ABSTRACT

MAPPING COGNITIVE CONSTRUCTS IN MALES AND FEMALES USING ZMET METHODOLOGY:
COMPARING MALE AND FEMALE EXPERIENCE WITHIN A CAMPUS MINISTRY ORGANIZATION

By K. Gail Sease

Research tools for understanding organizations have expanded in recent years in attempts to understand communication and organizational culture. In addition to traditional quantitative methods of questionnaires and surveys, non-traditional methods are also being utilized to expand this body of knowledge such as the Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique, or ZMET. This method gathers qualitative data to produce aggregate cognitive construct maps reflecting the most important constructs and construct relationships that participants hold in view of their respective organization. This study used the ZMET to analyze male and female organizational members of a large, Midwestern campus ministry. The resulting construct maps indicate that members of this organization share an overall strong organizational culture, however, subcultures within the organization emerged within the male and female participant groups, specifically in regards to perceptions of opportunities available, relationships to leaders, connectedness and the types of friendships that are cultivated.
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Chapter One: Review of the Literature

Past research has been directed at understanding an organization’s culture in order to explain, control, and shape that same culture (Rusaw, 1996). To do this one must have an understanding of the constructs that comprise an organization’s culture. Once this is understood, it is then possible to shape an organization’s culture into one that is more equitable for all of its members and, consequently, would result in a more meaningful and effective organizational experience.

Bond (1999), states “to the extent that we understand elements of the organizational contexts [cultures] that support diversity, we can open up new possibilities for the meaningful involvement of varied members.” (p. 328) Researchers in the communication discipline have studied the elements of organizational culture from many points of view, such as cultural perspectives (Alvesson, 1993), the interpretation of organizational communication cultures (Bantz, 1993), semiotics (Barley, 1983), symbolic convergence (Bormann, 1983), narratives (Brown, 1990), ethnography and critical cultural politics (Conquergood, 1991), cognition and message coding (Green, Kirch & Grady, 2000), symbols and meaning (Lee & Barnett, 1997), cultural performance (Pacanowksy & O’Donnell-Trujillo, 1983), leadership (Schein, 1985), communication rule stability and emergence (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1994), and root-metaphor analysis (Smith & Eisenberg, 1987). These communicative elements are what contribute to the creation and maintenance of organizations, and they help shape people’s lives within the organization. Since these elements, or constructs, can contribute to or detract from meaningful and satisfactory involvement of organizational members, it is important to understand how they are constructed and how they operate. Once we have this understanding, we can begin to influence an organization’s culture.

Researchers have attempted to examine organizational culture through various means. Quantitative methods, such as surveys or other approaches, have addressed certain aspects of organizational culture. However, these are limited by how survey questions are posed by the researcher; so as a consequence, certain elements of the organizational culture may not be included in the research instrument. In addition, the survey questions or answers do not usually reveal how members experience or perceive the organization through the members’ own perspectives and words. Another disadvantage to closed-question surveys is that they may be
able to ascertain what members feel, but they are limited in regard to explaining why members feel the way they do.

Qualitative research methods address these limitations, but they, too, are not without disadvantages. Reliability is a limitation with these methods, as is their inability to provide concise representations of findings. It is these issues with traditional methods of research that magnify the need to utilize a method that can penetrate symbolic and cognitive roles in developing organizational culture. Ideally, this new method would provide a way to transcend the limitations of other methods. The methodology that will be used in this study is able to overcome many of the limitations previously mentioned. The Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique (ZMET) will be used as the methodological tool to gather and analyze data. ZMET will be described in detail later in this paper.

The present study seeks to examine, using the ZMET, the role biological sex plays in shaping organizational experiences and culture in a campus ministry organization set within the context of a medium-sized, Midwestern university. This method will identify perceptions of organizational members from a sex-linked attribution perspective. Depending on the findings of this study, results may suggest areas of the organization’s culture that could be changed to promote equity and increase member loyalty to the organization, or results may generate ideas for strategic change to enhance organizational performance. Overall, this snapshot of the organization’s health will provide insights for increasing the effectiveness of the organization and member satisfaction.

Chapter one will focus on the concept of organizational culture, specifically, culture as symbolism and culture as cognition and culture as climate. It will also include gender research, in general, and gender research within religious organizations to adequately lay a foundation for what might be anticipated from the sample in this study. Next, the history and background of the organization being studied will be explained. Finally, past methods of research are explained in order to provide a rationale for the development of the ZMET and the core concepts that underlie the ZMET methodology are described. Chapter two will describe the research methods to be used in this study. The third chapter will present the results of the study, and the fourth chapter will discuss the findings of the study, implications of the findings and possibilities for future research.
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Organizational culture has been widely addressed in research literature (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). Although definitions may vary to some degree, the basic definition is that the culture of an organization reflects the organization’s core values, beliefs, and shared meanings. This definition also includes the idea that an organization’s culture is determined over time by members’ interactions and experiences. Kunda (1992) states, “culture is generally viewed as the shared rules governing cognitive and affective aspects of membership in an organization, and the means whereby they are shaped and expressed.” (p. 8) Many of these rules are not clearly visible, and yet others are clearly spoken and delineated.

These rules, values, beliefs, shared meanings and basic assumptions form the foundation of members’ experiences in the organization and are the lens through which all else is seen (Bond, 1999). These lenses can be problematic when they impact those in the organization negatively, such as marginalizing certain groups and individuals in the organization through unclear expectations or biases. This kind of organizational culture can perpetuate a monolithic organizational culture that is self-maintaining. Anyone who does not conform can be isolated and this could potentially compromise the ability to have a meaningful or positive organizational experience. It also could result in an inability to positively influence that same culture. Studying organizational culture is important because it helps those who lead organizations understand particular problems their organizations currently face or perhaps face in the future, and illuminates ways to change constructs within the culture to create a better and more inclusive experience for all.

The idea that organizations have unique and distinct cultures has been studied since the middle of the last century (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). Since that time, the prevalence with which organizational culture has been used as a lens to study organizations has rapidly increased, especially among communication scholars. Communication plays a “constitutive role in creating organizational culture” and therefore offers the communication researcher great opportunity in studying the way communication is performed and used in the creation of organizational culture (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001).

This study will provide a means of examining the role communication plays in the creation and performance of an organization’s culture. Specifically, it will allow insight into whether communication is different in its impact on males and females. Not only does this offer
much to be learned by the organization’s leaders, it also offers new perspectives to researchers. The narratives and insights produced through its study will offer new qualitative ground for researchers and allow them to step outside of previous research. Studying organizational culture through other texts, stories, ethnographies and performances opens up an entire new world.

Two assumptions underpin past approaches to studying organizational culture; the first suggests that culture is something an organization has, and the second suggests that culture is something an organization is (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). The first fails to recognize the pervasiveness of culture in an organization as well as implying that culture is something that can potentially be removed from an organization. It also denies the way culture is woven together with the essence of humanness; that is, how humans within an organization help create culture through shared customs and values (Dandridge et al., 1980). Also, without people there is no organization, therefore there is no culture. Consequently, culture cannot be something an organization has, but rather what an organization is. Because of this, the second perspective is held in higher regard by many organizational communication scholars (Dandridge, Mitroff, & Joyce, 1980; Bantz, 1993; Glaser, Zamanou, & Hacker, 1987).

Eisenberg and Riley (2001) introduce a number of general themes as a framework for looking at the role of communication in organizational culture. Some of those themes include culture as symbolism and performance, culture as text, culture as critique, culture as identity, culture as cognition, culture as climate and effectiveness, and others. This study will focus on and use the deeper understanding of the themes of culture as symbolism, culture as cognition, and culture as climate because of the way these themes interact with the research methodology that will be used. A solid understanding of these three themes and the way they interact is necessary in the analysis and clarity of potential subcultures, and those members’ experiences, within the greater organization.

A great deal can be learned from looking at organizational culture from the symbolism, cognition and climate points of view. Symbolism, within an organization, “refers to those aspects of an organization that members use to reveal unconscious feelings, images and values inherent in the context” of the organization (Dandridge et al., 1980). Cognition suggests that culture exists as a pattern of shared assumptions, shared frame of reference, or a shared set of values and norms (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). Lastly, organizational climate is described as
“shared perceptions of organizational policies, practices and procedures, both formal and informal” (Schneider, 1990, p. 22). These will be elaborated on further in the following section.

**Organizational Symbolism**

Previous research and study of organizational culture as symbolism were highly limited by the way symbolism was characterized (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). The early approach was often characterized as a perspective based on the “management of meaning” and treated symbols as literary devices. Later, as the area of study evolved, the organizational symbolism approach was inclusive of a broad spectrum of definitions and frames of organizational culture. Some “specialists” focused on narratives, stories, hallway talk and vocabulary, yet others called “generalists” tried to cultivate a more comprehensive view of how all forms of communication play a part in constructing and maintaining organizational culture. Bantz (1993) had a generalist approach and developed a communication-based technique called organizational communication culture (OCC) that analyzed messages in an organization and their interpretations. From this generalist point of view all messages are perceived as either resources or constraints that either build or transform what is reality within the organization. Instead of looking at symbols alone, it is important to realize symbols are sewn together as a system that operates within a greater system of organizational speech (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). Therefore, both the symbols and the system of symbols must be investigated to gather a complete picture of the organization.

Bantz’ work was referred to as a structurationist view that Witmer (1997) used in a study on Alcoholic’s Anonymous. Witmer found that rituals in an organization bound members together in such a way that organizational practices were clearly codified and articulated. Witmer studied the founder of the Alcoholic’s Anonymous organization, who was strong and charismatic. Witmer noted that a strong, charismatic leadership created a power imbalance and resulted in a dependency on the founder by members. This resulted in embedding the participants’ personal identities within the discursive structure of the group. This is not an unusual phenomenon. Schein (1983) looked at the impact of the founder on an organization’s culture and found that it affected the culture pervasively. This notion will be expounded on later in this paper when the founder of the organization to be studied is discussed.

Kunda (1992) investigated symbolic analysis in a study of a high-technology organization in his desire to learn how an organization creates and maintains strong culture. The managerial belief that “normative control is a better ideology than bureaucratic control”
motivated Kunda to focus on ritual performance as a framing device in how organizational members form common definitions of identity (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). Through this study he learned how dissent is suppressed and how those who disagree with the organization’s ideology can be informally ostracized. This focus led to looking at performance of culture in organizations.

Performance of culture has been studied by several communication researchers. Pacanowsky and O’Donnell Trujillo (1983) proposed that communication researchers pay attention to cultural performance in trying to understand cultural processes in organizations. After this proposition, Conquergood (1991) pointed out that culture was not always displayed verbally; that it was expressed and contested through “dance, music, gesture, food, ritual, artifact, symbol, action, as well as words” (p. 189). Finally, organizational culture as symbol and performance moved beyond looking at artifacts and symbols. This area of research began to realize that symbolic expression of culture can take the form of many voices and is expressed in many ways, even ones that seem contradictory (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001).

As mentioned previously, symbolism, within an organization, “refers to those aspects of an organization that members use to reveal unconscious feelings, images and values inherent in the context” of the organization (Dandridge et al., 1980). Symbolism embodies the basic ideas and values put forth by an organization. Mumby (1988, p. 12) says organizational symbolism is the basic rules, values, norms, attitudes, etc., that both regulate and constitute organizing.

Symbols used in communication are the manifestation of an individual’s thoughts and are a representation of a reality that already exists independent of its symbolic form (Mumby, 1988). Symbolism serves as a certain interpretation of reality in organizing values, norms, beliefs and attitudes in a certain way between members of an organization and the system to which they belong. Much like members and the organization they belong to, this symbolism is formed by a relationship between constructs and systems of constructs.

According to Kelly (1963), constructs and concepts are almost synonymous. Constructs are created when certain actions, events, and concepts become defined by the organization. When members of an organization are part of acknowledging and comprehending a common point of reference, constructs emerge. Both the constructs and the relationships among the constructs are important to understand an organization’s culture (Bantz, 1993). It is these
relationships that reveal the importance of constructs and how each relationship impacts the organizational environment and the manner in which it is arranged (Kelly, 1963).

Constructs are first communicated in general concepts. General concepts then transform into specific ones in the organization and are recognized by fellow members of the organization; they become a part of their collectively organized experience (Barley, 1983). Understanding these relationships will help organizational communication researchers comprehend the unique uses and purposes of them. Understanding these specific kinds of constructs, recognized by members of the Campus Crusade for Christ organization, is what this study intends to investigate. However, it is important to first understand the role that metaphors play in forming constructs.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explain how metaphors are the basic building block of how we process life around us; that is, how metaphors form constructs through which we operate our lives. They also note how metaphor bridges cognitive domains, legitimates actions and guides behaviors. Metaphors are representative of how people construct their realities and perceptions of the world around them (Leonard, 2002). Metaphor also describes and helps to understand the discursive nature of organizations and helps in organizational research (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001; Leonard, 2002). Metaphors function both to facilitate change in organizations and to preserve stability; however, they do not represent inherent or static meanings, they are living texts and clusters of meaning that provide understandings of how constructs are connected in an evolving symbol system (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001). Metaphors are important rhetorical devices that can capture the nature of organizational life in various ways, generate insights about organizational life, and construct new means of viewing organizations (Leonard, 2002).

Stories are also a paradigm or systems of constructs for existence that create a symbolic picture of beliefs, values and ideologies in an organization. Stories serve an important function for organizational members through socializing new members, creating bonds and cultural identification, praising heroes or criticizing foes, etc. (Putnam et al., 1991). Through framing events and providing necessary information, stories create paradigms or systems of constructs for people to operate out of in relation to an organization. Stories communicate culture and build a bridge between old members and new members. They help solve problems, inspire, and help build perceptions of an organization. Ultimately, stories help shape the culture of an
organization and manage the meaning of its activities (Putnam et al., 1991). Reading organizational stories allows the researcher access into the organization’s culture (Brown, 1990).

Organizational Cognition

The process of understanding the relationship between the construction of the individual’s identity and the social construction of the organization is mostly a cognitive one. That is, in order to understand the relationship between people and the organization they belong to, it is necessary to look at the cognitive framework that facilitates the relationship. Organizational cognition, as a paradigm, suggests that culture exists as a pattern of shared assumptions, a shared frame of reference, or a shared set of values and norms (Eisenberg & Riley, 2001). In other words, organizational cognition focuses on what people are as opposed to what people say or do. Because these individual cognitions arise as a result of social interactions (Sackman, 1991), they often impact how people decide what course of action will be taken and why it needs to be taken. Schein (1985) believes that many of the reasons why people do what they do are concealed or unconscious. Therefore before a culture can really be understood, it is important to investigate the assumptions behind the reasons for the group’s behavior; it is these assumptions that determine what actually happens in the group.

Mohan (1993) believes that cultures are comprised of subjective constructs that are found in individual members’ minds. Cognition focuses on those underlying structures behind organizational behavior (Greene, Kirch, & Grady, 2000). So, if cognitions structure culture, there needs to be a way to categorize the shared assumptions, frames of reference and norms (Mohan, 1993). Sackman (1991) divided cognitions into these three types of knowledge and then they were combined into cognitive maps. These cognitive maps overlapped and formed a map that constituted the organization’s culture that was being studied. Sackman believed that over time these cognitive maps evolved into a cultural knowledge map that was filled with relevant organizational experiences.

Social interactions help create this symbolic system of culture which is not necessarily shared by all organizational members (Mohan, 1993). Though all members face problems and circumstances, the problems and circumstances faced are not all the same. Neither is the way they are interpreted. What seems one way to a certain member may be seen entirely differently by another (Frost, Moore, Lundberg, & Martin, 1991). Even those with the most connectedness to the organization will still have differences (Mohan, 1993). The cognitive maps that exist are
never entirely the same, especially when considering the number of subgroups, or subcultures that may exist in any organization (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1994). There is rarely unanimity in an organization.

**Organizational Climate**

Organizational climate has been referred to as “the feeling that is conveyed in a group by the physical layout and the way in which members of the organization interact with each other, with customers, or outsiders” (Schein, 1985). Schein also discusses three major theoretical perspectives in regard to organizational climate that include describing climate “as an attribute or set of attributes belonging to an organization,” … “as an interaction of an organization’s characteristics and the individuals’ perceptions of those characteristics,” and … “as an individual’s summary perceptions of his or her encounters with the organization” (1985).

The first perspective casts organizational climate as something that an organization possesses. These attributes are seen as characteristics that exist separate from individuals within the organization. In other words, despite the kinds of individuals that make up an organization, there are certain definable characteristics that would remain based on the existence of the organization itself. These characteristics are also believed to endure over time, to be independent of individual members’ perceptions, and to entail consensus across observers as to the quality of the characteristics (Schein, 1985).

The second perspective holds that climate is “an interaction of an organization’s characteristics and the individuals’ perceptions of those characteristics (Schein, 1985).” In this perspective climate is a variable based on perceptions and dependent on self-report measures. Climate also is descriptive, not evaluative, and expected to be congruent with other members’ reports of the organization’s characteristics. It is this approach that places the formation of organizational climate within the individual.

The third perspective, which is essentially a psychological approach, is based on attributions from individual perceptions about the organization. This position interprets the individuals’ perceptions as being influenced by the experiences an individual might have within the organization and views a subsystem as the unit of analysis (Schein, 1985). This approach provides the individual with a cognitive map with which to view the organization.

However, the most contemporary perspectives put meaning and sensemaking as the focus in studies on organizational climate (Rentsch, 1990). Some suggest that organizational climate
can be seen as the primary means through which the fundamental constructs of a culture interact in different circumstances, among different group members and even within the culture itself (Moran & Volkwein, 1992). This represents a different side of organizational theory and is separate from perspectives like structuration (Poole & McPhee, 1983). Poole and McPhee suggest that climate is constantly being structured and restructured by the members of an organization as they function within their environment (1983); in addition to this, they believe that communication is a constitutive force for all climates in an organization, regardless of how the climate is analyzed. Many climates can exist on many levels within an organization, and within many elements that make up that organization (Schneider, Wheeler, & Cox, 1992), and there is little agreement among scholars how to study organizational climate (Fink & Chen, 1995).

Because members of an organization share a similar environment, it is reasonable to surmise climate is created in response to the demands and contingencies of that environment (Moran & Volkwein, 1992). An organization’s rules and norms are similarly perceived by members exposed to them (Schneider, 1990). Individual members of an organization decide on the climate, and it is likely that they do this in psychologically meaningful ways that are lasting and in response to that exposure (Rensch, 1990). Therefore, climate results from perceptions that members share in response to the same environmental messages (Moran & Volkwein, 1992).

**Differences Between Organizational Climate and Organizational Culture**

Organizational climate differs from organizational culture and it is important to make that distinction (Moran & Volkwein, 1992). Though they are very similar and somewhat reciprocal, organizational climate focuses on perceptions that members share and is created by organizational culture (Schneider, 1990). Some of the similarities between climate and culture include: both are used to make sense of an organization, both are learned through the interaction of organizational members, both are monolithic and multi-faceted, and both are used to make sense of members’ behavior. Organizational culture is more slowly developed and is much more pervasive than organizational climate; and members are generally unaware of how deeply it penetrates the collective experience (Moran & Volkwein, 1992).

**Subcultures**

Organizational symbolism, organizational cognition and organizational climate support the approach of looking at organizations as cultures and construct a foundation of also looking at
potential subcultures. Subcultures are defined by Conrad and Poole (1998) as “groups of people whose shared interpretation of their organization helps bind them together and differentiate them from other groups of employees” (p. 117). Subcultures may share part of the organization’s cultural characteristics, but not all of them. They are usually small groups within the organization and are distinguished by their own set of characteristics as well. Sometimes members of groups will define themselves in an oppositional way and are referred to as countercultures. Countercultures sometimes express conflict in an organization and reflect the need for differentiation “while maintaining an “uneasy” symbiotic relationship with an officially sanctioned corporate culture” (Mohan, 1993). Because there is no universal method for analyzing cultures, it is likely that for one to emerge it would need to be in the form of an in-depth analysis that is performed through the eyes of those members in the organization being studied.

**SEX DIFFERENCES IN ORGANIZATIONS**

One example of a subculture within organizations that has been gaining more attention is that of sex differences. Research has found men and women do not always experience organizations in the same way. In fact, certain types of organizations, specifically those in the business realm, present very different experiences for women and people of color (Bond, 1999; Hardesty, 1992). Women and minorities are generally found grouped in entry-level jobs or lower mid-level positions, offered lower pay and possess less power than those held by white men (Bond, 1999; Epstein, 1997). Along with the difference in pay and power there is often a different experience in relation to working conditions. Sexual harassment and racism, in addition to other social problems called micro inequities, are experienced on a daily basis and the consequences of these experiences leave their mark on the recipients of this treatment (Bond, 1999; Epstein, 1997). Often, this kind of treatment results in lower job satisfaction, stress, depression, feelings of inadequacy and impede the ability to engage in organizational relationships with meaning and connectedness (Bond, 1999). Because of this, women are often impacted differently in their organizational experiences.

Organizations are often conceived of as value-free, neutral, and objective structures which are impacted by the stereotypes and biases of the people that are a part of it (Rubin, 1997). The use of formalized procedures to select and include women attempts to erase the existence of deeply embedded issues regarding sex differences. This is done through creating the appearance
of an approach of fairness. In this way, sex differences only become an issue if a question related to sex is asked, or if an assessment is made on sex role-stereotyped assumptions. Even when the issue of sex difference is addressed, through educating organizational members about discrimination, the basic ideas and assumptions underlying the sex difference issue can continue to be overlooked. It is important to investigate the core values and beliefs about men and women, and their role within the organization, in order to effectively address potential and existing underlying problems (Epstein, 1997). These values and beliefs are evidenced in the existing structure of the organizational context and they affect the organizational culture and meaningful engagement by its members (Bond, 1999).

In addition, viewing organizations from this neutral, value-free position fails to acknowledge two important issues (Rubin, 1997). Those issues overlooked are first, the historical contexts and second, the social relationships that exist in organizations. Both of these issues contribute to how sex differences are constructed. Schein (1983) investigates the first issue, historical context, by addressing how the founder of an organization impacts the organizational culture that evolves. This element will be addressed later in this paper.

The second issue points to the reality that most organizations are grounded in bureaucratic, organizational relationships; and those relationships are built around certain sex difference assumptions about the separation of public and private life (Rubin, 1997; Leonard, 2002; Brereton & Bendroth, 2001). Men generally and historically have dominated the public sphere and women were given responsibility for the domestic sphere. Because a religious organization encompasses a strong capacity for caring, interpersonal skills and flexibility, characteristics that are largely known as feminine, the lines between domestic and public sphere become less clear (Rubin, 1997). (It is possible to argue that a religious organization could operate in a public sphere, a domestic sphere, both spheres, neither, or a sphere not yet defined.) It is this division of organizational responsibilities that draws a clear line of distinction between the experiences of men and women within an organization. Men’s roles within an organization tend to be facilitated by the work of women (Rubin, 1997; Leonard, 2002; Brereton & Bendroth, 2001).

In the past, prejudice and discrimination within organizations tended to be more overt and direct; however, the way prejudice and discrimination are played out within organizations today can be much more covert (Bond, 1999; Rubin, 1997). Many of the ways discrimination and
inequity manifest themselves are embedded in organizational culture and, consequently, are much more difficult to distinguish (Bond, 1999; Fobes, 1997). The implications of these experiences are not always obvious to the recipients either (Fobes, 1997). Sometimes the implications are not present in the conscious part of a person’s thoughts or experience, and therefore remain rarely addressed.

Research has documented how working conditions for men and women are different, and how this affects women’s connectedness to the organization, including their influence and meaningful participation (Acker, 1998; Cohen, Pant & Sharp, 1998; Leonard, 2002; Mankowksi & Thomas, 2000; Mills, 2002; Rubin, 1993; Shields, 2000). These differences experienced by women have also been acknowledged through sensitivity training by acknowledging how negative treatment of women is less overt in its manifestation. However, there are ongoing, covert manifestations that often emerge and show that intervention is still needed in this area. Instead of an organization recognizing and owning biases against its women, they usually reinforce biases for preserving the status quo (Bond, 1999; Fobes, 1997; Rubin, 1997).

Male and Female Experiences and Religious Organizations

All organizations face challenges, however, religious organizations have their own challenges in regard to sex differences. Research on religious organizations has found a number of situations. For example, Rusaw (1996) looked at pastors from urban churches who were attempting to change the culture of their churches into one that embraced a greater sense of diversity. She used questionnaires and interviews as well as historical documents from each church. Using narratives, symbolic meanings of common activities, problems and concerns, she uncovered diversity issues and ways pastors could influence change within their church culture through integrating symbols, beliefs and practices of subgroup into overall church worship services and through sharing common social service goals with nonreligious, government, or community organizations.

Bendroth’s (2001) research uncovered the complicated picture of evangelical conservative Protestantism and its view of women. Her research showed that although the assumption has been toward women being defined in a certain and unchanging way, the contrary may be more of a current reality. She went on to point out how various groups of people in religious life are questioning the treatment and positions towards women and how this may
ultimately impact the image of religion, possibly challenging the broader context of how women have been subrogated through the structural properties of religion.

Brereton and Bendroth (2001) magnify the existence of a female majority in religion and how this majority presence of females is a form of social power that is actually changing the face of religion. They found that much of the recent work on women in conservative religion is challenging the secular assumption that religion and feminism are antithetical. They also pointed out that the number of women involved in religion remains strong, but that the numbers of men are decreasing.

Bartkowski (2000) researched the Promise Keeper’s movement, its impact on ideas of masculinity, and its construction of divergent forms of masculinity. Through interviews and ethnographic research, he found that Promise Keepers juxtaposes masculine and feminine identity definitions consistently, and they define masculinity consistently in terms of the “other”, that is, in terms of women. Bartkowski (2001) also researched the negotiation of sex roles in evangelical families and the competing viewpoints that war against one another. Through using historical material, textual analysis, interviews and ethnographic observation, he revealed the intense negotiation that ensues in evangelical culture. He discussed the multiple discourses that are enacted and practiced within evangelical families and churches.

Fobes (1997) examined sex differences in a religious organization and how it was used in contradictory ways as a cultural resource. Her conclusive finding was that organizations can use sex differences to support a patriarchal agenda without ever specifying or codifying its presence. In other words, it influence is covert and therefore has the potential to be more insidious than that which is obvious. Mankowski and Thomas (2000) investigated through narrative analysis how personal identity was supported by community narratives, which served as a psychological resource, in a campus ministry community. Cohen, Pant and Sharp (1998) found that university students hold women to a higher moral standard than they hold men. This finding was more pronounced among the men than the women.

Griffith (1997) researched Women’s Aglow Fellowship, an evangelical women’s organization. Griffith’s ethnographic investigation of this organization illuminated how women in this organization have pushed the boundaries of evangelicalism. She shows how the organization has many important connections to feminism, in spite of their seeming opposition. Hardesty’s research (1980) on evangelical women throughout history uncovers how women have
historically dealt with the same biases and how they coped with them. She uncovers women’s contributions concerning abolition, temperance, suffrage and ordination. Through her historical study, she discusses male-female relationships, the place of women in the church, and their early leadership roles in church organizational life.

Finally, one of the most important works in this area of research is Scanzoni and Hardesty’s (1992) research on biblical feminism. Their work researches the roles of men and women within churches and religious organizations. They offer direction on future approaches to this topic for individual women as well as women, in general. Their research is significant because it offers an historical account of the experiences of men and women in religion, including the reasons that precipitated the present position of evangelicals regarding the role of women in religion. In a personal interview, Nancy Hardesty (2003) stated, “Evangelicals define their position on women as a response to the liberal position concerning women. Before the Women’s Liberation Movement, evangelicals ordained women, but once liberals took a position on the affirmative involvement of women in religion, evangelicals decided to take the completely opposite position and figuratively drew a line in the sand. Evangelical churches decided totally against some of their own history of ordaining women, not because they thought it was wrong, but because liberal churches did ordain.”

Religious organizations can often exhibit the same biases for preserving the status quo, or protecting patriarchal values and roles as secular organizations. While they may be unintentional, those biases can be hurtful to their female organizational members and cause them to sometimes feel alienated in the organizational experience. It is important to investigate the role of sex differences within religious organizations for several reasons. First, it is imperative to delineate whether women have the same opportunities presented to them as do men. Many religious organizations have taken the position of saying that women are equals to men and should be treated as such, but then fail to carry out those intentions (Rubin, 1993). Others take the position that women are not the same and should not expect the same opportunities to be available (Rubin, 1993).

Second, it is important to research the role of sex differences in religious organizational experience in order to challenge the universalized and essentialized position of dichotomized sex categories (Rubin, 1993). Younger members of religious organizations are challenging historically held perspectives with regard to male and female roles and experiences. Because of
this, assessing the existing climate could possibly provide a more effective organizational
environment for these members and deepen the meaning of organizational involvement for these
members.

Third, skills and characteristics that have been typified as masculine and feminine are in
actuality shared by both men and women. Because of structural changes in organizations and
competition to retain employees and members of an organization, characteristics that have been
typically viewed as feminine, “such as caring, interpersonal skills, flexibility and an interest in
part-time work” are increasingly those traits that men have to adapt to remain competitive
(Rubin, 1993). This is consistent with the concept of androgyny advanced by Bem (1974).

Lastly, it is important to examine sex differences in religious organizations because of the
practical need to appreciate differences and diversity of members and the potential for failing to
do so. The homogeneous and exclusive nature of many religious organizations can isolate them
from those they would like to reach; not to mention it potentially constrains at least half of the
members of their organizations. In order for religious organizations to be effective in how they
serve their audiences, it is important to uncover any existing inequities. In examining these
elements of organizational culture, religious organizations could maximize their impact on those
they would like to reach in a couple of different ways. Equity can be expressed through
communicating a desire to empower all the members of their organization and then doing so.
Also, valuing the presence and contribution of all members and communicating these values can
create an attractive organizational culture. The opportunity to remedy any underlying issues
creates an atmosphere that is free from one of the most stratifying constructs of any organization,
sex differences. In order to be more effective in organizational goals and strategies, it is
imperative that religious organizations eradicate any form of discrimination and inequity. The
following section will describe in considerable depth the history and background of the
organization that is being studied in this research.

CAMPUS CRUSADE FOR CHRIST

Campus Crusade for Christ is an evangelical campus ministry organization that was
founded in 1951, on the campus of UCLA in California, by Bill and Vonette Bright. A year after
its founding, Bill Bright wrote the religious booklet entitled, “The Four Spiritual Laws”, and it
has come to be the most widely distributed religious booklet in history, with approximately 2.5
billion to date. The underlying concept that formed its foundation was to “win campus today and
change the world tomorrow” (Campus Crusade, 2003). In less than a decade of existence, Campus Crusade for Christ had expanded to more than 40 other college campuses in the United States and in two other countries. By 1983, the organization had arranged an event that drew 17,000 college students. In 1995, Campus Crusade for Christ was named the top religious charity in the United States, and in 1996 Money magazine named the organization the most “efficient” religious ministry in the U.S.

Campus Crusade for Christ International, the parent organization for Campus Crusade for Christ, had grown to an organization that had 24,000 full-time staff members, exceeded 553,000 trained volunteers, and served 191 countries by 2000. Currently, in the U.S., the organization has active movements on more than 1,000 campuses with 44,000 students involved.

The Role of the Founder in the Organization’s Culture

Schein (1983) addressed the fact that a founder plays a role in the culture of an organization. Schein states, “…an organization’s culture begins life in the head of its founder—springing from the founder’s ideas about truth, reality, and the way the world works.” Bill Bright has played a significant role in building the culture that defines Campus Crusade for Christ. Bright led the organization until August of 2001. Leading the organization for more than 50 years, Bright certainly has much of who he is woven into what defines Campus Crusade for Christ. Investigating the culture of this organization should prove to be interesting given Bright’s approach to the church and Christians at large. Bright questioned church and religious environments when he made the statement, “I made up my mind then that I would spend my time with nonbelievers, and when they became Christians, I would do everything I could to keep them separate from the old diseased Christians. I didn’t want them to catch their diseases” (Zoba, 2001).

Schein (1992) further develops his thought about how a founder impacts the culture of an organization in his perspective regarding the primary functions of a leader. He believes the primary function of a leader is to manipulate the culture of the organization. He believes that a leader must have the vision to create a culture and the ability to articulate and enforce the vision of the organization (Schein, 1992; Zdenek, 2003).

Bright was influenced considerably by his mother, whom he went to church with often as a young boy; however, the overall experience was not necessarily a positive one. The pastor of his mother’s church was known by Bright as a womanizer and adulterer who eventually left his
family and divorced. Later on in Bright’s early adulthood experiences, he was influenced more greatly by Christian educator Henrietta Mears of First Presbyterian Church of Hollywood. Throughout that time Bright owned a candy business and went to seminary, Mears continued to influence him in several ways as he grew in his faith. Mears taught him to dream big, guided his soon to be wife to have faith in Jesus Christ, and provided support to Bright and his wife when their ministry was close to collapsing (Dart, 2001). The Brights were without a place to live after losing their apartment situated near the UCLA campus. Mears stepped in and bought a mansion that she and the Brights could live in next to the campus, and this prevented the collapse of the campus ministry. This support laid the very groundwork that Bright needed to build Campus Crusade into a viable, strong organization. Without Mears’ influence and support, it is possible that Campus Crusade would have never had the opportunity to get off the ground as an organization.

**Summary**

In light of Mears’ influence on Bright’s success in the ministry, this study seeks to examine how experiences in the organizational culture of Campus Crusade for Christ are impacted by sex differences. Campus Crusade is an interesting evangelical organization to examine because even though it is evangelical, it is possible that Bright has not adopted the same evangelical position in regard to the role of sex differences in the organization’s members since his own experience was so greatly impacted by a female leader. In order to accomplish the goal of examining how sex roles are constructed, it was important to discuss organizational culture and how it is enacted through symbolism and cognition, how sex roles are constructed in organizations, and more specifically, how sex difference impacts experiences in religious organizations. This discussion has laid the foundation for conducting research to reach the goals of this paper and has demonstrated need for a methodology that can overcome many of the limitations inherent in past research methodologies. The ZMET seems to be able to overcome these limitations. The development of the ZMET methodology will be discussed next, but how it is implemented will be discussed further in chapter two.

The ZMET has been used to highlight the different symbolic and cognitive constructs of race in a university community (Vorell, 2003), and to gain insight into consumer behavior by first eliciting and then mapping consumers’ mental models that underlie their feelings of involvement (Christenson & Olson, 2002). In this study, ZMET will be used to map a mental
model of members’ perceptions of their experiences in the Campus Crusade organization and analyzed to determine whether there are sex differences.

**ZMET – ZALTMAN METAPHOR ELICITATION TECHNIQUE**

The communication discipline is known for adopting theories, ideas, knowledge and concepts from other disciplines. This adoption has created a rather integrated foundation which has produced many benefits. For example, psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, political science and marketing are part of the interdisciplinary roots and richness of the communication discipline. Other fields also use many communication ideas; and this phenomenon has created a reciprocal relationship for the interdisciplinary exchange of both theory and methodology.

Just about every discipline that studies human beings, in some form or fashion, uses surveys, ethnography, interviews or observations. As Bond (1999) noted in a study on sex differences, race and class within organizations, there is a need for new approaches that are rooted in understanding how the dynamics of potential discrimination play themselves out in various organizational contexts. One such new approach, developed for studying marketing issues by Gerald Zaltman, uses metaphor to understand a participant from a different perspective. This methodology is referred to as the Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique (ZMET). The method’s protocol calls for the use of various approaches like metaphor, art therapy and story analysis to discover constructs; this results in allowing the interviewees to tap into their more deeply held thoughts toward a particular subject.

**Development of the ZMET**

The ZMET methodology was developed as an approach to understanding consumers’ interpreted meanings of a product or a brand (Christensen & Olson, 2002). The ZMET focuses on symbolic and subjective perception of something, including the cognitions that formulate these perceptions. This approach can be adapted for the study of organizational culture. The goal of organizational culture research is to examine concepts like symbolism and subjective perception to understand how the organization’s system was created and therefore how it influences members of the organization. In turn, this can create the ability for leaders or managers to develop more effective strategies in marketing their products (Zaltman & Higie, 1993). As its use has been increased it has also included exposing internal organizational issues. To date, the methodology has been used by over 25 companies in 20 countries. Because the
ZMET’s measures are cognitively based, this method has many advantages for use in examining organizational culture.

The ZMET was intended to be used as a marketing research tool that measures how current and potential customers think and feel about a certain product. The goal of the ZMET is to better understand participant’s thoughts and feelings about a particular topic; that is, their goals, desires, needs and values concerning it. Zaltman argues that these thoughts and feelings are not always readily accessible or able to be accessed through verbal discussion alone (Zalman & Higie, 1993; Zaltman & Coulter, 1995; Zaltman, 1996; Eakin, 2002). These thoughts and feelings can take the form of images or even other forms such as tactile, olfactory, auditory and so on. Consequently, the images are referred to as metaphors. The qualitative personal interview process provides the opportunity to gather verbal descriptions of the participants’ thoughts and feelings in relation to the image presented and allow for deeper understanding. Since participants select their own images, the method gives participants control of the research stimuli and connection to the research experience. This results in representation of the participants’ thoughts and feelings in a more complete and accurate manner than if the researcher had presented the stimuli (Zaltman, 1996).

Since it relies on organizational symbolism and organizational cognition to achieve its insights, the ZMET process can be modified to reveal the same thoughts and feelings of an organization’s member toward the organization. Vorell (2003) found, in his study on racial subcultures in a university community, that subcultures do exist in a university’s organizational culture. The cognitive construct maps that were analyzed in his study revealed only a few similar cognitive constructs between the white and black students, and only one shared relationship in reference to the culture. Both groups also felt like the university communicated to them symbolically and that symbolism resulted in influencing how they processed the university’s culture and climate. This study, in addition to past research by Zaltman and Coulter (1995), has produced results that are generalizable to the public. This has paved a way to further apply the method to the current study.

There are seven basic assumptions that drive the ZMET process (Zaltman, 1996; Zaltman & Coulter, 1995). These assumptions include:

1. Most communication is nonverbal. There is general agreement that at least two-thirds of all social meaning is communicated in nonverbal terms, which is also consistent with the
finding of two-thirds of all stimuli penetrating the brain is visual (Zaltman, 1996). Understanding more about this symbolic process will enable researchers to have insight to how organizational values are conveyed.

2. Thoughts occur as images. Although thoughts usually occur as images, they are expressed verbally. So, the way thoughts occur is not the same as how they are expressed. Because of this, consumers need the ability to express their thoughts in images in order to bring the researcher closer to their perceptions of certain things. This combination of both verbal and nonverbal terms to describe something can offer a much more comprehensive understanding of how a participant thinks and feels about something (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995; Zaltman, 1996).

3. Metaphors are central to cognition. Metaphors provide access to consumers’ thoughts and feelings, and this allows understanding of their behavior (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995, Zaltman, 1996).

4. Cognition is grounded in embodied experience. Sensory-based metaphors serve as devices for understanding consumers’ thoughts and behaviors. Pictures and visual metaphors provide access to these thoughts and behaviors (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995).

5. Reason, emotion and experience co-mingle. Healthy decision-making and response to experiences includes both emotion and reason (Zaltman, 1996).

6. Deep structures of thought can be accessed. It is possible, with the right technique, for researchers to help consumers fully articulate these deeper thoughts and feelings (Zaltman, 1996). Customers are often willing to share them once they are discovered.

7. Everyone has underlying thoughts. These underlying thoughts can be bridged and will allow feelings to express themselves externally (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995).

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to examine how sex differences are constructed, through mapping male and female cognitive constructs using ZMET in an organizational context, and specifically in the study of culture and subculture in a religious organization. The campus ministry organization will be treated as an organizational culture, and male and female members are seen as possibly distinct subcultures. The ZMET will allow the researcher to gain a better
understanding of how each subculture perceives and discerns its place in the organizational culture. The overarching research question posed is:

\textit{RQ1. How do the cognitive construct maps of male organizational members differ from the cognitive construct maps of female organizational members?}
Chapter Two: Methodology

PARTICIPANTS

Sixteen undergraduate students, eight male and eight female, who were current members of the Miami University Campus Crusade for Christ organization, were recruited to participate in this study. In order for the participants to be eligible, they had to be involved in Campus Crusade for Christ for at least a year and have general interest in participating in the research. Student participants were drawn from a subject pool comprised of COM 134, 135, and 136 students. Announcements of the study were made during class by the individual instructors who teach COM 134, COM 135 and COM 136. (The researcher of this study did not use her own students because of the potential for conflict of interest.)

Students enrolled in the COM 134, 135, and 136 courses were given course research participation credit for volunteering to participate. The signup time for participation had to be extended to achieve the desired number of participants. Later, when participants were still needed, students were verbally referred from friends who knew about the study. Those remaining participants came from the general population of Miami University students who were members of Campus Crusade for Christ. Those students did not receive any research participation credit, and simply participated on a volunteer basis. (Because of the eligibility criteria set forth for participation in the research, the need to belong to and be active with Campus Crusade for at least a year, a larger subject pool had to be created.)

Research Team Demographics

The research team included a second-year female graduate student (the author of this thesis) and a first-year female graduate student, who served as a coder for reliability.

ZMET Procedure

Data collection began by having each member take ten to fifteen photographs representing their thoughts and feelings about the campus ministry organization at Miami University (Zaltman & Higie, 1993; Coulter, Zaltman, & Coulter, 2001). After being given initial instructions (to take 12-14 pictures that represent their thoughts and/or feelings about Campus Crusade) and a disposable camera, a personal interview was scheduled with each participant approximately seven to ten days later. Participants were then instructed when and where to return the disposable cameras in order for the researcher to get the photographs developed.
When the participants arrived at the interview, the photographs were ready to be viewed. Participants arrived at the interview having spent a considerable amount of time identifying images that reflected their thoughts and feelings. Each one-on-one interview lasted approximately two hours (Zaltman, 1996). Notes were taken by the researcher throughout the interview and recorded on paper. In addition, each interview was video-recorded for viewing later, if necessary.

The photographs, generated by the participants, serve as the metaphorical means for investigation into their thoughts and feelings towards the Campus Crusade for Christ organization. The photographs are the entry points into the participants’ perceptions (Zaltman, 1996). Because the participants supply their own images, they have full responsibility for providing the stimuli used in the research interview. This offers a unique advantage to the researcher because the information gained from the interviewee’s point of view is much richer than information from the researcher’s perspective (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995).

Various interview probes, generally used in art therapy, are employed during the interview process (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995). These are used in order to tap into verbal descriptions of what the images represent to each participant. Each image represents the attitudes and feelings each participant holds toward Campus Crusade for Christ at Miami University. The guided conversation allows the researcher insight concerning the participant’s deeper cognitive concepts of their campus ministry experience. This is similar to what is collected through more traditional means such as surveys and focus groups. The in-depth interview has significant merit and can produce greater validity, reliability, and relevance in its findings than traditional means of data gathering (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995; Holstein & Gubrium, 1995).

One interviewer handled the one-on-one interview sessions in this research. The interviewer was trained to interview by watching 12 hours of research videos, where a similar study was conducted, that also used the ZMET methodology. That particular study examined the cognitive maps of black and white female students at a large Midwestern university (Vorell, 2003).

**ZMET Steps**

The ZMET interview uses several steps to bring guiding metaphors and constructs to the surface in order to determine their governing relationships. These steps include: [1] storytelling,
The steps are specific to the ZMET process and provide various opportunities for identifying and understanding the cognitive metaphors that drive the image selections (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995). The multiple steps provide a safety net for recovering any important ideas that could be missed in the other methods. As the interview progresses, each step provides validation of ideas from the previous steps. The redundancy increases confidence about the validity and importance of the ideas being shared.

In the first step participants were asked to describe how each picture related to his or her impressions of the campus ministry organization at Miami University (Coulter, Zaltman, & Coulter, 2001). Since human memory revolves around storytelling, past research has indicated that most participants come to the interview with stories they want to tell about the images (Coulter, Zaltman, & Coulter, 2001). Participants were encouraged to explain what was going on in the image through imagining themselves in the image, and then they were asked to describe what things or people are present (ZMET Research Process). The researcher refrained from interpreting any of the images selected in order to not unduly influence the interview process. The stories told are often rich in metaphors and are very insightful about the participants (Coulter, Zaltman, & Coulter, 2001).

In the second step the interviewer asked the participant if he or she had other important ideas they wished they could express but for which they were unable to find any images. Then the researcher explored what kind of images might have represented those particular thoughts or feelings. The reply was recorded on an index card and included with the rest of the images (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995). The importance of this is to capture all appropriate and applicable images (Coulter, Zaltman, & Coulter, 2001), and in doing this allows any forgotten images to surface.

The third step had the participants sort the pictures into categories of their own creation. Doing this step allows constructs to emerge concerning how they may view or even categorize the organization through their thoughts and feelings.

The fourth step had the participant try to identify how two of three randomly selected images are alike but different from the third image. Then the relevance of these distinctions to
the participant was probed to find any relationships between the participant and the images. This allows major themes or constructs in their thoughts and feelings toward the campus ministry organization to emerge (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995).

The fifth step involved the interviewer randomly selecting an image and asking the participant to think about what might be included in the picture if the frame were widened. This question was asked in relation to the same idea about relationships between the participant and the images that were probed in step four.

The interviewer asked participants during step six to describe the organization in terms of sensory images such as color, taste, touch, smell, and sound. This can be answered in an affirmative way, such as what the organization is, or in the negative, as in what it is not. These answers were further explored to reveal deeper descriptions of the participants’ thoughts and feelings (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995).

In the seventh step, the interviewer asked the participants to create a one-act play or a video that expresses the most important ideas about the topic. This revealed deeper planes of the participants’ cognitions and feelings about the topic (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995).

Finally, the eighth step had the interviewer review all the constructs that emerge during the interview. These constructs were recorded throughout the interview. The interviewer then had the participant review them and check their accuracy. They were also asked if there were any missing constructs. Participants were then asked to create a diagram of key concepts using note cards and to indicate the relationships between the constructs. Then the participants were asked to walk the interviewer through the cognitive map that was created.

**Data Analysis**

After the research was completed, both members of the research team reviewed the videotaped interviews independently in order to identify key constructs or themes. Constructs were created by the researchers through abstraction and represent common ideas, themes, and concepts expressed by the participants of the study. The constructs represent important aspects of the participants’ mental maps such as core values, feelings, emotions, thoughts, ideas, themes, etc. Each construct has its own importance and meaning, but the real importance of the constructs is the relationships that exist between the individual constructs (ZMET Coding Guide).
Each researcher took notes, while reviewing the videos, and content-analyzed the participants’ responses in order to identify key constructs and construct relationships. This increased the reliability of the research findings. (It is important to note that review of the videotapes and note-taking was first conducted individually by the researchers, without reference to one another.) Once these were identified, the existence of these constructs and construct relationships were compared to the maps the participants created.

The researchers’ content analysis notes were compared at this point, and the researchers discussed each construct and construct relationship on each participant’s map to provide a single map acceptable to one another. Some constructs were edited off the final map by participants, even after a certain amount of interview time was spent talking about those constructs. At this point, if each construct was discussed at any length and supported by quotes during the videotaped interview, it was added to a participant’s individual map. Consensus was required by both coders before anything was added to the maps. This approach of requiring consensus in adding or deleting items off the maps ultimately contributed to 100% reliability because of the agreement between coders. With regard to the maps created by the participants, if both researchers had quotes from the content analysis and videos, and the researchers agreed on the constructs and their relationships, they were left on the map. When consensus could not be achieved, the construct was dropped or left off the maps.

Criteria levels were set for frequency of emergence for each construct. Zaltman usually recommends that at least one-third of the participants must mention a construct and one-fourth must indicate a relationship before it is added to the consensus map (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995). Zaltman and Coulter (1995) do not consider a construct meaningful unless at least one-fourth of the participants mention it. (Because this study grossed so many constructs and construct relationships, criteria levels were set higher than in past studies in order to make the information malleable.) This is different than the normal criteria used in past studies by Zaltman (1996). In this study, if each construct was mentioned by at least half of the participants within the sex category, it was placed on the general construct map. If a construct relationship was mentioned by at least half of the participants, then a chain was created, creating a consensus map.

After each individual map was completed, the number of times each construct was mentioned was tallied; the number of times a construct relationship was mentioned was tallied,
as well. The number of times the constructs and their relationships emerged was analyzed by the researchers and this analysis created the consensus map for each sex (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995).

For example, if at least four of the eight male participants mentioned the construct of opportunities, then a four was written down next to that on the construct list. The same procedure was carried out for the construct relationships also. An example of this would be if six of the eight females mentioned that friendships lead to challenge, then that construct relationship (expressed as friendship → challenge) received a six next to it. This number expressed how many females mentioned this construct relationship. When a construct was mentioned within two different construct relationships, a chain was created. One example of this is in the female sample construct map when perceptions suggested that Campus Crusade Communication leads to friendships (Campus Crusade Communication → friendships) and that friendships lead to challenge (friendships → challenge). That chain of relationships on the construct map would be written as Campus Crusade Communication → friendships → challenge. The maps are created to be simple, but as mentioned before, this study had a large number of constructs and construct relationships and this resulted in complexity at times. The final consensus map for the males shows a construct relationship that seemed to not be connected to the greater map. This did not create a problem because at times people’s thoughts are not always connected. Once the final consensus maps were created for both the male sample and the female sample, they were compared with one another to examine whether there were any distinctions, and if so where the distinctions were.
Chapter Three: Results

The research question asked whether the cognitive construct maps of male organizational members differ from the cognitive construct maps of females. Because this is a broad question, it is best to answer it by examining the constructs and construct relationships gathered from both samples. The charts that follow, as well as the cognitive maps that were created, are based on certain criteria.

As mentioned before, at least half of the participants in each sample had to mention the construct before it was placed on the map. In regard to the construct relationships, at least four of the eight participants in each sample had to mention the relationship for it to be considered a secondary relationship; however, if at least six participants mentioned the relationship, it was then considered to be a primary relationship. The criteria levels appear as:

- 4 or greater = placed on construct map
- 4-5 participants mentioned relationship = moderate construct relationship / secondary relationship
- 6-8 participants mentioned relationship = strong construct relationship / primary relationship

Table 1 below shows the constructs that are unique to each sample, as well as the constructs that are shared by each sample. Table 2 shows the construct relationships specific to each sample, and the construct relationships shared by each sample.

Following these tables, this chapter will reveal excerpts by each sample group that depict the constructs and the construct relationships existing between them. The quotes are derived from actual dialogue introduced by the participants during the interview phase of the research. Each participant was coded according to whether they were male or female, and then each was assigned a unique number, odd numbers for females and even numbers for males. For example, all male codes begin with MP, which simply stands for “Male Participant.” The same follows for female participants, FP, which stands for “Female Participant.” The coding of participants in this manner distinguishes males from females and one participant from another. It also indicates the researcher’s reliance on excerpts from many participants as well as reinforcing the anonymity of the participants.
First, the female sample will be reviewed, with examples, quotes of constructs and construct relationships, and the consensus map for that sample. This will then be followed in a similar manner by the male sample.

**Table 1: Constructs Mentioned by the Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct Common to Both</th>
<th>Constructs Specific to Females</th>
<th>Constructs Specific to Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Samples</strong></td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Bible Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Cliques</td>
<td>Brotherhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>Home/School Together</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships (Christian, Female &amp; Non-Christian)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Crusade Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Construct Relationships Mentioned by the Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Construct Relationships</th>
<th>Primary Construct Relationships</th>
<th>Primary Construct Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common to Both Samples</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific to Females</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific to Males</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational COM → Fellowship</td>
<td>Organizational COM → Encouragement</td>
<td>Friendship → Male Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational COM → Worship</td>
<td>Organizational COM → Friendships</td>
<td>Leaders → Encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational COM → Overwhelming</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities → Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational COM → Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities → Trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Construct Relationships</th>
<th>Secondary Construct Relationships</th>
<th>Secondary Construct Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common to Both Samples</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific to Females</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific to Males</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational COM → Evangelism</td>
<td>Friendships → Challenging</td>
<td>Bible Studies → Encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules → Age</td>
<td>Organizational COM → Cliques</td>
<td>Faith → Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules → Leading</td>
<td>Organizational COM → Diversity</td>
<td>Friendship → Brotherhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships → Females</td>
<td>Organizational COM → Home/School</td>
<td>Organizational COM → Bible Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships → Christians</td>
<td>Together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships → Non-Christians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational COM → Fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational COM → Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational COM → Refuge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules → Friendships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational COM → Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPERATIONALIZATION OF COMMON CONSTRUCTS**

*Age.* Generally, this construct was used in the conventional sense of chronology. However, in both samples when this construct was mentioned, it was always in terms of chronological measures equaling maturity, cognitive ability and leadership ability. Both samples mentioned this at the same frequency.

FP 7: “When we stop learning, we stop growing. We need the older, wiser staff members.”

FP 9: “I like to be fed by older people. I don’t always feel comfortable around people my age.”

MP 10: “At bible studies there are guys that know what you’re going through, that are older and more experienced.”
MP 16: In regard to the staff and student leaders another participant stated, “It’s good to look up to them, it’s good that they’re older, that they’re adults.”

**Campus Crusade Communication.** In this study, this construct is used rather broadly to encompass multiple means of communication that take place through endorsed leaders and programs which are generated by the organization. Through the various services, events, groups and social opportunities available to participants, this term refers mostly to what is communicated by leaders through formal programming such as in the organization through “PrimeTime,” Bible Studies, Noon Service, Disciplers/Disciplees, social time after these events and leader/follower relationships.

FP 7: “Upperclassmen will keep you accountable as disciplers.”

FP 15: “Mark Brown is the main influence on relationships seriousness. He’s good at describing how relationships should go.”

MP 6: “Campus Crusade gave us the encouragement and tools to care about people and love one another through training and through modeling those same things to us.”

MP 16: “Campus Crusade encourages reaching out to new people when they come to PrimeTime or when we are on a trip.”

**Encouragement.** Both samples also had this construct in common. Its meaning indicates when the participants feel supported, accepted, excited, loved, cared for, or an increase in confidence based on how they are treated interpersonally or how they treat others.

FP 13: When describing relationships, she stated, “building your brother in Christ up, being encouraging…Campus Crusade relationships are more intentional and less like a real world relationship.”

FP 1: “Campus Crusade is supportive.”

MP 2: “Campus Crusade has given me brothers to encourage me. It’s an outlet. It’s a support.”

MP 4: “It’s an encouragement to know others are going through the same things you are going through.”

**Evangelism.** In this construct, sharing of faith or beliefs with nonbelievers, away from the normal meeting places, is the general meaning. Sharing their beliefs about Jesus Christ, or the gospel, is encouraged by Campus Crusade and a number of participants have gone on trips out of the state or even the country to do so.
FP 11: “Campus Crusade’s evangelism is very seeker-sensitive. These things in the picture are tools to share the gospel.”

FP 7: “Campus Crusade tells you to share your faith with the people that matter to you.”

MP 4: “They do a lot to get students involved in evangelism. They’re always talking about how to share your faith, in a logical, applicable way; how to share the gospel, your faith. This is highly stressed. I haven’t gone on any of the trips yet. Always will be sharing your faith with others, no matter where you are.”

MP 14: “We are really evangelistic. We feel there are a lot of really lost people…we try to reach people…we are a people-friendly group.”

_Fellowship._ The construct mentioned here refers to socializing and connecting with other members from Campus Crusade. It also speaks of togetherness, sharing, community, belonging, closeness, and investing one’s time or energy into others.

FP 7: “We go to friends’ houses some nights…it’s really cool to have upperclassmen be willing to let underclassmen be crazy and open up their house…fellowship helps you feel like you’re not by yourself.”

FP 15: One participant stated when discussing her Campus Crusade relationships, “Campus Crusade brings people together, it’s just important because it shows fellow Christians meeting each other.”

MP 2: “Campus Crusade is my church family.”

MP 6: “Fellowship is one of the biggest parts, finding people you have things in common with and growing.”

_Friendships._ This term describes just what it intimates, friendship in both general and intimate terms. Female participants mentioned friendships very strongly in their construct relationships; the male participants only mentioned it in terms of organizational rules. Instead, they referred to the construct “brotherhood”, which had very specific male underpinnings.

FP 3: “Friendships made through Campus Crusade are meaningful, strong, because it’s through religion.”

FP 11: “I have made lots of Campus Crusade friends, they encourage you, help you, and they center around Jesus.”

MP 8: “Having a group of guy Christian friends is good. It keeps me accountable.”

MP 16: “Campus Crusade represents friends.”
Fun. In the most general sense this construct refers to pleasure, humor, good times, an ability to be one’s true self and be silly or goofy. This construct was mentioned in similar terms by both sample groups.

FP 13: When describing a picture of friends, one participant mentions, “We are goofing around, making faces, having fun, it shows that we have a lot of fun.”

FP 1: “Christianity needs to be fun, if not, I wouldn’t go.”

MP 12: “People think that since we are Christians, we don’t have fun, but we have more fun than the average person.”

MP 14: “Campus Crusade is a fun, huge group that promotes the best thing. It’s the most important thing to me – a relationship with Christ.”

Growth. This construct was mentioned by virtually every participant in the study. It refers to intellectual, spiritual and personal growth. It also points to ideas of change, life-changing experiences, learning, equipping, focusing on where one wants to go, maturity, being refreshed and continual movement in relation to one’s faith.

FP 15: “Campus Crusade helps change people in their thinking…it helps me grow as a Christian.”

FP 9: “Change is vital; you should always be changing and growing in your faith.”

MP 10: “Just because you have fun with Christians doesn’t make it fellowship. There must be growth after you leave.”

MP 14: “We help each other grow in Christ, we are really close. We have a blast together.”

Leading. This construct is mentioned in relation to the organization’s rule about leadership, or rather who gets to grow in leadership. It refers to the ability to lead others, or be seen as a leader, a speaker, to be in charge of others in the organization.

FP 11: “They like to have guys in Crusade as the leaders because it is biblical. Men are strong. They really want to build up their men as leaders, because they are lacking.”

FP 5: “Guys get checked up on. There are more guys in leadership. They will do more one-on-one time with them.”

MP 10: “Biblically, men are viewed as leaders.”

MP 2: “Men need to be the leader of the household…All these are biblically-based by looking at male leaders in the bible…Jane didn’t lead even though she had more
experience. Some 26-year-old guy did rather than Jane, who had 28 years experience. If she had led, it would have hurt his masculinity.”

**Opportunities.** This construct refers to the chance to get to do something or having access to bettering one’s self. This also refers to favorable circumstances, timing or conditions. The female participants mention opportunity, but are not able to define cohesively what the opportunities are in the organization. The male participants articulated at least two opportunities collectively.

FP 15: “Campus Crusade showed ads. They are good at advertising opportunities.”

FP 7: “Campus Crusade offers outreaches, activities, but you have to make the initial effort.”

MP 16: “In Campus Crusade there is a chance for leadership.”

MP 4: “Active leaders get students involved in trips, retreats, and leadership.”

**Overwhelming.** This construct was used in both a negative and positive manner. It means large, big, intimidating, great, huge, distracting, or awkward and uncomfortable for newcomers or outsiders. Although this construct was mainly about size, the present construct reflects how the size impacted their experience within the organization.

FP 11: “Campus Crusade is big in size and that sometimes makes it hard.”

FP 1: “Campus Crusade is so big, it’s not overwhelming for me, but it is for others.”

MP 14: “Campus Crusade looks big, but really we are small…they don’t always reach out the best.”

MP 2: “I would think Campus Crusade would be a little intimidating, because it’s big and not somewhere you would go alone.”

**Refuge.** This construct is used to delineate a difference between Campus Crusade’s social environment and all other social experiences encountered by the participants, such as American culture, Miami University culture, and college culture, in general. Campus Crusade is viewed as a place that is separate from the rest of those social experiences the participants encounter, that it is a safe place to go to, or a getaway from what the participants experience in their everyday life.

FP 5: “People want to be there, are excited to be there. It gets my mind off of school.”

FP 7: Another participant describes her experience as “a time to take a break from the chaos of campus life.”
MP 8: Going to Campus Crusade, with the band and the massive amount of people, one participant says, “It is a release from everything that’s going on, an escape from burdens.”

MP 6: “Campus Crusade is fun without alcohol.”

**Rules.** This construct is used to describe values, boundaries and roles that are communicated within the organization about age, friendships, dating, Christianity, and leadership, that is who gets to lead or not. Both samples recounted the same frequency for the existence of these rules, but the strength of how the rules are communicated in regard to friends, age and leadership was somewhat different.

FP 11: “The emcees who speak have always been male. Men are held higher biblically.”

FP 1: “I don’t like him that way. You have to be careful when you invite people, or boys, places.”

MP 10: “You’ll never find a man discipling (mentoring) a woman, and vice versa.”

MP 2: “In dating, it’s the guy’s responsibility to be a leader in the relationship and to set boundaries.”

**Worship.** Mostly, this construct is defined by collective participation in music, singing, and expressing oneself while the band is playing; but, it is also defined as an effort to grow in faith in God. The male sample tended to define this construct as an action, whereas, the female sample defined it as an experience.

FP 11: “Worship is at every PrimeTime. There is something different about worshipping with a lot of people.”

FP 3: “People are worshipping, people with their hands up. I don’t do this, but I watch them do it. People gesturing, reacting…I am uncomfortable with it.”

MP 16: “Music enhances connection with God.”

MP 4: “It was great to get that release, relaxing to sing praise and worship.”

**OPERATIONALIZATION OF FEMALE CONSTRUCTS**

**Challenging.** This construct refers to being held accountable, or kept in check, in interpersonal relationships within the organization through motivation, testing, setting boundaries, and being forced to step outside what is comfortable.

FP 7: Operationalized this challenge in relationships by saying “having people there will keep you accountable.”
FP 1: “Conversations with people from Campus Crusade both challenge and help me to learn.”

**Cliques.** This construct is used to describe how relationships within the organization can be exclusive or socially isolating, as opposed to inclusive. The females mentioned this in regard to the social climate that exists for those who are not in the in-group.

FP 1: “We don’t always say ‘hi’ to people…some people are not aware of it, and some are, but don’t care.”

FP 3: “It’s not welcoming. People have formed cliques…more people are there about them, and not God or others.”

**Diversity.** The construct of diversity is used to refer to openess, acceptance, and different kinds of people.

FP 13: One female operationalizes diversity by saying “it’s good to attract different kinds of people…there a sea of people, different perspectives helps me appreciate it (Campus Crusade) more.”

FP 5: “Campus Crusade is made up of other confident people, people from all different types of campus organizations, sorority and non-sorority, sports, arts, all over.”

**Home/School Together.** This construct is related to the uniting of parts of home life and school life and mixing it with the Campus Crusade.

FP 9: “Friends from home and friends from Miami and Campus Crusade are tied together.”

FP 1: “I rekindled a friendship with Laura. There is a connection to home and here. I think to have both is important.”

**OPERATIONALIZATION OF MALE CONSTRUCTS**

**Bible Studies.** This construct is defined as a small group that meets to study scripture, share personal concerns and struggles, or in order to connect, stay accountable or grow in one’s faith. The male participants mentioned how much this construct contributed to their overall feeling of connection to one another, to leaders and to the organization.

MP 2: “Bible studies have shown me how to submit to God and what God’s commands are.”

MP 4: “My senior bible study leader keeps me accountable.”

**Brotherhood.** The construct mentioned here refers to a phenomenon that is deeper than friendship. It is the sense that a person is embedded in a family that encourages them to express and take pride in their masculinity. Through the friendships that are established, male-bonding
occurs on a level that the participants identify with the struggles that are unique to males. The female participants did not mention this kind of construct in any terms.

MP 2: “Campus Crusade has given me brothers to encourage me...they’ve been my brothers who can learn a lot from.”

MP 14: “People love Matt. He reflects Campus Crusade’s aspects; he is a good resource for knowledge. He is a strong guy that is walking with the Lord. Campus Crusade is not a home or a church. We are brothers.”

**Faith.** The construct of faith is defined as a personal relationship with God, awe of God, a larger view of God, lordship, the cross, identity in Christ, and things that are Christ-centered.

MP 2: “I have found a place to be – a place to learn about faith… Relationships are the most important thing that has helped me be firm in my faith.”

MP 10: “Campus Crusade is focused on students, the gospel and to help students grow in their faith.”

**Leaders.** The leaders construct is inclusive of many terms such as disciplers (those older staff leaders and student leaders who help others to learn about the Bible and Christianity), discipleship, leadership, leading by the example of one’s conduct, guiding, and role modeling. This construct was mentioned twice as much by the male participants as the females.

MP 2: “The older people and staff members have helped guide me along the way.”

MP 14: “The guys on staff are strong, solid guys we can talk to and learn from.”

**Leadership.** The unique meaning of this construct is relative to another construct, opportunities. This simply includes the opportunity to develop the ability to lead others or provide direction to individuals or groups based on one’s expertise or experience. The female participants did not mention this opportunity in any form.

MP 2: “Campus Crusade has taught me that men need to be leaders.”

MP 14: “I helped more with running sound this year. So, I stepped up and took that leadership role.”

**Male Friends.** Only the male participants mentioned anything about male friends specifically. Often the construct of friends was mentioned, but usually in a general sense, or in reference to females, Christians and non-Christians. However, the male participants made a distinction over other relationships when referring to their male comrades.
MP 10: In relation to a photo of two friends at Ovations dining hall, one participant described the scene, “It’s a picture of two guys getting into the Word. Two guys hanging out, being buddies.”

MP 16: “These are my dogs, my boys. This is male bonding in faith.”

Trips. One opportunity in Campus Crusade generated a construct labeled trips. This construct simply defines the opportunity to go on excursions arranged by the organization where the participants are able to share their faith. They can be small, regional trips or trips that are on the other side of the world. Although the female participants made mention of this opportunity, it did not make it on their construct map because not enough mentioned the construct.

MP 14: “Campus Crusade trips change lives. Change is important, to change your heart and to change for the better…This is what many nights looked like in Daytona and this is my feelings about what happened, represented in picture form.”

MP 12: In reference to one participant’s experience on a trip to Macedonia, “There were people of different ages working together contributing to the goal, though we were from different parts of the world, it was still different backgrounds working together.”

Just as it was important to define each construct and show how the participants operationalize the constructs, it is important to demonstrate how the constructs are structured in relationships. Constructs are most meaningful in relationships because the associations illustrate how the participants currently think about a topic (Zaltman, 2003). Associations are not necessarily causal, but merely perceptions of the constructs that are most prominent in participants’ minds. Therefore the consensus maps are an anatomy of sorts of how the participants view the organization. The following section describes and illustrates through dialogue how constructs are related in participants’ perceptions of Campus Crusade.

OPERATIONALIZATION OF CONSTRUCTS COMMON TO BOTH SAMPLES

Campus Crusade Communication → Fellowship. This relationship implies that Campus Crusade, as an organization, and through all the communication media within the organization, communicates the value of fellowship to its members. The frequency with which this relationship was mentioned was equal in both sample groups.
FP 3: “Relationships formed through Campus Crusade are meaningful and strong because they are formed through religion. You need to have good Christian fellowship.”

FP 5: “I am excited to be there, not forced. I look forward to the praise and worship part…I get social interaction and catch up with people and Christian fellowship.”

MP 2: “Campus Crusade is the biggest Christian group. People not in Christian organizations are stagnant in their faith, they are not connected; they are not being fed. When they are in Campus Crusade, they are not complacent.”

MP 16: “Crusade has a basketball team. There is hanging out and friendships that mean a lot. They provide common interest and connection.”

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Growth.** This relationship indicates that one of the core outcomes of Campus Crusade is the personal, spiritual, and intellectual growth, or metamorphosis, that happens to members. Virtually every participant of the study mentioned growth as a construct in their thinking; however half of both samples mentioned that it was related to the way the organization communicates.

FP 5: “This tree represents a foundation and growth in Campus Crusade. It provides a blessing for a foundation. The branches reach out.”

FP 9: Another participant described how learning from her Campus Crusade friends impacted her personal experience by sharing, “Change is vital. You should always be changing. I have learned a lot from them.”

MP 16: “Speakers seem to be important (in Crusade), and growing and learning during talks.”

MP 12: “Learning and growing is important in Crusade.”

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Worship.** Many participants, when referring to these constructs in a relationship, indicated that attending Campus Crusade meetings always leads to worship because of the emphasis of always including music and singing, or praise. They also indicated how worship was cultivated through contact with Campus Crusade events.

FP 9: “Worship drew me more toward Campus Crusade. They sang more songs.”

FP 11: “Worship is at every Campus Crusade meeting.”

MP 10: “Worship is the best way to prepare your heart for the message.”

MP 4: “I see worship as worship – an expression of my love to God. It’s intimate. Everyone joins in and sings for 5 songs.”

40
**Campus Crusade Communication → Overwhelming.** The implied relationship here refers to the largeness or relative size of how Campus Crusade presents itself through its weekly Thursday night meetings. Both sample groups of participants indicated with the same frequency that the overall presentation, including population, setup, busyness, and packaging left an impression of bigness that made them feel that it was something larger than them. Some were turned off by it and others were excited by it.

FP 1: “Campus Crusade is a large organization. The disadvantage is that people don’t always say ‘hi’. It is so big.”

FP 3: “People haven’t gotten involved because it is too big and not welcoming.”

MP 8: In reference to going to Crusade meetings on Thursday nights, one participant described his impression, “There are so many people there, but you’re all on your own.”

MP 14: “You can get lost in the crowd, it’s intimidating, and it can feel like you don’t always fit in. It can be pretty busy.”

**Campus Crusade Communication → Rules.** All but one participant indicated the existence of rules and norms that govern behavior, roles and dynamics within the organization. These rules and norms are communicated through leaders, teachings, speakers, and behavior within the organization.

FP 11: “Bible studies are for the more mature Christian whereas PrimeTime is for everyone, but mostly newcomers. No jargon is used.”

FP 1: “We need another person, we can’t do things alone. We need to relate to others.”

MP 14: “We talk about boundaries we should have, things that cause our brothers/sisters to stumble. We talk about being intentional.”

MP 10: “Staff, that are women, are mostly on staff because their husbands are.”

**Campus Crusade Communication → Evangelism.** Another strong aspect of the culture in Campus Crusade is the construct relationship mentioned between how the organization communicates their focus on evangelism. Going to Crusade-related events make them aware of the organization’s core value of evangelizing those who are not Christian. Participants felt encouraged to adapt this value and were given opportunities to develop knowledge and skills to do so.
FP 5: “Campus Crusade is less growth and more outreach to non-believers. You can get growth out of going. The goal is evangelistic, a good way to share the gospel.”

FP 11: In describing Campus Crusade and evangelism, one female participant described the organization as being “very seeker sensitive.”

MP 4: “They do a lot to get students involved in evangelism, they’re always talking about how to share your faith…this is highly stressed.”

MP 14: “Campus Crusade is very evangelistic and so is he.”

**Rules ➔ Age.** This construct relationship was mentioned by half of the participants in each group. Emphasis on the necessity for one to learn from another who is older seems to be a well-supported theme in the organization. One’s age is seen as congruent with wisdom, maturity and insight that is then used to mentor those younger in the organization.

FP 7: “Upperclassmen will help keep you accountable as disciplers. It builds trust within the movement and makes you more comfortable.”

FP 15: “Jane is a woman who meets with teenage girls, a wonderful speaker. She’s an important figure for the women. She makes an effort to contact women and meet with them to have Bible study.”

MP 6: “During the meeting, they (the speaker on stage) teach. We learn from different staff people to be challenged. I like that time. It’s good to hear from older people.”

MP 10: In relation to having “an older man” to disciple him, another participant stated, “It’s good to have someone to look up to, it helps your self grow.”

**Rules ➔ Leading.** The construct relationship depicted here expresses the link between certain rules that seem to be communicated about who leads or is able to lead within the organization. Leaders are generally older members of the organization and generally are male. Male leaders are preferred over female and when both are present, the male leader regardless of age, leads over the female. Male participants showed a strong existence of this relationship in their thinking about the organization. Female participants showed a moderately strong existence of this relationship.

FP 11: “I play guitar. I tried out for being a worship leader…but I didn’t make it. But, that’s OK. There were some better guys. They like to have guys in Crusade as the leaders, because it’s biblical.”
FP 13: “A guy is the initiator in the relationship, especially in dating relationships. Men are leaders. It’s part of their role—to lead—this carries onto all the relationships.”

MP 10: “You’ll never find a man discipling a woman, or vice versa…it’s always going to be guy to guy…”

MP 2: “Men are encouraged to stand up and lead.”

Interviewer: “More than women?”

MP 2: “Yes.”

**Friendships ➔ Female.** It seemed like relationships were very segmented from the participants’ perceptions. This construct relationship expresses how one segment of engaging in relationships with others leads to friendships with females.

FP 9: “I’ve learned a lot from my roommate, Lara…I met her at Freshman Picnic. I made a connection with her life and with other people. I can always find a connection.”

FP 1: “Laura is my best friend. She is a very influential person. We have very similar personalities and sense of humor. We started going to Campus Crusade together at the beginning of freshmen year.”

MP 16: “Eric, CJ, and Ashley are friends of mine. We have family suppers together a lot.”

MP 6: “Laura is a girl I am friends with. We met at a concert; then we became friends. We hang out a lot. She represents a girl I can find things in common with, and that encourages me.”

**Friendships ➔ Christians.** Another relationship that shows how relationships were segmented in participants’ thinking is expressed in this construct relationship. This relationship shows how developing some relationships leads to friendships with others who are Christians.

FP 1: “I have two sets of friendships -- one at Campus Crusade and one not at Campus Crusade.”

FP 13: “Emily is growing in faith and in relationships. After Campus Crusade, she is a different person. She represents change as good.”

MP 6: “This is Pat, I met him on the water ski team and then at Campus Crusade. We have good talks at Shriver. We are the only Christians on the water ski team.”
MP 8: “Andrew and I play Frisbee. We have the same interests and we both like playing sports. He is my accountability. We always have questions and we will talk about issues in Bible study.”

**Friendships ➔ Non-Christians.** One other relationship that is distinguished by the participants is that friendships lead to relating to non-Christians, even if it is only to share their faith.

FP 1: “There is a separation of my friends. I talk about spiritual issues with my Campus Crusade group. The other group is more about hanging out.”

FP 11: “Trissick and Adam are my non-Christian friends.”

MP 6: “I met Trissick through Anna. I began to play soccer with him and he is Buddhist, but he still goes to Campus Crusade.”

MP 4: “There are specific friends I know I need to reach more, I could reach more. This is representative of all the people I could reach.”

**Rules ➔ Friendships.** Both sample groups mentioned how the organization communicates rules about how friendships are supposed to be ordered. Female participants reported a higher frequency than males, but all reported at least a moderately high relationship between these constructs.

FP 11: “I’ve made lots of Campus Crusade friends. They encourage you, and help you. They center around Jesus. There are mini-sermons about relationships and how to love. Campus Crusade wants us to focus on being friends rather than attraction.”

FP 13: “All of February was about relationships, how to have friendships, especially with our brothers in Christ.”

MP 16: “Eric, CJ, and Ashley are friends of mine. We hold each other accountable, and this is very important. We feed off one another. We have a responsibility to one another.”

MP 10: “Campus Crusade is big on building relationships amongst believers. You should also have relationships with non-believers.”

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Fun.** Another construct relationship that was mentioned by both groups was the idea of how the organization communicates that it is fun and that fun is very important. Also the means by which many ideas are communicated are through a “fun” medium. Female participants mentioned this more than the males.
FP 9: “Campus Crusade often does funny and stupid skits. It is very important. They explore creatively.”

FP 3: “This is a picture of guys in Crusade on the beach having fun. Worship is fun.”

MP 6: “Having fun is a part of life and goes along with my friends in Campus Crusade.”

MP 14: “Campus Crusade helped me come to Christ. These people have fun on the weekend without partying.”

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Refuge.** These constructs are mentioned in relation to one another at about the same frequency by both groups. Participants communicated how Campus Crusade culture runs counter to normative college culture, and even American culture. This distinction was mentioned by well over half of the total number of participants.

FP 7: “Events go beyond PrimeTime. There is no alcohol or other typical college things going on…People live with mostly Christians. You know you won’t be exposed to alcohol or drugs.”

FP 11: “I want to open a coffee shop for people to go and be loved, to go and spend time there as an alternative. The bar scene is not healthy for me and my convictions.”

MP 4: “Campus Crusade is a place to learn about faith. And feedback and support is important. It’s difficult to do the things you want to do. The Christian culture has so many things you have to do that are counter to what the culture tells you to do and these friends help.”

MP 2: Another participant referred to being a Christian in a normal college environment: “You have to go against the grain; you have to be an outsider. Crusade members have the label of Bible-beaters. They are not seeking pleasure like others through girls, drugs, etc.”

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Opportunities.** This construct relationship shows how the organization communicates the availability of various opportunities. Male participants mentioned this relationship almost twice as much as the female participants. Males went further to indicate the types of opportunities available to them, however, females failed to mention any enough to be placed on the consensus map.

FP 11: “Campus Crusade offers Bible studies. I led one last year…It’s a good organization to be in. There are opportunities.”
FP 5: “Campus Crusade offers a chance to make connections.”
MP 2: “Campus Crusade has equipped me with the skills I need to share the gospel and given me opportunities to do that.”
MP 16: “Playing on the basketball team for Crusade is another opportunity to connect.”

**OPERATIONALIZATION OF FEMALE CONSTRUCT RELATIONSHIPS**

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Encouragement.** Female participants in the study identified the relationship between encouragement and the way the organization communicates. This is different than what the males indicated about encouragement. Although the construct of encouragement was shared with the female sample, the way it was related cognitively differed. Many of the female participants felt encouraged in some way by their relationship with the organization.

FP 11: “The trip to Liverpool encouraged my faith…Campus Crusade has encouraged me to share my faith more.”
FP 3: “I would have taken a picture of the two girls we share with in Daytona, because they represent what I have learned about love and encouragement.”

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Friendships.** This construct relationship exemplifies the impact that the organization’s communication has on how they develop friendships through their connection to the organization.

FP 3: “This is a picture of the friends I have made in Campus Crusade.”
FP 5: “Danielle is my housemate for next year. I met her last year…she is in my sorority and Bible study and is another connection I’ve met through Campus Crusade.”

**Friendships ➔ Challenging.** Another construct that deals with friendships is the recognition of how friendships impact the participants personally through making them accountable for their choices and challenging them to grow personally, spiritually and emotionally.

FP 1: “Conversations with friends from Campus Crusade both challenge me and help me to learn.”

FP 11: “Liz represents friendships in Campus Crusade and she provides accountability to me. We are all accountable for each other.”

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Cliques.** Most female participants who identified this construct relationship believe that the way many in Campus Crusade conduct their behavior in a large group meeting creates an environment that may seem exclusive to someone who is not part
of the in-group. They recognize the reality that at that point they are representative of the larger organization, which may seem to communicate that cliques are endorsed within the organization.

FP 1: “Some are turned off if not greeted. They won’t expand their friends and don’t want to...They like the comfort of their clique.”

FP 5: “They have cliques, if you’re not in the loop. I am not as connected, not in the ‘inner circle’. It’s not a bad thing. The ‘inner circle’ controls everything.”

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Diversity.** This construct relationship points to the idea that the organization communicates its desire to embrace those who might be different through its openness.

FP 7: “The staff leader’s message is uplifting and there is a funny emcee. We’re always challenged with some sort of message. It’s good to attract different kinds of people.”

FP 13: “I think PrimeTime is an open environment, but I am not sure if other people feel that way.”

**Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Home/School Together.** One last common construct relationship for female participants was the connection for many between home and school. Many female participants felt like Campus Crusade initiated the same feelings, and even some of the same connections with people, as they had at home.

FP 13: “This is a picture of two girls. One is from my hometown and one I am rooming with at Daytona. Emily is a roommate of friends at home.”

FP 5: “This is Josh. He is a high school friend from home. He represents a long-term friendship and we are able to keep up connection because of Campus Crusade.”

**OPERATIONALIZATION OF MALE CONSTRUCT RELATIONSHIPS**

**Friendships ➔ Male Friends.** This construct relationship was unique to the male sample. Female participants mentioned all of the other construct relationships that the male sample mentioned except for this relationship. This relationship shows that relationships, or friendships lead to male friends.

MP 4: “Relationships are the most important thing. The guys in the hall have helped me be firm in my faith.”

MP 16: “This is a picture of my friend Alex. We play basketball with Crusade…it’s a way to connect with guys.”
Leaders ➔ Encouragement. Male participants indicated that being in relationship with leaders on about any level led to feelings of encouragement. Three-fourths of the male participants identified this construct relationship. They did not relate it to the organization, in general, like the female participants, but specifically to those leaders who personally influenced them.

MP 16: “Scott is my Bible study leader. He has really encouraged me to be more involved.”

MP 2: “Starbucks is a common meeting point for me and my discipler, Grant. I am challenged and encouraged by him.”

Opportunities ➔ Leadership. Another distinct relationship that nearly all of the male participants highlighted was not only the presence of opportunities, but they specified what kind of opportunities they experienced the most. In this instance opportunities are related to a chance to develop leadership within themselves and over others.

MP 16: “In Campus Crusade, there is a chance for internship, for leadership, and encouragement to get more involved.”

MP 2: “Women have a lot of gifts, but Campus Crusade teaches that men are in charge.”

Opportunities ➔ Trips. Another construct relationship all but one of the male participants identified was the opportunity to go on trips with the organization. These opportunities to travel were most often linked to the organizational goal of evangelizing.

MP 16: “One missed image would be of the Daytona trip. It would show the groups I was in talking to guys on the beach, sharing my faith.”

MP 2: “I’ve learned a lot about surrendering daily and that my life is not my own. On the Macedonia summer trip I was challenged to do this.”

Campus Crusade Communication ➔ Brotherhood. Again three-fourths of the male participants identified this as a strong theme within the organization. This relationship identifies the perceived way the organization communicates the value of brotherhood they experience in Campus Crusade. It specifically indicates how the masculine side of their relationships is encouraged.

MP 8: “Male-bonding is good. I have 5 or 6 friends from Campus Crusade. All are great guys. They are friends who make sure I go to PrimeTime and Bible study. They create accountability.”

MP 12: In reference to a photo of a Macedonian mission trip, one participant shared, “It represents the bonds of brotherhood in Campus Crusade and in Christ.”
Campus Crusade Communication ➔Leaders. The construct relationship expressed here shows how the organization values the impact of leaders on followers and communicates this value. The leader-follower relationship is very dominant within the organization and surfaces in multiple ways; this occurs for example, through corporate leadership, disciplers, mentors, age of leaders, sex of leaders, etc.

MP 14: “Mike and Josh are worship leaders of the PrimeTime band. They have had a huge impact on the movement.”

MP 2: “The older people and staff members have helped guide me along the way.”

Bible Studies ➔Encouragement. Another relationship that is unique to the male participants is the way they are encouraged. Female participants felt most encouraged through corporate communication, however, male participants felt like their Bible studies led to encouragement.

MP 12: “Bible studies and support are important in Campus Crusade.”

MP 8: “We start out Bible study trying to catch up on each other’s lives. We will share problems, gain insight from other people and that is nice.”

Faith ➔Worship. This construct is somewhat of a large net for ideas that lead to faith in some way or another. For example, a personal relationship with God, awe of God, a larger view of God, the concept of lordship, the cross, one’s identity in the Lord, and meeting with other Christians or in a Christ-centered group all lead to development of one’s faith. Development of one’s faith then leads to worshipping God.

MP 12: “PrimeTime is a place to meet people, get connected, learn about faith from the speakers and what it means to worship God.”

MP 10: “I go to the basement of “Ses” (Sesquecentennial) Chapel for a time of reflection with other Campus Crusade members. It is a way to start the week. Worship is the best way to prepare your heart for the message.”

Friendship ➔Brotherhood. Male participants identified their friendships by creating deeper meaning in them. Not only did friendships results in relationships with various kinds of individuals, females, males, Christians, non-Christians; but they also led to a deeper idea of friendship, that of a familial quality. Their friendships, if intimate enough, led to brotherhood, an enhanced meaning that became specifically tied to sex.
MP 12: In reference to a book that taught him to share his faith one participant commented, “It symbolizes brotherhood, friends right away working towards the same goal.”

MP 14: “This is a picture of a lot of guys that I live with. Some are freshmen, but they’re mostly sophomores. They are my brothers in Christ.”

Campus Crusade Communication → Bible Studies. The final construct relationship that was part of male participants’ experience was the value that the organization put on Bible studies. The male participants highly defined Crusade in relation to their experience in a Bible study, usually held in their dorm.

MP 6: “Campus Crusade has Bible studies in our dorm.”

MP 8: “The Bible is very important to Campus Crusade. I am Catholic, and other people in the Bible study are different sectors of Christianity.”
Chapter Four: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to apply the ZMET within the campus ministry organizational context in order to compare male and female experiences to ascertain the possible existence of a female subculture. The ZMET is a research tool designed to allow the emergence and understanding of the mental construct maps of male and female Campus Crusade members’ perceptions of the organization. This final chapter will first reiterate the theoretical importance of organizational research in relation to organizational culture, subcultures, and sex differences within organizations. In addition, the similarities and differences in the groups of males and females will be discussed, along with some practical implications of the findings. Finally, the limitations of the current research will be presented as well as recommendations for future research.

Organizational Symbolism

In this study, those symbols used by participants within this particular organization were primarily in the form of metaphors, stories, rites and rituals. Specific examples of each type of symbol are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Metaphors

Metaphors are used to describe one thing in terms of another. Many different metaphors were used by participants in this study to describe their experience within the campus ministry organization. For example, the metaphor of family was often used in terms of referring to one another as brothers, sisters, family, etc. The organization was also described metaphorically as a place of refuge for participants to go to in order to experience a reprieve from the stressors of university and American life.

Stories

Symbolic interaction, in the form of stories told by every participant, played a huge role in this research when collecting data during the interview phase. Each participant spent time discussing the photographs they generated and the particular story behind each picture. The stories could be fact or fiction and were a part of the first step of the methodology. About half of the interview was focused on this type of storytelling using photographs that were generated by the participants. Then the participants told what each picture meant to them, framing their thoughts or feelings, within the context of stories, toward the Campus Crusade organization.
These stories reflected deeply held values and beliefs about their experience and perceptions toward the campus ministry organization’s culture.

*Rites & Rituals*

This form of symbolism included events or various activities that were a part of the organization where members came together to fulfill a collective initiative of the organization. For example, the weekly large group meetings at “PrimeTime” that are held on Thursday evenings and the smaller segregated Bible studies are rituals intended to serve a larger purpose in the organization. A number of individuals in the study saw the mission trips as a certain rite of passage in their experience at Campus Crusade. Often those experiences gave way to leader roles, deeper friendships, or other opportunities. Some other examples or rituals are going to Tuffy’s after “PrimeTime”, meeting at Starbucks for Bible study, worship music at meetings, and having a mentor. Other examples of rites of passage are being mentored, being a mentor, leading worship, and leading a Bible study. Being a part of these kinds of activities was seen as favorable and qualifying to be considered capable of being able to mentor or lead others.

*Organizational Cognition*

This research investigated and observed some differences in cognitions, or constructs, as well as construct relationships between the female and male participants and their collective view of the organization. Female participants in this study listed 4 unique constructs and 2 unique construct relationships, whereas male participants mentioned 7 unique constructs and 6 unique construct relationships. However, males and females shared 17 constructs and 15 construct relationships. Not only did the overall number of constructs between sexes differ, but the number of construct relationships between them differed as well, which resulted in the male map being somewhat larger than the female map.

*Organizational Climate*

In this study, participants identified many similar and many different characteristics of the Campus Crusade climate. Both male and female participants identified the climate as being fun, evangelistic, overwhelming, and as communicating rules related to relationships. These characteristics are communicated at many levels of the organization and interact with aspects of the climate the males and females differed upon. Females perceived the climate as perpetuating cliques, but open to diversity.
Subcultures

This research focused on investigating whether female cognitions and experiences in this organization differed from male cognitions and experiences and ultimately, whether each sex group could be considered a subculture. Using the ZMET would allow for these relationships, and the way they function within this campus ministry organization, to be revealed if they existed. According to the definition set forth early in this paper, and established by Conrad and Poole (1998), subcultures are defined as “groups of people whose shared interpretation of their organization helps bind them together and differentiate them from other groups of employees” (p. 117). Subcultures may share part of the organization’s cultural characteristics, but not all of them. They are usually small groups within the organization and are distinguished by their own set of characteristics as well. The findings of this study do not indicate a distinguishable shared interpretation or a strong enough differentiation to determine that a female subculture actually exists. The consensus maps included constructs and construct relationships that were unique to each subculture and not mentioned by the other, however, although differences are indicated, the similarities are much stronger. These will be discussed in greater depth later in this chapter.

This study also did not indicate the existence of any counterculture. Sometimes members of groups will define themselves in an oppositional way and are referred to as countercultures. Females in this study did not do this or reflect the need to differentiate themselves. The following sections will first look at the similarities between the groups and possible implications, and then the differences will be assessed along with their potential impact on the organizational experience for the female participants.

SIMILARITIES

As a whole, the male and female subcultures within this organization shared more similarities than differences. These similarities included 17 shared constructs and 15 shared relationship constructs. The shared constructs of importance included age, Christian friendships, Refuge, encouragement, evangelism, fellowship, female friendships, friendships, fun, growth, leading, non-Christian friendships, opportunities, organizational culture, overwhelming feelings, rules, and worship. The fact that both groups share these same constructs is not surprising since both participate in the larger campus ministry organization. Because of this shared experience it is only natural that they would have some constructs in common. The number of commonalities speaks to the strength of the dominant culture of the organization. However, there is something
further that can be surmised from the commonality of these constructs, that the average campus ministry member in this organization experiences the importance of these constructs through their involvement. This idea is supported by past research using the ZMET indicating that these results are generalizable to the greater population of this shared culture (Zaltman & Coulter, 1995).

In addition to the constructs, there are also construct relationships that were shared by members. The shared construct relationships included the construct “Campus Crusade Communication.” Various symbols (organizational symbolism) in the form of metaphors, stories, rites and rituals contributed to the construct and their relationships (organizational cognition), or cognitive framework, were included in the definition of “Campus Crusade Communication” and this represented the overall message (organizational climate), or shared perception, conveyed by the organization. Specifically, this included leaders, weekly meetings called “PrimeTime,” Bible studies, mentors, older members that serve as leaders, and any other venue that served as a medium for the organization. This term also refers to the overarching messages reinforced by the way the organization operates and communicates either through overt messages by leaders, or more covert messages that are part of the programming structure. The participants shared the construct relationships of Campus Crusade Communication leading to fellowship, Campus Crusade Communication leading to feeling overwhelmed, Campus Crusade Communication leading to rules about how to behave, and Campus Crusade Communication leading to worshipping God.

Some of the specific ways the Campus Crusade organization reinforced this culture to members were expressed in the ways the participants described their experiences in the organization. For example, some of the ways that fellowship was supported within the organization were through organizational emphasis through formal messages or speaking engagements on relationships, small groups, Bible studies, meeting in a large group once a week, intramural sports teams, and through creating an organization built out of individuals that share values.

Another construct relationship reinforced in the organization is one of leading to feelings of overwhelming presence. The large meeting venue in Sesquecentennial Chapel, the number of people that are drawn, and the impersonal climate of the building and programming all create feelings of being lost, of the organization being too large and of individuals not fitting in.
In addition to fellowship and overwhelming, the organization also reinforces certain rules and norms on various levels. The idea that large meetings are for less mature believers and the Bible studies and small groups are for more mature believers is reinforced through messages that leaders share in meetings and other programmed events, including discipleship relationships. A distinction is made in what types of relationships are acceptable and not acceptable to males and females through the messages of leaders, as well as who is more capable of being a leader and who is not. The need for others is also communicated through providing other types of places to connect as well as mentoring relationships.

A final message that was continually reinforced by the organization is the importance of worship. In almost every meeting music plays a core role, along with singing and praise. Whether at PrimeTime, a Bible study or “hanging out,” music plays a primary role in facilitating an emphasis on worship. Providing music, that is culturally relevant in style and which creates a mood of contemplation, is emphasized as a tool for creating openness to the core message of the organization, which is the importance of Jesus Christ in the everyday life of the members.

So what does this mean for these two groups to have these construct relationships in common? These shared construct relationships represent the core of what both groups shared in their experience of this organization. In other words, these constructs and construct relationships represent the main messages that are communicated to them through their involvement in this organization. Because of the emergence of these messages, it is possible that the organization’s leadership would want to evaluate whether these are the messages they want the participants to receive, and whether there are other messages that they also want to emerge.

Awareness of the way these messages are communicated can be invaluable. Not only does it allow leaders of the organization to see the effectiveness of the messages they want to convey, but it also opens up new ways to convey new messages or dispel undesirable ones. New ways to emphasize a different message could be opened up through the way programming is set up and reinforced, evaluating what kind of message the places the organization meets might convey, and the way behavior is defined and reinforced through messages, stories, rituals and metaphors, etc. The ZMET reveals the way messages are conveyed on multiple levels within an organization. To remove undesirable messages, it would be important for leaders to evaluate the potential ways these messages might be already conveyed, and then create a new message or do away with these sources. For example, some messages that could be occurring in regard to the
study results are the ways cliques are being perceived as perpetuated by the organization among females. Perhaps the organization may want to address this through increasing ways that diversity could be communicated as a value. Creating more messages of acceptance and openness would be desirable for dispelling the commonly perceived negative impact of cliques.

**DIFFERENCES**

There are a smaller number of constructs and construct relationships that were not shared by the participants of each group; however, that does not mean the differences are less important in the scope of their potential impact on the organization or the quality of the organizational experience by its members. We will discuss this further in a moment. The constructs that the groups did not share were first those that are unique to the female participants, such as challenge, cliques, diversity, and home/school together. The second set of constructs not shared were unique to the male participants and contained the constructs of Bible Studies, brotherhood, faith, leaders, leadership opportunity, male friends, and trips.

Construct relationships specific to females were Campus Crusade Communication leads to encouragement, and Campus Crusade Communication leads to friendships. Construct relationships specific to males were friendships lead to male friends, leaders lead to encouragement, opportunities lead to leadership, opportunities lead to trips, and Campus Crusade Communication leads to brotherhood, Campus Crusade Communication leads to leaders. Because of these differences in the thinking of the organization’s members, it is important to investigate the core values and beliefs about men and women in evangelical organizations and the role of those values and beliefs within the organization, in order to effectively address potential and existing underlying problems (Epstein, 1997).

Bartkowski discussed in his research the multiple discourses that are enacted and practiced within evangelical families and churches (2001). Some of those discourses include the reinforcement of certain values and beliefs about sex differences. For instance, feminine and masculine identity definitions are consistently juxtaposed, which accentuates and widens the line between the sexes. In addition, Brereton and Bendroth (2001) address the discourse that religion and feminism have been regarded as antithetical positions. Cohen, Pant and Sharp (1998) point out that, as a whole, women have been and are held to a higher standard than males. Rubin (1993) discusses how religious organizations hold that women are not the same as men and should not expect the same opportunities. In addition to this, he discusses how certain skills and
characteristics have been typified as masculine and feminine, such as a task orientation for men and a social orientation for women, which tends to put women in non-leadership roles. Rubin also addressed how in these same organizations there has been a universalized and essentialized position of dichotomized sex categories.

Females in this study expressed a construct relationship between what they experienced in their home life experience and what they experience within Campus Crusade. Since members of the Campus Crusade organization self select into the organizational relationship, it would be normal for female participants to select an organization that would reinforce norms from their childhood. Consequently, the differences that exist between the female consensus maps and the male consensus maps would not be problematic for these female participants. Although males seem to have a different experience within the organization, it is a difference that is expected and accepted by the females based on their selection of an organization structure based on sex differences.

The male participants had a larger number of construct and construct relationships that were unique to their subculture. In addition, they also had three times as many construct relationships unique to them than the female participants. What is interesting to note is that there are twice as many females in this specific campus ministry organization as males, and there are twice as many male leaders in the organization than female leaders. Males reported friendships that were specifically male, whereas females did not mention this as a significant theme. Males also mentioned the theme that the organization communicated a sense of brotherhood among the male members. This construct relationship alone would point to a patriarchal core value in the organization, especially in light of the absence of such an experience for females (Bond, 1999; Hardesty, 1992). Males also described feeling encouraged by their relationships with leaders, whereas the females only mentioned feeling encouraged by the organization, in general. Female participants did not mention opportunities to develop leadership or to go on trips with any significance and at least 75% of the male participants mentioned these opportunities.

One manner of explaining the occurrence of this difference in the findings is addressed by Bond’s reference to the way values and beliefs are evidenced in the existing structure of the organizational context. As a result, they affect the organizational culture and meaningful engagement by its members (1999). Females in the sample hardly seemed to recognize the discrepancy in numbers, in regard to the number of males to females and male leaders to female
leaders, which Fobes addresses in saying how the implications of these experiences are not always obvious (1997). However, once again, for those who would have a non-feminist orientation, this would not necessarily pose a problem.

The same cannot be said about those who have a more feministic point of view. The implications of the existence of these discrepancies is addressed again by other researchers who have found that the way prejudice and discrimination are played out within organizations today can be much more covert (Bond, 1999; Rubin, 1997). It is equally viable to consider that perhaps the leaders of the organization are also unaware of the differences in numbers and in the potential impact on members’ experiences. Many of the ways discrimination and inequity could manifest themselves are embedded in organizational culture and, consequently, are much more difficult to distinguish (Bond, 1999; Fobes, 1997).

It is possible that males are addressed more directly and more frequently within the organization and this could explain the difference in number of constructs and construct relationships. If this is so, then it only stands to reason that males would feel more encouraged and connected to leaders and to the organization. Although this more direct and frequent interacting may not be intentional, it might explain the difference in male and female experiences.

The uniqueness of characteristics in a religious organization can also greatly impact the communication of these messages. For example, the complicated and varied picture drawn by evangelical and conservative Protestants in regard to females (Bendroth, 2001), in addition to the way male and female identities are consistently dichotomized in religious organizations (Bartkowski, 2000) helps set the stage for possible mixed messages in this same kind of organization, which reflects identical kinds of values. Also, historically, sex differences within religious organizations have enabled sex to be used as a cultural resource that supports patriarchy without ever needing to identify its presence (Fobes, 1997).

The impact of these findings could be significant if this were a different type of organization that did not dichotomize sex differences as part of their value system; especially when considering their generalizability to the rest of the organization and other similar kinds of organizations that potentially share the same kinds of values. These findings could give us further insight into the values of the organization and its members regarding sex roles. In the event that these core values and beliefs did not allow for this dichotimization, the implications of
this study could be important because of the potential impact the differences would possibly have on the organizational experience of females.

LIMITATIONS

As with any research method, there are limitations to the ZMET research method. Though past research has found the method to be 95% reliable in its findings (Zaltman, 2003) the small sample size could still be a weakness to the method.

Another issue that exists as a potential problem with this method is the need for the researcher to be an experienced interviewer. Appropriate training by an experienced researcher in this method, first by observation and then by actual interview situations, is important and helps resolve this issue. Neglect of this issue could create a situation where it is possible to miss, neglect or lose valuable information that is introduced by the participants and will affect the quality of the participants’ responses.

Both the researcher and the coder in this study were females. It is possible that the reliability could be further strengthened with additional coders. It is also worth considering the value of adding coders that are male. Male coders could strengthen the coding reliability by adding a balancing presence, or it is possible for the presence of a male coder or interviewer to be a weakness in a situation where females were not as comfortable addressing true thoughts or feelings.

FUTURE RESEARCH

The communication discipline could benefit from the application of the ZMET research method to this organization in a number of ways. Because all research methods have certain limitations, the ZMET could be used as only one point of analysis in tandem with other methods to create a holistic picture of the phenomena surrounding certain communication issues within organizations. There are implications for practitioners in the communication discipline especially when this method is combined with other research tools.

One way that this study could be extended is through using other research tools, but apply the research directed specifically at females within the organization. By first using a scale such as the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC) (Moradi & Subich, 2002), which measures whether an individual has a feminist orientation or not, along with the passive acceptance scale (Hanson, 2002), to select two groups of participants, it would be enlightening to further investigate whether the organization contains females that identify themselves as feminists, and if they do, to
compare the consensus maps generated by those who do not identify themselves as such. If members had such an orientation, then the findings for this study would be far more problematic for those members of the organization because of the implications in how they would experience potential inequities within the organization. Individuals with a feminist orientation may question the core beliefs and values and the way they manifest themselves in the rules and norms of the organization.

Second, while performing the content analysis for this study, an informal analysis recognized the potential constructs of accountability and hierarchy possibly existing. In future research of this organization, it would be interesting to examine how these might emerge as constructs or as a part of construct relationships. This could be accomplished through specifically looking at thoughts or feelings of participants toward leaders within the organization.

Another way that the ZMET tool could be used is to look at sex differences within organizations in other arenas of life, and not only religious life. As pointed out earlier in this chapter, religious organizations have structures that not only accept sex differences as a norm, but also endorse them. The same is not true for other organizations and that is where the tension lies. Using the ZMET in the same fashion when looking at other organizations that do not have this innate quality could prove interesting, not only to members of those organizations, but also to the leaders of those organizations. An organization that is aware of the some of the ways discrimination or inequity might occur could use this tool to evaluate how well they are performing in the area of diversity awareness and equality.

It is possible to apply this approach also in relation to other religions, race issues, political organizations, and socioeconomic issues within the same kind of organization or even a different one. In evaluating the various ways the differences between sexes was manifested and accepted in this organizational study, such as through the introduction of rules and norms in relation to male and female relationships, leadership and friendships, it would be insightful to examine the ways this might be manifested and accepted in the larger culture in more covert ways. Furthermore, it would be interesting to look at other religious organizations along the evangelical continuum, even non-Christian organizations, to discover if different religions share common sex differences.

Finally, the ZMET can lend insight into how to create new paradigms. The ZMET helps break down the line between basic and applied research. The ZMET addresses real consumer
phenomena and creates implementable validity; that is, it creates opportunity for effective action with the ability to address situations with a strategy for change. These characteristics, that are part of the ZMET’s approach to research, form a solid foundation for the application of the method to multiple problems that exist within organizations, whatever type they are, and within the realm of the communication discipline.
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APPENDIX A

Dear Instructors of COM 135 and 136:

I am conducting research that will involve members of Campus Crusade’s student ministry organization. Because students in COM 135 can participate in a research project for extra credit, and students in COM 136 are required to complete a research participation assignment, I am hoping to find the participants for my study through these particular COM classes.

I am looking for two population sample groups, one of males and one of females, each consisting of about 7-10 Miami undergraduate students. The participants I am seeking will need to consist solely of Campus Crusade members who have been actively involved in the organization for at least one year. I appreciate your help in announcing this study to your students and would be grateful for your encouragement of their participation in this study. Below you will find an announcement that I ask you read to your classes. Thanks for your help!

Sincerely,
K Gail Sease

A research study on the perceptions of Campus Crusade members is being conducted this semester. This study is open only to Campus Crusade members. Participants must be 18 or older. You can sign up on the green and yellow sheets of paper on the bulletin board outside 162 Bachelor. Sign ups sheets will only be up for one week from February 17 until February 24. Be sure to note the time and room for the meeting you sign up for. Participation in this research will count for extra credit in COM 135 and/or as your out of class research assignments for COM 136. For more information contact K. Gail Sease at 529-1879 or Dr. Gary Shulman at 529-7472. Participants may also contact the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship (OARS) (513-529-3734) or humansubjects@muohio.edu for any questions about their rights as subjects.
Figure 5: Map Key

**Consensus Map Criteria:**
- 4 or greater = placed on construct map
- 4-5 participants mentioned relationship = moderate construct relationship / secondary relationship
- 6-8 participants mentioned relationship = strong construct relationship / primary relationship

**Map Legend for Figures 1 and 3:**

Dotted lines = Moderate / Secondary relationship between constructs

Solid lines = Strong / Primary relationship between constructs

**Map Legend for Figures 2 and 4:**

Pink words and lines = Shared construct or construct relationships between males and females

Black words and lines = Unique constructs and construct relationships to each subculture