

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CONTENT PRODUCTION OF DIASPORIC
MEDIA IN THE U.S

by

JUN XU

(Under the Direction of C. Ann Hollifield)

ABSTRACT

This research utilized the organizational culture perspective to study the content production of the Hispanic-language and Chinese-language diasporic newspapers in the United States. A telephone survey was conducted to illicit cultural values, goals and performances related to their content production. The study found that diasporic media in general shared such goals as serving the non-English-speaking immigrant populations and standing up for the minority. The national/ethnic cultures of diasporic media's home countries were helpful to the understanding of their difference in profit-orientation, perception of media's watchdog role and a number of news selection criteria.

INDEX WORDS: Diasporic media, organizational culture, sociology of news construction

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CONTENT PRODUCTION OF DIASPORIC
MEDIA IN THE U.S

by

JUN XU

Bachelor of Arts, Shanghai International Studies University, China, 2004

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2006

© 2006

Jun Xu

All Rights Reserved

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND CONTENT PRODUCTION OF DIASPORIC
MEDIA IN THE U.S

by

JUN XU

Major Professor: Ann Hollifield

Committee: Hugh Martin
Lee Becker

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2006

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my major professor and thesis committee chair, Dr. Hollifield, for her guidance throughout the project. This thesis would not be a reality without her help. I would also like to thank her for her willingness to listen to my stresses, problems and concerns throughout my experiences as a Master's student. She has been more than just an advisor to me; she is a mentor I deeply respect and admire.

I wish to extend my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Martin and Dr. Becker for their support through the duration of this thesis. Their insightful guidance challenged me to think deeper. They treated my study like their priority and made it possible for me to complete this endeavor without major speed bumps.

To my parents, Zhili Huang and Meifang Xu, and my brother, Liang Huang, thank you so much for all of your love and support throughout my life. You have always been there for me. I love you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGE	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION & LITERATURE REVIEW	1
Introduction	1
Literature Review	6
Research Question	24
2 METHOD	28
3 FINDINGS	33
Profit-Orientation	36
Perception of Advertisers' Values.....	39
Entertainment	41
Government Watchdog Role	42
Localness as Criterion	46
Timeliness as Criterion.....	48
Overview of Media's Roles Perception.....	50
Overview of Ethics Perception.....	52
4 CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION	55
Conclusions	55

Limitations.....	63
REFERENCES	66
APPENDIX.....	75

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Spanish & Chinese Newspapers by Dailies & Weeklies.....	33
Table 2: Dailies & Weeklies	33
Table 3: Dailies & Weeklies by Ownership	34
Table 4: Public vs. Private Companies	34
Table 5: Group-owned vs. Independent Companies.....	35
Table 6: Ownership by Language.....	36
Table 7: Relationship between Ownership & Profit Orientation.....	37
Table 8: Most Important Goal.....	37
Table 9: Relationship between Audience Culture & Profit Orientation.....	39
Table 10: Relationship between Ownership & Perception of Advertisers' Value	40
Table 11: Comparison of Advertisers' Influences by Ownership	41
Table 12: Relationship between Ownership & Entertainment Role.....	42
Table 13: Relationship between Audience Culture & Entertainment Role	42
Table 14: Relationship between Audience Culture & Government Watchdog Role	43
Table 15: Relationship between Audience Culture & Adversary Role	44
Table 16: Relationship between Ownership & Adversary Role.....	45
Table 17: Relationship between Ownership & Proximity of Content	46
Table 18: Relationship between Audience Culture & Proximity of Content	47
Table 19: Most Important Goal by Ownership.....	48

Table 20: Relationship between Ownership & Timeliness of Content.....	49
Table 21: Relationship between Audience Culture & Timeliness.....	50
Table 22: Media’s Roles Rated as Very Important.....	51
Table 23: Approval Rates of Ethics	52
Table 24: Approval Rates of Ethics by language.....	53
Table 25: Ethics by Ownership.....	54

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In the present-day world of globalization, population flow has become commonplace. The United Nations Population Division estimates the migrant population in 2005 at between 185 and 192 million people worldwide – up from 175 million in 2000 (United Nations International Organization for Migration, 2005). The visibility of the migrant population in highly industrialized countries is much greater than the average. The U.S 2000 census shows a foreign-born population of more than 30 million in the United States, approximately 10% of the total U.S population (U.S Census Bureau, 2000), and around one-sixth of the world's total migrant population.

Notions like transnationalism, Diasporas and hybrid identity have been explored as products of the geographic displacement of populations. Whether referred to as diasporic, migrant or expatriate population, these people share some common characteristics according to migration scholars. One prominent characteristic is a strong shared identity (Ang, 2001; Cohen, 1997; Safran, 1991). The shared identity among a given diasporic community is oriented towards the home country. Host countries are viewed in a different light. In their host countries, diasporic groups have “a homing desire which is not the same thing as desires for ‘homeland’” (Brah, 1996, p.182).

The phenomenon of migration has been studied in the realms of sociology, economics and demography (King & Wood, 2001). It was not until recently that the significance of mass media in relation to migration was made explicit. Studies tapping into the media of the Diasporas from a functional perspective have raised the issue of the specific needs not met by most mainstream national media of host countries due to the distinctiveness of diasporic experiences (Greenberg et al., 1983; LaRuffa, 1982; Lee, 1981; Wilson & Gutierrez, 1985). Specifically, mainstream national media either tend to overlook or assimilate immigrants. Ogan (2001) conducted a study about Turkish migrants' media use in Amsterdam in relation to their diasporic identity. According to Ogan's survey, migrants regard mainstream host country media as inadequate because of the "lack of producers and presenters of content who represent the group; lack of content that addresses the needs and interests of the groups; and portrayal of the group as the 'other, rather than as included in the majority or welcoming their minority views in the community or nation (p.75)."

Media niches have developed to serve displaced communities. Diasporic people had a wide array of media available to them, including host-country media, media transmitted from home countries, and media produced by migrant communities, and foreign-language media produced by both domestic and home-country media owners. The media of the diasporas – niche media specifically targeting migrant populations – are believed to play the role of disseminating information in a group's native language, connecting its members to their homeland and very importantly, helping them evaluate culturally different worlds and build an identity (de Santis,

2003; Gillespre, 1995; Naficy, 2003; Ogan, 2001; Riggins, 1992; Sinclare et al, 2001; Tsagarousianou, 2001).

It is hard to give a close estimate of the number of diasporic media in the U.S. These media are seen almost everywhere, especially in cities with large immigrant populations. Spanish-language media, for instance, are especially numerous and successful in the growing market resulting from Hispanic population growth in the U.S. (Albonneti & Dominguez, 1989; Downing, 1992; Greenberg et al., 1983). The first U.S Spanish-language press was launched in New Orleans in 1808 with *El Misisipi* (Subervi-Velez, 1997). The number of newspaper-type publications increased ever since and reached more than 380 by 1991 (Wilson & Gutierrez, 1985). Now the number has more than tripled in 15 years (Bacon's directory, 2005). Apart from newspapers, there are other publications, television, and radio. Major players in the market include companies such as Grupo Televisa, Univision TV networks, ImpreMedia. All are familiar names. Besides the Hispanic market, opportunities are opening up in other markets as varied and segmented as the languages spoken by the immigrant populations.

Most research to date, however, has looked at the consumption of diasporic media, and generally has found that people prefer to use native-language media (Rosenthal, 1978; Spanish-language market study, 1977). Such preference of consumption was explored and explained in relation to diasporic media's functions as to how they are used by audiences in the surveillance of the new environment and in the process of adaptation where ambivalence of personal and national identification exists (de Santis, 2003; Gillespre, 1995; Naficy, 2003; Ogan, 2001; Riggins, 1992 ; Sinclare et al, 2001; Tsagarousianou, 2001). Diasporic media also help

assimilate immigrant population into the culture of the host country (Black & Leithner, 1987; Hardt, 1989; Zubrzycki, 1958). The availability of diasporic media was also examined as an indicator of diversity in media, or a form of alternative media.

However, little is understood about the production side of diasporic media. Content production of diasporic media is a complex process shaped by various factors. Diasporic media are, first and foremost, media organizations, only with several different characteristics or functions. Like other media organizations, the production of diasporic media is a complex process involving different individuals, agencies and institutions and shaped by various factors. Influences on the production process come from ideological, institutional, organizational and individual levels (McNair, 1998; Shoemaker & Reese, 1991). For instance, these influences include but are not limited to government institutions and society, other business, organizational goals and structures and education of individual journalists. These levels of influences interact and form a cultural mix that shapes the production process of a media organization. In diasporic media, ideological/national, institutional, and organizational, institutional cultures might be expected to vary from those of the mainstream host-country media. If so, these cultural forces would be of particular interest as they interact, overlap and conflict to influence the content of media serving the immigrant sectors of the population.

Organizational culture is an apt perspective in studying the production process of diasporic media. Culture as a concept has been used by anthropologists to refer to customs and rituals that are developed by a society and shared by its members – people's ways of thinking (Morgan, 1986; Schein, 1985). When the notion of culture is applied at the organizational level,

it is still possible to conceive of it as an organization's way of thinking in terms of rules, values and credos that guide behaviors and performances (Bantz, 1997; Kueng, 2000; Ott, 1989; Schein, 1985). Organizational culture has been regarded both as a variable and a metaphor (Schultz, 1995). It also is an important perspective for understanding organizations, media organizations included. Bantz (1990, p.124) said: "In a news organization, an understanding of culture will reveal, for that organization, the way news stories are defined, what constitutes a good or bad reporter, when a reporter is 'doing right' in seeking a story, how deadlines are set, and how the physical 'turf' of the newsroom is divided."

With an effort to understand the production process of diasporic media in the U.S, this study utilizes the organizational culture perspective to relate the process of message creation to the elements of the systems, or different factors of influence. To be more specific, this study explored the relationship between national, organizational, and professional cultures in shaping diasporic media's journalistic behavior. National/ethnic culture was operationalized as the language in which the media was published. Admittedly, culture is a broader concept than language; language is widely recognized to be an essential part and a symbol of culture and ethnicity (Dorian, 1980; Fishman, 1977). Language is more than a means of communication; it becomes a prime ethnic value or cultural object retained from an old ancestry. The language that a group of people speak reflects their culture values. The languages of minorities have long been studied in sociolinguistics as cultural objects. Therefore, for the purposes of comparing diasporic media home-country cultures, language was introduced as a measure for culture. Organizational

culture was operationalized as ownership structure, and professional culture was operationalized as news values, ethics, and priorities.

Organizational culture provides a basis to understand the interaction of different cultural forces and how they affect organizational behavior and performance. Content production is the essential behavior that distinguishes media from other organizations. In diasporic media the combination of cultures may be particularly complex, and previous studies indicate the final product bears distinctive features to satisfy the different needs of diasporic populations. To better understand the content production of diasporic media, this study will discuss national, organizational and professional cultural influences on diasporic media respectively. How these cultural forces interact and affect diasporic media content production could extend the knowledge of the effects of various forms of culture on the production of media content, a subject on which research has been done largely in mainstream mass media organizations. Such research also could help bridge the gap in our knowledge about the relationship between the consumption side of diasporic media and the production side.

Literature Review

Organizational behavior is associated with two basic activities of organizations: goals and decision-making (Weber, 1947; Aldrich, 1979). One of the mechanisms through which organizations define their goals and shape their decisions is through the development of distinct organizational cultures. Organizational goals also influence the formation of organizational cultures. The perspective of organizational culture is the theoretical underpinning of this study.

Organizational Culture Perspective

Organizational culture in a broad sense is defined more or less similarly by scholars. According to Schein (1985), organizational culture is “a pattern of basic assumptions – invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration – that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (p. 9). Also among the most widely cited is Bantz’s (1985) definition: organizational cultures are “patterns of meanings, the expectations that define appropriate action [of its workers], and the relationship between meanings and expectations” (p.126).

Despite certain explicit differences in definitions, many of them share some common grounds around the “goals” and “decision-making” of organizations. First, organizational culture is a pattern of shared assumptions or meanings (Schein, 1985; Schultz, 1995). Second, culture guides the decision-making of an organization and defines its boundary as to what kind of action is appropriate. Third, culture guides that organization towards its goals and has been successful in helping achieve goals in the past.

Scholars also recognize, however, that organizational culture is not a unitary construct or an internally consistent package of manifestations. Rather, it is a mix of forces that interact together within an organization, operating with varying levels of influence on organizational behavior to create an organizational culture that is unique to that particular company (Gregory, 1983; Martin & Frost, 1997). The forces that interact to produce individual organizational

cultures include national/ethnic cultures, the unique internal characteristics of the organization itself, and the various professional cultures that operate within the organization

Knowledge in organizational studies in general has been extended to media organizations by communication scholars. In media organizations, national, organizational level and professional cultures have been recognized as factors of influence on media organizational culture (Breed, 1955; Schein, 2003; Turow, 1997), which in turn guides an organization's behavior such as content production. Media organizational culture studies are focused on different cultural forces and how they translate through a cultural mix into media content. Though not explicitly stated, diasporic media, as one type of media, are subject to the influences of national/ethnic culture, organizational-level culture and professional culture. Unlike other media, however, diasporic media may be subject to the influences of multiple and potentially conflicting national cultures as well as multiple and potentially conflicting professional cultures.

The Social Construction of News Perspective

The study of organizational culture in media organizations parallels the research of the social construction of news – the study of influential factors on media content production. Both perspectives identify similar factors of influences on media organizations and content production.

The sociology of news production puts forth such notions as “gatekeepers” and layers of influential factors, analogous to the different cultural aspects. The formal study of how media organizations produce content dates back to the American studies in the 1950s of news “gatekeepers” by Lewin (1948) and White (1950). Other studies in the same stream included

reasons for reporter's conformity to policies (Breed, 1955) and objectivity as a mechanism against criticism and competition (Tuchman, 1972). Later, researchers expanded the notion to include "gatekeepers" at different levels as they each work in some way to determine what constitute a news story worth reporting. Shoemaker and Reese (1991) constructed their famous layer-on-layer model, identifying factors of influence and organizing them in a hierarchical order. From the most macro to the most micro, these layers are ideological influences, extra-media and national/ethnic influences, organizational factors, news routines and the personal influences of individual journalists. A slightly different model describing the "social determinants of journalistic output" includes such factors as political pressure, professional culture, organizational constraints (deadline pressure for instance) and economic pressure (proprietary demands, markets forces, etc.) (McNair, 1998, p3).

Whatever the terminology, these determinants imply the same levels of influence as the organizational culture perspective. Take Shoemaker and Reeses' model for example, the first two layers – individuals and news routines, can be readily regarded as professional culture, because the facets of individuals and news routines related to news construction are occupational values and guidelines that are actually parts of professionalism. As Gregory (1983) observed, professionals, be they accountants, lawyers or reporters, appear to be the "same everywhere." Similarly, the news routines of different newspapers are defined with no fundamental difference, because newspapers, as a media industrial segment, share the same line of business (Ettema, Whitney and Wachman, 1987). The fourth and fifth layers – extra-media and ideological influences can be treated as national/ethnic culture variables that provide an overarching premise

for modern media organizations. However, it should also be noted that these levels or layers of influence actually are neither layered nor separable. They interact, overlap and sometimes conflict with each other, and in doing so, help to form unique organizational culture mixes for different organizations.

Such overlap results from the fact that organizations are not socially autonomous entities (Aldrich, 1979; Riggins, 1992). They are inevitably related to other major constituencies of a society: government, other institutions and organizations. The essence of media content production is the struggle over the society's resources (Turow, 1997). Economic resources, key to a media organization's viability, determine the capital the organization can commit to content production. Information per se is also a resource, for the access to information provides "raw material" to media content. For broadcast media, the space or spectrum allocated to them also falls into the categories of resources.

National Culture Influences on Media Content

National culture is a key variable in the study of organizational culture, because the national culture or social context in which an organization exists provides the framework of the organization's structure and culture (Chang, Wang & Chen, 1998; Gurevitch, Levy & Roeh, 1991; McQuail, 1994; Merrill, 1983). National culture is a larger culture, referring to the social and historical context of a country. To compare the influences of different national cultural context, scholars employed a cross-national approach to compare organizations in different countries and their behavior (Hirokawa & Miyahara, 1986; Ouchi, 1981; Stenski, 1986). One purpose of such studies is to derive managerial implications. The success of the Japanese management model, for

instance, sparked awakening interest in organizational studies (Martin & Frost, 1996; Morgan, 1986). However, managerial strategies are not universally applicable regardless of national cultural differences (Peters & Waterman, 1982).

In the study of media organizations, there is a strong correlation between national culture and organizational culture (Kueng, 2000). Media companies are private enterprises with a public-service orientation within a broader social system, drawing on the key resources of a society (Turow, 1997). They work under the social, economic and political constraints of the broader system and operate within the regulatory and market economic framework set by the national culture (deBeer and Merrill, 2004). McQuail (1994) said:

The media are both a product and also a reflection of the history of their own society and have played a part in it. Despite the similarities of mass media institutions across societies, the media are by origin, practice and convention very much national institutions and respond to domestic political and social pressures and to the expectation of their audiences. They reflect, express and sometimes actively serve the “national interest,” as determined by other, more powerful actors and institutions (p.121).

The influence of national culture on media organizations is also illustrated by comparison of media across national borders. Such comparative studies have allowed researchers to get insight into the social workings of mass media and what influences the process of production in different national context (Chang et al., 1998; Lazarsfeld, 1976). Early works relating media to social systems are mostly in the vein of the Four Theories of the Press, which categorized the press according to the social political context of a country (Siebert et al., 1956). Although the rigid linear state-press relationship model has been widely criticized and modified to give it more predictive power (Akhavan-Majid & Wolf, 1991; Hachten, 1981; Merrill &

Lowenstein, 1979; Ostini & Fung, 2002), studies trying to account for media behavior from a national/social-system perspective provide important empirical evidence for the existence and influence of national culture on media content and performance.

Examination of media organizations also suggests a link between national culture and media content. Studies have found U.S media to be highly commercial and characterized by economic independence and ownership concentration. (Chang et al., 1998; Hong, 1993). The national commercial media culture relates to media content in that the notion of serving the public becomes more a matter of providing what the public wants rather than of providing what is believed to be good for the public (Holtz-Bacha, 1997). In contrast, a number of European countries, such as Britain and Germany, have a different model where regulatory issues are more manifest, especially when broadcast media are concerned. A public service legacy left broadcast media in the British and German with a dual broadcasting system where commercial and public service broadcasters co-exist (Holtz-Bacha, 1997; Kueng, 2000). Public service providers were established for optimal allocation of broadcast spectrum and with an eye to providing information believed to be essential to the good of the public. They hold it to be evident that serving the public means providing what is believed to be necessary for the well-being of the public, as opposed to giving the public what they want regardless of media professional's judgments (Holtz-Bacha, 1997).

Still another example of the relationship between national culture and media behavior is found in the People's Republic of China. The Chinese model used to be regarded as the antithesis of a free and commercial Western media system – a closed system within the tight grip of the

government (Akahvan-Majid, 2004; Lee, 2000; Pan & Chan, 2003). Media content was full of ideological content for social control (Hong, 1993). However, the Chinese economic reform has changed the traditional culture fostered by a quota economy, characterized by government- rather than free-market-optimal- resources allocation. The form of media organizations and media content are changing on a continuum of party mouthpiece model to commercialization (Akahvan-Majid, 2004).

For diasporic media, the importance of host country and home country national cultures has been observed indirectly in some studies. Host country is the country where diasporic media are located and operate, while home country is the diasporic media's country of origin. Home country, in most cases, is the audiences' country of origin. One study of minority media, diasporic media included, found host country culture to be crucial to minority-media production (Riggins, 1992). Minority media compete with mainstream national media for resources of the host countries' audiences' and advertisers' time and money. Allocating resources to diasporic media outlets subtracts what is available to mainstream media. It is concluded that favorable conditions in host countries, such as technological and economic transfers, are crucial to minority media production. However, there are few studies directly relating diasporic media to their home-country or ethnic culture. It is argued media outside their home countries still maintain culturally specific orientations to reach their audience (Gurevitch et al., 1991). Home-country or ethnic culture is a potential source of media content and audience's interest (de Santis, 2003; King & Wood, 2001; Ogan, 2001). To sum up, diasporic media have a cultural orientation towards the home countries and rely on the resources of both home countries and host

countries for content production. However, little is known about how those competing influences operate to shape the content of diasporic media.

Organizational-Level/Corporate Influences on Media Content

Apart from national culture, organizational level variables are another factor key to the understanding of organizational culture mix and how culture relates to content production. Organizational-level culture, in relation to organizational structure, roles and technology, denotes the distinctive values of an organization or a corporation. Journalism is the result of a production process centered on the newsroom (McNair, 1998). Media organizations are the site of content production. Organizational culture mediates the larger political economy and corporate imperatives with day-to-day journalistic practices (Schudson, 1989).

There is a large body of research on organizational influences on media content. Extensive research has been done on the effects ownership structures have on content and the findings of that body of literature strongly suggest that the structure of media ownership is positively related to differences in content. Specifically, studies have found newspaper chain owners were more likely to have homogenizing effects on their papers (Wachman, Gillmor, Gaziano & Dennis, 1975; Gaziano, 1989; Akhavan-Majid, Rife & Gopinath, 1991). The homogenizing effects of group-owned papers may produce uniformity of editorial positions on controversial issues, rendering group-owned newspapers less editorially independent. A study of Minnesota newspapers indicated that group-owned papers with headquarters outside of the state had less coverage of local controversy than newspapers owned by in-state companies (Donohue, Olien & Tichenr, 1985). Finally, research has found that English-language newspapers in a chain

owned by a foreign company gave more coverage to stories of interest to the parent company's home country over a longer period of time and were more likely to editorialize on the issue when compared to domestically owned newspapers in the same circulation areas (Hollifield, 1999).

Siebert et al.'s (1956) work on national press systems makes clear that the organizational culture of media organizations, including its profit orientation, cannot be completely isolated from the national cultures with which they interact. A continuum can be constructed according to the press' relationship with governments, the public, press freedom and so forth. Media are more likely to serve as propaganda apparatus in countries prone to authoritarian political systems. In liberal societies, commercial media are dominant. They are supposed to be more politically and financially independent.

Siebert et al.'s work was intended to be normative. In the present-day world, commercial media, regardless of the country in which they operate, are private enterprises with bottom-line pressures. Cottle (2003, p.3) said that "media organizations, in their own terms, are business, sites of investment and sources of employment." They are, in essence, economic entities in pursuit of financial benefits by allocating resources. A profit-oriented culture characterizes commercial media organizations at large, whose primary goal is to make money.

However, a profit-oriented organizational culture impinges greatly on the production of media content. Scholars have long pointed out that media content was increasingly produced by an industry dominated with profit-making corporations (Herman, 1985; Herman & Chomsky, 2002; Kellner, 2004; Kreig, 1987; Kwitney, 1990; McChesney, 1997; Underwood, 1993). The

structured relationship of media organizations to other power groups leads to the production of news skewed to the commercial ends (Picard, 2004).

The influence of a profit-oriented organizational culture on media content production has been discussed by many scholars in several respects. First, media content was found to be system maintaining, as the organizations align themselves with the powerful that are in control of resources key to their viability and profitability (Hall et al., 1981; Philo, 1999). The power mainly lies in two groups: the investors and the clients. The investors or owners of media organizations have the ultimate power of resource allocation and employment decision-making. Major clients of today's commercial media are advertisers (Napoli, 2003; Turow, 1997). They are the major revenue source for most media, especially direct mail, newspapers and television.

The dominant profit-oriented organizational culture is believed to function to the detriment of quality news (Bagdikian, 1987; Herman, 1985; Kreig, 1987; Kwitney, 1990; McChesney, 1997; Underwood, 1993). Commercial media organizations are owned by investors concerned with the bottom line. For publicly owned organizations, stock performance and return on investments are indicators of success. Media owners align themselves with institutional power that can promise them competitive edges, which in turn can be translated into profits (Kellner, 2004). The influence on media content can be indirect and exerted through the "selection of topics, distribution of concerns, framing of issues, filtering of information, emphasis of the tone, and by keeping debate within the bounds of acceptable premises" (Herman & Chomsky, 2002, p.298). Combining the findings of several extensive content analyses of Canadian press, a study found that newspapers tend to be less critical of their parent companies and downplay the media

industry as a political interest group (Hackett & Uzelman, 2003). Their handed-down editorial stances often influence their news coverage and the frames to be presented to the public.

Diminished concern for public service is another result of a profit-oriented media organizational/corporate culture. Media content becomes increasingly dependent on its economic marketability. The underlying reason is that the communication industry as a whole is supported by advertising. As a result, advertisers wield considerable influence over media content. Media organizations sell advertisers access to audiences as well as selling content to audiences (Napoli, 2003). Consequently, media companies seek to aggregate the largest possible audience, focusing not just on the size of the audience but also the desirability of the audience to advertisers. Media organizations charge advertisers based on certain indicators such as paid circulation and ratings. In order to boost ratings and maximize the audience bases, certain formats are used to attract the audiences desired by advertisers.

A profit-oriented organizational culture also subjects media content to advertisers' influences in a manner: advertisers can sometimes change the decisions about what is fit for print or broadcast. Studies about advertising pressures on editors and writers at newspapers and some other specialized publications such as farm, business, and consumer magazines found high-level influence of advertisers on content (Hays & Reisner, 1990; Parsons & Rotfeld, 1990; Soley & Craig, 1992). A survey of newspaper reporters showed that about 90% of advertisers attempted to influence the content and more than one-third succeeded in doing so (Soley & Craig, 1992).

Admittedly, the notion of profit-oriented organizational or corporate culture has dominated research about present-day media organizations; there are other kinds of organizations

with different goals and organizational culture. There are media meant by a communication firm to explore the cost and profitability of entering a market. Public service providers such as the BBC pride themselves on having a professional culture based on commitment to the public service ethos (Kueng, 2000). There also are media that serve as government propaganda apparatus or corporations public relations organs, which also have a diminished profit-orientation, if any at all.

Professional Culture Influences on Media Content

Within an organization, there exists a variety of subcultures shared by people working in the same profession, in the same department, or on the same project (Bloor & Dawson, 1994; Martin & Frost, 1996; Ott, 1989). Professional culture or professionalism is commonly acknowledged as an important variable in media organizational culture. There is a professional culture that cuts across organizational boundaries and is shared by people working in the same industry, for instance the newspaper industry and the broadcast television industry. Shared professional cultures may come from professional education processes, formal associations, and codes of ethics.

Taking the form of subcultures within media organizations, media professionalism is an overarching cluster of basic assumptions that define the core of the occupation or the set of an industry (Ettema, Whitney & Wackman, 2003). At a more practical level the values or assumptions take the form of routines that guide the daily activities of journalists, define their expectations and limitations. Routine helps journalists develop “news senses” through a

“vocabulary of precedents” that help them recognize, produce and justify their selection and treatment of stories (Ericson, Baranek & Chan, 1987).

There is a common conviction of an international standard of journalistic professionalism with shared basic values (Reese, 2001), such as media’s role of information dissemination (Weaver, 1998). However, whether such shared values actually exist is highly arguable, and there clearly are historically and culturally defined differences between the professional cultures of journalism in different countries (Akhavan-Majid, 2004; Chan, Pan & Lee, 2004; Deuze, 2002).

While it is true that journalists in many countries have similar perceptions of media’s roles in society and share some reporting practices and professional values, it also is the case that national and professional cultures are interwoven and professionalism is framed within a specific national cultural and ideological content. Media professionals in different countries have different perceptions of what is fit for press and what are media’s primary roles in societies. For example, a survey of global journalists found that Chinese journalists and Mexican journalists regarded media’s entertainment role as relatively not important, while this media function is high on American journalists’ priority list (Weaver, 1998). Similarly, research identified certain Asian beliefs that inform Asian journalism, which might seem alien to U.S. or Western European journalists: the emphasis of harmony over conflict and the respect for order and authority (Blackburn, 1994; Chu, 1988; Hauvel & Dennis, 1993; Lent, 1979; Massey & Chang, 2002; Snijders, 1994; Xu, 2000). Chinese media have been found to appraise positively the official

party organ model more than the watchdog function (Weaver, 1998). Media are regarded as “partners rather than antagonists [of government]” in some Asian countries (Chua, 1998, p.153).

Literature the media gate-keeping process was abundant. Not only have studies addressed different layers of gate-keepers, but also research has identified important shared criteria in the selection of news stories. Localness, timeliness, human interest and impact were found to be among the most important guidelines (Berkowitz, 1990; White, 1950).

The Intersection of Conflicting Cultures in Media Organizations

Considering the distinctive features of media organizational culture and professional culture, research suggests that media organizational culture and professional culture are more-often-than-not at odds with each other (Bantz, 1997; Hollifield, Kosicki & Becker 2001; Shoemaker & Reese, 1991; Ettema, Whitney & Wachman, 1997).

When professional culture confronts organizational culture, empirical studies suggest that the business usually gets the upper hand. Bagdikian (1987) has observed a triumph of media organizational culture over professionalism over the past decade or so. Media executives emphasized the imperatives to beat competitors and boost ratings and readership at the price of quality reporting. Advertorials are an example of the power struggle between professional values and organizational goals of increasing advertising revenue, or the clash between two cultures. A similar example in television is the infomercial. Advertorials and infomercials are advertisements in the guise of editorial copy. They borrow editorial credibility that advertisements cannot generate (Salmon, Reid, Pokrywczynski & Willett, 1985). The practice of carrying advertorials misleads readers (Cameron, Ju-Pak & Kim, 1996). Advertorials are the triumph of business

organizational culture over professionalism. Eckman and Lindlof's (2003) case study of organizational dispute over advertorials showed in the negotiation of news priorities and business priorities the initiative was in the hand of the business side.

Although research findings usually suggest that organizational culture takes precedence over professional culture, this is not always the case. A survey showed 85% newspaper editors reported their papers carried articles considered critical or harmful to advertisers (Soley & Craig, 1992). It should also be noted that professional culture that cuts across organizational boundaries also sets limit on how conflicting messages could be negotiated into media content.

Professionalism constitutes an overarching, trans-organizational control mechanism. From a historic vantage point, media organizations have found it best for them to uphold professional norms such as objectivity and impartiality in the fear of losing integrity and creating unnecessary challenges (Soloski, 1989).

The relationship and interaction of national, organizational and professional cultures is complex. However, one thing is uniformly observed – the lines between the previously distinct cultures are increasingly blurred (Eckman & Lindlof, 2003; Salmon, Reid, Pokrywczynski & Willett, 1985). Media organizations are conglomerations of different cultures and subcultures, through which powers at different levels come into a final collision. The blurred lines between different cultural forces echo the notion of “routinization of conflicts” (Bantz, 1997, p.127). In media organizations both compatible and incompatible factors are to be expected and defined as appropriate.

Different organizations develop different cultural definitions and consequent norms of conflict. The argument presented here, however, is that the culture of news organizations, particularly television news organizations, will define conflict as a routine, expected, and appropriate occurrence. [...] The concomitant cultural expectations will be that conflictive behavior is “appropriate,” perhaps even “required” for organizational functioning.

As routinization brings together elements of different cultures, conflicts can be regarded as one form of interaction between cultures. The hybrid culture, or organizational culture mix, in turn, influences the media production process.

Diasporic Media Organizational Culture

Overall, the literature on media organizational culture and the social construction of content is abundant. But few works addresses diasporic media from this perspective. The question becomes how the status of serving migrant populations influences the culture of a media organization and whether the process of content production is affected differently.

Diasporic media have become a growing sector in the U.S media industry. Two types of diasporic media are usually identified and compared: U.S-based and foreign-based diasporic media companies. As previous studies have established, diasporic media organizations are also under the influences of such cultural forces as national/ethnic culture, organizational-level/corporate culture, and professional subculture. Put another way, in journalistic organizations that seek to serve diasporic audience groups, what are the comparative influences of the national cultures of both home and host countries, the organizational-level culture, and the professional culture in shaping news construction?

First of all, diasporic media operate in a certain host country. Such media owned by a host country firm are inevitably influenced by the national culture of the host country. Under a

dominant profit-seeking national business environment, diasporic media organizations owned by U.S companies, especially group owners, are expected to be profit-driven in targeting diasporic communities and have a profit-oriented culture. Such media came into being as a great number of U.S media companies diversified themselves into the non-English language media market. Some scholars believe this to be a phenomenon of the discovery of attractive markets (Albonneti & Dominguez, 1989; Downing, 1992). As immigrant population and their buying power grew, retailers were attracted to the markets. Once media companies discovered there were unserved or underserved advertisers in a market, they tended to draw those customers by offering access to their target customers.

The national and organizational cultures of foreign-owned diasporic media, however, are not specified by previous studies. It is not specified which factor is more influential in shaping the news values and organizational goals within diasporic media organizations: the national culture and professional journalism culture of the home country or that of the host country. Empirical research indicates these media operate to counter the under- and mis-representation of the diasporic populations they serve and to address the needs and interests of those groups. (Black & Leithner, 1987; Hardt, 1989; Zubrzycki, 1958). Therefore, these organizations might be expected to have different organizational cultures from U.S owned diasporic media.

Research Question

As previous studies suggest, media organizational culture is a mix of national culture, organizational-level/corporate culture and professional culture. These cultural forces interact, overlap and conflict. They are factors of influence on media content.

In diasporic media organizations, the combination of these cultures may be particularly complex. By utilizing the organizational culture perspective, this research studies how the combination of different cultures affects the news values and organizational goals of diasporic media organizations. This study also tests several hypotheses about non-English diasporic media in the U.S., both those owned by U.S corporations and those owned by companies or individuals overseas.

RQ: How does organizational culture influence diasporic media content production?

As previous studies suggest, the national culture in which a company operates influences the organizational culture of the local company. For example, research also has shown that media organizations in the U.S tend to be highly profit driven, while media organizations in many other regions of the world, including China, tend to place more value on serving some public interest. Organizational culture also is instilled, in part, by an organization's founders and leaders. Finally, research has shown that in the media industry, organizational cultures and values as reflected in media content are influenced by ownership structures, including chain ownership and public ownership influence content.

Taken together, these findings suggest that one vehicle through which national cultural values may be transmitted to a media organization is through ownership structure, with the

strength of the influence of the home-country culture varying with ownership. Therefore, it would be expected that diasporic media organizations in the U.S owned by U.S companies would be more likely than diasporic media owned by foreign companies or citizens to be profit-driven. The importance of public service is diminished in the organization's goals. Also characteristic of a profit-oriented organizational culture is the importance of advertisers' opinions about media content. Therefore:

H1. Non-English language media organizations with U.S ownership will be more likely than those with foreign ownership to have a stronger orientation towards profit-generation than towards public-service.

H2. Non-English language media with U.S ownership will be more likely than those with foreign ownership to value advertiser's opinions of media content.

The entertainment function of media is viewed differently in different cultures. In terms of national culture, the perception of media's entertainment role varies with national cultural contexts. According to a survey of global journalists, Chinese journalists and Mexico journalists regarded media's entertainment role as relatively not important, while this media function is high on American journalists' priority list (Weaver, 1998). In terms of organizational-level culture, the more profit-driven a media company is, the more it tries to capture the allegiance of large groups of audience for advertising revenue. Commercial packaging of entertainment content has proved to be a cost-effective audience draw with universal appeal. Therefore:

H3. Non-English language media owned by U.S companies are more likely to value the entertainment character of content during the production process than foreign-owned diasporic media do.

Although certain universal professional standards (such as objectivity and media's role of information dissemination) hold for media in different societies, there are historical and cultural differences. The media's watchdog function is widely advocated by U.S media and believed to be highly important by media professionals. A media organization's perception of this professional ideal influences its coverage of government and officials sources. Advocates of the watchdog ideal are expected to be more critical about official sources. The perception of media's watchdog function also varies by countries. For instance, research identifies certain Asian beliefs that inform Asian journalism: the emphasis of harmony over conflict and the respect for order and authority (Blackburn, 1994; Chu, 1988; Hauvel & Dennis, 1993; Lent, 1979; Massey & Chang, 2002; Snijders, 1994; Xu, 2000). Chinese media have been found to appraise positively the official party organ model more than the watchdog function (Weaver, 1998). Media are regarded as "partners rather than antagonists [of government]" in some Asian countries (Chua, 1998, p.153). Research also shows media in developing countries not only inform but also tend to contribute to the course of certain new policies regarded favorable to the nation's development (Holopainen, 1987). The differences in such cultural values in relation to media professionalism may well be expected in diasporic media organizations as well. Therefore:

H4. Chinese-language media regardless of ownership would be less focused on watchdog role than would Hispanic language media, which would be expected to be more influenced by North American and Western European professional values.

In the research on gatekeeping, localness and timeliness are identified as among the most important criteria among U.S journalists in the selection of news stories (Berkowitz, 1990). Studies about such criteria used by diasporic media are lacking. It remains to be answered whether the national culture of the audience's home country is related to how localness is practically defined during the gatekeeping process. One study found that foreign ownership of newspapers did not necessarily influence the amount of news coverage a firm's home country received, but did influence coverage of major issues in that home-country (Hollifield, 1999). Those foreign-owned papers were found to be more likely to write about and comment on key issues in the home country. If, in diasporic media, localness is defined as the home country of the newspaper owner, U.S.-owned diasporic media would be more likely to be focused on local events in the U.S., while non-U.S owned diasporic media may be more likely to carry stories about their home countries. Therefore:

H5. Non-English language media with U.S ownership will reflect the journalistic professional culture in the U.S more than those media organizations with non-US ownership in that they are more likely to define localness as events within the U.S. based community the newspaper serves.

H6. Non-English language media with U.S ownership will reflect the journalistic professional culture in the U.S more than those media organizations with non-US ownership in that they are more likely to value timeliness in the selection of news.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

This study used a telephone survey design. The population for the study was Chinese and Spanish daily and weekly newspapers in the U.S. The 2005 Bacon's Newspaper Directory was used to identify the subjects of this study. Based upon the list of foreign-language newspapers in Bacon's, it was determined that the population consisted of 13 Chinese daily newspapers, 12 Chinese weeklies, 20 Spanish dailies and several hundred Spanish weeklies.

A census of the Chinese and Spanish daily newspapers was attempted for the study. A census also was attempted for the Chinese weeklies. However, because the Spanish weeklies outnumbered the Chinese weeklies by a large margin, a matched sample was used for the Spanish weeklies. The Spanish weeklies were drawn from the same DMA as the Chinese weeklies with similar circulation. Therefore, 10 Spanish weeklies were sampled. In two DMAs, only two Spanish weeklies were found to match the four Chinese weeklies in their circulation ranges. In all, 55 diasporic newspapers in the U.S. were contacted for this study. The 55 papers included 13 Chinese dailies, 12 Chinese weeklies, 20 Spanish dailies, and 10 Spanish weeklies.

The study used a structured survey instrument which was developed based upon previous research of diasporic media, media ownership, and news construction. The survey instrument was developed in conjunction with the thesis adviser. The instrument was submitted to the University of Georgia's Institutional Review Board for approval prior to being taken into

the field. Following approval, the instrument was pilot tested by journalists working on a university newspaper, a local weekly, and in several newspapers in China.

The final survey instrument was structured into four parts with a total of 50 questions. Editors-in-chief were identified as the appropriate respondent. Initial contacts were made through email and telephone, the editor was invited to participate and, if the person agreed, a time was scheduled for the survey. When an editor-in-chief was not available, other executives such as news editors and managing editors were contacted instead. In several cases, copies of the questionnaire were sent to the participants via email upon their request and retrieved for data collection.

Data were collected between March 20 and May 5, 2006. The survey was administered by the researcher. Two other researchers with knowledge in Chinese and Spanish respectively helped conduct the telephone interviews. The average telephone survey session took 15 minutes to complete. The questions were about each newspaper company's basic business profile, organizational goals and news coverage, perception of media's roles, journalistic ethical practices, and executive's background.

One independent variable of this study was ownership. A distinction was made between newspapers owned by U.S companies and those owned by non-U.S firms or citizens. Another independent variable was audience culture, or the national/ethnic culture of the audiences. Audience culture was operationalized by the language in which a newspaper was published. The language of a diasporic newspaper could reflect the national/ethnic culture of its readers and was used as a surrogate measure. Accordingly, the diasporic newspapers were categorized into

Spanish-language and Chinese-language papers. There were two Spanish-English bilingual newspapers in the study, which were as Spanish-language papers because their basic line of business was publishing in Spanish.

The dependent variables for this study included the organization's emphasis on entertainment content, proximity and timeliness in news selection, its focus on profits as an organizational goal, and the professional values reflected by the organization's attitudes towards advertiser influence on content the importance of the government watchdog role, and the relationship between media and government.

Each of these dependent variables was operationalized by a number of structured questions. For instance, advertisers' influence on media content was measured by asking how important the papers thought satisfying advertisers' needs would be. The papers also were also requested to rate the importance of advertisers' opinions on content on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 indicating the least important and 5 indicating the most important. Comparison was made between the statistics about the importance of advertisers' opinions and those about the importance of readers' opinions. Another example would be the government watchdog function. One question concerned the importance of fulfilling the watchdog function by investigating government claims. A separate question was asked about the perception of the adversary role to government officials. These two questions were meant to explore the importance of such professional ideals as watchdog and adversary in relation to governments. There was a difference between the two roles and how they would be reflected in the content.

The response rate for the 55 targeted dailies and weeklies was 45.5%. An analysis of the response rate for dailies and weeklies separately showed that each subgroup also had a response rate of 45.5%. For the Chinese dailies, the response rate 53.8%. Surveys of the Chinese weeklies had a response of 41.7%. For the Hispanic dailies and weeklies, the response rates are 40% and 50% respectively.

The total number of the papers that completed the survey was 25, of which 15 were dailies and 10 were weeklies. The 25 papers could be subdivided into 13 Spanish-language newspapers and 12 Chinese papers. Among the Spanish newspapers, 8 were dailies and five were weeklies. Seven out of the 12 Chinese papers were dailies.

Chinese newspapers were basically located in the states with large Chinese immigrant populations: California, New York and Texas. The Spanish dailies were in Texas, California, Florida, New York, and Georgia. The number of Spanish dailies in each of these states was proportionate with the Hispanic population. Texas and California, which had more than half of the total Hispanic population in the U.S, also had the largest number of Spanish dailies. Spanish dailies, however, were more dispersed in location. Circulation of the Chinese dailies ranged from 10,000 to 359,900, while for the Hispanic dailies it varied from 5,000 to 200,000. The 10 weeklies had a circulation range of 6,000 to 28,000.

The small population of Spanish and Chinese language dailies in the country became an issue for statistical analysis. Because of the categorical nature of the data, crosstabulation was the primary technique used for data analysis. However, as a result of the small number of cases, many of the cell counts in the cross tabs fell below the minimum requirement of 5, making it

impossible to use tests of statistical significance. The small number of cases was particularly problematic when more detailed analyses were being conducted on subcategories such as daily and weekly newspapers in isolation for one another.

Because traditional test couldn't be used, the researcher established a standard of a 16.7% difference between outcomes as the basis for determining whether any differences that showed up were potentially meaningful. The standard of 16.7% represents a difference of 2 cases among the dailies, which was deemed a reasonable benchmark in a total of sample of 25 divided across 2 categories.

CHAPTER 3

FINDINGS

A total of 25 Spanish and Chinese newspapers completed the survey. Among the 25 papers, 13 or 52% published in Spanish, and 12 or 48% published in Chinese. Eight or 61.5% of the 13 Spanish newspapers were dailies, and seven or 58.3% of the Chinese papers were daily newspapers (Table 1). Daily newspapers, totaled 15 and constituted 60% of the surveyed papers. The other 10 papers, or 40%, were weeklies (Table 2).

Table 1. Spanish & Chinese Newspapers by Dailies & Weeklies

	Spanish	Chinese
Daily	61.5%	58.3%
Weekly	38.5%	41.7%
N	13	12

Table 2. Dailies and Weeklies

	Frequency	Percent
Daily	15	60.0
Weekly	10	40.0
N	25	100.0

An analysis of the paper’s ownership structures showed that 13 or 52% papers were owned by U.S companies, while the other 12 or 48% were owned by foreign-based companies or non-U.S citizens. U.S companies owned 9 or 60% of the dailies and 4 or 40% of the weeklies. 40% of the dailies and 60% of the weeklies were owned by foreign-based companies or non-U.S citizens (Table 3).

Table 3. Dailies and Weeklies by Ownership

	Daily	Weekly
US-owned	60.0%	40.0%
Foreign-owned	40.0%	60.0%
N	15	10

According to the statistics, private companies owned more newspapers than public companies. More than 80% of the newspapers were owned by private firms and investment groups (Table 4). Only a number of group-owned daily newspapers were public companies.

Table 4. Public vs. Private Companies

	Frequency	Percent
Public	4	16.0
Private	21	84.0
N	25	100.0

Owners of the newspapers also included group owners and independent owners. Nine of the 25 newspapers were group-owned (Table 5). Major players in the Spanish daily market also were large U.S newspaper companies. Tribune and Knight Ridder each had two Spanish-language daily newspapers in two states. Other large U.S newspaper firms included Belo Corporation, Gray Television and Freedom Communications. Major group owners in the Chinese daily market were two Hong Kong-based Chinese newspaper companies: Ming Pao Inc. and Sing Tao. World Journal Inc., with the largest combined Chinese daily circulation, operated different editions of its paper in several cities densely populated by Chinese immigrants. Most weeklies were independently owned. Only Eastern Group Publications owned both Spanish and Chinese weekly newspapers.

Table 5. Group-owned vs Independent Companies

	Frequency	Percent
Group-owned	9	36.0
Independent	16	64.0
Total	25	100.0

Breakdown of the newspapers by language was not the same as the same as that of the papers by ownership (Table 6). Among the U.S-owned diasporic papers, 53.8% published in Hispanic-language, and 46.2% in Chinese. The foreign-owned newspapers had a half-and-half split between the two languages. Therefore, the analyses by language or audience culture of the

papers were not the same as the analyses between U.S-owned and foreign-owned diasporic papers.

Table 6. Ownership by Language

	US-owned %	Foreign-owned %
Spanish	53.8	50.0
Chinese	46.2	50.0
N	13	12

Profit Orientation

The first hypothesis stated that non-English newspapers owned by U.S firms would be more likely to be profit-driven than those owned by non-U.S companies. However, this study found no support for this hypothesis. As shown in Table 7, 69.2% of the U.S-owned newspapers strongly agreed or agreed that staying in business and making profits was one of their goals. The percentage of non-U.S-owned newspaper firms that strongly agreed or agreed was 75%. Under the pre-established standard of meaningfulness for this study, the difference cannot be considered meaningful and might be an artifact of the size of the N. In short, there was essentially no difference between U.S-owned and non-U.S-owned diasporic newspapers in their profit goals. Due to the small number of subjects, no statistical test for significance could be conducted.

Table 7. Relationship between Ownership & Profit Orientation

	US-owned %	Foreign-owned %
Agree & strongly agree	69.2	75.0
Neutral	30.8	16.7
Strongly disagree & disagree	.0	8.3
N	13	12

This conclusion was further supported by the results of another analysis. Compared with such goals as providing information and helping maintain language/cultural ties, making profits was not regarded as important by the senior editors of either U.S.-owned or foreign-owned papers. When asked a question about the most important organizational goal, no newspapers chose making profits (Table 8). None of the editors of diasporic newspapers regarded the profit goal to be more important than serving the readers in a number of ways, although they differed in the priorities they assigned to individual audience-service functions. Little difference was found among the diasporic newspapers by ownership in this respect.

Table 8. Most Important Goal

	Frequency	Percent
Information about surroundings	16	64
Language & culture maintenance	6	24
Information about home countries	3	12
Business & profit	0	0
N	25	100

Though not hypothesized, a comparison of newspapers' profit orientation also was made based upon the language of publication. Language was used a surrogate measure for the culture of the audiences and the home countries and, by extension, one of potential national-cultural influences on the newspaper organization. If the national culture of the target audience were not a disparate influence on the newspapers' organizational culture, no meaningful differences in organizational culture values should be found based upon the language of publication as newspapers in both languages are subject to the national culture of the same host country.

In fact, however, the analysis showed that there was a big difference in profit making as a goal between Spanish papers and Chinese papers (Table 9). Ninety-two percent of the editors of Spanish newspaper firms agreed their papers aimed at staying in business and making profits, while only 8% were neutral on expressing profit-making as one of their newspaper's important goals. When it came to the Chinese newspapers, there was a split between the editors that agreed and those who didn't, with 50% of the 12 Chinese papers regarded profit-generation as a key goal, 8% disagreeing, and the remaining 42% neutral on the question. Although no statistical test was feasible to establish the significance of the difference found, the differences met the test for meaningfulness established for this study. Based on these observations, editors of Spanish newspapers were more likely to regard making profits as an organizational goal.

Table 9. Relationship between Audience Culture & Profit Orientation

	Spanish %	Chinese %
Agree & strongly agree	92.3	50.0
Neutral	7.7	41.7
Strongly disagree & disagree	.0	8.3
N	13	12

Taking these two analyses together, the relationship between language, or the home-country national/ethnic culture of the audience and profit-related organizational goals was stronger than that of ownership structure and profit-related goals. One likely explanation is the difference between the values embedded in the Chinese national culture and Hispanic ethnic culture of the audiences to whom the newspapers seek to relate.

Perception of Advertisers' Values

Hypothesis 2 stated that U.S.-owned diasporic media would reflect the U.S national culture in that they would value advertisers' opinions of media content more than non-U.S.-owned diasporic media would. This study, however, found mixed results for this hypothesis. The editors of foreign-owned newspapers were more likely than the editors of US-owned newspapers to say that satisfying advertisers was either very or fairly important. However, editors in U.S. owned newspapers were more likely to rate advertisers' opinions on content as important.

When asked how important it was to satisfy their advertisers, the editors of foreign-owned papers were more likely to say that it was very or fairly important, with the

relationship opposite the one hypothesized. As shown in the table, 83.3% U.S.-owned diasporic newspapers and 100% foreign-owned papers reported satisfying advertisers to be very or fairly important. The difference of 16.7% was meaningful according to the standard established for this study (Table 10).

Table 10. Relationship between Ownership & Perception of Advertisers' Value

	US-owned %	Foreign-owned %
Very or fairly important	83.3	100.0
Not very or not important	16.7	.0
N	12	12

However, the data from another question found some support for the hypothesis. Each newspaper was asked to rate the importance of advertisers' opinions and readers' opinions respectively on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 indicating the most important and 1 indicating the least important. The mean score across all respondents for advertisers' opinions was 2.96. For comparative purposes, The calculated mean of advertiser's influence as rated by U.S.-owned papers was 3.15 with a standard deviation of 1.28, and the mean with the foreign-owned papers' ratings was 2.75, with a standard deviation of 0.75 (Table 11). However, statistical tests didn't show the difference to be significant. According to the contradictory findings, no conclusion could be reached about the relationship between diasporic media ownership and perception of advertisers' value.

Table 11. Comparison of Advertiser’s Influence by ownership

	U.S.-owned	Foreign-owned
N	13	12
Mean	3.15	2.75
Standard deviation	1.28	0.75

Data analysis also indicated that in comparison to readers’ opinions, advertisers’ opinions about the newspapers’ content were less valuable to the diasporic newspapers in the study. The mean score for advertisers’ opinions was 2.96, while the mean for readers’ opinions was 4. Both the median and the mode for advertisers’ opinion were 3, and those for readers’ opinion were 5.

Entertainment

Hypothesis 3 predicted that U.S.-owned diasporic media were more likely to value the entertaining character of content than would foreign-owned diasporic media. This hypothesis was not supported by the study. Data showed foreign-owned diasporic newspapers were more likely to value the entertaining character of content, with 91.7% foreign-based papers in this study reporting that bringing readers entertainment to be very or fairly important, compared with 84.6% of the U.S.-owned papers (Table 12). The 7% difference did not meet the standard for meaningfulness established for the study. Due to the small number of subjects, such a difference in percentage didn’t indicate a meaningful difference in the entertainment role perception by ownership type.

Table 12. Relationship between Ownership and Entertainment Role

	US-owned	Foreign-owned
Very or fairly important	84.6	91.7
Not very or not important	15.4	8.3
N	13	12

Though not hypothesized, an analysis of the relationship between national/ethnic culture as measured by the language of publication and the entertainment role found no meaningful difference either. The editors of 92.3% of the Spanish papers and 83.3% of Chinese newspapers regarded the entertainment role to be very or fairly important (Table 13). Again the small number of subjects may account for the difference in percentage. In sum, this study found no relationship between diasporic media’s entertainment role and either ownership or culture.

Table 13. Relationship between Audience Culture & Entertainment Role

	Spanish %	Chinese %
Very or fairly important	92.3	83.3
Not very or not important	7.7	16.7
N	13	12

Government Watchdog Role

The fourth hypothesis predicted that Chinese-language diasporic media regardless of ownership would be less focused on the watchdog role of media than would Hispanic-language

media because of the influence of national culture. This study found support for hypothesis 4 (Table 14). All Hispanic-language newspapers reported being a government watchdog to be a very or fairly important role. It was important for newspapers to investigate claims of the governments. However, only 16.7% Chinese newspapers regarded the watchdog function to be important. The rest, 83.3%, reported such a role to be not very or not important.

Table 14. Relationship between Audience Culture & Government Watchdog Role

	Spanish %	Chinese %
Very or fairly important	100.0	16.7
Not very or not important	.0	83.3
N	13	12

This suggests that the different national or ethnic culture of the diasporic newspaper's home countries is influencing some key elements of their professional culture in U.S. operations. Chinese media in general, though undergoing changes, have long established a harmonious relationship with the government. Harmony, instead of conflict, is deeply rooted in Chinese philosophy. Although Chinese media could no longer simplistically be regarded as a party mouthpiece, the ideal of mass media being a government enterprise still holds sway in China.

Although the home countries of the audiences of Spanish diasporic newspapers vary because readers came from many different countries, as a whole, Spanish-language newspapers would be expected to reflect professional journalism values common to Western countries where

some expectation that media will play a watchdog role on government is common. In a number of Hispanic nations, the mass media have been critical toward the governments and the political parties in power. Under the influence of the national culture, Chinese diasporic newspapers could be expected to be less critical to governments than would Hispanic newspapers.

This study also looked into the relationship between the role of being an adversary to officials and diasporic media by audience culture and by ownership. The relationship between audience culture and adversary role was similar to that of audience culture and government watchdog. Chinese diasporic newspapers were less likely to be critical to government officials than Hispanic papers were (Table 15). Among the editors of Chinese papers, 75% papers deemed being an adversary to officials not very or not important. The percentage was 53.8% in Spanish newspapers. Although not as big as the difference in the perception of the government watchdog, it was still meaningful according to the standards established for this study.

Table 15. Relationship between Audience Culture & Adversary Role

	Spanish %	Chinese %
Very or fairly important	46.2	25.0
Not very or not important	53.8	75.0
N	13	12

The difference was also manifest when the papers were categorized by ownership (Table 16). There was a 50% split between foreign-owned diasporic newspapers that reported the

adversary role to be very or fairly important and those that reported the role to be not very or not important. U.S.-owned papers were less critical to officials in that 23.1% regarded being an adversary to be of some importance.

Table 16. Relationship between Ownership & Adversary Role

	US-owned %	Foreign-owned %
Very or fairly important	23.1	50.0
Not very or not important	76.9	50.0
N	13	12

One possible explanation to why foreign-owned diasporic media were more critical to officials was that the status of being diasporic – away from the home countries gave media more freedom to criticize government officials at the home countries without having to worry about potential harmful outcomes. Another explanation could be that the diasporic media serving certain expatriate communities plays a resistance role to the home-country government and officials. A third explanation could be that some diasporic papers, bearing the readers’ interests in mind, were critical to host-country officials in the hope of fighting for more power for the immigrant populations. However, the original question didn’t make a distinction between home-country and host-country governments or officials. Therefore, such explanations for the difference cannot be definitely tested with these data.

Localness as Criterion

Hypothesis 5 stated that U.S.-owned diasporic media would be more likely to value localness in content because of a shared professional culture and because of ownership influences in that for the owners, 'the U.S. is local. However, the hypothesis was not supported by this study. Localness was defined as actual proximity of the news story to the immigrant population's current geographic location. This study actually found an inverse relationship between ownership and emphasis on the localness of news coverage (Table 17). In terms of news coverage, 83.3% foreign-owned diasporic newspapers deemed local events the most important category of news, as compared to state news, U.S national news and international news, especially the events at the home countries. Only 16.7% of the foreign-owned papers regarded international news to be the most important. By contrast, only 53.8% of the editors of U.S.-owned papers reported local news to be the most important category of news, while 46.2% said international events, especially those in the audiences' home countries, were the most significant. The difference was meaningful according to the standards established for the study.

Table 17. Relationship between Ownership & Proximity of Content

	US-owned %	Foreign-owned %
Local events	53.8	83.3
International events	46.2	16.7
N	13	12

When a secondary analysis was conducted to see whether the focus on localness was related to national/ethnic culture influences, it was found that Hispanic diasporic newspapers were more focused on local events, and Chinese papers were more focused on international events. Respondents at 100% of the Spanish newspapers selected local events to be the most important in terms of their news coverage, while only 33.3% of Chinese editors reported focusing on local events, and 66.7% reported international events to be the most important (Table 18). The result was consistent with a previous analysis in that 76.9% Spanish newspaper listed informing readers about their immediate surroundings in their native language to be the most important goal, rather than informing them about the home countries and helping maintain their language and culture (Table 19). The findings support the argument that the professional culture of the media organizations in the study is being shaped by the national/ethnic cultures of the audiences they seek to serve.

Table 18. Relationship between Audience Culture & Proximity of Content

	Spanish %	Chinese %
Local events	100.0%	33.3%
International events	.0%	66.7%
N	13	12

Table 19. Most Important Goal by Ownership

	Spanish %	Chinese %
Business & profit	.0	.0
Information about surroundings	76.9	50.0
Information about home countries	7.7	16.7
Language & culture maintenance	15.4	33.3
N	13	12

Timeliness as Criterion

Hypothesis 6 predicted that diasporic media owned by U.S companies would be more likely to value timeliness than would non-U.S-owned media as the result of a share professional culture in the host country. However, hypothesis 6 wasn't supported by this study: 61.5% U.S-owned diasporic papers and 72.7% foreign-owned newspapers regarded breaking hard news to be the most important in terms of their coverage. Similarly, 38.5% U.S-owned and 27.3% foreign-owned diasporic papers regarded soft news stories such as feature and investigative stories to be the most important (Table 20). The difference of percentage fell below the benchmark of 16.7%, set for the study, indicating too small a difference between papers of the two ownership kinds to be considered meaningful. Moreover, the actual difference was in the opposite direction of the one hypothesized, meaning foreign-owned diasporic newspapers may be more focused on timeliness. It should be noted that 60% of the U.S-owned papers were dailies compared with only 40% of the foreign-owned papers. Considering the fact that dailies were

more likely to value timeliness in content than would weeklies, the hypothesis was particularly untenable and should be rejected.

Table 20. Relationship between Ownership & Timeliness of Content

	US-owned %	Foreign-owned %
Hard breaking News	61.5	72.7
Feature & investigative stories	38.5	27.3
N	13	11

The result was different, when differences in national/ethnic culture were analyzed instead of ownership. Hispanic-language diasporic papers were more likely to value timeliness of the content than were their Chinese counterparts. The data showed a more than 40% difference with 84.6% of Spanish papers regarding timely news to be the most important in terms of coverage, as opposed to 45.5% of the Chinese diasporic newspapers (Table 21). This suggests again that national/ethnic culture shapes the professional journalism culture within diasporic media. However, it also is the case that the percentage of daily newspapers within the sample of Hispanic papers was slightly higher than that of the Chinese dailies in the Chinese paper total. When the analysis controlled for daily newspapers, Hispanic papers and Chinese papers didn't show much difference in carrying timely content.

Table 21. Relationship between Audience Culture & Timeliness of Content

	Spanish %	Chinese %
Hard breaking News	84.6	45.5
Feature & investigative stories	15.4	54.5
N	13	11

Overview of Media's Roles Perception

Besides the questions for hypothesis testing, the surveyed diasporic newspapers were asked a series of questions about their perception of media's normative roles such as disseminating information, providing analysis and being a government watchdog. Editors were asked to rate the relative importance of different utilities that media might provide to an audiences on a 5-point scale of very important to not very important. The three utilities that were listed by the largest percentage of editors as being very important for them to provide to their readers were all related to the specific needs of immigrant communities (Table 22). Specifically, they were providing information to non-English speakers, disseminating information about home countries, and standing up for the minority. All the surveyed diasporic newspapers reported serving non-English readers to be very important, while 92% of the papers regarded informing readers about their home countries to be very important, and standing up for the minority was deemed very important by 80% of the diasporic newspapers. Such general media functions as getting news to readers quickly and providing analysis and interpretation came in the fifth and

the sixth, while they were top on the priority list of mainstream media in a large number of countries, including the U.S, China and Mexico (Weaver, 1998).

Table 22. Media’s Roles Rated as Very Important

	Very important	Percent
Informing non-English speakers	12	100.0
Providing home-country information	15	88.0
Standing up for minority	1	80.0
People’s forum	10	64.0
Getting news quickly	7	60.0
Analysis & interpretation	5	48.0
Satisfying advertisers	10	45.8
Promoting culture	20	44.0
Entertainment	10	40.0
Developing public interests	5	40.0
Help forming cultural bond	11	30.4
Government watchdog	25	28.0
Signaling new trends	22	20.8
Influencing public agenda	7	20.0
Challenging other mainstream media	11	12.5
Adversary to officials	3	4.0

In general, the results of this study when compared to the results of previous research suggest that diasporic newspapers differ from other mainstream media in their perception of their roles in relationship to their audiences. They value diasporic media’s role of severing immigrant

populations more than they do the more general media functions of information dissemination and interpretation.

Overview of Ethics Perception

The survey also included a series of questions related to journalistic ethics. The diasporic newspapers were asked if certain practices were acceptable, might be acceptable or not acceptable. According to the combined percentage of the “acceptable” and “might be acceptable” choices, the two most unproblematic practices were using confidential sources and going undercover to gain inside information, each with an approval rate of 80% or above (Table 23). The two most problematic issues were unauthorized use of private information and harassing sources, each with a disapproval rate of more than 80%.

Table 23. Approval Rates of Ethics

	Might be acceptable	Percent
Using confidential source	20	88.0
Undercover to gain inside information	5	80.0
Disguised identity	4	44.0
Paying for information	9	40.0
Using hidden camera	3	36.0
Reveal confidential source	10	24.0
Unauthorized use of government information	11	20.0
Harassing news sources	22	16.0
Unauthorized use of private information	6	12.0

When the opinions of Hispanic-language papers and Chinese newspapers were compared, a pattern of difference was found. In general, more Chinese diasporic newspapers deemed going undercover to get information, using hidden camera, paying for information, using disguised identity, and revealing a confidential source to be acceptable in certain cases (Table 24). More Hispanic newspapers, however, regarded unauthorized use of government information to be acceptable to some extent.

Table 24. Approval Rates of Ethics by Language

	Spanish %	Chinese %
Using confidential source	84.6	91.7
Undercover to gain inside information	61.8	100.0
Disguised identity	7.7	83.3
Paying for information	23.1	58.3
Using hidden camera	15.4	58.3
Reveal confidential source	7.7	41.7
Unauthorized use of government information	30.8	8.3
Harassing news sources	18.2	20.0
Unauthorized use of private information	8.3	20.0

The difference between diasporic newspapers of the two ownership types was not as manifest as the difference by audience culture, with the exception of the “revealing a confidential source” issue and the use of hidden camera (Table 25). About 40% foreign-owned diasporic newspapers said revealing a confidential source was acceptable or might be acceptable. The

percent among U.S.-owned papers was about 7%. A difference of 34% among the two types of newspapers was large. As to the use of hidden camera, more U.S.-owned companies said the practice was acceptable or might be acceptable. A difference of 21.2% was also big. Overall, ownership was relevant when such ethics as revealing confidential sources and using hidden camera were studied.

Table 25. Ethics by Ownership

	US-owned %	Foreign-owned %
Revealing confidential source		
Acceptable & might be	7.7	41.7
Not acceptable	92.3	58.3
Using hidden camera		
Acceptable & might be	46.2	25.0
Not acceptable	53.8	75.0

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION

Conclusions

This study explored the relationship between national, organizational, and professional cultures in shaping diasporic media's journalistic behavior. National/ethnic culture was operationalized as the language in which the media was published; organizational culture was operationalized as ownership structure, and professional culture was operationalized as news values, ethics, and priorities. Based on previous studies, six hypotheses were tested, relating diasporic media ownership with profit-orientation, advertisers' influence on content, entertainment content and news criteria of proximity and timeliness. Also hypothesized was the relationship between diasporic national/ethnic culture and media's watchdog role.

Business Goals & Serving Audiences

The study found that the different cultural forces interacted with each other and influenced media content production through the channel of diasporic media organizations, the site of production. In terms of profit-orientation, the study found no meaningful difference between diasporic newspapers owned by U.S companies and those owned by foreign companies or non-U.S citizens. Instead the data showed that the difference in profit-orientation between diasporic papers of different languages were much bigger than that between the papers of the two ownership types. Hispanic newspapers were more likely than their Chinese counterparts to

express that staying in business and making profits as an important organizational goal. The ownership of the diasporic newspapers didn't determine if the papers would be more or less profit-oriented towards its news content. Though not hypothesized, diasporic newspapers with different audience cultures differed in profit-orientation. Therefore, the results of testing Hypothesis 1 suggested that national/ethnic culture had greater influence on the professional culture of diasporic media organizations than did organizational culture.

Related to media organizations' profit goal is the relationship between media and their advertisers. Previous research has found that advertisers as the major client group of media can wield considerable influence over media content (Turow, 1997). Consistent with hypothesis 1, the second hypothesis predicted that as the result of a profit-oriented organizational culture predominant among U.S media firms, diasporic media owned by U.S companies would value advertisers' opinions more than non-U.S-owned diasporic media would.

However, the study found mixed support for the prediction that U.S-owned diasporic media would be more likely to value advertisers' opinions. No meaningful difference was found in U.S. and foreign-owned newspapers' sensitivity to meeting advertisers' needs. However, U.S-owned papers were more likely to report that advertisers' opinions of content were very important or important to them. This finding lent some support to the predicted relationship between ownership structure and perception of advertisers' values. U.S-owned diasporic newspapers were more likely to value advertisers' opinions than their foreign-owned counterparts. Comparatively speaking, U.S-owned newspapers tended to pay more attention to

the business ends than to such normative media's role as being an adversary, which was consistent with the findings of previous research on U.S media organizations.

To sum up, organizational culture as measured by ownership structure influenced diasporic media's perception of advertisers' values to certain extent, while audience culture was the more influential element in affecting diasporic media's profit-orientation. Such a result implies that a comparison between different national/ethnic cultures rather than between home countries and host countries could be more useful in studying diasporic media's professional culture and, by extension, journalistic behavior.

When the professional culture of diasporic media organizations was more closely examined, interesting results were obtained. Diasporic media in general had several commonalities. Regardless of ownership and audience culture, no diasporic newspaper reported its organization's business goals to be as important as serving their readers. None of them said advertisers' opinions on content were as valuable and influential as readers' opinions. All of the diasporic papers regarded serving non-English speakers and standing up for their interests as the most important functions of diasporic media. Comparatively speaking, sensitivity to audiences was the driving force in shaping the values expressed by the editors of diasporic media. Such a phenomenon was consistent with previous research that suggested serving immigrant populations to be a distinct character of diasporic media and an important reason for their very existence (Ogan, 2001; Riggins, 1992).

News Selection Criteria

When the respective influences of national/ethnic and organization culture were used to more closely examine differences in news values, organizational culture as measured by ownership structures again failed to predict differences in news values such as proximity, timeliness, and entertainment. No meaningful difference existed between U.S.-owned and foreign-owned diasporic newspapers in terms of the adoption of these news selection criteria. This may be explained by previous research, which notes that professional cultural values may transcend organizational boundaries and organizational values being shared by professionals working within the same industry but in different organizations (Bloor & Dawson, 1994; Martin & Frost, 1996; Ott, 1989).

However, also as previous research has suggested, national/ethnic cultures may shape professional cultures/values in measurable ways (Akhavan-Majid, 2004; Chan, Pan & Lee, 2004; Deuze, 2002). When audience culture was analyzed in relation with the news criteria, the results indicated that home-country national/ethnic cultures were influential to diasporic media's professional practices. Chinese diasporic newspapers were more focused on international news, especially events that happened in China. Hispanic-language papers paid more attention to local news.

There are several possible explanations for these differences. The first is the effects of national/ethnic culture on professional culture. Hispanic diasporic newspapers put more emphasis on disseminating information about surroundings in the readers' native language, as opposed to the Chinese papers that considered carrying news stories about the home country and

helping maintain the cultural bond of considerable significance. An alternative explanation that cannot be ignored, however, is that Chinese diasporic media served an audience with a unitary national background, while Hispanic diasporic media served audiences with a shared ethnic culture but different coming from many different nations. Therefore, Chinese media could more easily meet audience's needs of home-country information. In contrast, it would be problematic for Hispanic media to identify a specific home country. Instead, Hispanic diasporic media could address to the shared Hispanic ethnic culture and the audiences' shared identity of being Hispanic Diaspora.

Similarly, diasporic media organizations with different national/ethnic cultures also were found to differ in their focus on the importance of timeliness of content. However, the original finding was ambiguous because the percents of daily and weekly newspapers were not the same in the categories of Hispanic and Chinese diasporic papers. Timeliness could mean different things to dailies and weeklies because of the different production cycle and circulation frequency. Further breakdown of the papers was be meaningless, as the differences in percentage were artifacts of the number counts.

Watchdog & Adversary Roles

Media's roles of serving as a government watchdog and adversary to officials were also found to differ according to national/ethnic culture. When these roles were was analyzed for diasporic media in the U.S., the importance of national/ethnic culture was confirmed. Chinese media, with a long history of harmonious relationship with the ruling class, were less sensitive to the role of government watchdog and adversary to officials. Hispanic media, on the other hand,

valued highly the media's watchdog and adversary functions. Previous cross-cultural media studies have long established that Chinese journalists preferred helping explain government policies and regulations to being a watchdog. Media professionals in a number of Hispanic countries viewed being government watchdog as the most important role as a result of the social turmoil and abuse of power by government officials.

The findings of this study also suggest, however, that organizational culture may play a role in terms of editors' perceptions of their relationship to government. U.S.-owned diasporic media were less likely to see themselves as an adversary to government officials than were their foreign-owned counterparts. This may reflect the development of stable, predictable professional relationships between U.S. media organizations and the U.S. government. In contrast, particularly in countries going through transitions where the media systems are going through change, relationships between the media industry and government can be hostile as the "new normal" for media-government relationships is negotiated. The data for this study are not specific enough to test that explanation. But it remains a possibility.

Summary

The results of this research suggest that national/ethnic cultures have more influence on the professional culture and journalistic behavior of diasporic media than do organizational cultures as measured by ownership. In this study most hypotheses about the effects of ownership structures of professional culture were not supported. There was no meaningful relationship between diasporic media ownership and profit-orientation, sensitivity to advertiser demands, the emphasis on entertainment content over news, or the news selection criteria of news proximity

and timeliness. Whether a diasporic media organization had host-country or home-country owners failed to predict its goals and practices. Host-country ownership couldn't prescribe to diasporic media organization's a dominant professional cultural orientation. Therefore, ownership structure didn't predict diasporic media's certain values in their journalistic practices.

However, national/ethnic culture was found to influence the professional journalism culture, even among host-country owned newspapers. Diasporic media serving Chinese and Hispanic audiences differed meaningfully in their orientation towards profit, advertisers' influences, news selection values of proximity and timeliness of content, their belief in the government watchdog function of media, and the view of themselves as an adversary to government officials. Only in the valuation of news and entertainment content were no differences found in the comparisons of diasporic media across national/ethnic cultures. This implies that a comparison of national/ethnic cultures among diasporic media's home countries might be more revealing than comparison between home-country and host-country national cultures when trying to understand their organizational and professional behavior.

The big difference in the perception of such normative roles as government watchdog and adversary to officials between diasporic media with different national/ethnic cultures lent further support to the significance of home-country national/ethnic culture as a cultural force. Diasporic media with a home-country national culture advocating harmonious relationship with government were less likely to emphasize their roles of government watchdog and adversaries to officials. By contrast, diasporic media with a home-country social context of government

fallibility and power abuse were more likely to be advocates of media's watchdog function and even the adversary role.

Similar to the perception of media's normative roles, the perception of ethics-related professional practices differed among media organizations with different home-country national/ethnic cultures. In a number of Hispanic countries as in the U.S, pretending to be someone other than a journalist was unarguably unethical. In China, disguised identity sometimes was seen as acceptable as a means to carry out investigative reporting that would otherwise be impossible.

In sum, the combination of cultural forces at national, organizational and professional levels was varied and complex among diasporic media. The national cultures of diasporic media provided overarching frameworks for the formation of diasporic media's professional cultural mixes. National cultures influenced the professional subcultures within the media organizations, with the professional subcultures then influencing the media organizations' business and journalistic practices. In diasporic media, a comparison of different home-country national/ethnic cultures could shed light on the understanding of the difference among diasporic media organizations.

Despite the differences among diasporic media organizations, diasporic media in general shared certain values, distinguishing them from other mainstream media in general. Previous studies from the consumption side raised the issue of diasporic media's special functions unfulfilled by mainstream national media in host countries. From the production side, this study found that the diasporic media did strongly advocate their diasporic functions such as serving the

migrant populations, helping maintain language and cultural ties, and standing up for the minority.

Limitations

One significant limitation of this study was the small number of subjects. The number of diasporic newspapers in the U.S, especially daily newspapers, is small, and no source is likely to have a comprehensive list mapping the diasporic media organizations in the U.S. The small number of cases makes it more difficult to determine when differences in behavior are meaningful. A change in even a small number of cases results in large change in percentage difference. The cut-off standards for meaningfulness established for this study are thus arguable. Future study could expand the diasporic media list by including other forms of media and media in languages other than Chinese and Spanish. Increasing the number of subjects could decrease the influence of potential outliers and the possibility of chance discovery.

Second, this study had all the limitations of research using espoused values for an understanding of organizational culture. Espoused values didn't always accord the underlying assumptions or the actual behavior of an organization. The inherent problem of the method is the difficulty of identifying the discrepancy between espoused values and the true culture of an organization – the underlying assumptions. One solution was to combine methods of data collection. Organizational artifacts, structure for instance, can be easily observed. Espoused values could be obtained from narratives of the members. In-depth study of an organization could reveal the underlying assumptions shared by its members. A combination of two or three

methods of observation would be more accurate in describing the culture of a diasporic media organization.

A third key limitation comes from the interrelationships of the measures of culture used. Ownership structures are directly related to organizational culture and ownership has been established as a causal factor in the development of organizational culture. In this study, however, the ownership structures used as the comparative measure of organizational culture was foreign versus domestic ownership. Foreign ownership as an ownership category cannot be entirely separated from differences in national/ethnic culture.

Besides, this study did not control for the sizes of the diasporic newspapers in relation to their owners, which could be confounding variables. Large Hispanic diasporic papers were basically owned by big financially strong U.S newspaper firms, while foreign-owned Spanish language papers were relatively small in size. As for the Chinese diasporic newspapers, the situation was reversed. Several major Chinese dailies were owned by foreign chain-owners, and U.S-owned Chinese papers tended to be comparatively small in size.

Similarly, the news construction literature recognizes that news judgments and values can be influenced by the individual organizational cultures of media organizations as well as the overarching professional culture of journalism. Further, organizational cultures are at least partly the product of the relationships between the various professional subcultures that exist within a given organization. Thus, in any study of this type, it is impossible to deem national/ethnic, organizational, and professional cultures to be wholly mutually exclusive as variable categories.

Nevertheless, the use of national, organizational, and professional culture as discrete measures is well established in the management literature.

The nature of the diasporic media under study, the method of analysis and the limited literature on diasporic media's behavior determined the limitations of this study. Future research could expand the study in scale and scope to overcome the limitations. As media markets are becoming increasingly fragmented, the distinct values of diasporic media and how they influence such behavior as content production are worth asking. Among the questions of interest but not answered by this study are what are some of the most important values and practices that distinguish diasporic media among themselves and from other media and what are the specific cultural aspects shaping their values, goals and practices.

REFERENCES

- Akhavan-Majid, R. (2004). Mass media reform in China: Toward a new analytical framework. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies*, 66, 553-565.
- Akhavan-Majid, R., Rife, A., & Gopinath, S. (1991). Chain ownership and editorial independence: A case study of Gannett newspapers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 68, 59-66.
- Akhavan-Majid, R., & Wolf, G. (1991). American mass media & the myth of libertarianism: Toward an 'elite power group' theory. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 8, 139-151.
- Albonneti, J. G., & Dominiguez, L. V. (1989). Major influences on consumer goods marketers' decision to target U.S Hispanics. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 29(1), 9-21.
- Aldrich, H. (1979). *Organizations and Environments*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ang, I. (2001). *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living between Asia and the West*. London, Routledge.
- Bacon's Newspaper Directory (2005). Chicago, IL: Bacon's Information Inc.
- Bagdikian, B. H. (1987). *The Media Monopoly*. Boston: Beacon Press
- Bantz, C. R. (1997). News organizations: Conflict as a crafted cultural norm. In D. Berkowitz (Ed.). *Social Meanings of News: A Text-Reader* (pp. 123-137). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Berkowitz, D. (1990). Refining the gatekeeping metaphor for local TV news. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 34(1), 55-68.
- Black, J. H., & Leithner, C. (1987). Patterns of ethnic media consumption: A comparative examination of ethnic groupings in Toronto. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 19(1), 21-41.
- Blackburn, K. (1994). Does the West need to learn Asian Values? *IPA Review*, 47(20), 35-36.
- Bloor, G., & Dawson, P. (1994). Understanding professional culture in organizational context. *Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 275-295.

- Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Breed, W. (1955). Social control in the newsroom: A functional analysis. *Social Forces*, 33, 326-335.
- Cameron, G. T., Ju-Pak, K-H, & Kim, B-H. (1996). Advertorials in magazines: Current use and compliance with industry guidelines. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 73(3), 722-733.
- Chan, J. M., Pan, Z., & Lee, F. L. F. (2004). Professional aspirations and job satisfaction: Chinese journalists at a time of change in the media. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(2), 254-273.
- Chang, T-K., Wang, J., & Chen, C-H. (1998). The social construction of international imagery in the post-cold war era: A comparative analysis of U.S and Chinese national TV news, *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 42(3), 277-296.
- Chu, L. L. (1988). Mass communication theory: A Chinese perspective. In W. Dissanayake (Ed.). *Communication Theory: The Asian Perspective*. Singapore: Asian Mass Communication Research & Information Center.
- Chua, L. H. (1998). Walking the tightrope: Press freedom & professional standards in Asia. In A. Latif (Ed.). *Singapore* (pp. 142-155). Singapore: Asian Media, Information & Communication Center.
- Cohen, R. (1997). *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. London: UCL Press.
- Cottle, S. (Ed.). (2003). *Media Organization and Production*. London: Sage.
- de Beer, A. S., Merrill, J. C. (2004). *Global Journalism: Topical Issues and Media Systems*. 4th Ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- de Santis, H. (2003). Mi programa es su programa; Tele/visions of a Spanish-language diaspora in North America. In K. H. Karim (Ed.), *The Media of Diaspora* (pp. 63-75). London, New York: Routledge.
- Deuze, M. (2002). National news culture: A comparison of Dutch, German, British, Australian, and U.S. journalists. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(1), 134-149.

- Donohue, G. A., Olien, C. N., & Tichenor, P. J. (1985). Reporting conflict by pluralism, newspaper type and ownership. *Journalism Quarterly*, 62, 489-499, 507.
- Dorian, N. (1980). Linguistic language as an ethnic marker. *Language in Society*, 9, 33-41.
- Downing, J. D. H. (1992). Spanish-language media in the greater New York region during the 1980s. In S. H. Riggins. (Ed.). *Ethnic Minority Media: An International Perspective* (pp.256-275). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Eckman, A., & Lindlof, T. (2003). Negotiating the gray line: An ethnographic case study of organizational conflict between advertorials and news. *Journalism Studies*, 4, 65-77.
- Ericson, R. V., Baranek, P. M., & Chan, J. B. L. (1987). *Visualizing Deviance: A Study of News Organization*. Toronto, Buffalo: University of Toronto Press
- Ettema, J. S., Whitney, D. C., & Wachman, D. B. (1987). Professional mass communicators. In C. H. Berger & S. H. Chaffee (Ed.), *Handbook of Communication Science* (pp. 747-780). Beverly Hills, Sage.
- Fishman, J. (1977). Language and ethnicity. In H. Giles (Ed.). *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations* (pp.15-57). London: Academic Press
- Gaziano, C. (1989). Chain newspaper homogeneity and presidential endorsements, 1972-1988. *Journalism Quarterly*, 66, 836-845.
- Gillespre, M. (1995). *Television, Ethnicity and Cultural Change*. London: Routledge.
- Greenberg, B. S., Burgoon, M., Burgoon, J., & Korzenny, F. (1983). *Mexican Americans and the Mass Media*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gregory, K. L. (1983). Native-view paradigms: multiple cultures and culture conflicts in Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 359-376.
- Gurevitch, M., Levy, M. R., & Roeh, I. (1991). The global newsrooms: Convergence and diversities in the globalization of TV news. In P. Dahgren & C. Sparks (Ed.). *Communications and Citizenship: Journalism and Public Sphere in the News Media Age* (pp.195-216). London: Routledge.
- Hackett, R. A., & Uzelman, S. (2003). Tracing corporate influence on press content: A summary of recent NewsWatch Canada research, *Journalism Studies*, 4, 331-346.

- Hall, S., et al. (1981). The social production of news: Mugging in the media. In S. Cohen (Ed.), *The Manufacture of News* (pp. 335-367). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hachten, W. (1981). *The World News Prism*. Ames: Iowa State University.
- Hardt, H. (1989). The foreign-language press in American press history. *Journal of Communication*, 39(2), 114-131.
- Hauvel, J. V. & Dennis, E. E. (1993). *The Unfolding Lotus: East Asia's Changing Media*. New York: Freedom forum Media Studies Center, Columbia University.
- Hays, R. G., & Reisner, A. E. (1990). Feeling the heat from advertisers: Farm magazine writers & ethical pressures. *Journalism Quarterly*, 40, 936-942.
- Herman, E. S. (1985). Diversity of news: 'Marginalizing' the opposition. *Journal of Communication*, 35(3), 135-146.
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (2002). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hirokawa, R. Y., & Miyahara, A. (1986). A comparison of influence strategies utilized by managers in American and Japanese organizations. *Communication Quarterly*, 34(3), 250-265.
- Hollifield, C. A. (1999). Effects of foreign ownership on media content: Thomson papers' coverage of Quebec independent vote. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 20(1), 65-82.
- Hollifield, C. A., Kosicki, G. M., & Becker, L. B. (2001). Organizational vs. professional culture in the newsroom: Television news directors' and newspaper editors' hiring decisions. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 45(1), 92-117.
- Holopainen, V. (Ed.). (1987). *Case Studies on International Norms & Journalism*. Tampere: University of Tampere.
- Holtz-Bacha, C. (1997). Development of the German media market: Opposition & challenges for U.S media firms. *Journal of Media Economics*, 10(4), 39-58.
- Hong, J. H. (1993). China's TV program import 1958-1988: Towards the internationalization of television? *Gazette*, 52, 1-23.
- International Organization for Migration, UN. (2005) *World Migration Report 2005*. Geneva, Switzerland.

Kellner, D. (2004). The media and the crisis of democracy in the age of Bush-2. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 1, 29-58.

King, R., & Wood N. (2001). *Media and Migration: Construction of Mobility and Difference*. London, New York: Routledge.

Kreig, A. (1987). *Spiked: How Chain Management Corrupted America's Oldest Newspaper*. Old Saybrook, Conn.: Peregrin Press.

Kueng, L. (2000). Exploring the link between culture and strategy in media organizations: The case of BBC and CNN. *The Journal of Media Management*, 2, 100-109.

Kwitney, J. (1990). The high cost of high profits. *Washington Journalism Review*, 1, 19-29.

LaRuffa, A. (1982). Media Portrayals of Italian Americans. *Ethnic Groups*, 4, 191-206.

Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1976). The prognosis for international communications research. In H. D. Fischee & J. C. Merrill (Eds.). *International and Intercultural Communication*. New York: Hastings House.

Lee, A. M. (1981). Mass Media Mythmaking in the United Kingdom's Internal Ethnic Struggles. *Ethnicity*, 8, 18-30.

Lee, C. C. (2000). Chinese communication: Prisms, trajectories, and models of understanding. In C. C. Lee (Ed.). *Power, Money, and Media: Communication Patterns and Bureaucratic Control in Cultural China* (pp. 3-44). Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Lent, J. A. (1979). *Topics in Third World Mass Communication: Rural & Development Journalism, Cultural Imperialism, Research & Development*. Hong Kong: Asian Research Service.

Lewin, K. (1948). Channels of group life. *Human Relations*, 1(2), 145.

Martin, J., & Frost, P. (1997). The organizational culture war games: A struggle for intellectual dominance. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. R. Nord (Ed.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 599-616). London: Sage.

Massey, B. L. & Chang, L. J. A. (2002). Locating Asian values in Asian journalism: A content analysis of web newspapers. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 987-1003.

- McChesney, R. W. (1997). *Corporate Media & the Threat to Democracy*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- McNair, B. (1998). *The Sociology of Journalism*. London, New York: Arnold.
- McQuail, D. (1994). *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction*. 3rd Ed. London: Sage.
- Merrill, J. C. (Ed.). (1994). *Global Journalism: A Survey of the World's Mass Media*. New York: Longman.
- Merrill, J., & Lowenstein, R. (1979). *Media, Messages & Men: New Perspectives in Communication*. New York: Longman.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images and Organizations*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Naficy, H. (2003). Narrowcasting in diaspora: Middle Eastern television in Los Angeles. In K. H. Karim (Ed.), *The Media of Diaspora* (pp. 51-66). London, New York: Routledge.
- Napoli, P. M. (2003). *Audience Economics: Media Institutions and the Audience Marketplace*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ogan, C. (2001) *Communication and Identity in the Diaspora: Turkish Migrants in Amsterdam and Their Use of Media*. New York: Lexington.
- Ogan, C. (2001). Communication, Politics and Religion in an Islamic Community. In R. King, & N. Wood. (Ed.). *Media and Migration: Constructions of Mobility and Difference* (pp. 127-142). London, New York: Routledge.
- Ostini, J., & Fung, A. Y. H. (2002). Beyond the four theories of the press: A new model of national media systems. *Mass Communication & Society*, 5(1),41-56.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). *Theory Z*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ott, J. S. (1989). *The Organizational Culture Perspective*. Chicago, IL: The Dorsey Press.
- Pan, Z., & Chan, J. M. (2003). Shifting journalistic paradigms: How China's journalists assess media exemplars. *Communication Research*, 30(6), 649-682,
- Parsons, P. R., & Rotfeld, H. J. (1990). Infomercials & TV station clearance practices. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 9, 199-211.

- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Philo, G. (Ed.). (1999). *Message Received: Glasgow Media Group Research 1993-1998*. New York: Longman.
- Picard, R. G. (2004). Commercialism and Newspaper Quarterly. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 25(1), 54-65.
- Reese, S. D. (2001). Understanding the global journalists: A hierarchy-of-influences approach. *Journalism Studies*, 2, 173-187.
- Riggins, S. H. (Ed.). (1992). *Ethnic Minority Media: An International Perspective*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rosenthal, M. (1978). Indicators of growth abound in Spanish media community. *Radio/TV Age*, A17-A27.
- Safran, W. (1991). Diaspora in modern societies: Myths of homeland and return, *Diaspora*, 1(1), 83-97.
- Salmon, C. T., Reid, L. N., & Pokrywczynski, J., & Willett, R. (1985). The effectiveness of advocacy advertising relative to news coverage. *Communication Research*, 12, 546-567.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (2003). The culture of media as viewed from an organizational culture perspective. *The International Journal on Media Management*, 5, 171-172.
- Schudson, M. (1989). The sociology of news production. *Media, Culture & Society*, 11, 263-282.
- Schultz, M. (1995). *On Studying Organizational Cultures: Diagnosis and Understanding*. Berlin, New York: Walter De Gruyter.
- Siebert, F. S., Peterson, T., & Schramm, W. (1956). *Four Theories of the Press*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Sinclair, J., Yue, A., Hawkins, G., Kee, P., & Fox, J. (2001). Chinese cosmopolitanism and media use. In S. Cunningham, & J. Sinclair (Ed.), *Floating Lives* (pp. 35-90). New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (1991). *Mediating the Message: Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content*. New York: Longman.

Snijders, M. L. (1994). Communication ethics in a changing Asia. *Media Asia*, 25, 37-41.

Soley, L. C. & Craig, R. L. (1992). Advertising pressure on newspaper: A survey. *Journal of Advertising*, 21(4), 1-10.

Soloski, J. (1989). News reporting and professionalism: Some constraints on the reporting of the news. *Media, Culture and Society*, 11, 207-228.

Spanish-Language Market Study. (1977). *Radio/TV Age* (Nov. 1977), S1-S24, A18-A20.

Strenski, J. B. (1986). Understanding of culture essential to success in Japanese market. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 31(2), 9.

Subervi-Velez, F. A. (1986). The mass media and ethnic assimilation and pluralism: A review and research proposal with special focus on Hispanics. *Communication Research*, 13(1), 71-96.

Subervi-Velez, F. A. (1997). Hispanic-oriented Media. In C. E. Rodriguez. (Ed.). *Latin Looks*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Tsagarousianou, R. (2001). 'A Space Where One Feels at Home': Media Consumption Practices among London's South Asia and Greek Cypriot Communities. In R. King, & N. Wood. (Ed.). *Media and Migration: Construction of Mobility and Difference* (pp.158-172). London, New York: Routledge.

Tuchman, G. (1972). Objectivity as strategic ritual: An examination of newsmen's notions of objectivity, *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(1), 110-131.

Turow, J. (1997). *Media Systems in Society: Understanding Industries, Strategies, and Power*. New York: Longman.

Underwood, D. (1993). *When MBAs Rule the Newsroom: How the Marketers & Managers Are Reshaping Today's Newspaper*. New York: Columbian University Press.

U.S Census Bureau. (2000). *United States Census 2000*. Retrieved 2006 from: <http://www.census.gov/>.

Wackman, D., Gillmor, D., Gaziano, C., & Dennis, E. (1975). Chain newspaper autonomy as reflected in presidential campaign endorsements. *Journalism Quarterly*, 52, 411-422.

Weaver, D. H. (1998). *The Global Journalist: News People around the World*. Cresskill, NJ,: Hampton Press.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York, York, Oxford University Press.

White, D. M. (1950). The gatekeeper: A case study in the selection of news, *Journalism Quarterly*, 27, 383-390.

Wilson, C. II., Gutierrez, F. (1985). *Minorities and the Media: Diversity and the End of Mass Communications*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Xu, X. (2000). Asian perspectives in communication: Assessing the search. *American Journal of Communication*. Online serial, 3(3). Retrieved 2006 from: <http://acjournal.org/holdings/vol3/iss3/speel/xiaoge.html>.

Zubrzycki, J. (1958). The role of the foreign language press in migrant integration. *Population Studies*, 12, 73-82.

APPENDIX

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Consent Script

Hello. This is Jun Xu. I am a graduate student from the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Georgia. I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements for my MA thesis. The title of this research is Organizational Culture and Content Production of Non-English Language Media in the U.S. The goal of this study is to learn more about the media in the U.S that serve immigrant and foreign language audiences. The study will also help provide information about the types of news and information available to people who may not use the mainstream media. You are invited to participate, and your participation is voluntary. I would like to ask you several questions about your news organization and its news priorities. The interview will take about 10 minutes. All the data collected will be kept confidential. All documents will be kept in my faculty advisor's locked office and be destroyed no later than May 2007. Your participation will be greatly appreciated. You are also free to withdraw at any time. Shall I begin now?

If Yes, continue with research questions.

If No, make an appointment for calling again to finish the interview.

Questions

I'd like to begin by confirming the information about your paper I found in the Bacon's Newspaper Directory and learn a bit more about your organization.

Q1. What is your paper's circulation?

Q2. How many days each week do you publish?

Q3. In what language or languages do you publish?

Q4. How many full-time employees does your newspaper currently have?

Q5. How many full-time employees, including the executive editor and including yourself, does your newspaper have working in the newsroom?

Q6. Who/What company is the primary owner of your newspaper?

Q7. Is the owner a U.S company, a foreign-based company, a U.S citizen or a foreign citizen?

Q8. Is your newspaper public-owned or private-owned?

Q9. Is your newspaper group-owned or independently owned? If group-owned, what company is the group owner?

Q10. Is any of your newspaper's owners a non-U.S citizen or foreign-based company?

Q11. What is the percentage of foreign investment in your newspaper?

1. 0
2. 1 – 25%
3. 26% – 50%
4. 51% – 75%
5. 76% – 99%
6. 100%
7. DK

Now I'd like to ask you a series of questions about your perceptions of your newspaper's goals.

Q12. I'll read you some statements of goals, please tell me to what extent do you agree upon each item as your organizational goals?

- a. Stay in business and make profits
 Str Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Str Agree
- b. Provide readers with information about their surroundings in their native languages
 Str Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Str Agree
- c. Serve readers by providing them with information about their native country or region
 Str Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Str Agree
- d. Help readers and their families maintain their native language and culture
 Str Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Str Agree

Which of the aforementioned statements best describes your organizational goal?

- e. Other, please specify:

Q12a. According to the amount of coverage your newspaper gives to news stories, which of the following categories of events would you say are the most important?

- a. Local events (Define: events happen in the community or the city of the readers)
- b. State events
- c. U.S National events
- d. International events, esp. events happened in the reader's native country or region

Q12b. According to the amount of coverage your newspaper gives to news stories, which of the following categories of events would you say are the most important?

- a. Breaking hard news stories (Define: telling readers who, what, when and where of breaking events in a timely manner)
- b. Feature stories (Define: appeal to readers' interests; may not be very timely)
- c. Investigative stories (Define: unearth significant information about matters of public importance in nonroutine methods; usu. carry follow-up stories)

Q14. Now I'll ready you a number of media's roles are listed below. Would you say they are very important, fairly important, not very important or not important?

14a

Provide analysis and interpretation

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14b

Get news to the readers quickly

- a. Very important

- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14c

Be an adversary of public officials

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14d

Give people a chance to express their views

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14e

Investigate claims of governments

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14f

Signal new trends

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14g

Develop intellectual/culture interests of public

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14h

Stand up for the minority

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14i

Provide entertainment

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14j

Exert influence on public/political agenda

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14k

Provide a good environment for advertisers

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14l

Provide people who cannot speak English with information

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14m

Provide migrant people with information about their home country

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14n

Help people with the same cultural heritage form a bond/identity

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14o

Promote the culture of the home country

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

14p

Challenge the views of mainstream U.S media

- a. Very important
- b. Fairly important
- c. Not very important
- d. Not important
- e. DK

Q15. Now I'd like to read you a series of statements about various practices that journalists sometimes use when reporting the news below. Please then tell me whether, in your opinion, each of these practices would be acceptable most of the time, some of the time, or never, for journalists in your news organizations.

15a

Go undercover to gain inside information

- a. Acceptable
- b. Might be acceptable
- c. Not acceptable

15b

Use business/government's documents without permission

- a. Acceptable
- b. Might be acceptable
- c. Not acceptable

15c

Badger or harass news sources

- a. Acceptable
- b. Might be acceptable
- c. Not acceptable

15d

Use hidden camera/microphone

- a. Acceptable
- b. Might be acceptable
- c. Not acceptable

15e

Use private documents without permission

- a. Acceptable
- b. Might be acceptable
- c. Not acceptable

15f

Paying for information

- a. Acceptable b. Might be acceptable c. Not acceptable

15g

Claim to be someone other than a journalist

- a. Acceptable b. Might be acceptable c. Not acceptable

15h

Use an unnamed confidential source

- a. Acceptable b. Might be acceptable c. Not acceptable

15i

Reveal a confidential source

- a. Acceptable b. Might be acceptable c. Not acceptable

Q16. Now I would like to ask you a few questions about your newspaper's relationship with advertisers and readers.

16a. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 indicating the most important and 1 indicating the least important, how important do you think advertisers' opinions about stories are when your news organization makes decisions about stories?

16b. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 indicating the most important and 1 indicating the least important, how important do you think readers' opinions about stories are when your news organization makes decisions about stories?

Q17. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about yourself.

a. How many languages do you speak?

b. What is your native language?

c. What is your country of citizenship?

d. What was your citizenship when you were born?

e. Do you have a degree in journalism?

f. What is the highest degree you received? (if applicable)

Less than high school

High school graduate

Some college

College graduate

Graduate school graduate

g. What area is your highest degree in?

This is the end. Thank you for your participation. If you have any questions or comments, you may either contact me at (706)389-6376 or my faculty advisor, Dr. Ann Hollifield at the University of Georgia, at (706)542-4966. This research is supervised by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Georgia. If you have any questions about your rights, please call (706)389-3199 or email irb@uga.edu. Again, thank you for your time.