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ABSTRACT

COMPETING IDENTIFICATIONS AMONG A NEWSPAPER’S JOURNALISTS AND ADVERTISING SALESPEOPLE

by

William F. Kelvin

Master of Arts in Communication Studies

California State University, Chico

Fall 2009

This thesis is a case study attempting to explain the cause of ideological disagreements among a single newspaper’s journalists and its advertising salespeople. The impetus for this study was the researcher’s work experience at this newspaper organization, in both the editorial and advertising departments (not simultaneously). The researcher was informed about divergent, department-based perspectives on past and present interdepartmental episodes, and witnessed agitation during and after communication interactions resulting from work-based interdepartmental disagreements. The researcher hypothesized that such conflicts were caused by value differences between members of these two departments.

Using a previously successful study of newspaper journalists’ identifications as a model, the researcher used a standardized instrument to survey journalists and advertising salespeople at one Northern California, mid-sized daily newspaper. The
author measured the strength of respondents’ identifications with their employing organization and their respective professions and departments. These measurements were taken for the purpose of determining if these employees’ organizational, professional or departmental identifications might have had some role in the interdepartmental disagreements communicated to and witnessed by the author. While this study found no significant differences between editorial employees’ identifications or between editorial and advertising employees’ identifications, advertising employees surveyed identified significantly more strongly with their profession than with their organization, while journalists surveyed identified in the same direction, but their scores only approached statistical significance. Interactions between professional tenure and departmental identification were also found, as long-term newspaper employees identified significantly stronger with their department than did mid-term employees.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When analyzing behavior, people often first look toward motivation. In the modern, organized world, internal drives to succeed clearly motivate people’s behavior, compelling individuals to pursue education, show up to work and strive for upward mobility. Yet humans are governed by many complex and deep-seated psychological processes. The communication construct identification has proven particularly useful for theorizing explanations for humans’ decision-making processes in organizational situations.

Background on Identification

Social identifications are individuals’ psychological bonds to external entities. They are considered internal perceptions that one’s fate is interwoven with that of a social group (Ashforth & Johnson, 2001). Kenneth A. Burke’s treatises on human identities (1937, 1950) and their relationship to social action elaborated the theoretical foundation for this perspective (Cheney, 1983). Burke (1937) argued that identity is not something “peculiar” (p. 139) to the individual, as had previously been supposed. From Burke’s perspective, the “so-called “I” is actually a unique combination of affiliations with “corporate we’s” (p. 140). Burke labeled these mental connections to social groups as identifications. The act of identifying with an external group causes that entity to
become part of the person’s self-concept (Burke, 1950, Cheney, 1983). One can identify with all sorts of things—tangible entities, such as one’s family members or spouse; or concepts with elements both tangible and abstract, such as one’s nation or, as this study will make use of, one’s employing organization.

According to Cheney’s (1983) analysis of Burke’s work, people act to identify with something, to be anchored to external elements in the social world. Burke writes that this identification-seeking behavior is caused by people’s inherent loneliness, as we strive to identify with other people or entities to overcome the separation we feel (as cited in Russo, 1995). People who feel detached from others in social environments seek ways of being anchored or embedded (Giddens, 1991). Identifying with a social group such as a work organization is one way to gain that sense of feeling embedded (Russo, 1995). According to Patchen (1970), identifications with work organizations have come to fill an internal void created in Americans as increased geographic mobility eroded ties to community and the extended family. Scitovsky writes that careers are the most significant source of satisfaction in life (as cited in Pokrywczynski & Crowley, 1997). Consequently, “it is natural” for members of industrialized societies to identify with their employing organizations (Burke, 1937, p. 140). The processes by which individuals come to identify with organizations take place through communication and begin practically at birth.

The process of individuals identifying with social units is an active one, as identifications are dynamic, formed and constantly reshaped through communication (Cheney, 1982, 1983, Cheney & Tompkins, 1987, Giddens, 1991). From initial societal
perceptions through the very present moment, one’s interpersonal interactions and
mediated experiences affect conceptions of organizations and work roles (Jablin, 2001).
Those conceptions help shape individuals’ career paths (Jablin, 2001) and subsequently
which external entities are most integral to one’s” identity (Giddens, 1991). The processes
by which individuals come to identify with organizations and reconsider those affiliations
are briefly outlined here to demonstrate the fundamental role communication plays in the
identification process.

Before a person assumes a role in an organization, the individual has
preconceived notions about the organization and the field of choice. These attitudes begin
forming at an early age, as people absorb work-related information through
communication transactions in a process Jablin (2001) calls “vocational anticipatory
socialization” (p. 733). Subsequently, individuals seek out organizations whose stated
goals and values match their own. Likewise, organizations search for applicants who will
be compatible with the organization; they desire a good “person-organization fit”
(Kristof, 1996). Thus, new members are likely to identify with their organization upon
entrance. However, even though identifications may start strong, they change over time
and circumstances (Cheney, 1983, Russo, 1998). Organizational identifications are
strengthened or weakened by communication between the organization and its members.

Identifications are malleable, so organizations desiring strong organizational
identification from members must work to maintain and increase these feelings (Ashforth
& Johnson, 2001). The organization conducts this “inducement process” by
communicating to members its mission, goals and policies (Cheney, 1983, p. 345). When
the process of inculcating organizational identification is successful, the dominant
organizational worldview is infused into the new member, as evidenced by the member’s
adoption of the organization’s preferred decisional premises (Kaufman, 1960, Cheney,
1983). Such behavior communicates to others the organizational role’s importance to the
member. However, communication between a member and the organization is not the
only way identifications are modified. Even after transitioning from pre-work
socialization experiences to actual employment, employees continue considering the
merits of various identification targets, and communication continues to play a role in
such ruminations.

We can assume that many organizational members regularly discuss their
organization with both outsiders and insiders. These organizational evaluations are
logically linked to the strength of a member’s identification, as members with strong
organizational identification are likely to discuss the organization in positive terms
(Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994). During conversations related to the organization,
other organizational members and non-members also express opinions about the
organization. People want to affiliate themselves with organizations perceived as
prestigious, to share in the prestige and enhance their own self-esteem (Dutton et al.
1994, Smidts, Pruyn, & Van Riel, 2001). Members’ perceptions of what is distinct and
enduring about the organization are influenced by how they believe outsiders and other
members view the organization (Dutton et al. 1994). In this fashion, conversations with
others shape members’ perceptions of their organization, affecting how strongly they
identify with it and, consequently, how they view themselves (Dutton et al. 1994, Russo,
An important end result of these communication patterns is that the identifications people hold lead to greater self-understanding, one of many benefits identifications provide to the individuals who hold them.

When members identify with their organizations, they come to internalize the values and goals of the organization (Kaufman, 1960, Simon, 1997/1945). Therefore, employees’ identifications help them cope with the potentially bewildering array of possible decisions regularly facing them in the workplace (Simon, 1997/1945). Identifications focus members’ attention on certain values, pieces of information and behavior alternatives, while excluding contrary facts, values and behavioral choices (Simon, 1997/1945). As such, organizational identifications provide mental frameworks (Ashforth & Johnson, 2001) that help individuals make sense of experience, organize thoughts and anchor the self (Cheney, 1983). Additionally, identifications have been linked to work processes important to individuals’ satisfaction, including hiring, promotions and transfers (Kaufman, 1960, Cheney, 1983). For example, employees who understand the functions and importance of organizational identification are better able to choose appropriate communication styles in organizational situations and are therefore more capable of achieving workplace goals (Conrad, 1990).

Organizational identification affords advantages not only to individuals, but also to the organizations those individuals serve. Patchen (1970) distilled previous identification research and determined that employee behavior stemming from organizational identification falls into three categories: (1) feelings of solidarity with the organization, (2) support of the organization and (3) perception of shared characteristics.
with organizational members. These categories were later renamed by Cheney (1982), as “loyalty,” “membership” and “similarity.” Essentially, these member attitudes signal positive affect toward the organization, from which many organizationally desirable outcomes result. Employees with high organizational identification are more likely to work overtime without pay, defend the organization and its goals to both outsiders and insiders, mimic the behavior of model members (Patchen, 1970), remain with the organization (Bartels, 2006), be punctual, and enact citizenship behaviors (Russo, 1995).

Multiple and Competing Identifications

Numerous scholars have elaborated on Burke’s (1937) thoughts concerning individuals’ multiple psychological attachments to social entities. Essays and studies have demonstrated that employees hold overlapping attachments to more work-related entities than simply their employing organizations (Morrow, 1983, Reichers, 1985, Barker & Tompkins, 1994, Russo, 1998, Ashforth & Johnson, 2001, Bartels, 2006). Other possible work-related targets of identification include organizational subunits, such as department, work group (Cheney, 1983) and self-managing work teams (Barker & Tompkins, 1994), and extra-organizational targets, such as unions and professions (Patchen, 1970, Cheney, 1983, Russo, 1998).

For employees and employers, the simultaneous existence of multiple identifications is not necessarily a hindrance to efficiency or stability (Patchen, 1970, Russo, 1998). According to Burke, the variety of identifications that people hold sometimes work in complementary, or concentric, fashion, reinforcing each other and strengthening connections (as cited in Cheney, 1983). At other times, these multiple
identities conflict (Kronus, 1976, Barker & Tompkins, 1994, Ashforth & Johnson, 2001). Managing such conflicts can pose a difficult challenge for organizational members (Cheney & Tompkins, 1987), so the effects of divided identifications on employees and their employing organizations can be significant (Russo, 1998).

Organizational members’ internal conflicts may have many undesirable results, including decreasing members’ job satisfaction (Russo, 1998) and causing them to psychologically withdraw from the organization (Reichers, 1985). Withdrawal can result in turnover, absenteeism, and reduced effort, especially in extra-role behaviors such as volunteering to work overtime or socialize newcomers (Russo, 1998). Also, employees who identify more strongly with entities other than their organization may make work-based decisions using premises not endorsed by their organization (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985, Simon 1997/1945). These types of internal conflicts frustrate organizational leaders who want employees effortlessly utilizing organizationally approved premises (Simon, 1997/1945). Identification conflicts can be persistent for some individuals (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985) as multiple attachments vie for supremacy. Because the effects of multiple identifications are mixed (Patchen, 1970), sometimes detrimental for organizations and individuals, and not completely understood, they are deserving of further study (Russo, 1998).

Newspaper Organizations: Appropriate Environments for Studying Identification

Because newspaper employees work on a wide variety of tasks and can have very different backgrounds, Russo (1998) writes that the newsroom is a place where
studying identification is particularly relevant. Pollard (1995) supports this position, writing that journalists must always contend with two different sources of guidance--their profession and their employing organization. There is another group of employees in newspapers whose loyalties also may be similarly divided, advertising sales personnel. This group is vital to newspapers, under-studied and involved in an intricate relationship with editorial employees. Through work experience in a newspaper organization, the author became cognizant of the fact that editorial and advertising coworkers may have different perspectives, evidenced by an interdepartmental relationship sometimes marked by conflict.

During the author’s time working for the newspaper studied, the interdepartmental communication between advertising employees and editorial employees was sometimes characterized by disagreements. The author’s curiosity concerning the organizational communication environment in newspapers led to research which indicated that divergent identifications may be the root of apparent value differences between members of these two departments. The author suspected a side-by-side comparison of these employees’ attitudes might help explain some of the ideological conflict witnessed. No past studies have compared the attitudes of these two groups of employees. Accordingly, this thesis examines why newspaper journalists are likely to hold multiple, competing workplace identifications, then turns to advertising employees in an attempt to understand how their potential identifications affect interactions with their editorial counterparts.
Russo (1998) argues that newspaper journalists are appropriate subjects for studying multiple identifications, because their loyalties are frequently divided between two potentially competing sources of direction, the profession and the organization. Each of these directing sources is a powerful attractor for journalists’ loyalty, each encompassing unique values and methods which can conflict with the other’s, profoundly impacting newsworkers and their employing organizations (Pollard, 1995). In fact, Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman (1976) found discrepancies between pre-work expectations and organizational realities to be the most common cause of dissatisfaction in young, activism-oriented journalists. Such findings exist because professional values are ingrained in many journalists before they ever begin working.

Becoming a journalist today practically requires a bachelor’s degree, and a majority of journalists major in mass communication or communication programs (Weaver, Beam, Brownlee, Voakes & Wilhoit, 2006). In these majors, students are attenuated to the beliefs, values, and practices of their profession (Russo, 1998). For this reason, Russo (1998) describes newspaper journalists as good examples of “knowledge workers” employees whose specialized work requires lengthy education or training (Halal, 1996, p. 13, see also Drucker, 1993). Because of the long periods of time knowledge workers spend on pre-work training, they frequently come to identify with their occupation before joining an organization (Russo, 1998). The ingrained importance of this initial relationship causes knowledge workers to refer to themselves primarily as
members of their profession, even after beginning their careers (Drucker, 1993). For these reasons, Russo hypothesized that newspaper journalists are likely to identify more strongly with their profession than their organization.

Though the professional role may be paramount in the minds of knowledge workers, as Russo (1998) posits, such employees also need to be affiliated with organizations in order to engage in the practices of their profession (Drucker, 1993). This situation has been especially true for journalists, whose labors have traditionally required the platforms media organizations provide (Russo, 1998). Therefore, the organization and profession are involved in a complicated and mutually necessary arrangement in the work lives of journalists (Pollard, 1995). An analysis of empirical research indicates that any potential disparity between journalists’ professional and organizational identifications likely results from the degree to which their employing news organization hampers or facilitates their professional mission.

While journalists require organizations to enact their duties, the degree to which news organizations facilitate journalists’ professional desires varies. When news organizations facilitate journalists’ work by giving them the freedom and resources necessary to perform their duties, journalists’ sense of professionalism is enhanced and they are more content in their labors (Pollard, 1995, Weaver et al. 2007). When journalists feel their employing organizations are restricting their autonomy and the resources they need to create a robust news product, these workers are less satisfied and more likely to leave the field (Weaver et al. 2007).
As both satisfaction and intent to leave an organization have been shown to be related to identification (Pollard, 1995, Miller, Allen, Casey, & Johnson, 2000), an analysis of how these factors interact encourages the formation of a hypothesis concerning the relative strength of journalists’ affiliations with their profession and employing organizations. The evidence seems to strongly indicate that news organizations making the task of gathering and disseminating news a top priority and placing emphasis on performing this duty in a high-quality fashion will have more satisfied journalists. Satisfaction is both an antecedent and a consequence of identification (Dutton et al. 1994), so it seems logical to assume that highly satisfied journalists will identify more strongly with their organizations than less satisfied journalists. However, some news organizations are perceived as being oriented toward profits first, high-quality news second. Journalists working for media outlets so oriented are less satisfied (Weaver et al. 2007) and thus likely to identify less strongly with their organizations than satisfied journalists. From this analysis, we glean that news organizations optimally fulfilling journalists’ professional expectations are likely to invite identifications on par with journalists’ attachment to their profession. Conversely, news organizations perceived as having a profits-first orientation will be at a disadvantage in terms of securing journalists’ loyalty. For these reasons, a logical proposal is that journalists’ professional identifications tend to be equal or stronger than their organizational identifications.

Because journalists are likely to hold competing identifications, and because these identifications are not completely understood, Russo (1998) measured the strengths
of one newspaper’s journalists’ identifications with both profession and organization. The journalists Russo surveyed identified significantly more strongly with their profession than their organization. This finding supported her arguments implying that journalists adhere to the professional model of occupational socialization (Kronus, 1976), which states that values learned in pre-work training last a lifetime for professionals, allowing them to resist organizational pressures to change their values. Weaver’s et al. (2007) nationwide survey of journalists provides empirical support for this position; journalist respondents indicated that training has greater influence on their conceptions of newsworthiness than other referent groups, including coworkers, supervisors and news sources. However, in Russo’s study respondents’ identification levels with both profession and organization were high. This finding reinforces her argument that both entities are important to journalists because journalists require an affiliation with both to fulfill their “calling” (DeLorme & Fedler, 2005, p. 30), yet also confuses the issue of which entity is more central to journalists’ self-concepts.

Russo (1998) writes that evaluating and comparing newspaper journalists’ concurrent identifications could produce findings with broad application, because many types of organizations have employees who manage these kinds of identity conflicts. According to Drucker (1993), the proportion of knowledge workers in the world will continue to increase markedly in the early 21st Century, so workers dealing with competing identifications will likely become an increasingly common phenomenon, thus enhancing the importance of investigations into how multiple identifications affect workers. Russo’s study was a one-time sampling of the attitudes of one newspaper
organization’s employees, so we cannot generalize from its findings. In order to solidify knowledge in this area, Russo recommends that other scholars examine identification levels of journalists at other newspapers. This thesis attempts to answer Russo’s call. It revisits her quantitative techniques in order to strengthen the foundation of journalist case studies for future scholars to utilize in a larger study capable of producing confirmatory data. Russo’s argument that journalists’ professional values influence the strength of their identifications is reinforced by empirical findings, including her own. Thus, the present investigation attempts to further knowledge in this area by testing the following hypothesis:

\[ H_1: \text{The journalists working for this newspaper organization will identify more strongly with the journalism profession than with their employing organization at a significance level of } p = .05. \]

Besides replicating Russo’s (1998) measurement of journalists’ identifications at a different newspaper, this thesis extends exploration of identifications in newspaper organizations by examining a second group of newspaper employees. Russo’s research, like most studies of news organizations, does not take into account a vital component of newspapers, the advertising department.

**Advertising Employees: Overlooked, but Crucial to Newspapers’ Success**

Pokrywczynski and Crowley (1997) call advertising employees in journalism organizations a special subsection of a sparsely studied occupational field, writing that despite the uniqueness of advertising work, the industry “seems to be a neglected pocket”
These scholars compared job satisfaction in newspaper advertising departments with similar data from past studies of newspaper editorial departments, advocating that future studies examine these departments simultaneously using similar measures and sampling procedures. This thesis attempts just such a feat in regard to identification, a communication construct closely related to job satisfaction (Miller et al. 2000).

Newspaper advertising employees present many unique elements worthy of examination (Pokrywczynski & Crowley, 1997). Further, the interdepartmental relationships they share with their editorial coworkers call for further research (DeLorme & Fedler, 2005), as do the effects of departmentalization on identification generally (Bartels, 2006). Typical of organizational members whose departments handle different tasks (Reichers, 1985), editorial and advertising employees’ interests sometimes conflict (Pokrywczynski, & Crowley, 1997), a situation possibly indicative of dissimilar identifications. While advertising departments feature a variety of different roles, selling advertising space seems to be advertising’s most important objective. Advertising sales personnel bring in necessary revenue, so newspaper publishers are very concerned about them (Rodman, 2006). Pokrywczynski and Crowley (1997) attest to the importance of newspaper advertising salespeople, measuring their satisfaction levels and comparing them to those of editorial employees. This division of employees seems especially interesting to the author of this thesis, as during his newspaper employment he witnessed advertising sales coworkers expressing dissatisfaction at times in their interactions with editorial employees. Because advertising salespeople are under-studied, at times have
conflict with editorial employees, and are a driving force of newspaper advertising departments, this thesis aims to discover how these workers identify through the following exploratory research question: RQ: How strongly do advertising salespeople at this newspaper organization identify with their employing organization, profession and department?

The Historical Relationship of Newspapers’ Advertising and Editorial Departments

Newspapers’ editorial and advertising departments share a long-standing, complex, and symbiotic relationship, according to Delorme and Fedler (2005), who only recently pioneered exploration into the historic roots of journalists’ attitudes toward advertising and its influence. Though employees in these departments have disparate goals and “different people to please” (Pokrywczynski & Crowley, 1997, p. 146), most parties agree the work of both departments is essential to the success of any newspaper (Agnew & Dygert, 1938), as well as other modern media formats such as magazines and radio stations (Rodman, 2006).

In regards to the necessity of editorial contributions, the public desires information; journalists fill that need. These complementary interests create the newspaper, a space where advertising can be profitably placed. Thus, journalists’ efforts produce an occupational niche for advertising workers. Due to journalists’ traditional objectivity and disinterest in participating in business, they do not wish to be involved in the selling or creation of advertising (Blythe, 1912, Compaine & Gomery, 2000), and so leave that work to others.
Though newspaper advertising salespeople require journalists’ efforts for their field to exist, advertising also plays a pivotal role in keeping newspapers solvent and effective (Agnew & Dygert, 1938). Since 1950, advertising revenue has accounted for more than half of newspapers’ total income, so papers can be sold for less than the cost of production (Delorme & Fedler, 2005). The ad-driven model of newspapering benefits both readers and journalists, as newspapers without advertising would either be significantly more expensive (Ogilvy, 1964), or able to cover only a small amount of news due to lack of capital. Either scenario damages journalists’ mission of informing the public on the most important issues of the day. If newspapers were too pricey, only the wealthy could afford them, and journalists would not be serving the majority of society. If newspapers had only small pools of capital, they would be able to employ few journalists and cover few stories. For these reasons, journalists benefit from advertising employees’ labors and accept the presence of advertising in their finished products (DeLorme & Fedler, 2005). Though newspaper journalists accept advertising’s presence, they detest its influence. Editorial employees are usually purposefully separated from advertising employees to keep editorial content objective (DeLorme & Fedler, 2005). Because the two groups of employees have little contact with each other, they do not spend much time learning to understand each other, a dynamic which may play a role in journalists’ decidedly negative views of advertising and its practitioners.

The nation’s earliest journalists viewed their work as more important to newspapers’ success and prestige than the work of other departments, and tended to view themselves as having more integrity and being more noble and pure than “anyone
associated with advertising” (DeLorme & Fedler, 2005, p. 7). These attitudes clearly must have encompassed journalists’ counterparts in newspaper advertising departments. For example, a noted advertising practitioner recalls how a former editor of The New Yorker lost no opportunities to “belittle” the employees he labeled “ad-men” (Ogilvy, 1964, p. 155). The reasoning behind these haughty attitudes seems to lie with journalists’ perceptions of their own work and that of advertising employees. Journalists believe “they serve their readers and communities, whereas advertising personnel are interested only in money” (DeLorme & Fedler, 2005, p. 7). The idea that these workers serve different interests—journalists the altruistic goal of serving the public and advertising personnel the self-interested goal of collecting profits—relates to their identifications.

The fact that the professional goal of serving the public takes precedence for journalists over organizational directives concerning profits is well documented, supporting Russo’s (1998) argument that journalists tend to identify more strongly with their profession than their organization, as she found in one newspaper. While not much is known about newspaper advertising personnel, Pokrywczynski and Crowley (1997) speculate that these employees’ satisfaction would likely increase if business interests were perceived as primary in the organization’s values, a perspective oppositional to journalists’. Although advertising workers in newspapers are more business-oriented than journalists, which entity they feel the most allegiance to is not clear. While little research has been done on advertising workers’ identifications per se, much has been written concerning the degree of professionalism present in the advertising field and whether or not the field qualifies as a profession. By comparing journalists and advertising
practitioners in terms of professionalism, we can gain insight into the identifications of members of both of these occupational groups, as an emphasis on professionalism is likely related to professional identification.

Comparing Editorial and Advertising Personnel in Terms of Professionalism

Both advertising practitioners and journalists are white-collar workers who aspire to be labeled professionals (Lynn, 1974, Elsaka, 2005) and attain the accompanying respect and recognition. The term “profession” can be used colloquially as a synonym for occupation, describing a full-time activity from which people can earn a living, partly defined by its recognizable body of knowledge, judgment, and skill (Davis, 2004). However, scholars disagree on the matter of what exactly defines a profession (Davis, 2002). Several perspectives on what constitutes a profession exist, including traits-based and power approaches. While scholars using these more popular approaches tend to disqualify both journalism (Elsaka, 2005) and advertising (Lynn, 1974) from professional standing, a philosophical perspective on professionalism exists, based on the service of moral ideals, in which journalism could qualify (Davis, 2004).

Some scholars state that professions should serve certain functions or goals, or ideals necessary to the accomplishment of those ends. Davis (2002) believes that for an occupation to be a profession, it must serve a moral ideal. This moral ideal approach incorporates one sociological trait considered common to professions, what Lynn (1974) labels concern “for society above and beyond personal gain” (p. 13). In Davis’ (2002) words, professionals must have ethical codes requiring them to conduct themselves to a
standard higher than what laws, market dynamics and common decency require. From this approach to professionalism, journalism has an advantage over advertising and other for-profit fields, in that its pro-social aspects are more readily ascertained.

While the advertising industry seems to exist to make money for its clients and practitioners, a true profession must have as its primary purpose “something more than benefiting its members”: a moral ideal, according to Davis (2002, p. 6). A moral ideal is one that rational people, at their rational best, would support and be willing to sacrifice for (Davis, 2002). One goal people almost unanimously support is public service. Though Davis (2002) posits that public service is not the only acceptable ideal professions can serve, he argues that possessing this type of goal is an acceptable criterion for professional status. While advertising has enormous potential to serve the public (Keane, 1974), advertising practitioners do not have above-average concern for the general populace (Lynn, 1974). Though advertising campaigns can serve the public good, such as campaigns against vices (Keane, 1974), the majority of advertising practitioners’ energy is funneled into campaigns to enhance private entities’ profitability. Sometimes practitioners are even upset when predicted hardships do not befall the public (Lynn, 1974).

Conversely, public service has long been ingrained into the mission of journalists (Russo, 1998). Stepp (1995) describes altruism’s importance to journalists, stating that “social responsibility has long been a cherished value, public dependence has been an article of faith” (p. 18). This vision journalists hold “of themselves as a kind of chosen tribe” (Stepp, 1995, p. 18) and “keepers of a noble flame” (p. 16) is a powerful
one, shared by many members of the public, scholarly community and journalists alike.
Because of these attitudes, Davis (2004) argues that journalism can indeed be a profession, because “facilitating public discussion and engagement is a good thing,” one that would be considered a moral ideal by rational people (p. 218). As long as journalists voluntarily agree to abide by ethical codes serving this ideal, which he writes that they basically do, then the field can be considered a profession.

So, according to opinions proffered by the public, scholars, journalists and some advertising practitioners, advertising does not fulfill the moral standards required of professions. This opinion is not in comparison to journalism, but on the field’s own merits. Meanwhile, the public and academia have tremendous respect for the work that journalists do. It is true that journalism cannot match the traits associated with traditional professions, fields such as medicine and law that are unquestionably regarded as professions due to traits such as licensure for practice, member organizations that regulate the field and high salaries. Yet the public places such a premium on journalists’ services that the field is considered to have professional responsibilities, even though it does not rival the professionalism of such other fields. Because a perspective exists in which journalism could be considered a profession that disallows granting the same status to advertising, one would expect these opinions to affect workers in these fields.

The effects of these common attitudes on newspaper employees’ identifications can be surmised, but have not been empirically researched. Dutton et al. (1994) posit a positive relationship between employees’ conception of their organization’s image among non-members and their own organizational identification.
Smidts et al. (2001) found that employee communication affects organizational identification and also found, as Dutton et al. (1994) postulated, a positive correlation between perceived external prestige of an identification target and a person’s identification with that target. So, outsiders simultaneously disparaging the field of advertising employees and praising the cause of journalists likely affect these employees’ occupational identifications. These voices, from inside and outside both professions, state that advertising practitioners are not noble and that their services are not borne from a desire to serve the public, while simultaneously speaking to the virtues of journalists’ work. Thus, advertising workers in newspapers labor next to coworkers whose efforts are deemed more socially responsible, and perhaps more important, than their own. While neither field fulfills traditional expectations of what determines a profession, more respect is given to journalism, considered a sine qua non of democracy, than to advertising, a field held in disfavor by the public (Keane, 1974). Due to expressed, contrasting conceptions of these two fields, journalists likely take greater pride in their occupation because of its long tradition of professionalism than do advertising practitioners. These differences in perceptions of professionalism likely express themselves as differences in professional identification.

The way one feels about one’s field affects the degree to which that field is considered a primary component of one’s self-image. As such, Russo (1998) postulated a link between feelings of professionalism and professional identification. Most scholars agree that autonomy is a principal component of professionalism (Russo, 1998). In Russo’s study, autonomy correlated positively and significantly with both organizational
and professional identification, empirically linking professionalism to identification for
newspaper journalists. Russo also found autonomy to correlate positively and
significantly with job satisfaction, as did Weaver et al. (2007) for journalists generally.
Job satisfaction has been linked theoretically to identification (Cheney, 1983) and is
considered both an antecedent and consequence of identification (Dutton et al. 1994).
These findings portray relationships between these constructs signifying that newspaper
employees who are allowed to be as professional as they wish, as a result of organizations
granting them autonomy, are more satisfied with their work and more likely to identify
with both organization and profession. This line of argument coincides with previously
mentioned findings that journalists are most satisfied and intent on remaining in their
field when their organization helps, rather than hinders, the fulfillment of their
professional mission. Pollard (1995) found that for many journalists, there exists a
simultaneous decline in professionalism, job satisfaction and intent to remain in the field.
These findings, in toto, demonstrate the importance of professionalism to journalists, and
the strong effects that professionalism has on their identifications.

In summary, popular conceptions of the advertising and journalism
occupations favor journalism in terms of professionalism. Researchers have shown that
outsiders’ perspectives on potential identification targets’ prestige affect individuals’
social identifications, meaning these opinions are likely to affect the attitudes of
employees in these fields. Finally, professionalism has been empirically linked to
identification and related constructs for journalists. Thus, when comparing journalists and
advertising workers, we are likely to find that journalists more strongly identify with their
profession than do advertising workers. This reasoning results in the following hypothesis:

\[ H_2: \text{The journalists at this newspaper will identify more strongly with the profession of journalism than the newspaper’s advertising account executives will identify with the profession of advertising sales, at a significance level of } p = .05. \]

Summary

Russo (1998) found significant differences between journalists’ professional and organizational identifications, though both values were strong. This thesis builds on Russo’s argument to advance a hypothesis testing her findings at a different newspaper:

\[ H_1: \text{The journalists working for this newspaper organization will identify more strongly with the journalism profession than with their employing organization at a significance level of } p = .05. \]

Further, this thesis collected data on a newspaper’s advertising personnel, a group the attitudes of which are not well researched. An exploratory research question investigates these workers’ identifications: \text{RQ: How strongly do advertising salespeople at this newspaper organization identify with their employing organization, profession and department?}

After considering the historical relationship of advertising and editorial departments, and journalists’ attitudes toward advertising practitioners, the author determined that differences in professionalism may exist. These differences likely result
in differing degrees of professional identification, as detailed in the study’s second hypothesis:

\[H_2: \text{The journalists at this newspaper will identify more strongly with the profession of journalism than the newspaper’s advertising account executives will identify with the profession of advertising sales, at a significance level of } p = 0.05.\]

The present study examines perspectives of both journalists and advertising salespeople within a newspaper organization, utilizing the identification construct in order to gain insight into attitudes that may be related to ideological conflicts between these employees. The author used quantitative methods to gather data on editorial and advertising employees at one Northern California, mid-sized daily newspaper. In the following chapters, the methodology the author used is detailed, the results of the survey are explained and the implications of the results discussed.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The following chapter explains the steps the researcher took in gathering and analyzing data for this thesis. A narrative description is provided so that future scholars wishing to understand or replicate the techniques used herein may do so.

Measurement of Variables

This thesis compared a newspaper’s advertising salespeople and editorial employees. The independent variables were departmental membership and demographics. Employees’ departmental statuses were determined from the company’s organizational chart, which was available online. Demographics were collected through questionnaire items that measured organizational and professional tenure, gender, age, degree of education, work title and supervisor status within the organization [Appendix B].

Respondents were compared in terms of the strength of their organizational, professional and departmental identifications. These attitudes were measured using modified versions of the Organizational Identification Questionnaire (OIQ) developed by Cheney (1982), after he thoroughly examined previous instruments that measured identification and related concepts (Bullis & Tompkins, 1989). An identification is defined here as an external entity that is considered a part of one’s self-concept; stronger
identification means increased centrality of the entity for the individual. These values, represented by OIQ scores, are the dependent variables under study. The original, 25-item OIQ [Appendix F] has consistently shown high levels of internal reliability since its creation (Rubin, Palmgreen, & Sypher, 1994). In its earliest studies by Cheney (1982, 1983), the OIQ proved highly reliable, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .94, matched by Bullis and Tompkins’ (1989) use of the instrument. Russo (1998) reports Potvin’s study of three organizations with an overall Cronbach’s alpha of .96 as a further example of the original scale’s reliability.

Each item in the OIQ is a statement with which respondents are instructed to indicate their level of agreement. These statements are designed to tap into the three distinct aspects of social identification isolated by Patchen (1970) and refined by Cheney (1982): feelings of similarity (“In general, the people employed by The Paper are working toward the same goals”), membership (“I often describe myself to others by saying, ‘I work for The Paper’ or ‘I am from The Paper’), and loyalty (“I would probably continue working for The Paper even if I didn’t need the money’}. Early scale testing of the OIQ revealed that these three components of identification operate as a single dimension (Cheney, 1982). When responses to these sentiments are combined, they illustrate an entity’s importance to one’s self-concept.

Each item is followed by a Likert-type scale allowing respondents to circle one of seven options presented in this fashion: YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!. Each possible response is connected to a symbolic value ranging from agree very strongly to disagree very strongly; the key linking responses to their values is presented at the
beginning of the questionnaire. Response scores are compiled by assigning each item-response a point value, from 1 point for NO! (disagree very strongly) to 7 points for YES! (agree very strongly). Some items are reverse coded, such as “I feel very little loyalty to The Paper,” and are scored accordingly.

OIQ scores are calculated by assessing a total, sum-item score, or a mean-item score. Calculating a respondent’s total score on a scale involves summing the responses for each item. In this manner, a respondent could score between 20 and 140 (20 questions multiplied by the minimum-item value of 1 or the maximum-item value of 7). Because this work is closely patterned after Russo’s (1998) study, which used the 140-point sum-item scale, total scores are presented in the Results section. However, some identification researchers, such as Bullis and Tompkins (1989), use a mean-item score, dividing the sum score by the total number of items. Mean-item scores range from 1.0 to 7.0 (sum-item range of 20 to 140 divided by 20, the number of items). Both types of scores are presented in table form, allowing comparison to studies using the mean-item score, such as Barker and Tompkins (1994), whose tables serve as the basis for tables in this study.

Instrument Customization

This case study uses modified versions of the OIQ to collect quantitative data on a work population’s identifications with multiple targets. Originally, the OIQ had been primarily used to measure a person’s level of identification with one particular target, usually the organization, according to Barker and Tompkins (1994), who adapted the questionnaire into two scales to measure individuals’ identification levels “with two
targets simultaneously” (p. 227). This technique allowed Barker and Tompkins “insight into the relative effectiveness” of multiple entities’ attempts at encouraging member identification, the organization and work teams in that particular study (p. 227). Since then, Scott (1996) used modified OIQs to measure four workplace identifications for geographically dispersed government employees, as did Russo (1998) to measure newspaper journalists’ identifications with both organization and profession.

Russo (1998) and Barker and Tompkins (1994) reduced the number of items from the OIQ’s original 25. Russo reduced the number of items to 20 because 5 of them could not be logically rephrased from their original organizational orientation to a professional orientation. Barker and Tompkins had to make the scale even smaller due to time constraints placed on the researchers, creating a 33-question instrument measuring both organizational and work team identification. When the OIQ is adapted to measure attachments to multiple entities, the items are altered, but presented in a parallel fashion. These items relate to different entities but are worded similarly, as seen in these sample items from the instruments used in this thesis:

- I am glad I chose to work at The Paper rather than another organization.
- I am glad I chose to work in my department rather than another.
- I am glad I chose to work in journalism rather than another profession.
- I am glad I chose to work in advertising sales rather than another profession.

Russo’s (1998) modified versions of the OIQ both had a .92 Cronbach’s reliability coefficient. Barker and Tompkins’ (1994) modified version had a .939
Cronbach’s reliability coefficient. Such scores are more than adequate proof that the scale is robust and can maintain its high levels of reliability even when modified.

Numerous scholars have successfully employed the OIQ (Cheney, 1983, Tompkins & Cheney, 1983, Bullis & Tompkins, 1989, Scott, 1996); Cheney estimates that more than 250 studies have utilized it (personal communication, 2005). Cheney (1983) found content validity for the instrument through respondents’ feedback on the instrument’s items and correlations between 14 of the 25 items and a general question asking if respondents identified with their organization (Rubin et al. 2004). Barge and Schlueter (1988) write that Cheney’s research supports the OIQ’s predictive validity, a point addressed by Potvin who found composite OIQ scores to have a significant, negative Pearson coefficient correlation with employees intentions to search for other jobs (Rubin et al. 2004).

Concerning construct validity, the OIQ has been shown to have convergent validity, but not discriminant validity. Potvin found OIQ composite scores to highly correlate with responses to the most widely used organizational commitment questionnaires (Rubin et al. 2004), attesting to its convergent validity. However, the OIQ’s similarity to measurements of commitment is considered a limitation of the instrument by some (Miller et al. 2000), who argue that the instrument’s derivation of items from commitment measures shows that it actually measures commitment, not identification. This argument is somewhat supported by Rubin et al. (2004), whose review of research concerning the instrument leads them to write that discriminant validity of the OIQ has not been credibly established. This statement implies that the
instrument may not be sufficiently dissimilar from measurements of other constructs, most likely organizational commitment. This concern is addressed in the Limitations section of this thesis’ Discussion chapter.

The external validity of the OIQ in this study is verified by the fact that the respondents represented almost the entire population under study: the advertising and editorial employees of this newspaper. Although the results cannot be generalized to other newspapers, the responses are representative of the population studied.

**Questionnaire Development**

The author developed the questionnaires for this study by contacting Russo and acquiring the modified OIQ and professional identification scales used in her research (1998) to make the findings comparable. The text of the questionnaires was then adapted for the particular organization studied. Following the work of Barker and Tompkins (1994) and Russo, the author adapted the OIQ for this study into unique versions measuring employees’ identification with separate targets—the employees’ organization, department and profession. The professional and organizational questionnaires are virtually identical to Russo’s, with only cosmetic changes made [see Appendix A]. In this study, the scales measuring organizational, professional, and departmental identification had Cronbach’s alphas of .756, .852, and .812 respectively. Rust and Cooil (1994) write that most social scientists follow the reliability standards provided by Nunnally (1978). Nunnally writes that Cronbach’s alpha coefficients above .70 are acceptable for preliminary research on predictive measures and experimental testing of construct measures, while alphas above .80 are appropriate for beginning
research. For applied research, such as situations in which results affect important personnel decisions, Nunnally cautions that measures’ alphas must be at least .90. Because this study is in an early experimentation phase and the OIQ has not been used extensively to measure professional and departmental identification, the reliability levels of these instruments for the purposes of this study are acceptable.

Pilot Study

The instrument was refined through a pilot study at the student-run newspaper of the author’s university. Three volunteers each were recruited from the newspaper’s advertising sales and editorial departments. Respondents were asked to respond to items on a pilot version of the instrument as if they were being surveyed, then provide feedback. The verbal requests were basically the same [Appendix E]. The instrument was somewhat tailored to these student volunteers, as their organization was the name of the organization in the questionnaire text.

The volunteers were able to easily understand the instructions of the questionnaire, ensuring that the study’s respondents would be able to complete their versions without difficulty. The pilot test took the students roughly the same amount of time the author estimated it would (about 15 minutes or less), validating the instructions provided with the final instrument concerning its likely duration.

Pilot testers also offered feedback that was used to modify the final versions of the instruments. While most of the students’ feedback consisted of confusion concerning the applicability of questions that made more sense in a professional organization than they did in a student organization, such as issues concerning pay and careers, useful feedback was given concerning the layout of the questionnaires.
Participants and Procedures

Respondents

Participants in the study were employees of a Northern California daily newspaper organization in the 25,000 to 75,000 circulation range that has only one main office. All 30 of the on-site editorial employees agreed to participate in the survey and 8 of the 9 advertising sales department members agreed (one account executive refused), resulting in 38 self-administered survey questionnaires being distributed. All employees who agreed to participate in the survey returned a questionnaire.

All participants indicated gender: 22 males and 16 females. All respondents indicated professional tenure and all but two indicated organizational tenure (88%). The mean length of employment with the organization was 8.3 years and the median 4.7 years \((SD = 9.1\) years). The mean length of employment within one’s profession was 13.1 years and the median 8.1 years \((SD = 11.8\) years). A majority of the respondents (76%) reported they had no supervisory responsibilities, while 23% \((n = 9\) reported some supervisory responsibilities. The mean age was 43.5 years and the median 42.5 years \((SD = 12.5\) years). All employees reported the level of education they had completed. Most (84%) held at least a bachelor’s degree. Possessing a bachelor’s degree was the modal response \((n = 21, 55\%)\), only 4 of 38 employees reported less education (11%). Nine employees reported some advanced degree work (24%) and 2 reported having completed an advanced degree (5%). For editorial employees, reporter was the most common position \((n = 16\) , with 10 employees reporting editor duties, including 4 as copy editors.
and 1 as photo editor. All 8 advertising employees listed themselves as account executives.

Administration of Questionnaire

Prior to the distribution of questionnaires, verbal consent had been given by the newspaper’s publisher, editor (editorial department supervisor), and advertising director (advertising department supervisor). Written consent was later collected from the same three individuals. During this preparatory period, paperwork was filed with the Human Subjects Committee at the author’s university, which gave clearance to proceed with the study. In order to prepare employees for the arrival of the researcher, a brief explanatory e-mail was sent to each department head to be forwarded to the appropriate employees [Appendix D]. A week later, the researcher began distributing the questionnaires by hand to employees.

At the moment each respondent verbally consented to take part in the study, he or she was given a questionnaire; 38 were distributed. The researcher’s conversation with each organizational member was basically similar, though unscripted. He explained the general purpose of the research, ensured respondents their identities would remain confidential and thanked employees for participating.

Employees were told their responses would never be connected to their identities by their employing organization or readers of the published research. However, in written information respondents received, both in an email before the survey was received and in a cover letter with the email, the author mistakenly described the questionnaire responses as “anonymous” [See Appendices C and D]. In point of fact,
responses were confidential, not anonymous. Only the researcher had access to data linking respondents to questionnaires, ensuring confidentiality, but not anonymity. This aspect of the study was explained verbally to respondents who inquired about the identification numbers on the questionnaires. The researcher, for purposes of completing data collection, linked each employee to his or her questionnaire through a unique identification number. The numbers were sequentially assigned to each questionnaire and divided by department signifiers. Each employee’s name was recorded at the time the questionnaire was given to that employee. Only the researcher had the information linking each employee to her or his survey. The data have been appropriately safeguarded from the organization that employed the respondents and the links between respondent and responses will be destroyed after completion of all data analyses, including analyses in a planned future survey. The methods by which employees’ anonymity would be maintained was stressed in each questionnaire’s cover letter, along with other important information.

The cover letter was the first page of the each questionnaire [Appendix C], and included with each questionnaire was a stamped return envelope addressed to the researcher. Besides assuring respondents of their anonymity in the study, the cover letter introduced the researcher, explained possible benefits and risks of involvement in the study, listed contact information for the author and chair of the study, and described ways respondents could return the questionnaire. As previously explained, the cover letter’s functions were in a way redundant because the letter’s content was explained verbally by the researcher to potential respondents while consent was being secured. Note that these
transactions were facilitated by the fact that most of the subjects were familiar with the researcher from his previous employment with the organization. Another feature of the cover letter was an empty line upon which the date that the survey was to be returned by was recorded.

The researcher discussed with each subject a mutually agreed-upon date by which the questionnaire would be completed. Some employees took longer than the agreed-upon length of time to complete the questionnaire; such respondents were called by telephone on their office extensions and visited in person until such time as a completed questionnaire was returned. Employees were free to fill out the questionnaire at their convenience in whatever setting they chose, and management had implied that completing the questionnaire during work hours was acceptable. Due to the repetitive nature of the question sets, the questionnaires could easily be completed within 10 to 15 minutes, which was explained by the researcher verbally and in the cover letter.

While all respondents had the option of returning questionnaires by mail, the researcher returned to the organization regularly to collect completed questionnaires, and the majority of questionnaires were collected in person by the researcher (28) as opposed to being returned by mail (10). So, approximately 98% of the target population’s members agreed to complete a questionnaire (38/39), and 100% of the employees who agreed to participate returned their questionnaire. If one question was left blank, the author contacted the respondent to gain the answer through phone calls where the question and its scoring system were explained and the response was recorded. For one subject who missed a significant portion of questions, the questionnaire was placed in the
subject’s work mailbox, and then later collected from the same place. Another respondent felt uncomfortable answering a demographic question concerning organizational tenure, due to fears of being identified. When the researcher explained the importance of having this response for the purpose of categorizing responses by tenure, the respondent decided to offer a figure that was not exactly accurate, but placed the respondent in the correct tenure category.

Four weeks after data collection began, a small number of survey responses were still not completed, including two professional tenure questions, one organizational identification item and one professional identification item. Because this missing data was not critical to the planned analyses, the data matrix was finalized. However, when missing responses were identification scale items, answers were created from a person’s average response score for each individual scale. This process is known as “mean imputation” or “mean substitution” (Newton & Rudestam, 1999, p. 159). For example, if a subject left one entry on the professional identification scale blank, that subject’s mean score for the remaining professional identification items was substituted in place of the blank entry. The substituted values were then used in subsequent analyses.

Toward the end of the collection process, the author began coding completed surveys’ responses and entering them into the data processing program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows. After questionnaires were no longer being collected, the author compared the data collected with survey responses to double-check for accuracy, and then the data were analyzed. All significance tests used an alpha criterion of $p < .05$. Newton and Rudestam (1999) write that the level of
significance means the level of risk that any differences between means found occurred solely as a result of chance. A significance level of .05 means that the probability of attaining any differences found in the results purely by chance is (in the long run) 5 in 100. This minimum $p$ value is suggested by convention as a level of significance which is acceptably strict in barring insignificant results from being treated as significant, but also not “too difficult to achieve” (Newton & Rudestam, 1999, p. 65). The results of the data analysis are detailed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter describes the results of the study, including statistical analysis of survey data. Multiple pair-wise comparisons tests are reported. Mixed factorial analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to examine both a between-groups factor (comparing advertising and editorial employees) and a within-subjects factor (each member’s score on each of the identification scales). This study had two hypotheses and one research question. Post-hoc data analyses are also reported.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that this newspaper’s journalists would identify more strongly with their profession than with their employing organization, while the null hypothesis states that any differences in these journalists’ identifications will not be statistically significant:

H1: The journalists working for this newspaper organization will identify more strongly with the journalism profession than with their employing organization at a significance level of \( p = .05 \).

Fail to reject \( H_0 \): if differences in identification between professional and organizational targets are not significant, \( p > .05 \).
A simple paired $t$ test comparison within the main effects Repeated-Measures ANOVA was used to test the research hypothesis against the null hypothesis; these results are presented in Table 1. The simple main effects for journalists’ identification scores did not show significant differences. Therefore, the research hypothesis was not confirmed, but the data showed a non-significant trend in the predicted direction.

Journalists surveyed ($n = 30$) identified more strongly with their profession ($\bar{x}_P = 101.2$, $SD = 16.0$) than with their organization ($\bar{x}_O = 93.6$, $SD = 14.9$), but this difference was not quite statistically significant ($p = .056$). Therefore, the results fail to reject the null hypothesis and the research hypothesis cannot be accepted.

Table 1
Mean Differences in Organizational, Professional, and Departmental Identification by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Workers Mean $n=38$ (SD)</th>
<th>Editorial Workers Mean $n=30$ (SD)</th>
<th>Advertising Workers Mean $n=8$ (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum / Mean</td>
<td>Sum / Mean</td>
<td>Sum / Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational $^a$</td>
<td>91.3 / 4.57</td>
<td>93.6 / 4.68</td>
<td>82.6 / 4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>(15.9) / (.80)</td>
<td>(14.9) / (.75)</td>
<td>(17.7) / (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional $^a$</td>
<td>100.6 / 5.03</td>
<td>101.2 / 5.06</td>
<td>98.4 / 4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>(16.1) / (.80)</td>
<td>(16.0) / (.80)</td>
<td>(17.4) / (.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental $^a$</td>
<td>100 / 5.00</td>
<td>101 / 5.05</td>
<td>96.1/ 4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>(15.6) / (.78)</td>
<td>(14.6) / (.73)</td>
<td>(19.8) / (.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partial $\eta^2$ (effect size)</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p(F)^b$</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Both total-sum scores and mean-item scores are presented.

$^a$ All Groups ANOVA results $p > .05$, ns

$^b$ Simple Main Effects of Within Group Factor (c.f. findings of Barker and Tompkins, 1994)
**Research Question**

The Research Question sought to discover information about how members of this newspaper’s advertising department identify with relevant work targets: RQ: How strongly do advertising salespeople at this newspaper organization identify with their employing organization, profession and department? Mixed Factorial ANOVAs examined simple main effects for advertising employees and found significance; these scores are presented in Table 1. The simple main effects for advertising employees’ identification scores showed significant differences. The advertising account executives surveyed identified significantly more strongly with their profession ($\bar{x}_p = 98.4$, $SD = 17.4$) than with their employing organization ($\bar{x}_o = 82.6$, $SD = 17.7$), with a large effect size ($F_{(1, 7)} = 12.929$, $p = .009$, $\eta^2 = .649$).

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 stated that this newspaper’s editorial employees would identify more strongly with their profession than the newspaper’s advertising account executives would identify with their own profession, while the null hypothesis states that any differences in these employees’ identifications will not be statistically significant:

$H_2$: The journalists at this newspaper will identify more strongly with the profession of journalism than the newspaper’s advertising account executives will identify with the profession of advertising sales, at a significance level of $p = .05$.

Fail to reject $H_0$: if differences in professional identification between journalists and advertising account executives are not significant, $p > .05$
A series of one-way ANOVAs compared editorial and advertising employees’ identification scores, which are presented in Table 1. The main effect did not yield significance. The second hypothesis was not confirmed, as journalists’ professional identification ($\bar{x}_P = 101.2, SD = 16.0$) was not much stronger than advertising employees’ ($\bar{x}_P = 98.4, SD = 17.4$), and the difference was not statistically significant ($p = .67, ns$). Therefore the results fail to reject the null hypothesis and the research hypothesis cannot be accepted.

**Further Analysis**

Mixed Factorial ANOVAs treated the newspaper employees as one group to check for differences on the main effect of identification, which collapses across groups, and another interesting relationship was found besides those hypothesized. A series of one-way ANOVAs for each of the identification scores was conducted for the variables of professional tenure, organizational tenure and departmental membership (advertising or editorial). A significant effect was found concerning the collapsed group of employees’ scores, as the strengths of respondents’ departmental identifications varied based on organizational tenure. These scores are presented in Table 2. The employees fell roughly into three groups of organizational tenure—short-term, mid-term and long-term. Short-term employees had been with the organization for fewer than 3 years, mid-term employees for 3 to 7 years and long-term employees for more than 7 years. The post-hoc Scheffé test on the one-way ANOVA comparing organizational tenure with departmental identification showed that long-term employees identified with their department significantly more strongly ($\bar{x}_D = 108.5$) than did mid-term employees ($\bar{x}_D = 91.4$), with a small effect size ($F_{(2, 33)} = 4.09, p = .031, \eta^2 = .199$). All other comparisons were non-significant.
Table 2

Mean Differences in Organizational, Professional and Departmental Identification by Organizational Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Workers Mean</th>
<th>Short-Term Workers Mean</th>
<th>Mid-Term Workers Mean</th>
<th>Long-Term Workers Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum / Mean</td>
<td>Sum / Mean</td>
<td>Sum / Mean</td>
<td>Sum / Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. a</td>
<td>91.2 / 4.44</td>
<td>89.8 / 4.49</td>
<td>84.2 / 4.21</td>
<td>95.7 / 4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>(16.1) / (.81)</td>
<td>(17.5) / (.88)</td>
<td>(16.4) / (.82)</td>
<td>(10.8) / (.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. a</td>
<td>100.8 / 5.04</td>
<td>104.6 / 5.23</td>
<td>92 / 4.60</td>
<td>102.5 / 5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>(16.3) / (.82)</td>
<td>(16.8) / (.84)</td>
<td>(17.0) / (.85)</td>
<td>(13.9) / (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. *</td>
<td>99.7 / 4.99</td>
<td>97.5 / 4.88</td>
<td>91.4 / 4.57</td>
<td>108.5 / 5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>(15.8) / (.79)</td>
<td>(16.1) / (.81)</td>
<td>(14.7) / (.74)</td>
<td>(13.0) / (.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partial $\eta^2$</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Both total-sum scores and mean-item scores are presented.

a Between Groups ANOVA results $p > .05$, ns

b Simple Main Effects of Within Group Factor

* Between Groups ANOVA results $F(2, 33) = 4.09, p < .05$
(c.f. findings of Barker and Tompkins, 1994)
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Implications

Russo’s (1998) finding supported her contention that newspaper journalists may consider themselves journalists first, and employees of a certain organization second. The differences between identification levels of journalists in this thesis were not statistically significant, thus were inconclusive and do not lend support to Russo’s ideas. However, the trend of the scores was in the direction of Russo’s findings and approached significance, so the findings do not challenge her arguments. Though analyses of editorial employees’ responses did not yield significance, the responses of advertising personnel in this study and statistical analyses involving editorial and advertising employees treated as one group of subjects yielded statistically significant findings. These results provide some background to the author’s initial quest to understand possible roots of conflict between these two groups of coworkers.

The researcher was surprised to learn that the advertising department employees in the study reported identifying significantly more strongly with their profession than their organization. The author operated under the assumption that newspaper salespeople had much less pre-service training than newspaper journalists. If this assumption is true, advertising employees would seem unlikely to be indoctrinated
with professional ideals contradicting organizational communications. Therefore advertising employees would seem likely to identify more strongly with their place of employment than their particular field of employment. Further, this thesis’ arguments concerning advertising’s lack of professional recognition indicated that the profession would not hold a very strong attraction for its practitioners because it is looked down upon by outsiders. This perspective would seem especially strong when practitioners make the inescapable contrasts with their editorial coworkers, who are widely viewed as altruistic, and thus could be perceived as more professional. These lines of argument are not supported by this study’s findings. The author can think of several potential reasons for this fact.

First, perhaps the advertising employees at this organization have more pre-service training than the author speculated. In order to learn more about this possibility, the author examined advertising respondents’ professional and organizational tenure to check for any differences indicative of pre-employment training in the profession. Three of the account executives had spent practically their entire time in the profession at this organization and one employee had been with the organization for a year before entering this particular field. Four had spent years in the advertising field before joining this organization, 3, 4, 7 and 17 years, in fact. While this study did not investigate how much training these employees had in their fields before joining any organization, what is clear is that four of the eight surveyed had spent quite some time in the field before joining this particular newspaper.
A second possible reason for this thesis’ arguments proving unsound could be that these advertising practitioners may have higher opinions of the professionalism of their own work than argued for by this thesis’ treatment of available scholarly literature. Reasons for this discrepancy could be that the opinions of outsiders are not as negative toward advertising as literature reviewed in this thesis suggests, these alleged opinions do not affect newspaper advertising salespeople as strongly as surmised, or these workers may not associate themselves with the negative connotations of the advertising industry as a whole. Much research has shown that people generally do not trust the ethics of advertising practitioners (Hunt & Chonko, 1987). As Keane (1974) puts it, “Whether deserved or not, advertising as an institution is held in low public esteem” (p. 6). However, these particular advertising practitioners may feel somewhat disassociated from the maligned industry because of their incorporation into the more altruistic newspaper industry. Perhaps they believe their practices are more ethical than advertising practitioners’ oft-criticized campaigns, which were described by a majority of college students in Haller’s (1974) study as “irritating, misleading, unnecessary, and insulting to their intelligence” (p. 33). The employees at this newspaper are not designing ad campaigns to enhance the profits of multinational corporations. They are simply filling advertising space with somewhat benign material that often supports local interests, which may be regarded as a somewhat altruistic act, at least by the employees and their clients. Most important from an academic perspective, the advertising account executives studied were shown to have strongly held professional identifications,
refuting this thesis’ specific arguments concerning their attitudes but reinforcing its argument that these employees belong to a labor sector worthy of more attention.

Also, though results of journalists’ self-reported data were inconclusive, this finding concerning advertising employees at this newspaper addresses the author’s initial interest in the subject groups: a desire to discover the attitudes at the root of their occasional interdepartmental conflicts. For the advertising employees studied, the profession of advertising is more important than the particular organization they work for. Therefore, these members are not likely to regard their organization as the most important disseminator of decision-making premises, per the perspective on identification developed by Simon (1997/1945) and refined by Cheney and Tompkins (1987). During instances of interdepartmental disagreement, profession-first attitudes may come sharply into focus. These advertising employees seem unlikely to ask themselves what is best for the organization, but rather what a typical member of their profession would consider most important. Assuming the interests of advertising and editorial employees are contrary at times, as literature indicates (Pokrywczynski & Crowley, 1997, Russo, 1998, DeLorme & Fedler, 2005), these professional orientations set the stage for enduring friction between advertising and editorial employees. Such a scenario seems especially likely if editorial employees are similarly more strongly professional identified, as Russo’s (1998) results suggest.

The other statistically significant finding in this study concerned the newspaper’s employees treated as one group. Analyses of the survey data showed that long-term members of the organization identified significantly more strongly with their
department than did mid-term members. Interestingly, short-term workers and long-term workers had higher identification scores than mid-term workers in regard to every target measured--organization, department, and profession. Though only one of the relationships was statistically significant--long-term workers’ departmental identification compared to mid-term workers’--these results suggest that mid-term employees in this study are the members who may be drifting from the organization, their department or their profession altogether. This finding could prove insightful for leaders at this organization, but also complements findings of past studies of editorial workers.

Though readers must be cautioned that the results of journalists’ questionnaires did not produce significant findings, this concept of newsworkers becoming increasingly distanced from their organization and field after a handful of years has been found in other studies. Johnstone et al. (1976) found that journalists between the ages of 25 and 34 years old were most likely to consider exiting the field. This age group would seem to correspond more with the middle-tenure group (3 to 7 years in organization) than with other tenure groups in this thesis’ results, considering that most respondents had college degrees. Johnstone et al. (1976) also found that young, highly educated journalists oriented toward participant journalism were the most dissatisfied with their jobs. These results mirror Pollard’s (1995) finding that journalists with higher levels of professionalism quickly become dissatisfied with their jobs, leaving the field after a few years. These types of employees would also probably fall into this thesis’ mid-tenure group.
For advertising employees, Pokrywczynski and Crowley (1997) found that the youngest third of their sample, ages 19-32, were the least satisfied with their jobs. The most significant factor of job satisfaction for these employees concerned “their pride, loyalty and enthusiasm about coming to work every day” (p. 152), qualities clearly related to identification. As organizational is negatively related to intent to leave the organization and positively related to job satisfaction (Johnstone et al. 1976, Miller et al. 2000), waning identification of members is a trend organizations should be concerned about. Pokrywczynski and Crowley (1997) impress the importance of attending to younger employees’ attitudes by explaining that newspaper managers will necessarily base future success on this age group. This thesis’ results, coupled with previous journalist studies, seem to indicate that news organizations, or at least this newspaper organization in particular, should be most concerned with maintaining a positive attitude toward work life and the organization among employees who have been with the organization for more than a few years, but who are not yet veterans of the news industry.

Also possible is that individuals in the early stages of their careers are considering departing their fields, regardless of what field is examined. Thus, the tenure-related findings in this study may be explained by characteristics of age cohorts. This perspective seems supported by the fact that the tenure-related finding in this study is based on treating the newspaper employees as a single group, and so finding speaks more to identification generally than to newspaper organizations in particular. Still, the
results provide another interesting bit of information in the quest to understand the relationship between tenure and identification.

Researchers have long hypothesized a positive, linear relationship between organizational tenure and organizational identification. However, Cheney (1983) cautions scholars against assuming such a relationship, noting that the relationship between organizational tenure and organizational identification is quite complicated and that attempts to confirm such a correlation have had mixed findings. Likewise, Bartels (2006) writes that past studies of the relationship of these two constructs have been inconclusive. The findings in this thesis, though non-generalizable, suggest a nonlinear relationship between departmental identification and organizational tenure at this particular organization. In fact, the results imply the intriguing possibility of a somewhat curvilinear relationship between tenure and identification, as work identifications start fairly high in this organization, dip somewhat after a few years, then become especially strong after about 7 years. The author offers a possible rationale for this interesting trend: new hires in fields considered exciting, such as the newspaper industry, are likely enthusiastic just to be a part of the profession and on board with the organization, and thus quickly form bonds with available targets of identification, such as their departmental coworkers. Employees who have long committed their careers to working in their respective departments have moved past any reservations they may have had concerning their chosen vocation and have come to identify quite strongly with their departments.
While this case study’s findings cannot be generalized to other newspaper organizations, the findings could be utilized by organizational leaders at the newspaper studied. As reported, advertising account executives at this newspaper identify significantly more strongly with their line of work than their employing organization, and the editorial employees identify in a similar direction, though the findings are statistically non-significant for the journalists. Because these employees seem to identify in similar fashions, some common ground may exist for them to be led to explore. For instance, one potential interdepartmental issue is that account executives may be seen as occasionally colluding with advertising clients in an attempt to influence journalists’ coverage patterns, yet journalists likely do not attempt to influence account executives’ work decisions. Exposure to the finding that both groups at this organization feel more strongly allied with their profession than their organization might help the employees come to respect each other’s professional guidelines and see that they are not as different from each other as they might think.

Directions for Future Research

This case study somewhat illuminates the attitudes of editorial and advertising employees at one newspaper, yet these groups’ interdepartmental dynamics, frequently based on opposing interests, are still very much in need of examination.

Though the hypothesis that journalists would identify significantly more strongly with their profession than with their organization was not confirmed, the relationship appears to be worthy of further investigation. Surveying more than one
newspaper at a time could yield increased statistical significance and generalizable data, as larger sample sizes reduce sample error. In this respect, this thesis could be seen as a pilot project. The small sample sizes in this research resulted in a lack of power for the statistical tests performed. Future research should gather respondents from a random sample from cross sections of the total population of newspaper organizations, controlling for variables such as location, circulation and staff size. These employees should then be randomly sampled to determine if Russo’s (1998) finding is idiosyncratic to the particular work environment she studied. Weaver et al. (2007) hope that the nationwide studies of media employees they continued from Weaver and Wilhoit (1991, 1996) in the tradition of Johnstone et al. (1976) will continue. If such studies included an identification scale, such as the OIQ, communication theory could be incorporated into the vast amount of information gathered in such studies. Surveying employees’ attitudes that reflect on communication theory would seem a constructive addition to the highly useful attitudinal and demographic data sampled in these seminal studies.

This thesis’ finding that advertising sales employees’ identify significantly more strongly with their profession than with their organization merits further investigation. This measurement could be idiosyncratic, but also possible is the idea that salespeople generally are more committed to their profession than their organization. Further, more research in general should be done on these hard-working employees whose efforts are crucial to the success of news-media organizations. Finally, another issue was presented by various people consulted with concerning the profession of this distinctive group of employees. Specifically, the author designed the questionnaire to
measure how strongly these employees identified with the profession of advertising sales, yet they may identify simply with the profession of sales, rather than advertising sales in particular. Studies conducted after this one should dig more deeply into this area, discovering exactly what advertising salespeople consider their profession to be.

When dealing with the semantics of professional identification, another issue comes into play. After consideration of the words used in this thesis and its questionnaire, the author realized that scholars use the terms “professional identification” to mean “occupational identification.” Any employee can identify with her or his occupation, regardless of whether or not it is considered a profession by interested parties. The authors’ use of the word “profession” in the measurement instruments may have affected responses of individuals who do not consider their field a true profession. Some employees of both departments surveyed likely fall into this category, as debates over professionalism have been held for many decades concerning both fields. Subsequent investigations into the feelings of professionalism of newspaper employees in both editorial and advertising departments may help flesh out interesting differences in these workers’ perspectives.

Should future research continue to examine the identifications of advertising and editorial employees in newspapers, it would be useful to use more complex designs than the one used in this study. Cheney (1983) urges scholars to not only view identification as a state to be measured, but as a process. To this end, future identification scholars should use mixed methodologies to measure identification, both quantitative and qualitative, as Russo (1998) did. Scholars should follow the suggestion of Cheney and
seek verbal accounts from newspaper employees on how they believe their identification has been inculcated. Such investigation could capture the nuances and relative effectiveness of different methods of strengthening identification employed specifically in the unique business environment of newspaper organizations.

Organizational leaders should also be interviewed to learn which identification-building strategies are consciously being exercised, as Cheney writes that all organizational communication, both purposeful and unintentional, affects employee identification. The more research that is conducted on methods of building identification, the more efficient organizational identification conscription methods can become. Increasing understanding of how to strengthen organizational members’ identifications would allow news organizations to become more effective at their public service function, and assist other organizations in improving the commitment and satisfaction levels of their members.

Another important aspect of identification to attend to in research is its temporal nature. Though case studies provide useful data, one-time data samplings are less-than-ideal. While a common type of research in the publish-or-perish world of academia, one-time samplings yield less theoretical or practical significance than do longitudinal studies. Cheney (1983) found previous identification research deficient because researchers were treating the concept solely as a state, a characteristic of an individual, rather than a process through which individuals and organizations exercise mutual influence. Taking multiple “snapshots” would increase understanding of the complex phenomena studied here.
Capturing the momentary states of identification of employees of a newspaper’s editorial and advertising departments has somewhat enlightened us as to how these organizational members feel about themselves and their respective roles. However, it will not, without additional prompting, inform us as to how the members feel about their counterparts. Of particular concern to this researcher is the degree of cross-departmental identification within a newspaper organization. Cheney (1983) describes identification as oppositional to “alienation” (p. 362). Thus, when studying which groups people identify with, researchers may pass over which groups they do not identify with, and more importantly, why they do not identify with those groups. Future research in this area should measure for cross-departmental identification of employees and the sources of such attitudes, possibly using open-ended questions concerning individuals’ attitudes toward other groups.

Limitations

Being a case study, this research examined only one organization. Russo (1998) writes that case studies provide depth, but one of their limitations is that we cannot know to what degree the findings “would be replicated in other newspapers with different histories and context or with a different population of journalists” (p. 103). Clearly we cannot generalize from the findings of only two case studies, this thesis and Russo’s examination of one newspaper organization. Further, the organization studied was a small one, thus the sample size “limits the conclusiveness” of the quantitative data (Barker & Tompkins, 1994, p. 233), as significance is more difficult to attain with small
sample sizes (Newton & Rudestam, 1999). Future studies with larger samples may be able to obtain significance where this case study could not. Also, a one-time sampling of data delivers only a “snapshot” of an organization at one point in time; longitudinal samplings would be preferable.

As for the data gathering method used, survey data based on self-reports can be biased to portray an idealized image. Sometimes respondents seek to provide the response they think researchers want and avoid portraying themselves or their employing organizations in a negative light, a phenomenon known as social desirability bias. To block such an occurrence, every attempt was made by the researcher to explain that the data collected would be used for scholarship purposes, not to negatively alter organizational life for the respondents. Respondents were assured that management did not conceive the study and that individual responses would not be reported to management; therefore, there was no reason to exaggerate responses in a positive fashion. Further, because confidentiality was stressed above all else, employees should have felt free to be honest in their responses.

Another potential issue with the survey is that the instrumentation’s design may have influenced a similarity in identification scores (Russo, 1998). Specifically, the questions designed to measure identifications with each target were of a parallel design, which may have caused respondents to answer similarly for each target (Russo, 1998). In order to mitigate this possibility, pre-survey communication from the researcher to respondents, in interpersonal conversations, a mass e-mail, and the questionnaire’s cover letter, conveyed the idea that respondents’ feelings toward different entities were to be
measured. This pre-survey communication should have helped respondents understand that each section of the questionnaire covered different identification targets, and that employees’ attitudes toward each were to be considered independently. Another limitation of the measurement process was that each questionnaire measured organizational, professional and departmental identification in the same order. So, the ordering of sections may have affected respondents’ answers in favor of a certain target.

Any methodology has limitations; sole reliance on quantitative methods was itself a limitation of this study. Scholars debate the merit of using only a single questionnaire to measure communication in organizations. Some, such as Downs (1988), recommend supplementing questionnaires with qualitative data collection methods such as interviews. These methods of “triangulation” allow for a more in-depth view of the phenomenon studied; several instruments are designed to be supplemented by other such forms of data (Rubin et al. 2004, p. 73). In fact, Cheney never intended for the OIQ to be used without supplementation by qualitative interview data (Miller et al. 2000). Cheney writes that “paper-and-pencil measures,” while uncovering considerable information about a respondent at one time, provide scant opportunities for comprehending complex, “individual-organizational” relationships (1983, p. 345). Both Cheney (1982) and Russo (1998) both correlate interview quotations with individuals’ OIQ scores to give a more complete picture of the identifications of individual respondents, a technique the author of this thesis would like to have incorporated. However, quantitative methods may have been superior to qualitative data collection methods in this particular research because of the author’s relationship with respondents. As stated previously, the author was a former
member of both departments studied and had thus formed relationships with most of the employees surveyed. These relationships could have biased interview responses in myriad ways. Employees may have wanted to avoid any negative information getting back to their coworkers through the author, or they may have interpreted the author’s purpose and attempted to produce useful answers—a behavior known as demand characteristics.

Scholars interested in pursuing the line of inquiry of this thesis might want to utilize interview questions the author considered asking these subjects. Such questions would be designed to investigate employees’ attitudes toward other newspaper departments and understandings of those departments’ functions and contributions to the overall organization. Further, the author was informed by employees in informal conversations that income disparities between departments may have caused employees to hold negative feelings toward each other, this assertion would be investigated. Finally, the author’s preliminary research and questionnaires did not ascertain the differences in educational and training background of newspaper journalists and advertising salespeople generally, or these workers in particular. Questions addressing the way education and training histories affect identifications would be very useful in future studies.

Besides any issues with the methodology of using multiple OIQs of parallel construction, Miller et al. (2000) argue that the OIQ itself is actually not a valid measure of identification, but actually measures affective organizational commitment, the degree to which employees have positive, negative, or neutral feelings toward the organization. Miller’s et al. analysis that the OIQ’s items do not represent identification as
operationalized by Cheney (1982), Cheney and Tompkins (1987), Simon (1997/1945) and Burke (1937) are convincing. Further, other scholars disagree with Cheney and Tompkins’ (1987) perspective on identification, such as Ashforth and Mael (1989), who argue for a re-conceptualization of identification that encompasses only feelings of intertwined fates or group membership, and removes any emotional features that had traditionally been tied to the construct. Also, Miller et al. (2000) write that only one previous study, Johnstone et al. (1976), had reported reliabilities of the OIQ used to measure organizational identification over time. Thus, in order to further examine the instrument, researchers may want to revisit populations of previous studies and re-administer the OIQ.

The debates over what exactly identification is and how it is different from commitment are long-standing ones unlikely to be immediately resolved. Because defining and measuring the construct of identification is a contentious issue, future scholars researching the concept may want to juxtapose multiple tests of identification to search for valid construct measures worthy of standardization. If a consensus is reached that the OIQ in fact does not measure identification, but rather a broad form of commitment, than past studies should be reinterpreted. Further, organizational communication studies should be designed to investigate the differences between identification and affective commitment, as conceptualized by various scholars. Including measures of other related constructs, both complex ones and simpler indicator variables, such as job satisfaction, intent to leave, role ambiguity, etc., would inform researchers as to how these constructs interact and which are more closely related to outcome variables.
For example, organizational identification might be more closely linked to intent to remain in the organization than organizational commitment, while affective commitment might be more closely linked to job satisfaction than identification. The target of these feelings, whether it be profession, organization, department, or some other entity further complicate research in this area. A variety of complex studies are needed to determine how affective organizational commitment and organizational identification are both similar and different, and which other constructs are involved in these complex interplays of individuals’ experiences within organizations.

Conclusions

While the findings of this study were not monumental, they do build on the foundation laid by Russo (1998) and call attention to an under appreciated field of employees. Now that two case studies have examined journalists’ identifications, future studies will be more informed about journalists’ identifications, which appear to favor the profession over the organization, though this thesis neither supported nor refuted that claim. Further, the author hopes that future scholars will continue to examine the perspectives of newspaper advertising salespeople, who seem to identify similar to journalists, with their job first and their company second. Finally, the somewhat curvilinear relationship between organizational tenure and identification found in this study may inform future scholars attempting to better understand the complicated relationship of these two characteristics of organizational members.
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APPENDIX A
Modified OIQs used in this study. [NOTE: The organizational name in the survey instruments is replaced with The Paper for purposes of anonymity. Also, in the original, double-sided versions, items 1-8 fit on the front, 9-20 on the back].
Organizational Identification survey instrument

Instructions: Think of your role as an employee of The Paper.

For each item below select the answer that best represents your belief about or attitude toward The Paper. Please respond to all items. The responses are:

YES! I agree very strongly with the statement.
YES I agree strongly with the statement.
yes I agree with the statement
? I neither agree nor disagree with the statement.
no I disagree with the statement.
NO I disagree strongly with the statement.
NO! I disagree very strongly with the statement.

After reading each statement, please circle your response.

1. I would probably continue working for The Paper even if I didn't need the money.

   YES!    YES    yes    ?    no    NO    NO!

2. In general, the people employed by The Paper are working toward the same goals.

   YES!    YES    yes    ?    no    NO    NO!

3. I am very proud to be an employee of The Paper.

   YES!    YES    yes    ?    no    NO    NO!

4. The Paper’s image in the community represents me as well.

   YES!    YES    yes    ?    no    NO    NO!
5. I often describe myself to others by saying, "I work for The Paper" or "I am from The Paper."

   YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

6. I try to make on-the-job decisions by considering the consequences of my actions for The Paper.

   YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

7. We at The Paper are different from others in our field.

   YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

8. I am glad I chose to work at The Paper rather than another organization.

   YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

9. I talk up The Paper to my friends as a great company to work for.

   YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

10. In general, I view The Paper’s problems as my own.

    YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

11. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help The Paper be successful.

    YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

12. I become irritated when I hear others outside The Paper criticize the company.

    YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

13. I would be quite willing to spend the rest of my career with The Paper.

    YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

14. The record of The Paper is an example of what dedicated people can achieve.

    YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!
15. I have a lot in common with others employed by The Paper.
   YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!  NO!

16. My association with The Paper is only a small part of who I am.
   YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!  NO!

17. I find that my values and the values of The Paper are very similar.
   YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!  NO!

18. I feel very little loyalty to The Paper.
   YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!  NO!

19. I find it easy to identify with The Paper.
   YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!  NO!

20. I really care about the fate of The Paper.
   YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!  NO!
Professional Identification survey instrument for journalists

Instructions: Think of your role as a journalist.

For each item below select the answer that best represents your belief about or attitude toward the profession of journalist. Please respond to all items. The responses are:

- YES! I agree very strongly with the statement.
- YES I agree strongly with the statement.
- yes I agree with the statement
- ? I neither agree nor disagree with the statement.
- no I disagree with the statement.
- NO I disagree strongly with the statement.
- NO! I disagree very strongly with the statement.

After reading each statement, please circle your response.

1. I would probably continue working as a journalist even if I didn't need the money.
   
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

2. In general, journalists are working toward the same goals.
   
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

3. I am very proud to be a journalist.
   
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

4. The image of journalists in the community represents me as well.
   
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

5. I often describe myself to others by saying, "I am a journalist."
   
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

6. I try to make on-the-job decisions by considering the consequences of my actions for the profession of journalists.
   
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
7. We journalists are different from other working people.
   YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!

8. I am glad I chose to work in journalism rather than another profession.
   YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!

9. I talk up journalism to my friends as a great profession.
   YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!

10. In general, I view problems in journalism as a whole as my own.
    YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!

11. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the profession of journalism be successful.
    YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!

12. I become irritated when I hear others outside the profession criticize journalism.
    YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!

13. I would be quite willing to spend the rest of my career as a journalist.
    YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!

14. The record of journalism is an example of what dedicated people can achieve.
    YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!

15. I have a lot in common with other journalists.
    YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!

16. My association with journalism is only a small part of who I am.
    YES!  YES  yes  ?  no  NO  NO!
17. I find that my values and the values of other journalists are very similar.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

18. I feel very little loyalty to the profession of journalism.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

19. I find it easy to identify with the profession of journalism.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

20. I really care about the fate of journalism in America.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
Professional Identification survey instrument for advertising sales representatives

Instructions: Think of your role as an advertising sales representative.

For each item below select the answer that best represents your belief about or attitude toward the profession of journalist. Please respond to all items. The responses are:

YES! I agree very strongly with the statement.
YES I agree strongly with the statement.
yes I agree with the statement
? I neither agree nor disagree with the statement.
no I disagree with the statement.
NO I disagree strongly with the statement.
NO! I disagree very strongly with the statement.

After reading each statement, please circle your response.

1. I would probably continue working in advertising sales even if I didn't need the money.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

2. In general, sales reps are working toward the same goals.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

3. I am very proud to be a sales rep.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

4. The image of sales reps in the community represents me as well.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

5. I often describe myself to others by saying, "I am a sales rep."
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

6. I try to make on-the-job decisions by considering the consequences of my actions for the profession of advertising sales.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
7. We sales reps are different from other working people.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

8. I am glad I chose to work in advertising sales rather than another profession.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

9. I talk up advertising sales to my friends as a great profession.
   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

10. In general, I view problems in advertising sales as a whole as my own.
    YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

11. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the profession of advertising sales be successful.
    YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

12. I become irritated when I hear others outside the profession criticize advertising sales.
    YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

13. I would be quite willing to spend the rest of my career as a sales rep.
    YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

14. The record of advertising sales is an example of what dedicated people can achieve.
    YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

15. I have a lot in common with other sales reps.
    YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

16. My association with advertising sales is only a small part of who I am.
    YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
17. I find that my values and the values of other sales reps are very similar.

YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

18. I feel very little loyalty to the profession of advertising sales.

YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

19. I find it easy to identify with the profession of advertising sales.

YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

20. I really care about the fate of advertising sales in America.

YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
Departmental Identification survey instrument
[Note: the blank line in item 5 was filled in with the appropriate department name for respondents]

Instructions: Think of your role as a member of your department.

For each item below select the answer that best represents your belief about or attitude toward the profession of journalist. Please respond to all items. The responses are:

YES! I agree very strongly with the statement.
YES I agree strongly with the statement.
yes I agree with the statement
? I neither agree nor disagree with the statement.
no I disagree with the statement.
NO I disagree strongly with the statement.
NO! I disagree very strongly with the statement.

After reading each statement, please circle your response.

1. I would probably continue working in my department even if I didn't need the money.

   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

2. In general, people in my department are working toward the same goals.

   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

3. I am very proud to work in my department.

   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

4. The image of my department in the community represents me as well.

   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!

5. I often describe myself to others by saying, "I work for The Paper’s _______ department."

   YES! YES yes ? no NO NO!
6. I try to make on-the-job decisions by considering the consequences of my actions for my department.

   YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

7. Employees of my department are different from other working people.

   YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

8. I am glad I chose to work in my department rather than another.

   YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

9. I talk up my department to my friends as a great place to work.

   YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

10. In general, I view problems in my department as my own.

     YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

11. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help my department be successful.

     YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

12. I become irritated when I hear others outside my department criticize it.

     YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

13. I would be quite willing to spend the rest of my career in my department.

     YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

14. The record of my department is an example of what dedicated people can achieve.

     YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!

15. I have a lot in common with other people in my department.

     YES!   YES   yes   ?   no   NO   NO!
16. My association with my department is only a small part of who I am.
YES!       YES       yes       ?       no       NO       NO!  

17. I find that my values and the values of others in my department are very similar.
YES!       YES       yes       ?       no       NO       NO!  

18. I feel very little loyalty to my department.
YES!       YES       yes       ?       no       NO       NO!  

19. I find it easy to identify with my department.
YES!       YES       yes       ?       no       NO       NO!  

20. I really care about the fate of my department.
YES!       YES       yes       ?       no       NO       NO!
Demographics questions included with all questionnaires distributed for thesis. [Note: The name of the organization is replaced here with The Paper.]

Demographic Questions

The following questions are for classification purposes only. Remember, individual responses will be combined with responses of other survey participants and reported as averages.

Gender: Male / Female

Birth Year: ________

How long have you worked at The Paper?: _____Years _____Months

Current position at The Paper: _______________________________

How long have you worked in this profession? ___Years __Months

Do you supervise any employees at The Paper? Yes / No

What is the highest level of education you’ve obtained? [Check one]:

☐ Some high school

☐ High school graduate

☐ Some college, no degree

☐ Associate degree, occupational

☐ Associate degree, academic

☐ Bachelor’s degree

☐ Some advanced degree work, no degree
☐ Master’s degree (MS, MA, MBA, etc.)

☐ Professional degree (J.D., LL.M., etc.)

☐ Doctorate degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)

Thank you for your time! Please return the survey in the envelope provided.
Cover sheet to survey instrument for newspaper organization

DATE RECEIVED: DATE TO RETURN:

PURPOSE: The research being undertaken in your organization is designed to help the researcher learn more about the degrees to which journalists and advertising sales representatives identify with The Paper as an organization and their respective professions and departments. The findings should extend previous research on the subject as well as fill gaps in understudied areas of research.

CONSENT: I agree to be part of a study conducted for William Kelvin, a graduate student in Communication Studies at California State University, Chico. I understand that I will complete a survey and that the duration of my participation will be from 15 to 20 minutes, and all or part of the information gathered during this time may be used in his graduate thesis and/or for other informational or educational articles and papers.

Results of this survey will be analyzed by computer to produce statistics. I give my consent for this information to be used for this purpose. I also understand that these questionnaires will be destroyed upon completion of his thesis. In addition, I understand my name will not appear on these forms, thus assuring complete anonymity. Information linking survey responses to individuals will be destroyed upon return of completed questionnaires. The links between surveys and individuals are present only to allow the researcher to keep track of which employees have filled out surveys and which must be reminded of their agreement to participate.

A benefit this study may result in is insight into relationships and processes in my workplace. I also may consider information that may enhance the quality of my life. Though there are no physical risks involved in this study, I am aware that if I feel uncomfortable answering any questions raised in this survey, I may choose not to participate. I understand that my participation is voluntary, and refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled, and I may discontinue participation at any time.

DIRECTIONS: Questionnaires are to be filled out and returned to the researcher in the self-addressed, stamped envelopes provided, or hand-delivered to the researcher who will be visiting the premises regularly. There are three double-sided pages and a final page to be filled out in the questionnaire; there is no need to return this consent form. The return address you use may be your home address or your work address, or any address you feel comfortable with, but please use one so that non-delivered questionnaires can be kept
track of. For issues about the questionnaire of for replacement materials, the researcher can be contacted by phone at (530)891-9828 or by e-mail at wkelvin@mail.csuchico.edu.

For further questions about this project you may contact the chair of the researcher’s thesis committee, Dr. William Todd-Mancillas in the Communication Arts and Sciences Department at CSU, Chico at (530)898-5751. Thank you for your time.
Hello [newspaper’s name] employees, my name is Bill Kelvin and I have been given permission to distribute surveys for member of the editorial and retail advertising departments to fill out and return for my thesis, which will help me complete my master's degree in communication studies.

Participation is voluntary, and the survey is brief; it should only take you 15 to 20 minutes. Your responses will be anonymous, once a questionnaire has been returned no one will be able to link your responses to you. Responses will be combined when reported, so readers of the thesis will not be able to connect any one's responses to his or her individual identity.

The study is on the strengths of employees’ identifications with their organization, profession and department. “Identification” consists of feelings of similarity, membership and loyalty.

There will be an envelope for you to send the questionnaires back to me, or you can hand them to me when I visit the office during afternoons. I appreciate your participation. As a former staff writer and advertising sales clerk, I identify with the work that you all do, those experiences spurred my interest in this subject.

- Bill Kelvin
Script for attaining orally informed consent for pilot study on identification

“Hi, my name is Bill Kelvin and I’m working on a thesis for my master’s degree in Communication Studies. I will be studying member identification with organization, profession and department in a journalism organization.

This survey is a pilot version of the instrument I will be giving to a different organization. I’m hoping to refine the instrument through your insights in this pilot study. Your participation is voluntary, anonymous, and there will be no penalty to you should you choose not to participate or to stop at any time. There is no anticipated risk or benefit to participating. The survey should take 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

You must be 18 to participate. If you are not yet 18, please do not take the survey. Please don’t write your name on the survey. The findings may supplement my thesis and future educational articles and papers, but this research is mainly preliminary. By taking this survey you confirm your consent to participate.”
APPENDIX F

The response scale appears after each statement in the original OIQ.

Organizational Identification Questionnaire

Instructions: Think of your role as an employee of Organization. For each item below select the answer that best represents your belief about or attitude toward Organization. Please respond to all items. The alternative responses are:

YES! I agree very strongly with the statement.
YES I agree strongly with the statement.
yes I agree with the statement.
? I neither agree nor disagree with the statement.
no I disagree with the statement.
NO I disagree strongly with the statement.
NO! I disagree very strongly with the statement.

After reading each item carefully, please circle your response. _______

1. I would probably continue working for ______ even if I didn't need the money.
2. In general, the people employed by ______ are working toward the same goals.
3. I am very proud to be an employee of _______.
4. ______’s image in the community represents me as well.
5. I often describe myself to others by saying, “I work for _______” or “I am from _______.”
6. I try to make on-the-job decisions by considering the consequences of my actions for _______.
7. We at _______ are different from others in our field.
8. I am glad I chose to work at _______ rather than another company.
9. I talk up _______ to my friends as a great company to work for.
10. In general, I view ______’s problems as my own.
11. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help ______ be successful.
12. I become irritated when I hear others outside _______ criticize the company.
13. I have warm feelings toward _______ as a place to work.
14. I would be quite willing to spend the rest of my career with _______.
15. I feel that ______ cares about me.
16. The record of _______ is an example of what dedicated people can achieve.
17. I have a lot in common with others employed by _______.
18. I find it difficult to agree with _______’s politics on important matters relating to me.
19. My association with _______ is only a small part of who I am.
20. I like to tell others about projects that _______ is working on.
21. I find that my values and the values of _______ are very similar.
22. I feel very little loyalty to _______.
23. I would describe _______ as a large “family” in which most members feel a sense of belonging.
24. I find it easy to identify with _______.
25. I really care about the fate of _______.