideology \times scale interaction ($F, 4, 128 = 11.55, p < .001$) suggested we were justified in examining the univariate effects of ideology on the five scales separately. The membership \times scale interaction and the three-way interaction were not significant.

The analysis of the first scale, “Diversity concerns can improve social relationships,” revealed a significant effect of ideology ($F, 1, 32 = 6.92, p < .02$). No other effects were significant. As can be seen in Table 1, agreement that diversity would bring beneficial social relationships was much stronger for ideological “progressives,” i.e., those who endorse aggressive diversity policies. Equally as important, neither respondent status as either a member or nonmember of an affected group nor the interaction accounted for significant shares of variance in the responses.

The second scale, “Diversity concerns can harm social relationships,” showed a similar pattern of responses. The ideology main effect was highly significant ($F, 1, 32 = 10.53, p < .003$), while the membership main effect and the interaction term were not significant. As the pattern of means presented in Table 2 makes clear, greater agreement that diversity policies can harm social relationships existed among “traditionals” than among “progressives.”

Our third scale, which we have labeled “Diversity will improve the College work environment,” also showed only an effect of ideology ($F, 1, 32 = 5.19, p < .03$). The means for this optimistic view of diversity outcomes showed the predictable pattern: progressives were much more likely to agree than were traditionalists. And once again, membership and the two-way interaction were not significant.

The fourth scale represented items for a factor we have called “Diversity ought to be a greater concern in the College.” This set of items represented an opinion that more frank and open discussion of diversity was desirable. Once again, a sizable main effect of ideology ($F, 1, 32 = 19.4, p < .001$) was the only significant effect. For this scale, however, the effect of group did at least approach significance ($p < .10$), perhaps due to somewhat less agreement among nonmembers of affected groups. Table 4 shows that progressives expressed far greater agreement than did traditionalists for this scale.

Finally, the fifth scale (see Table 5) represented three items that reflect fears about diversity. We have labeled this scale “Diversity can lead to problems.” The analysis suggested that once again, the only significant predictor of agreement with the scale proved to be ideology ($F, 1, 32 = 8.49, p < .006$). Traditionalists were more likely to agree with these items than were progressives.

To summarize: Five scales tapping hopes and fears for diversity were analyzed using membership in an affected demographic group and ideology as predictors. In all five cases the results were remarkably consistent: membership was largely irrelevant to level of agreement, while ideology was a significant predictor of agreement. In general, “progressives” were more likely to agree that diversity has beneficial outcomes, and to

agree that diversity should be of greater concern to faculty in the College. “Traditionals” were more likely to agree diversity would lead to negative outcomes.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was threefold: to discover a structure among responses to policy items for purposes of developing one or more ideology scales, to discover a structure among items related to diversity outcomes, and to examine the utility of predicting agreement with the outcome measures using both a sociotropic measure (the ideology scale) and a self-interest measure (respondent status as either a member or nonmember of the affected groups). Our findings suggested a single dimension underlying responses to the policy items, and five dimensions underlying responses to the diversity outcome measures.

An analysis of the five dimensions using ideology and membership argued for a significant role of the former and no role of the latter. That is, responses were consistently affected by ideology, and were never significantly affected by membership. It should be pointed out, however, that such conclusions are at least somewhat premature, because ideology and membership are not in fact independent constructs. By this we mean that membership seems to be a predictor of ideology (since ideology is not likely to be a “cause” of membership!). A majority of members of affected groups (by over a 2-1 margin) are “progressives,” while a slight majority of white males are “traditionals.” Thus, it is not quite accurate to claim that group membership plays no role in responses.

Overall, however, it seems clear that if one is to predict responses to diversity among this group, it is far more helpful to understand a respondent’s ideology than one’s group membership. This resonates most clearly with the sociotropic perspective of Sears

and Funk (1991) reviewed earlier than it does with a pure “self-interest” model. Faculty members seem to be responding to diversity in a more symbolic way.

Table 1: Diversity concerns can improve social relationships

	Diversity Ideology Oriented Towards:	
	Progressive	Traditional
Member of Actively Recruited Group	2.4 (n=9)	3.6 (n=4)
Nonmember of Actively Recruited Group	2.6 (n=9)	3.9 (n=13)

Note: Means can range from 1 to 7. Lower numbers indicate greater agreement with scale items. Numbers in parentheses reflect cell n's.

Table 2: Diversity concerns can harm social relationships

	Diversity Ideology Oriented Towards:	
	Progressive	Traditional
Member of Actively Recruited Group	5.4	3.8
Nonmember of Actively Recruited Group	5.3	4.0

Note: Means can range from 1 to 7. Lower numbers indicate greater agreement with scale items.

Table 3: Diversity will improve the College work environment

	Diversity Ideology Oriented Towards:	
	Progressive	Traditional
Member of Actively Recruited Group	2.4	3.0
Nonmember of Actively Recruited Group	2.7	3.5

Note: Means can range from 1 to 7. Lower numbers indicate greater agreement with scale items.

Table 4: Diversity ought to be a greater concern in the College

	Diversity Ideology Oriented Towards:	
	Progressive	Traditional
Member of Actively Recruited Group	1.6	3.4
Nonmember of Actively Recruited Group	2.6	3.7

Note: Means can range from 1 to 7. Lower numbers indicate greater agreement with scale items.

Table 5: Diversity concerns lead to problems

	Diversity Ideology Oriented Towards:	
	Progressive	Traditional
Member of Actively Recruited Group	5.0	3.8
Nonmember of Actively Recruited Group	4.3	3.1

Note: Means can range from 1 to 7. Lower numbers indicate greater agreement with scale items.

Although this study focused on the faculty of a large, southeastern university, the researchers believe the findings may have implications for other colleges and universities. However, whether or not the findings are generalizable remains an unanswered question. Further research is needed to explore the multidimensional issues uncovered in this research.

For example, what are other colleges and universities doing to understand the issues and concerns diversity raises for their faculty members? In addition, have other programs been more or less successful in opening up the dialogue and bridging the gap between the progressive and traditional ideologies? If they have been successful, what have they done? Do faculty members generally believe diversity has enriched the college work environment or led to more problems? Would ensuring a fair process for diversity policies find almost universal support among other faculty members? Answers to these questions may be fundamentally important for institutions interested in developing a cohesive and comprehensive approach to the challenges this new era is bound to bring.

The goal of our project was to lay the groundwork for dialogues that would foster mutual understanding and respect among faculty members. What we uncovered was a clear dichotomy in ideology and at least two very different views of the world. The findings indicate that these views strongly influence how faculty members approach diversity. The progressives appear ready to embrace diversity and all the challenges and opportunities it has to offer. The traditionals, on the other hand, are more reticent and concerned about how diversity might corrupt the hiring process and stifle free speech.

Despite these chasms, faculty members at the institution studied generally express a high level of support and mutual respect for their colleagues.

Finally, with this study, the researchers began to uncover the differing hopes, dreams, and fears that faculty members associate with diversity. It appears clear that these hopes and fears are heavily influenced by a faculty member's ideology. These findings suggest the need to increase our understanding of the different ideologies that may influence the way we approach the critical issue of diversity. This research may have implications for other institutions interested in opening up dialogues and fostering mutual understanding and respect.

References

- Auletta, G.S., & Jones, T. (1990). Reconstituting the inner circle. American Behavioral Scientist, 34(2), 137-152.
- Bartlow, R.D., Escalante, V.T., & Vasquez, O.A. (1993). Exploring new frontiers. Women of color in academia. In P. Creedon (Ed.), Women in mass communication (pp. 264-275). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Blum, D.E. (1988, June 22). To get ahead in research, some minority scholars choose to "play the game." Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A 22.
- Blum, D.E. (October 9, 1991). Environment still hostile to women in academe, new evidence suggests. Chronicle of Higher Education, A1, A20.
- Bourguignon, E., Blanshan, S.A., Chiteji, L., MacLean, K.J., Meckling, S.J., Sagaria, M.A., Shuman, A.E., Taris, M.T. (1987). Junior faculty life at Ohio State: Insights on Gender and Race. Unpublished manuscript.
- Cheng, L.L. (1990). Recognizing diversity. The need for a paradigm shift. American Behavioral Scientist, 43(2), 263-278.
- Chertos, C.H. (1983). Hard truths for strategic change: dilemmas of implementing affirmative action. Women's Studies International Forum, 6(2), 231-242.
- Cortes, C.E. (1991). Pluribus & unum. The quest for community amid diversity. Change, 23(5), 8-11.
- Daniels, L.A. (1991). Diversity, correctness, and campus life. A closer look. Change, 23(5), 16-20.
- Dupagne, M. (1993). Gender differences in predicting productivity of faculty. Journalism Educator, 48(1), 37-45.
- Gamson, Z. (1991). Five takes on "PC," diversity, and community. The view from student affairs. Change, 23(5), 41-47.
- Grunig, L. (1989a). Sex discrimination in promotion and tenure in journalism education. Journalism Quarterly, 66(1), 93-100, 229.
- Grunig, L. (1989b). The glass ceiling effect on mass communication students. In P. Creedon (Ed.), Women in mass communication. Challenging gender values (pp. 125- 147). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hill, P.J. (1991). Multiculturalism. The crucial philosophical and organizational issues. Change, 23(4), 38-47.

Keohane, N.O. (1986). Our mission should not be merely to 'reclaim' a legacy of scholarship--We must expand on it. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 88.

Lattin, P.H. (1983). Academic women, affirmative action, and mid-America in the eighties. Women's Studies International Forum, 6(2), 223-230.

Liebler, C.M. (1993). The patterns of diversity in the student body. Journalism Educator, 48(2), 37-45.

McKay, N. (1983). Black woman professor--white university. Women's Studies International Forum, 6(2), 143-148.

Miller, D. (1989). Women in public relations graduate study. Public Relations Review, 14(3), 29-35.

Morton, L. (1993). Minority and female representation plans at accredited schools. Journalism Educator, 48(1), 28-36.

Nieves-Squires, S. (1991). Hispanic women: Making their presence on campus less tenuous. Project on the Status and Education of Women (pp. 1-14). Washington, DC: American Association of American Colleges.

Palmer, S. (1983, September 14). In the 'Fishbowl': When Blacks work at predominately White colleges. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 19-21.

Reyes de la Luz, M., & Halcon, J.J. (1988, August). Racism in academia. Harvard Educational Review, pp. 299-313.

Rosser, J.M. (1990). The role of the university president in realizing the multicultural university. American Behavioral Scientist, 34(2), 223-231.

Rush, R. (1993). A systematic commitment to women in the academy. Journalism Educator, 48(1), 73-79.

Rush, R., Oukrop, C.F., & Ernst, S.W. (1972, August). More than you ever wanted to know about women and journalism education. Paper presented to the Division of Minorities and Communication, Association for Education in Journalism, Carbondale, IL.

Sandler, B.R., Hall, B.M. (1986). The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students. Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women Association of American Colleges.

- Scott, J.W. (1991). The campaign against political correctness. What's really at stake? Change, 23(6), 30-43.
- Schamber, L. (1989). Women in Mass communication education. Who is teaching tomorrow's students. In P. Creedon (Ed.), Women in mass communication (pp. 148-159). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sears, D. O., & Funk, C. L. (1991). The role of self-interest in social and political attitudes. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 24, pp. 2-92). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Sharp, N.W., Turk, J.V., Einsiedel, E.F., Chamber, L., & Hollenback, S. (1985). Faculty women in journalism and mass communication: Problems and progress. Columbia, SC: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.
- Staples, R. (1984). Racial ideology and intellectual racism: Blacks in Academia. The Black Scholar, March/April, 2-17.
- Stuart, E.W. (1988). 1987-1988 Association of Schools in Journalism and Mass Communication faculty/administrator demographic survey. Columbia, SC: ASJMC.
- Theodore, A. (1986). The campus troublemakers: Academic women in protest. Cap and Gown. Houston.
- Viswanath, K., Kosicki, G.M., & Creedon, P.J. (1993). Women in mass communication education: Progress, problems, and prospects. In P. Creedon (Ed.), Women in mass communication. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Weaver, D., & Wilhoit, G. Cleveland (1988). A profile of JMC educators: Traits, attitudes and values, Journalism Educator, 43(2), 4-41.
- Why women don't publish more. (1990, February). Outlook. p. 6.
- Wong, F. (1991). Diversity and community. Right objectives and wrong arguments. Change, 23(4), 48-54.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Dimensions of Diversity: Ideology & Group Membership as Predictors of Diversity Implications.</i>	
Author(s): <i>Linda Chatters Hon et al.*</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: <i>AEJMC '96.</i>

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE: *One author's signature is sufficient.

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents



Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) and paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Level 1

Level 2

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here → please

Signature: <i>Linda Hon</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Linda Hon Assistant Professor</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>P.O. Box 118400 Univ of FL Gainesville, FL 32611</i>	Telephone: <i>352-392-6522</i>	FAX: <i>352-392-3919</i>
	E-Mail Address: <i>LHon@JOU.UFL.EDU</i>	Date: <i>10/15/96</i>



III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: <p style="text-align: right;">ERIC/REC 2805 E. Tenth Street Smith Research Center, 150 Indiana University Bloomington, IN 47408</p>
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

~~ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 100
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305~~

Telephone: 301-258-5500
FAX: 301-948-3695
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
e-mail: eriefac@inet.ed.gov