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ABSTRACT

An Organizational Communication Analysis of a Medium-Size Newspaper

A medium-size newspaper in Central Florida was observed for 8 weeks in the Spring and Summer of 1976 and 58 employees interviewed to determine internal communication patterns and measure attitudes toward the communication system, organization and job related variables. A systems theory of organizations provided basic theoretical assumptions.

Since communication activities occur within the framework of internal organization elements such as structure, objectives, leadership style, reward system, technology, intergroup relations, and individual employee characteristics, those elements were described. Communication activities were reported in terms of message purpose, network traversed, method of diffusion and relationships.

Findings indicated that the nature and technology of the organization were more important predictors of communication activities than other elements. Messages were primarily task related, diffused both horizontally and vertically over formal and informal networks. The method of diffusion was primarily oral in face to face dyadic or small group situations. Analysis of attitudinal data indicated that communication satisfaction was the most important predictor of organization and job related attitudes. Persons occupying the lowest levels in the organizational hierarchy were the most negative about the communication system and were least involved in it. Persons occupying the upper levels were the most positive about the system and were the most involved in it. A factor analysis of the attitudinal data revealed 14 factors to be considered in future research.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Communication occurs when there is human interaction. The process and the effects of communication have been systematically studied in a variety of interaction contexts. One context that has recently become the focus of systematic study is the formal organization. Hicks (1972) offers the definition of a formal organization.

A formal organization has a well defined structure that may describe its authority, power, accountability and responsibility relationships. The structure can also define the channels through which communications flow. Formal organizations have clearly specified jobs for each member. The hierarchy of objectives ... is explicitly stated. Status, prestige, pay, rank and other perquisites are well ordered and controlled. Formal organizations are durable and planned. ... Membership is gained consciously at a specific time, and usually openly. (p. 14)

Formal organizations have been classified into four broad areas by Katz and Kahn (1966) according to the function they perform in society. The type of organization this study describes falls under the productive/economic classification. Such an organization creates wealth, manufactures goods, and/or provides services for the general public. The production organization may perform primary, secondary or tertiary activities. The
organization this study describes performs both secondary and tertiary activities of manufacture, processing, service and communication. A newspaper organization is the focus of this study.

Communication processes within newspaper organizations have received little attention. Most newspaper research has dealt with minority representation in the newsroom (Lublin, 1972a; Lublin, 1972b; McCall, 1974), newsroom decision making (Bowers, 1967), characteristics of editors (Chang, 1975; Wilhoit & Drew, 1972), and the socialization of reporters (Breed, 1952). However, newspapers are becoming more centralized and bureaucratized (Johnstone, 1976); reporters are demanding a greater voice in decision-making processes (Bissland, 1975; DeMott, 1973; Diamond, 1970; Nelsen, 1973); journalism as a profession is being debated (Hill, 1975; LeRoy, 1973); advanced technology and automation are changing newsroom behaviors (Barrier, 1974; Wilken, 1975). Although the effect of organizational constraints on communication patterns was noted by Johnstone (1976) and Argyris (1974), the systematic study of a newspaper organization's internal communication processes is nonexistent. The external validity of research dealing with communication processes can be extended by studying communication in a variety of organizational settings. Newspaper organizations are a potentially fertile
area for exploring the utility of organizational communication theories.

**Evolution of Organizational Communication**

One systematic study of communication processes in formal organizations evolved from a general systems theory approach to the study of organizational functioning. Systems theory assumptions about the nature and functioning of organizations and of the importance of communication processes differ from those of earlier organization theories.

The classical/scientific theory of organizations emphasized a scientific approach to the study of organizational functioning. Accordingly, the most efficient organizations were those adhering to specific principles of division of labor and laws of management (Koehler, Anatol & Applbaum, 1976, pp. 15-16). The anatomy of the organization was the primary focus (Scott, 1967, p. 102); the worker was seen as a factor of production rather than as a human being. Classical theorists saw the worker as economically motivated -- driven to work by the fear of hunger and the search for profit (Etzioni, 1964, p. 21). With regard to communication,

Classical scientific management theory . . . seldom accorded communication individual significance in the organizational scheme. Preoccupied as they were with the effective exercise of authority in achieving organizational goals, these theorists saw the corporate communication system as a means of transmitting instructions downward to those
who would carry them out and confirmation upward that they had been carried out. (Koehler et al., 1976, p. 36)

Communication was treated as an instrument of authority. It was seen as fixed, static and having one function -- to aid the organization in achieving maximum production in the most efficient way. (For additional explication see Etzioni, 1964; Goldhaber, 1974; Koehler et al., 1976; Scott, 1967.)

The humanist approach to the study of organizational functioning emphasizes the human factor. Stress is placed on the emotional, unplanned, nonrational elements in organizational behavior. The significance and importance of friendship and social groupings is emphasized. Theorists assume that workers have needs beyond economic ones (Etzioni, 1964, p. 39). Efficient production is seen as a function of worker attitudes, capabilities and perceptions as well as the design of the organization. Harmony between the interests of the individual and those of the organization is deemed crucial (Goldhaber, 1974, p. 35). The role of management is seen as improving relationships among workers as well as coordinating work activities.

Humanists give more attention to communication than do classical theorists. They feel that rapport between management and the worker improves both morale and productivity. They also maintain that informal communica-
tion channels are at least as effective as formal communication channels. Humanists stress the importance of improving communication among all organizational members. However, they see communication as a static element of the organization -- one that can be manipulated to produce harmonious relations and, therefore, increased productivity (Koehler et al., 1976, p. 36).

The major shortcoming of both scientific and humanist theories is their view of the organization as a closed system, as having no interaction with the surrounding social/cultural/economic environment (Koehler et al., 1976, p. 32).

In their explication of organizations as open social systems, Katz and Kahn (1966) criticize earlier theorists for assuming organizations to be merely devices for achieving efficient production. They declare that theoretical concepts concerning organizations should begin with the input, output and functioning of the organization.

Organizations are flagrantly open systems in that the input of energies and the conversion of output into further energic input consist of transactions between the organization and its environment. All social systems, including organizations, consist of the patterned activities of a number of individuals. Moreover, these patterned activities are complementary or interdependent with respect to some common output or outcome; they are repeated, relatively enduring, and bounded in space and time. (p. 17)

As open systems, organizations 1) import energy
(raw materials, human abilities and information) from the larger environment; 2) transform the energy into a product or outcome; 3) export the product into the environment; 4) exhibit a cyclic character in the patterned activities of the energy exchange; 5) arrest the tendency to move toward disorganization by importing more energy than they expend; 6) utilize a "coding process" to select inputs from the environment; 7) are characterized by a "steady state;" 8) move toward differentiation and elaboration (through progressive mechanization); and 9) achieve the same final state in a variety of ways (equifinality) (pp. 19-26).

Interpreting, systems theory explains organizational functioning in terms of the organization's relationship to the larger environment. To understand organizations, each part of the organization must be understood as it relates to other parts of the organization and as the whole relates to its environment. Within the organization, all parts are interdependent. When there is change in one part there is change in all others (Goldhaber, 1974, p. 43). (For additional analyses of organizations as open systems see Goldhaber, 1974; Hicks, 1972; Katz & Kahn, 1966; Koehler et al., 1976; Sanford, Hunt & Bracey, 1976; Scott, 1967.)

Since systems theory views organizations as dynamic and changing, influenced by interactions with the envir-
onment, comprised of interrelated and interdependent parts, the role of communication is explained differently.

It was only with the view of the organization as process rather than structure -- as a product of the interaction of its components . . . that the communication function began to be perceived as a crucial force in the life of the organization. It is the role of communication as an independent and dynamic force that is missing in the humanist and scientific management models . . . neither treats it as a force that shapes and is shaped by the environment in which it operates. (Koehler et al., 1976, pp. 36, 38)

According to Katz and Kahn (1966), communication is the essence of a social system. There must be information about inputs. Transformation of inputs depends on communication among people in each subsystem of the organization as well as among subsystems. The output or product carries meaning; its use is influenced by public relations and advertising. The amount of support an organization receives from its environment is affected by information which groups have about its goals, activities and accomplishments. "Communication is thus a social process of the broadest relevance in the functioning of any group, organization or society" (p. 225).

To summarize, classical/scientific and humanist theories view organizations as closed systems although each focuses on different organizational variables. Communication is seen as a tool of management rather
than a dynamic, ongoing process that affects all parts of the organization. With systems theory, the importance of communication is stressed. Since an organization is an open system, it is dynamic and changing. Communication is essential -- it binds the various parts of the organization into a whole.

Recently, organization theorists have utilized a "communication" approach to the study of organizations. In so doing, they define organizations as "restricted communication systems" (Thayer, 1968, p. 103) or "restricted communication networks" (Katz & Kahn, 1966, p. 225). As "restricted communication systems/networks," organizations must select appropriate information from all that available in its environment, structure the transportation of information throughout the system so that individuals who need it get it, and thus accomplish organizational objectives. Researchers have studied communication systems in organizations; they have attempted to locate and analyze variables that relate to the communication process. Such studies fall under the rubric of organizational communication.

Organizational Communication Studies

In general, organizational communication researchers attempt to synthesize systems theory, organization theory, management theory and communication theory (see Goldhaber, 1974; Hall, 1972; Hicks, 1972; Koehler et al.,
One problem in the field is noted by Roberts, O'Reilly, Bretton and Porter (1974).

Organizational communication appears to be mired in an identity crisis. Researchers interested in organizations frequently confound communication in them with a host of other phenomena such as leadership and control. Because there are no adequate theories of organizational communication, existing relevant research remains unintegrated. (p. 501)

Roberts also comments that there are no clear definitions of either communication or organizational communication. The isolation and lack of integration of organizational communication research as well as the myriad operationalizations of concepts is also noted by Farace and MacDonald (1974).

To clarify concepts for this paper, Thayer's distinction between "communication" and "data systems" is relevant.

Communication is a process which occurs within a consumer of the system's outputs, not in the system which transports data to him. . . . That communication which occurs is a property of the consumer and the data flow combined -- not of the data flow itself. (p. 115)

Since communication occurs within an individual, communication processes and effects are studied. Thayer defines organizational communication as, "All those data flows that subserve the organization's communication and intercommunication processes in some way" (p. 102). Goldhaber's definition of organizational communication is
similar in that, "Organizational communication is the flow of messages within a network of interdependent relationships" (1974, p. 11). Therefore, the concept of "communication" in organizations is defined as the processes by which data or information is transported and transformed within the organization.

The definition of "organization" varies among researchers. Several characterize organizations as communication systems. Instead of using the traditional organization chart to determine the structure of the organization, they look at interaction (communication) patterns. They maintain that the "communication structure" of the organization is the key to understanding organizational functioning (see Conrath, 1973; Koehler et al., 1976; Mazza, 1975). Others view organizations as open systems in which several processes operate, of which communication is one, albeit vital. Variables that influence communication processes as well as communication variables that influence other processes are identified (see Goldhaber, 1974; Hall, 1972; Hicks, 1972; Likert, 1967; Sanford et al., 1976; Vardaman & Halterman, 1968).

The current research is based on the latter approach. Variables that influence the communication process are described as well as communication variables. Accordingly, the definition of organization offered by Sanford et al. (1976) is followed: "An organization is a
social system of structured individual roles and tasks which require coordination and communication to accomplish a specific purpose" (p. 9).

Goldhaber (1974) defines communication variables in terms of message (information) flow. He classifies messages according to purpose (task, maintenance or human), the relationships among persons who receive messages (dyad, small group or the internal public), the network through which messages travel (formal, following formally established channels of communication vertically or horizontally, or informal, bypassing established channels or utilizing the grapevine), the recipients of the message (persons inside or outside the organization), and the diffusion method (media used). He suggests that communication in organizations be studied according to his message classification system.

Thayer (1968) states that communication (messages or information) serves four functions: informing, instructing/commanding, influencing/persuading, and integrating (p. 187). The functions, as well as communication needs of an organization, are fulfilled through three communication systems, each of which is composed of people, rules for communicating, and a resultant communication structure. The operational communication system conveys data about task related activities within the organization. The regulatory communication system
conveys rules, orders and instructions that regulate material and/or information processing. The maintenance and development system conveys feedback about people or communication channels on which the organization depends (pp. 102-104).

According to Hicks (1972, p. 345), organizations are communication systems in that coordinated activity depends upon information from other parts of the organization and the environment. Communication travels through two networks, or pathways. The formal communication network is related to the formal organizational authority/activity relationships that are depicted on formal organization charts. The informal communication network is comprised of flexible and changing communication channels such as the grapevine (pp. 347-350).

Sanford et al. (1976, pp. 11-12) state that organizational communication has five functions: integration, maintenance, orientation, member growth and decision making. Those functions are fulfilled through the organization's communication system.

Elements of the organizational communication system are the formal communication subsystem, the communication climate and interpersonal skills. Decision making and production are the heart of the system. The formal communication subsystem consists of five networks through
which messages/information move: the authority network, the information network, the task-expertise network, the friendship and the status networks. The communication climate is the attitudinal dimension of the overall communication system. It includes the attitudes that individuals have formed about the organization and immediate workgroups. Attitudes affect individual propensities toward communicating. Interpersonal skills deal with the communication skills that message sources have. The skills, as well as the attitudes and formal networks, determine the effectiveness of the overall system.

The organizational communication system is also affected by seven internal elements of the organization. They include the objectives of the organization, the structure, the leadership style, the reward system, the technology, intergroup relations, and characteristics of the individuals within the organization.

Both the organizational communication system and the internal elements of the organization are affected by the external environmental factors of managerial assumptions about human nature, cultural and economic conditions. The interaction of external factors, internal elements and the communication system determines an organization's effectiveness -- its attainment of goals, the satisfaction of its members and its ability
to adapt to changing environmental conditions. An organization's effectiveness in turn affects external environmental factors which feed back into the system. And so it goes. Although Sanford et al. are primarily interested in the organizational communication system and provide the most inclusive criteria for its evaluation, they place equal emphasis on the importance of internal, external, and communication factors.

Although emphases regarding organizational communication differ among Goldhaber, Thayer, Hicks and Sanford, all stress the importance of communication in organizations. They identify purposes or functions that communication serves and they outline the processes by which information is transported through the organization.

Other approaches are less inclusive in that one or two communication variables are isolated and studied. The communication behaviors of supervisors were evaluated by Warnemunde (1976); Wager and Brinkerhoff (1975) related the perceived quality of communication exchanges in conferences to overall assessments of the conference; predictors of an individual's involvement in the communication network of an organization were noted by Wade (1968). Message distortion and direction of the message (upward and downward) were studied by Athanassiades (1974), Kri-vunos (1975), Liska (1976), Marrett, Hage and Aiken.
(1975), Read (1962), Roberts and O'Reilly (1974b), Stull (1975) and Sussman (1974). Attitudes toward communication were assessed by Dennis (1974), Fitz-Enz (1975) and Roberts and O'Reilly (1974a). Mazza (1975) evaluated organizational communication climates. Typologies of messages and relationships to various organizational factors were studied by Sadler (1974); McElreath (1975) related an organization's orientation to the structure and functions of task-related messages; Huseman, Lahiff and Wells (1974) identified communication problems; Hall (1974) assessed communication skills; Greenbaum (1974) evaluated the effectiveness of organizations' communication systems.

Whatever the approach or variable studied, all research rests on the assumption that information flows through organizations according to systems (or networks) that are developed in each organization. There is varying emphasis on the sources of messages, various typologies of message type or function, various means of assessing message flow through the organization, various measures of output and feedback, varying emphases on employee attitudes. However, all view organizations as open social systems and stress the importance of communication in organizational functioning. Those assumptions are followed in the present paper.

In the present paper, communication processes in
a newspaper organization are described according to criteria established by Sanford et al. (1976) and Goldhaber (1974). Two elements of the organizational communication system as defined by Sanford are described: the formal communication subsystem and the communication climate. Criteria for describing the formal communication subsystem are taken from Goldhaber. Questions that assess the communication climate are based on Roberts and O'Reilly (1974a), McCall (1974) and Likert (1967).

The seven internal elements of the organization are described because they provide the framework within which the communication system operates. It is also assumed, following systems theory, that each part influences and is influenced by the other, that all parts are equally important. Therefore, the order in which descriptions of the internal elements, the formal communication subsystem and the communication climate are presented is arbitrary.

**Internal Elements of the Organization**

**Organizational Objectives**

According to Sanford et al. (1976, p. 20), organizations have objectives which they try to achieve. Objectives are the reasons why organizations exist. Objectives are major determinants of the design of the formal communication system as they determine what decisions need to be made, when they need to be made and by
whom they need to be made. The degree to which objectives are known, understood and accepted by members of the organization can influence attitudes toward both the organization and communication. Therefore, the objectives of the newspaper organization are described in Chapter III and discussed in Chapter IV.

Organizational Structure

An organization's structure is based on planned relationships among its members (Sanford et al., 1976, pp. 95-96). Relationships are determined by the division of labor and authority. Formal authority and activity (labor) relationships constitute an organization's formal structure.

According to classical theorists, labor is divided according to the nature of the job and the amount of authority the job entails (see Scott, 1967, pp. 102-109) for complete explanation). The nature of the job determines the functional division of labor. The amount of authority a job entails is described by scalar processes (i.e., by position in the line of authority). Line relationships are often called the "chain of command." There are both functional and line relationships in an organization. There are also "staff" relationships in that some persons work to provide service and assistance to line members. Such persons are secretaries, assistants and specialists. In general, like activities
are grouped together and supervised; the supervisor has a specified amount of authority which determines his/her place in the line.

Classical theorists also state that the principle of unity of command -- one supervisor for a number of employees -- should be followed. The number of employees one supervisor can effectively control is referred to as the span of control.

If the span is large, many job functions are performed under one supervisor, the organization has few levels of authority, authority is decentralized, decision making occurs throughout the organization and the organization has a "flat" shape. If the span is small, few job functions are performed under one supervisor, there are many levels of authority, authority and decision making are centralized near the top and the organization is "tall" (Goldhaber, 1974, p. 32). In flat organizations, the direction of the information flow (or communication) is primarily horizontal; in tall organizations, it is vertical.

Different organizations have different structures and shapes. Rucker and Williams (1974) identified three types of organizational structure: pyramidal (like the military), functional, and line and staff. They said that the line and staff structure was best for newspaper organizations and that most newspaper organizations
fulfilled criteria for that structure.

Therefore, the formal authority/activity structure of the newspaper organization is described in Chapter III as is the structure of the newsroom. Job functions, levels of authority, span of control and organizational shape are specified.

Technology

According to Sanford et al. (1976, p. 114), "Organizations are systems which combine human abilities and physical resources to produce outputs and attain goals. Communication is the vehicle through which this combination takes place." Physical resources include technology.

Technology refers to the kind and degree of mechanization utilized by workers. It is related to the way work is done. According to Sofer (1972), the nature of tasks and the character of technology influence the structure of work organizations and the behavior of members. Accordingly, tasks and technology constrain behavior in that some foster small group unity, others personal independence and yet others continuous consultation (pp. 219-220). Concomitantly, the nature of the job and technology used affect the information flow -- who needs to communicate what to whom.

Newspapers are becoming increasingly automated with the use of electronic composing and editing equipment.
In many newspapers, type is set through computers. In general, technological development requires job specialization, which can minimize the skills required of workers and reduce their motivation to work (Sanford et al., 1976, p. 120). However, in the newsroom, advanced technology does not necessarily have that effect. "Technological change promises to restore the newsroom's control over all aspects of newspaper production" (Barrier, 1974, p. 50), thus requiring less specialization and a larger view of the workings of the organization.

Therefore, descriptions of the way jobs are performed in the newsroom and the type of available technology are provided in Chapter III.

**Leadership Style**

Sanford et al. (1976, p. 21) define leadership style as the general or predominant style in the organization. Leadership is seen as a process performed by an individual through communication; it is a pattern of communication behaviors that occurs when one person tries to influence another (p. 129). According to Sofer (1972, p. 273), leadership has four functions: decision making and execution, control, organizational integration and emotional maintenance. All are necessary for effective performance.

Various typologies of leadership style have been developed (see Blake and Mouton [cited in Sanford et al.,
1976]; Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik, 1961; White & Lippitt, 1960). Sanford et al. (1976) derive their typology from Likert's four systems of organizations (1967). The styles are based on methods of goal-setting, decision-making, control, motivation, interaction and communication. The leadership style that characterizes the newspaper organization in general and the newsroom in particular is defined according to the Sanford/Likert scheme in Chapters III and IV. Accordingly, there are four leadership styles, one of which theoretically characterizes an organization. Criteria for assessment are listed below.

Under the **exploitive authoritative** leader, goals are dictated from above, decisions are made at the top of the organization, control is exercised from the top through reports and orders, interaction between levels is formal and impersonal. Under the **benevolent authoritative** leader, goals are dictated from above but some response is allowed from the lower echelons. Major decisions are made at the top with little input from below. Close supervision and reporting are control mechanisms; interaction between levels is largely formal. Under the **consultative** leader, goals are set at the top after receiving input from lower levels, decisions are made throughout the organization within limits imposed from the top, control is exercised from the top but focuses
primarily on problem areas. Interaction between levels is frequent and personal. Under the participative style, goals are set through group participation, decisions are made throughout the organization, control is exercised by all levels, interaction is frequent and informal. The communication aspects of the leadership styles are described in a later section.

In newspaper organizations, top editors or publishers have traditionally been authoritative in that they have handed down decisions on hiring, firing, pay, hours, coverage, editorial policy, news play, etc. Decisions are traditionally made at the upper levels of management, without regard for the needs, opinions, desires or knowledge of staff members (Nelsen, 1973). Many editors feel that is the only way to operate a newspaper successfully. Since one person has the ultimate responsibility, that person makes the decisions. Coupled with the responsibility/accountability aspect is the belief that the product rather than the process of producing is crucial (Bissland, 1975).

Breed (1952) stated that control in newsrooms is exercised by the peer group through socialization rather than sanctions (punishments). To succeed, the individual reporter must adopt the norms, values and characteristics of the peer group. The norms and values with respect to news policy are seldom explicitly stated;
rather, blue pencilling and informal conferences create knowledge.

Therefore, the leadership style of the newspaper organization is described in Chapter III; its conformity with traditional newspaper leadership styles and control mechanisms is evaluated in Chapter IV.

Reward System

The reward system refers to rewards that employees are given for job performance. Rewards are used to motivate employees. Communication is affected because employees differ in their perceptions of the effect that communication will have on rewards (Sanford et al., 1976, p. 22).

Classical theorists felt that monetary rewards produced the best work performance as they saw workers as motivated by economic needs (Etzioni, 1964, p. 21). Humanists believe that socio-emotional needs motivate workers as much as economic ones and that rewards should center on fulfillment of those needs. Systems theorists state that systems function effectively for various reasons; several behavior patterns are required of members in organizations and different motivational patterns (or reward systems) produce different behaviors (Katz & Kahn, 1966, p. 337).

Katz and Kahn (p. 341) identify four motivational patterns that produce required behaviors. Legal compli-
ance involves conforming because authority requires it and the authority is seen as legitimate. The second involves the use of such rewards as seniority, fringe benefits, cost of living raises, pay incentives, promotions, superior approval and peer approval. The third includes internalized patterns of self-determination and satisfaction from accomplishment. As the complexity, variability and responsibility of jobs increase, so does the opportunity to express skills and abilities through performance. The reward is self-satisfaction. The fourth motivational pattern consists of internalized organizational values and the self-concept. It is influenced by the extent to which the individual participates in organizational decision making. Thus the reward is both personal and organizational success.

Sofer (1972) stated, however, that the purposes of the organization could be distinct from those of its members. Emphasis could be placed on the extrinsic rewards of money and fringe benefits rather than on the personally fulfilling nature of work; opportunities for promotion, higher salaries, more prestige and responsibility might receive more attention than the content of the work and thus lead to a discrepancy between rewards provided by the organization and rewards desired by its members (p. 243).

Motivational patterns emphasize either extrinsic
rewards such as money or peer/leader approval or intrinsic rewards such as self-satisfaction and integration of personal and organizational goals. The type of motivational pattern and resultant reward(s) exhibited in a newsroom are described in Chapter III according to the above criteria.

**Intergroup relations**

Communication in organizations is influenced by the work norms, values and relations among peer groups (Sanford et al., 1976, p. 22). The willingness of different groups to communicate (pass information to) with one another affects not only the quality of communication but the channel utilized. Groups in the newsroom are described according to the sections listed in Chapter III.

**The Individual**

Although Sanford et al. (1976, p. 21) describe the individual in terms of behavior, needs and personality type, this paper concentrates on demographic characteristics such as sex, age, educational level, work experience, seniority and marital status. The basic assumption is that individuals have different characteristics that influence the formal communication subsystem, communication climate and interpersonal communication skills.

**Summary**

Criteria for assessing the seven internal elements of an organization have been presented. All influence
one another; all are related to the organizational communication system. Two aspects of the organizational communication system are discussed in the next section, as are relationships among elements and the system. The two aspects are the formal communication subsystem and the communication climate.

The Formal Communication Subsystem

Although some studies of communication systems have identified communication structures (interaction patterns [see Conrath, 1973]), the focus of the present paper is on the communication processes and activities within the formally defined organizational structure rather than a delineation of a communication structure of the organization.

Sanford et al. (1976, pp. 192-195) discuss the formal communication subsystem in terms of five networks through which messages travel. However, Goldhaber (1974, p. 95) provides a message classification system that is more inclusive yet simpler to use in describing the formal communication subsystem. Accordingly, Goldhaber's framework is used to describe the newspaper's subsystem in this paper. Emphasis is placed upon messages that flow within the organization rather than those that flow between the organization and its environment. Relationships between the formal subsystem and internal elements are also described in subsequent chapters.
Goldhaber (1974, pp. 110-113) identifies three types of messages, each of which fulfills a specific purpose. Task messages deal with products with which the organization is concerned. Improving sales, markets and the quality of products are the purposes of task communication. Task messages give employees the information necessary for efficient handling of the job. Training, orientation, goal setting, problem solving and brainstorming are types of task messages. They relate to the content of an organization's output. Maintenance messages help the organization remain alive and perpetuate itself. Policies, regulations, commands, orders and procedures are examples. They relate to the achievement of output. Human messages are directed at persons within the organization -- attitudes, feelings, satisfactions, interpersonal relationships, self-concept and morale. Such messages include praise, appraisal interviewing, rap sessions, luncheons, social/athletic events and counseling.

Messages, whatever the type, flow through networks. Networks are patterns of relationships among organization members. Formal networks are established channels of communication that are identical with authority, accountability and responsibility relationships. Messages that follow formal networks travel upward (from subordinate to superior), downward (from superior to sub-
ordinate) and horizontally (among persons on the same hierarchical level). Informal networks are flexible channels such as the grapevine. They evolve and operate within the formal network.

Whatever the type of message or the network it travels, different methods of message diffusion are utilized. The method of diffusion refers to the media used. The media may be verbal, written, or telephone. The media differ according to message type and network.

Relationships are defined in terms of the number of people receiving the message -- the dyad, the small group or the entire organization (the "public"). The network, media, message type and relationship are interdependent.

The current paper identifies message type, diffusion method, network and relationships in the newsroom; they are described in Chapters III and IV. Relationships among parts of the communication system are noted, as well as the amount of feedback. Strengths and weaknesses of the formal communication subsystem are also discussed.

The relationship between the internal elements of organizations and communication systems has been researched. McElreath (1975) found that an organization's orientation or objectives (product-processing/efficiency-orientation or people-processing/service-orientation) influenced the structure and function of task-related mes-
sages. He found that task-related messages occurred more frequently in the input and processing activities of the product-processing organizations; they occurred more frequently in the output activities in people-processing organizations. Accordingly, the following questions were considered. Given the nature of the organization, what type of message is observed most often? Do communication activities center on information acquisition (input), transportation/processing or feedback?

Hage, Aiken and Marrett (1971) compared the type of organizational structure to observed communication activities and the type of coordination practiced by the organization (through planning or feedback) in 16 health and rehabilitative organizations. Structure was operationalized as the degree of diversity or complexity (the number of occupational specialties) in the organization and distribution of power and status (the degree of the centralization of decision making and the specificity of job descriptions). In general, they found that coordination by feedback occurred when there was more complexity and decentralization; it resulted in more interaction and unscheduled (informal) communication activities. Coordination by planning occurred with greater formalization and centralization; less interaction was observed in those organizations.

Given the organization's structure and shape, the
following questions were broached in this paper: What type of coordination is utilized in the overall organization and in the newsroom? Is there more vertical or horizontal communication? Are formal or informal networks utilized more frequently? What is the relationship between message type, network, diffusion method and relationship within the organizational structure?

It has been noted that organizational structure is related to organizational objectives and technology. Haehl (1974) investigated organizational communication literature in light of technology, environment and goals. She found that the technology of a work unit determined its social structure. In an empirical investigation, Sadler (1974) found relationships between message type, age, sex, job level, education, job satisfaction, technology and department size in 31 organizations. Messages were typed as formal (accountable), subformal (task related but not accountable) and informal (non-task related). He found that persons in departments with more rapidly changing technologies had more communication activity overall. More subformal communication was associated with those departments as well as with increased task variability.

Given the nature of jobs in the newsroom and the utilization of technology, the following questions are discussed in Chapters III and IV: Does communication
activity differ among departments? Do persons with more varied tasks interact more frequently than persons with largely routine tasks?

Although her work was related to manufacturing industries, Woodward (1965) found that the technology of various kinds of manufacturing types was related to organizational structure and the rigidity or informality of role relationships within the organization. Although this paper deals with a non-manufacturing organization, it is assumed that interactions among technology, organizational objectives, organizational structure and role relationships occur. All are related to the communication system. Authority relationships are role relationships -- they are influenced by leadership style.

The relationship between communication activities and leadership style was discussed by Sanford et al. (1976, pp. 141-143). The authors stated that under the exploitive authoritative leader, communication is formal and flows downward. Under the benevolent authoritative leader communication is largely downward. Employees voice their opinions but the opinions are seldom acknowledged. Under the consultative leader communication flows both up and down, though downward more often than upward. Communication is more personal and informal. Under the participative leader communication flows
freely along all channels -- upward is as valuable as downward communication.

The current paper dealt with a number of leadership-related factors. Given the leadership style in the newsroom, observed communication activities were compared to those derived by Sanford et al. (1976). The following questions are answered in Chapter III and discussed in Chapter IV: What type of message is sent most frequently -- and from what source? To whom are messages directed, according to what relationship and network? Are formal or informal networks utilized more frequently? Is there more vertical or horizontal communication?

Closely related to leadership style is the reward system/motivational pattern. Motivational patterns/reward systems affect communication activities -- they are affected by communication activities. Given the types of motivational patterns/reward systems observed in the newsroom, the following questions were derived and are discussed in Chapters III and IV: How are different rewards communicated or transported -- by way of formal or informal networks? Are they task, maintenance or human types of rewards, reinforcing extrinsic or intrinsic motivational patterns? What is the relationship when rewards are communicated?

The reward system and leadership style influence
relations among departments. Departments may compete for rewards or cooperate for long range rewards, such as organizational effectiveness (e.g., in this case, a widely read and respected newspaper). Interdepartmental cooperation or competition is reflected in communication activities. Given the general tenor of interdepartmental relations, the following questions are discussed in Chapters III and IV: Is there more communication between or within departments? Is the communication horizontal or vertical (occurring among persons of different status/authority levels)? Are formal or informal networks utilized? Is there a dominant message type? What is the method of diffusion?

Individuals, the seventh element of organizations, comprise departments and, to a degree, determine the relations among departments. Individuals are also the recipients of rewards -- and communication activities are affected by their desire for rewards. The studies cited below provide evidence that demographic characteristics of individuals are related to both organizational structure, leadership style, and communication activity.

Athanassiades (1974) found that females distorted upward communication significantly more \( (p < .02) \) than did males in hierarchical organizations. According to Acker and Van Houten (1974), many organizations are "sex structured" in that power is located among the males who
occupy upper level management positions. Their critique of the Western Electric ("Hawthorne") studies pointed to the effects of such sex-structuring. In the Western Electric studies, all supervisors were male. The high productivity group was all female; the low productivity group was all male. Productivity results were explained by Acker and Van Houten in terms of differential cultural conditioning and socialization of females and males rather than peer group influence, fulfillment of socio-emotional needs, or the importance of the informal organization.

Hamner, Kim, Baird, and Bigoness (1974) conducted a laboratory study with college students in which subjects were asked to assume a managerial role and rate all combinations of male-female and black-white job performances. They found that females were rated differently than males and blacks differently than whites. Females were rated significantly higher on task performance than males. They concluded that sex discrimination was less likely to occur when there was demonstrated job competence. Hall and Hall (1976) found that the race and sex of a job incumbent did not affect performance appraisals. However, they suggested that when raters did not have objective behavioral data they were likely to utilize traditional stereotypes in job ratings. When behavioral data was present, judgments were based
on actual behaviors rather than personal characteristics.

According to Lublin (1972a; 1972b), sex discrimination exists in the newsroom. Journalism is a predominately male occupation. Not only are there more males than females on all levels -- females are largely confined to "women's sections" and seldom have the opportunity to report hard news. Since newsrooms are sex-structured, it follows that communication activities could be influenced by the sex of the sender and recipient of the message.

With respect to age, Sadler (1974) found that younger employees sent more "formal" messages. With respect to educational level, Emergy, Ault and Agee (1970) stated that newspaper employers were looking more and more for college educated employees for "front end" and editorial positions. Nelsen (1973) noted the increasing numbers of college educated reporters who were asking for a voice in the decision-making process.

In all, demographic characteristics are related to an organization's communication system in that sex, age and educational level appear to predict propensity toward communicating. In this paper, the demographic makeup of the newsroom is described and the following questions discussed: Is there a difference in communication activities among members of different sexes and communication among members of the same sex? Does level
in the hierarchy or age influence communication activity?

In summary, the current paper provides an analysis of the relationship between the formal communication subsystem (message type, network, diffusion method and relationship) and seven internal elements of the organization. These relationships are discussed according to criteria derived from organizational communication research. Findings are compared to the results of other studies; differences and similarities are described.

The formal communication subsystem is also influenced by individuals' attitudes toward communication, the organization and jobs. Relationships among those attitudes, the formal communication subsystem and the seven internal elements are discussed in the next section.

The Communication Climate

The communication climate is the attitudinal dimension of the organizational communication system. It is comprised of the attitudes that individuals have about their organization and work group (Sanford et al., 1976, p. 210). Farace and MacDonald (1974, p. 16) also noted,

Most of the research in organizational communication focuses on indices of work performance, and to the economic aspects of communication; largely ignored is research on the relationship between the communication practices of an organization and their impact on the feelings of dignity, self-worth and overall self-evaluation of the organization's members. From the moment socialization of new members begins, two broad types of involvement
in communication can have considerable effect on the individual's self-view: interaction with supervisors and peers, and participation in the organization's information system.

In this paper, the communication climate is defined as employee attitudes and perceptions toward communication, the organization and their jobs. Research questions are derived from studies which treat internal organization elements, attitudes and communication systems.

The internal organization element of structure does influence employee attitudes according to Porter and Lawler (1965). They reported a positive relationship between job level and job satisfaction. They also found that other job perceptions were related to level and that the size of the organizational subunit (department) was significantly related to job satisfaction.

Fitz-Enz (1975) also found that the level a person occupied in a hierarchical organization was a significant predictor of satisfaction with the communication system of the organization.

Ivancevich and Donnelly (1975) studied the relationship between job satisfaction, organization structure, anxiety-stress and performance. The findings relevant to this paper showed that salesmen in "flat" organizations indicated greater satisfaction (operationalized as self-actualization and autonomy) than did salesmen in "medium" or "tall" organizations.
Johnstone (1976) found that newspaper size was related to the job functions of reporters, control over newswork and communication within the organization, and job satisfaction. Reporters in larger organizations were less satisfied with their jobs and felt that they had less autonomy in handling stories. Johnstone surmised that since larger organizations were more centralized, there was less face-to-face communication across status levels, more impersonality and less participation by lower echelon reporters in decision making. In other words, there was less interaction and less participation in the organization's information system and consequently less overall job satisfaction.

Results of the above studies indicate that structural variables such as organization size and shape, as well as a person's level in the hierarchy, are related to employee satisfaction with both jobs and communication. There is also some indication that the communication/information system that operates within an organization's structure is related to job satisfaction.

The relationship between communication systems and satisfaction with jobs and communication has also been investigated. Marrett et al. (1975) researched the relationship between two aspects of communication systems and two measures of employee satisfaction in 16 health and rehabilitative organizations. Regarding the commu-
communication system, direction of the information flow (upward, downward or horizontally) and the formality of the information flow (scheduled communication following formal communication channels vs. unscheduled communication bypassing formal channels) were studied. Measures of employee satisfaction with their jobs and with their coworkers were obtained. They found positive correlations (though significant at only $p < .10$) between job satisfaction and reliance on formal/scheduled communication. Employees were negative about coworkers in organizations where unscheduled upward communication prevailed; they were positive about coworkers in organizations where unscheduled downward communication predominated. There was a slight association between unscheduled horizontal communication and negative views of coworkers. In summary, job satisfaction was highest in organizations where unscheduled downward communication prevailed.

The findings seem to contradict those of Johnstone who located a negative relationship between job satisfaction, size and centralization (and concomitant emphasis on formal communication channels) in newspaper organizations. However, the nature of the work and information requirements differ between the two types of organizations.

An organizational communication study by Dennis (1974) related communication climate factors to measures
of job satisfaction and ratings of managers in an automotive manufacturing company and an insurance firm. He identified five factors that constituted a "communication climate:" superior-subordinate communication, quality and accuracy of downward communication, the superiors' perceptions of communication relationships with subordinates, perceptions of upward communication, perceptions of the reliability of information received from subordinates and peers. According to a post hoc analysis, superior-subordinate communication and the quality/accuracy of downward communication were significantly related to satisfaction with superiors and the organization. He found no significant relationships between the overall communication climate, job satisfaction and ratings of managers.

Although the relationship between communication and job satisfaction identified by Marrett et al. (1975) was not confirmed by Dennis, it must be noted that communication operationalizations differed. Dennis concentrated on perceptual aspects while Marrett studied structural elements such as "formality."

Mazza (1975) identified two components of "communication climate:" the structural (the formal communication system, consisting of such items as communication channels, feedback, directionality, patterns of communication and types of messages) and the attitudinal
(employee satisfaction with communication). Although he found that the formal communication system was more "closed" than "open" in that input and processing activities were limited to the upper echelons, employee communication satisfaction ranged from "neutral" to "mildly satisfied." However, employees differentiated between satisfaction with organizational communication activities and supervisory communication activities. The supervisory communication activities accounted for 81% of the total variance.

Roberts and O'Reilly (1974a) constructed an instrument to measure such dimensions of organizational communication as the direction of the information flow, modes used to transmit information, information overload, satisfaction with communication and desire to interact with others. Three variables that influence communication were included in their index: trust in the superior, perceived influence of the superior and mobility aspirations of the employee. Correlations among index items and overall job satisfaction, leadership-consideration, organizational competence, organizational commitment, respondent job tenure and educational level were obtained.

In validating the instrument, the authors found positive correlations (p < .05) between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction, leadership-consideration,
and organizational competence. There was no relationship between communication satisfaction and mode of communication or directionality. The relationships between communication satisfaction, superior trust and influence, and communication accuracy were highly significant \( p < .001 \).

Overall job satisfaction was significantly related to trust, influence of the superior and mobility aspirations \( p < .05 \). There was a significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and time spent communicating in an upward direction \( p < .05 \) though job satisfaction related positively with the amount of time spent communicating in a downward direction \( p < .05 \). Job satisfaction also correlated positively with the amount of information an individual passed along \( p < .05 \) but negatively with information overload \( p < .05 \).

Summarizing, it was found that communication satisfaction did relate to such internal organization elements as leadership. The positive correlation between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction is interesting, especially in light of the lack of such a relationship noted by Dennis. Though there were no significant relationships between communication satisfaction and mode or direction of communication, job satisfaction did relate positively, confirming the general finding of Marrett et al. (1975). The positive correlation between job satis-
faction and amount of information passed along could denote participation in the organization's information system and thus lend credence to Johnstone's speculations.

Although the relationships between job satisfaction, communication satisfaction and elements of the formal communication system are crucial, there are other internal elements of the organization that influence job satisfaction and, perhaps concomitantly, communication perceptions. The reward system/motivational pattern is related to the organizational communication system and therefore, as part of the system, the communication climate. All, according to Sanford et al. (1976), are related to member satisfaction.

The earlier discussion of reward system/motivational patterns is relevant here. Motivational patterns differ, as do rewards associated with each. Different motivational patterns produce different behaviors (Katz & Kahn, 1966, p. 337). Since attitudes are related to behavior, it follows that different motivational patterns could be related to different attitudes toward communication, the organization and jobs.

Tangentially, Herzberg (1968), a controversial motivation theorist, identified two factors which combine to motivate people to work. He called one factor "hygiene" and the other "motivators." Hygiene variables include company policy and administration, relationships
with supervisors, supervision, salary, status, work conditions and fringe benefits. Motivators include achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, growth and advancement. Herzberg found that when hygiene factors were fulfilled, there was no job dissatisfaction; when motivators were fulfilled, there was increased job satisfaction. Motivation was the result of the fulfillment of both factors. Each was fulfilled in different ways, involved different perceptions of rewards and resulted in different attitudes.

In this paper, employee attitudes and perceptions are measured to determine the degree to which hygiene and motivator factors are fulfilled. Since both are related to aspects of job satisfaction, and job satisfaction correlates positively with communication satisfaction, relationships between hygiene/motivators, job satisfaction and communication perceptions are described in later chapters.

Supervisor-subordinate relations have been investigated by organizational communication researchers. Roberts and O'Reilly (1974b) studied the relationship between upward communication and trust in superior, perceived influence of the superior and mobility aspirations of employees in four organizational settings: a medical center emergency room, a mental health institution, a military organization, and a financial institu-
tion. They found positive correlations between trust and communication openness and accuracy, between perceived influence and accuracy. They speculated that trust and influence interacted to reduce such distortion techniques as withholding information and blocking the information flow. Though Read (1962) found that mobility aspirations were negatively related to the accuracy of upward communication, he did note that interpersonal trust modified the communication/mobility relationship (p. 13). Roberts and O'Reilly found that mobility aspirations were less important predictors of communication accuracy than trust and perceived influence. Perceptions of supervisors were related to both attitudes and communication behaviors, thus confirming Dennis' finding that superior-subordinate communication was significantly related to satisfaction with superiors. It also reinforces Mazza's discovery that attitudes toward supervisory communication activity accounted for most of the variance in communication satisfaction. Johnstone's contention that greater impersonality and less frequent interaction among reporters and editors leads to job dissatisfaction is also supported.

Stull (1975) investigated supervisor-subordinate interaction in terms of perceived rewards for communication openness. Both supervisors and subordinates perceived "acceptance" and "reciprocation" to be rewards
for communication openness, though he found a discrepancy between superior and subordinate assessments of the frequency with which such rewards were dispensed. Stull contended that without such rewards communication would be distorted and superficial.

Liska (1976) found that employee perceptions of the effect of upward communication (in terms of being listened to) were related to evaluations of upward communication. In a survey of junior high school teachers, he found that teachers felt that their opinions were not acknowledged by administrators and consequently condemned upward communication in the school system. If subordinates are not "rewarded" by supervisors (through acceptance, reciprocity or feedback) for open communication upwardly, relations between supervisors and subordinates become strained and communication perceptions are negative.

Krivonos (1975) studied the relationship between a subordinate's intrinsic-extrinsic motivation, message distortion in upward communication, and perception of communication climate in two manufacturing companies. Intrinsic motivation comes from within; it includes such items as self-satisfaction, desire to achieve, desire for recognition. Extrinsic motivation depends on such things as salary, promotions and status. Krivonos found that intrinsically motivated subordinates distorted task-
related messages directed toward supervisors less than extrinsically motivated subordinates, but distorted non-task related messages more. Extrinsically motivated subordinates distorted messages less in "favorable" than in "unfavorable" situations. He also found that intrinsically motivated subordinates perceived the communication climate as more open, participative and satisfying than extrinsically motivated subordinates. Although he called his findings "provisional," Krivonos did locate relationships that were statistically significant between motivation, upward communication and perceptions of the communication climate.

The relationships between perceptions of autonomy, control and job satisfaction among reporters that were identified by Johnstone (1976) have already been discussed. However, his assessment of motivation and source of rewards for journalists is relevant here.

Newswork . . . can be divided between functions performed inside and outside the organization. Although most newswriting may be done within the confines of an office, journalists involved in news gathering spend a large proportion of their time away from the organization covering events and contacting news sources. . . . Editing, news processing, editorial supervision and management . . . are all functions performed inside the organization. . . . The distinction also overlaps with the principal career path in media journalism, since in time most journalists come to devote an increasing proportion of their work time to intra-organizational functions. . . . Yet while a journalist's income level and status in the organizational hierarchy accrue mainly from the internal responsibilities [s/she performs, his/her status
and recognition within the occupational community and in the society at large come mainly from the newswriting [s/he does. (pp. 6-7)

Consequently, motivation could depend on a journalist's career orientation: toward writing wherever and whenever or advancement within the organization in terms of editorial or management functions. Although reporters are at the bottom of the newsroom hierarchy, they may not perceive "growth and advancement" to be related to level in the organization, to advancing within the organization. Attitudes toward the organization might not be as salient as attitudes toward professions. Consequently, the relationships among internal organizational elements and the organizational communication system observed in prior studies might or might not be confirmed in newspaper organizations.

The relationships among communication climate (attitudes toward communication, the organization and jobs), organization structure, leadership behavior, the reward system and elements of the formal communication system have been discussed. Relationships among attitudes comprising the communication climate have been discussed. To provide comparisons between a newspaper organization and other organizations, the following research questions were formed:

1) What are employee attitudes toward the organization and job-related variables?
2) What are the communication perceptions of members of a newspaper organization (specifically, newsroom employees)?

3) What are the significant relationships among communication perceptions, demographic characteristics, and attitudes toward both the organization and the job?

4) What are the factors or dimensions that describe relationships among attitudes?

In Chapter IV, the attitudes, the formal communication subsystem and the internal organization elements of a newsroom are described and compared with the findings of other organizational communication research.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Chapter II describes the subjects of the study, the method of data collection, the instruments used to measure attitudes and perceptions, and the methods used to analyze the data.

Subjects

Subjects of the study were members of a newspaper organization in central Florida. At the time of the study, the newspaper had a circulation of approximately 50,000 daily and 55,000 Sundays. The subjects were the publisher, the heads of the six departments in the organization and newsroom employees. Newsroom persons interviewed included all editors, reporters and writers, with the exception of five persons in distant bureaus. Artists, photographers, wire room persons, typists and parttime personnel were not interviewed. Although the secretary and librarian were interviewed, data were not used as interest was focused on members of the "line" rather than the "staff."

To simplify data analysis, members of the newsroom staff were divided into levels according to the amount of responsibility and authority their jobs entailed.
The division was done by the interviewer through consultation with the managing editor and the assistant managing editor as no "organization chart" was available. Twenty-six persons were interviewed in Level 4 -- feature writers, columnists and reporters (an additional four reporters were not interviewed due to their inaccessibility). Twelve persons in Level 3 were interviewed; they were assistant editors and bureau chiefs. One additional bureau chief was not interviewed due to inaccessibility. Eleven persons were interviewed in Level 2 -- nine editors who were responsible for either a section of the newspaper or a particular topic, such as the state or business news, and the two "senior" assistant metro editors. The two assistants were included in Level 2 because they periodically assumed the job functions of the metro editor. Level 1 was comprised of the publisher and the six department heads, representing the newspaper as a whole. A total of 58 persons were interviewed, though data from only 56 were used.

Data Collection

Data were collected through face-to-face interviews with individual subjects. The author conducted all interviews. The interviews were held in a conference room near the newsroom, in offices separated from the newsroom, and in the newsroom itself. Those interviews in the newsroom occurred in isolated sections, out of the
hearing of other persons. Subjects were assured that answers would remain confidential, that there would be no attribution if quotes were used. Subjects answered questions posed verbally by the interviewer who then wrote the answers. Individual interviews averaged one and one-half hours; total interview time was approximately 85 hours. Data were collected from all "line" members of the newsroom except sports persons over a 6 week period in the spring of 1976. Data were obtained from sports personnel during a 2 week period in the summer, 1976.

The interview method was chosen because a comprehensive view of newsroom operations was needed. It was also felt that the individual, personal contact with subjects would create rapport between the interviewer and the subject and answers would consequently be more honest.

**Instrumentation**

The interviewer constructed three questionnaire-type interview sheets based on organizational communication research. Variables that had been shown to have a relationship with communication perceptions and activities were measured. There was no validation of the questionnaire as such because the entire newsroom population was surveyed. It was felt that pretesting within the population would contaminate results of the study; pre-
testing in a sample of another population could have produced misleading data. One interview sheet was used with Level 4 persons, the second with persons in Levels 3 and 2; the third was used with Level 1 personnel.

The questionnaire/interview sheet used with Level 4 contained 47 questions. The first 11 questions dealt with demographic variables such as sex, age, educational level, work experience, tenure/seniority and marital status. Answers to each demographic question were scaled nominally; e.g., for educational level, a master's degree was assigned a value of 4, a bachelor's degree a 3, "some college" a 2, and high school a 1. Regarding sex, males were placed in the number 2 category with females in number 1.

Four questions assessed the communication perceptions of employees. They were, "Is communication open in this department?" "How would you describe downward communication in this department?" "How would you describe upward communication in this department?" "How would you describe horizontal communication in this department?" Answers were nominally scaled, with indubitably positive answers assigned a value of 3, qualified answers a 2, and negative answers a 1.

Twenty questions dealt with organization-related questions such as the clarity of policies (salary, assignments, hiring, firing and promotions), the consistency
and competence of management, whether or not supervisors listened, the equitability of salaries and assignments, the quality of peer and supervisor relations, appraisal/evaluation, participation in the decision-making process, advancement within the organization, perceptions of favoritism/discrimination in terms of salaries, assignments, promotions, and treatment by sources. Several questions produced responses that were again nominally scaled, with very positive answers assigned a value of 3, qualified or neutral answers a value of 2, and negative answers a 1. Examples of such questions included, "Is there opportunity to advance within this organization?" "How would you describe your relationship with your supervisor?" With the remaining questions, answers were given according to Likert-type 5 point scale, with 5 as the most positive response and 1 as the most negative. Examples of such questions included "How competent (in terms of task-expertise) is management?" "Overall, how clear are policies on salaries, promotions, assignments, hiring and firing?" For the first question, an answer of 5 indicated "extremely competent;" an answer of 1 indicated incompetence.

Twelve questions assessed job perceptions, including such areas as evaluations of job performance, job satisfaction, job importance, opportunities for the use and development of job-related abilities, and perceived re-
wards. Again, some questions produced responses that were nominally scaled; e.g., "Is initiative and creativity encouraged?" Other questions were based on the 5 point interval scale; e.g., "To what degree are your abilities utilized and developed?" "To what degree do you have autonomy and independence in choosing and writing stories?" The interviewer encouraged subjects to give reasons for their answers.

The first 47 questions on the questionnaire/interview sheet used with Levels 2 and 3 were identical with those asked Level 4, as were scaling procedures. However, persons in Levels 2 and 3 were asked an additional seven open-end questions to gain insight into the self-perceptions of supervisors and management processes. Content of the questions included the type of training offered employees, the specificity of job descriptions, methods of orienting new employees, method of assigning "beats" or stories, and perceptions of employee satisfaction.

The questionnaire/interview sheet used with Level 1 persons utilized open-end questions that dealt with overall newspaper operations, the responsibilities and job functions of the six departments, management practices and philosophies, communication practices and perceptions, planning, problem-solving and decision-making methods. The purpose of interviewing Level 1 persons was
to gain insight into the functioning of the entire operation. Demographic data were also obtained from Level 1 persons. The questionnaire/interview sheets used for each level are contained in Appendix A.

Information regarding communication processes and activities was obtained through interviewing, informal conversations and interviewer observations.

**Data Analysis**

Since scaling techniques differed among questions, Pearson $r$ correlation coefficients were computed for all variables. Using correlation techniques, all variables could be compared to all other variables. Additionally, Spearman correlation coefficients and levels of statistical significance were computed.

A principal components factor analysis was applied to the communication, organization-related and job-related questions so that attitudinal dimensions could be isolated and interrelationships among variables more systematically described. The analysis yielded 14 factors with eigenvalues greater than unity. Those factors accounted for 81% of the variance. A varimax rotation of the factors was performed to refine the factors.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Internal Elements of the Organization

The newspaper organization under study is a medium-size daily with a circulation of approximately 50,000 daily. It is owned by a corporation with nationwide media holdings. In addition to the daily, the corporation owns two small weeklies in the same circulation area. Within the circulation area, the daily has three bureaus.

Although the newsroom is the focus of the present study, it is useful to provide a more complete picture of the organizational environment before presenting the empirical findings.

Objectives

The two major objectives of the newspaper organization are to produce a newspaper and make a profit for the organization's owners. Although owned by a corporation, the paper is autonomous regarding editorial and news policies and personnel. Management by objectives (MBO) is practiced; objectives deal primarily with economic considerations such as budgeting. Such plans and objectives are prepared in accordance with the parent com-
pany.

The newsroom's major objective is to plan and produce news and feature copy for the paper.

Structure

Overall organization. One person, the publisher, is the administrative and operating head of all three newspapers. He supervises the organization with and through the heads of the six departments of the daily newspaper and the publishers of the two weeklies. Together, they constitute the "Operating Committee," which meets formally once a week to plan, make decisions and exchange information. The publishers of the two weeklies have little input regarding operations of the daily paper. There are three organization-wide committees in the daily newspaper.

The Quality Control Committee is comprised of representatives from each department; its purpose is to teach representatives the functions of all departments of the paper to improve the overall quality of the paper. Representatives are expected to carry information back to their departments. The Safety Committee is comprised of volunteers who receive basic First Aid training. The Wage and Salary Review Committee is constructing a wage and salary profile for evaluation purposes.

The six departments of the daily paper are production, advertising, accounting, circulation, public
services/personnel and editorial (newsroom). Each performs different job functions; each has authority and responsibility equal to that of other departments; each is autonomous regarding hiring, firing, salaries, promotions and general departmental operations. Each has one formal head.

The production department is responsible for purchasing, advertisement and news composition (paste-up), maintenance, the mailroom, printing the paper and coordinating production services for other departments and the two weeklies. It is functionally divided into eight sections, each with a foreperson or supervisor. There are distinct levels of authority within each section. The number of employees per section ranges from 1 to 20; overall, there are 90 fulltime and 25 parttime employees. Written job descriptions are being prepared. There are regularly scheduled department meetings.

The advertising department coordinates the sale of advertising space for all three papers. There are five sections: dispatch (soon to be renamed Customer Service), national advertising, art, classified advertising and retail sales. With the exception of retail sales, each section has a formal head. The number of employees per section ranges from 1 to 18. Overall, there are 40 fulltime employees. There are no written job descriptions though there are regularly scheduled
The accounting department is responsible for controlling cash collections and the cash flow for the three papers. It is functionally divided into three sections: the office staff, credit, and data processing. Each section has a formal head. The number of employees per section ranges from three to nine; overall, there are 16 fulltime employees. Although each section performs different job functions, there are distinct levels of authority and responsibility within each. There are no written job descriptions. The department head prefers and "operations manual" which defines operations or functions of each job. There are regularly scheduled departmental meetings.

The circulation department is divided into two functional sections: operations and administration. The operations section is responsible for transportation, garage services and home delivery services for the three papers. There are 52 employees supervised by a formal head. The administration section is in charge of single copy sales of the three papers, subscriptions for the daily paper, and office staff responsibilities. There are 12 employees in this subsection supervised by one person. Within each section, there are very distinct levels of authority and responsibility. Department-wide meetings are rare; written job descriptions
are being prepared.

The public services/personnel department is responsible for conducting reader surveys, public relations, newspaper promotion and personnel services. Personnel services include updating dossiers on employees, explanations of employee benefits and orientation of new employees. The department head supervises two persons -- an assistant and a secretary.

The editorial department (newsroom) is functionally divided into nine sections: A desk, B desk (metro), sports features, systems, business news, state news, photography and the editorial page. Each section has a formal head; the number of employees in each ranges from 1 to 25. There are 78 fulltime employees overall. A secretary and two librarians provide staff services for the newsroom. There are no department-wide meetings; there are no written job descriptions.

In summary, departments vary in size, structure and shape. Heads of departments are specialists in that each has a college degree or broad work experience in his own area of expertise. A formal organization chart is contained in Appendix B. Specifics regarding the editorial department are contained below.

The editorial department. A managing editor is in charge of the newsroom (editorial department). He is ultimately responsible for the production, editing and
layout of the news and feature copy, as well as for the personnel within the department. He has one assistant who also fulfills the function of metro editor.

The department is divided into nine sections, each with a formal head. Each has a specified amount of authority and responsibility but are not necessarily equal. The sections are autonomous regarding story content though they function cooperatively in planning the "play" of stories and layout. Each section head makes recommendations regarding hiring, firing, promotions and salaries for personnel within his/her section.

A desk is responsible for national and international news. It is comprised of five persons: the news editor, the wire editor and three copy editors. The news editor is nominally in charge of A desk; he is responsible for page 1A five days a week. Although the title of "news editor" is held by one person, the job is actually a "slot" or function filled by the wire editor once a week and one of the copy editors once a week. The wire editor is responsible for selecting and editing incoming wire copy for Section A four days a week. Again, wire editing is more a "slot" than a specific job assigned to one person in that copy editors fill the position three days a week. The copy editors edit, write headlines and plan layout for Section A. However, the job functions overlap. One of the copy ed-
itors is also the systems editor and therefore a department head. Another copy editor supervises special sections and a Sunday editorial section. The third copy editor assists the state news editor twice a week. Therefore, the span of control ranges, depending on the day, as do the job responsibilities and autonomy for A desk personnel.

B desk (metro) gathers, compiles and edits local news. There is an official metro editor, though the job is a "slot." The metro editor fills the slot once a week as he is also the assistant managing editor. The slot is filled six days a week by a "senior assistant" metro editor and an "assistant" metro editor. The slot responsibilities include making assignments to reporters, editing, planning layout, writing headlines and overseeing the production of the section. When not in the slot, they edit copy, write headlines, and plan layout. Directly responsible to the slot are seven fulltime reporters, one parttime clerk/reporter, two investigative reporters, one columnist and one copy editor (who occasionally fills in at state and national desks). The three bureau chiefs (also called "assistant metro editors") are also responsible to the slot. Their responsibilities include making assignments to bureau reporters, gathering and writing local news, and occasional editing. Eight additional reporters are assigned to bureaus, as
are three part-time clerk/writers. Assignments to reporters generally follow a "beat" system in that specific areas, geographic and topical, are covered by specific reporters; e.g., there is one science reporter, one political writer, one county government writer, one education writer, one legal writer and one social services writer. Others cover specific municipalities or areas of the county. All occasionally fill in for one another. In all, there are 17 full-time reporters, five assistant editors, one copy editor, one columnist, and one metro editor, for a total of 25 full-time metro employees.

The state news desk is headed by one person who selects news from incoming wire copy. He also edits and plans layout for copy from one of the more distant bureaus. He is assisted twice a week by one of the A desk copy editors.

The sports section (section C of the paper) is headed by one person who coordinates assignments, edits, and plans layout. Although three of the seven full-time sports writers perform "inside" jobs such as editing and layout, the editor identified only one as his assistant. The remaining four writers perform the "outside" job of news gathering and writing. Assignments follow a "beat" system in that one person is responsible for prep (high school) sports, another covers outside/recreational
sports, another college games and professional sports. However, there is much overlap. Five to ten parttime "stringers" are also supervised by the sports editor.

The business editor writes and edits business news, writes columns and a Sunday feature. He edits and plans the layout for local and national business news six days a week; he supervises the makeup of stock market pages. He has one assistant who is responsible for a consumer advisory column, writes headlines and edits the daily "conversation" page.

The photography section is supervised by one person who coordinates photography assignments from other sections, supervises the developing and printing of photographs. He is responsible for five fulltime and one parttime photographer.

The systems editor is in charge of the hardware -- the electronic composing and editing equipment utilized by the newsroom staff -- as well as the computers. He interfaces with all departments of the newspaper. He also supervises seven wire-room persons and four CRT typists.

The editor of the editorial page writes editorials, edits letters to the editor, edits and plans the layout of seven syndicated columns (of which three are used daily). His one assistant is responsible for the same tasks.
The **features section** is headed by one person. Her responsibilities include supervising the editing and layout of the entire feature section, the production of a weekly television schedule, the production of the weekly feature magazine, the production of the weekly Food Guide, and supervising the art department. She is assisted by the magazine and Food Guide editors and two persons who edit and plan layout. Although everyone writes copy, there are six additional fulltime feature writers who cover specific feature or column assignments, one writer/clerk, two fulltime and two parttime artists. In all, she supervises 13 persons.

The various sections of the newsroom vary in size, span of control, levels of authority, and autonomy as job functions call for differing numbers of persons with differing responsibilities. The shape of sections differs, also. A complete organization chart of the newsroom is contained in Appendix C.

**Technology**

**Overall organization.** The accounting department is computerized. The advertising department is installing electronic editing and composing equipment. The production department is highly mechanized with more sophisticated production systems being planned. Circulation uses computers for daily delivery services.

**The editorial department.** The newsroom has become
almost fully automated in the last three years with the Harris 2500-50 Typesetting system. Under the system, 97% of all type is set electronically by individual persons.

IBM Selectric typewriters are used to type copy on special scanner sheets. The copy is taken to editors, who place it in an "out-basket." Wire-room persons pick up the sheets, feed them through a CompuScan, which produces a perforated paper tape. The tape is then fed into a computer and the scanner sheets are retured to the editor. The editor, utilizing the Harris 1500 Video Display Terminals (VDT) "calls up" the copy from the computer. The copy is displayed on the VDT screen. The VDT is little larger than a typewriter. Using special symbols, the editor corrects the copy, sets column widths, writes headlines, then "sets" the type by pushing a special button. If extensive rewriting is necessary, the editor either returns the article to the writer or works with him/her in correcting it with the VDT. Once set, the computer reproduces the copy on photographic paper which is delivered to the paste-up department. The paste-up persons clip and arrange copy according to the layout plans devised by news and editorial persons. The pasted up sheets are then sent to production for plate making and printing.

Copy from bureaus is sent to the central newsroom
via telephone. In the bureau, copy is typed on special machines which produce a perforated tape. The tape is fed into an AP DataSpeed machine. A telephone call is made to the wire room in the central newsroom stating that copy is ready. A button is pushed on the telephone which activates a receiving unit. As the tape is fed through the machine in the bureau, electrical impulses are transmitted over the telephone wires to the receiving unit, which reproduces the tape. The tape is then fed into the central computer. The editor "calls up" the copy on the VDT screen for editing, correction, headlining and typesetting.

Wire copy from five wire services (including AP and UPI) is received by way of DataStream machines, which reproduce copy at 1200 words per minute. Although copy is typed by machine onto paper that is delivered to appropriate editors by wire-room persons, copy is also stored directly in the computer as it arrives. The editor chooses stories s/he feels are appropriate or relevant to the paper, "calls up" the copy on his/her VDT, and proceeds as described above.

Copy that cannot be fed or stored directly in the computer -- such as letters to the editor -- are typed onto scanner sheets by CRT typists. The appropriate editor then "calls up" the copy and proceeds.

Once paste-up is completed, the page-to-photo-to-
plate-to-press process is accomplished in 15 minutes. The efficiency and speed of the system make it possible to make over pages when late breaking news arrives. Approximately 12 pages are made over daily. In addition, page 1B is replated for the various communities served.

The electronic and composing typesetting system requires more skill and responsibility on the part of the individual than the older "hot type" method of printing. There is more input and responsibility for the final product. Although editors use the system more than writers, writers are being taught how to use it. Increasingly, newsroom individuals work autonomously, with less frequent consultation with other newsroom members as copy is written and edited.

**Leadership Style**

**Overall organization.** The publisher is the leader of the newspaper organization. As such, he must attend to employees, advertisers and readers. Since different departments fulfill different functions with respect to employees, advertisers and readers, and provide different perspectives and have different needs, the publisher must coordinate all knowledge and fairly distribute resources.

Goal setting and decision making for the organization as a whole are accomplished through the Operating Committee. However, as one member commented, "The Op-
erating Committee does not make decisions. It contributes to them." The publisher has the final word. One area that requires extensive planning and decision making is "profit planning." Although profit plans must be negotiated through the parent corporation, individual department heads prepare profit plans for their department and coordinate them through the publisher. Salaries are an important part of the profit plan. For example, a salary "package" with x amount of money for the organization is agreed upon as are amounts allotted to individual departments. The individual department head then decides how salary monies will be allocated within his department.

Although the publisher has the final word, departments are on a "loose tether." Individual department heads are encouraged to make decisions regarding day to day departmental operations without consulting the publisher. Authority and responsibility are widely distributed among departments; department heads are encouraged to distribute authority and responsibility within their departments. There is emphasis on training and building management strength from within the organization although the extent to which it is done varies among departments. Supervisory techniques and control over the production process vary among departments as do goal-setting and decision-making activities. Departments dif-
fer in the degree to which they utilize employee input in decision making. Three department heads stated that they did all of the hiring and firing, for example; one head hires and fires according to the recommendations of supervisors; two heads have their supervisors hire and fire but final approval rests with the heads. All department heads, to varying degrees, work with supervisors in setting up profit plans. Lower echelon employees are not consulted for organization wide goal setting or decision making.

However, the publisher maintains control and supplements his knowledge of the day to day workings through regular visits to each section of each department and informal contact with all levels of employees. He also maintains an interoffice file of reports, memos, letters and articles. Interaction is informal and personal between the publisher, department heads, supervisors and lower level employees.

In summary, organizational goal setting and decision making are centralized in that the Operating Committee provides most of the input to the publisher, who makes the final decisions. They are decentralized in that departments make decisions and set goals for day to day operations. Control over the process is exercised by upper levels within the limits set by the publisher. Interaction occurs both formally and informally across
The editorial department. The managing editor is the leader of the newsroom. As such, he must coordinate the input from sections and readers to produce a saleable product. Two section heads provide most of the input regarding departmental decision making and goal setting. Formal meetings are rarely held; most of the contact is informal. Hiring and firing of "desk men" (or editors) is done by the managing editor; section heads either hire writers or are consulted before hiring is done. Section heads also provide input regarding salaries and promotions, though the managing editor makes the final decision.

Individual sections are responsible for the supervision and control of their production processes. They have wide discretion and autonomy for such supervision; techniques and styles differ among sections as their size and shape differ. There is much more emphasis on a "chain of command" in the metro section, for example, than in the features or sports sections because there is a larger number of employees who are widely dispersed geographically and who cover a larger number of topics. The managing editor leaves training and story critiquing up to supervisors; great autonomy regarding news judgment prevails. The managing editor seldom critiques or provides feedback regarding individual stories to the
individual writer, though comments are made to section heads or supervisors.

Interaction is largely informal between section heads and the managing editor as well as among levels and sections. There are no regularly scheduled meetings department-wide other than the daily "budget" meeting at which representatives from different sections plan the "play" of stories for the next day's paper. The managing editor may or may not attend.

The managing editor stresses the importance of professionalism in both news gathering and newswriting. Although there are no explicitly stated news, feature or editorial policies, such policies do exist, according to employees. Policies are taught to individual writers and editors informally by supervisors or through story rewrites. Regarding organization wide policies and procedures, the managing editor diffuses information through section heads. He feels that employees should follow the orders, procedures and policies that have been established, that authority should be recognized and respected. Although interaction between section heads and the managing editor is frequent and informal, there is little interaction across levels during working hours. However, there is some socializing across levels after hours.

To summarize, departmental goal setting and decision
making are highly centralized. Supervision centers on the product rather than the process of production. Supervision and control occur within sections according to the technique or style of the individual head; the degree to which individual heads utilize employee input varies, though autonomy and discretion with respect to news judgment is widespread.

Reward System

Overall organization. The philosophy that underlies the reward/motivational system in the organization is expressed in the following comment made by a member of the Operating Committee.

Personal involvement in areas of responsibility is essential. On every level, there needs to be some method or opportunity to upgrade oneself without being beholden to someone else. In that way, individuals are more interested in the job and their productivity increases. They are more competent so they receive a higher salary.

Personal involvement in the success of the organization is stressed. Although salary increases are an integral part of the reward system, more emphasis is placed on promotion and increased authority and responsibility. Personal excellence, in other words, is rewarded by giving the individual a larger stake in the future success of the organization, thereby incorporating personal goals with those of the organization.

In terms of promotion, six of the seven Operating Committee members were chosen from the parent corpora-
tion. The seventh rose from the rank and file newspaper employees. The publisher feels that management strength should be built from within the organization, that training should occur on all levels, that employees should perceive opportunities for vertical as well as horizontal movement, and that rewards for personal achievement should result in greater commitment to the organization.

Regarding salaries, the publisher feels that salary increases should be based on both competence and improvement. Future salary discussions are to be separated from performance appraisals so that areas needing improvement can be discussed, corrected and eventually result in higher salaries. Salaries are supplemented through occasional bonuses for outstanding performance.

Fringe benefits are also given to the employees. One day of paid vacation time is allowed for each five weeks of employment, though individuals are encouraged to take vacations in large blocks of time once a year. Five sick days are allowed per year; there are two "floating" holidays per year. The corporation has a retirement plan though participation by individual papers is not mandatory. Medical insurance is partially paid by the corporation as is a group life insurance program. Leaves of absence may be taken for maternity or military service. The corporation will pay the tuition
of any employee taking college courses once the course is successfully completed.

In summary, rewards include salaries, fringe benefits, promotions and increased authority and responsibility. The management is devising techniques to equate personal success with organizational success; rewards are designed to increase the individual's commitment to and involvement with the organization's success.

The editorial department. In the newsroom, rewards center on money and promotions. Salary increases range from $5.00 per week to $15.00 per week; they are given annually. The amount given depends on the supervisor's judgment of the individual's performance and the amount available through the profit plan. Occasional merit bonuses are given, though no general announcement is made. Salaries are exceedingly private matters. Two cash awards are given to employees each month. Called "feather" awards, one is given to an individual for superior "inside" work such as editing or layout; the other is given for superior "outside" work such as reporting or photography. The cash value of $15.00. Awards are also given to both teams of persons and individuals from professional associations such as the Orlando Press Club, national organizations such as the American Medical Association, and various community groups. If the awards have cash value, the corporation matches the amount.
Plaques are mounted in the foyer of the building for public viewing.

There is much inner mobility within the newsroom. Three persons are former wire room persons; at least six of the editors or highly placed editorial assistants are former writers for the organization. Promotion into managerial or editorial positions is a reward for good job performance, though there is little training regarding writing. Employees are expected to know how to write when hired. If a reporter demonstrates consistent outstanding work, s/he is given a "beat" that s/he requests. There is a star system within the newsroom -- writers with seniority and/or consistently outstanding stories are given preferred assignments. However, the only promotion that can be given to writers who do not desire managerial or editorial positions is more money, or a position in a larger paper. Since few of the corporation's newspapers nationwide are larger than the one under study, promotion opportunities for career writers within the organization or corporation are limited.

For journalists, rewards for job performance come from outside the organization (status/prestige in the community at large or within the professional community) or from within themselves (e.g., satisfaction at doing a good job). The rewards listed by journalists employed
by the newspaper under study are contained in Table 1 on page 79. It can be seen from the table that the largest proportion of persons across levels identified personal satisfaction as the greatest reward. None identified promotion, organizational success or participation as rewards provided by the job. More persons in Levels 2 and 3 identified salary as a reward than did persons in Level 4. However, the reward system in the newsroom focuses on such things as salary and promotion rather than constructive criticism or positive feedback—things that enhance self-satisfaction. All journalists expressed a desire for such feedback. It should also be noted that persons in Level 4 identified a wider variety of rewards provided by the job.

Intergroup Relations

Overall organization. Among members of the Operating Committee, interaction is frequent and informal. Relations were identified generally as "very good. There appears to be little competition because, as one member put it, "No one wants my job." It was explained that since all have equal authority and responsibility for departmental operations, a chance to be heard by the publisher, and all must cooperate in goal setting and decision making, conflict was minimized. None felt that favoritism was shown to one department over another. However, interdepartmental contact was generally limited
Table 1  
Rewards Identified by Journalists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of working for paper</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfaction</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom, flexibility and challenge</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating change</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego inflation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping someone or the community</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing or educating the public</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being creative</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting people</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting a response (from the public)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable feedback</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)*</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of persons answering the question. Percentages are based on the number of persons who gave that response. For example, four persons in Level 2 identified salary as a reward, equalling 36% of the total number of persons in that level.
to the upper levels of management.

The editorial department. Section heads within the newsroom interact frequently and informally. All identified relationships with peers as "good." However, one editor did comment,

There may be a feeling that we are putting out the paper as sections rather than as a whole. The paper here has no universal desk. There are four distinct sections of the paper. However, we do work well considering there are so many sections.

Another editor noted that the staff took pride in their personal relationships and individual contributions to the paper but, "They don't have equal concern for the rest of the product. They need to take pride in the collective product. Teamwork needs more emphasis."

Contact among sections is relatively infrequent among lower level employees. Most of the contact occurs within rather than between sections. Although descriptions of relations ranged from "okay" to "excellent," one person said, "The composition of the staff has changed a great deal. There was much more comradery several years ago. It's much more businesslike now."

Members of the feature section were the most enthusiastic about intrasectional relations. However, all felt that they were psychologically, if not physically, isolated from the rest of the newsroom. One person said, "I get the impression that metro people don't have much respect for feature types. There is occasionally a story
exchange, but there is generally a hands-off relationship." Members of the sports section expressed similar feelings, though little comment was made about feature or sports persons by other members of the newsroom. Lower level persons with A and B desks did state that they felt sports was favored over other sections; feature personnel stated that A and B desks were favored, as did sports persons. However, no overt conflict was observed.

Within sections, contact is very frequent and very informal. There are constant exchanges of story ideas and tips. However, a star system (pecking order) exists; several reporters felt that the same writers were given all the "juicy" assignments. One commented that some reporters were "resting on their laurels" and others working more than their share. It was noted, though, that within groups, all members worked until the job was completed rather than a specified number of hours. Also, much intersectional contact occurred after working hours in social situations.

The Individual

The demographic characteristics of Operating Committee members include sex, age, educational level, work experience, seniority and marital status. All members are male Caucasians. One person is in his twenties; all others are in the forties. The average age is 41 years.
Five of the members have bachelor's degrees in their specialty; the two others have attended college. All have worked on newspapers other than the one under study. Three have worked in other media fields and four have worked in non-media fields. The time spent working with newspapers ranged from nine to 30 years; the average was 18.5 years. In terms of seniority, two have been with the organization less than 6 months, four have been with the paper for 1 to 3 years, and one more than 5 years. Three have been in their present positions less than 6 months; the remaining four have occupied their present positions from 1 to 3 years. With the exception of one person, all are married. Generally, the average age is high, educational level is relatively high, broad work experience and extensive newspaper work is typical, and time with the organization is relatively slight.

The demographic characteristics of editorial department personnel are presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4 on the following pages. Level refers to position in the hierarchy with Level 2 the highest. For tabulation purposes, "news" refers to persons on A and B desks, state and business news and systems. "Feature" refers to persons in the feature section; "sports" refers to persons within the sports section.

From the tables it can be seen that the majority of Level 2 persons are 30 or older while the majority of
Table 2
Age Distribution of Editorial Personnel by Level and Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 - 29</td>
<td>30 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of persons per column.

aColumn includes one bureau chief not interviewed.

bColumn includes five reporters not interviewed.

Table 3
Distribution of Editorial Personnel by Sex and Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News</td>
<td>Feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of persons per column.

aColumn includes one bureau chief not interviewed.

bColumn includes five reporters not interviewed.
Table 4
Age Distribution of Editorial Personnel by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 - 29</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of persons per column. Numbers include one bureau chief and five reporters not interviewed.

Levels 3 and 4 persons are in their twenties. Females are generally younger than males. The "news" section has a majority of males, though from Levels 2 through 4, the number of females is greater. The feature section is predominately female while sports is predominately male. In all, 67% of the editorial department is male while 33% is female. The majority of persons in supervisory positions is male; supervisors are generally older than subordinates.

The remainder of the demographic data are presented as they relate to one another. Only the statistically significant correlations are presented in Table 5, page 85.
### Table 5

Statistically Significant Correlations Among Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Ed. level</th>
<th>Newsp. Exp.</th>
<th>Media Exp.</th>
<th>Unrelated Exp.</th>
<th>Time/ paper</th>
<th>Time/ posit.</th>
<th>Marital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>- .57***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Work experience - newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Work experience - media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Work experience - unrelated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time with paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Time in present position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
**p < .005
***p < .001
The significant negative correlations among level, work experience, age, time with the paper and time in present position indicate that the higher the level occupied, the older the person, the more likely that s/he has worked with other newspapers, has spent a longer time with the paper and a longer time in the position.

The positive correlations among age, work experience in fields outside media, time with the paper, time in the position and marital status indicate that persons who have been with the paper and in their positions longer times are more likely to be older and married.

Although the level of statistical significance was below that required by the study, the negative correlation between sex and section \( r (47) = -0.29, p < .02 \) indicates that fewer females than males are found in the sports section, that more females than males are found in the feature section (for comparison purposes, females were given a 1 and males a 2; news section was assigned a 1, features a 2 and sports a 3). The positive correlation between sex and newspaper work indicates that males are more likely than females to have worked in newspapers other than the one under study -- their newspaper work experience is broader. The lack of correlation between sex and other demographic variables indicates that the distribution of males and females according to level, age, education, work experience, seniority and marital
status is what one might expect to occur by chance.

The correlation between educational level and work experience indicates that individuals with higher educational levels have worked with media other than newspapers; e.g., they have broader work experience than those with lower educational levels.

The positive correlation between work in nonmedia fields and time in the present position indicates that individuals who have spent a longer amount of time in their present positions have also worked in nonmedia fields. Their work experience is broader than that of individuals who have spent little time in their present positions. Also, those who have spent more time in their present positions are more likely to be married. The positive correlation between time spent with the newspaper and time in one's present position indicates that as more time is spent with the newspaper, more time is spent occupying one position.

The correlations indicate that age and level account for most of the variance in demographic characteristics; i.e., that given the age and level of a person, one can predict the person's seniority, work experience and marital status with a fair degree of accuracy. With sex, one can predict the section in which an individual works.

In summary, this section has described the objectives of the organization and the editorial department,
as well as the structure, technology, leadership activities, the reward system, intergroup relations and the demographic characteristics of employees. The next section describes the formal communication subsystem.

The Formal Communication Subsystem

The newspaper's formal communication subsystem is described according to message purpose (task, maintenance or human), network that messages traverse (formal, following established downward, upward or horizontal channels, or informal), the method of diffusion (verbal, written or telephone) and relationships (dyad, small group or public). The message purpose, method of diffusion and relationships are described according to networks.

Organization-wide Communication

Formal network: downward. The publisher delivers task messages to department heads verbally in dyadic situations, usually face to face. Since jobs are highly specialized, individual contact is frequent. Since coordination is needed, the small group is a frequent recipient; it is comprised of whatever department heads are affected by the problem at hand. Task messages are also transmitted verbally in the weekly Operating Committee meetings, where information is exchanged, alternative solutions to problems discussed, decisions are made and goals for the organization set. An occasional written
memo directed to individual department heads will contain a task message. The publisher also meets with individual department heads and their assistants or supervisors to discuss a particular task; e.g., he might meet with the managing editor, the editor of the editorial page, the assistant editor of the editorial page to discuss candidate endorsements or with the production department head and forepersons to discuss new systems or time/scheduling problems. Although the telephone is occasionally used, verbal face to face interactions predominate. When the publisher receives input about the content or appearance of the paper from readers or the parent corporation, such information is usually transmitted verbally to the appropriate department head.

Maintenance messages are diffused through Operating Committee meetings (small group relationship) and written media such as the employee handbook or the monthly inhouse newsletter, "Page." Such written media are directed at the "public," or members of the entire organization. Such policies, rules and procedures as employee benefits, holiday or vacation scheduling or corporate news are transmitted downward via written media. Such policies, rules and procedures as salary and performance appraisal reviews, hiring and "termination" (firing) policies and financial reports are transmitted both verbally and through written media to the Operating Commit-
Members of the Committee diffuse such information as they desire.

Human messages are delivered in predominantly face to face, verbal situations, though they occur occasionally in small group meetings and social situations. Since contact both on and off the job is frequent and informal, human messages are sometimes interspersed with maintenance and/or task messages.

Within departments, task messages are usually given in verbal, face to face situations to individuals or small groups, such as assistants or forepersons, who then transmit information to their subordinates. Occasionally, department heads contact the individual employee to deliver task messages. Within departments, maintenance messages are usually diffused through memos, bulletin board pinups or during interdepartmental meetings. Three of the five large departments conduct weekly department-wide meetings for task and maintenance (and sometimes human) message diffusion; one conducts monthly intradepartmental meetings; one does not conduct department-wide meetings but has daily and weekly meetings for scheduling and planning. Maintenance messages for new employees (orientation, benefits and introductions) are delivered by the personnel officer verbally in face to face situations. Task messages to the new employee are usually delivered in the same manner by
the immediate supervisor. Few departments have written job descriptions. If a task or maintenance message must be transmitted to a bureau or one of the weekly papers, the telephone is the preferred medium.

Human messages are delivered verbally to either individuals or small groups. If the human message takes the form of an award, it is usually transmitted to the individual in a large group setting or individually, with a written notice of the award placed in the employee newsletter. Human messages are also transmitted in after hours social gatherings and in social/athletic settings such as softball games. Social gatherings usually involve small groups rather than entire departments; there are few organization-wide social events.

Formal network: upward. Messages containing employee input and feedback are sent upward through the organization. Since the Operating Committee meets weekly and organization-wide committees such as the Quality Control Committee meet regularly, employees do have the opportunity to provide input and feedback. Whether or not committee members obtain input from their departmental peers or subordinates varies according to the individual member.

Messages with task and maintenance purposes are sent upward verbally in small group or dyadic situations. Although all department heads maintain an "open door"
policy, all prefer that a formal chain of command be followed. However, one person commented that if an employee did bypass supervisors, "I won't throw them out. I do make it clear that whatever they tell me will be discussed with their supervisor, though." Task messages are usually transmitted to an employee's immediate supervisor verbally; maintenance messages occur in dyadic, small group and public situations, such as departmental meetings.

A suggestion system does exist. A recent attempt to obtain viable suggestions for improvement from employees lasted for three weeks. A suggestion box was placed in the employee lounge; the campaign was titled, "Let's Take Stock." Employees wrote suggestions and placed them in the box. A winner was chosen each week and awarded one share of the corporation's stock. At the end of three weeks, an overall winner was chosen and awarded five shares of stock.

Human messages are communicated verbally in dyadic, face to face situations. However, the entire organization recently sent a composite human message to the publisher. A mock A section was prepared containing tongue-in-cheek interviews with the publisher; newsstories and features were prepared about him. It was presented to the publisher as a birthday gift.
Formal network: horizontal. Face to face dyadic or small group contacts are frequent among members of the Operating Committee. Small groups are formed to plan or schedule special projects, to brainstorm or to review policy. There are few written or telephoned messages. There is more horizontal than vertical communication among Operating Committee members. However, contact among the various departments is usually limited to the upper echelons; lower level horizontal communication usually occurs intradepartmentally. Such contacts appear frequent and informal. They deal primarily with task and human messages.

In departments that perform "outside" work such as advertising sales or news gathering, vertical communication occurs more frequently than in departments that perform "inside" work as peers seldom see each other during working hours. In departments that perform such inside work as production, accounting or clerical tasks, there appears to be more horizontal than vertical communication. However, social gatherings after hours provide opportunities for additional horizontal communication. Most occurs verbally in face to face situations. Written and telephoned messages are seldom transmitted horizontally.

Informal network: bypassing channels and the grapevine. The publisher occasionally bypasses formal chan-
nels in his visits to all sections of all departments. He might deliver a task message (such as a suggestion for a story) to the metro or feature editor directly rather than through the managing editor; he might make a suggestion to one of the production forepersons. However, such bypassing usually involves task or human messages. If subordinates bypass supervisors when communicating upward, it is understood that the supervisor will be told what was said. Although the publisher and department heads to maintain an open door policy, they prefer that formal channels be followed. Occasionally, someone from a bureau will be unable to locate his/her supervisor and will pass information to either a peer or another supervisor in the central office.

Six members of the Operating Committee (including the publisher) indicated awareness of the "grapevine." The seventh member stated that there was no need for a grapevine in his department as he knew things first. Two members said they talked with "key communicators" as well as supervisors when they wanted information to be distributed quickly.

To summarize, among department heads there appears to be more horizontal than vertical communication. Information exchange is frequent and informal. The proportion of horizontal to vertical communication within departments varies according to the type of work the
department performs -- inside the building or outside. Informal as well as formal networks are utilized; messages are predominantly task-oriented; the most frequently used diffusion method is verbal in face to face dyadic or small group situations.

The Editorial Department Communication

**Formal network: downward.** The managing editor receives task and maintenance messages from both external and internal sources -- from newspaper readers or from the publisher or Operating Committee members. He also receives input from members of his department, though two section heads provide most of the input.

Task messages are diffused verbally in face to face situations through section heads or the editorial staff. Since each section focuses on different topics, there is frequent, informal individual contact. However, the heads of sections dealing with local news and features receive the most contact. Although there is occasional interaction with individual employees, most task messages emanating from the managing editor travel through formal channels.

Task messages are also diffused through small group meetings. The daily "budget" meeting at which the content and play of stories for the next day's paper are discussed is one such situation. Representatives from all sections of the department attend. Representatives
take decisions to their sections and plan layout accordingly. Another small group situation is the weekly bureau chief meeting. Story assignments and problems are discussed. A third type of small group interaction occurs when special supplements are planned. Editors and/or section heads attend the planning session, decide the story topics and assign them to individual writers. Topics and assignments are mimeographed and given to each writer with his/her assignment circled. Task messages such as those are diffused through written media to the entire department.

Assignments or schedules are usually given to writers by their immediate supervisors verbally in face to face dyadic or small group situations. The supervisor or assistant determines assignments or schedules. In the sports section and one bureau, assignments are written and posted on a wall. The editor of the feature section often supplements assignments with written individual memos.

Although news and editorial policies are within the realm of task messages, such policies are seldom the topic of task messages. It was stated that no formal policies exist, that issues were dealt with individually. However, one editor did comment, "We are liberal with respect to human rights and conservative regarding fiscal matters." Policies are communicated implicitly ra-
ther than explicitly through careful editing or informal chats.

Salary and performance evaluations are also task messages. Such messages are diffused in individual, face to face verbal situations. One editor takes employees to lunch or confers outside the building when salary or performance matters are discussed to insure privacy. Other editors either tell or discuss salaries with subordinates. If there is a question or complaint formal channels are followed. Downward feedback regarding job performance is rare.

Maintenance messages (those dealing with employee benefits, holiday or vacation scheduling, organization-wide announcements or corporate decisions) are diffused primarily through written media such as bulletin board pinups, memos to supervisors or the monthly employee newsletter. Messages are also diffused through special topic seminars, such as legal aspects of news reporting. Such messages are directed to the "public." However, notes are sometimes sent to individual members, especially those in bureaus who do not come to the central newsroom often. The telephone is used to deliver occasional maintenance messages to bureau employees, though bureau chiefs are responsible for passing along information. None of the sections in the editorial department hold regular section-wide meetings due to logistical pro-
blems -- most writers spend at least half their working hours in the community gathering information; scheduled meetings interfere with their appointments. Schedules are staggered, as are days off. If such meetings are held they do not include all section members.

Human messages occur verbally in face to face situations. Occasionally, a note of praise will be attached to an especially good story and placed on the writer's desk. Such messages do not occur frequently. The monthly "feather awards" are another type of human message. There is one award for inside work and another for outside work; the cash value of the award is $15.00 (tax is deducted). Such awards are presented publicly. Most human messages, however, occur after hours in informal, small group social settings.

**Formal network: upward.** Task messages containing employee input and feedback are directed to one's immediate supervisor verbally in face to face dyadic situations or via telephone. Such messages are frequently questions. Upward communication follows formal channels though section heads, like the managing editor, maintain "open door" policies. However, few task messages travel upward. Just as section heads differ in the amount of feedback they provide employees regarding job performance, they differ in providing opportunities for employee input and feedback. The greatest amount of
two-way feedback was observed in the feature section. Maintenance messages are sent infrequently. There is no suggestion system as such; there are no department-wide meetings. When maintenance messages are transmitted, they go to the supervisor or occur after hours. They include suggestions for changes in the paper's layout or design, suggestions for improving lighting or complaints about chairs or desk size. One editor said, "If you want to be heard, you have to know who to talk to. Only a few people are heard."

Human messages that are transmitted upward occur in face to face dyadic or small group situations. Most occur after hours.

Formal network: horizontal. Face to face dyadic or small group contacts are frequent among the editors of various sections. Coordination of stories and sections of the paper is essential. There is frequent and informal interaction; small groups meet daily in budget meetings, weekly in bureau chief meetings, or periodically to plan special sections. Task messages predominate; however, occasional maintenance or human messages crop up. The information exchange is verbal, though written media may be used to diffuse results.

Within sections, there is a vast amount of information exchange among peers. Tips for stories, com-
ments regarding writing, requests for clarification of policies or assignments, plans for social activities are topics of message exchange. Within sections, much comradery was observed. However, there is little contact between persons occupying the same level in different sections. Most messages are diffused verbally, though there are occasional written or telephone exchanges; dyads and small groups are situations for horizontal communication.

**Informal network.** The managing editor occasionally bypasses formal communication channels. He may work directly with an assistant editor or writer rather than through the supervisor, especially when special projects are underway. Situations such as election nights require instantaneous communication -- there is no time to go through formal channels. Employees also bypass their supervisors on occasion, though they are not encouraged to do so. The managing editor works in the newsroom, uses the same equipment as editors and writers; his office is in the newsroom so he is available for informal chats.

According to some writers, the grapevine is thriving and well in the newsroom. Several mentioned heavy reliance on the grapevine for policy and personnel information. Salary policies were recently changed but one person said, "I don’t know what the new policies
are. It's too early -- there's not much on the grapevine yet." The grapevine includes everything from salary to the handling of stories to editorial reactions to stories to off-the-record comments from editors to reporters. "A reporter being fired or transferred is usually the last to know," one person said. A bureau employee commented, "You have to rely on the grapevine to get an idea of what's going on. The jungle drums do work well here!"

Few editors commented about the grapevine, though they did note that much informal communication occurred after hours in a favorite local bar. "People can get a lot of things off their chest in an informal situation like that," one editor said.

In all, formal and informal networks are heavily used, though the formal predominates during working hours on normal days. There appears to be more downward than upward communication activity; there is more horizontal than vertical activity. Dyadic relationships are the most frequent. Messages are diffused orally in face to face situations or via telephone -- few written messages are transmitted. Task messages are sent more frequently than maintenance or human messages.

Within the organizational communication system, employees have attitudes and perceptions about the organization, their jobs and communication. Those attitudes
and perceptions are described in the next section.

The Communication Climate

The communication climate -- the attitudinal dimension of the organizational communication system -- is described below. Attitudes toward the organization and jobs that correlated significantly with demographic variables are presented first. Overall attitudes and perceptions are then described. Perceptions of communication are then presented as are significant correlations among communication perceptions, demographic variables, organization and job related attitudes. Lastly, factors or dimensions that describe interrelationships among attitudes and communication perceptions are identified.

Relationships Between Attitudes and Demographic Characteristics.

Significant correlations among demographic characteristics and organization/job-related attitudes are presented in Table 6 on page 103. Only the demographic variables with significant correlations are described.

The most highly significant correlations were with level occupied in the hierarchy. The higher the level, the lower the number assigned to it. The negative correlations indicated that higher (more positive) ratings of equitability of assignments, promotions, participation, awards received and autonomy/independence were
Table 6
Significant Correlations Between Demographic Characteristics and Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superv. listen</th>
<th>.32*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary F-D</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign. Equit.</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rcvd. Promotion</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to advance</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source F-D</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>-.78** .35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards received</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.35* .35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/indep.</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative/creat.</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job importance</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(society)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards commensurate</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  F = favortism and D = discrimination.

*p < .01
**p < .001
found in upper levels. Correlations with age included desire to advance (negative, indicating that older persons indicated less desire to advance), participation and satisfaction (both positive, indicating that older persons felt they participated more and were more satisfied).

The only correlations with sex were perceptions of favoritism/discrimination in terms of salary and treatment by sources. The positive correlations indicated that males were more likely to perceive favoritism and females discrimination. The negative correlations between section and feelings about supervisory listening, encouragement of creativity and initiative, ratings of the importance of jobs to societal functioning and commensurateness of rewards indicated that the lower the section number, the more positive the ratings; e.g., news persons were the most likely to feel that their jobs were very important to society and that rewards were commensurate with the time and effort expended. Feature and sports persons were more likely to give those variables lower ratings.

The positive correlation between educational level and autonomy/independence perceptions indicated that the more education an individual had, the more positive the rating of autonomy and independence -- the more likely it was that s/he felt that s/he had enough autonomy and independence. Work experience in media other than news-
papers correlated positively with responsibility, indicating that individuals with work experience in other media were more likely to feel that they had enough responsibility. Positive correlations with the amount of time spent with the paper indicated that the longer an individual had worked for the paper, the more likely it was that s/he had received promotions, participated in the decision-making process, had received more awards and felt that rewards were commensurate with the time and effort expended. The negative correlation between time spent in one's present position and desire to advance indicated that the longer one had been in his/her present position, the less s/he wanted to advance.

The following section merely describes attitudes toward organization and job related variables. No tests of statistical significance (such as t or F ratios) as it was felt that the correlation procedures would provide the necessary information.

**Overall Attitudes and Perceptions**

*Organization related.* Organization related questions assessed the clarity of policies, the consistency and competence of management, interpersonal relations, evaluations, opportunities to participate in the decision-making process, promotion opportunities, perceptions of favoritism or discrimination and perceived equitability of salaries and assignments.
Employees were asked to rate the clarity of organizational policies such as hiring, firing, salaries and promotions on a 5-point Likert-type scale with 5 as the most positive response. The mean assessment of clarity was 3.06, with Level 2 persons giving the highest assessment (\( \bar{X} = 3.5 \)) and Level 3 the lowest (\( \bar{X} = 2.8 \)).

According to the 5-point scale, the mean assessment of management competence (task-expertise) was 4.14. All levels rated competence above 4.0. However, perceptions regarding management consistency were lower in that the mean rating was 3.74. Level 2 persons gave the most positive consistency rating (\( \bar{X} = 4.2 \)). For comparison purposes, 11 of the 23 persons occupying Levels 2 and 3 were asked if they felt themselves to be consistent. All except one gave an unqualified "yes" answer.

Across levels, 61% of the subjects felt that their supervisors listened to them, 31% felt they were listened to sometimes, and 8% felt that supervisors did not listen to them. A larger proportion (73%) of Level 2 persons felt that supervisors listened than did persons in Levels 3 or 4 (58% for both levels). Of the 23 occupants in Levels 2 and 3, 12 were asked whether or not they listened to subordinates -- 100% said "yes."

The degree to which employees felt they participated in the decision-making process ranged widely across le-
vels in that 64% of the Level 2 subjects stated they participated frequently, 75% of the Level 3 subjects stated they participated sometimes, and 85% of the Level 4 subjects stated they did not participate at all.

However, opportunities for evaluating supervisors were perceived as practically nonexistent in that 96% of the subjects stated that they "absolutely did not" evaluate supervisors. In terms of personal evaluations, only 6% of the newsroom employees across levels could explain how their job performance was evaluated, 28% guessed and 66% had absolutely no idea. The most frequent comment was, "They'll tell me when I'm doing something wrong."

Despite the lack of participation and lack of knowledge of evaluation procedures, relationships with supervisors were characterized as "very good" by 80% of the respondents across levels. The proportion of "very good" answers ranged from 73% in Level 4 to 92% in Level 3. In terms of peer relationships, 80% of all respondents across levels described them as "very good." The proportion of "very good" answers ranged from 75% in Level 3 to 82% in Level 2.

When asked whether or not assignments were equitably distributed, 100% of the Level 2 persons answered "yes," 75% of the Level 3 persons said "yes," but only 31% of the Level 4 persons gave an unqualified yes
answer. Well over half the Level 4 respondents (58%) perceived salaries as inequitable, whereas over half the Level 3 respondents (55%) stated that salaries were equitable. More Level 2 persons felt that salaries were inequitable (45%) than equitable (22%).

Employees were asked if they had been discriminated against or favored at any time during their employment with the paper in terms of salaries, promotions, assignments or treatment by sources. The vast majority across levels stated that they had been neither favored nor discriminated against: 81% regarding salaries, 71% regarding assignments, 79% with respect to promotions, and 72% regarding treatment by news sources. The greatest range in responses was found in Level 4 answers as approximately 15% in each category perceived some discrimination. A higher proportion of females than males perceived discrimination in all categories (overall, 27% v. 9%), but the majority of females perceived neither favoritism nor discrimination. In all categories, a higher proportion of males (13%) than females (6%) felt they had been given favored treatment, but again, the vast majority perceived neither favoritism nor discrimination. It should be remembered that the correlation between sex and favoritism/discrimination was significant only with respect to salaries and treatment by sources.
When asked whether any groups were discriminated against or favored, 43% of the respondents across levels indicated that they felt males were favored over females; 24% stated that neither favoritism nor discrimination existed, and 33% stated that they felt females were discriminated against.

Across levels and sexes, a high proportion of persons felt they had received promotions: 91% in Level 2, 75% in Level 3, but only 42% in Level 4. A majority of the respondents did perceive opportunities for advancement in that 57% gave an unqualified "yes" answer to the question, 29% qualified their answers and 14% stated that there were no opportunities for them. Persons who gave qualified or negative answers were more interested in writing than management or editing. Advancement opportunities for writers were perceived as very limited.

A related question assessed respondents' desire to advance. Overall, 71% stated that they wanted to advance, though the proportion differed by level: positive answers were given by 64% of the subjects in Level 2, 58% of those in Level 3 and 81% of those in Level 4. Most of the persons in Levels 3 and 4 indicated a desire to advance in their careers rather than within the newspaper or corporation. Interestingly, a higher proportion of Level 4 subjects identified definite career goals (69%) than did Level 3 respondents (50%) or Level
respondents (55%). Level 2 subjects were interested in management and editing, Level 4 persons in writing and Level 3 persons were ambivalent.

To summarize, policies were perceived as moderately clear, management received a high competence rating but a moderate consistency rating. There was a discrepancy between the proportion of subordinates who felt supervisors listened and the proportion of supervisors who felt they listened. The proportion of persons who felt they participated in the decision-making process decreased according to level. Employees felt they were not given opportunities to evaluate supervisors nor did they know how their job performance was evaluated. Interpersonal relationships with peers and supervisors were generally characterized as "very good." The proportion of persons who perceived assignments as equitably distributed decreased by level though the relationship between level and salary equitability was curvilinear in that Levels 2 and 4 perceived the greatest inequities. Although little discrimination regarding salaries, assignments, promotions or treatment by sources was perceived by individual respondents, well over half stated that females as a group were discriminated against and males favored. There was a linear relationship between level and the proportion of persons who had received promotions -- more Level 2 persons had received promotions than had
Level 3 or 4 persons. Additionally, the majority perceived opportunities for advancement within the newspaper and corporation though desire to advance was linked more to careers than to the newspaper or corporation, as were career goals.

Job related attitudes. Job related questions dealt with perceptions of responsibility, autonomy, the utilization and development of abilities, the degree to which initiative and creativity were encouraged, and limitations; questions also assessed self-evaluations of job performance and job satisfaction, attitudes toward the importance of jobs and whether or not rewards were commensurate with the time and effort expended.

Overall, 67% of the subjects felt they had enough responsibility, though answers ranged widely among levels in that 91% of the Level 2 respondents gave positive answers, 63% of the Level 3 persons but only 58% of Level 4. A larger proportion of Level 3 respondents (37%) stated that they did not have enough responsibility than Level 2 (9%) or Level 4 (19%) persons. Perceptions of autonomy and independence were rated on the 5 point scale. The mean rating was 4.7, indicating that a very high degree of autonomy and independence was perceived. All levels rated autonomy and independence above 4.5.

The degree to which abilities were utilized and de-
veloped was also rated on the 5 point scale. Overall, the mean assessment was 3.61; ratings did not differ among levels. Subjects evaluated their own job performance according to the 5 point scale. The mean rating was 4.18; ratings did not differ among levels. Employee satisfaction with jobs was rated as 3.9 overall with no difference among levels. The degree to which rewards were perceived as commensurate with time and effort expended received a mean rating of 4.04 though the mean for Level 3 was higher (4.33) than that of Level 2 (3.90) or Level 4 (3.96). Employees rated the importance of their jobs to themselves highly as the mean was 4.60 with no appreciable difference among levels. However, jobs were perceived as less important in terms of societal functioning in that the mean rating was 3.78, again with no appreciable difference among levels.

The majority of respondents (57%) felt that management encouraged creativity and initiative. The 42% who qualified their answers stated that initiative was encouraged but creativity was not. Writers felt somewhat confined by the straight objectivity required of news reporting; some feature persons felt they were not allowed to write "hardhitting" stories. Editors felt confined with respect to the layout and design of the paper established 10 years ago. However, the limitations that
hindered effective job performance that were identified by subjects dealt with lack of time and quantity of work rather than stultification; 53% of the respondents overall said there were no limitations. Overall, 61% of the subjects stated that they had received awards for journalistic work either as individuals or as members of a team. The highest proportion of "yes" responses was given by Level 3 persons (75%); the lowest was given by Level 4 persons (58%).

To summarize, two-thirds of the newsroom employees felt they had enough responsibility; they also perceived a very high degree of autonomy and independence. The degree to which abilities were utilized and developed received a moderate rating. Subject evaluations of job performance and satisfaction were fairly high as were perceptions of the commensurateness of rewards. Jobs were rated as more important to selves than to societal functioning. Barely half of the respondents felt that management encouraged both creativity and initiative, yet only 22% specified limitations that prevented effective job performance.

Although there were few statistically significant correlations between attitudinal and demographic variables, the trend of the responses did indicate that level and section were moderately valid predictors of attitudes and perceptions, as was seniority.
Communication Perceptions

Assessments of communication channels. Employees were asked to describe the overall openness of communication in the editorial department as well as the quality of downward, upward and horizontal communication. Specifically, they were asked, "Overall, is communication open in this department?" Responses indicated a linear relationship between level and feelings about communication openness in that 82% of Level 2 persons gave unqualified positive responses, 42% of Level 3 but only 35% of Level 4 persons; 23% of Level 4 subjects gave unqualified negative responses. Overall, 47% of the respondents gave unqualified positive responses, 37% gave qualified responses and 16% negative. The proportion of all unqualified and qualified positive assessments was 84%.

When data were analyzed according to section, it was found that feature personnel gave the largest proportion of unqualified positive responses (64%); 53% of news persons gave unqualified positive responses and there were no unqualified positive responses from sports persons. In that section, 50% gave qualified positive responses and 50% gave negative responses.

Level occupied in the hierarchy, age, and section were found to correlate significantly with open communication and upward communication assessments. Table
Table 7

Significant Correlations Among Communication Perceptions and Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open Communication</th>
<th>Upward Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level in hierarchy</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate that the higher the level occupied, the more positive the assessment of communication openness and upward communication, indicating that level was a valid predictor of communication perceptions. The positive relationship between age and communication perceptions indicated that older respondents were significantly more likely to rate communication openness and upward communication quality more positively than younger respondents. The significant relationship between section and communication indicated that sports persons were significantly more likely to give negative assessments of communication.

Although upward communication was the only one of the three channels to produce significant relationships
with level occupied, the assessments of downward and horizontal communication indicate similar trends. Percentages of responses are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Descriptions of Communication Channels by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downward Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upward Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horizontal Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of persons per column.

Downward communication received the highest proportion of unqualified positive descriptions from Level
2, as did upward communication. For both channels, there was a direct linear relationship between level and unqualified positive, qualified positive and negative responses, with upper level subjects giving the most positive answers. Upward communication received the fewest number of unqualified positive responses and the largest proportion of negative. Horizontal communication assessments reflected basically the same relationships, though with little appreciable difference between Levels 2 and 3. Horizontal communication received the largest proportion of unqualified positive responses overall (78%) and no negative responses.

The next section describes significant correlations among assessments of communication channels and organization/job related attitudes.

**Communication Assessments and Attitudes.** Significant correlations among all communication and attitudinal variables were obtained through Spearman correlation tests for significance. They are presented in Table 9 on page 118.

The largest number of significant correlations occurred with assessments of communication openness. The most highly significant correlations were between communication openness and downward communication, upward communication, supervisory listening, clarity of policies, desire for advancement, relationship with the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Downward comm.</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Upward comm.</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Horizontal comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Supervisory listening</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Clarity of policies</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Management consistency</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Management competence</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Equitable assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Received promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Desire advancement</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Id. career goals</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Relationship/peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Relationship/supervisors</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Evaluation of supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Autonomy/Independence</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Initiative/Creativity</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Abilities used</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Rewards commensurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant between \( p < .01 \) and \( p < .002 \)
** \( p < .001 \)
supervisor and feelings about the encouragement of initiative and creativity. Other correlations included the consistency and competence of management, identification of career goals, participation, responsibility, autonomy/independence, utilization of abilities and job satisfaction. The correlations between communication openness and mobility aspirations were negative.

There were positive correlations between descriptions of downward communication and upward communication, clarity of policies, equitability of assignments, relationships with supervisors, participation in the decision-making process and management encouragement of creativity and initiative. Again, there were negative correlations between downward communication and mobility aspirations.

There were more correlations between upward communication and organization/job related attitudes than between the same attitudes and downward communication. Positive correlations included supervisory listening, clarity of policies, management consistency and competence, relationships with both peers and supervisors, limitations, participation, responsibility, autonomy/independence, creativity/initiative and job satisfaction. There was again a negative correlation between perceptions of upward communication and stated desire to advance.
Horizontal communication had few significant correlations. Those positive correlations dealt with promotions, relationships with peers and the commensurateness of rewards with time and effort expended. The one negative correlation dealt with opportunity to evaluate supervisors, indicating that if an individual felt that s/he had opportunities to evaluate supervisors, s/he gave horizontal communication a low rating.

In all, assessments of communication openness were found to be more predictive of other job related attitudes than were the assessments of specific communication channels. The next section deals with factors or dimensions of attitudes that describe interrelationships among communication and organization/job related attitudes.

Attitude Factors

A principal components factor analysis was applied to the attitudinal data. Table 10, page 121, contains the factor loadings; Table 11, page 122, contains the factor descriptions. Fourteen factors with eigenvalues above unity were identified and then rotated orthogonally using a varimax technique. Each variable's highest loading (largest correlation coefficient) was identified and factors constructed accordingly. The complete factor analysis is contained in Appendix D.

Factors 1 through 6 accounted for over half the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open communication</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward comm.</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward comm.</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superv. listening</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy clarity</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. consistency</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. competence</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Fav./Disf.</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Equity</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment F/D</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign. Equity</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv. promotion</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion F/D</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppor. advance</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter advance</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Id. career goals</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source F/D</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Fav./Disf.</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatns/peers</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation/superv.</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New employee</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval. superv.</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Dep.</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiat./creat.</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities used</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance job/ cowork.</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance job/ self</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F/D and Fav./Disf. indicate "favorable" or "disfavorable."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open communication</td>
<td>Assignment F/D*</td>
<td>Awards received</td>
<td>Abilities utilized/developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward communication</td>
<td>Received promotion</td>
<td>Importance job/society</td>
<td>Importance job/self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward communication</td>
<td>Promotion F/D</td>
<td>Rewards commensurate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of policies</td>
<td>Limitations (neg.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to advance (neg.)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
<th>Factor 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equitability of assignments</td>
<td>Salary F/D, Group F/D</td>
<td>Salary equityability</td>
<td>Horizontal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career goals identified</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How evaluated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 9</th>
<th>Factor 10</th>
<th>Factor 11</th>
<th>Factor 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of supervisors</td>
<td>Source F/D, Job performance</td>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>Supervisory listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship with supervisors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 13</th>
<th>Factor 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management competence</td>
<td>Management consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative/creativity encouraged</td>
<td>Opportunity to advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F/D indicates "favoritism" or "discrimination" perceptions
the total variance (52.1%). The fourteen factors together accounted for 81.5% of the total variance. Each factor contains one or more attitudinal variables that covary, that indicate one dimension of attitudes and perceptions in the newsroom. The factor or dimension is a summary of related attitudes. For example, Factor 1 was comprised of communication assessments, clarity of policies and desire to advance (negative relationship). It was labelled a communication factor and indicated that communication was one aspect of attitudinal considerations that could be measured. A more complete discussion of factors is contained in Chapter IV.

Summary

This chapter has presented findings concerning internal elements of the organization, the formal communication subsystem, and the communication climate. The relationships among the elements, the communication subsystem and climate are discussed in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

The present chapter discusses relationships among the internal elements of the organization, the formal communication subsystem and the communication climate. A brief review of the internal elements and the formal communication subsystem is presented first; relationships among the elements of each are identified and compared to findings from organizational communication research. The communication climate is then discussed in terms of attitudes toward the organization, jobs and communication; relationships among attitudes are noted and findings are compared with other organizational communication research findings. The communication climate is then discussed as it relates to internal elements of the organization and the formal communication subsystem.

Internal Elements of the Organization

The major objectives of the organization were to produce a newspaper and make a profit for the organization's owners. The major objective of the editorial department was to plan and produce copy for the paper. Therefore, the "orientation" (using McElreath's 1975 terminology) of both the organization and the editorial
department was "product-processing/efficiency."

The overall structure of the organization conformed to the line and staff division of labor identified by classical organization theorists in that the different levels in the organization exercised differing amounts of authority and responsibility. The top level was comprised of the publisher and the six department heads -- the Operating Committee. Within the top level, jobs were divided according to function: each department had equal autonomy responsibility and authority. Within each department, line and staff divisions were noted, but again within each level, jobs were divided functionally. The line and staff division was less clear-cut in the editorial department as persons fulfilled different job functions on different days and accordingly assumed different amounts of authority and responsibility. However, the editorial department was divided into nine functional divisions, though amounts of authority and responsibility accorded each section differed.

Within each section of the editorial department, there were again functional divisions of labor in that members were given specific job assignments. However, the span of control differed among sections as it ranged from 1 to 25. The number of levels in each section also differed.

Overall, the organization had a "flat" shape, as
did the editorial department. However, the metro (B) section within the editorial department was "taller" than other sections in that there were more levels of authority and responsibility. Both the organization as a whole and the editorial department were extremely complex as there were many different job specialties. However, within the editorial department, there were no written job descriptions. In both the organization as a whole and the editorial department, supervisory authority was decentralized as individual section heads controlled the activities of their subordinates. Much discretion was allowed with respect to day to day operational decisions. Decision making regarding organizational matters (policies, procedures and rules) was highly centralized in both, though the publisher seemed to utilize input from a larger number of persons than did the managing editor.

All departments within the organization were highly mechanized as computer services were utilized. The editorial department was almost completely automated with the Harris 2500-50 electronic composing and editing system. Within that system, much autonomy and responsibility is required of the individual. Job functions were varied in that one person gathered the news, wrote the story, edited the story, planned the layout and supervised paste-up, though few writers actually performed
editorial functions. Persons in the feature section performed more of the above tasks than did individual persons in the news section. All writers were being trained to use the system.

The style of leadership exhibited by the publisher was found to be primarily consultative in that he made final decisions regarding goals and plans after receiving input from department heads and lower echelon employees. Decision making was relatively decentralized and there was frequent, personal interaction. The style of leadership exhibited by the managing editor was a mixture of the benevolent authoritative and consultative styles in that departmental goal setting and decision making were highly centralized but production processes were decentralized. Latitude and discretion characterized news judgment. There was frequent, personal, and informal contact among members of the department. Leadership style differed among sections in that the head of the features section exhibited more consultative/participative traits than did sports or news section heads.

The reward system throughout the organization focused on salaries, fringe benefits, promotions and concomitant increased authority and responsibility. The reward system conformed to the second type of motivational pattern identified by Katz and Kahn (1966) in which such extrinsic motivators as raises, fringe bene-
fits, and promotions were utilized. However, the emphasis on pride, responsibility and authority conformed to the third type of motivational pattern, which relied on internalized patterns of self-determination and satisfaction from accomplishment. The publisher stressed the importance of building intrinsic motivation among employees more than individual department heads.

Within the editorial department, rewards were primarily extrinsic in that salaries, awards and promotions predominated. However, many journalists expressed a desire for such rewards as constructive criticism or positive feedback. The job-associated rewards they identified reflected a high degree of inner motivation (see Table 1, page 79). That inner motivation did not appear to be reinforced by the department's reward system. Johnstone's contention (1976) that status and overt recognition for job performance exist outside the organization appeared to be supported.

Operating Committee members identified intergroup relations as generally very good, as did members of the editorial department, though more intradepartmental and intrasectional interactions were observed that between-department or between-section interactions.

In terms of the individual, Operating Committee members' average age was 41, all had some college experience, the average amount of time spent in newspaper
work was 18\(\frac{1}{2}\) years. The length of time they had been with the paper ranged from less than six months to more than 5 years but the length of time spent in present positions averaged about 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) years.

Within the editorial department, 60% of the employees were under 30, reflecting a much younger age group. However, the largest proportion of under 30 persons was found in Level 4 -- the lowest rung of the hierarchical ladder. Of the editorial department line personnel, \(\frac{2}{3}\) were male; as level in the hierarchy increased so did the proportion of male occupants. Generally, as level increased, so did occupants' age, experience in working with other newspapers, seniority and time spent in present positions. The only significant correlation between sex and the other 10 demographic variables was work experience with newspapers other than the one under study \((r(47) = .40, p < .002)\), indicating that males were more likely than females to have worked with other papers. Although the proportion of females differed by level and section, confirming Lublin's (1972a; 1972b) findings that females were most often found in feature or society sections and limited to lower levels in the hierarchy, there were no statistically significant relationships. Females were as likely as males to have college educations, broad work experience and seniority, though trends indicated that males had broader work experience
and seniority.

The review of the internal elements of the organization was provided because it is the framework within which the formal communication system operates.

The Formal Communication Subsystem

The formal communication subsystem was described in terms of message purpose, network, method of diffusion and relationship. In terms of the organization as a whole, it was found that there was more horizontal than vertical communication among department heads; there was great reliance on both formal and informal networks. The greatest number of messages were task-oriented; the most frequently used diffusion method was verbal in face to face dyadic or small group situations. Within the editorial department, there appeared to be more horizontal than vertical communication activity, but within the vertical framework, there appeared to be more downward than upward communication. During working hours on routine days there appeared to be more reliance on the formal than the informal networks for vertical communication. The largest number of messages were task-oriented, diffused verbally in face to face dyadic or small group situations, or via telephone due to outlying bureaus needing to coordinate activities. Maintenance messages were diffused downward following formal channels; task messages were diffused on both
formal and informal networks, horizontally and vertically.

Most of the communication activities centered on information acquisition (input) and processing -- many employees commented on the lack of feedback about their jobs (downward communication) as well as the lack of opportunity to feed back ideas and suggestions upwardly. Since the organization's orientation was "product-processing/efficiency," the type of communication activity observed conforms to McElreath's (1975) findings.

The newspaper must be produced daily by a large number of persons with highly specialized job functions. According to the terminology of Hage et al. (1971), the newsroom has a complex structure because there are many specialized job functions. However, departmental decision making is centralized in that goals are set and plans made by the upper echelons; decision making is decentralized in terms of day to day activities as individuals are allowed much discretion and latitude in selecting, writing and editing stories. Coordination was achieved through planning with respect to departmental decision making; it was achieved through feedback regarding day to day operations. Hage et al. failed to make that distinction. Accordingly, coordination was achieved through feedback within levels for day to day activities; it was achieved by planning for longer range
activities and word was passed along through levels via formal channels. Conforming to their findings, more communication activity was observed within levels (horizontally) than between levels (vertically). Given the "normal" day, vertical communication followed more formal than informal networks.

Given the automation of the newsroom and the great variety of tasks associated with specific jobs, it is understandable that there is frequent informal communication. There is a need for information immediately about tasks. Although no comparisons were made between the editorial and other departments, the high volume of communication activity appeared to be related to the type of work done and machines utilized; Sadler's 1974 finding that more subformal communication was found in departments with rapidly changing technologies and high task variability is at least lent credence.

It was seen that formal channels were sometimes bypassed when important news was late in arriving or when a high volume of news was arriving (such as on election nights) and deadlines were drawing nigh. The nature of newswork demands that necessary information be gotten from whomever has it, whether it be one's immediate supervisor, the managing editor or a subordinate; the nature of the work and associated information needs preclude rigid categorization of "leadership style" or
"motivational pattern." Many of the classification systems and typologies were based on observations of organizations that did not have the daily deadline pressures that confronted newspaper organizations and editorial departments. As one editor put it, "We're not a box factory!"

Depending on the day and the nature of the news as well as the personality of the individual sitting in the supervisory slot, information needs changed, as did communication behaviors and leadership styles. Although the editorial department was tentatively placed in the benevolent authoritative/consultative category of leadership style, the communication activities of the editorial department (frequent and informal) were more typical of a consultative/participative leadership style. Although more downward than upward vertical communication was observed on "normal" days, indicating the benevolent authoritative/consultative style, more spontaneous, informal communication was observed on hectic days. Formal channels were bypassed, decisions were made on all levels, control was exercised by all members on those days, indicating the participative leader. With respect to the distinction drawn earlier between "task" and "maintenance" decision-making processes and the varied nature of communication activity, the only conclusion
that can be drawn about leadership style in the editorial department is that it ranged from benevolent authoritative to participative, depending on the day, the news, the type of decision and information needs of the employees.

Just as leadership style eluded categorization in the editorial department, so did explanations for observed motivational patterns. Many editors commented that journalists were highly motivated, inquisitive, mobile individuals; turnover was high. Rewards were necessary to keep journalists with the organization rather than entice them to perform. If rewards were greater in other papers, they did not hesitate to leave. Career orientation also affected motivation in that opportunities to advance in one's career could be more important than advancing within the organization; e.g., writing rather than editing or management. If so, there would be less interest in maintenance than task messages. However, if the organization intended to keep the person, it would have to involve the individual with the organization, align his/her perceptions of personal (or career) success with organizational success, provide opportunities for self-actualization and achievement of career goals. Both extrinsic (salaries) and intrinsic (feelings of self-worth, satisfaction and involvement) rewards must be communicated; maintenance and
human messages should be transmitted as well as task-related messages. Given the centralized departmental decision making that was observed, rewards that reinforced intrinsic motivation (such as participation and identification with the organization) were limited to the upper levels. The maintenance and human messages that many lower level employees desired were not received. Reinforcement of motivation that already existed (such as the desire to write a good story) appeared to be lacking with respect to lower level employees. In short, there appeared to be a discrepancy between rewards desired and rewards received. In spite of the discrepancy but perhaps because of career orientations, journalists continued to work for the organization.

Communication among sections of the editorial department seemed to be limited to upper level employees, also. Little intersection communication was observed, though frequent intrasection communication occurred. Since different sections wrote about different topics and task related messages predominated, it could be that the source of needed information was only within the section.

Differences in the communication behaviors of males and females were not found; there was no observed difference in the communication behaviors of persons of
different ages. An individual's location in a particular section or level seemed to influence communication behavior more than demographic characteristics. In accord with the findings of Hamner et al. (1974) and Hall and Hall (1976), supervisors stated that they rated job performance according to the job that was done rather than by the sex or age of the person. Task accomplishment was deemed more important than who did the task or how it was done. Females and males exhibited similar communication behaviors regarding approaches to the managing editor; however, the news sections appeared to have more contact than other sections. Again, section and/or level appeared to influence communication with supervisors more than demographic characteristics.

In summary, task messages predominated; the formal structure was bypassed when task-related information needs required it. It was seldom bypassed when maintenance messages were transmitted. The information (or communication) structure seemed to differ considerably from the formal authority/responsibility structure, depending on the day, the nature and volume of the news and the personality of the supervisor. However, in all, the technology and the nature of the work seemed to influence communication behavior more than specific leadership styles, motivational patterns, intergroup relations or demographic characteristics.
The internal elements of the organization and the formal communication subsystem both affect and are affected by the attitudes employees hold toward communication, the organization and their jobs. The attitudes are discussed in the next section.

The Communication Climate

Correlations

Employee attitudes toward the organization and management were, in general, fairly high. With the exception of the questions, "How often do you participate in the decision-making process," and, "Are you given an opportunity to evaluate your supervisor," a majority of respondents gave positive answers to yes-qualified-no questions; ratings on the 5 point scale exceeded 3.0. Management competence received the highest rating: \( \bar{X} = 4.14 \).

Employee job perceptions toward the utilization and development of abilities, the importance of jobs to societal functioning and supervisory encouragement of creativity and initiative received either moderate ratings or a scarce majority of positive responses. Perceptions regarding responsibility, autonomy and independence, job performance and satisfaction, and the importance of jobs to selves received the highest ratings.

Less than half of the respondents (47%) provided unqualified positive assessments of communication open-
ness though the proportion increased by level. The feature section had the largest number of unqualified positive responses but news evaluations, overall, were highest (i.e., news persons gave the lowest proportion of negative answers). Of the assessments of specific communication channels, horizontal received the highest proportion of positive responses and upward communication the lowest. Again, the largest proportion of negative responses came from lower level persons.

Comments from employees who elaborated their answers included, "Communication here is free and flexible;" and, "Open communication is mandatory in this type of work." One person said,

There was a time in the past when the staff was ready to revolt, to form a guild, due mainly to low pay and lack of communication. I don't sense that discontent now. There seems to be good communication, morale and understanding in the newsroom.

One editor said that the schedules of reporters and editors rarely coincided, creating a "delay in access."

"Sometimes they have to seethe a day or two," he explained. The following statement incorporated many of the negative comments heard.

We do not have open communication here. Lack of communication is the biggest problem in this newspaper. There are many decisions made about stories to be written, who will write them for special sections without consulting the people involved. Reporters don't know policies concerning hiring and salaries. There is a feeling that you have to do more work than you're actually ordered to do. The
reasons things are done are not explained. The greatest asset any paper has is the reporter. They should be encouraged to suggest; when suggestions are made there should be a response rather than a prize. You get the feeling that you shouldn't rock the boat, you should avoid saying anything that will get you in trouble. Management needs to open itself more.

Comments regarding specific communication channels were also made. Many persons in Level 4 stated that downward communication needed improvement. One person said,

Communication could be better as some editors overreact. Emotional reactions color communication. I don't know what causes those reactions. Anger is not the best way to communicate.

Another reporter stated,

Communication is not wide open. There is a layer between management and reporters. Reporters are not told everything that is going on or why. There is much better upward than downward communication though downward has improved significantly since October [1975]. There is no longer a shroud of secrecy on the executive level.

Another Level 4 person said, "Communication is not particularly open. There is not much vertical communication -- most is lateral." Another felt that the lack of downward communication hurt the quality of the paper. A second opinion regarding the relationship between the quality of the paper and internal communication was given by a writer. The person said,

I came here to learn. I'm not learning because my boss doesn't have the time to sit down with me, to teach me. I don't know of policy changes until they're implemented. There definitely needs to be more communication between staff and manage-
ment. Such communication keeps morale, interest and concern for the paper up.

Many subjects characterized upward communication as following a chain of command. However, one person noted that there were different chains of command for different problems. Questions regarding salary should be directed toward the top levels, he explained, whereas questions regarding assignments should be directed toward one's immediate supervisor.

One editor characterized upward communication as "extremely open." "I'm never afraid to walk into the managing editor's office," he said. However, another said, "Upward communication is limited. I know I'm not going to get what I want, so why ask for it?"

Level 4 persons expressed both positive and negative opinions with respect to upward communication. One said,

Under an earlier management, communication was much more formal and definitely through channels, but there was a lot of insecurity. The lines of communication are much clearer now.

However, another employee commented,

There is bad upward communication. The higher levels think of themselves as executives rather than working types -- there is less contact with the troops. There is a large number of middle management positions. The paper has more bureaucracy than most papers. It has a complex newsroom structure -- a galaxy of bosses.

Comments that dealt with horizontal communication focused on the lack of contact among sections of the pa-
per, but comments generally were positive.

The significant correlations among communication perceptions, organization and job related attitudes, and demographic characteristics proved interesting. Contrary to the findings of Porter and Lawler (1965), there was no significant correlation between job satisfaction and level occupied in the hierarchy ($r(46) = -.13, p < .10$). However, level was significantly related to perceptions of the equitability of assignments ($r(40) = -.52, p < .001$), the proportion of persons who had received promotions ($r(47) = -.42, p < .001$), participation in the decision-making process ($r(47) = -.80, p < .001$), the proportion of persons who had received awards ($r(43) = -.42, p < .002$), perceptions of autonomy and independence ($r(47) = -.36, p < .005$), perceptions of the openness of communication ($r(47) = -.33, p < .01$), and positive descriptions of upward communication channels ($r(47) = -.34, p < .009$). The negative correlations indicate that the higher the level occupied (smaller numbers were given to higher levels) the more positive the perceptions or attitudes (larger numbers were given to more positive answers). Upper level persons were more inclined to view assignments as equitable, to have received promotions, to participate, to have received awards, to perceive more autonomy and independence, and to be more positive about communica-
tion. The significant relationships between level and communication assessments confirm Fitz-Enz' 1975 finding that level was significantly related to communication satisfaction.

The significant relationships between level, job perceptions and communication indicated that the more involved a person was in the decision-making process (i.e., the higher the level occupied), the more satisfaction there was with both the job and communication. And, perceptions of communication openness were significantly related to job satisfaction ($r (46) = .38$, $p < .004$) as were positive descriptions of upward communication channels ($r (46) = .37$, $p < .005$), confirming the findings of Roberts and O'Reilly (1974a). Taken together, it appeared that job perceptions, including communication satisfaction, were more accurate predictors of job satisfaction than level occupied.

There were similar findings with respect to the section of the editorial department in which an individual worked. There was no significant correlation between job satisfaction and section ($r (46) = -.27$, $p < .03$), though the trend was pronounced. Since sections differed structurally (shape, span of control and unity of command) in that news section was the "tallest" and sports the "flattest," the lack of a significant relationship is contrary to Ivancevich and Donnelly's
1975 finding that persons in "flat" organizations were more satisfied with their jobs.

Perceptions of communication openness did relate significantly to section ($r (47) = - .34, p < .009$), as did positive descriptions of upward communication ($r (47) = - .33, p < .01$). The only other significant correlations with section were supervisory listening ($r (47) = - .32, p < .01$) and encouragement of initiative and creativity ($r (45) = - .39, p < .003$). The negative correlations indicated that the larger the number a section was given (news = 1, feature = 2, sports = 3), the lower the ratings of communication, supervisory listening and perceptions of management encouragement of creativity and initiative. However, the extremely low assessments given by sports persons could have pulled the assessments down as feature persons generally responded positively to the questions. The least satisfaction with communication was associated with the "flattest" sections. In all, job perceptions, including communication, were again better predictors of job satisfaction than such variables as section.

The only other significant relationship between demographic characteristics and job satisfaction was age ($r (46) = .33, p < .01$), which indicated that older persons were more satisfied with their jobs. Interestingly, age was also positively related to communication open-
ness \((r (47) = .40, p < .002)\) and descriptions of upward communication \((r (47) = .35, p < .006)\). It should be remembered that older persons were more likely to occupy upper levels. To summarize, structural variables and demographic characteristics were less important predictors of job satisfaction than attitudes toward management and the job. The significant relationships among communication perceptions, structural and demographic characteristics and job satisfaction, taken with the significant correlation between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction, point to the importance of communication in predicting both job perceptions and job satisfaction. Communication appeared to mediate the relationships; it did appear to be an "intervening variable" (Likert, 1967).

There was a larger number of significant relationships among job perceptions and communication perceptions than between job satisfaction and job perceptions. Job satisfaction was significantly related to the degree to which subordinates felt that supervisors listened to them \((r (46) = .32, p < .01)\), positive assessments of management competence \((r (46) = .45, p < .001)\), perceptions of favoritism with respect to assignments \((r (45) = .33, p < .01)\) and promotions \((r (45) = .41, p < .002)\), positive supervisory relations \((r (46) = .36, p < .006)\), encouragement of initiative and creativity
the degree to which abilities were utilized and developed ($r (46) = .34$, $p < .008$), the degree to which rewards were perceived as commensurate with time and effort expended ($r (46) = .32$, $p < .01$), as well as communication openness and upward communication. Satisfaction was negatively related to desire to advance ($r (46) = -.33$, $p < .01$), contrary to the findings of Roberts and O'Reilly (1974a). With the exception of perceptions of favoritism, all of the above variables were related to communication assessments, as were several more (see Table 9, page 118).

Individuals who were more satisfied with both jobs and communication were more likely to feel that supervisors listened to them, to see management as more competent, to have received promotions, to perceive good relations with supervisors, to feel that initiative and creativity were encouraged, to feel that abilities were utilized and developed, to feel that rewards were commensurate. In addition, those who were more satisfied with communication were more likely to feel that policies were clear, that management was consistent, that assignments were equitable, to not desire advancement or identify career goals, that peer relationships were good, that they were given more opportunity to evaluate supervisors, to participate in the decision-making process, to identify fewer limitations, to feel they had enough re-
sponsibility and autonomy. Overall, communication satisfaction was a better predictor of job perceptions than job satisfaction.

In addition, Johnstone's discovery that perceptions of autonomy and independence were significantly related to job satisfaction were not confirmed, though autonomy and independence in the current findings were significantly related to communication openness ($r (47) = .35, p < .007$) and upward communication descriptions ($r (47) = .36, p < .005$). The negative relationship between job and communication satisfaction and mobility aspirations confirm the findings of Read (1962) but are contrary to those of Roberts and O'Reilly (1974a). Although earlier research assessed the accuracy and quality of upward communication as it related to mobility aspirations and the current research did not, the finding that attitudes are related is interesting, as attitudes are related to actual behavior. Read (1962) did state in his findings that,

Of particular note is the modifying effect of interpersonal trust on the communication-mobility relationship. This finding not only lends emphasis to the crucial importance of attitudinal factors in communication, but also suggests that free and accurate information exchange may depend significantly upon positive and harmonious relationships between organizational members, particularly those who differ in formal power. (p. 13)

Since no empirical measures of such communication activities as the amounts of scheduled versus unscheduled
communication were made, the relationship between job and communication satisfaction and such activity cannot be stated with any degree of certainty. Marrett et al. (1975) did make such measures and found that both job and coworker satisfaction were related to scheduled and unscheduled activity. However, it was observed that much informal communication activity occurred; there were positive correlations between descriptions of peer relationships and qualitative assessments of upward communication \( r (47) = .31, p < .01 \). Marrett et al. found that employees were most positive about coworkers in organizations where unscheduled downward communication prevailed and most negative where unscheduled upward predominated. It has already been noted that there was greater reliance on formal channels with respect to upward communication and that there was more informal activity in terms of downward communication. Given the observed communication activity and the positive correlation between evaluation of peer relationships and upward communication, the current findings do substantiate, to a small degree, Marrett et al. findings. Additional support is found in the negative relationship between assessments of horizontal communication and opportunity to evaluate supervisors \( r (43) = -.38, p < .005 \). When horizontal communication was perceived as good, employees perceived fewer opportunities to evaluate supervisors.
It could be that such closeness to supervisors was detrimental to good horizontal communication; such closeness would indicate unscheduled upward communication and concomitant dissatisfaction with peers. Horizontal communication was significantly related to peer relationships ($r (47) = .46, p < .001$), indicating that positive feelings about horizontal communication meant positive feelings about coworkers.

Dennis (1974) found a significant relationship between superior/subordinate communication and assessments of downward communication. Although he evaluated the quality and accuracy of downward communication and the current research did not, current findings did indicate significant positive correlations between relationships with supervisors and communication openness ($r (47) = .32, p < .01$) and descriptions of upward communication ($r (47) = .58, p < .001$). Again, communication perceptions appeared to be related to variables much as did communication behaviors; communication attitudes as well as actual behaviors appeared to predict supervisor/subordinate relationships. Taking the findings of Dennis, Marrett et al., and the current research together, it appears that supervisor/subordinate relations need to be good -- but not so good that peer relationships and horizontal communication are impeded.

Although Dennis (1974) found no relationship be-
tween ratings of managers and communication assessments, the current research did. Perceptions of management competence were related to assessments of communication openness \( (r (47) = .35, p < .007) \) as were ratings of management consistency \( (r (45) = .37, p < .005) \). As mentioned earlier, ratings of management competence were also positively related to job satisfaction. Dennis conducted his research in an automotive manufacturing organization and an insurance firm, where, perhaps, management competence was not so highly valued as in a newspaper.

The above research indicated that leader behavior was related to both job and communication perceptions and satisfaction. Downey, Sheridan and Slocum (1975) found significant relationships between leader behavior, the degree to which tasks were structured and subordinate job performance and satisfaction. However, the degree to which leader behavior affected job performance and satisfaction was mediated by the degree to which tasks were structured. Roberts and O'Reilly (1974a) found, too, that leader behavior was positively related to communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. The positive correlation between supervisor relations and communication perceptions supported their findings, as did the positive correlations between supervisory listening and communication openness \( (r (47) = .43, p < .001) \) and positive assessments of upward communication \( (r (47) = .32, p < .01) \).
Liska's 1976 finding that supervisory listening was related to upward communication was supported. However, Dennis also found that supervisory communication activities accounted for greater variance in communication assessments than did organizational activities.

The current research found that most of the communication activity of lower level persons centered on immediate supervisors and peers; participation in organizational communication activity was limited to the upper echelons. Also, most of the input and processing of communication were limited to the upper echelons, confirming Mazza's 1975 finding. Interestingly, communication openness perceptions were positively related to participation ($r (47) = .36, p < .005$), as were descriptions of downward communication ($r (47) = .40, p < .002$) and upward communication ($r (47) = .38, p < .004$). A higher proportion of upper echelon respondents gave positive assessments of both participation and communication satisfaction, indicating more involvement in the system.

However, there was no significant relationship between participation and job satisfaction ($r (46) = .20, p < .08$). It appeared that communication satisfaction mediated the relationship between participation and job satisfaction as it was related significantly to both. As mentioned in a prior section, job satisfaction in
terms of perceived rewards was related to self-satisfaction at "doing a good job" rather than to organizational involvement. The career orientation rather than the organizational orientation of journalists is relevant here; satisfaction is derived from the job rather than the organization, though the organization can enhance the satisfaction through its reward system/motivational pattern.

When individuals perform a job well and derive satisfaction from the performance (as well as higher salaries and more promotions) they are intrinsically motivated and fall into Katz and Kahn's (1966) third category of motivational patterns. However, the fourth category details an even greater degree of intrinsic motivation in that personal goals are equated with organizational goals. Self-satisfaction is derived from both the job performed and the organization's success. Such intrinsic motivation is related to participation in the organization's decision-making process.

The findings indicated that only the persons occupying the higher levels perceived opportunities to participate, to equate personal and organizational goals. Intrinsic motivation of upper level persons was enhanced or rewarded through greater participation and autonomy and independence. The more negative assess-
ments of opportunity to participate and autonomy/independence by lower level persons indicated that reinforcement of already extant motivation was lacking.

Reinforcement of upper level persons was also greater in that more felt that supervisors listened to them; they perceived rewards for communication openness; they gave higher assessments of communication openness as well as the quality of specific channels than lower level persons. Thus, upper level persons were rewarded for both participation, performance, and communication. Lower level persons were rewarded for performance. Kri-vonos (1975) found that intrinsically motivated persons rated upward communication more positively than extrinsically motivated persons. If so, given the relationship between level and ratings of communication, the upper level persons who rated communication more positively were perhaps more intrinsically motivated and more representative of Katz and Kahn's fourth category of motivational patterns than were persons who gave negative assessments. The finding that upper level employees had been with the organization longer than lower level persons seems to support the speculation. If lower level persons are not made to feel a part of the organization, there is less likelihood that they will stay with it.

A second consideration involving motivation deals
with job satisfaction. Herzberg (1968) contended that job dissatisfaction was related to such hygiene variables as supervisory listening, clarity of policies and perceptions of favoritism; job satisfaction was related to such variables as recognition, responsibility and utilization of abilities. He repeatedly distinguished between the two. The current study found no such distinction -- job satisfaction was related to supervisory listening, perceptions of favoritism and promotions as well as the utilization and development of abilities, encouragement of creativity and initiative and the degree to which rewards were perceived as commensurate with time and effort expended. It has already been noted that communication perceptions were significantly related to a greater number of both types of variables than was job satisfaction. Therefore, it appeared as though communication satisfaction was at least as important as job satisfaction in terms of job and organization related activities.

To summarize, the current findings indicated that structural variables such as shape, unity of command, span of control were less valid predictors of job related attitudes than were communication perceptions. Demographic characteristics such as level occupied, section and age were found to be less important pre-
dictors of job related attitudes than communication perceptions. The high positive correlation between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction as well as the greater number of job related perceptions significantly related to communication indicated that communication perceptions colored more attitudes than "job satisfaction." However, upper level persons gave more positive assessments of communication, opportunity to participate and supervisory listening than did lower level persons, indicating that their involvement in the organization was greater and satisfaction was higher than that of lower level persons. Involvement in the communication system was positively associated with longevity as well as higher communication satisfaction with upper level persons; lower level employees were not permitted participation nor did they perceive rewards for involvement.

The attitudes and perceptions obtained by the current research existed within the framework of predominately verbal, face to face dyadic or small group communication activities. There was much horizontal and vertical communication, though downward occurred more frequently than upward. Formal channels were utilized more frequently in upward than downward communication. There was frequent informal contact. Messages were primarily task related, especially with lower level per-
sons; the lack of maintenance and human messages could have contributed to lower assessments of communication openness by those lower level persons.

The relationship between structure and communication activity generally conformed to findings of other organizational communication research. However, earlier research did not distinguish among types of decisions that were made in terms of centralization and decentralization. In the newspaper, maintenance and some task decisions were centralized; other task decisions were largely decentralized. Findings regarding technology and leadership style conformed to no other findings. Relationships between communication satisfaction and job related attitudes and communication activity generally confirmed those of other research, though findings regarding job satisfaction did not. The nature of communication activity in a newspaper's editorial department differed from that of other organizations as information was needed often from a great number of people, which precluded absolute reliance on formally structured roles and relationships or on formally prescribed channels of communication.

The factors that were identified regarding attitudes are described in the next section.

Factors

Fourteen attitude factors were identified through
a principal components analysis. Table 10, page 121, and Table 11, page 122, detail loadings and descriptions.

Factor 1 accounted for 18.7% of the variance in responses. It contained attitudes toward communication openness, downward and upward communication, clarity of policies and (negatively) desire to advance. It was labeled a Communication factor. Positive assessments of communication were related to positive perceptions of policy clarity; policies were perceived as clearer when communication was perceived as open or good. However, those who perceived communication as open were less inclined to desire advancement in the organization. They were either content with their present positions or oriented toward writing or careers outside the organization. Organizational advancement focused on editing and management. However, higher level persons were more likely to rate communication positively, as well as policy clarity. They had been in their positions longer and with the paper longer. They were older -- careers were largely behind them. The younger persons who occupied the lower levels had careers before them; there were more negative comments about communication in those levels. Again, perceptions and behavior affect each other in that desire to advance could preclude absolute openness in personal communica-
tion activities. Desire to advance could affect perceptions of the receptiveness of upper level persons (who control advancement) to open communication. Perhaps if they felt they could not communicate openly, they felt the system's communication system was not open. The communication factor, because it accounted for more variance than any other factor, was considered the most important predictor of attitudes of all the factors.

Factor 2 dealt with favoritism-discrimination, or fair treatment perceptions. It was labeled the Fair Treatment factor and accounted for 9.8% of the variance. Perceptions of favoritism/discrimination with respect to assignments and promotions had the highest relationships with the factor. Persons who perceived they had been favored or given fair treatment were more likely to feel they had received promotions and were more satisfied with their jobs. Persons who felt they had been given unfair treatment or discriminated against with respect to assignments or promotions were less satisfied with their jobs and felt that any change of job was more lateral than vertical. Interestingly, identification of limitations was negatively related to the factor, indicating that those who perceived fair treatment identified a larger number of limitations that kept them from performing their jobs effectively. It could be that promotion entailed more responsibility
and variability in jobs; time restrictions and extra
duties were the most often identified limitations. Such
"limitations" would increase with added responsibility
and variability.

The third factor accounted for 6.6% of the variance
and dealt with external aspects of job perceptions.
The variable with the highest relationship to the factor
was the perception of the importance of one's job to
society; the variable with the second highest relation-
ship was the degree to which rewards were perceived as
commensurate with the time and effort expended on the
job. The third, and final, variable was whether or
not individuals had received awards for their work --
awards from the professional community, local organiza-
tions or "in house." Such perceptions and awards would
enable journalists to rationalize the effort they put
into their work. If jobs were perceived as important
to societal functioning, it follows that rewards re-
ceived would be considered commensurate with the time
and effort expended. Receiving awards would reinforce
those feelings. The factor was labeled Rationalization.

Factor 4 dealt with perceptions of the importance
of the job to oneself. Included in the factor was the
"abilities utilized and developed" variable. If indivi-
duals felt their abilities were utilized and developed,
the job was perceived as more important to the person.
If individuals felt they were given an opportunity to gain new skills as well as display the ones they already had, they felt that jobs were vastly important to them. One person said, "I would hate to have to choose between my family and my job." If persons felt that they were not given the opportunity to grow and express themselves, they were less inclined to view jobs as integrally important to themselves. The factor was labeled Job Importance and accounted for 6.2% of the variance. Because job importance was related to ability utilization and not to such organization related variables as participation or level, the earlier speculation that journalists were more concerned with professions than organizational loyalty is lent credence.

The fifth factor accounted for 5.9% of the variance and was labeled Organizational Involvement. The highest relationships were found with perceptions of assignment equitability and participation in the decision-making process. The more a person participated, the more s/he perceived assignments as equitably distributed, and the more likely s/he was to identify specific career goals. The degree to which persons had specific career goals was related to participation and perception of assignment equitability, indicating that the more a person was involved with the organization, the more positive the assessments of organizational activities; personal goals
were more clearly defined.

The sixth factor dealt with perceptions of favoritism and discrimination with respect to salaries and specific groups in the editorial department as well as responsibility. Responsibility had the highest relationship with the factor; if persons felt they had enough responsibility, they were more likely to perceive favoritism or fair treatment regarding salary or groups. Several persons stated that for the amount of money they were paid they had enough responsibility. The factor was accordingly labeled Responsibility and accounted for 4.9% of the overall variance.

The seventh factor contained one variable: salary equitability. It accounted for 4.6% of the variance. Apparently, salary equitability perceptions constituted a distinct dimension of job related attitudes.

Factor 8 involved horizontal communication, relationships with peers, and knowledge of how one was evaluated. All were positively related to the factor; relationships with peers had the highest relationship with the factor. Consequently, the factor was labeled Peer Relationships. The inclusion of those variables indicated that the dimension involving peer relationships also involved horizontal communication and knowledge of how one was evaluated. Although peer relationships and horizontal communication were significantly related to
each other (positively), knowledge of how one was evaluated was not significantly related, though there was a weak trend in that direction.

Factor 9 accounted for 4.2% of the variance with one variable: evaluation of supervisors. Apparently, supervisory evaluation is a dimension that is separate from all other variables.

The tenth factor included job performance and perceptions of fair treatment by sources. Since job performance had the highest relationship with the factor, the factor was titled Job Performance. The highest evaluations of job performance were made by individuals who felt they had received favored or at least fair treatment from their sources.

Factor 11 was comprised of a single variable -- perceptions of autonomy and independence. It was so labeled, and accounted for 3.3% of the variance.

Factor 12 included supervisory listening and relationships with supervisors. The highest relationship was between supervisory listening and the factor. The Supervisor Behavior dimension showed that relationships with supervisors received the most positive assessments when subordinates felt that supervisors listened. The factor accounted for 3.3% of the variance.

The thirteenth factor dealt with management competence, encouragement of initiative and creativity
and the number of rewards employees listed. The variable with the highest relationship with the factor was management competence. If employees felt that management was competent (in terms of task-expertise), they felt that initiative and creativity were encouraged and listed a larger number of rewards the job provided them. The factor was titled Management Competence and accounted for 3.2% of the variance.

The last factor related opportunity to advance with perceptions of management consistency. If employees felt that management was consistent in its treatment of them, they were more likely to feel that there were opportunities to advance within the organization. Since the opportunity to advance variable had the highest relationship with the factor, the factor was labeled Advancement. It accounted for 2.8% of the variance.

Together, the fourteen attitude dimensions accounted for 81.5% of the total variance in responses. Summarizing, the factors that were identified were Communication, Fair Treatment, Rationalization, Job Importance, Organizational Involvement, Responsibility, Peer Relationships, Job Performance, Salary Equitability, Evaluation of Supervisors, Autonomy and Independence, Supervisor Behavior, Management Competence, and Advancement. The first six accounted for over half the total variance (52.1%); communication accounted for the most.
The importance of communication in the editorial department was greater than any other dimension or individual variable. The nature of the job required frequent, accurate, and instantaneous communication. The relative lack of emphasis on organization-related items indicated that the job was more important than organization-related matters.

Validity and Generalizability

The generalizability of the current research is limited. It was a "one shot case study" in that one organization was observed and described -- no experimental manipulations were involved. Findings could have been contaminated by a number of factors -- since there was no control group it is impossible to determine if such contamination occurred and if it did, the extent to which it affected the findings.

The first possible contaminant was the length of time required to interview subjects. A total of eight weeks was required. Changes in attitude, position in the organization, personnel and career orientation could have occurred between the first and last interviews. Secondly, the interviews themselves were time consuming; answers to the final questions were briefer than those to earlier ones. Thirdly, there could have been discussion among subjects about the questions. Many commented that they had never been asked "questions like
that," or that they had never given thought to such things. The experience for them was unique. Several reporters stated that the interview was the first time they had been on the "other side of the desk." Subjects were asked to not discuss their answers with others; the interviewer tried to give no information about prior answers to individual subjects by stating that all results would be presented at the end of the last interview. However, there was no assurance that subjects who were interviewed first did not discuss and contaminate the responses of those who were interviewed last.

The interviewer could have provided nonverbal cues which influenced answers. However, whatever the answer, she tried to remain impassive, but to develop a rapport with subjects. By relating personal experiences in an attempt to put the person at ease, an artificial expectation of what the interviewer wanted as answer could have been created. Subjects could have tried to give the interviewer answers they felt she wanted to hear rather than answers that were absolutely honest. Although subjects were given the questions in the same order each time, answers to some questions could have influenced answers to others. There was an attempt to separate like questions, or leading questions, and the interview did last an average of 1½ hours but there is again no
assurance that the questions did not influence other answers. Also, some questions were "double barrel"; e.g., "Does management encourage creativity and initiative?" Creativity and initiative are separate considerations. If the question had been focused on one or the other variable, results could have differed. The interviewer could also have been selective in the answers she heard and recorded, though no a priori assumptions were made about findings. Research questions rather than hypotheses guided the research.

Some questions were interpreted differently by different persons. To some the question, "Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?" was interpreted as satisfaction with the job-related duties performed; to others it meant how satisfied they were with the position they occupied in the hierarchy. The interviewer did try to stress general aspects of job satisfaction. The perceived vagueness of such questions, coupled with the different interpretations, could have produced invalid results. Finally, with respect to the questionnaire, the validity and reliability were not assessed. It was felt that pretesting a sample of the population would contaminate results; interest was focused on the entire population rather than a sample. Pretesting a different population could have produced misleading results as background, experience and age could differ.
The different scaling techniques used in categorizing answers could also have contaminated results, as could the arbitrary categorization of such open-ended questions as "rewards." The large number of significant correlations (130) could have contributed to a Type I error, though the .01 level of statistical significance was chosen to minimize such errors. However, by adopting a stringent level of significance, chances for a Type II error (failure to find significance when significance occurred) were increased.

The subjects of the study were selected specifically because they were newspaper employees. There was no random selection. The employees who were not interviewed were omitted due to inaccessibility rather than random exclusion. Although only the line population was interviewed, staff attitudes could have influenced results. There were no dropouts or personnel changes during interview periods, though a sports person was reassigned to features and two new sports persons were hired between the two interview periods. Two editors left, two lower level persons were promoted and two new writers were hired. Such changes could have influenced attitudes.

Although the results were believed valid for the specific time period of the study, personnel change has occurred since then. Different employees could have dif-
ferent attitudes. Different results could be obtained through identical study procedures.

The selectivity, the problems with instrumentation, the very personal nature of the interviewing and the conscious or subconscious biases on the part of both subjects and interviewer could limit the validity and generalizability of the findings. The time span of the interviews, the possible contamination of results through subject discussion of answers among themselves and the changes that occurred between interview periods are further limitations on the generalizability of results. To be considered also when generalizing to other newspaper populations is the relative youth of the paper, the frequent turnover of employees on all levels and the relative newness of upper level management. Employees in more stable or established newspaper environments could produce different answers.

However, the conformity of the present research findings with prior organizational communication research (Dennis, 1974; Fitz-Enz, 1975; Hage et al., 1971; Liska, 1976; Marrett et al., 1975; Mazza, 1975; McElreath, 1975; Read, 1962; Roberts & O'Reilly, 1974a; Sadler, 1974) lends support to the contention that results are both valid and generalizable. The above-listed contaminants were described according to threats to the validity of experimental research identified by
Campbell and Stanley (1963) though the present research was not experimental. They are sources of possible -- if not actual -- contamination; they should be considered when generalizing results. However, the care taken by the interviewer in wording questions and conducting interviews, as well as the stringent level of significance applied, lend viability to the results.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present study was an organizational communication analysis of a newspaper; a systems theory of organizations provided basic theoretical assumptions. Since communication activities occur within the framework of internal organization elements such as structure, objectives, leadership style, reward system, technology, intergroup relations and individual employee characteristics, those elements were first described. The communication activities were then described in terms of message purpose, network traversed, method of diffusion and relationships; attitudes toward communication, the organization and jobs that existed within the framework were measured and reported.

Findings indicated that the nature and technology of the organization were more important predictors of communication activities than such elements as structure, leadership style, reward system, intergroup relations or individual characteristics. Messages were primarily task-related, diffused both horizontally and vertically over formal and informal networks. The method of diffusion was primarily oral in face to face
dyadic or small group situations. Analysis of attitudinal data indicated that communication satisfaction was the most important predictor of organization and job-related attitudes. Persons occupying the lowest levels in the hierarchy were the most negative about communication and were the least involved in the system. Persons occupying the upper levels in the hierarchy were the most positive about communication and were much more involved in the system.

The nature of the work, the dichotomy between journalists' career orientations and demands of the organization, and factors that described attitudinal dimensions were discussed. Given the framework of internal organization elements and communication activities, the findings regarding communication attitudes confirmed other organizational communication research, though findings regarding job satisfaction did not.

Future research might deal with the communication structure of the organization, as opposed to formal authority and responsibility relationships. Interaction patterns, information sources and recipients, and message flow could be charted and related to measures of communication satisfaction.

Research could center on the dichotomy between journalists' orientation toward their profession and demands of the organization. The relative value of
rewards received from the external and internal environments could be assessed.

Subsequent research might also focus on identifying those variables that influence both job and communication satisfaction. Experimental manipulation of those variables could provide empirical evidence for speculations made in this paper (such as the relationships between involvement, intrinsic motivation and satisfaction).

Future research could include assessments of the organization's product -- how employees feel about the newspaper they create as a whole as well as how they think the reading public feels about it. Such attitudes could be further related to satisfaction measures.

Research could also utilize criteria identified by small group communication research as applied to newsroom communication (e.g., communication channels, task complexity, centralization and satisfaction). The identification of channels, communication leaders, centralization, task complexity and variability could lead to an extension of small group research findings to groups and group processes in organizational settings.

In all, the field of organizational communication is in its infancy. Communication has come to be regarded as crucial in the life of an organization; the current research findings support that contention. The find-
ings indicated that perceptions of communication colored other attitudes toward the organization and jobs and that such attitudes were related to the formal communication system of the organization.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES
Level 4

Personal

1. Please describe your job as well as the "level" you occupy in the newsroom.

2. How old are you?

3. What is your sex?

4. With which section do you work? Please describe the structure, functions, and responsibilities of your section.

5. What is your level of education? If you have a college degree, what was your major?

6. Is this the only newspaper you have worked with? If not, please list others.

7. Have you worked in other media-related fields?

8. Have you held jobs in nonmedia fields?

9. How long have you been with this newspaper?

10. How long have you occupied your present position?

11. Are you married?

Communication

12. Within this department, is communication open?

13. How would you describe the quality of downward communication in this department?

14. How would you describe the quality of upward communication in this department?

15. How would you describe the quality of horizontal communication in this department?

Organization-related questions

16. Do you feel that your supervisor listens to you? Please explain your answer.
17. Generally, to what degree are policies on hiring, firing, promotions and salaries clear to you? (1 to 5 scale)

18. To what degree is management consistent in its treatment of personnel? (1 to 5 scale)

19. In terms of task expertise, how would you rate the competence of the management of this department? (1 to 5 scale)

20. Have you ever felt discriminated against or favored with respect to salaries you have received?

21. Do you feel that salaries within this department are equitable?

22. Have you ever felt discriminated against or favored with respect to assignments you have received?

23. Do you feel that assignments within this department (or section) are equitable?

24. Have you received a promotion since you started working for this newspaper?

25. Have you ever felt discriminated against or favored with respect to promotions (or lack of) you have received while working for this paper?

26. Is there opportunity to advance upward in this newspaper organization or the parent corporation?

27. Do you want to advance?

28. What are your overall career goals?

29. Have you ever felt discriminated against or favored with respect to treatment by your sources of news information?

30. Do you feel that any particular group (male/female, black/white or section) is discriminated against or favored within this department?

31. How would you describe your relationship with your peers?

32. How would you describe your relationship with your supervisors?
33. Describe the way in which your job performance is evaluated.

34. Are you ever given an opportunity to evaluate your supervisor?

35. To what extent do you participate in the decision-making, goal-setting or problem-solving processes in this department?

**Job-Related Questions**

36. Please describe any limitations which keep you from performing your job effectively.

37. Have you received any awards for your journalistic endeavors? If so, please describe.

38. Do you feel that you have enough responsibility?

39. To what degree do you feel that you have the autonomy and independence necessary in your job? (1 to 5 scale)

*41. Do you feel that management (or supervisors) encourages creativity and initiative?

42. To what degree do you feel that your abilities are utilized and developed? (1 to 5 scale)

43. How well do you feel that you do your job? (1 to 5 scale)

44. To what extent are you satisfied with your job? (1 to 5 scale)

45. How important do you feel your job is to society (in terms of societal functioning)? (1 to 5 scale)

46. How important is your job to you? (1 to 5 scale)

47. What rewards does your job provide? Please list.

48. To what extent are the rewards commensurate with the time and effort you expend on your job? (1 to 5 scale)

*question 40, "Do you feel that you have enough freedom to write stories, develop story ideas, etc.?" was omitted as all answers were positive and could not be correlated with other variables.
The first 48 questions were identical with those asked Level 4 persons. The following questions were asked only Levels 2 and 3 persons.

49. Do you feel that you, as a supervisor, listen when subordinates discuss problems or ideas with you?

50. Do you see yourself as consistent in your treatment of subordinates?

51. Is there specific training or orientation for new employees?

52. Are written job descriptions provided for new employees?

53. Do you feel that your subordinates are generally satisfied with their jobs, assignments and/or salaries?

54. Do you feel that your subordinates' abilities are utilized and developed?

55. Have you ever been accused of being discriminatory or favoring persons or groups in this department? Have there been such accusations directed at other members of the department?
Please describe the structure, functions and responsibilities of your department (viz., number of employees, levels, job descriptions, etc.).

Within your department, who does the hiring, firing, evaluations, sets salaries, decides promotions, allocates monies?

How are departmental plans for the future made? Major decisions?

To what extent do you utilize input from your assistants and their subordinates?

Do you have specific criteria for hiring, firing, salaries and promotions? If so, do you feel that the criteria are clear to employees?

How would you describe your relations with your subordinates?

How would you describe the interpersonal relations among your subordinates?

Do you conduct regular department-wide meetings or social events outside working hours?

How are new employees trained or oriented when they assume their positions?

Is there training so that employees may advance within the organization?

Is there high turnover?

Do you feel that employees, in general, are satisfied with their jobs, assignments and salaries?

Do you feel that your subordinates perform their jobs well?

Is there an "informal structure" within your department?

What generates the most conflict within your department? How do you resolve it?
16. Generally, what is your management philosophy (i.e., how do you try to motivate and/or control your employees)?

Communication

17. Is communication open in your department?
18. How would you describe the quality of upward and downward communication in your department?
19. How would you describe the quality of horizontal communication?
20. Do you feel that formal channels (e.g., "chain of command") should be followed?
21. How do you communicate most frequently with your employees (e.g., face to face, memos, telephone or meetings)?
22. How would you describe communication in the overall organization?
23. Is there an active grapevine within your department?

Personal

24. How old are you?
25. What education have you had -- if college, in what area did you get your degree?
26. Please describe your work experience -- with other newspapers, with other media, in fields outside media.
27. How long have you been with this paper?
28. How long have you occupied your present position?
29. Are you married?
30. Are you generally satisfied with your job?
31. Do you feel that you do your job well?

Organizational

32. How are major decisions within the organization made?
33. Who establishes policies for hiring, firing, salaries, promotions, etc.?

34. How would you describe your relationship with other Operating Committee members?

35. How would you describe your relationship with the publisher?

36. Do you have much autonomy in running your department? Do others?

37. Do you feel that any one department is favored over another?

38. How has the paper changed since you've been with it?

39. Do you have any suggestions for improving the paper? If so, please describe.

40. Do you feel that your ideas are listened to, respected and acted upon?
APPENDIX B

FORMAL ORGANIZATION CHART

(overall newspaper)
APPENDIX C

FORMAL ORGANIZATION CHART

(EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT)
APPENDIX D

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX
### Varimax-Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
<th>Factor 8</th>
<th>Factor 9</th>
<th>Factor 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.21571</td>
<td>-0.84171</td>
<td>0.06517</td>
<td>-0.13451</td>
<td>0.12107</td>
<td>0.10734</td>
<td>0.02292</td>
<td>0.05485</td>
<td>0.08376</td>
<td>0.05941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Varimax-Rotated Factor Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 11</th>
<th>Factor 12</th>
<th>Factor 13</th>
<th>Factor 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.72318</td>
<td>-0.07359</td>
<td>0.12785</td>
<td>0.03791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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