

## Public Abstract

First Name:Jeesun

Middle Name:

Last Name:Kim

Adviser's First Name:Glen

Adviser's Last Name:Cameron

Co-Adviser's First Name:

Co-Adviser's Last Name:

Graduation Term:SS 2009

Department:Journalism

Degree:PhD

Title:Anger, Efficacy, and Identity in Activism: Public Perceptions of Threat Appraisal, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intention

This study was an exploratory attempt to apply an identity-based approach using concepts of avowed and ascribed identities to different types of activist organizations when managing a potential crisis based on the threat appraisal model (Jin & Cameron, 2007) and contingency theory (Cancel, Mitrook, & Cameron, 1999). A 2 (anger: high vs. low) x 2 (efficacy: high vs. low) x 2 (ascribed identity: matched vs. unmatched) mixed factorial design was employed to examine cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses to news stories about activist organizations. One of the most intriguing findings of this study is the main effect of ascribed identity across all dependent variables. An identity crisis leading to attributions of being a hypocrite caused by a perceived discrepancy between an avowed identity and an ascribed identity was found to raise expectations for the organization to perceive higher situational demands and more organizational resources, to have more negative and more intense feelings, to have more advocative stances, and to have a negative impact on attitudes and intention. This research extends the contingency theory framework to examine the dynamics of activist organizations, moving beyond the assumptions of two-way symmetrical communication in Grunig's excellence theory. From the standpoint of public relations practice, the main contribution of this study is to provide empirical evidence that in an identity crisis, being hypocritical in an activist organization's strategic conflict management can have a profoundly negative impact on the organization's image, reputation, and even survival.