

Working on Deadline:
Exploring Predictors of Career Success for U.S. Daily Newspaper Journalists

BY

SHAWN M. NEIDORF
B.S., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1995
M.A., University of Illinois at Chicago, 2005

THESIS

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Chicago, 2012

Chicago, Illinois

Defense Committee:

Maria Krysan, Chair and Adviser
William P. Bridges
Rachel A. Gordon
Pamela A. Popielarz
Stephen K. Doig, Arizona State University

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of Bob Reid and Dana Ewell.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members—Maria Krysan, Bill Bridges, Rachel Gordon, Pam Popielarz and Steve Doig—for their support, guidance and endurance on this long road. I would also like to thank Tim Johnson, director of the University of Illinois Survey Research Laboratory, and Lee Becker of the University of Georgia for much-appreciated advice and encouragement.

I am grateful to my colleagues at the Pew Research Center for their assistance and their patience with my many absences to complete this work. I especially would like to thank Scott Keeter and Leah Melani Christian for lending their expertise. I also would like to thank my fellow graduate students, who helped so much with the early conceptualization of this project. I am especially grateful to Zak Neal, who provided invaluable assistance throughout my work on this thesis. I also am grateful to the National Science Foundation for the Dissertation Improvement Grant (#0726712) that supported this research.

Finally, I would like to thank my family of origin and my family of destination; both provided essential support throughout my graduate studies. I would most especially like to thank my husband, Mark Athitakis, whose day-in, day-out support and unwavering faith in my ability to do this made the completion of this dissertation possible. Our son, Daniel Neidorf Athitakis, is too young to have been of assistance, but I am most grateful for his cheerful patience while I worked on this project.

SMN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Study Rationale	1
1.2	Journalists As Workers	2
1.3	Theory	4
1.4	Expectations	5
1.5	Choosing Career Outcomes to Study.....	8
2	LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES.....	14
2.1	Journalism Literature	14
2.2	Human Capital and Economics Literature	30
2.3	Social Capital and Networks Literature	36
2.4	Race and Gender Literature.....	42
2.4.1	Gender.....	44
2.4.2	Race	49
2.5	Hypotheses.....	52
2.5.1	Hypotheses and Variables	55
3	METHODS	60
3.1	Data Collection	60
3.2	Devising the Sample	60
3.3	Recruiting Respondents.....	69
3.4	Response	70
3.5	The Survey Instrument.....	71
3.6	Questionnaire Topics and Measures.....	72
3.7	Analysis Summary and Dependent Variables	73
3.8	Independent Variables	74
4	ANALYSIS—THE IMPACT OF HUMAN CAPITAL AND SOCIAL NETWORKS ON PAY (LOGGED) AND AUTONOMY	81
4.1	Testing Hypotheses Regarding Human Capital, Social Networks and Pay ..	82
4.2	Testing Hypotheses Regarding Human Capital, Social Networks and Autonomy.....	91
4.3	Testing Hypotheses Regarding the Impact of Gender and Race on Pay and Autonomy.....	95
4.4	Summary of Findings	113
5	CONCLUSION	116
5.1	Summary	116
5.2	Limitations.....	117
5.3	Contributions and Conclusion	120
	CITED LITERATURE	125
	Appendix A	135
	Appendix B	170
	Appendix C	174
	Appendix D	178
	VITA	181

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I SUMMARY OF INELIGIBLES	64
II COMPARING NON-RESPONDENTS TO ANALYZED CASES	67
III SAMPLE DEMOGRPAHICS.....	82
IV EFFECTS OF HUMAN CAPITAL, SOCIAL NETWORKS, RACE AND GENDER ON PAY, WITH CIRCULATION AS A MEDIATOR	83
V EFFECTS OF HUMAN CAPITAL, SOCIAL NETWORKS, RACE AND GENDER ON AUTONOMY	93
VI RACE AND GENDER AS PREDICTORS OF NETWORK COMPOSITION	100
VII EFFECTS OF HUMAN CAPITAL, SOCIAL NETWORKS, RACE AND GENDER ON LOGGED PAY, WITH CIRUCULATION AS MEDIATOR, AMONG MEN AND WOMEN	102
VIII EFFECTS OF HUMAN CAPITAL, SOCIAL NETWORKS, RACE AND GENDER ON AUTONOMY, AMONG MEN AND WOMEN.....	105
IX EFFECTS OF HUMAN CAPITAL, SOCIAL NETWORKS, RACE AND GENDER ON LOGGED PAY, WITH CIRCULATION AS A MEDIATOR, AMONG WHITES AND NON-WHITES.....	108
X EFFECTS OF HUMAN CAPITAL, SOCIAL NETWORKS, RACE AND GENDER ON AUTONOMY, AMONG WHITES AND NON-WHITES	110
XI SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	114
XII APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES	170
XIII APPENDIX C: ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS AMONG VARIABLES, WITH TWO-TAILED SIGNIFICANCE	174

SUMMARY

A Web-based survey of a representative sample of reporters, columnists and editors working full-time for U.S. daily newspapers that publish in English was conducted. The survey inquired about their professional experience, their preparation for the field, their social networks, their human capital, the quality of their jobs and their personal (demographic) characteristics. More than 1,500 journalists completed the survey, though some of them did not work in eligible positions; 1,344 respondents were employed in eligible positions. This analysis focuses on how well human capital, social networks race and gender predict pay (logged) and workplace autonomy. Newspaper circulation served as a mediator in the model predicting pay and a control variable in the model predicting autonomy.

As in other fields, human capital is beneficial to journalists; it is associated with higher pay and more autonomy. With regard to social networks, the results are more complicated. Networks have no effect on autonomy, and networks have limited benefit in increasing pay.

Notably, women have less rich networks than men. Minority journalists, however, do not have poorer networks than do their white colleagues. Being male is associated with higher pay and more autonomy, but being white is associated with lower pay. In examining how the models predicting pay and resources may function differently for whites and non-whites, men and women, the results were ambiguous, and not strong enough to demonstrate any clear difference in how men and women's social networks or human capital function.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Study Rationale

This study considers how human capital and social networks, race and gender, affect the careers of newspaper journalists. I undertook it for three reasons. The first, and least sociological, is personal interest. When I left the newsroom for graduate school, I did not intend to study journalists, but as I learned about the impact of human capital and social capital on careers, I would think, “Well, if someone had told me *that* ten years ago, I would have done a few things differently in my working life.” But often as soon as a few minutes later, I would start to wonder if principles so often tested on professional, technical and managerial workers applied to the quirky environment of the newsroom. “Someone ought to look into that,” I would think. Eventually, I decided to do it myself.

The sociological justifications for studying journalists and their careers are (at least) two. First, there is value in testing established theories on new populations to see if the theories apply broadly. Journalists work at an odd intersection of art, social mission and commerce. In this peculiar environment, do the “rules” of social capital and human capital apply to journalists and their careers? Finding out is one contribution I hope to make with this project.

More generally, even as the Internet has upended many assumptions about the power of traditional media, journalists—and newspaper journalists in particular—are still major players in providing information to and socialization of the public. They help set norms, establish which views and people are legitimately part of the political and social

spheres and teach the public about both the larger world and their own neighborhoods. Journalists play an important role in our culture, so understanding who they are and how they are rewarded (or denied reward) is important. This is particularly the case because even after decades of diversity efforts, journalists remain disproportionately white and male. This project will consider how social capital and human capital influence two forms of journalism career reward, pay and autonomy, and whether the impacts and outcomes vary by race and gender. This is another way in which this project seeks to add to the sociological understanding of journalists' careers.

As a career-outcome measure, pay has obvious appeal. Autonomy was chosen because it is a key element in the conception of journalism (particularly when journalism is conceived as a profession) and because journalists are, accordingly, socialized to value it highly. Hence, which journalists are rewarded with autonomy—and whether race, gender, human capital and social networks contribute to such distribution—is of substantial interest.

1.2 Journalists As Workers

Journalists share some characteristics with the kinds of educated workers addressed in well-regarded studies of social capital and social networks by Granovetter, Burt and others—while, in some ways, being very different. Whether journalism is even a profession is the subject of longstanding debate (e.g. Johnstone et al, 1972, 1976; Beam, 1993), a debate that has been reignited by the emergence of bloggers and other non-traditional “content providers” (e.g. Singer, 2003; Deuze, 2005; Beam et al, 2009). There is no set educational path or required credentials to become a journalist. And

unlike other fields, such as teaching, sales or engineering, there are no grades, revenue totals or product ratings in journalism to assess the quality of a person's work:

Evaluations are remarkably subjective.

Additionally, "success" in journalism does not necessarily mean becoming the executive editor. Some choose a conventional trajectory approach, in which advancing up through the ranks is a major goal, but others avoid such linear advancement in favor of jobs (often not in editing) that yield other forms of satisfaction, such as a sense of social utility, or the freedom to write more creatively, for example. Journalists value autonomy, resources and public service (e.g. Stamm and Underwood, 1993; Gade, 2004), and those goods are not necessarily tied to organization-chart ascendancy.

It should be noted that journalists and their employers often are at odds when it comes to goals. Journalists are trained to collect and present information for the benefit of the readership and larger community. Newspaper owners are intent on building readership and, ultimately, increasing advertising and other forms of revenue; for them, the newsroom is nothing more than a necessary but vexing financial drain on the company. Over the past few decades, newsroom managers and owners have put increasing pressure on journalists to focus on news that is cheap to gather and, ideally, that will attract more readers (especially online readers), regardless of how otherwise "newsworthy" the stories are. This runs quite counter to the value system of most journalists. After all, there is no Pulitzer Prize for pithiest blog post.

Finally, journalism is in a time of great upheaval, which makes studying it even more interesting, if perilous. For more than a decade, traditional media sources have struggled with how best to present information digitally—and how to make money doing

so. That question has still not been well answered, but newspapers (and television and radio stations) are losing money, greatly increasing the urgency of finding the answer. Additionally, the nation's economic woes and the questionable newspaper acquisitions that took place shortly before the economy tumbled in 2008 are making the challenges facing American newsrooms much more severe. Newsroom staffs and ambitions are shrinking. News priorities are volatile. The future of traditional news media, especially newspapers and television, is uncertain.

1.3 Theory

To study the careers of journalists, I employ human capital and social capital and social networks theories. I consider whether the amount of various forms of human capital, such as education, skills and experience, contribute to the pay and autonomy made available to newspaper journalists. Both common sense and the work of economists such as Gary Becker suggest that human capital should contribute to career rewards. The questions, then, are whether education will matter as much in a field in which educational standards are unsettled and certainly not legislated. How much does experience count if the ways in which news is gathered and presented are changing? What skills are valued, with so much transition going on in the field? Do traditional interviewing and editing skills matter, or will multimedia skills be more valued? Drawing on the work of Becker and others, it is expected that, overall, the more human capital a journalist has, the better he or she will be paid and the more autonomy he or she will have.

In examining social networks, this study concentrates on how many journalists of different ranks (junior/senior) and positions (reporter/editor) a journalist knew at the time just before he or she got his or her current job. I expect that having social networks with a large number of people with seniority and authority will be advantageous for journalists, as they have been shown to be for other types of workers. In designing this project, I was mindful of research by Granovetter (1973, 1995) and Padolny and Baron (1997) showing that people who find jobs through networks generally have better jobs and that networks can help people fit into and perform well in their work environments, though job-attainment methods are workplace fit are not directly addressed here. The study will rely heavily on Lin's notion of social resources (e.g. Lin et al, 1978, 1981; Lin, 1999), in which people with higher statuses may provide instrumental assistance to individuals in their networks. A measure of newspaper circulation will serve as a mediator in the model predicting pay; circulation will be a control variable in the model predicting autonomy.

Finally, this study considers the impact of race and gender on journalism careers, particularly with regard to their influence on social networks. Previous research (e.g. Ibarra, 1992; Moore, 1990; McDonald et al, 2009; James, 2000; McGuire 2002) has found that women and minorities have different networks than whites, that networks function differently for women and minorities than for white workers and that the processes leading to advancement differ by race and gender.

1.4 Expectations

It is possible that the particularities of newsroom life will add up in such a way that journalism careers will not be affected by human capital and social networks, race

and gender, as are other careers. Circulation, for example, is expected to have a substantial effect on pay, if only because larger papers have much more money to put into salaries than do smaller papers. However, the austere ways in which newsrooms have responded to recent economic problems may mean there are few benefits for anyone, regardless of human capital, social networks, race or gender. Circulation has traditionally been associated with lower autonomy, the notion being that larger organizations are more complex and bureaucratic, thereby hemming in autonomy (Johnstone et al, 1976). However, larger papers also provide more resources and lower workloads, which may contribute to autonomy (Beam et al, 2009).

Human capital may be less valuable for journalists than for other types of workers, particularly in the current, cash-strapped newsroom environment, when experience, in particular, may be seen as little more than a bigger payroll expense to those who set newsroom budgets. Indeed, buyouts have slashed the ranks of the most seasoned reporters and editors in recent years. Furthermore, the rush of technology that has overtaken newsrooms in the past decade may mean that some forms of human capital, especially technology-related skills, may be more valuable than other types of human capital, notably traditional reporting and editing skills. Another possibility is that human capital is more important than ever, given the faster pace of news production—with fewer editors left to catch mistakes. Being able to do one's job well and without much assistance is crucial when mistakes are as glaringly public as they are in journalism, and human capital, in the forms of both experience and particular skills, may well contribute to one's ability to perform under such pressure.

Social networks are probably as important, if not more important, for journalists than for other types of workers. The aforementioned pressure of newsroom work makes getting along with one's colleagues and being able to function in that particular newsroom's way of doing things essential. Being "vouched for" is likely a big part of much, if not most, newspaper hiring. That said, with so many journalists having lost their jobs in recent years, many members of a journalist's network may be in much less of a position to help than in the past.

It is certainly possible that journalists' careers may not operate like those of other types of workers, given the quirks of the newsroom in general and the specific ways in which journalism organizations have responded to economic and technical change. It also is possible that human capital and social capital may be even more important for journalists, precisely because of these pressures. On the whole, I expect that journalists will benefit from human capital and social networks, much as do workers in other fields, and that being white and male will be advantageous for journalists, as has been shown to be the case elsewhere. Hypotheses will be constructed under this assumption. However, it is possible that, several decades of efforts to increase diversity in newsrooms (Najjar, 1995) may reduce the usual negative impacts of being a woman or not being white.

This study focuses on full-time journalists working for English-language daily newspapers in the United States. For practical reasons related to constructing the sampling frame, the targeted groups are reporters, editors and columnists. Participants were surveyed via an online survey about their careers and personal history. Linear regression (OLS) was used to test hypotheses related to the impact of human capital

and social networks on pay and work-related autonomy. After an initial attempt to include circulation as a control variable showed its impact to be rather large on pay, its placement was reconsidered. Ultimately, circulation is treated as a mediating variable in the model to predict journalists' pay, as no matter how much human capital or social capital a journalist has, a smaller paper simply cannot (and will not) pay as much as a large paper. Circulation will, therefore, mediate the effect of such factors. Circulation is not theorized to operate in the same fashion with regard to autonomy, so in the model predicting autonomy, circulation is an independent variable, not a mediator. The impact of the direct and indirect effects, with circulation as a mediator, on pay and were tested using Hayes's Indirect macro for SPSS (Preacher and Hayes, 2008; Hayes, 2009).

1.5 Choosing Career Outcomes to Study

It may be useful, at the outset, to briefly discuss journalists and the practice of journalism and to situate it relative to other occupations—and, in turn, to situate the dependent variables of interest in this context. Studies of journalists have found they are drawn to the field for a variety of reasons, summarized by Weaver et al (2007: 56) as: “the intrinsic appeal of the tasks that journalists perform; the desire to be in a profession that has an important social or political role; the journalist's early experiences with or connection to the profession; and the belief that the work would be varied and exciting.” Notably missing from these motivations are desires for high pay or a corner office with a “chief” title.

Indeed, when it comes to career building, journalists are not necessarily inclined toward linear advancement through an organization. This means, in part, that

successful reporters who have won positions that maximize those goods (e.g. projects reporters, investigative reporters, arts critics) may choose to remain in their jobs or take other jobs of those types rather than “advance” into positions higher on the organization chart (e.g. editing). “Success” is not entirely about hierarchical advancement, though some do choose to pursue that path.

Studies of journalists have shown that they place high value on autonomy and the values of news judgment, over and above the financial success of their individual news organizations (e.g. Stamm and Underwood, 1993; Pollard, 1995; Gade and Perry, 2003; Gade, 2004). “It is clear from our study that journalists are happier when they are about the business of journalism—rather than the business of business,” Stamm and Underwood conclude (1993: 538). Related to these priorities, having the resources (including time) to do their jobs the way journalists see fit also is important, though these are discussed less in the literature, and often as being a subset of autonomy. It is easy to see, however, how a lack of resources would, at the very least, impinge on autonomy. One cannot do one’s job as one sees fit if there is neither the time nor the facilities nor the training to do so.

The career outcomes that will be studied in this study are autonomy and pay, a measure of reward tied to professional or occupational values and a measure of a reward that directly benefits the individual beyond his or her occupational values. Though pay is not a primary motivator for journalists entering the field, it is an important facet of career success, simply on its face. It has been considered innumerable times as an outcome measure in other career studies because of its baseline importance. Earning a living is, of course, essential, and pay is a straight-forward way of keeping

score. Turning back to journalism, while pay may not be a reason to enter journalism, concerns about pay have been shown as a reason to leave the field (Pease, 2000; Weaver et al, 2007), demonstrating that the importance of pay carries over to the newsroom. Notably, pay is dependent on how well off a newspaper is, which is largely tied to how high its circulation (and, relatedly, ad revenue) is. Hence, journalists have two options for maximizing pay; they are not mutually exclusive. Journalists may pursue higher-ranking positions in a given newsroom, accruing additional pay as they advance (if they are successful in this pursuit). Another option is to pursue work at a paper with higher circulation. This may require taking a lower-ranking position, but may still be beneficial, particularly in the long run, if future promotions are possible. Of course, the optimal scenario to increase pay would be to have a high-ranking position at a large newspaper—but, again, such pursuit may run counter to a journalist's other occupational priorities. Autonomy is less closely related to the wealth of the paper (and not related to circulation in the same way), as there are various forms autonomy may take, some less dependent on access to the kinds of resources more generally available at large, well-off papers, some independent of those resources.

I also collected data about journalists' estimates of their jobs' prestige, as well as ratings of their access to resources in their job, how much opportunity their jobs provide for skill development and occupational social-network development. These latter two variables are at least as much about preparation for the next job as for working in the current job, and I wanted to focus, at least in this project, on the current job alone. Given the long-standing concern in journalism about autonomy and the practical necessity of

getting paid for full-time work, pay and autonomy were the variables selected for analysis.

Autonomy is frequently discussed in a wide range of academic literature, in numerous contexts. In work-related research, it often is discussed as a component of or predictor of job satisfaction or as a signifier of professionalism. Workplace autonomy focuses on control over one's work, including what to do, how to do it and when to do it. Adler (1993), for example, describes it this way (p. 452):

Job autonomy can be regarded as a work-related reward similar to wages, authority and status because it entails independence and control for the worker. It refers to the extent to which workers are able to use their own initiative in carrying out work activities (Hall, 1986). Specifically, Parmelee (1978) argues that job autonomy is the 'probability of an individual's exercise of discretion in his or her work role' (p11).

Similarly, Meiksins and Watson (1989), citing Spenner (1983), define autonomy as "the ability to initiate and conclude action, to control the content, manner and speed with which a task is done." Meiksins and Watson, citing Bailyn (1985), note that that autonomy may relate to setting of policy or goals or to the implementation of policy and goals set by others.

This project operationalizes autonomy in a very general way that meshes initiative and execution. Journalists were asked to assess their autonomy, defined as "control over what you do and how you do it." They were asked to rate their autonomy on a 1-to-7 scale (with 1 indicating "no autonomy" and 7 indicating "a lot of autonomy"). Journalists also were asked to rate their autonomy relative to other journalists in their own newsrooms and relative to journalists at other U.S. dailies. The answer categories for both of these questions were "much more autonomy, somewhat more autonomy, about the same amount of autonomy, somewhat less autonomy" and "much less autonomy."

Analysis of autonomy was limited to the national comparison for this study. (Other ratings may be studied later.) The reason for this is that newspaper journalism is a relatively small field, and has been conceptualized by at least one researcher (McGill, 1987) as being a single competitive arena, in which advancement often entails inter-organizational transfer. Hence, the most interesting metric is, arguably, the comparison with the rest of the field. There would be no harm in assessing the absolute ratings, of course, but I was most curious about the relative ratings and chose to focus on that.

Autonomy might be considered the holy grail of journalism research. Autonomy, itself, is the thing that everyone dearly wants, the thing of greatest value, but efforts to explain variance in its availability has been largely unsuccessful. Modern attempts to measure journalists' autonomy are modeled on efforts included in Johnstone et al's 1971 survey of American journalists (including, but not limited to, daily newspaper reporters), published as a wide-ranging "sociological portrait" in 1976. Journalists who were primarily reporters were asked whether they made their own work assignments, whether their stories were edited by others, whether they had freedom in selected stories and whether they had freedom in selecting which elements of stories to emphasize. About six-in-ten journalists said they had "almost complete freedom" in selecting stories, and three quarters said they had "almost complete freedom" in choosing what information to emphasize. Fewer said they made their own story assignments (46 percent) or went unedited (32 percent). An index of these four elements also was constructed, with one point assigned for each question to which a journalist said he or she had autonomy. With a range of 0 to 4, the index had a mean score of 2.15 and a standard deviation of 1.33. Johnstone et al found that journalists in

larger organizations reported significantly lower autonomy, but that media experience and higher rank increased autonomy.

More recently, Weaver and Wilhoit (1996) sought to determine the predictors of autonomy for reporters across media platforms (using an index of three questions concerning influence over news content), testing a model with 20 wide-ranging independent variables, including some human capital measures, but no social capital measures. The model explained only 12 percent of the variance. Weaver et al returned to this topic in 2007 with a new model and a two-question autonomy index. This model also had 20 predictors, but focused more on reporters' assessments of the goals and practices of their news organizations. This model predicted 14 percent of the variance. This study builds on those efforts, but uses a broader range of predictors, in hopes that the new model will better predict autonomy.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

The career outcomes and predictors to be tested were chosen after a review of the literature of human capital and social capital and networks, as well as the literature concerning journalists themselves and their careers. It is highlighted here.

2.1 Journalism Literature

In weighing outcomes and predictors of journalism success, it may be useful to consider the nature of journalism, as well as literature focused on journalism careers, in particular. The question of what journalism is—is it a profession, a craft or trade—has been a subject of debate for decades. Of course, the nature of professionalism, itself, has been a subject of long-running academic disagreement, highlighted briefly below.

In defining a profession, Wilensky (1964: 138) asserts: “Any occupation wishing to exercise professional authority must find a technical basis for it, assert an exclusive jurisdiction, link both skill and jurisdiction to standards of training, and convince the public that its services are uniquely trustworthy.” Others have developed their own checklists. Snizek (1972), revisiting Hall’s (1967, 1968) list, sets forth a list of criteria for professionalism: using a professional organization as a “major referent” of professional values, belief and identity; a belief that one’s profession is “both indispensable and beneficial to society” (p. 109), a belief in self-regulation, a sense of calling to the field and autonomy.

The notion of what a profession is—and how neatly professions may be defined—faces challenges, particularly as “professionals” find themselves working in settings with non-professionals, answering to supervisors who may not share their

profession or professional values and finding their jurisdictions of control challenged (e.g. Leicht and Fennell, 1997). Friedson (1984) summarizes two strains of professions-skepticism: deprofessionalization and proletarianization. The former strain, Friedson says, drawing on Haug (1973, 1975, 1977), argues that “the professions are losing their position of prestige and trust” as characteristics of professions including monopoly over knowledge, altruism and the ability to make their own rules are disappearing (p. 4). These challenges come from computers—which can store vast troves of knowledge, accessible to anyone, increased education of the population, which makes knowledge less “mysterious,” (p.4), and increased specialization, which requires professionals (such as doctors) to rely on other specialists in new fields, who make their own claims of jurisdiction. Proletarianism, by contrast, draws on the Marxist claim that capitalism eventually “reduces all workers to the status of the proletariat, i.e., dependent on selling their labor in order to survive and stripped of all control over the substance and process of their work” (p.5). This concern arises from professionals going to work for others, such as lawyers who work as in-house counsel for corporations, or doctors who work for health maintenance organizations, instead of working for themselves.

Friedson (1984, 2001) argues against both of these interpretations, noting that technology developments in medicine, for example, leave doctors with more specialized knowledge, not less, and makes extending jurisdiction into new areas possible. Friedson also suggests that professionalism does not lie in employment status, but rather in the value of and demand for one’s talents. When these are high, one may exercise significant control, whether self-employed or working for others. Journalists have long worked for others (though some freelance), and have contended from the

start with non-newsroom overseers from the business side of news organizations, whose priorities are not necessarily consistent with ideas of newsroom professionalism. Their control over their work, as conceptualized by Friedson, can be extensive, though it has been under increasing pressure from economic strife and technological change.

In considering whether journalism is a profession, it should be noted that the very traditional notion of a profession, the ideal type, is facing challenges—in practice and in theory. This is not entirely new: Bucher and Strauss (1961) noted that factions within professions are often in conflict, challenging the notion of a unified professional identity or set of values forty years ago. More recently, criticism of the notion of professions as well-defined, with clear jurisdictions and autonomy has reflected changes in the way professionals work with and in the larger (often bureaucratic) world, from lawyers working as corporate counsel rather than in their own firms, to doctors facing jurisdictional challenges from other specialties, not to mention insurance companies that impinge on treatment decisions (e.g. Friedson, 1984; Abbott, 1981, 1988). Journalists may not quite be professionals, but professionals may not be as “professional” as once thought, either. Will the factors previously shown to affect the careers of other types of workers, particularly professionals, work the same way for journalists? Or will the semi-professional status of journalism and the quirkiness of newsroom work—a mix of art, social criticism and market-driven production—make for a different outcome?

Johnstone et al conducted the first, modern-day large-scale survey of American journalists in 1971, publishing a summary of their findings in 1976. Therein, they contemplate whether journalism is a profession. Running through some of the more

typical professional-checklist items, they conclude that “the results of this analysis are uneven” (p 111). They explain:

In terms of formal structural criteria, journalism easily qualifies as a profession since the field has passed through all of the historical stages which mark the emergence of a profession. Moreover, in terms of their values regarding work, journalists seem to be oriented as professionals: They value public service, autonomy and freedom from supervision, and tend to de-emphasize the importance of economic and other tangible rewards. It is in their organizational behavior, however, that journalists are not like other professionals, since their rates of participation in professional associations are comparatively low. It is significant that there is no single professional association in journalism which is influential enough to speak for more than a small minority of the practitioners in the field. This fact makes it difficult to define journalism in occupational terms, and it is this characteristic perhaps more than any other that reinforces the heterogeneity, segmentation and lack of unity found within the field as a whole.

It is, perhaps, worth noting that it is still the case that no journalism organization has ever represented a majority of journalists (Beam et al, 2009).

Others have, like Johnstone, found journalism to be at least somewhat professional, if not a profession. Abbott refers to journalism as an “incumbent profession” (1988: 225). He notes the historical development of the “news jurisdiction” as evolving from entertainment to fact (albeit with some detours), and concludes that “the news jurisdiction has been founded on providing current ‘factual’ information to the public since the turn of the century.” He notes, however, that journalism is a “permeable” occupation, with people going back and forth between journalism and other occupations (e.g. public relations), and that while there are schools and ethics codes for journalism, “there is no exclusion of those who lack them.” Singer (2003: 143) ponders these issues and reaches a similarly mixed conclusion:

Although professionalism “is a term journalists often use to describe the excellence to which they aspire” (Weaver and Wilhoit, 1996: 125), sociological definitions of professionalism have never been a comfortable fit. Journalism has no entrance requirements, no discrete body of knowledge and no elite inner group with the ability to “de-press” wayward members (Merrill, 1996: 210). However, journalism’s commitment to public service and its demand for practitioner expertise arguably make it a profession for all practical purposes (Dennis, 1996).

Beam has visited this issue in 1993 and again in 2009. In 1993, he called journalism a “semi-profession” in an article assessing the impact of group-ownership and group size on newspaper-journalism professionalism. Beam employed 28 items organized into seven indices concerned with professional development, resource commitment, impartial practices, occupational prizes, editorial aggressiveness, news process control and professional involvement. He did not find that group ownership itself affected professionalism, but that larger groups—and larger individual organizations—rated higher in professionalism. Concluded Beam (1993: 913): “The fact that larger papers tend to adhere more closely to practices that the occupational group sets out as ideal may be a bitter pill to swallow for journalists at smaller media organizations. In part, this finding may simply reflect the reality that professionalism is expensive and that larger organizations have greater resources.”

In 2009, Beam et al returned to the topic of journalism professionalism, this time reviewing measures of autonomy, role conceptions, ethical practices and membership in professional organizations. Looking at survey data collected in 2002 and 2007, they found that shrinking staff and the corresponding increased workloads were a threat to autonomy, that membership in professional organizations—never especially high among journalists—had dropped, and that concern about ethics had increased, following several high-profile lapses.

As has been demonstrated numerous times, journalism and journalists exhibit some elements of professionalism, but lack others. Journalism is not alone in this in-between semi-professional state. Pharmacy (Denzin and Metlin, 1968; Tanner and Cockerill, 1996), and classical music performance (Frederickson and Rooney, 1990), to

name two very different examples, have been located in this in-between occupational space, having achieved some, but not all, of the common criteria for professional status.

Abbott's assessment of journalism is particularly interesting, more than 20 years later. His emphasis on news jurisdiction brings to mind the concept of "gatekeeping" in journalism—the idea that a big part of the job for journalists is determining what is newsworthy and, indeed, what news is. As has been amply chronicled by Deuze (2007), Singer (2006) and others, "professional" journalists' ability to determine what is and is not news and what is and is not worth discussing (i.e. what is newsworthy) has been under attack by forces unleashed by the Internet. The technology allows "non-professionals" to distribute information at little cost. This includes individual bloggers, non-professional community news sites and politicians and sports teams who wish to go directly to the public with their version of news about themselves rather than to have their information mediated by journalists.

In light of these changes, the Pew Research Center asked U.S. journalists in late 2007 whether they thought journalists were still gatekeepers, given the rise of the Internet, or whether they had lost that role (Pew Research Center, 2008). More than 60 percent of journalists and two-thirds of print journalists, in particular, said they remained gatekeepers. As incongruous as that might seem, it is consistent with Singer's findings that journalists are simply redefining the gatekeeper role—their sense of jurisdiction, one might say—not giving it up. When she interviewed newspaper reporters and editors in 1995, they continued to see the gatekeeper role as vital, but "their role becomes less about selecting stories for dissemination and more about bolstering the value of what they disseminate so that it rises to the crest of the information tidal wave" (Singer, 1997:

74). Whether that maintains (or changes in a tolerable way) journalism's jurisdiction is a currently being debated in newsrooms and academic conferences. What is clear, however, is that the threat posed by the Internet, together with extreme financial pressure in many news organizations, constitutes a threat to journalism's tenuous grasp on professional designation.

In 1986, the *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* devoted much of an issue to weighing the nature of journalism with regard to professionalism. No author proposed that journalism already was truly a profession, though one suggested it was "in the running" (Hodges, 1986: 33). Several authors viewed professionalization as a negative outcome. Kaul (1986) suggests that journalists are really proletarians working in "news factories," a reality recognized in the formation of the Newspaper Guild in 1933. Says Kaul (p. 52):

To protect itself against vulnerability to labor radicalism and profit-threatening strikes, the press barons proffered professionalism to accommodate journalists' status ambitions while subverting their economic claims. ...

Professionalism ideologically substituted morality for "mere pecuniary gains," mental for manual labor. The new professional "class feeling" disassociated working journalists from militant laboring classes, aligned them with publishers' property interests—proletarians strike, professionals serve—and insulated newspapers from profit-threatening disruption.

Merrill also is cynical about the ostensible benefits of press professionalization, but his concerns are more for the process and product of news gathering. He is concerned that professionalization will mean homogenization and curtailment by professional norms, especially if enforced. Says Merrill (1986: 58 [*italics original*]):

American journalism has been getting along pretty well without being a profession. So, another option is to keep what we have: an "open" craft where anyone can be a journalist and where ethical standards are basically determined by the journalists themselves and by editors, publishers and other media managers on a pluralistic basis. What I am saying is this: What is wrong with our present system of *pluralistic ethics* which is compatible with, and is working alongside of, our system of pluralistic journalism exemplified by the diversity of our media and their messages?

For in spite of professionalization's advantage over governmental or judiciary control of journalistic activities, the concept of journalism as a profession is still filled with many

weakness and even dangers. Not least among these are (1) the loss of individual freedom, and (2) the constriction of journalistic pluralism or diversity.

Soloski (1989) dismisses the importance of whether or not journalism is in any technical sense of profession and takes the Merrill/Kaul arguments in a somewhat different direction. He suggests that news professionalism benefits news organizations as businesses by controlling journalists' behavior; specifically, professionalism sets norms and standards and "determines the professional reward system" (p. 212). The vaunted norm of objectivity, for example, benefits newspapers that are monopolies (the case in most communities). Were the paper to operate from a particular ideology, that would leave room for a competitor to spring up and challenge the paper's dominance.

Citing Kornhauser (1963), Soloski notes that businesses create two career ladders: a management ladder, with promotions into upper ranks, and a professional ladder. The latter is designed to reward professionals without promoting them or giving them too much additional authority. After all, everyone cannot become senior management. Soloski notes that this arrangement exists within newsrooms (p.217):

The structure of the news department permits management to promote successful journalists without having to bring them into the organization's decision-making process. As successful journalists move up the professional ladder in the news department, they have more individual freedom to pursue stories without carrying more responsibility for decision concerning the allocation of scarce organizational resources. By providing opportunities for upward movement, the news organization is able to maintain the loyalty of key professionals without providing access to the actual power hierarchy of the organization. Although some journalists move onto the management ladder and into key management positions, most journalists use the professional ladder as their gauge of success, and movement on that ladder will be determined by professional norms. The viability of the professional ladder as a measure of success is the result of journalists' professional training, and it is part of the romantic lore of the profession. Journalism schools, stories about crusading journalists themselves have all contributed to making the professional ladder a means of measuring success.

In considering pay and autonomy as its outcome measures, this study simultaneously addresses both journalists who are on the "professional track" Soloski

describes, as well as those on a more traditional advancement trajectory. By including newsroom position in the models, as a control variable, this difference may be at least partially accounted for. Tenure with one's newspaper, which is included as a human capital variable, also helps to account for these career path choices, but this study does not seek to divide journalists into two career-path classes and assess them separately.

It is worth briefly reviewing studies of journalists that focus on the impacts of human capital, social networks and race and gender. In 1993, Lee Becker et al published a study attempting to explain job-search success (and failure), looking at numerous predictors, including major, prior work experience, having worked at college media outlets, having had an internship (or internships), the accreditation (or lack thereof) of the graduate's communication program, grade point average, and search strategy. Looking at job-search outcomes for print journalism majors, Becker et al tested 15 predictors, which explained 15.7 percent of the variance in their getting communications-related jobs. The only significant predictors were having had a professional internship, grade-point average (both positively associated with getting a communications job) and having used a university placement service or a general placement service (negative). "In the end, it is important to note how little of the overall variance in job seeking success has been explained by the analyses presented here," Becker et al note, in the final paragraph of the 1993 article. "There is much that is unmeasured, such as the way the graduate presents himself or herself during interviews, the determination of the applicant, the sheer enthusiasm for the task before him or her, and even much of the aptitude for that task" (p. 930).

Lowrey and Becker addressed some less tangible elements of career success in 2003, looking at cultural fit and personal connections in job-finding success, again looking at recent communication-school graduates. The study found that journalism and mass communications graduates with personal connections with those making hiring decision are more likely to get job offers. Also, personal connections and “confidence in the ability to present oneself in a way that is consistent with the professional culture” (p. 2) mattered more to finding a job than did GPA, internships, working at campus media or what specific “curriculum sequence” the students pursued in college.

Weaver and Wilhoit (2007) looked at predictors of pay across media sectors, including daily and weekly newspapers, magazines, radio and television. They found that experience, having supervisory duties, belonging to a union, belonging to a journalism organization, education, newsroom size, public news-organization ownership, and being at a news organization owned by a larger company all were positive predictors of pay. Being a woman, Asian American or white was negatively associated with pay, while being Hispanic or African American was insignificant (with “other race” as the reference category). Working at a daily newspaper, a weekly newspaper or in radio was negatively associated with pay, as is working in the Midwest or South (compared with the Northeast). The total adjusted R^2 for their 14-item model was .56 (p. 105). Notably, this model includes no social capital or social network variables, other than whether a journalist belongs to a journalism organization. They had tested a similar model on data from the early 1980s and early 1990s, which yielded R^2 s of .54 and .55, respectively (Weaver and Wilhoit, 1996: 97). Many of the Weaver and Wilhoit variables are included in this study, but given that this study is not focused

primarily on new graduates, it will not focus on Becker et al's GPA, campus media involvement or curriculum sequence.

Race and gender are especially important to consider when studying journalists for reasons that transcend particular occupations, but also for reasons particular to journalism and its history. In short, the field is overwhelmingly white and newsrooms struggle to hold onto women who enter the field. (See, for example, American Society of News Editors, 2009; Newkirk, 2000; Everbach and Flournoy, 2007). Historically, women were relegated to "soft" news and minorities were largely excluded from the newsrooms of general-circulation newspapers.

Becker et al (2003a) noted that while women have been the majority of undergraduate students in communications programs since the late 1970s, women more often study public relations. Also, while most communication graduates do not look for work in media, fewer women do so than men. Additionally, the women who enter journalism do not stay, Becker et al say, pointing to data collected by Weaver and Wilhoit (1986, 1996): "In 1992, 44.8 percent of journalists with four or fewer years of professional experience were women. Ten years later, that cohort was only 34.4 percent female. In 1992, 41.7 percent of journalists with five to nine years of experience were female. Ten years later, that cohort was 26.2 percent female" (2003a: 6).

The racial makeup of newsrooms began to change from virtually all white in response to the 1968 findings of the National Commission on Civil Disorders, better known as the Kerner Commission report. The report criticized press coverage of African Americans as inadequate and inaccurate and questioned the lack of black journalists in American newsrooms. Initial efforts began to change the racial makeup of newspapers,

if not always attitudes about minorities, but as recently as 1978, 68 percent of Americans had no minority journalists on staff (Newkirk, 2000). In 2009, just more than 13 percent of newspaper journalists were minorities, according to the American Society of News Editors (ASNE). The organization has focused on racial diversity since the early 1970s, and in the late 1970s, ASNE set a goal that by 2000, the proportion of minorities in America's newsrooms would match the proportion of minorities in American society (Najjar, 1995). Since then, ASNE has conducted annual censuses to measure progress. The goal was not achieved, but the campaign is credited with helping to increase minority hiring and efforts at retention. More recently, the plunge in overall newsroom employment has been accompanied by a slight decline in the proportion of journalists who are minorities. ASNE estimates that there were 41,600 newspaper journalists in the United States in 2010, 13,500 fewer than in 2007. Last year, 12.79 percent were journalists of color, down .47 from 2009. The proportion also declined slightly in 2008 and 2009. Minority journalists remain 11 percent of all supervisors, which has been the case for four years; 22 percent of minority journalists are supervisors, according to ASNE. By comparison, 89 percent of supervisors are white and 27 percent of white journalists are supervisors. Journalists of color tend to work at larger papers, with more than half working for papers with circulations of more than 100,000. Almost one-fifth (19 percent) work at the largest newspapers, those with circulations of 500,000 or more (ASNE, 2011). Among white journalists, 39 percent work for papers with circulations of more than 100,000, and 11 percent work for papers with circulations of 500,000 or more. Though much remains to be addressed, women and minorities no longer are absent from newsrooms or their highest ranks, even if their

presence and authority are far below what would be expected if opportunities were equally available to all.

Looking at the roles of gender and race in entry-level journalism hiring, Lee Becker et al (1999) found that gender had little impact on whether recent graduates got jobs, while minority status had a negative impact; however, that impact drops out once other factors (e.g. major, internships) are included in the model. Furthermore, the authors noted that job openings likely can be learned of through informal channels, but that informal hiring practices appear to be less beneficial to minority candidates. This would be consistent with findings in other fields that minorities and women do not benefit from social networks in the same ways as do white men.

Of course, getting in the door is not the only important measure of how women and journalists of color fare. Another key question is whether they are treated differently, once they are hired. The evidence is mixed. Notably, women are far less likely to work in sports departments, making up about 10 percent of the reporters and 6 percent of editors (Hardin and Whiteside, 2009), leading to issues associated with tokenism, and there is some evidence that story assignments vary by race (Pritchard and Stonebely, 2007).

Walsh-Childers et al (1996) surveyed 227 female newspaper journalists and found that most women reported having been offered or hired at a lower salary than equally qualified men, and about a fifth had been passed over for promotion in favor of an equally, but not more, qualified man. Notably, older women are much more likely to say they have had these experiences. Whether this means that women are treated more fairly in newsrooms than they used to be—or whether younger women simply

have not *yet* experienced discrimination—is impossible to tell. A study of self-reported levels of autonomy (Liebler, 1994) found that there was no difference in perceived autonomy by gender but that minority journalists—male minority journalists, in particular—were less likely to perceive themselves having autonomy. Liebler suggests that women, who have had a substantial newsroom presence longer than minorities have, may have achieved “the freedom” that eludes minority journalists (p. 128).

Looking at the relationship between race and story assignment, Pritchard and Stonebely (2007) studied news coverage in the *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, looking for coverage of local public issues and the race of the journalists covering them. They found that journalists of color (mostly African Americans) were far more likely to cover local public issues that were focused on minorities, while white journalists were far more likely to cover issues that had no overt racial or ethnic overtone. Pritchard and Stonebely also interviewed eight members of the *Journal Sentinel* staff about the role race may place in story assignments. They found the staff conflicted (and offering conflicting answers, often within the same interview), but the authors note that:

The journalists, regardless of race, spoke of racial diversity only when they were talking about minority reporters and minority-oriented topics. The hegemony of whiteness was such that none of the journalists appeared to have thought about the role of whiteness in the coverage of the largely white realms of politics and business. ...

By and large, reporters of color covered Local Public Issues of secondary importance to people in the newsroom. Everyone acknowledged (although reluctantly in some cases) that minority reporters' race was a factor in the topics they covered. In contrast, no one ever whispered that race might have been a factor in the choice of white reporters to cover centers of power such as politics and business. The implicit notion was that minority reporters get their assignments because of their race, while white reporters get theirs because of hard work and talent. Such thinking keeps journalists of color at the margins of news creation and newsroom decision making (p. 244).

Though the divide of assignments by race is interesting in and of itself, the study did not address whether journalists of color chose to cover topics (e.g. urban affairs)

that would result in their concentrating their efforts in covering minority communities, or whether they were prodded or compelled to do so. Regardless, the evidence in these studies suggests that women and minorities who work as reporters, editors and columnists for daily newspapers may not be shunted as far to the margins as Kanter describes for women in 1977, but they may not have equal access to power and rewards. This study does not consider assignments at so granular a level. Given that papers vary in which topics of news coverage get priority and bring prestige for those who cover them, I was wary of this line of analysis in a sample of journalists working at many different papers. However, at the level of position, whites and non-whites are proportionately represented among reporters, columnists and three levels of editors. There is some difference among the upper two levels of editors by gender, with men more concentrated in the highest level and women more concentrated in the mid-level of editors.

Finally, a few words about circulation and its influence on journalists and their careers. Circulation is almost never discussed as a predictor of journalism outcomes in journalism literature, perhaps because circulation's omnipresence renders it invisible. It is, after all, quite obvious to knowledgeable observers that circulation is closely related to newsroom staff size, newsroom structure, newsroom resources and prestige of employer. Concern and inquiry have traditionally been more focused on ownership—whether papers are owned by individuals or families or by groups and whether those groups are privately held or publicly traded. Today, the vast majority of newspapers are chained owned, which has quieted (though not eliminated) discussions of the benefits and drawbacks of ownership types. News organization size and newsroom staff size—

which are directly tied to circulation—are discussed with some frequency, and concerns about them may be taken to apply to circulation, indirectly, as well. Johnstone (1976), for example, noted that larger organizations are good for pay, but bad for autonomy (p. 94):

Though large news organizations are more powerful and prestigious than small ones, and though ... they also pay better, there are nonetheless costs of the journalist who works in them. Large news organizations exert more formal controls over the work a newsman does, and they also narrow the range of functions he performs, thus removing him to some extent from the final product of his work.

Others have acknowledged the logic of this line of thinking, but have not demonstrated it in their research. Demers (1995), for example, notes that the “conventional wisdom” holds that in larger organizations, key decisions are made by a proportionately smaller share of the newsroom staff, more editors are involved in reviewing copy, and “work routines are more highly regulated” (p 93). Accordingly, he hypothesized that journalists at larger papers would have less autonomy, except for those near the top of the hierarchy. What he found, however, was that reporters at larger, corporate papers were more satisfied in their jobs and did not report lower autonomy than did reporters at smaller papers. As Demers had expected, senior editors did report higher autonomy than lower-ranking journalists.

I chose to use circulation instead of newsroom size for several reasons. The first is that circulation is closely tied to staff size, but also is related to availability of newsroom resources and prestige in a way that staff size, strictly speaking, is not. Secondly, while hardly stable, circulation is more stable in the current environment than is staff size. Also, I did not expect that journalists completing the survey would be especially good at giving accurate figures for staff size or circulation, but I was able to look up the latter through the Audit Bureau of Circulations. There was no way for me to

ascertain staff sizes. I did, however, inquire in the survey for this project about changes in staff sizes, a factor that has been found to predict autonomy (Beam et al, 2009).

2.2 Human Capital and Economics Literature

Many labor market researchers have looked to human capital—the accumulated investment in a person’s skills, training, experience, knowledge—to explain career-related outcomes (e.g. Becker, 1962, 1985; Polachek, 1975; Chiswick, 1988). The influence of human capital on careers—and the general principle that human capital is helpful to careers—is well established in the economics and sociological literature. Individuals invest in themselves by gaining education, skill and experience, which contribute to rewards such as pay and promotion, and employers often invest in employees with education and training, for example, in hopes of making them more productive and profitable for the company.

In reviewing human capital literature, it may be most useful to begin with Gary S. Becker’s 1962 totem article, published in *The Journal of Political Economy*, in which he defines the concept. “Activities that influence future real income through the imbedding of resources in people” is Becker’s definition of “investing in human capital” (p. 9). He includes a wide range of activities, from education and on-the-job training to health insurance and pensions. Individuals may invest in human capital for (and in) themselves, and others—notably employers—may invest in a person’s human capital, as well. The earnings associated with this capital may accrue to the employer (if the capital acquired may be used only in service to that employer to increase productivity), to the individual (if the capital acquired may be useful in a variety of settings) or to both

(when the capital is useful in a limited number of firms). Becker theorizes that no employer would pay to train an employee in skills that were of a general nature and could be easily taken elsewhere. If such training is available, employees pay for it in the form of depressed wages. Similarly, students defer wages while attending school, absorbing that opportunity cost in hopes of a later payoff in terms of higher earnings.

Becker notes that a number of “empirical phenomena” could be explained by human capital investment, including that earnings tend to increase with age, but at a declining rate; younger people change jobs more frequently but also get more schooling and on-the-job training than their seniors; and that “abler” people get more education and training (1962: 10; also noted by Mincer, 1989). Regarding the first phenomenon, Becker explains that those undergoing training get lower wages while being trained as a way of paying for their training, but they get higher wages later, leading to a steeper wage curve as they age than that of those who are untrained. He notes that those in school tend to be young, and that the young (and unencumbered) are more willing to switch jobs and move in service of their careers. Older workers, meanwhile, become constrained by family and other limitations, such that they are less willing or able to take on additional education or move to new places. This may lower both their inclination to invest in their human capital by restricting their options to get and reap benefits from it. Age also may lower an employer’s inclination to invest in older workers, as the employer has less time in which to reap the benefits of that investment before the workers retire. Becker and others (e.g. Mincer, 1989) note that wage profiles are typically concave: They grow quickly in one’s early career, and eventually level off or decline. It should be noted that while payoffs to human capital may diminish with age, some researchers

have found that tenure, or the number of years in the same job, has a positive effect on earnings (Topel, 1991; Altonji and Williams, 2005). There remains, however, dispute over how powerful the impact of tenure may be (Topel, 1991; Stevens, 2003; Altonji and Williams, 2005).

A key question for this project is whether journalism rewards human capital as we would expect, based on research done on other types of workers, and, if so, what kinds of human capital journalism rewards. The particulars of journalism must be considered. Even as journalists have become more educated—the vast majority have at least bachelor's degrees—and majoring in journalism has become more common, a lively debate continues over the value of education for journalists and, in particular, the value of a journalism degree. One side holds that journalism has evolved into a profession at least enough to merit its own training and socialization, that practitioners should be specifically taught to gather and distribute news, as well as to understand journalism's historical and social role. Others suggest that journalists should study anything *but* journalism, learn as much as they can about other topics and pick up the craft of journalism by doing it, in more of an apprenticeship approach. Regardless of where they stand on this issue, few editors hire journalists today who do not at least have a bachelor's degree. Additionally, with smaller staffs, on-the-job-training is likely to be getting short shrift.

On the whole, given the divided opinions over preparation for newsroom work, I suspect that education functions mostly as a credential—a hurdle to jump to indicate a dedication to preparedness, but not a guarantee of much. Entering the field with less than a bachelor's degree has been difficult for some time and would be virtually

impossible now. Education may have been a bigger differentiator for new entrants decades ago when fewer journalists had degrees. Today, it's a price of admission. Hence, there may be a period or cohort effect in that the impact of education should be weaker for newer entrants for whom a bachelor's degree is virtually universal. Today, incoming journalists are expected to have worked on campus media, perhaps even starting their own news sites, and to have completed internships prior to seeking full-time work. The professional preparation bar has risen sharply in recent years, as the number of journalism jobs has declined and the number of journalism graduates has continued to outpace demand for positions. Newsroom internships are practically required at this point to gain employment, and my previous research suggests that having two internships may be a kind of threshold that makes subsequent employment more likely (Neidorf, 2008). Internships, a form of training and experience, are treated as type of human capital in this study.

This skirmish over how journalists should prepare for their work—how much education, what type, what other preparation—is tied to a larger, long-running question of whether journalism is or is not a profession, as noted above. Unlike medical or legal professionals, journalists do not follow a set course of study or get a license to do their jobs, though there are some commonly understood standards of professionalism and ethics with emerging norms about the amount of education required (bachelor's), if not the focus of that education. Some journalists complete additional education beyond the bachelor's degree, and about a fifth of those in this study have completed an advanced degree. (See Appendix B for education details.)

Beyond the seemingly endless debate over whether journalism is or should be a profession is the undeniable reality that technological change in how news is gathered and presented and the financial devastation of newspaper companies in recent years have led to major changes in newsroom structure and opportunity. In short, papers have slashed newsroom staffing and budgets (ASNE annual censuses, Edmonds, 2008) and shifted toward emphasizing digital content and downplaying printed content. Together, these changes have profound effects on journalists and their career paths—and may privilege certain types of skills and experience over others. In particular, multimedia skills (e.g. shooting and editing video, preparing podcasts, writing for a newspaper blog) and more recent education may be seen as more valuable than years of experience and more traditional “shoe leather” journalism skills (e.g. interviewing people in person, tracking down paper records at courthouses, and even writing itself). This study considers how various types of skills—editing skills, reporting skills, multimedia skills—contribute to pay and access to resources for journalists, controlling for the positions they hold. It is expected that skills that relate to a particular position will be particularly valuable, but also that multimedia skills—given their relative “newness” and, therefore, their scarcity among journalists—may be valued across positions. Though skill has often been measured by proxies such as wages (Juhn et al, 1993) or exposure to training (Acemoglu and Pischke, 1999; Dustmann and Meghir, 2005), in this study, I have collected self-assessment of very specific skills in reporting, editing and multimedia production. Given the opportunity to address the value of skills within a very specific population, I wanted to hone the questions to be most relevant to the occupation.

Numerous researchers, from Gary Becker on, have made distinctions between general skills and firm-specific skills or task-specific skills (e.g. Becker, 1962; Gibbons and Waldman, 2006; Gathmann and Schonberg, 2010), suggesting different rates of returns to different players (employers or employees) for them. These are tricky distinctions when talking about journalism. The basic skills of reporting and editing are useful across papers and, indeed, in other fields as well. However, newsrooms make great investments in customizing how they do things, from the process of managing copy flow and storing files to how they design graphics and Web sites to how they use particular elements of language. Learning “how we do things” is an important undertaking for any new hire, a matter of socialization of the sort Padolny and Baron discuss (1997), as well as more formal on-the-job training. While familiarity with hardware and software common to journalism may be transferrable, the investment in learning the specifics of how a given newsroom uses those tools is not. Furthermore, the transferability of journalism skills, beyond the basic writing and researching, is questionable for two reasons. First, the types of adjacent fields into which one might plausibly transfer (e.g. advertising, public relations, journalism instruction) have been facing the same recent financial pressures and staff cuts that have prompted some in newspapers to want or need to find other work. After all, cuts in advertising that affect newspapers also affect advertising firms, and the same economic pressures reduce spending on public relations. These avenues are no longer as available as they were in good times. Second, there are only so many daily newspapers, and most cities and towns have only one, creating a kind of quasi-monopsony. Newspaper journalists who want to remain in daily journalism have to work at that one paper or move or else take

on long commutes to other towns. For journalists tied to a location for family or other personal reasons, this can reduce the transferability of their skills, something known to both the employer and the employee, which may lower the rewards attached to them for journalists.

In light of these findings, this study considers the impacts of education, internships (a form of pre-on-the-job training), reporting skills, editing skills, multimedia skills, newsroom experience, access to job-related resources and tenure with one's current employer on journalists' pay and autonomy. The expectation is that human capital will be positively associated with autonomy, as those who have skills, education and experience may be assumed to be able to work more independently and make the best use of autonomy. On the whole, human capital also is expected to be positively associated with pay.

2.3 Social Capital and Networks Literature

One would expect human capital to be a major predictor of job quality for anyone—this fits both theoretical expectations and common sense notions of how careers are supposed to work. However, human capital is not the *only* predictor of career outcomes. *What* one knows is important, but *whom* one knows also is important. A person's social network gives one access to various goods—contacts, information, introductions, advocacy—that can advance a career.

There is a voluminous literature on the topic of social networks and how they affect people's experiences in the labor market. What is attained through these networks is social capital, or as, Lin puts it (2000: 786):

Social capital may be defined as investment and use of embedded resources in social relations for expected returns (Lin 1999a, 2000). Social capital is conceptualized as (1) quantity and/or quality of resources that an actor (be it an individual or group or community) can access or use through (2) its location in a social network. The first conceptualization of social capital emphasizes resources the resources embedded in social relations, or social resources. The second conceptualization emphasizes locations in a network or network characteristics. The general proposition is that social capital enhances the likelihood of instrumental returns, such as better jobs, earlier promotions, higher earnings or bonuses, and expressive returns, such as better mental health.

Tying social capital and social networks together in the context of job-searching, Flap and Boxman describe the terms as follows: (in Lin, Cook and Burt, 2000:161):

Social networks are social capital because they are instrumental in goal attainment, e.g., in getting a job. Social capital the resultant of the size of the network, the structure of the network, the investments in network members and the resources of these members (Burt, 1992, 2000; Flap, 1999, 2001).

For the purposes of this study, then, social capital may be thought of as the sum of resources that may flow through the social network; the information, advocacy and assistance that one may get through one's family, friends, friends of friends, acquaintances, colleagues and others, drawing on Lin (and others') conception of social resources ("the wealth, status, power, as well as the social ties, of those persons who are directly or indirectly linked to the individual," Lin et al, 1981).

The impact of social networks and social capital on job quality is important for journalism because it has been suggested that journalism hiring and promotion may rely more heavily on network influence, perhaps in part because journalism lacks objective criteria on which to judge a potential hire (Lee Becker et al, 1999). One could count the number of articles written or edited in, say, a year, but this is too crude a measure, given the vast range of lengths and complexities in articles. Additionally, the high-pressure newsroom environment demands that journalists be able to work together under stress and tight deadlines, making social "fit" an important criterion.

Researchers have differed over what elements of a person's social networks are important for getting jobs and other benefits. Granovetter (1973) noted that weak ties, not strong ties, lead people to better jobs because weak ties (e.g. to acquaintances, friends of friends), serve as bridges to opportunities that could not likely come from strong ties. Others (e.g. Bridges and Villemez, 1986) did not find that tie strength mattered to finding jobs. Burt (1992) holds that ties are important, but Burt focuses on whether a tie spans a "structural hole"—a relational gap between individuals or groups—and how valuable that bridge can be to both groups, as well as the person in the middle.

Lin et al (1981) found that for instrumental purposes, such as job-seeking, people "can acquire a structural advantage by dealing with a person at a higher status level. Further, it has been demonstrated that *weak ties tend to lead to those of relatively higher status in the hierarchical structure.*" (p.1166, emphasis in the original.) With its focus on pay and work-related autonomy as the outcomes of concern, this study will draw heavily on Lin's conception of social resources (Lin et al, 1978, 1981; Lin 1999). Others have debated the merits of tie strength and ties that bridge structural holes (e.g. Burt, 1992; Granovetter, 1973; Padolny and Baron, 1997; Bian and Ang, 1997), and while those questions are not uninteresting, Lin's approach (1981, 1999) is well suited to the questions at hand, namely whether the size of one's social network and the status of its members—affects career outcomes. This study draws more on Lin's notion of accessed (rather than mobilized) social capital (Lin, 1999) and relies on a simplified variant of a position generator to collect network data.

Other research, it must be noted, argues against expecting too much from networks. Some have found that while networks may be useful for finding jobs—and jobs that are better suited to the people taking them—jobs found through networks do not offer higher wages than jobs found in other ways (See, for example, Montgomery, 1992 and Franzen and Hangartner, 2006). Franzen and Hangartner note that while a person's network may know a fair amount about an available job and whether their friend, family member, or other contact is suited for it, network members probably do not know what it will pay. Therefore, using networks to find jobs raises the likelihood of a good match, but not of higher pay. Wielgosz and Carpenter (1987), meanwhile, find that using networks in search for a job shortened the length of the job search but did not lead to a better job in terms of satisfaction. Focusing on what happens after one lands a job, Podolny and Baron (1997) point out that while large networks and weak ties may be useful for getting information and resources about otherwise unknown opportunities, they are less useful for learning workplace norms, forming an acceptable social identity at a company, developing trust that is needed to get resources and getting social support. For these purposes, a small, dense, cohesive network is better.

Taking all of these findings into consideration, I expect that those with networks rich in journalists of seniority and authority will have greater autonomy as network members may—if they have authority over the journalist—offer autonomy directly, or else influence those with authority over the journalist, encouraging autonomy. Even less directly, having a powerful network might suggest to those who have authority over the journalist that this journalist is worthy of trust. Of course, this refers to a kind of positive autonomy given, with intent, by managers. Journalists at less well staff, more

overworked, underfunded papers may still have a form of autonomy in the sense that they are let alone, but it is difficult to see how networks could enable this type of autonomy.

I am not certain how networks will affect pay, particularly when accounting for the mediating effect of circulation. I expect the effect of circulation to be powerful, both because larger papers simply *can* pay more and because the larger the paper, the more likely it is to be operating in a larger city with a higher cost of living—thereby requiring it to pay more to its workers than must a paper in a smaller, lower cost-of-living community. In terms of increasing pay, network members may be most helpful in getting journalists into bigger papers, by hiring them or influencing those who do the hiring. However, network members may be able to influence pay within a newsroom by either offering higher pay (if serving as the journalist's boss) or by putting in a good word for the journalist or otherwise influencing those who determine the journalist's pay.

Networks may be even more important to getting a job in journalism than in some other fields because of the nature of newsroom work and the vital importance of hiring people who can fit in. Journalism is not a job for independent loners. Even “mojos” (mobile journalists who report almost exclusively from the field, using technology to file from remote locations) have to interact repeatedly with editors, photographers, graphic artists and other reporters. Journalists *have* to be able to get along with their colleagues and pick up on and follow the norms of their newsrooms (something network members can advise on) to survive in an environment in which each person's work product is very closely tied to the next person's, and in which intense time pressures make delays and mistakes difficult to tolerate. Furthermore, when errors get past a journalist and his or

her colleagues, they are on display to thousands, if not millions, of people. If for no other reason than to avoid personal and corporate humiliation, one has to be able to do the job and work well with others doing theirs.

How does a hiring editor know if a potential employee will be able to work in that newsroom in the position for which he or she is hiring? A hiring editor can look at training and experience and work product, but they are only so telling. Did the journalist really learn how to report and edit in college or did he or she learn how to get As? In previous jobs, how thorough and clean was the journalist's original output, before it landed in the hands of editors and designers? This cannot be discerned from the final published product. Hence, references—formal and informal—are crucial, especially in this time of reduced staffs and budgets, when editors can ill afford to make a bad hire.

This study considers the relative standing of professional contacts in a respondent's social network, dividing them into junior reporters, junior editors, senior reporters and senior editors, the idea being that those who are more senior or more powerful (editors) will be able more assistance in obtaining resources and higher pay. This draws the finding by Lin et al (1981) that the status of network ties used in job-hunting is an important outcome in job searches, both early and later in careers. (It should be noted that this research was conducted on men only.) Lin also found (1999) that those in higher-ranking jobs have larger social networks.

Seibert et al (2001) tested a path model that, in part, considered how the rank of a person's network members ultimately helps predict salary, promotions over a career and career satisfaction among workers in a variety of occupations. Notably, having more contacts at higher levels of an organization was found to contribute directly to

access to career sponsorship and access to information. The latter, in turn, was positively related to having access to resources, which in turn was positively correlated with salary and satisfaction. (Autonomy is not part of Seibert et al's model.)

I expect that having more higher-ranking journalists in one's networks will be positively associated with both pay and autonomy. I am uncertain whether status (junior/senior) of network members will matter more or whether holding editing positions, as opposed to reporting positions, will matter more when it comes to influencing job outcomes. I expect junior reporters—with the least prestige and authority—to be the least useful network members and senior editors to be the most helpful, in accordance with Lin's finding (Lin et al 1981) that higher-ranking network members are more valuable. I do not, however, know whether senior reporters—with high prestige but generally no authority over others—will be more valuable than junior editors—who have less prestige but may have hiring, pay-setting and autonomy-awarding authority or at least direct input on these things. Additionally, it is expected that larger networks, overall, will be more valuable than networks that are smaller, in part because larger networks would be more likely to include bridging ties. Networks are expected to have a substantial indirect effect on pay by helping journalists land at better-paying, larger, papers, but network members also are expected to have some direct, within-paper, influence on pay.

2.4 Race and Gender Literature

It would be difficult, even irresponsible, to look at career outcomes without considering the impacts of race and gender, which have long been recognized as

important axes of stratification. Gender and race may be thought of as social structures themselves. Notes Risman (2004: 433):

Gender is deeply embedded as a basis for stratification not just in our personalities, our cultural rules or institutions but in all of these, and in complicated ways. The gender structure differentiates opportunities and constraints based on sex category and thus has consequences on three dimensions: (1) At the individual level, for the development of gendered selves; (2) during interaction as men and women face different cultural expectations even when they fill the identical structural positions; and (3) in institutional domains where explicit regulations regarding resource distribution of material goods are gender specific.

It is beyond the scope of this study to consider gender identity at the individual level—there are no measures of personal, gendered identity under consideration—but the impact of gender on interactions between men and women should be evident in the social networks they form and how they use them, which is of concern for this project. Newsroom positions and resources were once explicitly, rigidly gendered—women wrote for the religion, family and “society” pages while men covered everything else, edited almost everything and managed everything. This is no longer the case, though the residue of this structure can be seen in the gender makeups of various departments and authority levels within newsrooms today. How much gender continues to determine access to resources, pay and autonomy is of direct concern to this study.

Bonilla-Silva (1997) suggests that racism exists within larger racialized social systems, “societies in which economic, political, social and ideological levels are partially structured by the placement of actors in racial categories or races” (1997: 469).

Explains Bonilla Silva (1997: 469):

In all racialized social systems the placement of people in racial categories involves some form of hierarchy that produces definite social relations between the races. The race placed in the superior position tends to receive greater economic remuneration and access to better occupations and/or prospects in the labor market, occupies a primary position in the political system, is granted higher social estimation (e.g. is viewed as “smarter” or “better looking”), often has the license to draw physical (segregation) as well as social (racial etiquette) boundaries between itself and other races, and receives what DuBois (1939) calls a “psychological wage” (Marable, 1983; Roediger, 1991). The totality

of these racialized social relations and practices constitutes the racial structure of a society.

The primary area of concern for this study is, of course, economic remuneration, and autonomy obtained within the world of newspaper journalism. This study will consider whether race and gender affect career outcomes for journalists and, if so, how. Research into race and gender and their impacts on career outcomes have pointed in at least two directions: toward differences in what workers bring to the labor market, including human and social capital, and differences in how the labor market treats workers on the basis of race or sex, once other factors are accounted for. Some of that literature brought to bear on this study and is highlighted here.

2.4.1 Gender

Literature concerning the impact of gender on career outcomes has sought to determine not just how much gender might affect careers, but how it does so. If career outcomes are obtained in the same way for men and women, explaining them would be a fairly simple matter of measuring men and women's human capital, social capital or whatever other variables were under consideration as predictors. However, if career outcomes are not determined in the same way for men and women, merely knowing how much education people have or the size of their networks is not enough.

Considering the impact of gender on human capital acquisition and pay—specifically, trying to explain the pay gap between men and women—Becker in 1985 pointed out that married women spent less energy on market work than did married men, noting married women's increased responsibility for child care. Becker also noted that women who had entered the labor market for the first time in then-recent years

brought fewer skills to the labor market. He concluded that women sought less demanding jobs so that, even when they worked as many hours as married men, they earn less money. He acknowledged that women were less rewarded for their hours of work, but framed this differential in terms of women's offering less human capital (in the form of energy and investment in work) to the employer. This argument suggests that to the extent women are treated differently, it is not a malicious form of discrimination so much as a logical reward system that takes into account not just hours worked but personal investment in one's career.

In 1992, Becker focused on women's gains in earnings and labor market participation, and argued that while the Civil Rights Movement helped women (and minorities) in the labor force, women benefitted far more from their greater investment in their own human capital (e.g. by getting more education) and from a greater attachment to the labor force. A few years earlier, Becker had argued that women were paid less because of their lesser commitment and greater constraints; in 1992, with a focus on recent historical developments, he argued that women were faring much better than they had in the past because of changes in their behavior. Although his perspective on women's career outcomes (pay, mostly) differed from 1985 to 1992, his focus on market rewards to human capital did not. In both articles, Becker holds that the way women are treated is a function of how they act and what they offer.

Other researchers, while not discounting the importance of human capital (or social capital), argue that it is not just the quantity of these things that may differ by gender or race, but the way they are perceived and responded to by the market. They see things in a different light, arguing that women and minorities are treated differently

because of who they are—and how that differs from those assigning career rewards, usually white men, such that their human capital, social capital and other qualities do not function the same way in developing careers as they do for (white) men. One of the most important proponents of this perspective is Kanter (1977/1993), whose description of homosocial/homosexual reproduction among corporate managers has become a key concept undergirding these arguments. She explains:

Managers [at the corporation Kanter studied] tend to carefully guard power and privilege for those who fit in, for those they see as “their kind.” Wilbert Moore [1962] was commenting on this phenomenon when he used the metaphor of a “bureaucratic kinship system” to describe the corporation—but a kinship system based on “homosexual reproduction” in which men reproduce themselves in their own image. The metaphor is apt. Because of the *situation* (emphasis original) in which managers function, because of the position of managers in the corporate structure, social similarity tends to become extremely important to them. The structure sets in motion forces leading to the replication of managers as the same kind of social individuals. And the men who manage reproduce themselves in kind (Kanter 1977 [1993 edition: 48]).

How they enact that reproduction is described by Kanter and others, and tested by them, as well. Sponsorship is one way. Kanter notes that informal sponsors who mentor and advocate for less senior or lower-status employees are helpful for men, but crucial for women—though more difficult for them to come by. Sponsors can directly influence promotions, even in the face of ostensibly objective ratings systems, but they also are able to get “inside information, to short-circuit cumbersome procedures or ... cut red tape,” Kanter explains (1993: 182). Sponsors also signal to others that the sponsored person has been chosen or endorsed, providing what Kanter calls “a form of ‘reflected power’” (p. 182). (The notion that sponsorship is important for managers, especially women managers, is picked up by and confirmed by Burt (1992).) Kanter holds that men, who are more likely to be in positions from which they can be effective sponsors, cannot identify with women and, therefore, do not often sponsor them.

When women acquired sponsors, the reasons were often different from the male sponsor-protégé situation. In one case, officers were looking for a high-performing woman they could make into a showpiece to demonstrate the organization's openness to good women. In another instance, an executive was thought to have "hung his hat on a woman" (decided to sponsor her) to demonstrate that he could handle a "tricky" management situation and solve a problem for the corporation (p184).

Kanter also discusses the gendered nature of work assignments in the corporation she studied, including women's frequent relegation to secretarial work, and the relative exclusion of women from centrally important roles. While this is an important idea, it is not key to this study, as the three roles studied—reporters, editors and columnists—are all centrally important in newsrooms. By definition, the women in this study have not been pushed to the outskirts of the newsroom in the way Kanter discusses, though they may have more or less authority.

In the more than three decades since Kanter's *Men and Women of the Corporation* was first published, many have studied concepts highlighted by Kanter, such as sponsorship (including sponsored versus contest mobility) and, related to that, how women use networks and how networks work for women, compared with men. Brass (1985) studied the interaction patterns between men and women at a newspaper (though not just in the newsroom) as predictors of a person's influence and promotions and found that patterns of information interaction are important. Women build networks, but they tend to build them more with other women than with men. Because women tend not to be in centrally important roles, these networks were less useful.

Leicht & Marx (1997) found that those who use informal methods to find jobs tend to seek information from people of the same gender; that women tended to refer other women to gender-typical jobs more than men do; and that when the job seeker and the person providing the referral to a job are of different genders, seekers get jobs

lower in the hierarchy than those making the referral. In another study, McGuire (2000) concluded that structural constraints—few women and minorities being in positions of power or in control of resources—put them at a disadvantage, in terms of having higher-status networks. These findings reflect homophily (Ibarra, 1993; McPherson et al, 2001), the tendency to associate with people like one's self. This practice may render women and minorities unwanted in some networks. At the same time, the networks that would welcome them would be less useful for career development, as Brass found.

One rationale offered for homophily and homosocial/homosexual reproduction is that it may be a response to uncertainty. When a job involves a lot of judgment and is unpredictable in the skills it may call upon or the range of demands the job may make, gender becomes a bigger factor in decisions about promotions and other opportunities. Past performance may get less attention as managers lean toward someone more like them, someone male. Gorman (2006) looks at how uncertainty embedded in positions affects law firm promotions and finds support for this theory: uncertainty reduced the promotion of women. This uncertainty principle may apply to newspaper journalism, both because of the inherent unpredictability of the work but also because of the current turmoil, caused by economic and technological influences. Uncertainty may affect the way women and minorities working in newspaper journalism are treated, particularly with regard to how much they are entrusted with autonomy.

Smith (2005) considered the impact of race and gender, together, on promotions and finds support for both Becker's emphasis on the importance of human capital as an explanation for career outcomes and for Kanter's findings regarding sponsorship and homosocial/homosexual reproduction. Studying residents of several urban areas, Smith

found that gaps in promotions are largely a function of group differences in performance indicators (human capital measures) and work commitment indicators, such as time spent at work, marital status and parenthood status and work commitment. Smith found no difference in the processes through which white men and women got promotions—sponsorship did not matter for promotions—but found that blacks and Latinos needed more human capital (experience, tenure with the same employer) to get promoted. Notably, white men had more education, job tenure and experience.

In light of these findings, this study will consider how gender affects the size and quality of networks (measured by status of network members), how gender predicts pay and autonomy, and how gender interacts with other human capital and social capital-related variables to predict the outcome measures.

2.4.2 Race

Many studies that consider the impact of race on careers apply the same (or similar) ideas employed to study the impact of gender on careers. Some also study the impact of race and gender simultaneously, as Smith (2005) did. McDonald et al (2009), for example, considered how social networks lead to job leads and how race and gender affect that process. They found that white men have significant advantages over white women and Hispanics when it comes to getting job leads through networks, and relatedly, that networks with many white males yield more job leads than networks with more women and minorities. Because social networks tend to be homophilous along race and gender lines, women and minorities are at a disadvantage. The advantage for white men was greatest among those with the most supervisory authority. Women and

minorities “in upper management tend to be both structurally (Collins, 1997) and informally (Kanter, 1977; McGuire, 2002) isolated from core production activities,” McDonald et al noted. “Consequently, it is not surprising that while males maintain their greatest advantage in job leads at the highest levels of authority” (2009: 397).

Slightly earlier, Baldi and McBrier (1997) sought to extend the homosocial reproduction theory described in Kanter (1977) to race, looking at differences in promotions between whites and blacks. Among their findings were that whites benefitted from an internal labor market, while blacks did not, and, overall, that while whites advanced through sponsorship mobility, blacks relied on a formal contest system to win promotions. Wilson et al (1999), also studying promotions and race, had similar findings, namely that blacks benefitted more from human capital.

In studying the relationships between both human capital and social capital and race in predicting promotions among managers at a financial firm, James (2000) found that race moderates the relationship between human capital and promotion rates, such that blacks do not benefit as much from their human capital as do whites. There was no significant difference in human capital investment by race, so the outcome had to be one of differential treatment, not different rates of accrual.

Parks-Yancy (2006), using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, also addressed questions about earnings and promotions, looking at how they differ by race and gender at several time points. Drawing on Lin’s (2001) distinction between capital deficits and return deficits, Parks-Yancy set out to determine the amount of access to social capital resources people had and how they differed by race and gender and the effect of access to those social capital resources on careers. She found that white men

and women have greater access to social capital, relative to black women. Comparing black women and men, she found no difference. Whites were more likely to get promoted than black women, and black women were more likely to get promoted than black men.

Evidence about the impact of social capital on promotions was mixed. Overall, Parks-Yancy found that social capital predicted promotions in 1996, but not in 1994. Whites were more likely to get promoted based on using social capital resources than were black women, who were more likely to do so than were black men. Whites and black men earned more than black women and using social capital to get jobs boosted earnings. White women who used networks to get jobs earned more than black women. In summary, whites have more social capital than do blacks, and benefit more from their social capital. Variation by gender was complicated by race, yielding only partial support for hypotheses regarding gender differences in social capital or benefits of using that capital.

This study will consider how race affects the quality of networks, how race predicts pay and autonomy, and how gender interacts with other human capital and social capital-related variables to predict the outcome measures. In this study, all minority journalists are treated as a single category, and comparisons are made between whites and minorities. This is the approach used in some studies, but many focus on differences between whites and blacks. In the current survey, 122 minority journalists are in both models (after listwise deletion). This includes 41 Hispanics/Latinos, 39 African Americans, 14 Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders, 3 Native Americans and 25 people of mixed race.

I am uncertain what to expect regarding the networks of minority journalists. It may be that the paucity of minority journalists and tendencies toward homophily among white journalists may hurt their chances at having many high-status journalists in their networks. However, given that journalists of color—both rank and file and elite managers—tend to work at larger papers, minority journalists may have more opportunity to network with each other than might otherwise be expected. Additionally, the small number of minorities in journalism is viewed by the field's leaders as a problem, leading to ASNE's monitoring of minority hiring and retention, so there is impetus to try to hold onto minority journalists. (There also is some concern within journalism about the lack of women in the field's upper ranks—particularly that women join the field and then drop out.)

2.5 Hypotheses

The data for this study were collected through a survey of American newspaper journalists, who were asked about their newsroom careers, their preparation for the field and about the quality of their jobs. Their answers are used to test an overarching model that hypothesizes that journalists' human capital and social networks will affect the quality of their full-time daily newspaper jobs, and that race and gender will affect career outcomes, as well. Job-quality measures analyzed here are pay (logged in the analysis) and job-related autonomy (ordinal, analyzed with five codes). The basic models are: Human capital + social network = logged pay and human capital + social network = logged pay autonomy, with circulation as a mediating variable in the case of pay. The hypotheses are structured under the assumption that journalists' careers will be affected

similarly by human capital and social networks to the ways other types of workers are affected with the understanding that, as noted earlier, this may not be the case.

As noted above, after early analysis suggested circulation should not be treated as simply another independent variable, the model was revised to treat circulation as a mediating variable. The idea that access to resources also should be a mediating variable in the model to predict pay was considered and tested, but the associations between circulation and resources and resources and pay were miniscule, so access-to-resources was returned to its independent variable status.

The general expectation when it comes to the human capital hypotheses is that—as in other fields—more is better: The more education, experience and skills, a journalist has, the higher his or her pay is expected to be and the greater his or her access to resources is expected to be. I expected the particularities/peculiarities of journalism may be found in which types of capital are most advantageous and for whom and when over the course of careers, which will be discussed in greater detail in the analysis. It is expected that social networks richer in highly placed journalists will be more advantageous in attaining higher pay and greater autonomy. Being a journalist of color and being a woman are hypothesized to be negatively associated with pay and access to resources, though there is some hesitance to do so with regard to race. It is possible that given concerns about racial diversity in newsrooms that this will not be the case. Indeed, being a minority journalist may be positively associated with pay and access resources. Interaction models will be used to test hypotheses about how race and gender might mediate the effects of other independent variables in the model.

Circulation is included as a mediating variable because it greatly affects the total

pool of money allotted for wages and dedicated to resource provision in any paper. Larger papers simply have more money to spend on staffing and resources, including technology and training. Earlier models to predict pay also did a fairly good job predicting circulation, adding to the evidence that mediation may be occurring.

It is worth noting that the tremendous financial and organizational tumult that newsrooms have been undergoing in recent years may affect the relationships between these variables. Social networks (and human capital) may matter less in such an environment of such upheaval—or they may matter more, particularly to newer entrants, who must establish themselves in these circumstances. A dummy variable has been added to the model that indicates whether a journalist has entered the field in or after 2002, the first year (in some time) in which the ASNE censuses recorded a decline in employment. A measure of whether employment at one's paper has lost staff and, if so how severely, also is included as a control. Journalists were asked about whether the number of newsroom jobs at their current papers had increased a lot, increased a little, stayed the same, declined a little or declined a lot over the past five years. Perhaps not surprisingly, few said their staff sizes had stayed the same or grown; those answers are combined into a single variable and used as a reference category. A dummy variable that indicates whether newspapers jobs have gone down a little is included, as is a dummy that indicates whether newspaper jobs have gone down a lot.

Though configured somewhat differently—circulation is a mediator in the model predicting pay but not autonomy—both models feature the almost identical sets of variables. The primary purpose of this project is to ascertain how human capital and social networks influence career outcomes for journalists, and the literature suggests no

reason to think different forms of human capital or different measures of social networks would be particularly useful in either of the models. The variables chosen, such as key skills, experience, education and size of networks among reporters and editors, are not exotic. It is possible to imagine that, for example, one type of skill may be more valuable in attaining higher pay than in attaining more autonomy, but it is as plausible to think such a skill would affect both types of career rewards, and the prudent approach seemed to be to check by including the variables in both models.

As noted above, autonomy is generally treated as an indicator of other career outcomes, such as satisfaction or professionalism. When autonomy has been studied as an outcome for journalists, many of the elements included here in both models are used. Furthermore, given that the career rewards are offered in the same environment by the same people and organizations, using the same measures seems logical. This approach allows for a full complement of predictors and controls to be employed, reducing concerns about omitted variable bias and allowing a fuller exploration than would be possible with more narrowly focused models. Had I determined any reason to use any particular variable in only one model, I would have done so.

2.5.1 Hypotheses and Variables

H₁: Human capital will be positively associated with pay. Effects are expected to be both direct and indirect, as human capital would make journalists better able to get jobs at larger papers (the indirect effect) and lead to higher pay within their papers (the direct effect).

HC variables

Experience (in years)

Tenure with current employer (in years)

Education level (dummy variables for various levels)

Journalism internships (number)

Reporting skills (scale)

Editing skills (scale)

Multimedia skills (scale)

Multimedia skills (scale)

Access to resources (ordinal—only variable not mediated by circulation)

- H₂: Having more network members at higher levels of the journalism hierarchy (senior reporters and senior editors) will be positively associated with pay. This effect is expected to be primarily indirect, in that a highly placed network will be able to help a journalist get hired at a larger, better-paying paper. However, network members may also have influence or control over a journalist's pay within his or her own newspaper, so some direct effect is possible.

Network variables

There are three dummies for how many senior reporters were known at the time the journalist got his or her current job and three for how many senior editors were known. The reference category for junior reporters is 0 or 1 known, and the other categories are 2-to-10 known and 11 or more known. For senior editors,

the reference category is 0 known, and the other categories are 1, 2-to -5 and 6 or more known.

- H₃: Having more network members who are newspaper editors (junior or senior) will be positively associated with pay. This effect is expected to be primarily indirect, in that editors may be able to help a journalist get hired at a larger, better-paying paper (including hiring them). However, network members may also have influence or control over a journalist's pay within his or her own newspaper, so some direct effect is possible.

Network variables

There are three dummies for how many junior editors were known at the time the journalist got his or her current job and three for how many senior editors were known. The reference category for both groups is 0 known. The other categories are 1, 2-to-5 and 6 or more.

- H₄: Human capital will be positively associated with autonomy.
- H₅: Knowing more senior journalists (reporters and editors) will be positively associated with autonomy. It is expected that senior journalists may be able to provide or permit autonomy for journalists who report to them or to influence the autonomy of other journalists, though this relationship may be weaker than the relationship between senior journalists and pay.

- H₆: Having a network richer in editors (junior or senior) will be positively associated with autonomy.
- H₇: Being male will be positively associated with pay. There may be both direct and indirect effects, but is expected that the direct, within-paper effect will be larger. Larger papers have tended to be more engaged in efforts to expand opportunities for women and minority journalists and may be more sensitive to concerns regarding pay equity. Hence, higher circulation (and the indirect effect) may depress the gender imbalance in wages.
- H₈: Being white will be positively associated with pay. There may be both direct and indirect effects, but is expected that the direct, within-paper effect will be larger, as above, because of larger papers' greater sensitivity to diversity issues with regard to pay and occupational opportunity.
- H₉: Being male will be positively associated with autonomy.
- H₁₀: Being white will be positively associated with autonomy.
- H₁₁: Women will have less valuable networks than do men, meaning they will have fewer highly placed journalists in their networks, controlling for race and other characteristics.

- H₁₂: Women's networks will be less likely to have a positive impact on pay than men's networks will have on their pay.
- H₁₃: Women's networks will be less likely to have a positive impact on autonomy than men's networks will have on their autonomy.
- H₁₄: Journalists of color will have less valuable networks than do white journalists, meaning they will have fewer highly placed journalists in their networks, controlling for gender and other characteristics.
- H₁₅: The networks of journalists of color will be less likely to have a positive impact on pay than whites' networks have on their pay.
- H₁₆: The networks of journalists of color will be less likely to have a positive impact on autonomy than men's networks will have on their autonomy.
- H₁₇: Human capital will be less likely to have a positive impact on pay for journalists of color than it does for white journalists.
- H₁₈: Human capital will be less likely to have a positive impact on autonomy for journalists of color than it does for white journalists.

3 METHODS

3.1 Data Collection

The project is based on data collected in late 2008 and early 2009 from a nationally representative sample of full-time daily newspaper journalists (with a focus on reporters, editors and columnists) who worked for U.S.-based papers that published in English. Some 6,600 journalists were invited to take part in an online survey that was available between late November 2008 and mid-January 2009. This chapter describes how the sample was created and how the survey was conducted.

3.2 Devising the sample

An important goal of this project was to create a representative sample of newspaper journalists on which research could be conducted. Journalists are not licensed, nor do they tend to belong to any one professional organization, so there is no readily available sampling frame to use. There are, however, directories of journalists. Several are designed to capture top leadership at newspapers, so they are not appropriate for selecting a representative sample of reporters, editors and columnists working at all levels. I used the printed version of the *Bacon's 2008 Newspaper Directory*, which includes positions at all levels, to build a sample.

The Bacon's directory is organized by newspaper, and newspapers are arranged alphabetically by state and municipality. Senior management is listed first, followed by the members of each department (e.g. sports, features, etc.). The directory is intended for use by public relations professionals and, as such, tends to be quite granular so that

PR people may reach the exact person (position) they seek. Hence, a journalist who thinks of himself as a “business reporter” may be listed as the “small business reporter,” the “real estate reporter” and the “local business columnist.” Not surprisingly, there are a lot of duplicates in the list. Among the 1,588 respondents who completed at least 50 percent of the survey (the vast majority did far more), the average number of appearances of a single individual in the directory is 2.58 (standard deviation: 2.09). Features and business staff tend to be listed most often, in part because these departments tend to produce special inserts (e.g. Sunday real estate sections, weekend entertainment guides) that get listed separately in the directory, showing who works on them. Additionally, the most senior newspaper staff members (e.g. executive editor, managing editors) tend to be listed only once, as their roles are more distinct.

Cision, the company that publishes the Bacon’s directory, updates information about newspapers and their staffs on a continuous basis. Across media types (e.g. daily newspapers, weekly newspaper, broadcast outlets), Cision updates 20,000 entries a day, according to Amy McElharney, manager for print media¹. Information for smaller papers is updated at least annually, but for larger, better known papers, updates are much more frequent. Cision contacts journalists for whom they already have information to confirm that that information is current (or, of course, to update it, if it is not). The company also contacts administrators at the newspapers to learn of new staff members. Updates for the annual newspaper director are completed in September of the prior year, and the directory is copyrighted in October. Hence, by the time I was surveying journalists, their contact information was at least 14 months old.

¹ I spoke with Ms. McElharney in July, 2011, to confirm information I had received from her and others at Cision at the time I decided to use their directory for my sampling.

Given the layout of the directory and its paper format, I opted to use a systematic sampling strategy. Beginning on a random page, at a random name, I drew every n th name to build my sample, recording duplicates and ineligibles separately. The directory includes publishers, circulation and advertising executives and photography directors, all of whom were ineligible for my study. This allowed me to get a truly national sample, and one that well represented staff at both large and small papers: There are more small-circulation papers, but larger-circulation papers tend to have larger staffs. By choosing every n th person, I set out to capture the correct proportion of journalists working at all sizes of papers in all parts of the United States.

Based on two pretests and on conversations with others who have surveyed journalists, I knew not to expect an especially high response rate, especially for a survey that would impose a substantial burden in terms of time and sophistication of answers sought. I expected the response rate to be about 20 percent, but perhaps as low as 15 percent or as high as 25 percent.

Weaver et al got a higher response rate for their 2001 journalists survey (Weaver et al, 2007: 257-259), but they contacted newspaper editors to get staff lists, which may have aided in cooperation. If one's employer hands over one's contact information, one may be more inclined to participate in the survey. They added to these lists by culling names of journalists from the news organizations' Web sites. The downside to this is the names on such sites are likely to focus on public-facing employees. Many editors likely would be left off these lists, as well as other positions that neither Weaver and Wilhoit nor I surveyed, such as copy editors, page designers and photographers. Ultimately, Weaver et al sought interviews with 1,466 journalists of all types (e.g. print, broadcast,

wire services) in their main sample, and completed 1,149. They do not describe how much of an interview a respondent had to finish to be considered “complete.”

I wanted at least 1,200 to 1,500 cases to analyze, so invited about 6,000 journalists to take part. I was uncertain exactly how many actual journalists (as opposed to listings of names included duplicates) were in the directory and how many duplicates and ineligible would be encountered. However, a few tests involving small-sample draws led me to believe I would need to choose every fifth or sixth name to get enough potential sample; ultimately, I chose every fifth name. In the end, this approach yielded almost 8,700 unique individuals. I assigned each name a number, and I used a random number generator to select almost 2,700 names for removal to reduce the sample to the desired 6,000.

Under ideal circumstances, I would have removed duplicates and ineligible from the Bacon’s list at the outset, but given its paper format and its length, that was infeasible. Hence, in choosing every fifth name, I encountered 2,483 names that were ineligible for various reasons. They are summarized in Table I (page 64). Notably, 745 of those 2,483 were duplicates of eligible, chosen cases.

I was concerned about having enough journalists of color in my sample to do any analysis of the impact of race on career progression. Journalism is an overwhelmingly white business, with more than 85 percent of newspaper journalists being white (ASNE 2009). I wanted to increase the likelihood of having enough journalists of color in my respondent pool by creating a supplementary sample of that would be more likely to include journalists of color than would a simple systematic sample alone.

Table I: Summary of Ineligibles

Number	Reason
994	Ineligible position (e.g. publisher, circulation manager, photo editor).
109	Newspaper at which journalist is employed is not published in English.
169	Person (usually a columnist) is not a full-time journalist. This often includes doctors or real estate agents, etc., who write advice-type columns on their areas of expertise on a freelance basis and are not journalists.
273	No contact information available. This includes journalists who do not have an individual e-mail address at work (who share them, say, with all other others in their department) for privacy reasons. Others are foreign correspondents in dangerous areas whose contact information is not shared for their safety.
181	Other. Many of these are people I know personally who were excluded for that reason. A few are journalists who died between the time I drew the sample and began the survey. A few worked for newspapers that closed between the time I began drawing the sample and launched the survey.
<u>745</u>	Duplicate entries of people already in the sample.
2483	TOTAL

I used several lists of surnames from the Census Bureau to solve my problem. The Census released a set of lists of names (Word et al, date unknown) that are most likely to be held by people in various racial and ethnic groups. This does not, of course, mean that all (or even most) of the people with those names belong to a particular ethnic group. The lists included the top 10 surnames most likely to be held by whites, African Americans, Hispanics and Asian Americans. There was a list for Native Americans, but so few Native Americans held the names that were most common among them that they would not have been useful for sampling purposes. The Census also listed the 50 most common surnames in the United States and the proportions of people with each name who are white, African American, Asian American, Native American or Hispanic. I compiled a list of the top-10 names for African Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanics and added to it any name in the top 50 surnames that was had by at least 35 percent of any racial or ethnic minority group.

In all, 46 surnames made my list. I used an electronic version of the Bacon's directory² to search for reporters, editors and columnists who had those last names. I removed duplicates from the resulting list. I then removed anyone who was already in the main sample. The rest, about 600 journalists with high-minority-likelihood last names, became a supplementary sample and were invited to take part in the survey.

Ultimately, 6,612 journalists were invited to take part in the survey, including 6,000 from the main sample and 612 from the supplementary sample³. Across both groups, 1,588 responses are considered sufficiently complete for analysis in this dissertation. Of those, 1,542 answered 80 percent or more of the 93 closed-ended questions open to all respondents; they are considered "completes." Other questions were asked only of a subset of respondents. For example, some questions were only for editors, some only for reporters. These and open-ended questions were not considered in determining survey completion. Another 46 respondents answered 50 percent to 79 percent of the 93 closed-ended questions; they are considered "partials." An additional 147 journalists answered at least some of the questions, but less than half of those offered to all respondents. Their data were not used.

The dual-frame approach worked to make the survey more representative of the racial-ethnic breakdown of journalists. According to the American Society of News Editors (ASNE), 13.41 percent of journalists were people of color in 2009, about a percentage point different than my respondents. Given that the main sample was almost

² I would have used the electronic list for all of the sampling, but it is not available as a dataset, in and of itself. Rather, an electronic database is offered only as service, and users work with an interface to find the individuals they are seeking. This was not useful for building the main sample, as I could not simply request all daily newspaper journalists through this interface. (This is not really feasible, given the way the interface works. Additionally, trying to rebuild the database as I would have needed to would have been a violation of the terms of use.)

³ Not included in this count are six substitutions. These were made in cases in which a journalist had departed a position and his or her direct replacement contacted me with a request to take part in the survey in place of the original sample member. Five of the six completed the survey.

ten times as large as the supplementary sample, it is not surprising 89 percent of the completes and partials are from the main sample and 11 percent are from the supplementary sample. Overall, 12 percent of the total respondents are journalists of color, meaning that in a race-ethnicity question that allowed respondents to check all that apply, they did not skip the question and they did not choose white as their only answer⁴. Ultimately, analysis was restricted to reporters, editors and columnists, a total of 1,344 respondents (1,303 complete interviews and 41 partial interviews). This includes 1,119 cases from the main sample and 145 from the supplementary sample. Of these, 1,119 self-identify as white and 168 as African American, Asian American/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, Native American or mixed race; 57 journalists refused to disclose their racial/ethnic background.

It is not possible to create a weight to account for the probability of getting into the sample, for several reasons. First, the directory from which the main sample was drawn was not cleaned prior to sample selection, so the true probability of any individual getting into that sample cannot be known. (Members of the supplementary sample had a 100 percent change of inclusion, of course.) Though an estimated weight strictly to address with likelihood of being in the sample could be created, I decided to analyze these data unweighted, in keeping with advice from several survey and sampling experts, including Timothy Johnson of the University of Illinois Survey Research Laboratory. This raises challenges for generalization, but should improve the quality of

⁴

The 12 percent figure is calculated on a denominator that includes respondents who did not answer the race question (64 cases). If they are removed from the total, 12.5 percent of the respondents are journalists of color. This includes 134 from the main sample, meaning journalists of color comprise 9.5 percent of the main sample, and 57 from the supplementary sample, meaning journalists of color comprise 33.5 percent of the supplementary sample.

the regression findings by providing unbiased estimates with more accurate standard errors (Winship and Radbill, 1994).

Although I have less information about my non-respondents than about my respondents, I did check some key variables to see how comparable the two groups. Fortunately, they are quite comparable, which should help assuage concerns about non-response bias and further the argument against weighting for regression analysis. I randomly selected 1,500 non-respondents and compared their sample origin, gender and position (according to the Bacon's directory) with the information reported by the 1,344 reporters, editors and columnists who completed the survey and were included in the survey.

As seen in Table II (page 67), of the 6,612 journalists invited to take part in the survey, 6,000 names came from the main sample, drawn from the paper directory, while the 612 comprising the supplemental sample came from the electronic version. Therefore, 91 percent of those invited came from the main sample, and the remaining 9 percent came from the supplementary sample. These proportions are well matched among both the non-respondents and the analyzed cases: 92 percent of the non-respondents and 89 percent of the analyzed cases come from the main sample.

Table II: Comparing Non-Respondents to Analyzed Cases

	Main Sample	Supple- mentary	Men	Women	Editor	Reporter	Columnist
Total sample (N=6,612)	90.7%	9.3%	--	--	--	--	--
Non-respondents (N=1,500)	92.0%	8.0%	62.0%	38.0%	45.9%	48.5%	5.6%
Analyzed cases (N=1,344)	89.2%	10.8%	59.6%	40.4%	39.1%	53.9%	6.9%

I coded the first names of the 1,500 non-respondents for gender, and was able to do so with relative confidence for all but 88 of the names (e.g. Pat, Terry, Chris, Jamie). Among these 1,500 non-respondents, 58 percent were men, 36 percent were women and the remaining 6 percent were of unknown gender. Looking just at the known cases, 62 percent were male and 38 percent were female. This is comparable to the 1,344 analyzed cases, for which 57 percent of all cases, including those who did not provide gender, were men and 60 percent of known cases were men and 40 percent women.

Finally, I coded the positions of the non-respondents into editor, columnist or reporter and compared these frequencies to those of the 1,344 analyzed cases. There are somewhat more editors among the non-respondents, but this is to be expected. The Bacon's directory is likely to "overlist" or exaggerate editing positions, as it lists every editor of every special section (e.g. the Home section, the Fashion section, the Outdoor section), most of which are produced by a larger departmental staff such as features or sports. Bacon's even lists editors for minor elements, such as events calendars. This makes sense, given the directory's mission of serving public relations workers who hope to get coverage for their clients, but it means a person who spends 75 percent or more of his or her time as a features reporter may be listed as an editor in the directory in addition to being listed as a reporter, just because he or she puts together a list of art gallery openings each week. The 1,344 respondents were asked about their primary duty to get a more realistic version of what they do and, as expected, the proportion saying they are editors is lower than would be assumed from the directory. The directory did not have relevant position information for six of the 1,500 non-respondents, but among the 1,494 for which position is known, 46 percent are editors, 48 percent are

reporters and 6 percent are columnists. Among the 1,344 respondents, 39% say their primary duties are editing, 54% say their primary duties are reporting and 7 percent say they are primarily columnists.

3.3 Recruiting Respondents

Respondents were recruited through U.S. mail and e-mail. Surveys were completed between Wednesday, November 26, 2008 and Tuesday, January 13, 2009.

The first contact was a short e-mail message that introduced the project and let the recipient know that a U.S. mail letter would be forthcoming. This message was sent on Wednesday, November 26, 2008, through Vovici, the company that hosted the Web survey, though the e-mail was programmed to look as though it was coming from my university e-mail account.⁵ A single-page invitation letter on UIC Sociology Department letterhead was mailed to each sample member late on Tuesday, November 25, 2008. Each letter was addressed to an individual by name, each was hand signed, and each bore a regular U.S. postage stamp, all intended to increase response rates (Dillman et al, 2008). Ninety-five of the letters were returned by the U.S. postal service for various reasons; in many cases, the U.S.P.S. did not indicate why the letters had been undeliverable.

Respondents received follow-up e-mails prodding them to complete the survey, sent through Vovici, though programmed to look as though they came from my UIC e-mail account. Of course, those who completed the survey did not receive subsequent reminders. The e-mail messages were sent on Wednesday, December 3, 2008,

⁵ In hindsight, I do not think I would use this approach again, as the mismatch between the server from which the e-mail was sent and the address from which I made it appear to be sent may have made the e-mail appear to have been a "phishing" expedition. Hence, my message might have ended up tagged as spam by more e-mail systems than it otherwise would have.

Thursday, December 11, 2008, Wednesday, December 17, 2008, Monday, December 22, 2008, Wednesday, December 31, 2008, and Wednesday, January 7, 2009. The mailed letter and all subsequent e-mail follow-ups included the URL for the survey, as well as information about how to log in. Each respondent needed an individually assigned password; for privacy reasons, these passwords were not in any way related to the person's e-mail address, name or employer.

I cannot tell how many of the messages ended up in spam filters, but 1,407 of the introductory e-mail messages sent to all 6,612 sample members, "bounced" back to the mailing server at Vovici, many of them because the recipient was not recognized. Some of these may have been incorrectly entered either by the directory preparers or by me, but many of these likely reflect layoffs, which have been at record high levels in the years leading up to the survey.

3.4 Response

In accordance with standard definitions offered by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), I have calculated Response Rate 1 and Response Rate 2, the most conservative response rates in standard use. The first, essentially, is the total number of completed interviews divided by the total number of people invited to take part in the survey. In this case, that is: $1,543/6,612=23.33\%$. Response Rate 2 is somewhat more generous, including both completed and partial interviews in the numerator. In this case, that is: $1,589/6,612=24.03\%$. I have opted not to calculate Response Rate 3 or 4, both of which would allow me to reduce the denominator by estimating that some proportion of those who did not complete the survey (and who did

not outright refuse) were ineligible. In light of the extraordinarily high rate of layoffs in newsrooms in recent years (Edmonds: 2008) and the likelihood that at least some of those who did not respond (particularly those whose e-mails bounced) may have no longer been employed as full-time daily newspaper journalists at the time I first attempted to contact them, it could be justified to use this approach. However, I have chosen to be conservative, so I have not engaged in this kind of estimation.

3.5 The Survey Instrument

The survey included a mix of open- and closed-ended questions. (See Appendix A for the full survey questionnaire.) The median length-of-interview was 27 minutes 20 seconds, long for a Web survey. That said, respondents who logged into the survey either quit at the beginning or completed the instrument. In all, 1,735 journalists completed at least one of the 93 closed-ended questions that were available to all respondents who completed the survey. Almost nine in 10 of those who answered at least one closed-ended question (1,542) completed 80 percent or more of the survey.

The survey was programmed by Princeton Survey Research Associates International (PSRA). The survey was created in the WebSurveyor program, an offering of the company Vovici. Each respondent was assigned a unique user name with which to log into the survey. This helped to prevent people from completing the survey more than once (admittedly unlikely) and to reduce the likelihood that non-sample members would complete the survey. Data were downloaded into SPSS, with each respondent's user name serving as a unique identifier.

Respondents were able to complete part of the survey, log out and return later to the survey, picking up where they left off. Respondents also were able to leave the survey open on their desktop for hours at a time, working on it through the day as they had time. Hence, calculating a mean survey length is realistically impossible, and even the median should be taken with at least a few grains of salt.

3.6 Questionnaire Topics and Measures

The questionnaire focused on five areas of job quality (to be used as dependent variables in analysis). These were: autonomy, access to resources, prestige, opportunity for skill development, opportunity to build one's professional network and pay. The first five outcomes were measured in three ways each. Respondents were asked to rate each job-quality element on a 1-to-7 scale (1=none; 7=a lot), to rate the outcome relative to other journalists in their own newsroom and to rate the outcome relative to journalists at other U.S. newspapers. Respondents also were asked to estimate their pay from their full-time journalism jobs for the current year (2008 or 2009, depending on when the survey was completed). Ultimately, the analysis for this project focuses on two outcomes: access to resources compared with journalists at other U.S. dailies and pay.

The questionnaire also asked journalists about:

- Their education and training prior to entering and since entering the field
- Their professional experience and training
- Their reporting, editing and multimedia skills
- Their social networks at the time they obtained their current jobs

- Methods they may have used in seeking their current jobs
- Their personal backgrounds, including age, race, gender, marital status and parenthood status.

These elements provided the independent variables for analysis.

3.7 Analysis Summary and Dependent Variables

I developed models for two outcome measures: self-estimated pay for the current year (2008 or 2009, depending on when the survey was completed), which was logged for analysis, and a rating of one's work-related autonomy, compared with journalists at other U.S. daily newspapers. Autonomy was defined as having control over what one does and how one does it. The five response categories were: having much more autonomy, somewhat more autonomy, about the same autonomy, somewhat less autonomy or much less autonomy than journalists at other U.S. dailies. These answers were recoded onto a scale of 1 (much less) to 5 (much more) with 3 indicating journalists had about as much autonomy as did other journalists. Linear regression (OLS) was used to test the association between human capital and network variables on logged pay (plus circulation as a mediator) and autonomy, plus controls in each model. (See Appendix B for a description of all variables.) Direct and indirect effects were measured for pay.

Because the questions were designed to measure the behaviors, experiences and evaluations of reporters, editors and columnists, analysis was limited to journalists who self-identified as being in one of those three job categories (n=1344.) About 200 people in other positions completed the survey, but the data collected, particularly on

human capital, would not be appropriate measures for them. Listwise deletion further reduced the cases analyzed to 879 for the autonomy model and 888 for the logged pay model. Item non-response was not especially high for most items. Even for pay, arguably the most sensitive question on the survey, only 149 of the 1,344 journalists, or 11.1 percent, did not answer. The network-related questions, which posed a higher burden for respondents, also have somewhat higher rates of non-response than do other questions, ranging from 70-114 missing cases (5.2 percent to 8.5 percent.) On average, the remaining variables had 30 missing cases each, for a mean non-response rate of 2.2 percent. Experiments with imputation suggested it would not change which variables were significant, nor would it change their impact in a meaningful way. Hence, it was not employed.

3.8 Independent Variables

Independent variables include measures of human capital and social networks and personal characteristics. Human capital independent variables include measures of professional experience, education, internships and journalistic skills. The experience variable is a measure of the number of years a journalist full-time for a print newspaper, including for such papers' Web sites. The tenure variable measures the number of years a journalist has worked for the same newspaper. Education is addressed in dummy variables, indicating that a person has a bachelor's degree, some graduate school or a master's degree or more education. Having less than a bachelor's degree is the reference category. The internship variable reflects the number of journalism

internships journalists completed before taking their first full-time job at a daily newspaper.

Another three human capital measures are skills indices, reflecting self-assessments in reporting (based on five items), editing (based on two items) and multimedia skills (based on four items). For editing skills and reporting skills, each composite skill-item was coded as 1 if a journalist claimed to be “very proficient.” Lesser proficiency is coded 0. For multimedia skills, three skills were coded as 1 if a journalist reported being very or somewhat proficient, 0 if less proficient or not at all proficient. A fourth item, a yes or no question about whether a journalist contributed to a blog for the newspaper, was coded 1 if the journalist said yes, 0 otherwise. The use of a more generous standard of proficiency is appropriate for the multimedia skills, as they are far less common than are reporting and editing skills. The final human capital measure is access to resources. Notably, resources are investments the employer makes in the staff and, to the extent resources are limited in a given newsroom, in individual staff members.

Social networks variables are dummies. For junior reporters, there are dummies for knowing two-to-ten and knowing 11 or more, with knowing zero or one serving as the reference category. There are comparable dummy variables for senior reporters. For junior and senior editors, there are dummy variables for knowing one, knowing two-to-five and knowing six or more. In both cases, knowing zero serves as the reference category. In all cases, the social network variables refer to the network the journalist had just before he or she got his or her current job.

The social network variables are based on questions that asked journalists how many junior reporters, senior reporters, junior editors and senior editors they knew just prior to getting their current jobs. This simplified version of a position generator did not probe too deeply for fear of imposing too heavy a burden on respondents who, after all, may have gotten their job last month or decades ago or anything in between. Journalists were offered ranges for the number of junior reporters, senior reporters, junior editors and senior editors they knew at the time they got their last job.

Network questions, like all questions, are subject to human error in answering them. These questions ask about a person's network at the time he or she got his or her current job. They follow a series of questions about the process leading to that job (how the job was sought, if it was sought, and how it was ultimately attained). It was hoped that the earlier questions would help prompt the respondent's memory of that time—which may have been very recent or very long ago. It is possible that in trying to recall and reconstruct their networks, respondents would have made errors. To avoid “telescoping,” the questions refer to an event that surely all respondents have at least some memory of, getting their current jobs. This should be more helpful than simply asking about their networks on or around a particular date. Groves et al (2009) suggest that when respondents try to fill in gaps in memory, they tend to answer with present information, which would not be an especially negative outcome for this survey, in which network data are used to explain current circumstances.

This study does not consider whether journalists' networks are composed of strong or weak ties (or ties that bridge structural holes, etc.). Rather, I limit my network data-collection to the number of senior reporters, junior reporters, senior editors and

junior editors a journalist knew at the time just before acquiring his or her current job. The relevant questions literally ask about how many of each group one “knew” at that time. More conventional approaches feature name generators or position generators, the latter often used by Lin and his colleagues. I considered using a more traditional position generator, in which survey respondents are asked to report the number of people they know in a variety of positions and then often asked additional details about each person, including the nature of the tie between each alter and ego. I chose not to use this approach for reasons particular to this survey population. Newsrooms are structured in many different ways, such that using a position generation with reliability would be difficult. Weaver et al (2007) note the difficulty in determining how to aggregate newsroom roles (albeit across media platforms) for discussion purposes. Though they were not discussing the use of a position generator, their difficulty in categorizing journalism roles is cautionary for anyone who would consider using a position generator to ask journalists about journalists (Weaver et al, 2007: 65-66):

The job titles in newsrooms are hardly a study in uniformity. Depending on the organization, the top newsroom manager might be the editor, the editor-publisher, the executive editor, the managing editor, the news director, the executive news director, the executive producer or the editorial director—and that’s not an exhaustive set of titles for senior news managers. The grouping of tasks into jobs and the systems set up to orchestrate the efforts of individual news workers are equally diverse. Team structure? Hierarchical structure? Work groups? Each news organization is a little different, and the titles and responsibilities associated with a given job seem to be unique to each organization.

Even the same title may not connote equal statuses across individuals within the same newsroom. For example, the term “general assignment reporter” may refer to a low-on-the-totem-pole young reporter who is compelled to cover any story he or she is assigned without the privilege of developing a beat. The term also may refer to a senior reporter who is freed from the mundane tasks of everyday beat reporting and is able to

pursue stories he or she thinks are interesting, often cherry picking them from other people's beats.

In the end, Weaver et al (2007) settled on three categories for their purposes in defining journalists' statuses: senior managers, junior managers and non-management staff (Weaver et al, 2007: 66). I use a similarly blunt, approach, breaking newspaper journalists into reporters and editors and breaking those categories into junior and senior statuses. It was also hoped that the simpler approach would reduce respondent burden. Because this survey asks journalists about their occupational networks, those networks may be large. Many work in newsrooms with hundreds of reporters and editors, so a position generator requiring the provision of names and additional information would be difficult unless a higher bar than someone known to the journalist at the time he or she got his or her last job were used. Journalists were asked about their networks at the time just prior to them getting their current jobs, with the hopes that those would be the network data most relevant to influencing their getting the current jobs and the quality of the jobs themselves. It might have been helpful to have collected current network data, particularly for those who have been in the same job for a long time, but that would have presented a high burden for respondents and was therefore not done.

Whether a journalist does or ever did belong to journalism organizations and a scale variable reflecting the number of conferences he or she has attended are included as control variables. Because this model is principally concerned with how social resources might flow through social networks, conference attendance and organizational membership are not of principle concern, but given that they may

influence one's network, they are included as controls. Conceptually, conference attendance may be thought of as either a human capital or a social capital variable—or as both. Conferences provide training opportunities, but also networking opportunities. A test of the influence of conferences on skills and networks, however, showed that conferences had much more to do with one's network than one's skills. While it is treated as a control, it is thought of as more closely related to social networks than to journalism skills.

Other variables in the model include personal characteristics such as race (dummy variable; white=1) and gender (dummy variable; male=1). Parenthood status (dummy variable; parent=1), and job title also are included as controls. The job categories include columnist, low-level editor, mid-level editor and high-level editor. The reference category is reporter. Editors are subdivided because in earlier models, in which editor was treated as a single category, women did not benefit from being editors while men did. Further investigation showed that men tended to be more senior editors. Given the interest in how gender affects career outcomes, and given that hierarchy is more explicit in editing than in reporting or writing columns, the job category was broken into three. Low-level editors include lower-level line editors who work directly with reporters and editors who oversee some other editors, but not a department. Mid-level editors are those who oversee departments (e.g. features, sports). High-level editors include assistant-managing editors, managing editors, executive editors and editors who are their paper's sole editor (very small papers). Though it is not the focus of this study, including these ranked categories also accounts for the reality that journalists may improve their pay (and possibly autonomy) through hierarchical advancement.

Other variables include a dummy variable that indicates whether a journalist entered the field in or since 2002; this is when journalism employment began to fall off badly, and beginning a career in the midst of such a downturn could have its own effect. Another pair of dummies indicated whether the staff size at the journalist's paper declined a little over the past five years or whether it declined a lot over that time period (with no decline or an increase in staffing serving as a reference category).

The mediating variable, circulation, is based on the morning or evening weekday circulation of the newspapers at which the journalists are employed. I worried about the accuracy of journalists' knowledge of their papers' actual circulations, so I did not ask a question about circulation. Rather, I looked up the data myself for each respondent in the database of the Audit Bureau of Circulations, which kindly gave me free access to their data. For unaudited papers, I looked up circulation in the annual *Editor & Publisher Yearbook*, using the most recent year available from 2008 (when the field period started) backward to find the most recent circulation figure (not all papers get audited every year). The circulation variable in use here considers the range of circulations of respondents and divides the data into quartiles⁶. I considered using raw circulation (likely logged), but to talk about the impact of circulation in terms of percentage-based differences seemed very strange. The impact is less precise than that. Rather, what matters is whether one works for a small, midsize or large publication. I wanted to reflect those clefs in how I used circulation. Dividing the sample into quartiles resulted in a break that resembles those used by ASNE, though they tend to report data in finer gradients.

⁶ Circulation quartile breaks are approximate and represent the percentage of the workforce in each quartile, not the percentage of papers. First quartile: Circulation of less than 27,500. Second quartile: Circulation of 27,500-77,499. Third quartile: Circulation of 77,500-199,999. Fourth quartile: circulation of 200,000 or more.

4 ANALYSIS—THE IMPACT OF HUMAN CAPITAL AND SOCIAL NETWORKS ON PAY (LOGGED) AND AUTONOMY

The expectations undergirding the hypotheses are that human capital and social networks will be positively associated with the two outcome measures. It is expected that being white and being male will be advantageous in securing higher pay and more autonomy.

At the outset, it may be useful to quickly review some characteristics of the journalists studied here. (These descriptions are based on the journalists included in both the pay and autonomy models, after list-wise deletion.) Like the field, this group is predominantly male (61 percent) and white (86 percent). Just more than half the group are reporters (55 percent), while 38 percent are editors and 7 percent are columnists. On average, this group has worked 20 years in daily newspaper journalism, about 13 of them with their current employer. Six-in-ten of these journalists are parents (see Table III, page 82).

Not surprisingly, such characteristics vary by race and gender. White journalists are more likely to be male (63 percent) than are minority journalists (52 percent), and male journalists are slightly more likely than female journalists to be white (88 percent versus 83 percent). There are no significant differences in positions by race, but men are more likely than women to be senior editors, and women are more likely to be mid-level editors, suggesting that women might be poised to achieve higher rank in higher numbers soon.

Table III: Sample Demographics

	Full sample		Whites		Non-Whites		Men		Women	
	Percent/ Mean	S.E.	Percent/ Mean	S.E.	Percent/ Mean	S.E.	Percent/ Mean	S.E.	Percent/ Mean	S.E.
Gender										
Men	61.43	.49	63.01*	.48	51.64	.50	1	.00	0	.00
Women	38.57	.49	36.99	.48	48.36*	.50	0	.00	1	.00
Race										
White	86.12	.35	1	.00	0	.00	88.33*	.32	82.60	.38
Non-white	13.88	.35	0	.00	1	.00	11.67	.32	17.40*	.38
Position										
Reporter	55.18	.50	55.09	.50	55.74	.50	55.74	.50	54.28	.50
Columnist	6.94	.25	6.47	.25	9.84	.30	7.74	.26	6.19	.24
Low-level editor	8.19	.27	8.06	.27	9.02	.29	8.89	.28	7.08	.26
Mid-level editor	19.45	.40	19.82	.40	17.21	.38	15.93	.37	25.07*	.43
High-level editor	10.24	.30	10.57	.31	8.20	.28	12.04*	.33	7.37	.26
Experience	20.24	10.10	21.03*	10.19	15.37	7.97	21.80*	10.19	17.77	9.44
Tenure	13.38	9.50	13.99*	9.64	9.55	7.56	14.22*	9.94	12.03	8.59
Parent	60.30	.49	62.48*	.48	46.72	.50	64.44*	.48	53.69	.50
N	879		757		122		540		339	

* p < .05. Noted figure is significantly higher than its comparison group. Comparison groups are whites and non-whites, men and women. Differences in frequencies tested with margin of error formula for two samples with independent variances. Means tested with two-tailed t-test.

White journalists and male journalists have more experience and longer tenure at their current papers than do non-white and female journalists. White journalists also are more likely to be parents than are journalists of color (63 percent versus 47 percent), and men are more likely than women (64 percent versus 54 percent).

4.1 Testing Hypotheses Regarding Human Capital, Social Networks and Pay

The first hypothesis predicts that human capital would be positively associated with pay, both directly and indirectly. The evidence is mixed (See Table IV, page 83.), offering mild support for the hypothesis. Few human capital variables have an impact on pay. Notably, education and skills have no significant impact. Each year of experience is

Table IV: Effects of Human Capital, Social Networks, Race and Gender on Pay, with Circulation as Mediator

	X→Y (c) IVs→Pay		Indirect effect: X→M (a)		Indirect effect: M→Y (b)		Total indirect effect (a x b)		Direct effect: X→Y (c')	
	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.
Human capital variables										
Experience	.01*	.00	.03*	.01	.22*	.01	.01*	.00	.00*	.00
Education: BA/BS ¹	-.03	.57	-.03	.79	.22*	.01	-.01	.02	-.02	.61
Education: Some grad school	.11	.06	.11	.13	.22*	.01	.03	.03	.08	.05
Education: MA or more	.05	.05	.22	.12	.22*	.01	.05	.02	.01	.04
Internships	.03*	.01	.13*	.03	.22*	.01	.03*	.01	.00	.99
Reporting skills	-.00	.01	-.05	.03	.22*	.01	-.01	.01	.01	.01
Editing skills	-.01	.02	-.04	.04	.22*	.01	-.01	.01	.00	.01
Multimedia skills	.00	.02	-.05	.04	.22*	.01	-.01	.01	.11	.01
Tenure with newspaper	.00	.00	-.02*	.00	.22*	.01	-.00*	.00	.00*	.00
Access to resources	.12*	.01								
Social network variables²										
Jr. reporters: Knew 2-10	-.02	.05	-.22	.12	.22*	.01	-.05*	.02	.00	.04
Jr. reporters: Knew 11+	-.04	.06	-.06	.13	.22*	.01	-.01	.03	-.02	.05
Sr. reporters: Knew 2-10	.10*	.05	.24*	.11	.22*	.01	.05*	.02	.05	.04
Sr. reporters: Knew 11+	.18*	.06	.51*	.14	.22*	.01	.11*	.03	.07	.05
Jr. editors: Knew 1	.02	.05	.11	.13	.22*	.01	.02	.03	-.01	.05
Jr. editors: Knew 2-5	.06	.05	.20	.12	.22*	.01	.04	.03	.01	.05
Jr. editors: Knew 6+	.13*	.06	.27	.15	.22*	.01	.06	.03	.08	.05
Sr. editors: Knew 1	-.14*	.05	-.30*	.12	.22*	.01	-.07*	.03	-.07	.04
Sr. editors: Knew 2-5	-.12*	.05	-.38*	.12	.22*	.01	-.08*	.03	-.04	.04
Sr. editors: Knew 6+	-.05	.06	-.26	.14	.22*	.01	-.06	.03	.01	.05
Race and gender										
Race (white=1; other race=0)	-.08*	.04	-.40*	.09	.22*	.01	-.08*	.02	.01	.03
Gender (male=1; female=0)	.08*	.03	-.14*	.06	.22*	.01	-.03*	.01	.11*	.02
Controls										
Parent (1=parent; 0=nonparent)	.04	.03								
Journ org(s) (1=belong[ed]; 0=not)	.02	.03								
Number of conferences attended	-.01	.01								
Low-level editor ³	.20*	.05								
Mid-level editor	.12*	.03								
High-level editor	.33*	.05								
Columnist	.14	.05								
Entered field 2002+ (1=yes;0=no)	-.13*	.04								
Staff declined a little ⁴	.06	.04								
Staff declined a lot	.23*	.04								

¹ Some college or less serves as the reference category for education.² Social networks at time just before getting current job. (Answer options were categorical.) For junior reporters and senior reporters, knowing none or one is the reference category. For junior editors and senior editors, knowing none is the reference category.³ Reporters serve as the reference category for position.⁴ Indicates change in newsroom staff size over the past five years. Stayed the same or increased is the reference category.

* p < .05.

Note that controls were included in the full model to discern direct and indirect effects, but only total effects are shown. The resources variable is not hypothesized to have an indirect effect.

N=888.

associated with a 1 percent increase in pay, with just more than half of that being indirect and just less than half direct. Each internship is associated with a 2.8 percent increase in pay, all of the influence being indirect.

There had been some concern that, at some point, taking an additional internship becomes less helpful, or even unhelpful. That is certainly theoretically possible, but it is not happening here, when it comes to pay. Forty-two percent of respondents completed no internships, though this is more prevalent among older journalists in the study. Almost half (47 percent) completed one or two, and the remaining 11 percent completed three or more internships. A test using three dummies—zero internships, one or two internships and three or more internships—showed that having no internships had no significant impact on pay, while having three or more was positive. Having one or two internships served as the reference category in that test. Internships, particularly those that pay, are highly competitive, so they are not an easy alternative to getting a full-time, permanent job. Hence, *Internships* has remained in the models to test predictors of pay and access to resources as an ordinal variable.

Findings elsewhere show that tenure is positively related to pay (e.g. Topel, 1991; Altonji and Williams, 2005), but this study differs. Indeed, tenure has an interesting effect (or non-effect, ultimately) on pay. It has a very small negative indirect effect, which makes sense: If one does not change papers, one is unlikely to see much of a positive change in circulation—the general trend is downward—and one does not benefit from moving to a larger paper. However, tenure has an equally small, but positive, direct impact, which also makes sense, in that the longer one sticks around in one place, the more opportunities one has to get a raise. These effects are almost

exactly equal and opposite, so they cancel each other out resulting in no total effect of tenure on pay.

Access to resources, the only human capital variable that is not an investment by the employee so much as an investment by the employer, has a notably high total effect on pay. Each one-unit increase in resources (out of five possible) is associated with a 12.5 percent increase in pay. Resources are not theorized to be mediated by circulation because this would not make sense. Though resources from a prior job may have influenced the circulation of the paper at which a journalist now works—having had more resources may have led to a bigger paper—the access-to-resources measure in this model measures current resources. Whatever else resources may have the power to do, an individual journalist's access to them likely cannot raise the circulation of the paper at which that journalist works. There is a mostly colloquial argument that better-equipped and better-staffed newsrooms produce more sophisticated journalism that attracts larger and more advertiser-friendly (read: wealthier and more sophisticated) audiences, but this has not been a winning theory with cost-cutting managers, especially in recent years. No one would seriously argue that giving resources to a journalist would boost the circulation of his paper in any measurable way (and certainly not in the short term), and I am not about to do so here. Indeed, given that circulation influences how much money a paper has available for all manner of newsroom expenditures, including salaries and resources, the effect may run in the opposite direction.

The reasons for the role of resources, particularly as they are conceptualized and operationalized in this study, may be several. First, having resources—and putting them to good use—is an excellent way to demonstrate why one deserves higher pay. The

reporter or editor who makes the best of technology or travel money or extra time by delivering excellent journalism may, at the same time, increase his or her paycheck. One cannot ignore, however, that newsroom managers may be inclined to make resources available to those in whom they have made an investment (reflected in higher pay), so the relationship between resources and pay may be more complex. Entorf et al (1999) found that French companies paid computer users better than non-users, but that those who were given computers for their work had been paid better even before that. (A model in which resources also served as a mediator was tested, but did not yield fruitful results. The impact of resources as a mediator was significant, but miniscule, in its impact on pay.)

The model to test this hypothesis (and others related to pay) includes the circulation quartiles variable as a mediator. The impact of all human capital (and other) variables, with the exception of access to resources, is expected to be mediated by circulation. Each increase in circulation quartile raises pay by 24 percent, meaning the indirect effect of just circulation on pay (the “b” path) in this model increases it that much. Smaller papers simply cannot reward human capital (or other forms of capital) to the same degree that larger papers can, so it makes sense to treat circulation as a mediator in predicting pay.

The effects of circulation on newsroom life are so omnipresent that they are rarely discussed in the journalism literature, and the impact of circulation is almost never a focus of research. It is widely understood that larger papers have more resources and pay higher wages. However, there is a substantial mythology built up around a career path that begins at a small paper and works up through larger and larger papers. Young

journalists often are encouraged to start at smaller papers, ostensibly so they will get more attention and grooming than they might at larger papers. There is often some nobility, even morality, in the suggestion that a career be built this way. Yet, in light of these findings, it must be acknowledged that such a path may be disadvantageous to a journalist who follows it.

The lack of impact of education and skills is interesting, and perhaps somewhat alarming. The education measures are fairly straightforward, but there is some question about people's ability to assess their own skills, so the non-significance of skills could be related to the quality of the measures. In a 2004 monograph, Dunning et al describe the dismal variety of ways self-assessment falls short of an ideal way of learning about a person's skills. Employees tend to overestimate their skills, in part because people often lack information that would help them assess themselves accurately, and because their evaluations "tend not to be tethered very tightly to objective performance in tasks that should reflect those skills and character traits" (p. 70). People's tendency to think of themselves as above average is driven in part by insufficient information to render judgment, incomplete feedback from superiors and because in many arenas, defining competence is difficult, Dunning et al (2004) explain. Knowing that people do not like to rate themselves negatively, I tried to offer a wide enough range of answer categories (very proficient, somewhat proficient, not very proficient and not at all proficient) that respondents were not forced to choose merely between competence and incompetence. I feared that approach would have boosted the overestimation higher than it otherwise would be. The vast majority of journalists in the study rate many of their reporting skills as "very proficient."

This may well include some overestimation, but these are bedrock skills in any newsroom—interviewing, using documents, writing—and one would expect journalists, especially those who have survived the layoffs of recent years, to have those skills. There are five skills in the reporting index, and just 15.3 percent of the journalists gave themselves a “very proficient” rating on all of them. On the other hand, just 8% gave themselves a “very proficient” rating on zero or one of the skills. There were just two skills in the editing index—editing quickly on deadline and editing longer narratives. The spread is much more even for editing: 33.7 percent gave themselves a “very proficient” rating on neither of the editing skills, 29.4 percent gave themselves a very proficient rating on just one and the remaining 36.9 percent rated themselves very proficient in both skills. Not surprisingly, those working as editors were more likely to give themselves high marks, but even so, just 58.5 percent of editors gave themselves highly proficient ratings on both editing skills. The skew on multimedia skills is much more negative. Fully 68.1 percent of the journalists in this study gave themselves a less-than-proficient rating on each of the skills in the multimedia skill index (shooting video, editing video, creating podcasts and blogging). Indeed, no one rated him or herself very proficient on all of them. Of course, I have no objective standard with which to compare these ratings, but they were less inflated than I had feared. In a sense, however, this makes it more peculiar that skills do not appear to influence pay. Even in good times, competition for journalism jobs is fierce. With so many fewer available in recent years, having a lot of education or skills simply may be required to get or keep a job. It may not be enough to increase pay. To test this possible explanation, the relationship between human capital and pay would have to be retested at a less dire time for journalism.

In summary, there is some support for H_1 . Some forms of human capital do, indeed, pay off, directly and with the mediation of circulation. Additional investigation into the relationships between education and pay, skills and pay and tenure and pay are warranted, in light of the findings noted above.

The second and third hypotheses will be discussed together. They concern which types of network members may be more useful to journalists when it comes to increasing pay: those with more senior positions (senior reporters and senior editors) or those with editing positions (junior editors and senior editors). H_2 predicted that having more network members at higher levels of the hierarchy—senior reporters and senior editors—at the time just before the journalist got his or her current job would increase pay. H_3 predicted that having more network members who are editors (junior or senior) just before getting one's current job would increase pay. The evidence for both hypotheses is mixed.

Knowing senior reporters does have a positive effect on pay, though only the indirect effect is significant. Knowing two-to-10 senior reporters increases pay indirectly by 5.4 percent, while knowing 11 or more increases it by 11.7 percent. The total effects are 10.4 and 19.5 percent, respectively. Knowing senior editors, however, has a negative effect on pay, again, only indirectly, with the mediation of circulation. The indirect effect of knowing two-to-five senior editors reduces pay by 6.8 percent, while the indirect effect of knowing six or more senior editors reduces pay by 11.7 percent. The total effects are 14.7 and 12.8 percent, respectively. Only those who know six or more junior editors see an effect of knowing junior editors on pay. The total effect is positive, increasing pay 14.4 percent, but the only significant relationship is that

between circulation and pay. The relationship between knowing six or more junior editors and circulation is not significant, nor is the direct relationship between knowing six or more junior editors and pay. In summary, then, the support for H_2 is curiously mixed—knowing senior reporters raises pay while knowing senior editors lowers it. The support for H_3 is minimal. Knowing senior editors lowers pay, and, by and large, knowing junior editors makes no difference.

In terms of the value of senior reporters, it may be that something more complicated might be going on than journalists benefitting directly from resources nested within their own network members. Put another way, a journalist may not need to know an editor with a job, raise or promotion to offer in order to benefit. Perhaps it is enough to know someone who has a relationship with that editor (or other influential person who determines hiring or pay or access to resources and the like). It may be that two-step leverage of the sort described by Gargiulo (1993) is underway, such that journalists use their ties to influence, or even constrain, the hiring and wage decisions of their network members' ties to the ego's benefit. It also is possible that over the course of a career, strong ties similar to the *Guanxi* ties described by Bian (e.g. Bian and Ang, 1997) are brought to bear in a multi-step process. Senior reporters may use their influence to influence the pay of network members. It is unclear why knowing senior editors would *hurt*, but it may be that they are too far removed from decisions about pay and efforts to maintain relationships with these editors takes away from opportunities to focus on other relationships. Granted, that is a stretch. This study cannot answer the question of mechanism—I do not have enough information about specifically how

journalists have gotten their jobs or who may have advocated for them to get pay or other career goods, but these findings suggest this is an area ripe for future study.

That network members have such modest (and, in some cases, negative) effects on pay suggests that Montgomery (1992) and Franzen and Hangartner (2006)'s findings that networks do not increase pay may apply to journalists. It may be that networks never were able to boost pay, or else that strained financial circumstances in today's newsrooms have curtailed the power of networks to influence pay. The only way to answer this question would be to undertake a similar study in the future, when (one hopes) the financial condition of newspapers will be better.

4.2 Testing Hypotheses Regarding Human Capital, Social Networks and Autonomy

The next three hypotheses predict occupational autonomy, which is measured from a rating of 1 (have much less than journalists at other newspapers) to 5 (have much more than journalists at other papers). The independent variables of concern are the same as those used to predict pay. Models were run on reporters, editors and columnists (the base for the analysis on pay) as a group and also run on reporters alone, as analysis of journalistic autonomy often has concentrated on those primarily tasked with reporting.

The fourth hypothesis predicts that human capital would be positively associated with autonomy. There is some evidence to support this hypothesis. For the larger group, reporting skills have a modest, positive impact on autonomy (.06) Access to resources (.17) and having attended some graduate school (.30) have larger effects. It may seem

strange that some graduate school—not having an advanced degree—has a significant effect, but taking some advanced classes is a common strategy for increasing useful skills and it seems to pay off. Bachelor's degrees are too common to boost autonomy, and an advanced degree does not appear necessary. Given that reporting, more than editing, benefits most obviously and immediately from autonomy, it makes sense that reporting skills may drive up autonomy while editing skills and multimedia skills would be more likely to chain those who have them to a desk and to serving other people's copy. There can be autonomy in that, but it is less obvious. Notably, tenure and experience do not contribute to autonomy for the entire group. It makes sense that access to resources would be positively associated with autonomy, both because bosses willing to intentionally provide resources to journalists would also be inclined to grant them the autonomy to use them and because the resources themselves feed a type of resource-rich autonomy. Having access to databases or time to work on a story or money for travel enhances this type of autonomy. Notably, among reporters, the only human capital variable that has a significant impact on autonomy is access to resources (.23). (See Table V, page 93.)

The fifth and sixth hypotheses deal with predictions of the associations between networks and autonomy. H_5 predicted that knowing more senior journalists (senior reporters and senior editors) would be associated with more autonomy, while H_6 predicted that knowing more editors (junior and senior) would be associated with higher autonomy. There is no evidence to support either hypothesis. No network measure had any significant influence on autonomy for the group as a whole, and the only network

Table V: Effects of Human Capital, Social Networks, Race and Gender on Autonomy

	<i>Reporters, editors, columnists</i>		<i>Base: reporters</i>	
	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>
Human capital variables				
Experience	-.00	.01	-.00	.01
Education: BA/BS ¹	.10	.11	.14	.17
Education: Some grad school	.30*	.03	.23	.22
Education: MA or more	.19	.13	.21	.18
Internships	.04	.03	-.00	.04
Reporting skills	.06*	.03	.08	.04
Editing skills	-.04	.04	-.06	.05
Multimedia skills	-.06	.13	-.10	.05
Tenure with newspaper	.01	.01	.00	.01
Access to resources	.17*	.03	.23*	.05
Social network variables²				
Jr. reporters: Knew 2-10	-.15	.12	-.37*	.15
Jr. reporters: Knew 11+	-.14	.14	-.45*	.18
Sr. reporters: Knew 2-10	.08	.11	.12	.14
Sr. reporters: Knew 11+	.20	.15	.34	.19
Jr. editors: Knew 1	.11	.13	.23	.17
Jr. editors: Knew 2-5	.03	.13	.14	.16
Jr. editors: Knew 6+	.02	.15	.18	.20
Sr. editors: Knew 1	-.05	.12	-.21	.15
Sr. editors: Knew 2-5	-.02	.12	.01	.16
Sr. editors: Knew 6+	-.04	.15	-.07	.20
Race and gender				
Race (white=1; other race=0)	.16	.09	.05	.12
Gender (male=1; female=0)	.15*	.06	.17*	.09
Controls				
Circulation (quartiles)	-.03	.04	-.17	.06
Pay (logged)	.19	.10	.49*	.18
Parent (1=parent; 0=nonparent)	-.04	.07	.02	.09
Journ org(s) (1=belong[ed]; 0=not)	.03	.03	-.04	.09
Number of conferences attended	.03	.03	-.00	.04
Low-level editor ³	.06	.12	--	--
Mid-level editor	.24*	.09	--	--
High-level editor	.12	.12	--	--
Columnist	.55*	.12	--	--
Entered field 2002+ (1=yes;0=no)	.06	.11	.08	.13
Staff declined a little ⁴	-.31*	.11	-.35*	.16
Staff declined a lot	-.21*	.10	-.28	.16

¹ Some college or less serves as the reference category for education.

² Social networks at time just before getting current job. (Answer options were categorical.) For junior reporters and senior reporters, knowing none or one is the reference category. For junior editors and senior editors, knowing none is the reference category.

³ Reporters serve as the reference category for position.

⁴ Indicates change in newsroom staff size over past five years. Stayed the same or increased is the reference category.

* p < .5

N=879 for regression on reporters, editors and columnists and 485 for regression on reporters. Adj. R² for reporters, editors and columnists is .105. Adj. R² for reporters is .127.

measure that affect autonomy for reporters is knowing junior reporters—and the effect is negative.

Notably, staff positions held have strong relationships to autonomy, suggesting that autonomy may be more a matter of what position one holds than the relationships one has. Additionally, the strong negative impact of declines in staff size suggests that factors outside the control of the individual journalist, his or her boss or social network members may have a brutal effect on autonomy. On one level, staff declines should increase the autonomy of neglect by reducing oversight, but staff declines also increase workload (as Beam et al, 2009 found), which leads to assembly-line journalism and curtails one's sense of autonomy.

Efforts to explain the drivers of journalistic autonomy always have fared poorly, and this one joins that company. The adjusted R^2 for the model on the full sample is .105. For reporters alone, it is .127. Clearly, autonomy is difficult to define and measure. Part of this is the varied nature of autonomy. Part of it is the fundamental importance of autonomy to journalistic identity. To say one lacks it is, in some way, to say one is not a journalist. Indeed, just 7.3 percent of the journalists in this study say they have below-average autonomy. Though there is variance in how much more autonomy they think they have; 69.7% say they have more autonomy than is typical. Given the many ways the concept of autonomy may be understood and the tendency to say one has it, it may be that self-administered surveys (or even surveys more generally) are not the best way to measure autonomy. Observation or in-depth interviews may be necessary.

4.3 **Testing Hypotheses Regarding the Impact of Gender and Race on Pay and Autonomy**

The remaining hypotheses deal with the effects of race and gender on pay and autonomy. H_7 through H_{10} address the impact of race and gender when human capital, social networks and personal characteristics, such as parenthood status and an individual's position in the newsroom, are included in the model. The underlying questions is whether, even after controlling for the human capital variations Becker (1985, 1992) and Smith (2005) credit with explaining much of the gender difference (and race, in the case of Smith), will gender and race still matter? After controlling for social networks—often found to either vary in size or usefulness by gender and race (e.g. Ibarra, 1992, 1993; Kanter, 1977; McGuire 2002)—will gender and race still matter? Will there be advantages to being white and male and, accordingly, disadvantages to being non-white and female? The hypotheses are based on the idea that these statuses will hurt, even in such a large model. There is some hesitation to -- make this claim, in part because of a more than 30-year long effort to diversify newsrooms by race, primarily, but also by gender. I am not sure whether these efforts will be strong enough to upset the traditional influences of race and gender, which is why the hypotheses are structured as they are, but I suspect diversity efforts may blunt the impact of race and gender. This may be one way in which newsrooms differ from some other occupational environments. Additionally, the journalists of color in this study are a diverse group, while many of the studies establishing the disadvantages of minorities with regard to networks focus on African Americans either primarily or exclusively.

As far as the impact of gender on pay goes, the traditional thinking holds. The seventh hypothesis predicts that being male will be positively associated with pay, and it is supported by the evidence: Though being male has a negative impact on circulation (the “a” path), the direct effect of being male is much more powerful (see Table IV, page 83) than the total indirect effect. Indeed, the total indirect effect of circulation’s mediation reduces pay for male journalists by 2.9 percent, but the direct effect raises pay by 11.2 percent. The total effect is an increase of 7.9 percent for men.

Similar to the seventh hypothesis, the eighth holds that being white will be positively associated with higher pay. As it turns out, race does matter to journalists’ pay, just not in the expected way. H_8 predicts that being white would be positively associated with pay, even when human capital, social networks and personal characteristics are included in the model. This hypothesis is not supported. Being white reduces pay, overall, by 8.4 percent. Notably, nearly all of this impact is through circulation. The indirect effect of being white is a reduction in pay of 8.8 percent. The negativity of the indirect effect is driven by the impact of being white on circulation (the “a” path), not by the impact of circulation on pay. The positive direct-effect of being white is miniscule and non-significant, meaning there is no benefit of being white, but no harm, either, within a newsroom. The impact of race on pay is related entirely to circulation.

H_9 hypothesizes that being male will increase autonomy. This hypothesis is supported. Being male increases resources by .15 (out of five points) for reporters, editors and columnists. For reporters alone, the figure is similar, .17, but the coefficient just misses significance, with a p of .05. H_{10} predicts that being white would be positively

associated with autonomy; this hypothesis is not supported. There is no significant effect of being white on autonomy, either among the full sample or among reporters alone.

In summary, then, being male is advantageous when it comes to increasing one's pay and autonomy, while being white is not. Notably, it is the indirect effect of circulation that wipes out any white advantage in pay. Though the findings regarding race run counter to the hypotheses, the role of circulation makes the findings make (more) sense: Minority journalists are far more likely to work at larger papers than to work at smaller papers, thus improving their chances for higher pay. The lack of direct effects may indicate that efforts to increase racial and ethnic diversity (in both newsroom presence and influence) may have leveled the playing field within newsrooms, in terms of pay and access to resources. The lack of a racial difference in autonomy may suggest, again, that autonomy is more a function of position held or changes in staff size (and, relatedly, workload) than a function of any personal characteristic.

Men, meanwhile, benefit from their gender not through circulation, but through direct effects. That men are treated differently—better—within their newsrooms, even after their experience, skills, network and other characteristics are accounted for, suggests that men and women and their characteristics are not treated the same way. Subsequent hypotheses, drawing on gender-interaction models, will probe this difference. Race-interaction models also will be brought to bear to test additional hypotheses about the impact of race on pay and access to resources.

H_{11} and H_{14} are discussed together, as they draw on the same model. They address, respectively, the relationships between gender and network quality and race and network quality. These hypotheses draw on Kanter's descriptions of homosocial/homosexual reproduction (as well as Ibarra [1992 and 1993] and McGuire's [2002] findings about differences in networks and network returns by gender and race), leading to the expectation that women and journalists of color in this sample will have networks with fewer higher-ranking members, controlling for other characteristics. It may be useful, first to consider where journalists fall in the newsroom hierarchy by race and gender. (See Table III, page 82.) For this analysis, all reporters are lumped together, as are all columnists, as discerning between higher and lower-ranking reporters and editors would be very difficult on the basis of titles. Editors, however, are divided into high-ranking, mid-ranking and low-ranking. Low-ranking editors include line editors who work directly with reporters and editors who supervise other editors, but who are not department heads (e.g. sports editor, features editor). Mid-ranking editors are the department heads. High-ranking editors include assistant managing editors, managing editors, executive editors and editors who are the sole editors at their papers.

Whites and minorities are proportionately represented at all newsroom levels. This means that almost nine-in-ten mid- and high-level editors are white, which suggests that where homophily or homosocial reproduction are at work, minority journalists have few options for making connections with higher ups. Of course, they have few options for making ties with minority journalists at all ranks. Men and women are proportionately represented at all levels, except the top two. Men are overrepresented among senior editor positions, while women are overrepresented

among mid-level editing positions. This suggests that women may be poised to be a bigger part of the most senior management in coming years. This also means more junior women can reach up to second-tier editors who are women, and even top-tier editors who are women, more easily than could journalists of color without tripping on the constraints of homophily or homosexual reproduction. It is worth recalling that there have been decades of efforts to increase minority and female presence and advancement in newsrooms, suggesting that homophily and homosocial/homosexual reproduction may be less powerful in this setting.

I tested a model to predict the range of junior reporters, senior reporters, junior editors and senior editors a journalist in the sample knew. (See Table VI, page 100.) The model included dummies for race and gender, but also human capital variables (experience, tenure, education, internships) social capital variables (conferences attended, whether or not a journalist belongs or used to belong to at least one journalism professional organization), plus controls for circulation, parenthood, whether or not the journalist entered the field in or after 2002, when economic and other forces began to pummel journalistic employment, and whether one's newsroom staff had fallen off somewhat or a lot in the past year. In short, H_{11} is supported, but H_{14} is not. Race did not have a significant effect on the number of junior reporters, senior reporters, junior editors or senior editors that a journalist knew at the time just before he or she got his or her current job. However, being male was associated with knowing larger number of all four categories of journalists.

These findings suggest that minorities are not disadvantaged in getting higher-ranking journalists into their networks, per se, but that women are. The gender finding is

Table VI: Race and Gender as Predictors of Network Composition

	Junior Reporters		Senior Reporters		Junior Editors		Senior Editors	
	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>
Human capital variables								
Experience	.03*	.01	.04*	.01	.03*	.01	.03*	.01
Education—Bachelor's degree ¹	-.32*	.16	-.51*	.15	-.28*	.02	-.27*	.12
Education—Some grad school	-.48*	.20	-.55*	.19	-.39*	.15	-.52*	.15
Education—MA or more	-.30	.18	-.51*	.17	-.24	.14	-.23	.14
Internships	.17*	.04	.11*	.04	.05	.03	.07*	.03
Tenure with newspaper	-.04*	.01	-.04*	.01	-.03*	.01	-.03*	.01
Social network variables								
Journ org(s) (1=belong[ed]; 0=not)	.15*	.04	.09	.09	.12	.07	.11	.07
Number of conferences attended	-.00	.10	.18*	.04	.13*	.03	.14*	.03
Race and gender								
Race (white=1; other race=0)	.01	.13	.14	.13	.08	.10	.06	.10
Gender (male=1; female=0)	.34*	.09	.20*	.09	.20*	.07	.15*	.07
Controls								
Parent (1=parent; 0=nonparent)	-.07	.10	.02	.09	.01	.07	.04	.07
Entered field 2002+ (1=yes;0=no)	-.22	.15	-.29*	.14	-.15	.11	-.15	.11
Circulation	.28*	.05	.37*	.04	.22*	.03	.20*	.03
Low-level editor ²	.33*	.16	-.02	.16	.22	.12	-.00	.12
Mid-level editor	.27	.12	.14	.11	.22*	.09	.18*	.09
High-level editor	.37*	.16	.32*	.15	.37*	.12	.26*	.12
Columnist	.26	.18	.16	.17	.45	.13	.25	.13
Staff declined a little ³	-.05	.16	-.05	.15	.07	.12	.07	.12
Staff declined a lot	.11	.15	.08	.14	.08	.11	.15	.11
Adj R ²	.18	1.25	.24	1.19	.19	.94	.19	.93

Number of each group of journalists known at time of getting current job=outcome measures. Ordinal variables with options representing: 0, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21+ journalists known.

¹ Some college or less serves as the reference category for education.

² Reporters serve as the reference category for position.

³ Indicates change in newsroom staff size over past five years. Stayed the same or increased is the reference category.

* p < .5*

N=879 (after listwise deletion for logged pay and autonomy models).

consistent with earlier research in other fields (e.g. Ibarra, 1992), that find women's networks and minorities' tend not to reach up into the upper echelons of workplaces (e.g. Ibarra, 1992; McGuire, 2002), but the non-effect of race is inconsistent. Additional hypotheses address whether networks function differently for men and women, white journalists and journalists of color, in accordance with findings in other populations. Fully interacted models (based on those used to test the first 10 hypotheses) are used to test these hypotheses.

H_{12} predicts that women's networks would be less likely to have a positive impact on their pay than would men's networks. (See Table VII, page 102.) The evidence is mixed. There is no network variable for which the direct, indirect or total effect on women's pay is significantly different than the effect on men's pay. However, there are variables that have a significant impact on men's pay but not women's, and vice versa.

For women, the indirect effect of knowing junior reporters is negative (by 8.8 percent for knowing two-to-ten and by 9.7 percent for knowing 11 or more), but knowing junior reporters does not affect men's pay. The indirect effect of knowing 11 or more senior reporters is positive for women, associated with a 16 percent increase in pay, but it is not significant for men. Similarly, the indirect effect of knowing 1 junior editor raises women's pay by 10.6 percent but has no impact on men's pay. Knowing two-to-five senior editors has a negative indirect effect for women (associated with an 8.2% cut in pay), but has no significant effect on men. Men, on the other hand, see a positive direct effect from knowing two-to-ten senior reporters (12.1 percent) and 11 or more senior reporters (15.2%), but women receive no such benefit.

Table VII: Effects of Human Capital, Social Networks, Race and Gender on Logged Pay, with Circulation as Mediator, Among Men and Women

	Regression coefficients for WOMEN			Regression coefficients for MEN		
	Total effect X→Y (c)	Total indirect effect (a x b)	Direct effect: X→Y (c')	Total effect X→Y (c)	Total indirect effect (a x b)	Direct effect: X→Y (c')
Human capital variables						
Experience	.01*+	.01*	.01*+	.00+	.00*	.00+
Education—BABS ¹	.10	.03	.07	-.04	-.01	-.03
Education—Some grad school	.13	.01	.12	.10	.03	.07
Education—MA or more	.09	.06*	.02	.04	.04	.00
Internships	.03	.03*	.00	.02	.03*	-.00
Reporting skills	.00	-.01	.01	-.01	-.01	.00
Editing skills	-.02	-.02	-.00	.01	-.00	.01
Multimedia skills	.01	-.00	.01	.00	-.01	.01
Tenure with newspaper	-.01+	-.00*	-.00+	.00+	-.00*	.01*+
Access to resources	.12*	.07*	.05*	.12*	.08*	.04*
Social network variables²						
Knew 2-10 junior reporters	-.09	-.08*	-.01	-.04	-.03	-.01
Knew 11 or more junior reporters	-.10	-.09*	-.01	-.01	.03	-.04
Knew 2-10 senior reporters	.03	.06	-.04	.17*	.05	.12*
Knew 11 or more senior reporters	.15	.15*	.01	.23*	.08	.14*
Knew 1 junior editor	.09	.10*	-.01	-.02	-.02	.00
Knew 2-5 junior editors	.12	.05	.07	.03	.03	-.01
Knew 6 or more junior editors	.18	.10	.08	.12	.04	.07
Knew 1 senior editor	-.12	-.05	-.07	-.13	-.06	-.07
Knew 2-5 senior editors	-.07	-.08*	.00	-.16*	-.08	-.08
Knew 6 or more senior editors	-.06	-.06	-.00	-.06	-.05	-.02
Race and gender						
Race (White=1)	.04	-.06	.11	-.03	-.07*	.04
Gender	.20	-.07	.27	-.20	.07	-.27
Controls						
Parent (1=parent; 0=nonparent)	-.05+	-.03	-.02+	.11*+	.01	.10*+
Journ org(s) (1=belong[ed]; 0=not)	.01	-.04	.05	.03	.02	.01
Number of conferences attended	-.02	-.03*	.01	-.02	-.02*	.01
Low-level editor ³	.27*	.14*	.13	.17*	.03	.14*
Mid-level editor	.08	-.08*	.16*	.15*	-.11*	.26*
High-level editor	.23*	-.11	.35*	.37*	-.14	.51*
Columnist	.02	.03	.00	.19*	.03	.16*
Entered field 2002+ (1=yes;0=no)	-.12	-.01	-.11	-.15*	-.02	-.13*
Staff declined a little ⁴	.10	-.00	.10	.07	.06	.01
Staff declined a lot	.34*	.15	.19	.18*	.14*	.05

¹ Some college or less serves as the reference category for education.² Social networks at time just before getting current job. (Answer options were categorical.) For junior reporters and senior reporters, knowing none or one is the reference category. For junior editors and senior editors, knowing none is the reference category.³ Reporters serve as the reference category for position.⁴ Indicates change in newsroom staff size over the past five years. Stayed the same or increased is the reference category. Note that pay is a logged dependent variable. These results are not exponentiated. Indirect effects are bootstrap results (1,000 resamples).

* p<.05.

+ Difference between men and women significant at p < .05. Interaction model was run first with men as the group coded 1, then with women coded 1 to discern significance of coefficients for each gender.

N=888.

Women do not receive any direct benefits from their social networks, whereas knowing senior reporters has a significant, positive, direct effect for men. Men receive no indirect benefits from their networks, but women's networks have both positive and negative indirect effects on their pay. Women are hurt by knowing junior reporters and also for knowing two-to-five senior editors. They are helped by knowing a lot of senior reporters and one junior editor. This is, admittedly, a bit of an odd mishmash, but it suggests that women's pay is affected by how their networks help—or hurt—their access to large circulation papers. Men are not affected in this way, but do stand to garner at least some direct, positive benefits from their networks. Nevertheless, networks' effects on the pay of men and women are modest.

It should be noted that in this model, three variables yielded significantly different total and direct effects for men and women: experience, tenure with one's newspaper and parenthood status. Though experience is positive for men and women, the coefficients are much larger for women, and they are insignificant for men. The total effect of experience on women's pay was an increase of 1.8 percent per year, about equally divided between the direct and indirect effect. All are significant. For men, only the indirect effect is significant, associated with an increase in pay of 4/10 percent per year.

Tenure has a positive direct effect for men (associated with a 7/10 percent pay bump for each year) but a negative indirect effect (3/10 percent), yielding an insignificant total effect. For women, tenure's only significant impact is a negative indirect effect (4/10 percent). Men benefit directly from staying with a paper, while women do not receive that benefit and, like men, women suffer the negative indirect

effect of tenure, which is to preclude the chance of increasing one's circulation by moving to a larger paper. In short, men get the upside and the downside of tenure, but women get only the downside.

Parenthood is associated with positive total and direct effects for men, while the effects for women are negative, but not significant. Parenthood exerts no indirect effect on the pay of men or women. The direct effect of parenthood on men's pay is associated with a 10.6 percent pay increase (total effect: 11.7 percent). It is unclear why parenting would benefit men and hurt women—certainly one would not expect a journalist's abilities to depend on parenthood status—but it may be that children are a sign of stability for male journalists but a sign of outside obligation and lower commitment for women.

H₁₃ predicts that women's networks would be less likely to have a positive impact on autonomy than would men's networks. The evidence is mixed (see Table VIII, page 105.), does not support the hypothesis. For the entire sample, in a fully interacted model, no network measure has a significant effect on autonomy for men or women. Among reporters alone, knowing 11 or more junior reporters is significantly negative for women (-.75), but has no effect on men's autonomy. Knowing 11 or more senior reporters, is quite positive for women (.89) but makes no significant difference for men; this gender difference is significant. The only significant network effect for men is a negative effect of knowing two-to-ten junior reporters (-.42), which does not affect women.

Table VIII: Effects of Human Capital, Social Networks, Race and Gender on Autonomy, Among Men and Women

	COEFFICIENTS FOR WOMEN				COEFFICIENTS FOR MEN			
	<i>Base: reporters, editors, columnists</i>		<i>Base: reporters</i>		<i>Base: reporters, editors, columnists</i>		<i>Base: reporters</i>	
	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Coeff.</i>	<i>S.E.</i>
Human capital variables								
Experience	-.00	.01	-.00	.02	-.00	.01	-.01	.01
Education: BA/BS ¹	-.21+	.20	-.33+	.29	.14+	.12	.20+	.13
Education: Some grad	.38	.20	.05	.35	.22	.16	.25	.24
Education: MA/MS or more	.32*	.16	.30	.23	.09	.14	.09	.20
Internships	.03	.04	.03	.06	.03	.04	-.05	.05
Reporting skills	.09	.05	.21*+	.07	.05	.04	.02+	.05
Editing skills	-.17*+	.07	-.23*+	.09	.03+	.05	.06+	.07
Multimedia skills	-.08	.06	-.15	.09	-.04	.05	-.05	.06
Tenure with newspaper	.00	.01	.00	.01	.01	.01	.00	.01
Access to resources	.12*	.05	.18*	.07	.22*	.04	.29*	.06
Social network variables²								
Jr. reporters: Knew 2-10	-.09	.19	-.29	.24	-.16	.16	-.42*	.21
Jr. reporters: Knew 11+	-.18	.22	-.75*	.28	-.11	.18	-.40	.24
Sr. reporters: Knew 2-10	.13	.17	.19	.22	.06	.15	.10	.20
Sr. reporters: Knew 11+	.36	.23	.89*+	.31	.04	.20	.05+	.25
Jr. editors: Knew 1	.04	.21	-.06	.28	.13	.18	.31	.22
Jr. editors: Knew 2-5	-.14	.21	-.21	.29	.14	.17	.29	.21
Jr. editors: Knew 6+	.02	.25	.19	.34	.07	.20	.22	.25
Sr. editors: Knew 1	-.02	.19	-.27	.24	-.10	.17	-.19	.21
Sr. editors: Knew 2-5	-.06	.19	-.06	.24	-.06	.17	.05	.22
Sr. editors: Knew 6+	-.25	.22	-.34	.30	.03	.21	.13	.27
Race and gender								
Race (white=1; other race=0)	.06	.18	-.24	.24	-.17	.17	-.21	.25
Gender (male=1; female=0)	.24	.46	.64	.62	-.24	.46	-.64	.62
Controls								
Circulation (quartiles)	.00	.07	-.14	.09	-.08	.05	-.19*	.07
Pay (logged)	.22*	.10	.47*	.18	.27*	.10	.47*	.18
Parent (1=parent; 0=nonparent)	.09	.10	.25	.15	-.11	.09	-.09	.12
Journ org(s) (1=belong[ed]; 0=not)	-.09	.11	.07	.16	-.09	.08	-.05	.11
Number of conferences attended	.02	.05	-.02	.07	.04	.04	.01	.10
Low-level editor ³	.46*+	.22	--	--	-.16+	.15	--	--
Mid-level editor	.36*	.14	--	--	.19	.12	--	--
High-level editor	.36	.21	--	--	-.03	.15	--	--
Columnist	.58*	.21	--	--	.53*	.15	--	--
Entered field 2002+ (1=yes;0=no)	.12	.16	.10	.20	-.04	.14	.04	.18
Staff declined a little ⁴	-.40*	.19	-.11	.28	-.26	.13	-.34	.20
Staff declined a lot	-.35	.19	-.18	.27	-.12	.13	-.22	.20

¹ Some college or less serves as the reference category for education.

² Social networks at time just before getting current job. (Answer options were categorical.) For junior reporters and senior reporters, knowing none or one is the reference category. For junior editors and senior editors, knowing none is the reference category.

³ Reporters serve as the reference category for position.

⁴ Indicates change in newsroom staff size over the past five years. Stayed the same or increased is the reference category.

* p < .5

N=879 for regression on reporters, editors and columnists and 485 for regression on reporters. Adj. R2 for reporters, editors and columnists is .105. Adj. R2 for reporters is .127.

Autonomy for men and women is hurt by knowing junior reporters, though it takes more junior reporters to significantly affect women. Women are the only ones who benefit from knowing senior reporters. Neither gender benefits from knowing junior or senior editors. The preponderance of evidence suggests networks have minimal impacts on men's and women's autonomy (and, indeed, as demonstrated in H_5 and H_6 , networks do not effect autonomy, overall). To the extent that there is a difference, women benefit. This may suggest that the kind of endorsement and assistance network members can do is more important for women in obtaining autonomy, but with so little evidence, it is difficult to draw this conclusion.

Notably, several other types of variables do affect men and women's autonomy differently. Having a bachelor's degree lowers autonomy (-.21) for female journalists; it has a positive, but insignificant effect for men. (This pattern is seen among reporters, as well, though the coefficients are insignificant for both genders.) Having a master's degree or more education is positive for women's autonomy (.32), but has no effect on men. Editing skills decrease autonomy for all women (-.17) and for female reporters in particular (-.23). Editing skills do not affect men's autonomy, but the differences in men and women's coefficients among all journalists and among reporters alone are significant. It may be that editing, by its nature, is responsive to the work of others (generally reporters) and, therefore, may offer lesser opportunities for autonomy, except for top editors, whose work is more administrative and removed from the mundane elements of day-to-day news production. Interestingly, being a low-level editor is positively associated with autonomy for women (.46). For men the effect is negative

(-.16), but insignificant. It may be that the tasks assigned to low-level editors differ by gender, but that cannot be assessed here.

The final four hypotheses address social networks and human capital and their associations with pay and autonomy by race. H_{15} predicts that the networks of journalists of color would be less likely to have a positive impact on their pay than would the networks of whites (see Table IX, page 108.).

Evidence is weak, but suggests the opposite. Notably, knowing six or more senior editors is associated with a substantial direct (41.9 percent pay increase) and total (59.1 percent) effect on the pay of non-white journalists, but has no significant impact on white journalists. This is especially interesting, as it means journalists of color benefit from these relations within the newsroom, not as a function of using networks to land at a larger paper that pays better. The difference in these coefficients by race is significant. Whites, meanwhile, benefit indirectly from knowing two-to-ten senior reporters (5.2 percent), 11 or more senior reporters (9 percent) and are harmed by knowing two-to-five senior editors (12.1 percent), though the difference in coefficients by race on these network measures is not significant. (The reason may be the modest size of the sample of journalists of color.) The only direct effect of networks on pay for white journalists is knowing one senior editor, which is associated with 10.6 percent lower pay.

Explaining the positive direct effect of knowing senior editors on minority journalists' pay is easier than explaining the results for whites. Senior editors may be more likely than their junior colleagues to be involved with—or at least exposed to information from—the American Society of Newspaper Editors, which has held

Table IX: Effects of Human Capital, Social Networks, Race and Gender on Logged Pay, with Circulation as Mediator, Among Whites and Non-Whites

	Regression coefficients for NON-WHITES			Regression coefficients for WHITES		
	Total effect X→Y (c)	Total indirect effect (a x b)	Direct effect: X→Y (c')	Total effect X→Y (c)	Total indirect effect (a x b)	Direct effect: X→Y (c')
Human capital variables						
Experience	.01	.01	.00	.01*	.01*	.00*
Education—BA/BS ¹	-.03	.00	-.03	-.05	-.02	-.03
Education—Some grad school	-.14+	-.01	-.13+	.12*+	.03	.09+
Education—MA/MS or more	-.12	-.00	-.12	.04	.04	.00
Internships	.05	.04*	.01	.03*	.03*	.00
Reporting skills	-.05	-.02	-.02	.00	-.01	.01
Editing skills	-.01	-.02	.01	-.01	-.01	.00
Multimedia skills	-.00	.01	-.01	.02	-.01	.08
Tenure with newspaper	.01	.00	.01	-.00	-.00*	.00
Access to resources	.09*	.03+	.05	.12	.08*+	.04
Social network variables²						
Knew 2-10 junior reporters	.06	.05	.00	-.05	-.06	.01
Knew 11 or more junior reporters	.01	.07	-.07	-.03	-.02	-.01
Knew 2-10 senior reporters	-.10	.08	-.18	.11*	.05*	.06
Knew 11 or more senior reporters	-.18	.03	-.20	.20*	.11*	.09
Knew 1 junior editor	.11	.02	.11	.02	-.02	-.01
Knew 2-5 junior editors	.10	-.05	.16	.06	.05	.00
Knew 6 or more junior editors	.12	-.04	.17	.14*	.07	.08
Knew 1 senior editor	.10	-.04	.15	-.17*	-.07	-.10*
Knew 2-5 senior editors	.07	-.05	.13	-.14	-.09*	.06
Knew 6 or more senior editors	.46*+	.11	.35*+	-.11+	-.07	-.09+
Race and gender						
Race	-.01	-.07	.06	.01	.01	-.06
Gender	.15	-.01	.15*	.08	-.02	.10
Controls						
Parent (1=parent; 0=nonparent)	.05	-.04	.10	.05	.00*	.05*
Journ org(s) (1=belong[ed]; 0=not)	.11	-.01	.13	.02	-.00	.02
Number of conferences attended	.02	.01	.02	-.01	-.03	.01
Low-level editor ³	.18	.01	.18	.19*	.08*	.12*
Mid-level editor	.01	-.21*	.22*	.13*	-.08*	.22*
High-level editor	.17	-.10	.36*	.33*	-.13*	.46*
Columnist	.19	-.00	.18	.12*	.04	.08
Entered field 2002+ (1=yes;0=no)	-.08	.02	-.11	-.13*	-.02	-.11*
Staff declined a little ⁴	.00	.01	-.01	.06	.04	.02
Staff declined a lot	.13	.09	.03	.24*	.14*	.09*

¹ Having less than a bachelor's degree serves as reference category.

² Knowing zero or one junior reporter or senior reporter and knowing zero junior or senior editors serve as the reference categories.

³ Reporters serve as the reference category.

⁴ Indicates change in newsroom staff size over the past five years. Stayed the same or increased is the reference category.

* p<.05.

+ Difference between men and women significant at p < .05. Interaction model was run first with men as the group coded 1, then with women coded 1 to discern significance of coefficients for each gender.

Note that pay is a logged dependent variable. These results are not exponentiated. Indirect effects are bootstrap results (1,000 resamples).

N=888.

increasing newsroom diversity as a priority for decades. It may be that senior editors are simply more sensitive to issues of race and are more helpful to minority staff, which could explain the uniquely positive effect of knowing them for minority journalists.

That the effect of knowing senior editors is direct —when circulation is so key for minority journalists, in general—suggests that senior editors may provide within-newsroom sponsorship or mentorship that assists journalists of color with getting higher pay.

On the other hand, it may be that it takes someone with that much power and influence, that senior a position—indeed, a lot of those people—to help minority journalists. It may be that networks function differently—less helpfully—for whites, but why relationships with senior reporters and senior editors is associated with lower pay is perplexing. More research, ideally with more detail about network relationships and with larger samples, would be useful to unravel this finding.

H₁₆ predicts that the networks of journalists of color would be less likely to have a positive impact on their autonomy than would the networks of white journalists (See Table X, page 110.). The evidence is modest, but runs counter to the hypothesis. Only one network variable has any impact on the autonomy of minority journalists, knowing 11 or more senior reporters, and its effect is positive (.94). No network measure affects the autonomy of white journalists. Looking at just reporters, network measures have no effect on journalists of color's autonomy, but knowing junior reporters is associated with lower autonomy among whites (-.45 for knowing two-to-ten; -.59 for knowing 11 or more). Knowing 11 or more senior reporters is associated with greater autonomy for white reporters (.43), but has no significant effect on minority reporters.

Table X: Effects of Human Capital, Social Networks, Race and Gender on Autonomy, Among Whites and Non-Whites

	COEFFICIENTS FOR NON-WHITES				COEFFICIENTS FOR WHITES			
	<i>Base: reporters, editors, columnists</i>		<i>Base: reporters</i>		<i>Base: reporters, editors, columnists</i>		<i>Base: reporters</i>	
	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.	Coeff.	S.E.
Human capital variables								
Experience	-.01	.02	-.05	.03	-.00	.01	.00	.01
Education: BA/BS ¹	-.04	.14	.01	.21	.17	.12	.24	.18
Education: Some grad	.56	.31	.70	.67	.21	.14	.11	.22
Education: MA/MS or more	.43	.24	.33	.36	.14	.13	.15	.19
Internships	.04	.07	.02	.10	.04	.03	-.01	.04
Reporting skills	.31*+	.09	.43*+	.12	.04+	.03	.03+	.04
Editing skills	-.17	.14	-.06	.20	-.04	.04	-.05	.06
Multimedia skills	-.20*	.09	-.28*	.12	-.03	.04	-.06	.06
Tenure with newspaper	.03	.02	.09*+	.04	.00	.01	-.00+	.01
Access to resources	.19*	.08	.20	.12	.17*	.04	.22*	.05
Social network variables²								
Jr. reporters: Knew 2-10	-.06	.34	-.07	.48	-.16	.13	-.45*	.16
Jr. reporters: Knew 11+	-.03	.39	-.08	.54	-.19	.15	-.59*	.19
Sr. reporters: Knew 2-10	.42	.36	.09	.56	.11	.12	.19	.15
Sr. reporters: Knew 11+	.94*	.04	.57	.76	.22	.16	.43*	.20
Jr. editors: Knew 1	-.54	.38	-.26	.53	.19	.14	.33	.18
Jr. editors: Knew 2-5	-.07	.35	.29	.50	.01	.14	.18	.18
Jr. editors: Knew 6+	.09	.40	.53	.57	-.01	.16	.14	.21
Sr. editors: Knew 1	-.07	.35	.21	.45	-.08	.13	-.28	.17
Sr. editors: Knew 2-5	-.37	.37	-.26	.46	.01	.13	-.02	.17
Sr. editors: Knew 6+	-.69	.47	-.47	.48	-.04	.16	-.09	.21
Race and gender								
Race (white=1; other race=0)	.09	.66	1.31	1.05	-.09	.66	-.10	1.05
Gender (male=1; female=0)	.14	.19	-.09	.28	-.00	.10	.05	.15
Controls								
Circulation (quartiles)	-.02	.11	-.06	.15	-.03	.044	-.16*	.06
Pay (logged)	.20*	.10	.53*	.18	.20*	.097	.53*	.18
Parent (1=parent; 0=nonparent)	-.51*+	.19	-.65*+	.28	.03+	.071	.10+	.09
Journ org(s) (1=belong[ed]; 0=not)	-.08	.23	-.33	.34	-.08	.232	-.33	.34
Number of conferences attended	-.18+	.09	-.11	.15	.01+	.114	.02	.04
Low-level editor ³	.38	.36	--	--	.02	.127	--	--
Mid-level editor	-.23	.28	--	--	.27*	.094	--	--
High-level editor	.81	.41	--	--	.05	.669	--	--
Columnist	.01	.30	--	--	.59*	.135	--	--
Entered field 2002+ (1=yes;0=no)	-.71*+	.26	-.45	.35	.18+	.116	.24	.15
Staff declined a little ⁴	-.25	.36	.23	.71	-.31*	.113	-.35*	.17
Staff declined a lot	-.16	.32	.37	.55	.04	.031	-.26	.16

¹ Having less than a bachelor's degree serves as reference category.² Knowing zero or one junior reporter or senior reporter and knowing zero junior or senior editors serve as the reference categories.³ Reporters serve as the reference category.⁴ Indicates change in newsroom staff size over the past five years. Stayed the same or increased is the reference category.

* p < .5

N=880 for regression on reporters, editors and columnists and 485 for regression on reporters. Adj. R2 for reporters, editors and columnists is .105. Adj. R2 for reporters is .127.

H_{17} and H_{18} predict that the human capital of journalists of color will be less likely to have a positive impact on pay and autonomy, respectively, than human capital does for white journalists. Findings about the relationship between human capital and job rewards for African Americans in particular are complicated and sometimes conflicting. Human capital may be more important for African Americans because they rely more on contest mobility instead of sponsorship, according to Baldi and McBrier (1997). Wilson et al (1999) found that human capital matters more for African Americans than for whites when it came to promotions (Wilson et al 1999). However, Smith (2005) found that minorities often needed more human capital than white men to attain promotions. Smith's study did not find any difference in the process leading to promotions for blacks and white, however, contrary to Baldi and McBrier. In light of these earlier findings, H_{17} and H_{18} are meant to ascertain the role human capital plays in influencing pay and autonomy for white and non-white journalists (including, but not limited to, African Americans).

There is modest, though complicated, evidence that suggests whites benefit more from their human capital than do their minority colleagues when it comes to pay. Whites benefit from attending some graduate school, while non-whites see their pay decrease. However, only the total effect for whites is significant (pay increase of 12.6 percent). The majority of the impact is direct, but that is not significant. The total effect of some graduate school on minority journalists' earnings is not significant but is significantly higher than for whites.

Whites benefit directly and indirectly from professional experience, while minority journalists do not; however, the coefficients are very similar—the only difference is one

of significance. Again, a larger sample of minority journalists would make it easier to discern how differently experience treats minority journalists from white journalists. Tenure is associated with a modest, but significant, decrease in white's pay (3/10 of a percent per year through an indirect effect), but no significant impact on journalists of color; the coefficient is modest and positive. Internships have positive indirect effects for both groups (2.7 percent per internships for whites, 4.3 percent for minorities) and the difference in impact is not significant. Overall, there is not enough evidence to say with confidence that there is any substantial difference between how human capital affects pay for white journalists and how it affects minority journalists.

When it comes to autonomy, the differences in how human capital affects whites and non-whites are similarly modest. Most notably, non-white journalists benefit from reporting skills (.31) whereas white journalists do not. Access to resources is helpful for both groups. Multimedia skills are negative for non-white journalists (-.20) but insignificant for white journalists. The relative rarity of multimedia skills may force journalists who have them to use them on behalf of the organization as a whole, stepping in to assist on other people's projects rather than using them for their own priorities. This could impinge on autonomy. Why this would affect minority journalists more is not clear, though the effects are not very large. Why reporting skills help journalists of color more also is unclear, but as reporting tasks inherently permit some level of autonomy, having reporting skills may be useful in securing autonomy.

Among reporters alone, the same pattern holds with regard to reporting skills: reporters of color benefit (.43), but such skills make no difference to the autonomy of white reporters. Notably, tenure is modestly beneficial to non-white reporters (.09), but

has no impact on white reporters. The evidence suggests that differences in the impact of human capital on autonomy are minimal—and where they exist, they appear to favor minority journalists.

4.4 Summary of Findings

In considering the 18 hypotheses, three findings stand out. First, as expected, human capital is associated with higher pay and greater autonomy for journalists, as is the case for other types of workers (H_1 , H_4). More research would be useful to discern why certain types of human capital, notably relevant skills, do not yield much benefit, but, overall, human capital is helpful. There is less support, though some, for the idea that social networks rich in senior journalists and/or editors lead to higher paychecks but no support for the idea that better networks lead to more autonomy (H_2 , H_3 , H_5 , H_6). Future research could help determine whether certain types of relationships or certain types of behaviors by network members would help the ego; this study was not able to address those questions. Finally, while race does not appear to operate in the way that it does in other fields—whites do not appear to have significant advantages—gender does work the way it has been found to work elsewhere (H_7 , H_8 , H_9 , H_{10}). Namely, being male is advantageous when seeking more autonomy or higher pay. It also is associated with having more highly placed journalists in one's network (H_{11}). Efforts to discern how race and gender might affect the association between journalists' human capital and networks with pay and autonomy did not yield any support for the idea that human capital and networks function differently for men and women or for whites and non-whites (H_{12} - H_{18}). Additional research, with larger samples and more details about

networks might be able to shed additional light. It may be that there really is no difference in how men and women's human capital and social networks affect pay and autonomy. It may be that some other factor(s) determines why women, in particular, are disadvantaged. Given that women are more likely to leave the field than are men, solving this question would be a worthy undertaking.

Table XI: Summary of Findings

H ₁ : Supported	H ₅ : Not supported	H ₉ : Supported	H ₁₃ : Not supported	H ₁₇ : Not supported
H ₂ : Supported	H ₆ : Not supported	H ₁₀ : Not supported	H ₁₄ : Not supported	H ₁₈ : Not supported
H ₃ : Weakly supported	H ₇ : Supported	H ₁₁ : Supported	H ₁₅ : Not supported	
H ₄ : Supported	H ₈ : Not supported	H ₁₂ : Weakly supported	H ₁₆ : Not supported	

Though not the subject of any hypotheses, circulation yields another interesting finding: its sheer power when it comes to pay. For many of these hypotheses regarding pay, it is not the direct effect (or, at least, not primarily the direct effect) of an independent variable on pay or access to resources, but rather the mediating effect of circulation that matters more. It is not a surprise that circulation is powerful, but the breadth and depth of its mediation in so many relationships between human capital, social networks and pay was, to me, startling. These findings suggest that the role of circulation deserves additional attention in future research on journalists, including research into how journalists may increase their pay and improve other career outcomes in situations in which circulation cannot serve as a boost. This would include journalists working at small papers, at least for the time being, as well as journalists at virtually any sized paper who do not plan to seek work at a larger paper and, therefore,

must maximize the benefits available where they are. When it comes to autonomy, circulation has no significant impact on journalists overall, but on reporters alone, its impact is negative and significant (-.17). This is consistent with findings going back to Johnstone et al (1976) that larger newspapers, which have more refined divisions of labor and more bureaucracy, offer less autonomy. This research has typically been done on reporters, so it is unclear what previous researchers would have found if they had looked at a broader range of journalists.

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

This study set out to determine whether and how much human capital, social networks, race and gender affected two measures of journalistic career outcomes, or success: pay and occupational autonomy. This project sought to test whether principles established in studies of other types of workers—namely, that human capital and social networks contribute to beneficial outcomes—would apply to journalists, a group of quasi-professionals whose jobs mix art, commerce and social utility.

As in other fields, human capital is beneficial to journalists: It is associated with higher pay and more autonomy. The findings for social networks are more complicated. There is some limited indication that social networks, help, but Lin's conception of social resources is not a very good fit. There is modest support for the importance of networks, but it seems that those in positions of authority (editors) are not especially likely to be helpful in securing higher pay, and networks do not appear to affect autonomy at all. Knowing senior reporters is associated with higher pay, which suggests some form of brokerage may be going on. Consistent with the findings of others, women have less rich networks than men. Inconsistent with other findings, minority journalists do not have poorer networks than do their white colleagues.

While being male is associated with higher pay and more autonomy, being white is not; indeed being white is associated with lower pay. Looking more specifically at how the models predicting pay and resources may function differently for whites and non-whites, men and women, the results were ambiguous, and certainly not strong enough

to demonstrate any clear difference in how men and women's social networks or human capital function.

5.2 Limitations

Several limitations of this study merit discussion. Some are the result of intentional decisions, others are not. First, this study looks at journalists who were able to get jobs at daily newspapers, and only at those who work as reporters, editors or columnists. Those who tried to get jobs but were unsuccessful are not included, nor are those who left newspaper journalism—voluntarily or not. This success bias has substantial import for interpreting the importance of findings regarding race or gender, in particular. Minorities and women who could not get newsroom jobs—or else got them and left out of dissatisfaction or for other reasons—by definition, cannot be part of the sample. This bias also may help explain why skills indices perform so poorly in the models: Perhaps one needs a fairly high skill level to get (or keep) a job, such that being employed is the reward to those elements of human capital, and no additional pay or access to resources would be forthcoming. Additionally, journalists who work as copy editors, page designers, graphic artists or photographers also are not included. Hence, results of this study cannot be generalized to the entire newsroom. Any additional research into human capital, social networks, or the impacts of race or gender on newsroom careers would benefit from including other types of journalists and reaching out to those who never made it into the field or else entered and departed.

The definition of the word “job”—the boundaries that set one job apart from another—is always a challenge in newsrooms, which undergo not infrequent

reorganizations in even good times and which have combined and rearranged many jobs in recent years because of layoffs. Remaining employees often find themselves absorbing the responsibilities of former colleagues or reporting to a new boss or new department, even while continuing to do the work they were doing before these changes. Whether this constitutes a change in one's "job" is a difficult call—and one that had to be made by each respondent as he or she saw fit.

This reality may have created difficulties for journalists answering questions about their network composition just prior to getting this job. For journalists whose most recent transition included changing newspapers, this is more clear-cut—they know they have changed jobs. But for many, the line between one job and another may be fuzzy. Questions about jobs were preceded by the notice below to help respondents determine whether they had, indeed, changed jobs, but it remains a difficult determination:

CRUCIAL NOTE ABOUT JOBS: It is important that you understand what we mean by a "job." The word refers to the position you hold as a full-time journalism at a daily newspaper. That means that, to us, you change jobs anytime you...

- Get another editing or reporting assignment/beat at the same paper.
- Get another type of newsroom job at the same paper (such as switching from reporting to editing or vice versa).
- Take a job at another paper.
- Take a job outside of daily journalism.

Anyone who undertakes further efforts to study journalists and their job transitions should be mindful of this complication.

Social networks data in this study also have limitations. The study asked journalists about their social networks at the time just preceding their getting their current jobs. This is of concern because a journalist's social network may have changed since the current job was obtained, such that a different network composition is now affecting pay and resources. Plans to gather social network information for various

career points were abandoned because of the burden they placed on journalists completing the survey. However, it would have been useful to have had current network data, which may have been more relevant.

Another limitation concerns the perspective from which the data come. This study asks journalists to rate their autonomy, their own skills and to report other facets of their working life. This obviously provides a one-sided view of their careers. This project cannot say how employers would rate journalists' skills or autonomy, for example. One idea for a subsequent project would be to interview journalists and their bosses on these matters to see if their assessments match and to see, for example, how well a reporter's assessment of his skills affects pay versus how well his boss' assessment of his or skills affects pay.

Additionally, while this study considers the effects of race and gender on career outcomes, I have no data on journalists' perceptions of how race or gender affects newsroom life—theirs or others'. I also have no data on the race of network members or the racial breakdowns of newsrooms. Given that other studies (e.g. Ibarra, 1993, 1995; McGuire, 2002) have found that these factors may be important in other contexts, it is unfortunate that this project cannot take these factors into account. Future research would do well to measure the race of journalists' networks and work environments and include them in studies of professional outcomes by race, ideally with larger samples that would allow analysis of racial-ethnic groups individually.

5.3 Contributions and Conclusions

One of the motivating questions of this survey was to determine whether or not journalists were like other workers in the ways their careers were affected by human capital and social capital. The answer is... yes, in some ways. The “yes” is strongest for human capital—it pays off for journalists, as has been the case in previous research in other fields. The evidence is mixed for networks. Having network members in the highest reaches of the newsroom is not as beneficial as one might expect, and might even hurt. As has been found elsewhere, women are at a disadvantage in newsrooms, in terms of reaping pay and getting autonomy, but minorities are not disadvantaged at daily newspapers, as they are elsewhere. Efforts to probe these findings did not reveal any particular mechanism through which race and gender influence career outcomes, leaving this open as an avenue for future research.

This study addresses the impacts of human capital, social networks, race and gender on two aspects of newsroom career success, pay and autonomy. It also establishes a new method for sampling U.S. journalists, a method that does not require first sampling newspapers, then seeking their cooperation in building a sample. The use of the Bacon’s directory, with all its limitations and complications, allows a representative sample of reporters, editors and columnists to be drawn directly, without having to use multi-stage sampling that relies on news organizations’ cooperation to build the sampling frame. The use of the list of surnames associated with racial and ethnic minorities allowed a supplementary sample to be drawn, increasing minority participation in this survey. As with the use of the paper Bacon’s directory, the supplementary-sample draw from the electronic database version of Bacon’s is

imperfect, but it allows for greater representation of journalists of color without relying on cooperation from minority journalism associations and their members, whose demonstration of professional commitment from being organization members suggests they may not be representative of journalists of color in general. This has been done before with disappointing response rates (e.g. Weaver et al, 2007).

Though pay has never been found to be a principle motivation for entering journalism (with good reason), low pay has been shown to push journalists out of the business. This study offers some sense of what would increase pay—and what would not. It suggests that investments in human capital are worthwhile, though with experience and resources being two of the most powerful, this does not offer much hope to inexperienced journalists at resource-poor papers, unless they have completed several internships. It may sound craven to those who treasure the traditional model of working one's way up from smaller papers, to those who shun organizational-chart ascendancy in favor of ostensibly more fulfilling work in the reporting trenches, but the route to higher pay is made smoother by working at a larger circulation paper and by pursuing advancement into the editing ranks. These findings are not entirely surprising, of course, but they suggest the romanticism of the career that starts off with a job as a small-town reporter may need to be set aside. At the very least, a more open discussion can and should be had about what is and is not associated with higher journalistic earnings.

Though it was not a motivation for this study, it also highlights the profound impact of circulation in determining journalistic pay. That circulation would matter is not

a surprise, but the span and magnitude of its reach suggest that circulation deserves more attention in journalism research and in sociological research of journalists.

Autonomy has long been a subject of interest for journalism researchers, albeit a vexing one. This study offers new insights, but they are mostly into what does not predict autonomy, adding to a list compiled over the past 40 years by Johnstone, Weaver, Beam and their colleagues.

I cannot be certain but I suspect some of the reason these models perform so modestly is that the underlying assumptions about autonomy, here and in some other studies of journalism treat autonomy as the positive result of newsroom decisions. The implication seems to be that journalists are *given* autonomy—control and authority over news content they produce—with some forethought and intention by management. Based on my own experience in newsrooms and that of my friends and spouse, I tend to think that autonomy comes in at least two forms, and that there is a spectrum between them.

One form resembles what Weaver and others seem to be referring to: a type of autonomy in which journalists are granted authority over their work and provided with the resources to do it properly, as they deem fit. In the best of circumstances, such journalists would receive mentorship and support, while maintaining control over the direction and execution of their reporting and editing. On the far other end of the spectrum is what I would call the autonomy of neglect. Journalists experiencing the autonomy of neglect have a say over what they do and how they do it, but largely because their newsrooms are understaffed and poorly resourced. No one has the time

to oversee them (much less guide them), so they are left to make decisions on their own, unassisted. There is freedom in that, but it is more freedom *from* than freedom *to*.

Those are not the circumstances that would seem likely to ensure the kind of positive autonomy generally described in the literature. Nevertheless, those in privileged positions in more secure news organizations may still experience positive autonomy, while those in more stressful circumstances in less secure papers may also experience autonomy, albeit of a different form. This range in understanding of what autonomy is complicates analysis of what factors might contribute to autonomy. In an effort to better contextualize autonomy, the model I used included measures of newspaper circulation (a reasonable proxy for organization size but also for a paper's ability to provide resources), a journalist's self-reported personal access to work-related resources and recent changes in staffing that would indicate financial stress (or lack thereof) at a paper. Still, this model does not perform better than its predecessors.

Additionally, no social network measure had any significant influence on autonomy for the group as a whole, and the only network measure that affects autonomy for reporters is knowing junior reporters—and the effect is negative. These findings cut against the very notion of social capital. Autonomy—at least to the extent that it is intentionally given rather than a pleasant side effect of neglect—is rooted in trust: Bosses give autonomy to workers they trust. For that reason alone, knowing more people in authority in newsrooms seems as though it should contribute directly to autonomy by increasing trust. Where autonomy is more a function of neglect than intention, that might not matter. Notably, a journalist's staff position has a strong relationship to autonomy, suggesting that autonomy may be more a matter of what

position one holds than the relationships one has. Additionally, the strong negative impact of declines in staff size suggest that factors outside the control of the individual journalist or his or her boss (or social network members) may have a brutal effect on autonomy. On one level, staff declines should increase the autonomy of neglect by reducing oversight, but staff declines also increase workload (as Beam et al found [2009]), which leads to assembly-line journalism and curtails one's sense of autonomy.

In operationalizing autonomy, it may be better to break it into very discrete components of behavior, control and authority, rather than to study it as a single, unified concept, as I did here. To the extent that autonomy has been studied more granularly, the elements have focused on whether reporters can get information into the paper. A more expansive view of autonomy that considered access to resources, breadth or narrowness of tasks and influence over the larger direction of the paper's coverage, for example, may be more useful. Additionally, controls for staff size and changes therein might be useful. Clearly, more thought into how autonomy is experienced and perceived is required before its presence or absence may be better explained.

CITED LITERATURE

- Abbott, Andrew. 1981. "Status and Strain in the Professions." *American Journal of Sociology* 86(4): 819-835.
- . 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Acemoglu, Daron and Jorn-Steffen Pischke. 1999. "The Structure of Wages and Investment in General Training." *The Journal of Political Economy* 107(3): 539-572.
- Adler, Marina A. 1993. "The Consequences of Occupational Segregation and Authority Position." *The Sociological Quarterly*: 34(3): 449-465.
- Altonji, Joseph G. and Nicolas Williams. 2005. "Do Wages Rise with Job Seniority? A Reassessment." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 58(3): 370-397.
- American Society of Newspapers Editors annual censuses of newsroom employment. 2009 and 2011 used extensively. See:**
http://asne.org/key_initiatives/diversity/newsroom_census.aspx.
- Arnold, Mary and Mary Nesbitt. 2006. "Women in Media 2006: Finding the Leader in You." Media Management Center of Northwestern University and McCormick Tribune Foundation.
- Bacon's Newspaper Directory 2008: Daily Newspapers, Community Newspapers, New Services and Syndicates*. 2007. Chicago: Cision.
- Bailyn, Lotte. 1985. "Autonomy in the Industrial R&D Lab." *Human Resources Management* 24: 129-146.
- Baldi, Stephanie and Debra Branch McBrier. 1997. "Do the Determinants of Promotion Differ for Blacks and Whites? Evidence From the U.S. Labor Market." *Work and Occupations* 24(4): 478-497.
- Beam, Randal A. 1993. "The Impact of Group Ownership Variables on Organizational Professionalism at Daily Newspapers." *Journalism Quarterly* 70(4): 907-918.
- Beam, Randal A., David H. Weaver and Bonnie J. Brownlee. 2009. "Changes in Professionalism of U.S. Journalists in the Turbulent 21st Century." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 86(2): 277-298.
- Becker, Gary S. 1962. "Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis." *The Journal of Political Economy* 70(5) Part 2: 9-49.

- _____. 1985. "Human Capital, Effort, and the Sexual Division of Labor." *Journal of Labor Economics* 3(1) Part 2: S33-S58.
- _____. 1992. "Human Capital and the Economy." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 136(1): 85-92.
- Becker, Lee B. Gerald M. Kosicki, Thomas Engleman and K. Viswanath. 1993. "Finding Work and Getting Paid: Predictors of Success in the Mass Communications Job Market." *Journalism Quarterly* 70(4): 919-933.
- Becker, Lee B., Edmund Lauf and Wilson Lowrey. 1999. "Differential Employment Rates in the Journalism and Mass Communication Labor Force Based on Gender, Race, and Ethnicity: Exploring the Impact of Affirmative Action." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 76(4): 631-645.
- Becker, Lee B., Tudor Vlad, Jisu Huh and Nancy R. Mace. 2003. "Gender equality elusive, surveys show." *Freedom Forum* commentary posted on its Web site Dec. 5, 2003. Available online at www.freedomforum.org/template/documen.asp?documentID=17784.
- Bian, Yanjie and Soon Ang. 1997. "Guanxi Networks and Job Mobility in China and Singapore." *Social Forces* 75 (3): 981-1005.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review* 62(3): 465-480.
- Brass, Daniel J. 1985. "Men's and Women's Networks: A Study of Interaction Patterns and Influence in an Organization." *The Academy of Management Journal* 28(2): 327-343.
- Bridges, William P. and Wayne J. Villemez. 1986. "Informal Hiring and Income in the Labor Market." *American Sociological Review* 51(4): 574-582.
- Bucher, Rue and Anselm Strauss. 1961. "Professions in Process." *American Journal of Sociology* 66(4): 325-334.
- Burt, Ronald S. 1992. *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 1998. "The Gender of Social Capital." *Rationality & Society* 10(1): 5-46.
- Chiswick, Barry R. 1988. "Differences in Education and Earnings Across Racial and Ethnic Groups: Tastes, Discrimination, and Investments in Child Quality." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 103(3): 571-597.

- Collins, Sharon M. 1997. "Black Mobility in White Corporations: Up the Corporate Ladder but Out on a Limb." *Social Problems* 44: 55-67.
- Dennis, Everette E. 1996. "Dennis: Journalism Is a Profession," in Everette E. Dennis and John C. Merrill (eds) *Media Debates: Issues in Mass Communication*. 2nd ed. Whites Plains, NY: Longman.
- Denzin, Norman K. and Curtis J. Mettlin. 1968. "Professionalization: The Case of Pharmacy." *Social Forces* 46(3): 375-381.
- Deuze, Mark. 2005. "What is Journalism? Professional Identity and Ideology of Journalists Reconsidered." *Journalism* 6(4): 442-464.
- _____. 2007. *Media Work*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Dillman, Don A., Jolene D. Smyth and Leah Melani Christian. 2008. *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Dunning, David, Chip Heath and Jerry M. Suls. 2004. "Flawed Self-Assessment: Implications for Health, Education and the Workplace." *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 5(3): 69-106.
- Dustmann, Christian and Costas Meghir. 2005. "Wages, Experience and Seniority." *The Review of Economic Studies* 72(1): 77-108.
- Edmonds, Rick. 2008. "2400 Newsroom Jobs Lost: Biggest Dip in 30 Years." Posted on the Poynter Institute's Web site on April 13, 2008 and updated March 3, 2011. Available at: <http://www.poynter.org/latest-news/business-news/the-biz-blog/88236/2400-newsroom-jobs-lost-biggest-dip-in-30-years/>.
- Entorf, Horst, Michel Gollac and Francis Kramarz. 1999. "New Technologies, Wages and Worker Selection." *Journal of Labor Economics* 17(3): 464-491.
- Everbach, Tracy and Craig Flournoy. 2007. "Women Leave Journalism for Better Pay, Work Conditions." *Newspaper Research Journal* 28(3): 52-64.
- Flap, Henk D. 1999. "Creation and Returns of Social Capital." *La Revue Tocqueville* 20:5-26.
- _____. 2001. "No Man is an Island" in Lazega, E. and O. Favereau (eds) *Markets and Organizations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Flap, Henk and Ed Boxman. 2001. "Getting Started: The Influence of Social Capital on the Start of Occupational Career" in Lin, Nan, Karen Cook and Ronald S. Burt (eds) *Social Capital Theory and Research* pp 159-181. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Franzen, Axel and Dominik Hangartner. 2006. "Social Networks and Labour Market Outcomes: The Non-Monetary Benefits of Social Capital." *European Sociological Review* 22(4): 353-368.
- Frederickson, Jon and James F. Rooney. "How the Music Occupation Failed to Become a Profession." *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 21(2): 189-206.
- Friedson, Eliot. 1984. "The Changing Nature of Professional Control." *Annual Review of Sociology* 10:1-20.
- _____. 2001. *Professionalism: The Third Logic*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gade, Peter J. 2004. "Newspapers and Organizational Development: Management and Journalist Perceptions of Newsroom Cultural Change." *Journalism & Communication Monograph*.
- Gade, Peter J. and Earnest L. Perry. 2003. "Changing the Newsroom Culture: A Four-Year Case Study of Organizational Development at the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 80(2): 327-347.
- Gargiulo, Martin. "Two-Step Leverage: Managing Constraint in Organizational Politics." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 38(1): 1-19.
- Gathmann, Christina and Uta Schonberg. 2010. "How General is Human Capital? A Task-Based Approach." *Journal of Labor Economics* 28(1): 1-49.
- Gibbons, Robert and Michael Waldman. 2006. "Enriching a Theory of Wage and Promotion Dynamics inside Firms." *Journal of Labor Economics* 24(1): 59-107.
- Gorman, Elizabeth H. 2006. "Work Uncertainty and the Promotion of Professional Women: The Case of Law Firm Partnership." *Social Forces* 85(2): 865-890.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78: 1360-1380.
- _____. 1995. *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Groves, Robert M., Floyd J. Fowler, Jr., Mick P. Couper, James M. Pepkowski, Eleanor Singer and Roger Tourangeau. 2009. *Survey Methodology*. (Second edition) Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hall, Richard H. 1967. "Components of Professionalism." Paper delivered at the 1967 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- _____. 1968. "Professionalization and Bureaucratization." *American Sociological Review* 33: 92-104.
- _____. 1986. *Dimensions of Work*. London: Sage.
- Hardin, Marie and Erin Whiteside. 2009. "Token Responses to Gendered Newsrooms: Factors in the Career-Related Decisions of Female Newspaper Sports Journalists." *Journalism* 10(5): 627-646.
- Haug, M.R. 1973. "Deprofessionalization: An Alternative Hypothesis for the Future." *Sociological Review Monographs* 20:195-211.
- _____. 1975 "The Deprofessionalization of Everyone?" *Sociological Focus* 3:197-213.
- _____. 1977. "Computer Technology and the Obsolescence of the Concept of Profession." In *Work and Technology*, ed. M.R. Haug and J. Dofney. Pp: 215-228. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hayes, Andrew F. "Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical Mediation Analysis in the New Millennium." *Communication Monographs* 76(4): 408-420.
- Hodges, Louis W. 1986. "The Journalist and Professionalism." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 1(2): 32-36.
- Ibarra, Herminia. 1992. "Homophily and Differential Returns: Sex Differences in Network Structure and Access in an Advertising Firm." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 37(3): 422-447.
- _____. 1993. "Personal Networks of Women and Minorities in Management: A Conceptual Framework." *The Academy of Management Review* 18 (1): 56-87.
- James, Erika Hayes. 2000. "Differences in Promotions and Support: Underlying Effects of Human and Social Capital." *Organization Science* 11(5): 493-508.
- Johnstone, John W. C., Edward J. Slawski and William W. Bowman. 1972. "The Professional Values of American Newsmen." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 36(4): 522-540.

- _____. 1976. *The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and Their Work*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Juhn, Chinhui, Kevin M. Murphy and Brooks Pierce. 1993. "Wage Inequality and the Rise in Returns to Skill." *The Journal of Political Economy* 101(3): 410-442.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1993 [originally 1977]. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kaul, Arthur J. 1986. "The Proletarian Journalist: A Critique of Professionalism." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 1(2): 47-55.
- Kornhauser, William. 1963. *Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Leicht, Kevin T. and Mary L. Fennell. 1997. "The Changing Organizational Context of Professional Work." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23: 215-231.
- Leicht, Kevin T. and Jonathan Marx. 1997. "The Consequences of Informal Job Finding for Men and Women." *The Academy of Management Journal* 40(4): 967-987.
- Liebler, Carol. 1994. "How Race and Gender Affect Journalists' Autonomy." *Newspaper Research Journal* 15(3): 122-130.
- Lin, Nan, Paul W. Dayton and Peter Greenwald. 1978. "Analyzing the Instrumental Use of Relations in the Context of Social Structure." *Sociological Methods & Research* 7(2): 149-166.
- Lin, Nan, John C Vaughn and Walter M. Ensel. 1981. "Social Resources and Occupational Status Attainment." *Social Forces* 59(4): 1163-1181.
- Lin, Nan. 1999. "Social Networks and Status Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25: 467-487.
- _____. 2000. "Inequality in Social Capital." *Contemporary Sociology* 29(6): 785-795.
- _____. 2001. *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lowrey, Wilson and Lee B. Becker. 2003. *Cultural Fit and Personal Connections: Impact on Job-Finding Success*. (Unpublished supplement to the 2002 *Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Graduates*.) Available online at www.grady.uga/annualsurveys/.
- McDonald, Steve, Nan Lin and Dan Ao. 2009. "Networks of Opportunity: Gender, Race and Job Leads." *Social Problems* 56(3): 385-402.

- McGill, Lawrence Thomas. 1987. "Priorities in News Coverage and the Role of Beats in the Careers of U.S. Newspaper Editors." Northwestern University; sociology dissertation.
- McGuire, Gail M. 2000. "Gender Race, Ethnicity, and Networks: The Factors Affecting the Status of Employees' Network Members." *Work and Occupations* 27(4): 501-523.
- _____. 2002. "Gender, Race, and the Shadow Structure: A Study of Informal Networks and Inequality in a Work Organization." *Gender and Society* 16(3): 303-322.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin and James M. Cook 2001 "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 415-44.
- Meiksins, Peter F. and James W. Watson. 1989. "Professional Autonomy and Organizational Constraint: The Case of Engineers." *The Sociological Quarterly* 4: 561-585.
- Merrill, John C. 1986. "Professionalism: Danger to Press Freedom and Pluralism." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 1(2): 56-60.
- _____. 1996. "Merrill: Journalism Is Not a Profession," in Everette E. Dennis and John C. Merrill (eds) *Media Debates: Issues in Mass Communication*. 2nd ed. Whites Plains, NY: Longman.
- Mincer, Jacob. 1989. "Human Capital and the Labor Market: A Review of Current Research." *Educational Researcher* 18(4): 27-34.
- Montgomery, James D. 1992. "Job Search and Network Composition: Implications of the Strength-of-Weak-Ties Hypothesis." *American Sociology Review* 57(5): 586-596.
- Moore, Gwen. 1990. "Structural Determinants of Men's and Women's Personal Networks." *American Sociological Review* 55: 726-735.
- Najjar, Orayb. "ASNE Efforts to Increase Minorities in Newsrooms." *Newspaper Research Journal* 16(4): 126-140.
- Neidorf, Shawn M. "Wanted: A First Job in Journalism—An Exploration of the Factors that May Influence Initial Job-Search Outcomes for News-Editorial Students." *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, Spring 2008. Vol. 63(1): 56-65.
- Newkirk, Pamela. 2000. "Within the Veil: Black Journalists, White Media." New York: New York University Press.

- Parks-Yancy, Rochelle. 2006. "The Effects of Social Group Membership and Social Capital Resources on Careers." *Journal of Black Studies* 36(4): 515-545.
- Parmelee, Donna C. 1978. "Accounting for Sex Differences in Work Autonomy: Resources or Vested Interest?" *Southern Sociologist* 8:11-20.
- Pew Research Center for the People & the Press and the Project for Excellence in Journalism. 2008. "The Web: Alarming, Appealing and a Challenge to Journalistic Values." Released March 17, 2008. Available at people-press.org.
- Pease, Ted. 1992. "Newsroom 2000: Not my kid! Journalists leery of industry's future." *Newspaper Research Journal* Winter/Spring 1992: 34-53.
- Podolny, Joel M. and James N. Baron. 1997. "Resources and Relationships: Social Networks and Mobility in the Workplace." *American Sociological Review* 62: 673-693.
- Polachek, Solomon William. 1975. "Differences in Expected Post-School Investment as a Determinant of Market Wage Differentials." *International Economic Review* 16(2): 451-470.
- Pollard, George. 1995. "Job Satisfaction Among Newswriters: The Influence of Professionalism, Perceptions of Organizational Structure, and Social Attributes." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 72(3): 682-697.
- Preacher, Kristopher J. and Andrew F. Hayes. 2008. "Asymptotic and Resampling Strategies for Assessing and Comparing Indirect Effects in Multiple Mediator Models." *Behavior Research Methods* 40(3): 879-891.
- Pritchard, David and Sarah Stonbely. 2007. "Racial Profiling in the Newsroom." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 84(2): 231-248.
- Risman, Barbara J. 2004. "Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism." *Gender & Society* 18: 429-450.
- Singer, Jane B. 1997. "Still Guarding the Gate? The Newspaper Journalist's Role in an On-line World." *Convergence* 3(1) 72-89.
- _____. 2003. "Who are these guys? The online challenge to the notion of journalistic professionalism." *Journalism* 4(2): 139-163.
- _____. 2006. "Stepping Back from the Gate: Online Newspaper Editors and the Co-Production of Content in Campaign 2004." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* (83(2): 265-280.

- Seibert, Scott E, Maria L. Kraimer and Robert C. Liden. 2001. "A Social Capital Theory of Career Success." *The Academy of Management Journal* 44(2): 219-237.
- Smith, Ryan A. "Do the Determinants of Promotion Differ for White Men Versus Women and Minorities? An Exploration of Intersectionalism Through Sponsored and Contest Mobility Processes." *American Behavioral Scientist* 48(9): 1157-1181.
- Snizek, William E. "Hall's Professionalism Scale: An Empirical Reassessment." 1972. *American Sociological Review* 37(1): 109-114.
- Soloski, John. 1989. "News Reporting and Professionalism: Some Constraints on the Reporting of the News" *Media Culture Society* 11:207-228.
- Spenner, Kenneth. 1983. "Deciphering Prometheus: Temporal Change in the Skill Level of Work." *American Sociological Review* 48: 824-837.
- Stamm, Keith and Doug Underwood. 1993. "The Relationship of Job Satisfaction to Newsroom Policy Changes." *Journalism Quarterly* 70(3): 528-541.
- Stevens, Margaret. 2003. "Earnings Functions, Specific Human Capital and Job Matching: Tenure Bias is Negative." *Journal of Labor Economics* 21(4): 783-805.
- Tanner, Julian and Rhonda Cockerill. 1996. "Gender, Social Change, and the Professions: The Case of Pharmacy." *Sociological Forum* 11(4): 643-660.
- Topel, Robert. 1991. "Specific Capital, Mobility and Wages: Wages Rise with Job Seniority." *The Journal of Political Economy* 99(1): 145-176.
- Walsh-Childers, Kim, Jean Chance and Kristin Herzog. 1996. "Women Journalists Report Discrimination in Newsrooms." *Newspaper Research Journal* 17(3-4): 68-87
- Weaver, David H., Randal A. Beam, Bonnie J. Brownlee, Paul S. Voakes and G. Cleveland Wilhoit. 2007. *The American Journalist in the 21st Century: U.S. News People at the Dawn of a New Millennium.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Weaver, David H. and G. Cleveland Wilhoit. 1986. *The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. News People and Their Work.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- _____. 1996. *The American Journalist in the 1990s: U.S. News People at the End of an Era.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Wielgosz, John B. and Susan Carpenter. 1987. The Effectiveness of Alternative Methods of Searching for Jobs and Finding Them: An Exploratory Analysis of the Data Bearing upon the Ways of Coping with Joblessness." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 46(2): 151-164.
- Wilensky, Harold L. 1964. "The Professionalization of Everyone?" *American Journal of Sociology* 70(2): 137-158.
- Wilson, George, Ian Sakura-Lemessy and Jonathan P. West. 1999. 'Reaching the Top: Racial Differences in Mobility Paths to Upper-Tier Occupations.' *Work and Occupations* 26(2): 165-186.
- Winship, Christopher and Larry Radbill. 1994. "Sampling Weights and Regression Analysis." *Sociological Methods Research* 23:230-257.
- Word, David L, Charles D. Coleman, Robert Nunziata and Robert Kominski. "Demographic Aspects of Surnames from Census 2000." Manuscript available from the U.S. Census Bureau at <https://www.census.gov/genealogy/www/surnames.pdf>.

APPENDIX A. Questionnaire

The first section of the survey asks questions about your newsroom career.

- Q.1 At how many daily newspapers have you worked full-time as a journalist, not including internships?
(OE: NUMBER TO BE ENTERED IN BOX)

CRUCIAL NOTE ABOUT JOBS: It is important that you understand what we mean by a "job." The word refers to the position you hold as a full-time journalism at a daily newspaper. That means that, to us, you change jobs anytime you...

- *Get another editing or reporting assignment/beat at the same paper.*
- *Get another type of newsroom job at the same paper (such as switching from reporting to editing or vice versa).*
- *Take a job at another paper.*
- *Take a job outside of daily journalism.*

- Q.2 How many full-time journalism jobs have you held at daily newspapers?
(OE: NUMBER TO BE ENTERED IN BOX)

NO QUESTION 3

- Q.4 In what year did you start your first full-time journalism job at a daily newspaper, not including internships? (OE: FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX.)
[ADD "YYYY" NEXT TO BOX TO MAKE FOUR-YEAR DATE REQUIREMENT CLEAR.]

- Q.5 In all, how many years have you worked in any form of journalism, including for print, television, radio and Internet outlets?

- Q.6 In all, how many years have you worked as a journalist for print newspapers (including their online editions)?

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

- Q.7 What was the name of the newspaper at which you got your first, full-time daily-newspaper journalism job, not including internships?
(OE: NAME OF PAPER TO BE ENTERED IN BOX)

APPENDIX A (continued).

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

Q.8 In what city and state (or city and country, if outside the U.S.) was that paper based?

(OE: CITY AND STATE OF PAPER TO BE ENTERED IN SEPARATE BOXES, WITH THE WORDS "CITY" AND "STATE/COUNTRY" NEXT TO THEIR RESPECTIVE BOXES.)

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

Q.9 What was your first full-time journalism job at a daily newspaper? *(If you did more than one type of work, check the most appropriate title for your primary duties.)*

- 1 Reporter (GO TO 10)
- 2 Editor (GO TO 12)
- 3 Columnist (GO TO 15)
- 4 Copy Editor (GO TO 13)
- 5 Page Designer (GO TO 14)
- 88 Other *(Please explain.)* [BOX APPEARS] (GO TO 28)

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 AND Q.9=1, ASK:

Q.10 Were you a beat reporter who regularly covered a set topic or area, or did you cover a wide variety of things (i.e. general assignment)?

- 1 Beat reporter (GO TO 11)
- 2 General assignment reporter (GO TO 28)
- 88 Other *(Please explain.)* [BOX APPEARS] (GO TO 28)

APPENDIX A (continued).

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK AND Q.10=1:

Q.11 What beat(s) did you cover? Please check all that apply.
(GO TO Q.28)

- 1 Crime and/or courts
- 2 Local government
- 3 State or national government
- 4 Education/schools
- 5 Business
- 6 Sports
- 7 Lifestyle/culture/arts
- 8 Environment/science/medicine
- 9 A geographic area
- 88 Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN)

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 AND Q.9=2, ASK:

Q.12 What level of editor were you in your first full-time newspaper job?
(GO TO Q.28)

- 1 The paper's sole editor
- 2 Executive editor
- 3 Managing editor
- 4 Assistant-managing editor
- 5 Head of a section or department (e.g. sports editor, business editor)
- 6 Supervisor of other editors, but not the head of a section or department
- 7 Lower level line editor directly supervising reporters, but not the head of a section or department
- 88 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)

APPENDIX A (continued).

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 AND Q.9=4, ASK:

Q.13 What level of copy editor were you in your first full-time newspaper job?
(GO TO Q.28)

- 1 The paper's sole copy editor
- 2 Manager of all other copy editors
- 3 Lead copy editor for a section or department
- 4 Supervisory copy editor, overseeing other copy editors, but in charge of a section or department
- 5 Lower level copy editor working directly on copy, but not in charge of a section or department
- 88 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 AND Q.9=5, ASK:

Q.14 What level of page designer were you in your first full-time newspaper job?
(GO TO Q.28)

- 1 The paper's sole page designer
- 2 Manager of all other page designers
- 3 Lead page designer for a section or department
- 4 Supervisory designer, overseeing other designers, but not in charge of a section or department
- 5 Lower level page designer, working on pages directly, but not in charge of a section or department
- 88 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 AND Q.9=3, ASK:

Q.15 For what section were you a columnist? (GO TO 16)

- 1 Editorial Page/Section
- 2 Sports
- 3 Features/Arts
- 4 News/Metro/Politics
- 88 Other (*Please explain.*) [BOX APPEARS]

APPENDIX A (continued).

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 AND. Q.9=3, ASK:

Q.16 How often did your column run? (GO TO 28)

- 1 Less than once a week
- 2 Once a week
- 3 Twice a week
- 4 Three or more times a week
- 88 Other (*Please explain.*) [BOX APPEARS]

NO QUESTIONS 17-27.

ASK ALL

Q.28 What is the name of the daily newspaper at which you currently work?
(OE: NAME OF PAPER TO BE ENTERED IN BOX)

Q.28a In what year did you start working at this newspaper? (FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX) **[ADD "YYYY" NEXT TO BOX TO MAKE FOUR-YEAR DATE REQUIREMENT CLEAR.]**

Q.29 In what city and state is that paper located?
(OE: CITY AND STATE OF PAPER TO BE ENTERED IN SEPARATE BOXES, WITH THE WORDS "CITY" AND "STATE/COUNTRY" NEXT TO THEIR RESPECTIVE BOXES.)

Q.29a How did get your current job?

- 1 I applied for an opening at the newspaper for which I already was working
- 2 I was asked to consider taking a different job at the newspaper for which I already was working
- 3 I was required to take a different job at the newspaper for which I already was working
- 4 I applied as an external candidate for an opening at this newspaper and got it
- 5 I was contacted by someone at this newspaper and asked to apply as an external candidate for a position that was open or soon to open at that paper
- 6 This paper recruited me from elsewhere into a job designed for me specifically
- 88 Other (*Please explain.*) [BOX APPEARS]

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.30 What is your current full-time journalism job at a daily newspaper? *(If you do more than one type of work, check the most appropriate title for your primary duties.)*

- 1 Reporter (GO TO 31)
- 2 Editor (GO TO 33)
- 3 Columnist (GO TO 35a)
- 4 Copy Editor (GO TO 34)
- 5 Page Designer (GO TO 35)
- 88 Other *(Please explain.)* [BOX APPEARS] (GO TO 36)

Q.31 Are you a beat reporter who regularly covers a set topic or area, or do you cover a wide variety of things (i.e. general assignment)?

- 1 Beat reporter (GO TO 32)
- 2 General assignment reporter (GO TO 36.)
- 88 Other *(Please explain.)* [BOX APPEARS] (GO TO 36.)

Q.32 What beat(s) do you cover? Please check all that apply.
(GO TO Q.36.)

- 1 Crime and/or courts
- 2 Local government
- 3 State or national government
- 4 Education/schools
- 5 Business
- 6 Sports
- 7 Lifestyle/culture/arts
- 8 Environment/science/medicine
- 9 A geographic area
- 88 Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN)

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.33 What level of editor are you in your current full-time newspaper job?
(GO TO Q.36.)

- 1 The paper's sole editor
- 2 Executive editor
- 3 Managing editor
- 4 Assistant-managing editor
- 5 Head of a section or department (e.g. sports editor, business editor)
- 6 Supervisor of other editors, but not the head of a section or department
- 7 Lower level line editor directly supervising reporters, but not the head of a section or department
- 88 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)

Q.34 What level of copy editor are you in your current full-time newspaper job?
(GO TO Q.36.)

- 1 The paper's sole copy editor
- 2 Manager of all other copy editors
- 3 Lead copy editor for a section or department
- 4 Supervisory copy editor, overseeing other copy editors, but in charge of a section or department
- 5 Lower level copy editor working directly on copy, but not in charge of a section or department
- 88 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)

Q.35 What level of page designer are you in your current full-time newspaper job?
(GO TO Q.36.)

- 1 The paper's sole page designer
- 2 Manager of all other page designers
- 3 Lead page designer for a section or department
- 4 Supervisory designer, overseeing other designers, but not in charge of a section or department
- 5 Lower level page designer, working on pages directly, but not in charge of a section or department
- 88 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.35a For what section are you a columnist?

- 1 Editorial Page/Section
- 2 Sports
- 3 Features/Arts
- 4 News/Metro/Politics
- 88 Other (*Please explain.*) [BOX APPEARS]

Q.35b How often does your column run?

- 1 Less than once a week
- 2 Once a week
- 3 Twice a week
- 4 Three or more times a week
- 88 Other (*Please explain.*) [BOX APPEARS]

Q.36 Since taking your first full-time job at a daily newspaper, have you ever taken a break from working at DAILY NEWSPAPERS?

- 1 Yes (GO TO 36)
- 2 No (GO TO 38)

Q.36a How many voluntary breaks have you taken from full-time daily newspaper journalism?

- 1 One (Go to 36b)
- 2 Two (Go to 36c)
- 3 Three or more (Go to 36c)

Q36b How long were you out of daily journalism? (GO TO 37)

- 1 Less than six months
- 2 Six months to less than a year
- 3 One year to less than three years
- 4 Three years or longer

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.36c Thinking about your longest break, how long were you out of daily journalism?
(GO TO 37)

- 1 Less than six months
- 2 Six months to less than a year
- 3 One year to less than three years
- 4 Three years or longer

Q.37 Did you ever take a break from daily journalism primarily for any of the following reasons? (*Please check "yes" for all that apply.*)

- | | <u>Y</u> | <u>N</u> | |
|----|----------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. | | | To take a job in journalism that was NOT at a daily newspaper |
| b. | | | To take a job in a field OUTSIDE of journalism |
| c. | | | To return to school |
| d. | | | To care for a child |
| e. | | | To care for a family member other than a child |

The second section of the survey asks you to think back to your education and preparation for a career in journalism.

ASK ALL

Q.38 What is the highest level of schooling you had completed PRIOR to starting your first daily newspaper job?

- 1 Some High School (GO TO 40)
- 2 High School Diploma (GO TO 40)
- 3 Some College (GO TO 40)
- 4 Bachelor's Degree (GO TO 39c1)
- 5 Some Graduate School (GO TO 39c1)
- 6 Master's Degree/Professional Degree (GO TO 39b1)
- 7 Doctorate (GO TO 39a1)

APPENDIX A (continued).

ONLY ASKED OF THOSE WITH DOCTORATES:

Q.39 a1 In what field did you receive your doctorate?

- 1 Communications/Journalism
- 2 English
- 3 Political Science
- 4 Sociology
- 5 Psychology
- 6 Economics/Business
- 88 Other (*Please specify.*) [BOX APPEARS]

a2 In what year did you complete your doctorate? (OE: FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX) **[INSERT "YYYY" NEXT TO BOX TO MAKE FOUR-DIGIT YEAR REQUIREMENT CLEAR]** (GO TO 40)

ONLY ASKED OF THOSE WITH MA/MS/PROFESSIONAL DEGREES:

b1 In what field did you receive your master's or professional degree?

- 1 Communications/Journalism
- 2 English
- 3 Political Science
- 4 Sociology
- 5 Psychology
- 6 Economics/Business
- 88 Other (*Please specify.*) [BOX APPEARS]

b2 In what year did you complete your master's or professional degree? (OE: FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX) (GO TO 40)

ONLY ASKED OF THOSE WITH BA/BS DEGREES:

c1 In what field did you receive your bachelor's degree?

- 1 Communications/Journalism
- 2 English
- 3 Political Science
- 4 Sociology
- 5 Psychology
- 6 Economics/Business
- 88 Other (*Please specify.*) [BOX APPEARS]

APPENDIX A (continued).

- c2 In what year did you complete your bachelor's? (OE: FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX) **[INSERT "YYYY" NEXT TO BOX TO MAKE FOUR-DIGIT YEAR REQUIREMENT CLEAR]**
(GO TO 40)

ASK ALL

Q.40 Have you pursued any additional formal education since you began working in daily newspaper journalism?

- 1 Yes (GO TO 41)
- 2 No (GO TO 44)

ONLY ASKED OF THOSE WHO HAVE GOTTEN MORE ED SINCE STARTING WORK:

Q.41 What is the highest level of education you will have completed as of today?

- 1 Some High School (GO TO 44)
- 2 High School Diploma (GO TO 44)
- 3 Some College (GO TO 44)
- 4 Bachelor's Degree (GO TO 42c1)
- 5 Some Graduate School (GO TO 42c1)
- 6 Master's Degree/Professional Degree (GO TO 42b1)
- 7 Doctorate (GO TO 42a1)

ONLY ASKED OF THOSE WHO GOT DOCTORATES SINCE STARTING WORK:

Q.42 a1 In what field did you receive your doctorate?

- 1 Communications/Journalism
- 2 English
- 3 Political Science
- 4 Sociology
- 5 Psychology
- 6 Economics/Business
- 88 Other (*Please specify.*) [BOX APPEARS]

a2 In what year did you complete your doctorate? (OE: FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX) **[INSERT "YYYY" NEXT TO BOX TO MAKE FOUR-DIGIT YEAR REQUIREMENT CLEAR]**
(GO TO 44)

APPENDIX A (continued).

ONLY ASKED OF THOSE WHO GOT MA/MS/PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SINCE STARTING WORK:

b1 In what field did you receive your master's or professional degree?

- 1 Communications/Journalism
- 2 English
- 3 Political Science
- 4 Sociology
- 5 Psychology
- 6 Economics/Business
- 88 Other (*Please specify.*) [BOX APPEARS]

b2 In what year did you complete your master's or professional degree? (OE: FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX) **[INSERT "YYYY" NEXT TO BOX TO MAKE FOUR-DIGIT YEAR REQUIREMENT CLEAR]** (GO TO 44)

ONLY ASKED OF THOSE WHO GOT BA/BS SINCE STARTING WORK:

c1 In what field did you receive your bachelor's degree?

- 1 Communications/Journalism
- 2 English
- 3 Political Science
- 4 Sociology
- 5 Psychology
- 6 Economics/Business
- 88 Other (*Please specify.*) [BOX APPEARS]

c2 In what year did you complete your bachelor's? (OE: FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX) **[INSERT "YYYY" NEXT TO BOX TO MAKE FOUR-DIGIT YEAR REQUIREMENT CLEAR]** (GO TO 44)

NO Q.43

APPENDIX A (continued).

ASK ALL

Q.44 How many journalism internships did you complete prior to taking your first full-time job at a daily newspaper? (*Please count only internships in journalism, not those in public relations, advertising or another field.*)

- 0 None
- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three
- 4 Four
- 5 Five or more

Q.45 How many of those internships were at daily newspapers?

- 0 None
- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three
- 4 Four
- 5 Five or more

Q.46 How many of your journalism internships were unpaid, *meaning you received no money for your work from the news outlet or any organization?*

- 0 None
- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three
- 4 Four
- 5 Five or more

Q.47 was cut

APPENDIX A (continued).

ASK ALL

Q.48 Prior to taking your first full-time job at a daily newspaper...

- a. had you done any freelance reporting, editing, photography or design for a newspaper, magazine, broadcast station, Web site or blog, NOT counting work you may have done for college media outlets?
- b. did you have any full-time work experience in a field OTHER than journalism?
- c. did you have any full-time experience working in journalism OTHER than at a daily newspaper?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q.49 Prior to taking your first full-time job at a daily newspaper, did you belong to any national or local journalism organizations such as, but NOT limited to, the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ), Investigative Reporters & Editors (IRE) or the National Association of Black Journalists (NABJ)?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

NO QUESTIONS 50-96

APPENDIX A (continued).

The third section of the survey asks about how you found your current daily newspaper job.

ASK ALL

Q.97 In the process that led to your getting your current full-time job at a daily newspaper, did you...? (RANDOMIZE ORDER)

Answer choices:

- 1 *A lot*
 - 2 *Some*
 - 3 *Not at all*
-
- a. Use a school placement service
 - b. Respond to help-wanted ads
 - c. Ask relatives in the business for information or help
 - d. Ask friends from school for information or help
 - e. Ask friends from previous jobs or internships for information or help
 - f. Ask former bosses from internships, freelance or other journalism work for information or help
 - g. Ask professors for information or help
 - h. I was assigned to my current job by the newspaper for which I'd already been working (GO TO Q.98)

ASK IF Q.97 DOES NOT EQUAL h:

Q.97a Which ONE of these methods do you think was most effective?
(RANDOMIZE ORDER)

- a. Using a school placement service
- b. Responding to help-wanted ads
- c. Asking relatives in the business for information or help
- d. Asking friends from school for information or help
- e. Asking friends from previous jobs or internships for information or help
- f. Asking former bosses from internships, freelance or other journalism work for information or help
- g. Asking professors for information or help

ASK IF Q.97A IS ANSWERED:

Q.97b Why do you think this method was most effective? Please explain in detail. (OE BOX)

NOTE: Because of a programming problem, Q.97, Q.97a and Q97.b are unusable.

APPENDIX A (continued).

ASK ALL:

Q.98 How did you learn about the newspaper position you now have? *Check all that apply.* (RANDOMIZE ORDER)

- 1 Heard about it from a relative
- 2 Heard about it from a friend or acquaintance
- 3 Heard about it from an internship boss or colleague
- 4 Saw it listed in a help-wanted ad in print or online
- 5 Heard about it from a school placement office
- 6 Heard about it from a recruiter
- 7 Just approached the newspaper looking for work and got hired
- 8 Heard about it from a boss or colleague from a previous job
- 9 Other (please explain)
- 99 Don't remember

Q.99 How important do you think each of these factors was in your getting your current newspaper job? *Very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important?* (RANDOMIZE ORDER)

- a. The amount of formal education I had
- b. The topics/major I studied in school
- c. The prestige of the school(s) I attended
- d. My internship experience
- e. My skills (e.g. second language or computer-mapping proficiency)
- f. My journalism work experience outside of daily newspapers
- g. My work experience outside of journalism
- h. My family relationship(s) with journalist(s)
- i. My friendship(s) with journalist(s)
- j. My job-search strategy (*Please explain*) [BOX APPEARS.]
- k. My daily journalism experience

- 1 Very important
- 2 Somewhat important
- 3 Not very important
- 4 Not at all important

TEXT FOR BOX IF j=1, 2:

If you checked "very important" or "somewhat important" for *my job-search strategy*, please explain your strategy.

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.100 In searching for your current full-time job at a daily newspaper, did you every do anything unusual, or “unorthodox” to draw attention to your interest in a job?

- 1 Yes (GO TO 101)
- 2 No (GO TO 103)
- 3 I didn't really “search” for my job. (GO TO 103)

ASK ONLY THOSE WHO ANSWERED YES TO QUESTION 100:

Q.101 What did you do? (*Please describe in detail.*) [BOX APPEARS]

Q.102 Did this approach help lead to your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

The next set of questions deals with people you would have known in the period just before you landed your current full-time daily journalism job.

Q.103 At the time you got your current job, did you know any...

- a1. Junior level daily-newspaper reporters? YES NO
- b1. Senior level daily-newspaper reporters? YES NO
- c1. Junior level daily-newspaper editors? YES NO
- d1. Senior level daily-newspaper editors? YES NO
- g1. Journalism professors? YES NO

APPENDIX A (continued).

ASK ONLY THOSE WHO KNOW AT LEAST ONE JUNIOR-LEVEL DAILY NEWSPAPER REPORTER:

If a1. is yes...

a2. How many junior-level daily newspaper reporters did you know?

- 1 One
- 2 2 to 5
- 3 6 to 10
- 4 11-20
- 5 21 or more

a3. and a4. cut.

a5. Did the junior-level daily newspaper reporter(s)...

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

- aa. Provide general advice about how to approach the job search and/or review your resume, cover letter or clips
- bb. Provide information about a job opening
- cc. Provide specific advice about how to impress a particular editor or newspaper
- dd. Put in a "good word" for you to someone at a newspaper
- ee. Offer you a job himself or herself
- ff. Other (*Please describe.*) [BOX APPEARS]

a6. As far as you know, did the efforts of the junior-level daily newspaper reporter(s) help you get your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

a7. Did (any of) the junior-level daily newspaper reporter(s) work at the paper at which you got your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

APPENDIX A (continued).

ONLY ASKED OF THOSE WHO KNEW AT LEAST ONE SENIOR-LEVEL DAILY NEWSPAPER REPORTER:

If b1 is yes...

b2. How many senior-level daily newspaper reporters did you know?

- 1 One
- 2 2 to 5
- 3 6 to 10
- 4 11-20
- 5 21 or more

b3. and b4. cut.

b5. Did the senior-level daily newspaper reporter(s)...

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

- aa. Provide general advice about how to approach the job search and/or review your resume, cover letter or clips
- bb. Provide information about a job opening
- cc. Provide specific advice about how to impress a particular editor or newspaper
- dd. Put in a "good word" for you to someone at a newspaper
- ee. Offer you a job himself or herself
- ff. Other (*Please describe.*) [BOX APPEARS]

b6. As far as you know, did the efforts of the senior-level daily newspaper reporter(s) help you get your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

b7. Did (any of) the senior-level daily newspaper reporter(s) people work at the paper at which you got your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

APPENDIX A (continued).

ONLY ASKED OF THOSE WHO KNEW AT LEAST ONE JUNIOR-LEVEL DAILY NEWSPAPER EDITOR:

If c1 is yes...

c2. How many junior-level daily newspaper editors did you know?

- 1 One
- 2 2 to 5
- 3 6 to 10
- 4 11-20
- 5 21 or more

c3. and c4. cut.

c5. Did the junior-level daily newspaper editor(s)...

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

- aa. Provide general advice about how to approach the job search and/or review your resume, cover letter or clips
- bb. Provide information about a job opening
- cc. Provide specific advice about how to impress a particular editor or newspaper
- dd. Put in a "good word" for you to someone at a newspaper
- ee. Offer you a job himself or herself
- ff. Other (*Please describe.*) [BOX APPEARS]

c6. As far as you know, did the efforts of the junior-level daily newspaper editor(s) help you get your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

c7. Did (any of) the junior-level daily newspaper editor(s) work at the paper at which you got your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

APPENDIX A (continued).

ASK ONLY THOSE WHO KNOW AT LEAST ONE SENIOR-LEVEL NEWSPAPER EDITOR:

If d1 is greater than 0...

d2. How many senior-level daily newspaper editors did you know?

- 1 One
- 2 2 to 5
- 3 6 to 10
- 4 11-20
- 5 21 or more

d3. and d4. cut.

d5. Did the senior-level daily newspaper editor(s)...

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

- aa. Provide general advice about how to approach the job search and/or review your resume, cover letter or clips
- bb. Provide information about a job opening
- cc. Provide specific advice about how to impress a particular editor or newspaper
- dd. Put in a "good word" for you to someone at a newspaper
- ee. Offer you a job himself or herself
- ff. Other (*Please describe.*) [BOX APPEARS]

d6. As far as you know, did the efforts of the senior-level daily newspaper editor(s) help you get your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

d7. Did (any of) the senior-level daily newspaper editor(s) work at the paper at which you got your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

E AND F SERIES HAVE BEEN CUT

APPENDIX A (continued).

ASK ONLY THOSE WHO KNOW AT LEAST ONE JOURNALISM PROFESSOR:

If g1 is yes...

g2. How many journalism professors did you know?

- 1 One
- 2 2 to 5
- 3 6 to 10
- 4 11 to 20
- 5 21 or more

g3. Had (any of) the journalism professor(s) ever been a journalist?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

g4. and g5. cut.

g6. Did the journalism professor(s)...

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

- aa. Provide general advice about how to approach the job search and/or review your resume, cover letter or clips
- bb. Provide information about a job opening
- cc. Provide specific advice about how to impress a particular editor or newspaper
- dd. Put in a "good word" for you to someone at a newspaper
- ee. Offer you a job himself or herself
- ff. Other (*Please describe.*) [BOX APPEARS]

g7. As far as you know, did the efforts of the journalism professor(s) help you get current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

g8. Had (any of) the professor(s) worked at the paper at which you got your current newspaper job?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.104 This year, in your current job, about how much do you expect to earn? (*Please just enter a dollar figure—do not try to account for inflation.*) [BOX APPEARS] [IS IT POSSIBLE FOR THIS TO BE SIX BOXES, WITH THE COMMA AND DOLLAR SIGN WHERE THEY'D BELONG???

Q.105 Right now, in your current job, how much autonomy—control over what you do and how you do it—would you say have? *Please rate the level of autonomy on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating no autonomy and 7 indicating a lot of autonomy.* (RADIO BUTTONS SHOWING SCALE WILL BE DISPLAYED.)

Q.106 Compared with other journalists in your newsroom, how much autonomy do you have? Would you say you have...

- 1 Much more autonomy
- 2 Somewhat more autonomy
- 3 About the same amount of autonomy
- 4 Somewhat less autonomy
- 5 Much less autonomy

Q.107 CUT.

Q.108 Compared with journalists at other U.S. daily newspapers, how much autonomy do you have? Would you say you have...

- 1 Much more autonomy
- 2 Somewhat more autonomy
- 3 About the same amount of autonomy
- 4 Somewhat less autonomy
- 5 Much less autonomy

Q.109 Overall, how much does your current job allow you to develop new skills? *Please rate the level of skill development your current job offers on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating no opportunity for skill development and 7 indicating a lot of opportunity for skill development.* (RADIO BUTTONS SHOWING SCALE WILL BE DISPLAYED.)

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.110 How would the amount of skill development your current job offers compare with the amount of skill development other journalists in your newsroom are offered? Would you say you have...

- 1 Much more opportunity for skill development
- 2 Somewhat more opportunity for skill development
- 3 About the same amount opportunity for skill development
- 4 Somewhat less opportunity for skill development
- 5 Much less opportunity for skill development

Q.111 How would the amount of skill development your current job offers compare with the amount of skill development journalists at other U.S. dailies are offered? Would you say you have...

- 1 Much more opportunity
- 2 Somewhat more opportunity for skill development
- 3 About the same amount opportunity for skill development
- 4 Somewhat less opportunity for skill development
- 5 Much less opportunity for skill development

Q.112 Think about the resources that help journalists do their jobs—time to work on stories, access to databases, funding for travel, etc. How much does your current job offer in terms of resources? *On a 1 to 7 scale, with 1 indicating that your current job offers no resources and 7 indicating your job offers abundant resources, please rate your job's provision of resources.* (RADIO BUTTONS SHOWING SCALE WILL BE DISPLAYED.)

Q.113 Overall, how would the resources you have in your current job compare with the resources other journalists in your newsroom have? Would you say you have...

- 1 Much more access to resources
- 2 Somewhat more access to resources
- 3 About the same access to resources
- 4 Somewhat less access to resources
- 5 Much less access to resources

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.114 Overall, how would the resources you have in your current job compare with the resources journalists at other U.S. dailies have? Would you say you have...

- 1 Much more access to resources
- 2 Somewhat more access to resources
- 3 About the same access to resources
- 4 Somewhat less access to resources
- 5 Much less access to resources

Q.115 Some jobs provide a lot of opportunity to make many new social contacts, while others provide minimal opportunity to make new contacts. How much opportunity does your current job give you to make contact with other journalists in and out of your paper who could be helpful to you in building a career? *On a 1 to 7 scale, on which 1 means your job gives you no opportunity to meet journalists who could help you build a career and 7 means your job gives you a lot of opportunity to meet journalists who could help you build a career, please rate your current job.* (RADIO BUTTONS SHOWING SCALE WILL BE DISPLAYED.)

Q.116 How much opportunity does your current job give you to make new contacts in journalism, compared with other journalists in your newsroom? Would you say you have...

- 1 Much more opportunity to make new contacts
- 2 Somewhat more opportunity to make new contacts
- 3 About the same opportunity to make new contacts
- 4 Somewhat less opportunity to make new contacts
- 5 Much less opportunity to make new contacts

Q.117 How much opportunity does your current job give you to make new contacts in journalism, compared with journalists at other U.S. dailies? Would you say you have...

- 1 Much more opportunity to make new contacts
- 2 Somewhat more opportunity to make new contacts
- 3 About the same opportunity to make new contacts
- 4 Somewhat less opportunity to make new contacts
- 5 Much less opportunity to make new contacts

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.118 How has your current job met your expectations? Overall, is it:

- 1 Better than you expected
- 2 Pretty much what you expected
- 3 Worse than you expected

No questions 119-122.

Q.123 Thinking of your current full-time job in daily newspaper journalism, would you say your position is:

- 1 More prestigious than most positions in your newsroom
- 2 Of about average prestige in your newsroom
- 3 Less prestigious than most of the positions in your newsroom

Q.124 Compared with jobs at all daily newspapers, would you say your current full-time job in daily newspaper journalism is:

- 1 More prestigious than most positions at daily newspapers in the U.S.
- 2 Of about average prestige at daily newspapers in the U.S.
- 3 Less prestigious than most positions at daily newspapers in the U.S.

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

Q.125 Thinking back to your first full-time job in journalism at a daily newspaper, how much autonomy—control over what you did and how you did it—would you say had? *Please rate the level of autonomy on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating no autonomy and 7 indicating a lot of autonomy.* (RADIO BUTTONS SHOWING SCALE WILL BE DISPLAYED.)

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

Q.126 Overall, how much did your first daily newspaper job allow you to develop new skills? *Please rate the level of skill development your first job offered on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating no opportunity for skill development and 7 indicating a lot of opportunity for skill development.* (RADIO BUTTONS SHOWING SCALE WILL BE DISPLAYED.)

APPENDIX A (continued).

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

Q.127 Think about the resources that help journalists do their jobs—time to work on stories, access to databases, funding for travel, etc. How much did your first full-time newspaper job offer in terms of resources? *On a 1 to 7 scale, with 1 indicating that your first job offered no resources and 7 indicating your first job offered abundant resources, please rate your job's provision of resources.* (RADIO BUTTONS SHOWING SCALE WILL BE DISPLAYED.)

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

Q.128 Some jobs provide a lot of opportunity to make many new social contacts, while others provide minimal opportunity to make new contacts. How much opportunity did your first daily journalism job give you to make contact with other journalists in and out of your paper who could be helpful to you in building a career? *On a 1 to 7 scale, on which 1 means your first job gave you no opportunity to meet journalists who could help you build a career and 7 means your first job gave you a lot of opportunity to meet journalists who could help you build a career, please rate your first job.* (RADIO BUTTONS SHOWING SCALE WILL BE DISPLAYED.)

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

Q.129 How did your first job meet your expectations? Overall, was it:

- 1 Better than you expected
- 2 Pretty much what you expected
- 3 Worse than you expected

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

Q.130 Thinking of your first full-time job in daily newspaper journalism, would you say your position was:

- 1 More prestigious than most positions in your newsroom at that time
- 2 Of about average prestige in your newsroom at that time
- 3 Less prestigious than most of the positions in your newsroom at that time

APPENDIX A (continued).

IF Q.1 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2 OR Q.2 IS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 2, ASK:

Q.131 Compared with jobs at all daily newspapers, would you say your first full-time job in daily newspaper journalism was:

- 1 More prestigious than most positions at daily newspapers in the U.S. at that time
- 2 Of about average prestige at daily newspapers in the U.S. at that time
- 3 Less prestigious than most positions at daily newspapers in the U.S. at that time

Q.131a Thinking back to the final year of your first job in journalism, about how much did you earn in that year? (*Please just enter a dollar figure—do not try to account for inflation.*) [BOX APPEARS] [IS IT POSSIBLE FOR THIS TO BE SIX BOXES, WITH THE COMMA AND DOLLAR SIGN WHERE THEY'D BELONG???

The fourth section of the survey will deal with skills you may have and experiences you may have had.

ASK ALL

Q132. Other than English, how many languages can you read or speak fluently?

- 0 None
- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three or more

Q.133 Have you ever worked full-time for a wire service?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.134 Please rate your own level of proficiency for the following skills and activities (RANDOMIZE ITEM ORDER):

- a. Interviewing sources
- b. Using the Internet to send and receive e-mail and do basic searches
- c. Writing long-form narratives
- d. Using databases to search for public records such as court filings, records of land transfers and corporate documents
- e. Writing quickly on deadline
- f. Designing graphics for the newspaper (print and/or online)
- g. Editing long-form narratives
- h. Designing newspaper pages for the print paper
- i. Editing quickly on deadline
- j. Shooting video
- k. Shooting still photographs
- l. Editing video
- m. Creating podcasts

- 1 Very proficient
- 2 Somewhat proficient
- 3 Not very proficient
- 4 Not at all proficient

Q.135 As part of your current daily newspaper job, do you write for a blog?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q.136 During your journalism career, how many awards, if any, have you won for your journalism work?

- 0 None (GO TO 138)
- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three
- 4 Four
- 5 Five or more

ASK ONLY THOSE WHO HAVE WON AT LEAST ONE AWARD:

Q.137 In what year did you win your first award? (OE: FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX) **[BOX SHOULD HAVE “YYYY” AFTER IT TO SHOW NEED FOR FOUR-DIGIT YEAR.]**

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.138 How many journalism fellowships have you received?

- 1 None (GO TO 140)
- 2 One
- 3 Two
- 4 Three or more

ASK ONLY THOSE WHO HAVE GOTTEN AT LEAST ONE FELLOWSHIP:

Q.139 In what year did you receive your first fellowship? (OE: FOUR DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX.) **[BOX SHOULD HAVE “YYYY” AFTER IT TO SHOW NEED FOR FOUR-DIGIT YEAR.]**

ASK ALL

Q.140 Please list any journalism organizations to which you currently belong or to which you have belonged in the past. If none, click the box that says “none.” (OE: TO BE ENTERED IN NUMBERED LINES IN BOX or “NONE” box is to be checked.) (IF NONE, GO TO 143.)

Questions 141-143 cut.

Q.144 How many journalism conferences have you ever attended?

- 1 None
- 2 One
- 3 Two to five
- 4 Six to 10
- 5 11 or more

The fifth section of this survey deals with changes in the news business and your thoughts about the future.

Questions 145-146 cut.

ASK ALL

Q.147 Thinking about your duties at your newspaper, do you work...

- 1 exclusively on content for your paper’s print edition
- 2 primarily on content for your paper’s print edition
- 3 on content for the print and Web editions equally
- 4 primarily on content for your paper’s Web site
- 5 exclusively on content for your paper’s Web site

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.148 Has the ownership of your current newspaper changed in the past five years?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q.148a Has the number of newsroom jobs at your current newspaper gone up a lot, gone up a little, stayed the same, gone down a little or gone down a lot over the past five years?

- 1 Gone up a lot
- 2 Gone up a little
- 3 Stayed the same
- 4 Gone down a little
- 5 Gone down a lot

(NOTE: Q149 SHOULD BE ON ITS OWN PAGE.)

Q.149 As you know, the newspaper industry has been undergoing many changes in recent years, related to technology, ownership and financial performance. What **kinds of change** have affected you as a journalist, **and in what ways** have the changes affected you? (OE: BOX APPEARS)

Q.150 Where do you see yourself, professionally speaking, five years from today?

- 1 Working at the same newspaper (GO TO Q.154)
- 2 Working at a different newspaper (GO TO Q.154)
- 3 Working in journalism, but not at a newspaper (GO TO Q.151)
- 4 Working outside of journalism (GO TO Q.152)
- 5 Not working (GO TO Q.154)

ASK THOSE WHO EXPECT TO WORK IN A NON-NEWSPAPER NEWSROOM FIVE YEARS FROM NOW:

Q.151 In what type of newsroom do you see yourself most likely working in five years?
(GO TO 154)

- 1 Online publication
- 2 Personal blog/personal Web site
- 3 Television
- 4 Radio
- 88 Other (*Please specify*)

APPENDIX A (continued).

ASK THOSE WHO EXPECT TO WORK OUTSIDE JOURNALISM FIVE YEARS FROM NOW:

Q.152 What field or industry do you expect to enter in the next five years? (OE: TO BE ENTERED IN BOX.)

ASK THOSE WHO EXPECT TO WORK OUTSIDE JOURNALISM FIVE YEARS FROM NOW:

Q.153 Why do you think you might leave journalism in the next five years? *Please be specific and detailed.* (OE: TO BE ENTERED IN BOX.)

ASK ALL

Q.154 If a young person close to you—for example, your own child, a niece, or nephew—wanted to go into the news business, would you encourage or discourage the young person or remain neutral?

- 1 I would strongly encourage the young person
- 2 I would mildly encourage the young person
- 3 I would remain neutral
- 4 I would mildly discourage the young person
- 5 I would strongly discourage the young person

Q.155 Why would you (encourage/discourage/remain neutral) the young person to enter the news business? (OE: TO BE ENTERED IN BOX.)

Q.155a Given the rise of the Internet, some say traditional journalists have lost their role as the gatekeepers of news and information. Others say that even with the rise of the Internet, journalists still serve as the gatekeepers. Which of these comes closer to your view? (IF NO ANSWER, GO TO 156)

- 1 Journalists have lost their role as news gatekeepers (GO TO 155b)
- 2 Journalists still serve as news gatekeepers (GO TO 155c)

Q.155b How has the loss of the gatekeeper role changed the job of traditional journalists? (OE) (GO TO 156)

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.155c Has the gatekeeper role changed, in light of the rise of the Internet, or has it not changed?

- 1 It has changed (GO TO 155d)
- 2 It has not changed (GO TO 156)

Q.155d In what way(s) has the gatekeeper role changed for traditional journalists? (OE)

The sixth and final section of this survey is about you and your background. These questions are for statistical purposes only; no data will be reported in a way that you can be identified. These questions are VERY IMPORTANT, in that they help us make sure we are representing journalists of all ages, races and genders in this study.

Q.156 Are you...

- 1 Married (Go to 162)
- 2 Not married, but living with a partner (Go to 162)
- 3 Not married and not living with a partner (Go to 165)
- 4 Other (*Please specify*) (GO TO 165)

Q.157 through 161 have been cut.

Q.162 Do you consider...

- 1 Yourself to be the primary wage earner in your household.
- 2 Your spouse or partner to be the primary wage earner in your household.
- 3 You and your spouse or partner to contribute about equally to household finances.

Q.163 through 164 have been cut.

ASK ALL

Q.165 Do you currently have an additional job outside your newspaper job to make extra income?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.166 Which of the following best describes your household's current social class?

- 1 Lower class
- 2 Working class
- 3 Middle class
- 4 Upper middle class
- 5 Upper class

Q.167 How many children have you had, including stepchildren, foster children and adopted children? Include children who are now grown.

- 0 None (GO TO 169)
- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three
- 4 Four
- 5 Five or more

Q.168 In what year was your first child born or adopted? (OE: FOUR-DIGIT YEAR TO BE ENTERED IN BOX.) **[ADD "YYYY" NEXT TO BOX TO MAKE FOUR-YEAR DATE REQUIREMENT CLEAR.]**

Q.169 How many (more) children do you think you might have in the next five years?

- 0 None
- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three
- 4 Four
- 5 Five or more
- 88 Don't know/Not sure

Q.170 Have you ever passed on a career opportunity because of family considerations?

- 1 Yes (Go to 171)
- 2 No (Go to 182)

APPENDIX A (continued).

Q.171 Did this involve turning down a job offer?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Q.172 through Q.181 have been cut.

ASK ALL

Q.182 Thinking about the time when you were 16 years old, compared with American families in general then, where did your family's income fall?

- 1 Far below average
- 2 Below average
- 3 Average
- 4 Above average
- 5 Far above average
- 88 Did not live with family

Q.183 In what year were you born? 19 ____ ____

Q.184 through Q.186 have been cut.

Q187. How would you identify yourself? (Check all that apply)

- 1 African American/Black
- 2 Asian American/Pacific Islander
- 3 Caucasian/White
- 4 Hispanic/Latino
- 5 Native American

Q.188 What is your gender?

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

Table XII, APPENDIX B: Description of Variables

	<i>Description</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Range</i> <i>High</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
Outcome measures					
Logged Pay	The natural log of journalists' self-reported anticipated pay for their newspaper work in 2008 or 2009 (the year they took the survey in; most are 2008).	8.61	14.10	10.91	.45
Autonomy	Self-rating of autonomy, compared with journalists at other U.S. daily newspapers, with categorical codes 1-5 for having much less, somewhat less, about the same, somewhat more or much more autonomy that journalists at other papers	1	5	3.85	.89
Human capital variables					
Experience	Years of full time professional journalism experience	1	45	20.24	10.10
Education	Current level of education, ordinal, with categorical codes (1-7 for less than high school diploma, high school diploma, some college, bachelor's degree, some graduate education, master's degree, doctorate). Recoded into four dummy variables. Some college or less, served as reference category. Bachelor's degree Some graduate school Master's or more			.62 .10 .19	.48 .30 .40
Internships	Number of journalism internships completed prior to starting first full-time newspaper job. 0-4, 5 or more	0	5(+)	1.02	1.17
Reporting skills	Index. Count of those rating themselves currently highly proficient on five reporting skills (types of research skills, interviewing, writing skills). Each rating counted for one point; this is the case with all three skill indices.	0	5	3.35	1.18
Editing skills	Index. Count of those rating themselves highly proficient in deadline editing and longer narrative editing.	0	2	1.03	.84
Multimedia skills	Index. Count of those rating themselves currently somewhat or very proficient on shooting video, editing video and creating podcasts, plus one point if the journalist contributes to a newspaper blog.	0	3	.48	.80
Tenure with newspaper	Number of years employed with current newspaper.	0	42	13.38	9.50
Access to resources	Self-rating of current access to occupational resources provided by current job, compared with journalists at other U.S. daily newspapers, with categorical codes 1-5 for having much less, somewhat less, about the same, somewhat more or much more autonomy that journalists at other papers	1	5	2.71	1.02

APPENDIX B (continued).

	<i>Description</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
Knew 2-10 junior reporters	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 2-10 junior reporters at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 or 1 serves as reference category.)	.44	.50
Knew 11 or more junior reporters	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 11 or more junior reporters at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 or 1 serves as reference category.)	.40	.49
Knew 2-10 senior reporters	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 2-10 senior reporters at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 or 1 serves as reference category.)	.46	.50
Knew 11 or more senior reporters	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 11 or more senior reporters at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 or 1 serves as reference category.)	.31	.46
Knew 1 junior editor	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 1 junior editor at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 serves as reference category.)	.12	.32
Knew 2-5 junior editors	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 2-5 junior editors at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 serves as reference category.)	.38	.49
Knew 6+ junior editors	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 6 junior editors at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 serves as reference category.)	.30	.46
Knew 1 senior editor	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 1 senior editor at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 serves as reference category.)	.13	.34
Knew 2-5 senior editors	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 2-5 senior editors at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 serves as reference category.)	.39	.49
Knew 6+ senior editors	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist knew 6 senior editors at the time he or she got his or her current job. (Having known 0 serves as reference category.)	.27	.45

APPENDIX B (continued).

Race and gender	Description	Range		Mean	S.D.
		Low	High		
Race	Race dummy in which 1=white and 0=non-white. White includes only those whose sole answer to the race-ethnicity question was white.			.86	.35
Gender	Gender dummy in which 1=male and 0=female.			.61	.49
Controls					
Parent	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist is currently a parent			.60	.49
Journalism organizations	Dummy variable that indicates whether or not a journalist is or ever has been a member of a journalism organization			.62	.49
Number of conferences attended	Categorical variable (codes 1-5) that indicates how many journalism conferences a journalist has attended.	1	5	3.14	1.15
Low-level editor	Dummy variable that indicates whether a journalist is currently a low-level editor, meaning he or she edits reporters' copy or supervises some other editors but is not the head of a department (e.g. sports, features). For all positions, "reporter" serves as the reference category.			.08	.27
Mid-level editor	Dummy variable that indicates whether a journalist is currently a mid-level editor, meaning he or she is. a department head.			.19	.40
High-level editor	Dummy variable that indicates whether a journalist is currently a high-level editor, meaning he or she is an assistant managing editor, managing editor, executive editor or the sole editor of the newspaper.			.10	.30
Columnist	Dummy variable that indicates whether a journalist is currently a columnist.			.07	.25
Entered field 2002+	Dummy variable that indicates whether a journalist took his or her first full-time daily newspaper journalism job in 2002 or later. (In the current downturn, this is the first year of declining newsroom employment.)			.14	.35
Staff down a little	Dummy variable that indicates newsroom jobs at a journalist's paper have declined a little over the past five year. (No change or an increase of a little or a lot serves are the reference.)			.27	.44
Staff down a lot	Dummy variable that indicates newsroom jobs at a journalist's paper have declined a lot over the past five years. (No change or an increase of a little or a lot serves are the reference.)			.63	.48

APPENDIX B (continued).

		<i>Range</i>		<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
		<i>High</i>	<i>Low</i>		
Circulation	Circulation quartile breaks are approximate and represent the percentage of the workforce in each quartile, not the percentage of papers. First quartile: Circulation of less than 27,500 (23%). Second quartile: Circulation of 27,500-77,499 (27%). Third quartile: Circulation of 77,500-199,999 (24%). Fourth quartile: circulation of 200,000 or more (27%).	1	4	2.54	1.11

N=879 cases used in both logged pay and autonomy analyses.

In all cases in which ordinal variables are used, the simple dummy codes are used in analysis. Early on, analysis was done to determine whether it would be better to use midpoints of each category. It made no substantive difference, so codes were used for convenience.

APPENDIX C: Zero-order correlations among variables, with two-tailed significance

Key to variables:

- 1 Logged Pay
- 2 Autonomy
- 3 Circulation
- 4 Experience
- 5 Internships
- 6 Access to resources
- 7 Reporting skills
- 8 Editing skills
- 9 Multimedia skills
- 10 Education level: Bachelor's degree
- 11 Education level: Some graduate school
- 12 Education level: Master's degree or more
- 13 Tenure at newspaper
- 14 Knew 2-10 junior reporters at time just before getting current job
- 15 Knew 11 or more junior reporters
- 16 Knew 2-10 senior reporters
- 17 Knew 11 or more senior reporters
- 18 Knew 1 junior editor
- 19 Knew 2-5 junior editors
- 20 Knew 6 or more junior editors
- 21 Knew 1 senior editor
- 22 Knew 2-5 senior editors
- 23 Knew 6 or more senior editors
- 24 Number of journalism conferences ever attended
- 25 Currently/ever belong(ed) to any journalism organization(s)
- 26 Male
- 27 White
- 28 Parent
- 29 Entered professional journalism in 2002 or later
- 30 Low-level editor
- 31 Mid-level editor
- 32 High-level editor
- 33 Columnist
- 34 Staff size has gone down a little over past five years
- 35 Staff has gone down a lot

Chart on subsequent pages shows zero-order correlations, with 2-tailed significance below.

Based on 879 respondents in both models.

Table XIII, APPENDIX C (continued.)

[illegible]

Appendix C (continued).

	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
1	-.18 .00	-.05 .14	.37 .00	-.19 .00	-.04 .28	.33 .00	.19 .00	.14 .00	.18 .00	-.05 .14	.25 .00	-.35 .00	.17 .00	-.04 .23	.19 .00	.14 .00	-.15 .00	.24 .00
2	-.03 .32	-.05 .16	.11 .00	-.05 .14	-.01 .70	.08 .02	.06 .08	-.02 .60	.12 .00	.06 .09	.05 .11	-.07 .05	-.01 .89	.05 .15	.02 .48	.15 .00	-.06 .09	.00 .92
3	-.12 .00	-.05 .15	.26 .00	-.15 .00	-.06 .07	.26 .00	-.03 .43	.10 .01	.02 .57	-.17 .00	.03 .40	-.08 .01	.19 .00	-.22 .00	-.21 .00	.13 .00	-.22 .00	.33 .00
4	-.17 .00	.02 .60	.21 .00	-.07 .05	-.03 .45	.18 .00	.31 .00	.08 .02	.20 .00	.19 .00	.40 .00	-.58 .00	.07 .06	.01 .70	.14 .00	.14 .00	-.05 .11	.09 .01
5	.03 .42	.03 .46	.03 .35	-.01 .78	.07 .03	.04 .23	.01 .81	.14 .00	-.07 .04	-.25 .00	-.21 .00	.23 .00	.00 .95	-.10 .00	-.03 .35	-.03 .35	.05 .16	.01 .89
6	-.11 .00	-.03 .44	.19 .00	-.09 .01	.01 .77	.14 .00	.07 .03	.09 .01	.12 .00	-.04 .20	.08 .02	-.04 .20	-.09 .01	-.08 .02	-.05 .17	.04 .21	-.00 .94	.01 .73
7	-.01 .68	.02 .64	.08 .02	.01 .73	-.04 .24	.12 .00	.11 .00	.05 .15	-.05 .17	-.02 .54	.05 .15	-.02 .64	-.17 .00	-.13 .00	-.06 .10	.06 .08	-.05 .16	.05 .14
8	-.06 .09	-.05 .11	.14 .00	-.04 .24	-.04 .26	.12 .00	.14 .00	.02 .49	-.05 .18	.05 .13	.17 .00	-.17 .00	.15 .00	.23 .00	.21 .00	-.02 .52	.00 .99	-.02 .57
9	.03 .32	.03 .31	-.07 .06	.02 .51	-.03 .38	-.04 .23	-.03 .40	.00 .90	-.02 .56	-.16 .00	.13 .00	.19 .00	-.06 .07	.00 .91	-.04 .29	.06 .08	.03 .39	-.04 .22
10	.06 .07	.03 .33	-.08 .02	.08 .01	-.03 .39	-.03 .41	-.05 .13	-.06 .09	.01 .70	-.01 .87	-.08 .02	.10 .00	.01 .79	.01 .83	.02 .52	-.08 .01	.01 .76	-.01 .84
11	-.02 .62	-.02 .60	.03 .36	-.03 .33	.03 .35	-.03 .39	.09 .01	.09 .01	.01 .87	-.01 .87	.04 .28	-.12 .00	.02 .51	.05 .12	.03 .31	.04 .23	.03 .35	-.03 .41
12	-.04 .20	.01 .88	.03 .43	-.07 .03	.00 .91	.04 .29	.02 .62	.05 .12	-.05 .11	-.02 .58	-.01 .85	-.00 .84	-.02 .53	-.08 .02	-.06 .07	.04 .29	-.04 .24	.07 .04
13	-.06 .06	-.01 .87	.04 .27	.00 .99	-.02 .62	-.00 .96	.15 .00	-.10 .77	.11 .00	.16 .00	.32 .00	-.45 .00	.02 .48	.04 .24	.02 .48	.16 .00	-.02 .62	.04 .19
14	.21 .00	.34 .00	-.35 .00	.16 .00	.17 .00	-.24 .00	-.10 .00	-.01 .67	-.04 .24	.01 .72	-.03 .41	.04 .26	-.05 .15	-.04 .27	.00 .95	-.01 .81	.05 .15	-.20 .57
15	-.18 .00	-.13 .00	.58 .00	-.18 .00	.01 .78	.43 .00	.18 .00	.09 .01	.12 .00	-.05 .13	.05 .15	-.17 .00	.10 .00	-.00 .90	.04 .22	.04 .30	-.08 .01	.09 .01
16	.14 .00	.40 .00	-.30 .00	.18 .00	.44 .00	-.37 .00	-.04 .21	-.04 .23	-.05 .13	-.01 .73	-.03 .32	.05 .15	-.01 .77	.02 .58	-.02 .58	.02 .61	.09 .01	-.06 .10
17	-.24 .00	-.18 .00	.62 .00	-.24 .00	-.18 .00	.69 .00	.19 .00	.11 .00	.11 .00	-.00 .98	.09 .01	-.18 .00	.07 .04	-.04 .26	.05 .15	.04 .25	-.10 .00	.12 .00

APPENDIX C (continued).

[illegible]

APPENDIX D: Initial IRB Approval for Research

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO

Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS)
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research (MC 672)
203 Administrative Office Building
1737 West Polk Street
Chicago, Illinois 60612-7227

Approval Notice Initial Review (Response To Modifications)

November 19, 2007

Shawn Neidorf, BS
Sociology
1007 W Harrison St
M/C 312
Chicago, IL 60612
Phone: (708) 261-9156 / Fax: (312) 996-5104

RE: **Protocol # 2007-0813**
“Working on Deadline: A Study of the Careers of Journalists at U.S. Daily Newspapers”

Dear Mr. Neidorf:

Your Initial Review application (Response To Modifications) was reviewed and approved by the Expedited review process on November 15, 2007. You may now begin your research.

Please note the following information about your approved research protocol:

<u>Protocol Approval Period:</u>	November 15, 2007 - November 13, 2008
<u>Approved Subject Enrollment #:</u>	8,000
<u>Additional Determinations for Research Involving Minors:</u> These determinations have not been made for this study since it has not been approved for enrollment of minors.	
<u>Performance Site:</u>	UIC
<u>Sponsor:</u>	NSF.Program: Methodology, Measurement, & Statistics
<u>PAF#:</u>	- Not available
<u>Grant/Contract No:</u>	0726712

APPENDIX D (continued).

Grant/Contract Title: Social Capital/Networks, Human Capital and Career Outcomes in the Newspaper Industry

Research Protocol:

- a) Working on Deadline: A Study of the Careers of Reporters and Editors at US Daily Newspapers

Recruitment Material:

- a) Initial Invitation Letter to be sent by US Mail; Version 2; 11/10/2007

Informed Consents:

- a) Consent Screen; Version 2; 11/10/2007
b) A waiver of signed consent documents has been granted under 45 CFR 46.117 for the online survey

Your research meets the criteria for expedited review as defined in 45 CFR 46.110(b)(1) under the following specific category:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including but not limited to research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Please note the Review History of this submission:

Receipt Date	Submission Type	Review Process	Review Date	Review Action
10/24/2007	Initial Review	Expedited	11/04/2007	Modifications Required
11/13/2007	Response To Modifications	Expedited	11/15/2007	Approved

Please remember to:

→ Use your **research protocol number** (2007-0813) on any documents or correspondence with the IRB concerning your research protocol.

→ Review and comply with all requirements on the enclosure,
"UIC Investigator Responsibilities, Protection of Human Research Subjects"

APPENDIX D (continued).

Please note that the UIC IRB has the prerogative and authority to ask further questions, seek additional information, require further modifications, or monitor the conduct of your research and the consent process.

Please be aware that if the scope of work in the grant/project changes, the protocol must be amended and approved by the UIC IRB before the initiation of the change.

We wish you the best as you conduct your research. If you have any questions or need further help, please contact OPRS at (312) 996-1711 or me at (312) 996-2014. Please send any correspondence about this protocol to OPRS at 203 AOB, M/C 672.

Sincerely,

Sandra Costello
IRB Coordinator, IRB # 2
Office for the Protection of Research Subjects

Enclosures:

- 1. UIC Investigator Responsibilities, Protection of Human Research Subjects**
- 2. Informed Consent Document:**
 - a) Consent Screen; Version 2; 11/10/2007
- 3. Recruiting Material:**
 - a) Initial Invitation Letter to be sent by US Mail; Version 2; 11/10/2007
- 4. Protection of Human Subjects, Assurance Identification/Certification/Declaration (formerly Form 310)**

cc: Moshe Semyonov, Sociology, M/C 312
Maria Krysan, , M/C 312
OVCR Administration, M/C 672

VITA

Shawn M. Neidorf

Education

B.S. (with highest honors) University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Journalism (news-editorial), 1995

M.A. University of Illinois at Chicago
Sociology, with focus on work, labor markets and organizations, 2005

Ph.D. University of Illinois at Chicago
Sociology, with focus on work, labor markets and organizations, 2012
Interdepartmental Graduate Concentration in Survey Methodology also completed

Research Experience and Training

January 2007-present: Research Associate at the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press

May 2005 to May 2006: Research assistant for the UIC College of Education on multi-method data collection and analysis for an evaluation of a Chicago Public Schools effort to broaden the usefulness of schools to their students, parents and neighborhoods through the creation of “community schools”

March 2005 to August 2005: Face-to-face interviewer for the Chicago Area Study concerning housing choice and race

December 2004: Assisted with direction of focus groups and summarized the groups’ discussions for a NIOSH-sponsored study of workplace discrimination conducted at the University of Illinois at Chicago

Teaching Experience

Lecturer for Introduction to Sociology: summer 2006.

Teaching assistant for Introduction to Sociology: fall semester 2003 through spring semester 2005.

Publication and Presentations

Neidorf, Shawn M. “Wanted: A First Job in Journalism—An Exploration of the Factors that May Influence Initial Job-Search Outcomes for News-Editorial Students.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, Spring 2008. Vol. 63(1): 56-65.

May 2010: Second author on “Putting Context Effects in Context: The Variable Effects of Question Order” by Michael Dimock, Shawn Neidorf, Leah Christian and Jacob Poushter, which was presented by Michael Dimock to the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

August 2008: Presented “Still Minding the Gate? Journalists on Whether the Rise of the Internet Imperils Their Gatekeeper Role” to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

August 2005: Presented “Wanted: A First Job in Journalism” to AEJMC.

Neidorf VITA (continued).

Service and Affiliations

August 2009 to August 2010: Served as teaching vice chair of the Media Management and Economics Division of the Association of Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

May 2008 to May 2009: Served as a reviewer for *City & Community*, a journal of the American Sociological Association's Section on Community and Urban Sociology.

August 2005 to August 2007: Served as research chair of AEJMC's Internships and Careers Interest Group.

Professional Affiliations: The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR), the American Sociological Association (ASA), the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) and the International Communication Association (ICA).

Awards and Funding

2008: Third place in the 2008 Jung-Sook Lee student paper competition, sponsored by the Communication Technology Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) for "Still Minding the Gate? Journalists on Whether the Rise of the Internet Imperils Their Gatekeeper Role"

2007: National Science Foundation dissertation improvement grant (#0726712, \$7,492)

1996: Project Censored award for one of the top 25 censored stories of 1995 for an article about suppression of a government review of needle-exchange programs.

1994: Lulu Kelly Nardine Scholarship for excellence in journalistic writing from the University of Illinois College of Communications; inducted into Kappa Tau Alpha.

1993: Trebilcock Award for investigative reporting from the University of Illinois College of Communications and *The Daily Illini* received for a five-part series about 25 years of school desegregation efforts in Champaign, Ill.

1993: Illinois College Press Association third-place award for in-depth/investigative reporting received in May 1993 for a series about high-school overcrowding in Champaign, Ill.

Professional Journalism Experience

January 2000 to August 2003:	<i>San Jose Mercury News</i> (California), reporter
March 1997 to January 2000:	<i>Venture Capital Journal</i> , senior writer/editor in San Francisco
February 1995 to March 1997:	<i>The Union</i> daily newspaper, Grass Valley and Nevada City, Calif., reporter
May 1994 to December 1994:	<i>In These Times</i> magazine (Chicago), intern/freelance writer