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Chapter 1
Statement of the Problem

Since the time of Weber (1947) organization structure has been a main theme of inquiry among the students of organization theory (Scott, 1975). Apparently, "structure seems to be at the root of many of the questions we raise about organizations" (Mintzberg, 1979, p. xii). For its importance, a multitude of empirical studies have been conducted to gain knowledge on organization structure (e.g., Jablin, 1987). A result of these studies has been the conceptualization of organization structure as a number of dimensions such as formalization, centralization and complexity (Pugh, Hickson, Hinings and Turner, 1968; Hall, 1982). It is also established that these dimensions are caused by a number of contextual or contingency variables such as size, technology, and environment (e.g., Pugh, Hickson, Hinings and Turner, 1969; Ford and Slocum, 1977).

While a wealth of knowledge has been gained on the nature and causes of organization structure, there is a dearth of knowledge on the human processes which create organization structure (Benson, 1977). Almost all of the studies conducted on organization structure have emphasized the properties of organization structure rather than the
processes that lead to its creation and re-creation. In the terminology of Ranson, Hinings and Greenwood (1981) structure has been primarily dealt with as "framework", whereas the "interaction" creating this framework has been most often ignored or neglected. For example, while it is known that a dimension of organization structure is centralization, little is known about how an organization member comes to appreciate this dimension in practice, or how a manager actually produces the reality of centralization in the mind of a member. Even in studying the relationship between contextual or contingency factors and organization structure the focus has been on the size, significance, and direction of the relationship rather than on the social processes that mediate between the two statistically related factors (e.g., Benson, 1977; Mehan, 1978).

At least two reasons can be mentioned for the neglect of the social processes in creating social facts, such as structure, within organizations. They are: 1) the prevalence of a micro/macro distinction in the field; 2) the dominance of a functionalist paradigm in studying the phenomenon of organizations. Using Lawrence and Lorsch's (1967) words, the micro/macro distinction, while it has served the necessary function of differentiation for the field, has been unable to serve the equally needed function of integration for it. The students of each camp have
confined themselves to the study of their subject matters within the defined boundaries of their camps. The micro researchers have been primarily concerned with the unit of the individual within organizations, and the macro researchers have been primarily concerned with the unit of the organization within societies. The difference reminds one of Bennis's (1959) words, the micro researchers seem to study individuals in organizations as "people without organization", and the macro researchers seem to study organizations as "organizations without people".

Given the micro/macro distinction, the students of organization theory have been reluctant to incorporate any thorough discussion of individuals' social activities in their studies and theories of organizations. In turn, the majority of micro researchers have been limiting their attention to micro topics such as motivation, job design, perception and personality. In general, the micro or macro researchers have not dealt with the relationship between the individual and the creation and re-creation of their organizations. One alternative to this distinction is, of course, that the students of the field begin taking an integrative view for studying the relationship between organizations and the people within them, while retaining their different orientations. The integrative approach would then allow a researcher to study the micro processes that result in macro properties of an organization.
A second, but even more fundamental reason for the neglect of social processes in creating organizational facts lies in the paradigm commitment of organizational researchers. It has been noticed by many observers that the field of organizations is dominated by a functionalist paradigm (Silverman, 1971; Motamedi, 1978; Pondy and Mitroff, 1979; Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Morgan and Smircich, 1979; Morgan, 1980; Benson, 1983; Clark, 1985). The ontology of the functionalist view of organizations assumes the existence of an objective world. From this fundamental assumption, the functionalist researchers have long been searching for as many social facts as possible, in order to generate general laws which explain the nature and the relationship between the discovered social facts. Adherents of the functionalist view believe in and strive for the achievement of a value-free science of organizations. To achieve this goal, the functionalist paradigm has more or less had a bias for using research methods which impose a high degree of control over its subjects of study - experimentally and/or statistically.

The contribution of the functionalist view to the knowledge of organizations has been immense and fruitful (Morgan, 1984; Starbuck, 1981). As Morgan (1984, p.307) asserts, "the functionalist paradigm has provided the foundation for most modern theory and research on the subject of organization". But, while the students of the
field have benefited greatly from the functionalist view of organizations and many of them continue to investigate organizations with such a view (Clark, 1985), one can also benefit by looking at organizations from a different view (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Pondy and Mitroff, 1979; Benson, 1983; Morgan, 1984). One alternative to the functionalist view is a social constructionist perspective on organizations (Silverman, 1971; Berger and Luckmann, 1966). In the literature, the terms interpretive (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, Weick, 1979) and cultural (Pondy and Mitroff, 1979; Smircich, 1983a&b; Smircich and Calas, 1987; Pondy, Frost, Morgan and Dandridge, 1983) have been alternatively used for referring to the same, or similar, phenomenon that the term social construction does.

Adherents of social construction, like the functionalists believe in the existence of constraining social facts. However, unlike functionalists, they emphasize and underscore that these facts are being made and maintained by human beings. By way of distinction then, it should be mentioned that while the functionalists emphasize the finding and description of social facts, the social constructionists emphasize the finding and explanation of the social patterns and processes which lead to those facts. Recently, Astley (1985) highlighted the essence of the social constructionist perspective on organizations by
suggesting that administrative science itself is a socially constructed field of inquiry.

The social constructionist perspective (e.g., Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Silverman, 1971; Pondy and Mitroff, 1979) places a special emphasis on the role of language, primarily talk, in social construction of organizational realities. In recent years, a growing number of conceptual and empirical articles have proposed and studied leaders and managers as the primary users of language for the purpose of creating meaning, and organizing (i.e., structuring) the experiences of their employees in the work place (Pondy, 1978; Smircich and Morgan, 1982; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Frost and Morgan, 1983; Bennis and Nanus, 1985). Furthermore, social construction’s emphasis on verbal language is in harmony with the description of organizations as "speech communities" (Barely, 1983), in which managers are found to spend the majority of their time at verbal communication with other organizational members (Mintzberg, 1973).

While some have argued against any accommodation of different paradigms (e.g., Guba, 1985), the two approaches can be considered as complementary, at least partially (Astley and Van de Ven, 1983), since social construction describes many different social processes of life and functionalism describes the end result of these processes. Refocusing on structure, it seems reasonable to suggest that
while the functionalist paradigm stresses structure, the
social constructionist stresses structuring. Table 1 compares the functionalist and social constructionist
approaches to the topic of organization structure.

The functionalist paradigm adopts an overly macro
perspective on structure. The tendency is to explain
organization structure as a property independent from the
people constrained by it. This paradigm favors the analysis
of organizations at more aggregate levels such as systems
(Parsons, 1961), and populations (Hannan and Freeman, 1977).
Ironically, Giddens (1976) underscores the overemphasis on
the macro side of organizations by observing that there is
little action evident in the Parsons’ action theory of
systems.

For this neglect of micro processes, the social
constructionists have charged functionalists with the
reification of organizations (Silverman, 1971).
"Reification...refers to the fact that whilst men in their
day-to-day productive activities create the social world,
these activities and what results from them are seen as
divorced from men, as independent, objectified ‘things’"
(Burrell and Morgan, 1979). To avoid reification, one
alternative is to incorporate the analysis of micro
processes in constituting macro properties of organizations.
Giddens’ (1976,1984) structuration theory is a prominent
example of such an incorporation. Ranson et al., (1980) and
### Table 1

**A Summary Comparison of the Functionalist and Social Constructionist Approaches to Organization Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Construction</th>
<th>Functionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structuring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining Micro/Macro Interaction</td>
<td>Describing Macro Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Dimensions of Structure</td>
<td>Dimensions of Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns and Processes of Structuring</td>
<td>Causes of Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the Role of the Verbal Language</td>
<td>No Special Emphasis on the Role of Verbal Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Willmott (1981) have outlined the implications of the Giddens' structuration theory for the study of organization structure.

In summary, Giddens' theory analytically conceives of structure as a dual entity dichotomized into two sets, one consisting of dimensions of structure and the other consisting of dimensions of interaction. The two sets of dimensions are mediated by a set of modalities (see Figure 1). As Willmott (1981, p. 472) puts it, "these modalities are drawn upon by actors in their constitution of interaction. But equally, they are the media for the reproduction of the structural components of social systems". Thus according to social constructionists, as illustrated by Giddens' work, the micro processes of human interaction mediate to produce and reproduce the macro entities of human systems or organizations. And while, the social constructionists consider and highlight the role of the verbal language, as a major micro process in constructing organization realities, including organization structure, the functionalists do not give any major emphasis to the use of language in organizations.

The second issue of contrast between the functionalist and constructivist approach to organization structure is that of dimensions of structure versus the use of them. Functionalist researchers have conceptualized organization structure as a number of dimensions. The social
Figure 1

Giddens’ Duality of Structure
(Adapted from Giddens, 1976, and Willmott, 1981)
constructionist researcher is not interested in showing the existence of these dimensions; he/she is fundamentally and primarily interested in observing and showing the use of the dimensions by organizational members (e.g. Bittner, 1965), and in explaining the manifestation of the dimensions in the members’ actions. For example, while functionalists have found that formalization is a dimension of organizational structure, constructionists are interested in observing how organizational members use and manifest this dimension in their day to day organizational activities.

Finally, while the functionalists have been arguing and empirically testing for the causal effects of size, technology and environment on the structure of organization, they have almost neglected the social patterns and processes of structuring. Thus the emphasis placed on the two poles of the relationship – i.e., contextual factors and structural dimensions – rather than what transpires in between, has left a considerable knowledge gap to be filled by the researchers investigating the process of structuring vs. the state of structure. Adopting a social constructionist view provides the researcher with the necessary predisposition for being more sensitive and biased towards observing and studying the processes of structuring (i.e., how people get to or maintain structure) vs. describing what structure is.

From the above (and later) discussions, the conclusion here is that a social constructionist perspective can help
one to investigate the social processes that result in organization structure. Benson (1977) argues for the same point. "Rather than treating such relationships as determinate causal connections, for instance, arguing that technology determines social structure, the dialectician [or the social constructionist] investigates the social process through which the orderly, predictable relations have been produced and reproduced." (p. 6).

It was with the goal of exploring one of many possible processes of structuring that this dissertation author undertook the task of studying how the micro processes of organizational talk at organizational meetings contain certain content, strategies, and patterns that may result in the production and reproduction of the macro entities of organization structure. More specifically, the objective of the dissertation is to show that organizational talk at meetings contains structure. As a corollary objective, it is then suggested that the organizational talk containing structure results in constructing and reconstructing organizational structures in the minds of organizational members. Structuring, here, refers to the process of organizational talk at organization meetings with its content revolving around organization structure(s) of organizational members, which is assumed (suggested) to result in the creation and re-creation of organizational structure(s). Besides its content, organizational talk is
also analyzed for exploring the strategies and patterns associated with the process of structuring.

The choice of talk, or verbal use of language, was made in light of the emphasis given to it in the social construction perspective, which also provides a focus for this study of structuring of structure. However, it should be acknowledged that the social construction takes place through all communication forms and means including non-verbal communication. Moreover, though formal organizational meeting is the unit of analysis for this dissertation research, the social construction of organizations occurs in all other conceivable organizational settings, and certainly, it is not limited by the formal meeting settings. For example, organizational talk occurs in non-meeting and or non-formal settings, in dyads and many other group sizes. Formal organizational setting was chosen for it is a setting where a collection (vs. only two or a few) individuals meet, and it is a comparable unit of analysis across organizations where a collection of individuals meet.

In recent years a growing number of researchers have called on the students of the field to make their studies and theories more relevant to the real world practices of managers and other organizational members (Cummings, 1981; Thomas and Tymon, 1982; Campbell, Daft and Hulin, 1982; Mintzberg, 1982; Bennis, 1987). The study of verbal
patterns and process involved in organizational talk in the structuring of structures has a high degree of relevance to the real world, day-to-day activities of managers and others in organizations, as talking and verbal communication is an inevitable activity in any social organization. By understanding the way in which the structure of an organization is shaped by the verbal (talk) exchanges and experiences of organizational members, this research can develop a framework for analyzing how verbal communication strategies and patterns are effective in constituting the reality of organization structures. Thus organizational members can definitely identify with the implications of talk patterns and strategies, as they actually talk to individuals and groups in the course of their daily life in organizations.

An Overview of Dissertation

The research conducted for this dissertation was an exploratory study for finding (i.e., discovering/inventing) the processes: content, patterns, and strategies involved in structuring of organization structures at formal organizational meetings. Organizational talk from a total of eight organizational meetings was analyzed for the evidence of structuring content and exploring the patterns and strategies involved in structuring organization structures. The goal was to identify and develop a number
of generalizations based on which a preliminary outline of a theory of structuring at formal organizational meetings is presented towards the end of the dissertation. The next chapter will review the literature on organization structure and the available literature on organization structuring.

In chapter three a discussion of the underlying paradigm view adopted by this dissertation presents the assumptions and implications of employing an interpretive mode of inquiry. Chapter four will discuss the qualitative methodology and grounded theory approach of the study, and will present the specific interpretative methodology used in this research for exploring the process of structuring.

The findings and results organized under the three sets of categories of content, strategies, and patterns of organizational talk in structuring organization structures will be presented in chapter five. Chapter six discusses the findings and outlines a theory of structuring. Chapter seven will conclude and summarize the dissertation research and will present the implications of the study for the field and for the practitioners.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Structure is an inseparable property of any organization. The word "organization", by itself, reflects the centrality of the topic of structure to the study of organizations, for both ‘organization’ and ‘structure’ refer to the arrangement of parts in a whole. This arrangement, organization structure, has been theorized and investigated by students of organization theory as the cause and effect of many other organizational factors and phenomena, including and most important as the cause of organizational efficiency and effectiveness (Weber, 1947; Thompson, 1967; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Pennings, 1973; Dalton, Todor, Spendolini, Fielding, Porter, 1980; Ford and Scheiltenberg, 1982).

No one more than Max Weber, the German philosopher, has been responsible for making organization structure the central focus of organization theory, and for proposing it as a necessary pre-condition of organizational efficiency and effectiveness. By referring to him as "paradigm builder", Clark (1985) maintains that the influence of Weber’s work on bureaucracy in the field of organization theory has been immense, widespread and deep. Clark (p.44)
asserts: "Contemporary, sophisticated treatises on organizational theory seldom refer to Weber or his propositions except by brief historical notation. The assumption seems to have been made that Weber's work has been rendered obsolete by the modifications, additions, and transpositions of the theorists that have followed him. That is an error, for the heritage of Weberian assumptions is an impediment burdening the field of organizational theory and practice just as surely as the heritage of the positivist paradigm is obstructing the creation of new paradigms for inquiry."

Weber's theory of bureaucracy has impacted further conceptualization and research work on organization structure. First, Weber's bureaucracy has served as the foundation for conceptualization of, and research on, organization structure as a multidimensional entity. Second, Weber's bureaucracy has been referred to as one best way to design, and has been subsequently expanded, revised, critiqued and/or counterpoised by others who have proposed their own one best way to design. Third, Weber's bureaucratic model of organization structure has been the primary reason for the search for its authenticity and universality which in turn resulted in the emergence and establishment of the contingency theories of organization structure. The following review of the literature on organization structure is accordingly divided into three
parts based on the above observations. The discussion and conclusion of each part of the review will contrast the concept and research of structure with the concept of structuring - the theme of inquiry for this dissertation research. The contrast aims at showing that the traditional literature of organization theory deals with structure as a static product, rather than a dynamic process (of structuring). Figure 2 summarizes the literature review of this chapter.

The Concept of Organization Structure

A review of a number of representative definitions of organization structure, while showing slight differences among them, points to the existence of a common underlying theme. That common theme is captured by Mintzberg's (1979) definition of structure: "The structure of an organization can be defined simply as the sum total of the way in which it divides its labor into distinct tasks and then achieves coordination among them." (p.2). Apparently, the multiple ways of dividing and integrating (coordinating) the labor result in the emergence of "patterns and relationships that exist among organization of work unit elements." (Blackburn, 1982, p.59).

A multidimensional approach has been the rule rather than the exception in conceptualizing and operationalizing organization structure (Blackburn, 1982). As pointed out,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One Best Way to Design</th>
<th>What Structure Is:</th>
<th>What Causes Structure:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples:</td>
<td>Dimensions of</td>
<td>The Contingency View:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Weber’s Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Structure:</td>
<td>* Technology (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Likert’s System-4</td>
<td>* Complexity (CO)</td>
<td>* Environmental Uncertainty (EU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Mechanistic vs. Organic</td>
<td>* Formalization (F)</td>
<td>* Size (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Centralization (CN)</td>
<td>The Relationship Between Causes and Effects of Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* (Specialization)</td>
<td>S ----- (+) ---- CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* (Standardization)</td>
<td>S ----- (+) ---- F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* (Configuration)</td>
<td>S ----- (-) ---- CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T ----- (+) ---- CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T ----- (+) ---- F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T ----- (+) ---- CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EU ----- (+) ---- CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EU ----- (-) ---- F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EU ----- (-) ---- CN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tells US WHAT THE STRUCTURE IS: Structure as an outcome of rational decision making

TELLS US WHAT THE DIMENSIONS OF STRUCTURE ARE: Structure as a product of its dimensions

TELLS US WHAT THE CAUSES OF STRUCTURE ARE: Structure as the effect of contingency factors

NONE TELLS US ABOUT THE PROCESS OF STRUCTURING

Figure 2
The Traditional Literature on Organization Structure: Tells Us About Structure, Not Structuring
Weber's (1947) bureaucracy has served as the starting point for later conceptualization and empirical testing of organization structure in terms of a number of dimensions. The ideal model of Weber's bureaucracy - as it is referred to - is primarily characterized by the principle of rationality (Clark, 1985). Using this principle, Weber proposed his model based on a number of impersonal organizing and authority relationship principles which are aimed at achieving efficiency. These impersonal rules were essentially concerned with "...division of labor, specialization, formalization of behavior, hierarchy of authority, chain of command, regulated communication, and standardization of work processes and skills." (Mintzberg, 1979, p.85).

As one of the earliest and most systematic attempts for empirical testing of Weber's theory of bureaucracy, a group of the British researchers, called the Aston group, began a series of investigations by first laying out a conceptual plan for studying organization structure (Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, Mcdonald, Turner and Lupton, 1963). The Aston group contended that "in our view, the present study of work organization and behavior can no longer be content with a priori postulations or a continuing succession of one-case studies." (p.291). However, despite their contention, they evidently took on the a priori assumptions of Weber's work to begin their own investigations (Starbuck, 1981). "Thus
we have attempted to develop an empirically based multidimensional analysis of the structural variables of organization. In order to do this we must first of all isolate the conceptually distinct elements that go into Weber's formulation of bureaucracy. Then the relationships between these elements become a subject for empirical investigation and not for a priori postulation. The insights of Weber can then be translated into a set of empirically testable hypotheses." (Pugh et al., 1963, p.298).

In this way, the Aston group decided to conceptualize organization structure as a multidimensional entity. "We feel that our particular contribution is in the attempt to conceptualize organizational structure as being made up of a number of dimensions." (p.315). Of the six original dimensions proposed, only one, flexibility, did not stand the subsequent empirical testings. The other five dimensions, specialization, standardization, formalization, centralization and configuration were shown to be statistically significant dimensions of structure (Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, Turner, 1968). In the 1968 study, fifty-two "extremely varied" manufacturing and service companies were included in the sample. The study, using the method of principal component factor analysis, identified four overall dimensions for organization structure: 1) structuring of activities, i.e., specialization, formalization and
standardization, 2) centralization of authority, 3) line control of workflow and 4) supportive component (non-workflow). A wide range of subsequent studies and replications by the Aston group and other researchers provided further support for this multidimensional conceptualization of organization structure (e.g. Child, 1972a; Child and Mansfield, 1972; Payne and Pugh, 1976; Pugh, 1981).

Besides the Aston group, a number of other researchers, notably Richard Hall and Jerald Hage, also conceptualized organization structure as multidimensional and conducted empirical research for testing it. Hall, in two consecutive studies (1962, 1963), considered six bureaucratic dimensions of hierarchy of authority, division of labor, rules, procedures, impersonality and technical qualifications, as representing organization structure. Hall’s conclusion was that while the bureaucratic dimensions of organization exist, their existence is "a matter of degree, rather than kind". (1963, p.37).

Hage (1965), proposed a theory of organizations composed of two sets of variables: organizational means and organizational ends. Organizational means variables were structural dimensions of complexity, centralization, formalization and stratification. In a subsequent study, Hage and Aiken (1967) set out to operationalize Hage’s dimensions of structure and tested the relationship between
centralization and other dimensions. While many more research studies were conducted on the dimensions of structure, including some which appear in Table 2, the above studies served as the foundation upon which the multidimensional concept of structure was consolidated.

As is observable from Table 2, different researchers have operationalized organization structure with a varying number of dimensions. However, in recent years a growing agreement has been converged on limiting the dimensionality of organization structure to three dimensions of complexity, formalization and centralization (Child, 1974; Van de Ven, 1976; Ford and Slocum, 1976; Hall, 1982; Blackburn, 1982). While this closure on structural dimensionality has been questioned (Blackburn, 1982; Blackburn and Cummings, 1982), the following review will nevertheless limit itself to those three dimensions which have been the focus of most of the research done on organization structure.

1) Complexity  From Mintzberg's (1979) definition of structure, complexity is the outcome of the number of ways that an organization differentiates its labor. "The three elements of complexity most commonly identified are: horizontal differentiation; vertical, or hierarchical differentiation; and spatial dispersion." (Hall, 1982; p.78). With regard to complexity, Weber was first to write on the need for specialization and division of labor, hierarchy of authority, and technically qualified personnel
### Table 2

**Studies of Dimensions of Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(S):</th>
<th>Dimensions: CO</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall (1962)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter and Lawler (1965)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall et al., (1967)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indik (1968)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pugh et al., (1968)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickson et al., (1969)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkson et al., (1970 &amp; 1971)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prien and Ronan (1971)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child (1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne and Mansfield (1976)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrebinjak (1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdaway et al., (1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn and Cummings (1982)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:**

- **CO** = Complexity;  **CE** = Centralization;  **FO** = Formalization;
- **ST** = Standardization;  **SP** = Specialization;  **CF** = Configuration

Others were such things as: Span of control; Administrative intensity; Closeness of Supervision, etc.
for achieving efficiency in organization. The first and last elements of Weber's principles gave rise to the research on horizontal division of labor and the second element resulted in further research on vertical division of labor.

Horizontal division of labor is a function of two organizational properties, the extent of job specialization and professionalization and the extent of unit grouping. At the micro level, organizations resort to dividing their labor by either simple specialization, also called standardization of activities, or professionalization (Hall, 1982). Simple standardization is accomplished through dividing the work into distinguishable parts and assigning the personnel to work at different parts permanently. By implementing professionalization, organizations still divide the work into smaller pieces, but assign highly trained, educated and qualified personnel to them.

Different researchers have used slightly different numerical measures for measuring the amount of complexity in general and the horizontal division of labor in particular. Blau and Schoenherr (1971) count the number of unique positions and subgroups as an indicator of complexity. Hall, Haas and Johnson (1967) similarly used the number of divisions and the number of specialized jobs within those jobs for coming up with the complexity measure. Taking a different focus, Hage and Aiken (1967) measured complexity by counting the number of occupational specialties, "the
number of professional associations in which the respondents were involved, the number of meetings attended and the number of offices held or the number of papers given at professional meetings." (p.80).

Another form of horizontal differentiation used by organizations at a more macro level is "unit grouping" (Mintzberg, 1979). Unit grouping takes place in different forms. Functional departmentalization is the grouping based on the primary function of each department or division. Product divisionalization is based on the primary product or service each division produces or renders. Geographical divisionalization is based on the location. And finally, by imposing a product divisionalization on a functional division of labor a matrix way of unit grouping is created.

The second element of complexity is vertical division of labor. The basic idea is to impose a hierarchical order of authority on a labor, which is logically supposed to have been already horizontally divided (Thompson, 1967). The importance of this element is, however, mainly echoed in the discussion of organization's configuration and centralization. To measure vertical division of labor, researchers have mostly relied on a simple measurement of the number of levels in the organization. Finally the third element of complexity, spatial differentiation, is "... [a] form of horizontal and vertical differentiation. That is activities and personnel can be dispersed in space,
according to either horizontal or vertical functions, by the separation of power centers or tasks" (Hall, 1982, p.82).

2) Formalization Mintzberg (1979) mentions that behavior formalization "is the main thread running through Weber's description."(P.86). Hall (1982) also maintains that "in many ways, formalization is the key structural variable for the individual because a person's behavior is vitally affected by the degree of such formalization." (p.95). In general formalization is achieved through an organization's reliance on documentation, and rules for operating its every day business. "Documentation includes procedures, job descriptions, regulations, and policy manual." (Daft, 1986, p.16). Formalization has been mostly measured by counting the number and amount of written documents in an organization (Pugh et al., 1968; Hall, 1982; Hage and Aiken, 1967; Daft, 1986). In this way, organizations can be found to be formalized either minimally or maximally (Hall, 1982).

Similar to most other dimensions of structure, formalization, in a more direct way, is deemed to enable an organization to achieve a desired level of control and predictability over its flow of operations - the behavior of people. Formalization can serve an organization in achieving its two control functions. The two types of control are: behavior and output control (Ouchi and Macguire, 1975; Ouchi, 1977). Given this, an organization
can be considered more formalized if it applies a detailed set of rules and description for controlling both behavior and output within its boundaries than an organization which may apply the same rules to only one of the two functions of control. The level of detail of the rules and documents of an organization is a further indicator of maximal and minimal degree of formalization in an organization. Furthermore, an organization's standardization increases as more detailed description and specification of organization's activities are introduced into an organization. "Standardization is the extent to which similar work activities are performed in a uniform manner. In a highly standardized organization work content is described in detail, so similar work is performed the same way across departments or locations." (Daft, 1986, p.16).

Finally, standardization of work can take place in three forms: standardization of skills, of procedure, and of output. As with other organizational dimensions, formalization has an especially close affinity to the dimension of centralization.

3) Centralization Centralization refers to the degree and amount of power distributed along various vertical lines in an organization (e.g. Hall, 1982). Since power may also denote who makes the decision, centralization is also an indicator of the locus of decision making. The more power concentrated in the hands of a few organizational
members, usually located at the top, the more centralized is the organization. An alternative term used for describing centralization is its opposite: decentralization. While centralization refers to the concentration of authority, decentralization refers to the delegation of authority. Together, centralization and formalization are the structural dimensions which are used for the purpose of coordination and integration of a divided labor. Hall (1982) discusses three aspects of centralization. The first aspect is about decision making in organizations. That is, who has the right of decision making and how much latitude do the organization's decision makers have. The second aspect concerns the locus of evaluation of members' activities and decisions. This refers to who is charge of evaluating organizational members. Consequently, even if many organizational personnel at different levels are authorized to make decisions, but, nevertheless, are subject to the evaluation of few at the top, then the organization is considered centralized. The third aspect of centralization is its intensity, which indicates how an organization views its personnel. McGregor's theory X and Y may be used for illustrating two possible alternative views of personnel in a centralized versus decentralized organization.

4) **Configuration** The discussion of the previous three dimensions of organization structure can be summarized
by discussing another dimension of structure—configuration. Pugh et al., (1968) define configuration as "the shape" of the role structure." The particular shape that an organization takes on, as a result of its complexity, formalization and centralization, can be considered as its configuration. The most popular terminology used for referring to an organization's configuration is tall vs. flat distinction. A tall organization refers to a larger number of managerial levels and smaller spans of control, in comparison to a flat organization of fewer levels and larger spans of control.

A number of far more sophisticated configurations, also called taxonomies of organizations, have been offered by different researchers. Pugh, Hickson and Hinings (1969) use three dimensions: the level of structure to the activities (structured vs. unstructured), the type of control (line control vs. impersonal control) and, centralization (concentrated authority vs. dispersed authority), to propose seven types of organizational configuration. The seven forms are: Full Bureaucracy; Nascent Full Bureaucracy; Workflow Bureaucracy; Nascent Workflow Bureaucracy; Preworkflow Bureaucracy; Personnel Bureaucracy (1968, pp. 121-23).

Mintzberg (1979) also offers another set of organizational typology or configuration. The first of five types of organizations suggested by Mintzberg is the Simple
Structure, which is characterized by few hierarchical levels, small size and simple technology. The second configuration suggested is the Machine Bureaucracy having features such as large size, standardization of work and external control imposed on organization. The third type is Professional Bureaucracy, primarily occupied and shaped by professionalization. Divisionalized form is the fourth type, representing a high degree of organizational complexity along various horizontal and vertical lines. And finally the fifth type is Adhocracy characterized with "little formalization of behavior, highly trained specialists, and multidisciplinary project teams with functional and market grouping." (Zahrly, 1984, p.202).

Conclusion The literature on organization structure has taken a great leap from Weber’s seminal work on bureaucracy to delineating the dimensions and types of organization structure empirically. Research done on organization structure has been extensive and continues to appear in research journals. From this review, it can be concluded that organization structure has been primarily conceptualized as a multi-dimensional entity, which takes shape as a particular form called configuration.

The literature reviewed above has been primarily preoccupied with describing the nature of organization structure (i.e., multidimensional entity). It has been successful (in its own right) in providing researchers and
practitioners with a wealth of insight into, and knowledge of, what structure is. However, in the abundance of dimensional studies of organization structure, one does not see a discussion of how these dimensions are supposed to be known by organizational members, and/or how these dimensions are presented, held up, and used by managers and other organizational members in their day-to-day life in organizations.

**Ideal Models of Organizations**

Since its introduction, Weber’s bureaucracy has served more or less as the fundamental ground upon which the theoretical and empirical works on organization theory have sought their extensions and have fought their disagreements. On the theoretical side, Parsons (1951), fraught with revelations from Weber’s work, offered his own functionalist model of social systems with a later focus on organizations (1960). Parsons suggested that every social system should perform four basic functions in order to survive. The four functions are: adaptation, goal attainment, integration, and latency or pattern maintenance (called AGIL by Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

Despite inviting a host of criticisms against itself, Parson’s model has had a strong echo throughout later works on the nature of organizations. Georgieu (1973) argues that a preoccupation with goal attainment is an overarching
characteristic of almost all definitions of, and approaches to, organizations. The explanation of organizational sub-systems such as maintenance and production in Katz and Kahn's (1966, 1978) work on organizations has its roots in Parsons' functionalism. It is more interesting to know that recently Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983), using a multi-dimensional scaling procedure came up with a mapping of the construct of organizational performance into four cells, each matching with one of the four functions of Parsons AGIL scheme.

While Parsons was predominantly concerned with explaining the functions which preserve a system's equilibrium, his critics became primarily concerned with explaining how a system remains at, or returns to, equilibrium in the face of dysfunctions in the system. Among the prominent theorists of dysfunction were Merton and Gouldner. Both of these critics found trouble with the rule-governed nature of bureaucracies and the effects of rule enforcement in those organizations. Merton (1957) maintained that organizational rules and their enforcement results in rigid and inflexible behavior for organizational members, who should on the contrary be flexible in meeting the demands of the clients. Rules become a safety cushion for insensitive employees in the wake of conflictual demands from the clients. Dysfunctions of the rule
enforcement would then cause the disappearance of innovation and flexibility in the organizations.

Gouldner (1954) too, argues that the reliance on impersonal rules of conduct has dysfunctional effects for organizations. According to him, while rules set the minimum requirements of production and services, organizations are after the maximization of outcomes. In a contradictory way, with dysfunctional consequences, organizations introduce power into organizational relations for achieving maximum outcomes. From Merton and Gouldner it can be seen that while these theorists come one step closer to include the role of the human factor in the structuring of organization structure by focusing on dysfunctions, they fail to de-reify the concept of organization as they choose to focus on rules as "things", rather than on human beings as the interpreters and creators of rules. The point is that the people such as Gouldner, Merton, Selznick and Blau, despite their insights into, and criticisms of, both the Parsons' model and bureaucracy, remain committed to a functionalist analysis of organizations - which considers structure as a fixed (product) and macro entity (Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

Relying on the legacy of the Hawthorne experiments (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939), another set of organizational scientists rejected the general principles of the bureaucratic model and offered a number of
anti-bureaucratic models of organizations. Likert's system-4 (1961, 1967) is a well-known example of an anti-bureaucratic model of organization. In Likert's model, rather than upholding impersonal rules, more emphasis is given to the quality of interpersonal relationships based on personal feelings, affection, and understanding for achieving the desired outcomes of the organization. Under system-4 designs, group decision making rather than authoritative decision making is given priority. Channels of communication are more informal than the bureaucratic channels, and people are tied together as a family with the supervisors acting as "linking pins".

Bennis (1966) too, predicted "the coming death of bureaucracy" and argued that many changes in the modern life, such as the overall higher level of education among the population and technological change, will demand a non-bureaucratic structure for organizations. The search for an ideal model of organization continues to be a popular activity among those interested in the field of organizations. A recent prime example of such a continued interest is the proposition of theory Z organization by Ouchi (1981), in which he compares and contrasts the present organizational set-ups in the U.S. (as theory A) and Japan (as theory J) and proposes a middle ground organization design (as theory Z) for making American corporations more effective.
Conclusion  Similar to the idea of bureaucracy, the idea of system-4 design is another attempt at offering one best way to design. The bureaucratic and non-bureaucratic structures are also popularly referred to as mechanistic and organic types of structure (Burns and Stalker, 1961). None of these two models, like other ideal models, address the issue of the nature of social activities, actions and interactions which create organization structures. Their goal is rather to present a set of 'pre-made' elements of organizing, which are just in the need of "assembly" once a choice of an ideal model of organization structure is made by the decision makers of the organization. Thus in ideal models of organizations, people's actions are discounted while their wisdom of choice is put up-front. That is, organization structure has been theorized to be a product of human choice, whereas the process of reaching that product, using and maintaining it, has not been dealt with at all or adequately.

Contingency Approach to Organization Structure

With the advent of the open systems view of organizations and also with the rising interest in the empirical studies of organizations, the general faith in one best way to design receded and gave way to the emergence of a new faith, called the contingency approach to organizational design. In simple terms the open systems
perspective (Katz and Kahn, 1978) views organizations as interacting with their environments. Organizations receive inputs from their environments and after transforming the inputs return them to their environments in the form of outputs. Also, since organizations are open systems, they cannot be indifferent to the opportunities and threats posed to them by the environment. Rather, they should respond to the environmental demands. One important area of response is to change the organization structure (Thompson, 1967). Based on open systems view, the ideal models of organizations will be rejected as closed system and inefficient, unless they are set up as appropriate responses to environmental characteristics.

The empirical studies of the ideal model were for most part supportive of an open systems perspective on organizations. Burns and Stalker (1961), studying 20 British firms in electronics industry, observed that an organization’s structure depends on its surrounding environment. A mechanistic (bureaucratic) structure was found more suitable for a stable environment, and an organic (e.g. Likert’s system-4) was found more suitable for an unstable environment. Also checking on the relationship between organizations and environments, Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) undertook a landmark study of ten American companies operating in three industries (food, container and plastics). From their findings, Lawrence and Lorsch argued
that effective organizations have a "fit" between the degree of structural differentiation and integration among their subunits and the degree of environmental uncertainty in the subunit environments.

In a later research, Duncan (1972) suggested that uncertainty is a function of two characteristics of the environment: complexity (number of environmental elements) and stability (rate of environmental change). His study suggests that an organic structure best fits an uncertain environment with high levels of complexity and instability, whereas a mechanistic structure best fits a certain environment with high levels of simplicity and stability. The Lawrence and Lorsch study, while the validity of its findings were severely questioned later on (Tosi, Aldag and Storey, 1973; Downey, Hellreigel and Slocum, 1975; Downey and Slocum, 1975; Pennings, 1975; Weick, 1979), was nevertheless the beginning point for the rise of increasing interest in the contingency approach to organizational design. The theoretical blueprint for the contingency approach appeared in a profound work by Thompson (1967) in which he viewed organizations as open systems and proposed that a number of factors, including the principles of environmental and technological rationality as the most important, determine an organization's structure.

Another researcher who pioneered the contingency approach to organizational structure and design was the
British researcher, Joan Woodward. She (1958, 1965) was first to test empirically the relationship between technology and structure by studying a sample of one hundred small and medium sized manufacturing firms in South Essex, Great Britain. The findings of Woodward pointed to a technological imperative principle. Based on this principle the mode of production determines the type of structure. Three modes of production were identified: unit or small batch, mass and process. Woodward concluded that while the first and last modes of production required a more or less organic structure, mass production required a bureaucratic structure. The principle of technological imperative was soon to be challenged by the Aston group researchers in Great Britain.

With the emergence of the contingency approach, the Aston group laid down a conceptual plan for pursuing a line of research in order to determine the causes and effects of structure (Pugh et al., 1963). They launched a series of empirical investigations which has continued until now. In those studies, the Aston group, using their own operationalization, showed that a number of contextual variables such as size, dependence, and technology (Pugh et al., 1969) determine the structure of an organization having dimensions of formalization, standardization, specialization, concentration of authority, and configuration (Pugh, Hickson, Hinings and Turner, 1968; Child, 1972).
As an important development, the empirical results of the Aston group studies led its researchers to reject the principle of technological imperative and replace it with the principle of size determinism (Hickson, Phesey, Pugh, 1969). The national studies in England (Child and Mansfield, 1972) and Blau's research (1970, and with Schoenherr, 1971) in the U.S. and a study done on a sample of Ohio companies (Inkson, Pugh, Hickson, 1970) provided more support for the findings of the Aston group. Size determinism was soon to generate a debate between its advocates and many of its opponents who criticized this principle mainly on conceptual grounds (Aldrich, 1972; Kimberly, 1976; Ford, 1980). At best, the contingency literature on the relationship between organization structure and the contextual factors such as size, technology and environment is inconclusive and rival explanations abound (Ford and Slocum, 1977; Gerwin, 1981).

Conclusion A glance through any text book on organizational behavior and/or design will indicate that the contingency approach to organization structure is a well accepted fact of organization science. To recapture, the gist of the contingency factor is that a number of contextual factors, size, technology, and environment, determine (cause) the existence and the degree of a number of dimensions for organization structure. Figure 2 summarized the relationship between the contextual factors
and the dimensions of structure. A long list of primarily correlational studies have apparently verified the hypothesized relationship between the two sides.

However, while the causal relationship between both sides may be determined by using correlational and statistical methods, the process mediating between these two sets cannot be determined. As Mehan (1978) asserts for the case of school structure, researchers preoccupied with measuring and explaining the causes and effects of structure basically treat the organization (i.e. a collection of people) as "black box" (See Figure 3). The fact is, however, that what goes on inside the black box is a body and flow of social action and interaction which eventually translates into an outcome called organization structure. By ignoring that process and just being concerned with correlating the two sides, researchers have in effect considered the mediating social process as unimportant. Their interest has been in structure and its causes, and not in the human and social processes which may or may not follow because of those causes, but may very well result in structure. That process can be considered as structuring.

The Literature on the Structuring of Organization Structures

Despite their disagreements, the contingency theorists have generally asserted that there is a direct and causal relationship between an organization’s contextual factors,
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The View of Organization as Black Box vs. The Structuring View of Organization
dimensions of structure and performance results (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Payne and Pugh, 1976; Ford and Schellenberg, 1982). The significance of this assertion lies in its embodiment of an almost non-existent role considered for the human factor in this relationship. Apparently then, from the viewpoint of open systems and contingency approach one may infer that an 'invisible hand' or 'force' rather than very human acts and processes is responsible for structuring an organization structure.

The direct linkage proposition has not, however, remained without its critics (Child, 1972a; Montanari, 1978; Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Bobbitt and Ford, 1980; Lenz, 1981; Ford and Schellenberg, 1982; Ford and Hegarty, 1984). Child (1972a) argues that, although the contextual constraints limit the choice of structure by the decision maker, they do not eliminate this choice. Bobbitt and Ford (1980) suggest that besides the contextual constraints, a decision maker's cognitive and motivational orientations would also play a significant role in determining an organization structure. Also, the study of Kimberly (1979) is a clear indication of how the decisions of a person (dean of a medical college) rather than an invisible hand results in the creation and establishment of a medical school organization. Thus, based on these arguments and evidence one could conclude that the relationship between an organization's context and structure (and performance) is not direct and is rather mediated by an
individual’s decision making capacity. But what is the exact role of human beings in determining organization structure? Is it just a decision making role? Or is there more to the human being’s role in determining organization structure than just decision making?

A latent, long present, but only recently emerging and visible group of organization theorists have been arguing for the role of human and social processes in structuring of structure. Based on their arguments, it can be inferred that the role of the human beings in structuring goes well beyond the decision making function and embraces every sphere of humans’ activity. Those activities include, but are not limited to, the ability of individuals to assign meanings to different actions and situations (Bittner, 1965; Silverman, 1971), engage in enactment and interpretation of environment (Weick, 1979, Daft and Weick, 1984), talk or use one’s language (Silverman, 1971; Pondy and Mitroff, 1979), present one’s image in everyday life (Goffman, 1959). One may summarize the impact of these researchers’ works on the topic of structure and structuring in the following manner. The role of the human being in the process of structuring is the social construction of structure.

Recently, Ranson, Hinnings, and Greenwood (1980) have proposed a partially social constructionist model of organizational structure and structuring which considers an important role for humans’ cognitive capabilities and social
activities. They argue that structure, as realization of an ongoing and never ending process, is a function of interaction between the actors' provinces of meanings, their power dependencies, and contextual constraints. Provinces of meanings are created and shared in organizations by actors employing and deploying their interpretive schemes in order to understand and make sense of varied organization situations. An intersubjective interaction of actors' provinces of meanings and their power dependencies would constitute a partially socially constructed structure, which is also partially shaped by the presence and influence of contextual constraints.

Clearly then, while Ranson et al., incorporate the role of the human factor in structuring the structure, they yet maintain that contextual factors such as size, technology, and environment continue to determine structure independent of the very mediating human factor. This becomes almost an inevitable synthesis for Ranson et al., since their goal is to reconcile the view of contingency theorists of structure (structure as "framework") with the view of social constructionists on structure (structure as "interaction").

However, the synthesis of Ranson et al., is acceptable only if one considers the two different views as essentially reconcilable. It has been suggested that while social construction explains the ongoing process of structure, the "framework" perspective looks at the manifestations
(structure) of this process at one single time (Benson, 1977). In this way the two approaches are reconcilable based on a time perspective. Willmott (1981) basically disagrees with any incorporation of "framework" perspective into the concept of social construction of structure. "If our concern is to account for the actual structuring of organizational structures, then the focus of our analysis must be upon how this structuring is practically accomplished" (1981, p.471).

According to Willmott, it is a sheer inconsistency to argue for structure as social accomplishment of the social actors and on the other hand correlate "modes of structuring with forms of constraints" (p. 471). Furthermore, Willmott points out that the reason for the failure of Ranson et al., to conceptualize structure in purely social constructionist terms lies in their inconsistent adoption of Giddens' (1976) theory of structuration. "For, in Giddens' framework, structures are theorized as the properties of social systems that are the medium and outcome of practices that constitute social systems" (1981, p.471).

The arguments of Burrell and Morgan (1979) can be considered as further support for Willmott's position on the irreconcilability of the two views of structure. They argue that though it is possible that theories and perspectives within one paradigm differ from one another in terms of degree, the theories remain essentially members of the same
paradigm. Moreover, since each paradigm represents a totally different world view of its adherents (i.e. subjective vs. objective or change vs. order), then it is not possible to reconcile paradigms. It is, however, possible to import a particular concept (e.g., structure) originally defined in terms of another paradigm and redefine it in terms of a new paradigm. Apparently, that is what Ranson et al., have tried to do.

Trying to de-reify the concept of organization structure, Ranson et al., first succeeded to do so, by making a conceptual journey to the realm of the interpretive paradigm introducing the ideas of interpretive schemes and provinces of meanings. But soon after arriving at the interpretive paradigm, Ranson et al., consciously or unconsciously go back to the realm of functionalism by revitalizing the contingency factors' direct role in the structuring of organization structures. It seems reasonable to assert that if one intends to remain coherent with the assumptions of the interpretive paradigm then "The alternative is to base organizational analysis upon an unashamedly sociological conception of structure" (Willmott, 1981, p.473). To develop such an alternative, it is necessary to focus one's attention on the social actions and interactions of organizational actors. The Ranson et al., conceptualization, is nonetheless a serious beginning of
theorizing organization structure in new terms (i.e. social construction of structure).

The study by Bartunek (1984) using the Ranson et al., conceptualization comes another step closer to theorizing the concept of structure in new terms. Bartunek subscribes to the idea of changing interpretive schemes in order to change structures. She, however, correctly points out that Ranson et al., (1980) do not explain how changes take place in interpretive schemes themselves. Bartunek combines a number of perspectives on organization structure, including the decision maker's choice (Bobbitt and Ford, 1980), in order to present her own model for explaining how changes occur in interpretive schemes. In her model, changes in environment cause a subsequent need for changing the current prevailing interpretive schemes in an organization. Furthermore, changes in interpretive schemes would be mediated by "emotional reactions of organization members", members' actions, and "organizational leadership".

However, while Bartunek (1984) discusses how members' actions mediate the process of restructuring, she does not specify the form, processes, and patterns which those actions assume and/or follow. In literal terms, what is it that managers and other organizational members do that results in structure and structuring? The lack of focus on the actual process and patterns of actions which render structure to an organization is a main feature of almost all
theories and models of organizational structure. For example according to environment-structure contingency view, the nature of environmental uncertainty determines the shape of structure (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967). One major revision to this particular view has argued that individuals themselves enact their environment (Weick, 1979), and the source of uncertainty is rather the individual not environment (Starbuck, 1976). However, even after revising the original idea and thus accepting the basic concept of a linkage between an enacted environment and organization structure, there is still something missing for a full explanation of this linkage.

The missing point concerns the actual actions (e.g., its content, patterns, strategies) of structuring agents for translating an enacted environment's implications into an organization structure. Because, obviously and needless to prove, the structuring agent(s), manager and/or other organizational members must act (do something, say something) in order to structure an organization.

**Conclusion**

Blau (1981) observes that as their common denominator, students of structure are interested in "...those properties of an aggregate that are emergent and that consequently do not characterize the separate elements composing the aggregate." (p.9). He further distinguishes between an
aggregate and a structure by asserting that, "the aggregate is merely the sum of elements, but structure depends on the relationship, in the broadest sense, including under relationships, relative positions and indirect influences as well as direct connections." (p.9) And he emphasizes, "the criterion to repeat, is that the property can describe only the aggregate as a whole and not its component elements." (p.10). These assertions made by Blau were echoed in the literature on organization structure as reviewed in this chapter.

From the review, it is observable that, the students of organizational theory have considered structure as a macro property of organizations. While it is undeniable that patterns of relationship exist among a collectivity rather within a singular person, the fact also holds true that in order to establish such a pattern(s), one needs to create connection(s) between its formative elements, i.e., between members of an organization. It is important to note that organization is considered as a collection of people. And from this truism, it is also true that the connections should be created between people. The literature of organization structure has studied the created connections (the product) and has not dealt with the equally important issue of creating connections (the process).

In this way, the majority of the work done on organization structure has treated the connections that
characterize a structure as given, and has studied what those connections, i.e., complexity, formalization and centralization, are. In the event of causal inquiries, single factors as cause or effect were studied and not the process. For the most part, the process of structuring has been viewed as a logical and one shot occasion of decision making. Even Mintzberg’s work on structuring vs. structure, is an illustration of the prevalence of such a rationalistic perspective on organization structuring. For example, he writes:

"...we can describe organizational design as proceeding as follows, at least in principle. Given overall organizational needs-goals to be achieved, missions to be accomplished, as well as a technical system to accomplish them—the designer delineates all the tasks that must be done. This is essentially a ‘top-down’ procedure, from general needs to specific tasks. The designer then combines these tasks into positions according to the degree of specialization desired, and determines how formalized each should be as well as what kind of training and indoctrination it should require. The next step is to build the superstructure, first by determining what types and how many positions should be grouped into the first-order units, and then what types and how many units should be grouped into ever-more-comprehensive units until the hierarchy is complete. This last step is, of course, a ‘bottom-up’ procedure, from specific tasks to the overall hierarchy." (pp.104-105)

From the above, it can be inferred that Mintzberg is primarily concerned with the designers’ decisions and determination during a rational occasion of organizational designing. It is interesting to note that while organization theorists have dealt with organization structuring as an "on paper" process, a number of the same theorists have dealt with organization change, which
involves changing organization structure, as an "in action" process. Apparently, students of organization structure condone their macro bias, when they try to change an organization's structure via using the micro techniques of organization development (e.g. Beer, 1981).

A complementary approach to the traditional studies of organization structure is to begin a series of investigation for studying structuring of organization structures. To study the latter is the task undertaken by this dissertation. As a point of conclusion for this chapter, Table 3 presents a summary comparison between the themes of the traditional approach vs. the approach of this dissertation towards studying organization structure and structuring.

In the structuring view, while it is acknowledged that the outcome of structuring will be objectified in the mind of the organizational participant as a macro entity, the attention is primarily given to the interaction of micro processes and macro properties which create or re-create an organization structure. Therefore, using Giddens' work, structure is considered constituted by, and constitutive of, micro processes. One such micro process and pattern is displayed by the communicative acts of any structuring agent - a term denoting whomever is acting on others for creating organization structure. In this research, the goal was to observe and explore what is in the communicative acts, i.e.,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Structure (From the Literature)</th>
<th>Organization Structuring (This Dissertation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure: is the study of what structure is.</td>
<td>Structuring: is the study of the processes that make structure it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure is out there.</td>
<td>Structure is in there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product: studies structure as the product of causes.</td>
<td>Process: studies structure as an ongoing process of production and reproduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Dimensions: defines and measures them (e.g., formalization).</td>
<td>Uses of Structural Dimensions: is interested in how these dimensions are manifested in everyday actions of people in organizations (e.g., how rules are used - in conversation - to control behavior in organizations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal Explanation: defines contextual factors (e.g., Size), and measures their relationship with the structure.</td>
<td>Processual Explanation: is interested in how these contextual factors are reflected in the actions (e.g., talk) of organizational members, and how they construct and reconstruct organization structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation: studies structure as an aggregate entity.</td>
<td>Disaggregation: studies the micro processes that create and recreate structure as an aggregate entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis is placed on the reactions (behavior) of individuals to a given structure.</td>
<td>Emphasis is placed on the actions of individuals in creating and recreating many structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The study of Talk and Language is neglected.</td>
<td>The study of Talk and Language is essential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm Commitment: Functionalism</td>
<td>Paradigm Commitment: Social Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organizational talk, at organizational meetings, which is then suggested to result in the creation, recreation and/modification of organization structure.

It should be underscored that in verbal structuring of organization structures, the impact of contextual factors and the existence of organizational dimensions are considered as relevant only to the extent they are used, i.e. referred to, during the course of structuring by the member. Many of the points discussed in this chapter will be used in further conceptualization of the verbal structuring of organization structure in the next chapter. As the primary paradigm commitment of the structuring is a social constructionist (or an interpretive) one, a discussion of the tenets of this paradigm is the first task of the next chapter.
Chapter 3

A LOGIC OF STRUCTURING:

PARADIGM AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STUDY

Based on the review of the previous chapter, it was concluded that in general the literature of organization theory has not devoted much attention and thought to the process of structuring organization structures. In this chapter the theoretical background for studying the structuring of organization structures at organizational meetings via organizational talk (i.e., the verbal use of language) will be discussed, and its implications for the study will be presented.

Social Construction Paradigm

The fundamental premise on which this dissertation research is founded is that reality is socially constructed (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). The first task of this chapter is to clarify the assumptions which are employed under social constructivism, or alternatively called interpretive (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) or cultural (Pondy and Mitroff, 1979) paradigm.

Paradigm, a term coined and popularized by Kuhn (1970), refers to a set of basic beliefs shared by the members of a
scientific community for studying and interpreting the subject matter of their interest. For this study, as any other, it is important to highlight the assumptions of its underlying paradigm for establishing a logical coherence and link between its statement of the problem, and the model, the method, and the interpretations used for discussing the results of the study. The clarification of underlying assumptions becomes particularly important, if one agrees with the "...idea that 'all theories of organisation are based upon a philosophy of science and a theory of society'" (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p.1).

The interpretivist wants to "understand and explain the social world primarily from the point of view of the actors directly involved in the social process" (Burrell and Morgan, p. 227). The sources of order existing in the social affairs of people can be grasped and understood only in reference to the subjective experiences of the actors in social situations. The nature of reality is not concrete, hard, or so called 'objective'. There is no reality except for the one which is 'invented' by the subjective experiences of the individual actor(s) in society. In this way, "The knowledge...is not so much 'objective' as shared" (Burrell and Morgan, p. 225).

The human nature viewed through the "lenses" (Harmon, 1981) of an interpretive paradigm is predominantly voluntaristic than deterministic. It is voluntaristic
without denying that there are some socially constructed deterministic realities which the voluntaristic human being may someday come to experience. The voluntaristic nature means, that the world or the image of the world is the property of an individual person, rather than being a property of an objective and solid world (Boulding, 1956). The world begins with the individual person and is recorded as invented or experienced reality only after he/she begins experiencing it. Thus, the interpretivist "rejects any view which attributes to the social world a reality which is independent of the minds of men" (Burrell and Morgan, p.260).

For the interpretivist, the source of order in social life lies in the activities of the social actors for organizing and sharing of their life experiences. The sharing of life experiences results in social construction of realities. The process of experiencing and sharing the constructed realities is an active one. The social actors actively constitute their lives and experiences and invent realities from them which in turn constitutes and is constituted by the actors' further actions (Giddens, 1976). This active constitution of reality is called "social construction of reality" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966).

Social Construction Berger and Luckmann (1966) begin their treatise by posing their readers with the central question of "How is it possible that subjective
meanings become objective activities?" (p.18). For them, the beginning of the objectification of everyday life is an individual's everyday life itself. Individuals in society begin to objectify their everyday life from the moment they engage themselves in everyday interactions.

An individual is conscious of every day life based on two dimensions, space and time. I am "here", and I am here "now". The consciousness of everyday life interactions emanates from a feeling of "here and now". Therefore, to objectify the realities of life man has to order his activities based on time and space dimensions (e.g. "where am I doing this and when is it?", or "where did I do that and when was it?"). This ordering is basically accomplished in two stages. First, the consciousness of "here and now" is given a particular meaning or definition. In the second stage, the human's memory captures that meaning or definition, and stores it in the appropriate place for future retrieval.

A human's memory gives him/her the capacity of recording today's experiences for tomorrow's life. Once living in the world, he/she begins to habitualize what he/she does and encounters in everyday life. That is, when man does something today, he/she gives a particular meaning to it right then. Then, when he/she repeats the same activity (next day) he/she relies on his/her memory to retrieve the same meaning he/she gave to it yesterday.
He/she may, however, at times, for a variety of reasons, change or modify the old meaning with a new one. In this way, man preserves a sense of historicity for his activities. For example, an office secretary may assign meaning in the following way of thinking. "Yesterday, I did this thing in office X, and I am doing the same thing today in office X, ...uhmm...it means the boss is giving me a new responsibility".

As a given activity is repeated for many times, the activity becomes taken for granted, it becomes a habit. Now, if two men habitualize the same activity, or if a man succeeds to have somebody else habitualize the same activity he/she does, then they would mutually typify it. Typification of mutual experiences is the assignment of meanings to events, actions and social activities in general which are stable "across time and space" (Mehan and Wood, 1975, p.23). The social construction of a particular reality is constituted - though prone to reconstitution - when that reality is given a typification or frame of meaning in the minds of the social actors (Giddens, 1976; Goffman, 1976). Therefore, organizing the experiences of life into the frames of meanings becomes the source of order in society (Schutz, 1964; Goffman, 1976). "...typifications 'transform unique individual actions of unique human beings into the typical functions of typical social roles, originating in typical motives aimed at bringing about

Goffman’s (1976) conception of frames considers them as play scripts to be learned and memorized by the social actors which then makes the actors resemble the stage players. Thus, people perform regularly and orderly based on the frames of meanings they have made around their specific experienced performances. The next question is, how these shared or unshared frames of meanings are exchanged and mediated by the social actors.

The Importance of Verbal Language  According to Harmon (1981), social actors act on each other at the point of "face to face encounter" using their language capabilities. For two individuals to mutually typify an activity at the point of their face to face encounter, they first need to define the situation and/or activity in the terms identifiable to both of them. That is, they should use a mutually understandable signification system. "Language which may be defined here as a system of vocal signs, is the most important sign system of human society" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966, p.37). In general, the use of language is considered the most important vehicle for accomplishing the act of defining a social activity (Silverman, 1971; Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Goffman, 1976; Harmon, 1981; Spradley, 1979, 1980). For Gadamer, "it is the ontological process of human discourse in operation in
which, through the mediation of language, "life mediates life" (Giddens, 1976, p. 57) or reality becomes shared. Mead (1934, p.XIV) also seems to suggest "that mind and the self [and the reality] are without residue social emergents; and that language, in the form of vocal gesture, provides the mechanism for their emergence" (cited in Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

The language, then, as a mechanism for typification of shared and unshared meanings is as well the medium for objectifying the experienced world into names, labels, words and sentences. The power of language in giving meaning to the situations can be shown by Zimmerman's (1973, p.25) illustration of the reflexivity of talk as appearing in Figure 4 (Mehan and Wood, 1975, p.13). In that figure, as Mehan and Wood (p.13) observe, "The word projection does not merely appear in the scene reporting that scene. It creates the scene in which it appears as a reasonable object...It creates reality in which it may stand as apart of that reality". The attachment of meaning to events and experiences and objects enables people to move across time and space and still preserve the sense of reality which they had typified in previous 'here and now' situations. (Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Harmon, 1981).

Language and meaning typifications are also used for the exertion of control. They exert control since they "set up predefined patterns of conduct" (Berger and Luckmann,
Figure 4

Reflexivity of Talk: An Illustration
(Adapted from Mehan and Wood, 1975, and Zimmerman, 1973)
To illustrate, a first time 'here and now' social situation could be considered in which the participants of it will attempt to define the situation using their language capabilities. Whatever the process, an emergent dominant definition may become typified in the minds of the participants. The establishment of a particular typification in the minds of the actors in effect becomes a mechanism of controlling the future occasions of the same social situation in the terms compatible with the typification terms. Furthermore, it has been suggested that the prevailing definition has been in large part offered by the more powerful participants or the ones with "bigger stick" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Giddens, 1976; Silverman, 1971). Hummel (1982) referring to the bureaucratic language, considers it a language of extreme control. In his view, the language used in bureaucracies is so high on its control aspect that it no longer deserves to be considered language for communication; it is rather more appropriate to call it language of information exchange - machine or "nonhuman" language.

The importance of language does not, however, end with its powerful role in creating social realities; its importance continues with the crucial role that it plays in maintaining the currently and/or previously created realities. Language, in the form of daily and routine conversations and talk, is the key to the maintenance of an
already typified world. Berger and Luckmann (pp. 153-154) assert: "The most important vehicle of reality maintenance is conversation. One may view the individual's everyday life in terms of the working away of a conversational apparatus that ongoingly maintains, modifies and reconstitutes his subjective reality. In conversation the objectifications of language become objects 'of individual consciousness'" (1966, pp.153-154).

To recapitulate then, the discussion presented in this section suggests that the use of language and especially in its verbal form is the medium for the construction, reconstruction and maintenance of the typifications of meanings in the minds of social actors. These typifications follow, and do not precede, the individuals' experience and practical involvement in the day to day world affairs. The study of organization structure proposed here is based on the assumption of an interpretive paradigm, and subscribes to the notion of the social construction of reality to present and study its propositions.

Social Construction of Organizations From a social constructionist's perspective, organizations too, as abridged forms of society, are products of social construction. They do not exist prior to, or separate from the consciousness of the organizational actors. An organizational actor will not be aware of any organization whatsoever until he/she experiences an aspect of its
activity. Even upon the experience of that aspect of organizational activity, the actor's sense of reality of that organization is still limited to that experienced aspect. As an actor continues to live an organizational life, he/she will experience more and more of the social aspects and activities of that organization. The typification and the rehearsal of typifying practices results in social construction of organizational realities. These organizational realities are not necessarily shared; rather, in general, "organization stands as a concept which means different things to different people" (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p.273). The meaning and the reality of organization is shared by organizational actors to the extent that they have experienced the same events and aspects of organizational life and have also defined those experiences similarly.

If organization means different things to different people, then there are also organization structures for different people, rather than one structure for all. In fact, the objective studies of organization structure are a testimony to this assertion (Hall, 1963; Sathe, 1978; Ford, 1979). Organization structures are shared to the extent that the organizational members have experienced the same structuring events. Therefore, organization structure is not something 'out there' waiting for the discovery. The actors must first experience and mutually typify (share) a
structuring activity before they are able to recognize any structure at all (Silverman, 1971; Louis, 1980). It is the social use of structure by the actors which constitutes an actor’s realization of an organization structure (Manning, 1970; Bittner, 1965). It has been argued that, nowhere is the social use of organization and its structure more evident than their use in organizational talk (e.g. Bittner, 1965; Manning, 1970; Moch and Fields, 1984).

Organizational talk is a fact of every day life in organizations. Gronn (1983) suggests that not only talk in organizations "is the work", it also "does the work". McPhee (1985), after reviewing eleven themes of organizational structure, proposes that "structure is fundamentally communicational..." (160) and, "communication of structure is an odd sort of metacommunication, it is explicit and openly authoritative. It is also unusual in that it is not unambiguously the highest controlling level of communication, as it is in every day discourse. It must be adopted/ accomplished using ordinary language, the 'last metalanguage' (Habermas, 1980)" (cited in McPhee, P.162). The inherent suggestion is that organizations as realities are a practical accomplishment of their members. Thus, according to Gephart (1978, p.557) "...the organization is constituted by linguistic devices and interpersonal schemes which members use to make sensible certain conduct, events
and states of affairs and to methodically locate them as falling within the purview of the organization".

The proposition of verbal structuring of organization structure is especially illustrated by Bittner's three forms (models) of verbal construction of organization. Those forms are: "gambit of control", "model of stylistic unity", and "model of functional integrity" (in Gephart, 1978). In the utterance aiming at control, actors are basically told or reminded to obey organizational rules and authority. "Thus a factory foreman may construct the organization by means of the following gambit of compliance confronting a tardy employee with 'around here we start work at 7:30 sharp. Be here on time.'" (Gephart, 1978, p.557). Using the model of stylistic unity, a manager intending to construct formalization of behavior may comment to an employee that "yesterday you had some difficulty doing the paper work, but today you did it according to the rules". And finally by using the model of functional integrity a manager's intention is to construct a sense of interdependence among the employees. "If the contract doesn't go through, the whole place will fall apart. The shop will close" (Gephart, p.557). To further illustrate the concept of structuring and contrast it with the traditional concept of structure, a reconceptualization of two structural properties, configuration and formalization - as defined in the
literature - will be attempted along the social constructionist lines.

Configuration A general reference to the idea of organizational configuration is a dichotomy of organizations into tall versus flat. Tall organizations refer to those having many layers of authority in the hierarchical set up of organization. Flat organizations refer to those having few layers of authority. A traditional image of tall vs. flat organization is a mechanistic vs. organic structure (Burns and Stalker, 1961). Obviously, the tallness or flatness of an organization does not necessarily coincide with the degree of decentralization in an organization (Child, 1972b).

One useful way to illustrate a tall vs. flat organization is to show an organizational chart to an interested observer. Then, to find out the degree of tallness vs. flatness, an observer should become involved in some comparative counting of the number of authority layers of the organizational chart of interest with other organizational charts (For the purpose of illustration, it is assumed the observer does not have a self set criterion). Thus, for that matter, organizational charts A and B (see Figure 5) both reflect a tall hierarchy vs. the flat hierarchy reflected by organizational charts C and D (i.e., 8 and 7 layers in A&B vs. 5 and 4 in C&D).
Figure 5
Organizational Charts
The reconceptualization attempted here does not deny some validity and worth for the above method of handling organizational configuration, but it maintains that the method has very limited conceptual (academic) and practical contribution. Of course, it does not hinder managerial work to mention the number of hierarchical levels in an organization, but it does not help anybody to understand what this number represents beyond a simple categorization of an organization into tall vs. flat. The argument is that the actual experiences of organizational members determine the tallness and flatness of an organization for them. It is the understanding of those experiences that is critical to the understanding of organization structure, and it is the connotations of experiencing tall vs. flat organizations by organizational members that is crucial to the understanding of organizational behavior. To further illustrate this point the following hypothetical case is presented.

Assume two pairs of identical persons A and B, and, C and D, join organizations A, B, C, and D respectively. After working on their jobs for a month, they all find a need to go on a family trip for 5 days. All of them go to their supervisors and ask for permission. All supervisors agree with the basic request. However, supervisors A and C ask persons A and C to fill out a vacation form and just return it to them. On the other hand, supervisors B and D
ask persons B and D first to fill-out a form and return it to them for approval signature, and next take the form to the division's secretary for division's approval, and finally file the form with the company's personnel office. Which organizations are taller for identical pairs of A&B and C&D? A sheer counting of authority levels in the organizational chart would conclude that organizations A and C are taller than organizations B and D, respectively. A conceptualization based on the subjective but real world experiences of the hypothetical members, however, would conclude that organizations B and D are taller than organizations A and C. At least, this would be the conclusion made by members given their first experience of having gone through hierarchy levels of their respective organizations.

Formalization  Objectively, formalization has been measured and defined by "the degree of written instruction and procedures" (Payne and Pugh, 1976, p.1132). Thus, using the hypothetical example given above, a researcher seeking to find out how formalized organizations A and C are would go to both of these organizations and measure the degree of their respective written documents. Assume a researcher, after taking such a measurement, proclaims that organization A is more formalized than organization C. To reiterate, the reconceptualization attempted here would, however, argue for the assessment of the actual experiences of members in
organizations A and C before describing one as more formalized than the other. To illustrate, the previous hypothetical case would be used again.

Assume two identical members A and C after working for a month, for the first time, find a need to leave their respective workplace 3 hours earlier than the regular time-off. Both A and C go to their supervisors and ask them about this request. A's supervisor agrees with her request. Remembering her reading of the company manuals, A asks her supervisor if she needs to fill-out the necessary specified forms. A's supervisor answers: "Well, actually you should, but don't worry about it, I know you have been reporting earlier than usual everyday without actually getting paid for it. You know, most of the times it is O.K. as long as I know".

On the other hand C's supervisor also agrees with his request, but in addition asks him to make a memo on this matter and leave it with the supervisor's secretary. Meanwhile C wonders why his supervisor asks for a written memo? The next day, C glances over the company's rules manual and finds no provision for having to leave a memo with the supervisor in the case of needing to leave early. Later when C shares his dilemma with a co-worker, his co-worker says: "Don't worry, this is the supervisor's habit, he wants to keep track of everything". Given this picture, which organization is more formalized? The
reconceptualization would definitely suggest that organization C is more formalized than organization A, at least in the eyes of members A and C and given their identical experience.

The advantage of this reconceptualization is its focus on the actual actions which result in structuring the dimensions of structure. Talking in organizations reflects the action intentions of organizational actors who may also aim at structuring. Close attention paid to the verbal behavior of people in organizations may very well result in a more process oriented understanding of organizational behavior phenomena. In this way one may realize why Pondy (1978) refers to leadership as a language game, and why others propose that organizations change and adapt through the prevalence of one's dialectical argumentation (Backoff and Ford, 1985a), or how strategies form through arguments and argumentations (Backoff and Ford, 1985b).

**Implications for the Study**

From the preceding discussion of the social constructivism paradigm, three important and relevant implications for this research stand out. First, the social constructionist view makes the researcher to think 'ing' (Weick, 1979). Second, Whereas the traditional studies have searched for organization structure 'out there', the social constructionist view suggests that it should be searched for
'in there'. And finally the social constructionist perspective gives more emphasis to actions of organizational members versus their behavior.

1) Think 'ing' within a social constructionist paradigm, any organization phenomena is in a constant state of becoming. As Weick puts it vividly:

"Organizations deal with streams of materials, people, money, time, solutions, problems, and choices. Streams can be a useful metaphor to portray the continuous flux associated with organizations, but there are some subtleties in this image. A stream might be visualized as a single homogenous viscous flow that moves at a constant rate. Such a visualization is unduly limiting as a portrait of organizational processes, and a more appropriate image would be that of multiple, heterogenous flows of diverse viscosity moving at variable rates. If you can visualize something moving between two points, and then visualize the points also moving, that's what flows in organizations are like" (P.42).

From the literature review of the previous chapter it seems obvious that the students of organization theory have been overly concerned with studying organization structure as a static entity. The alternative is to consider it as a dynamic entity and theorize it using 'ing'. "Whenever people talk about organizations they are tempted to use lots of nouns, but these seem to impose a spurious stability on the settings being described....If students of organization become stingy in their use of nouns, generous in their use of verbs, and extravagant in their use of gerunds, then more attention would be paid to process and we'd learn about how to see it and manage it." (p.44). Taking Weick's advice,
this dissertation focuses on the process of structuring through organizational talking.

2) In There or Out There Another important implication of the social constructionist paradigm, for this study, lies in the idea of introducing reality as subjective creation of individuals. The subjective nature of reality does not, however, mean that there is no objectified reality (note: not objective). It simply means that human beings themselves, and not an invisible force, objectify their realities, via social interactions. Then, if individuals themselves create their objectified world, the separation between subject and object (a theme debated by philosophers for centuries) is an interactive one and takes place in the conscious mind of the individual. While the reflection of people's objectification can be seen in the form of art and physical science and changes, the objectification of rules and norms of conduct, action and behavior is kept in the mind of an individual - in his/her way of thinking.

In this way, the main structure that impedes or facilitates a person's actions, is the one that has left its sensible and real imprint on the brain of that person, the guiding organ of any person. Therefore the act of structuring aims at structuring an organization structure as it is conceived and stored in the minds of individuals. As Bougon, Weick and Binkhorst conclude: "social settings are defined and must be analyzed in terms of the participants'
epistemology: organization problems are mind-environment problems...that by anon-logical, but highly intelligent mental process, organization participants perform translation from the world of experience to the world of mind." (1977, 630).

It was already alluded to that students of organization structure have basically maintained structure is the property of an aggregate and not its individual parts (Blau, 1981). Logically then, organization theorists are implicitly suggesting that organization structure is out there imposed on the members from outside. This aggregate bias can be rebutted by first stating the truism that there is no aggregate without its component elements; and second, structure is an aggregate, but only in the eyes of its beholder, a micro being, be it an organization theorist or an organization member. Thus for structuring, "it is necessary, therefore, to do more than simple design structures or incentive systems to enact desirable and appropriate theories-in-use [structure perspective]. Participants must be approached from where they stand and their perspectives must be identified and made explicit." (Moch and Fields, 1984, p.82).

3) Action vs. Behavior By assuming a voluntaristic vs. deterministic nature for human beings, the social constructionist gives a primary emphasis to actions vs. behaviors of organizational members. Though the literal
difference of meaning between the two is somewhat blurred, it can be said that the word action as used, more and less, embodies an active and intentional role for its performer, while the word behavior, as it has been used, embodies a more passive and responsive role for its conductor, e.g., one acts on something vs. one behaves in response in a preceding action. Behaviorism, as a theory and method, is a vivid example of considering a passive identity for human beings under the word behavior. The gist of behaviorism can be captured by the principle of stimulus - response, or alternatively called cause and effect. Thus students of organization theory have been using the same model to study the effects of size, complexity, formalization and other structural factors on organization members' behaviors (e.g. Hall, 1982; Dalton et al., 1980; James and Jones, 1976). Organizational members are supposed to respond to these structural factors by attendance or absenteeism, by higher lower or higher productivity, by remaining in an organization or leaving it, i.e. turnover.

The word action on the other hand connotes that organizational members including managers commit actions and do things in an active and proactive manner for getting the work of organization accomplished. The acts of an organizational actor is not necessarily and always reactive or in response to a stimulus - it is not necessarily causal. An actor may very well act based on his/her "program of
action" - his/her intentions (Harre’, Clark, De Carlo, 1985, Moch and Fields, 1984).

Giddens (1976, p.76) defines "as 'intentional' or 'purposive' any act which an agent knows (believes) can be expected to manifest a particular quality or outcome, and in which this knowledge is made use of by the actor in order to produce this quality or outcome." And Giddens (p.79) concludes, "social life...is produced by its component actors precisely in terms of their active constitution and reconstitution of frames of meaning whereby they organize their experience." In general the intentional nature of many human actions can be identified by considering the realistic possibility that in doing something (whatever), the actor could have done something else, including not doing what he/she did (Harre’ et al., 1985).

Among the range of actions available to the actor, the communicative act, or the use of language is an important one (Giddens, 1976; Harre’ et. al., 1985; Moch and Fields, 1984). "Language is a social instrument. When we talk, we direct our words not to the air but to other people. Our aim is not to express our thoughts aloud but to affect the people we are talking to. We intend our listeners to recognize certain of our goals in saying what we say and they listen, intent on recognizing them." (Clark, 1985, p.179). These implications and the theoretical background provided in this chapter had a primary influence in choosing
the research methodology of this dissertation. Research methodology is discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

From the theoretical background presented so far it is reasonable to state that the overriding objective of this research was to explore or discover (versus confirm) the verbal content, processes and patterns used by organizational members in the structuring of organization structures. In the research language then, this study was exploratory rather than confirmatory. To discover the patterns of structuring the main research tool for this dissertation was observation. The basic idea was to observe how organizational actors engaged in verbal structuring (i.e., verbalization of structure), as interpreted (by the author) to (re)produce structure, and then report on the findings.

If observation of, and learning from, actors were the goals of this research, then a qualitative - observational methodology has been a suitable choice of research methodology (Lofland, 1976; Van Mannen, 1979; Spradley, 1979 & 1980). This choice can be compared and contrasted with the traditional positivist and more or less quantitative approaches which are the prevalent modes of investigation in social science – and in organizational science in
particular. The justification for the choice of a qualitative rather than quantitative methodology for this research will be discussed in the first section of this chapter. The discussion will be followed by a consideration of reliability and validity issues in qualitative method. And finally the third section of this chapter will present the specific procedure and techniques that were used for data collection, analysis, and interpretation of this study.

Qualitative Methodology: The Rationale

The rationale behind the choice of a qualitative methodology for this research lies in three main reasons. They are: 1) The social constructionist paradigm commitment of the research; 2) The emergence of qualitative methodology as a viable alternative research strategy to quantitative methodology in organization sciences; 3) The specific purpose of this research. Though the explanation of and elaboration on each one these three reasons is in fact interrelated, each will be dealt with separately in the following sections.

Paradigm Commitment

From the outset the impact of an interpretive or social constructionist paradigm commitment of this study on stating the research problem and the subsequent discussions were
acknowledged and presented. At this stage, the choice of a methodology is still very much dependent on the nature of the research's primary paradigm commitment. The connotation of paradigm commitment for one's selection of a particular research methodology is this: the assumptions inherent in the research paradigm determines the formulation of the research problem and the selection of a research strategy for studying that problem (e.g. Morgan, 1983). The illustration of this assertion is vivid in the debate between the two paradigms of inquiry: positivism and anti-positivism - also called naturalistic inquiry by Guba (1985) and Lincoln and Guba (1985).

While positivism embraces a host of causal and controlled experimental and more or less quantitative techniques of research modelled after the natural science mode of investigation, anti-positivism embraces a host of qualitative, phenomenological and hermeneutic techniques of research modelled after the anthropological and philosophical modes of investigation. Guba (1985) presents a useful comparison of the two modes of inquiry based on their four epistemological axioms (See Table 4). According to Guba, the epistemology of positivism is based on four axioms: 1) "subject-object dualism", 2) "development of general laws", 3) "causal explanation", 4) "value free inquiries".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axiom</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Anti-Positivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-object Relation</td>
<td>Dualism</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Knowledge</td>
<td>General Laws</td>
<td>Idiographic Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Explanation</td>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>Process/Pattern/Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Property of Inquiry</td>
<td>Value-Free</td>
<td>Value-Laden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subject-object dualism is a logical consequence of the belief in the existence of a separate and objective world from the observer. The dualism then nourishes this belief by urging for the detached studies of human conduct. Thus, dualism suggests, it is quite possible for the researcher to stand out of the world and to study its problems from a distance. The results of these detached studies are treated as the finding of the general laws, which are thought to be behind the regularity observed in the human society. Apparently then, according to positivists, these are the laws that determine human conduct in society, and not human beings making and determining laws.

The general laws discovered are presented as the embodiments of causal relationships which exist among many elements of the human society. Therefore, for every effect there is a cause, and many causes may give rise to one effect, and/or one cause may result in many effects. For example an organizational positivist searching for laws governing the tangible nature of satisfaction in organizations, would find that pay and supervisory relations (two examples) are causes of satisfaction (e.g., see Locke, 1976). This finding is then disseminated as a general law for recognition in all organizations.

The findings of causal relationships are however subject to one limitation set by the objective positivists:
they should be value-free. The positivists believe that science is and must be value-free and scientific findings are not supposed to spell out the researcher's preferences but should report the "actual" and "real" preferences of the social actors it studies. From the above, the eventual goal of the positivism is to find value-free laws of general and causal nature which can serve as the tools of prediction and control in the hands of their users.

One reason for so much emphasis on objectivity in positivism is the fact that its founders (e.g. Comte) were very much impressed with the practical accomplishments of the natural sciences and wished to create a "natural science of society" (Giddens, 1976 & 1979). The observation of people such as Comte and Marx was that the knowledge of human conduct in society was excessively handicapped by the existence of mysticism and superstitious beliefs about the functioning of society and needed to emancipate itself from these beliefs ("fetishes"). Positivism in social science then became a twentieth century legacy of its founders who sought to "... bring into being, a science of society which would reproduce, in the study of human social life, the same kind of sensational illumination and explanatory power already yielded up by the sciences of nature." (Giddens, 1976, p.13).

The critics of positivism and the advocates of naturalistic inquiry both contend that the subject matter of
study in social sciences is absolutely different from the one in natural sciences. Giddens (1976) maintains that while human beings do "transform nature, it [nature] is not a human production; [but] society is." (p.15). And later, in the same place, Giddens observes:

"The difference between the social and natural world is that the latter does not constitute itself as 'meaningful', the meanings it has are produced by men in the course of their practical life, and as a consequence of their endeavors to understand or explain it for themselves. Social life of which these endeavors are a part - on the other hand, is produced by its component actors precisely in terms of their active constitution and reconstitution of frames of meaning whereby they organize their experience. The conceptual schemes of social sciences therefore express a double hermeneutic, relating both to entering and grasping the frames of meaning involved in the production of social life by lay actors, and reconstituting these within the new frames of meaning involved in technical conceptual schemes." (P.79).

To an anti-positivist, then, there is no objective reality out there to be discovered by the social scientists in the society. The social realities are rather objectified or invented (Watzlawick, 1984) by the subjective experiences of the social actors.

According to Guba (1985), the four epistemological axioms of naturalistic inquiry, contrasting them with their positivistic counterparts, are: 1) "subject-object interaction", 2) "idiographic body of knowledge", 3) explaining process and events, 4) value-laden inquiries. The subject-object interaction holds that it is not possible to study one's subject in a detached way. Even the most detached and objective positivist approach for studying a
human problem consists of the researcher interacting with his/her subject(s) in such terms as giving them some directions or observing them directly or indirectly. To support this assertion one can even rely on the social facilitation studies which have basically shown that "the mere presence of others has drive-arousal effects" (Zajonc, 1980).

The axiom of idiographic knowledge holds that rather than pressing on to find general laws of social conduct, one should try to study every social situation as a unique case, which offers a "thick description" of the social event or episode as its finding. Because, in the subjective world of human society there are not many, if any at all, general laws to develop. A naturalistic inquirer may suggest then, "the only generalization is: there is no generalization" (Lincoln and Cuba, 1985). In this world of infinite realities the main function of a researcher is to know about the subject matter of his/her study as thoroughly and as completely as possible. Or as another group of critics have suggested, since the complex and ever changing nature of society does not render itself to be captured by the fixity of general laws, social scientists should, therefore, rather study the patterns of social relations (Harre' et al., 1985; Giddens, 1976; Daft and Wiginton, 1979).

The third axiom of naturalistic inquiry is against the causal explanation of the social phenomena. It maintains
that the description of an array of complex, intertwined and
dynamic processes and events which lead to the observed
phenomenon/outcome is more rich and realistic than is a
simple reduction of the processes and events to a number of
causes and effects. Finally, the last axiom states that an
inquiry of any sort is influenced by the values of its
researchers and research subjects - i.e., the research is
value-laden. The influence of researcher's values,
according to the proponents of qualitative research, is
inevitable as he/she "is part of the social world it studies
(p. X)...[that is] he or she is the research instrument Par

The idea of presenting the above discussions is not to
claim that one is right and the other not, but to suggest
and emphasize that the paradigm commitment leads the
researcher to view the social world in a particular way and
to choose a corresponding methodology (e.g., a qualitative
vs. a quantitative methodology). To summarize and conclude
this section a brief presentation and discussion of the work
by Morgan and Smircich (1980) will be made as an invaluable
clarification of the issue at hand.

Morgan and Smircich (1980) specify that any approach to
social science is founded on a certain set of ontological,
human nature, and epistemological assumptions (see chapter 3
for a discussion). They propose a continuum of approaches
to social science ranging from subjectivist to objectivist
views of the world, and based on that conclude that: "the case for qualitative research in social science begins as one departs from the objectivist extreme of our subjective-objective continuum." (p.497). And in specific reference to the contrast between the quantitative and qualitative methods they write:

"The quantitative methods used in the social sciences, which draw principally on the methods of the natural sciences, are appropriate for capturing a view of the social world as a concrete structure. In manipulating "data" through sophisticated quantitative approaches, such as multivariate statistical analysis, social scientists are in effect attempting to freeze the social world into structured immobility and to reduce the role of human beings to elements subject to the influence of a more or less deterministic set of forces. They are presuming that the social world lends itself to an objective form of measurement, and that the social scientist can reveal the nature of that world by examining lawful relations between elements that, for the sake of accurate definition and measurement, have to be abstracted from their context.

Once one relaxes the ontological assumption that the world is a concrete structure, and admits that human beings, far from merely responding to the social world, may actively contribute to its creation, the dominant methods become increasingly unsatisfactory, indeed, inappropriate. For if one recognizes that the social world constitutes some form of open ended process, any method that closes the subject of study within the confines of laboratory, or merely contents itself with the production of narrow empirical snapshots of isolated phenomena at fixed points in time, does not do complete justice to the nature of the subject. The very nature of the phenomena under investigation challenges the utility of such methodological closure (p.498).

This dissertation research too, from the beginning presented its primary paradigm commitment as a social constructionist one. Since the gist of this paradigm may be captured by referring to its subjective view of the world, then according to the argument and the continuum of Morgan and Smircich a qualitative method of inquiry is more
appropriate for answering the research questions of this dissertation.

**The Rise of Qualitative Methodology**

The greater awareness of the impact of a researcher's world view on the formulation of a research problem has coincided with the emergence of qualitative methodology as a viable research strategy in organizational sciences. While a variety of reasons are responsible for the rise of qualitative methodology (e.g., Van Mannen, 1982), only a few with more direct relevance to this study will be mentioned here. The two main and interrelated reasons are: the possession of an insider versus outsider perspective by the qualitative researchers and practical implications of qualitative versus quantitative research.

**The Insider Versus Outsider Perspective** One of the factors that Van Mannen (1982) mentions as responsible for a shift from quantitative to qualitative research is the realization that research (social, organizational) is not detached. The importance of this point, which was briefly discussed in the previous section, emanates from the realization that if research is not detached—regardless of its degree of objectivity—then research methods are different only with respect to the degree of the researchers' immersion in their respective studies (Evered and Louis, 1981). Evered and Louis (1981) assert that "the
critical feature that characterizes the various inquiry paradigms is the degree of physical and psychological immersion of the researcher, and that other distinctions are commonly discussed from this." (pp.391-392). It is being suggested here that, in general, qualitative research offers a greater degree of immersion to its users.

Developing an insider’s view of the research site and problem should help a researcher to gain insights otherwise unobtainable. Depending on the degree of immersion, a researcher is able to describe the aspects of social life in the setting of which the social actors (research subjects) may be self-aware and/or unaware (Van Mannen, 1979, 1982). Therefore, the insider view helps a qualitative researcher to lessen the degree of his/her imposition of pre-determined facts and schemes on the social setting, and rather permits the social actors to inform the researcher of the actual facts, schemes and structure at use in the social setting. The significance of an insider versus outsider research perspective will further manifest itself in the results and practical implications of such a research.

Practical Implications of Qualitative Research As the degree of researchers’ immersion in the research increases, the greater will be the opportunity for learning about the day-to-day and ongoing life of the social actors over an extended period of time. What amounts to ‘participant observation’, as an example, results in the
researcher observing and experiencing the actual flow of activity or social action to unfold in the social research setting. Therefore as the degree of immersion increases, the researcher has a greater opportunity to avoid cause and effect explanations and instead describes and explains the process leading to particular outcomes or states in the social life of the actors involved. Even if the researcher decides to do a causal analysis, he/she has the opportunity to identify a chain or a combination of causes (rather than a single cause) operating parallel, sequential, or otherwise (Kidder, 1981).

This opportunity for the delineation of the process and steps involved in the unfolding of a social phenomena by the researcher, provides the reader of qualitative reports with the actual and real world examples of the social issues in practice - as seen by the researcher. The process and/or pattern description in the qualitative research enables the readers to see for themselves how a social phenomenon occurs and how it is created by social actors with whom the readers can identify based on their mutual interests (e.g. business students identifying with the real world business managers). This process and/or pattern orientation also provides the interested reader with the recipe which others have used to succeed (or fail) in their various social struggles. The books "In Search of Excellence" by Peters and Waterman (1982) and "The Ropes to Skip and the Ropes to Learn" by
Ritti and Funkhouser (1982) are two prominent and successful examples of such a process and pattern descriptions. The first book discovers eight principles or patterns which make the American corporations excellent, and the second book uses a participant observation method to illustrate the actual life and lives of people in an organization.

Quantitative causal analysis, while it has had a significant influence on the advancement of knowledge in various fields of social science, seems to offer insignificant practical implications due to its overemphasis on finding general laws of cause and effect combined with its overall negligence of describing the very process which carves the surface of society’s plain. Van Mannen (1982) notes that one reason for the researchers shifting to qualitative research is the "growing disenchantedment with the results of quantitative studies." (p.13). The results seem to be more concerned with establishing the significance of variance or correlation explained rather than attending to the very social activities that triggered the interest in the research question in the first place.

The danger with putting so much emphasis on statistical significance of social relationships is, then, the neglect of theoretically and practically significant and relevant social relationships (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). In this way the researchers may lose sight of the practical implications of their research and produce non-relevant
research results (Thomas and Tymon, 1982). According to Thomas and Tymon (1982), who specify a number of properties for relevant research, descriptive relevance "refers to the accuracy of research findings in capturing phenomena encountered by the practitioner in his or her organizational setting." (p.346). It is reasonable to assert that qualitative research with its emphasis on natural setting inquiry is capable of producing relevant description.

Two additional properties of relevant research are goal relevance and operational validity. Goal relevance "refers to the correspondence of outcome (or dependent) variables in a theory to the things the practitioner wishes to influence" (p.347). Operational validity requires the researcher to be cognizant of the action implications of his/her study; the action implications should be synthesized and implemented by the practitioner before the research is said to have operational validity. Though both qualitative and quantitative research are amenable to these two requirements of relevant research, the former is in a more favorable position to fulfill them.

The above assertion can be justified on two grounds. First, the nature of qualitative research and its demand for the immersion of the researcher and its requirement for thick and process description is inevitably capable of having operational validity; i.e., it reports those operations which are actually being implemented by the
practitioners. Also, because of the qualitative researcher's interaction with the subjects of study, and his/her observation of what actually takes place, it is quite likely that goal relevance becomes a natural part of the qualitative research. Second, the favorable position of qualitative research can be asserted by the fact that the issue of useful and relevant research and knowledge has become a major concern in the field (see for example Lawler, Mohrman, Mohrman, Ledford, Cummings, 1985). One should naturally suspect that the issue has emerged partly (if not mainly) because of the inability of the dominant mode of inquiry to produce useful knowledge in organizational sciences.

A number of other researchers have also voiced their concern about the practical side of the field's research activity. Cummings (1978) warned organizational scientists to be more concerned about the performance of the field in practice. Campbell, Daft and Hulin (1982) report that the interaction between academicians and managers is not adequate and should be increased. Mintzberg (1982) dealing with the theories of leadership, tells the researchers that unless their theories are comprehensible and/or usable by the practitioners such as Bill and Barbara (two high level executives in a Canadian Film Organization), they are not serving leadership. In conclusion then, qualitative methodology, given its observational basis and descriptive
analysis of the data, is in a more favorable position than its rival quantitative research for offering research findings that are applicable to practitioners' situations. For this study two specific qualitative approaches were primarily influential in the process of collection and analysis of the data; they were: grounded theory and ethnomethodology. Both of them will be briefly discussed below.

**Research Method**

1) **Grounded Theory**: In their work in 1967, Glaser and Strauss argued that the primary goal of social science is to generate theory rather than testing hypotheses - i.e. verification. In rejecting the science of verification, they wrote, "A theory's only replacement is a better theory." (p.28). The theory should not however be deduced from a priori assumptions of the researcher; in contrast, Glaser and Strauss maintained that the theory should emerge from the data, which then becomes a "grounded theory".

The discovery of grounded theory is best accomplished if the researcher ignores the existence of the pre-existing theory and facts about the problems under study. While it is debatable if one can go into the field without any pre-existing frames of mind (Giddens, 1976), it is arguably possible to accept that one can go into the field by minimizing, rather than ignoring, the effects of the
previous literature on the findings of new research. For this research, the idea is to give preference (rather than ignoring the previous research) to the observation of the emerging categories from the data. This task is deemed as particularly desirable, because although the research on structure has been extensive, the research on structuring has been virtually non-existent (see the literature review for the few exceptions).

There are two requirements for the grounded theory method of research. First is the "underlying operation" of "joint collection, coding and analysis of data" and second is the comparative analysis of the data. The two requirements are intertwined. While one chooses an initial sample, and begins jointly coding and analyzing the data to generate an emergent theory, one should also change one's samples, sub-samples and find new comparison groups as the process continues.

The selection of comparison groups should be based on their theoretical relevance; but the groups are not required to have the same exact structural and non-structural features. Glaser and Strauss ask researchers to choose dissimilar substantive groups from different levels (of organization) and across many situations and locations in order to formulate a more powerful theory and/or explanation. This researcher, too, found access to different meetings across different organizations. While
formal meetings were the target of this study, the level, location, and internal and external environment of the organization and meeting did not affect the purpose of the study. The purpose was to observe, analyze, and report on, the process of structuring. While it is interesting to see if any of the above mentioned factors entered the process and affected it or changed it, the process will nevertheless continue to emerge; its form may or may not change because of those factors.

Another factor that may influence the process of structuring is the style of the meeting. Again the idea is to look for the effects of any possible style differences on the process of structuring rather than believing that style is not related to process. To reiterate, the primary focus was on the process of structuring in formal organizational meetings as only one of the social arenas and processes through which the social construction of organization structure takes place. There are other arenas and locations such as non-meeting talk and hall-talk that shape organization structure. Their existence and influence is not denied, nor rigidly controlled, but is partially checked through a meeting questionnaire. The non-meeting talk is not the focus of this dissertation. In short, the observational grounded theory approach for this research focused on how the episode of verbal structuring unfolded, and was manifested.
Using a grounded theory approach, the number of comparison groups were determined by the method of constant comparison (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). According to this method, comparison of groups begins by first comparing incidents with incidents and coding them. The comparison of group incidents results in the formation of the category(s) and its (their) property(s). Once a category is created, the comparison continues, only this time the new incidents are primarily compared with the property(s) of the existing category(s). If the incident fits the existing category, then no new category is developed. If, however, a fit does not appear to be the case, then the incident will be coded for the creation of another category. In general, Glaser and Strauss's rule is that if a new incident emerges which may warrant a new category, the researcher should go back to the field and collect more data. Re-coding in light of a new incident is not appropriate.

At the time of consolidating or delimiting the theory, the finding of new incidents, categories, or patterns should be in saturation; that is, the old ones seem to recur and repeat in the further collection and analysis of the data. The point of saturation is also an indication of the number of groups which will have been used for the study. Thus, since the number of groups to be observed is actually a post-hoc question, the actual number of groups is an emergent property of the study.
2) Ethnomethodology: Given the research interest in patterns of talk in structuring organizations, the importance of ethnomethodology for this research lies in the fact that "naturally occurring talk" is the focus of ethnomethodologists (Mehan and Wood, 1975). In this view talk is considered as performance (e.g. Austin, 1961). That is, by talking one "accomplishes an act...I promise' accomplishes promising." (Mehan and Wood, 1975, p.118). For ethnomethodologists the idea is to treat talk itself as the topic of investigation. Gronn (1983) observes "Though evidence indicates the importance of talking by managers and administrators, no one yet endeavored to analyze the content of talking, as if talk is a taken for granted as a presentation of simple behavior." (p.2).

The word ethnomethodology can be divided into two parts, ethno and methodology. According to Garfinkel (1974) 'ethno' refers "to the availability to a member of common-sense knowledge of his society as common-sense knowledge of 'whatever'" (p.16); or put it simply, it refers to different groups' way of life. 'Methodology' is the way of making sense of one's activity. Put together, ethnomethodology is the study of the practical accomplishment of day to day activities by the social actors. Therefore, by considering talk "as the doing of activity" (Mehan and Wood, 1975), ethnomethodologists endeavor to understand the accomplishment of various social
activities and realities by analyzing the verbal uses of those activities.

Everyday life is celebrated by the ethnomethodologist for its containment of the "accountable" practices of social actors (Garfinkel, 1967). Social practices are accountable in the sense that they are "observable and reportable" to others who are part of the activity scene (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). Everyday life is also important for it contains the use of activity typifications by the social actors in the course of practical accomplishment of those activities. Thus, while everyday life practices may seem to be obvious, it is this obvious practice that should be taken seriously and examined for its containment of socially constructed realities (Zimmerman and Pollner, 1970).

"The core of social reality" lies in what Garfinkel (1967, p.11) has described as the 'awesome indexicality' of everyday life. "Reality does not exist on the surface of human affairs offering itself for straightforward study as the functionalist organisation theorist so often assumes. Social reality lies deep within the network of typifications which individuals, if pressed, will summon to make sense of the situation in which they find themselves." (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p.274). The core idea is to analyze the everyday life of actors for learning how they do what they do.
In this way ethnomethodology like ethnography wants to learn from the people it studies. In organizational sciences, Gephart (1978) used ethnomethodology to investigate the process of organizational degradation and succession. Gronn (1983) also used it for studying how school administration accomplishes control by talk. The positive and plausible findings of these two example studies in particular, along with the general focus of ethnomethodology on talk analysis, give further credence to the choice of a qualitative method for this research. Despite its many apparent advantages, the critics have always charged that the findings and results of qualitative research are unreliable and/or invalid. In recent years, the advocates of qualitative research have been more vocal in responding to this charge, and the gist of their answers is provided below, as reliability and validity are two important issues of any research.

Reliability and Validity In Qualitative Research

The questions of reliability and validity have been traditionally posed by the critics of qualitative research for casting doubt on its objectivity. A partial answer to the issues of reliability and validity of qualitative, or any other research for that matter, was given in the previous chapter discussing the implicit assumptions of the researchers. From that discussion it was basically
concluded that a researcher is biased to the extent that he/she chooses a particular methodology vis-a-vis others available. Therefore, the choice of a given methodology would immediately introduce some bias and subjectivity to the desired objectivity of the research. This point was further highlighted by Hammersly and Atkinson (1983) as they invited researchers to realize that they are the research instrument Par Excellence. Or as Morgan (1983) highlights, "in research as in conversation we meet ourselves." It is further important to note that while qualitative researchers try to establish the reliability and validity of their findings, they do not do it based on the same logic used by positivist researchers. For example, on the issue of reliability, the anti-positivist inquirer simply does not believe in any stable, perfect, or unbiased instrument. As Skirt (1985) asserts, "The more perfect an instrument is (as the reductionist might purport a paper and pencil one to be), the less adaptable it is. The human, far from perfect, is virtually infinitely adaptable." (p.189). And Lincoln (1985, p.222) metaphorically observes, "Social systems are ongoing, regardless of how stable they may appear. Put differently no methodology allows us to step twice in the same stream in the same place."

Qualitative researchers often choose to present their concern about reliability and validity by different words such as trustworthiness (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) and
credibility (Weick, 1985). For Lincoln and Guba (1985) using the word "trustworthiness" instead of reliability and validity, "the basic issue is ... how can an inquirer persuade his/her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of?" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p.290). Weisman’s (1974, pp.325-326) list of validity guidelines is also an interesting presentation of the qualitative researcher’s frame of mind about the questions of trustworthiness and credibility (cited in Weick, 1985, p.605).

1. "Assume, at least at first, that no one is lying"
2. If you must choose between an official’s story and an individual’s story, assume that the institution is being less honest.
3. "There is nothing that happens or that people tell you about that ‘doesn’t make any sense.’ It is part of their lives. They think it makes sense. It is up to you to make sociological sense of it."
4. "Assume that human beings may not be very smart in the decisions they make, but that they do the very best they can."
5. "There is usually nothing that people tell you or that you will see (if it is within the research topic) that is truly irrelevant to your study. It probably belongs under another code heading, and is either background or foreground."
6. "There is no such thing as absolute truth. No one has the final word."

Besides these general guidelines, a number of specific ways exist that permit the researcher to establish the reliability and validity of qualitative research. The following is a presentation of some of the more frequently used, and more recently advocated, techniques:
a) Triangulation, which is "the use of multiple and different sources, methods, investigators, and theories" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p.305), is often used for establishing both reliability and validity of the research. To establish the reliability is to say that "... the investigator has a substantial phenomenon in hand." (Weick, 1985, p.604). Weick, specifically referring to reliability (rather than triangulation), mentions of four possible comparisons to be used for an ideal observational study.

First, the ratings of two persons observing the same event would be correlated, a measure that would rule out the errors of change in the person and the environment. Next, the ratings of the same observer watching a similar event at two different times would be compared (this would rule out error of content sampling). Then the agreement of two observers observing an event at two different times would be correlated. This measure is vulnerable to all four sources of error and would be expected to yield the lowest reliability of the four comparisons. Finally, the observations of a single observer watching a single event would be compared in a manner similar to odd-even item correlations in a test. This is a check on internal consistency or the extent at which the observer agrees with himself. If the category system is well defined, this measure of reliability would be expected to yield the highest correlation. Admittedly, it is possible only to approximate this ideal, but if investigators must assign priorities to these four comparisons, they should try hardest to secure satisfactory interobserver agreement of a single event, because unless this is achieved, there is no assurance that any distinct phenomenon is being preserved in the record.

In this research, the establishment of reliability was attempted by the use of different sources (i.e. comparison groups), and by the use of interobserver agreements on the coding of talk as structuring vs. non-structuring and on the verification of the categories (i.e., the findings).
Further triangulation took place by a post-meeting questionnaire. The questionnaires were used as "member checks" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985); that is, asking people about the accuracy and appropriateness of interpretations ["is this what you are doing?" (Weick, 1985, p.604)]. Therefore social actors (the study subjects), themselves, had a chance to look at the results and determine its trustworthiness.

b) "Prolonged engagement" with, and "persistent observation" of, the research subjects, i.e., meeting participants, setting and data, should result in a deeper understanding of the social situation and/or phenomenon by the researcher. In this study, prolonged engagement with, and persistent observation of, the data was achieved by the researcher constantly listening to the tapes of organizational meeting, while focusing (i.e., persistent observation) on verbalizations of organizational structure, for numerous times (see chapter 6 for further discussion of this aspect of trustworthiness of the study).

d) "Negative case analysis", that is, to check if the emergent theory does not account for some data found and cases appearing, and why not. Negative case analysis is an embedded part of the method of constant comparison (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), a main methodological approach for this study, which was discussed in the previous section.
e) "Peer debriefing", that is, letting a colleague play the role of devil's advocate against your study and its findings. In this research, five hired reviewers compared the researcher's interpretations and findings against the transcripts of three meetings.

f) "Referential adequacy", that is, checking the records of observation, e.g. tapes, for the evidence of insufficient representation of them in interpretation of the data. An indirect check for referential adequacy took place for this study, as the researcher and additional reviewers listened to the tapes, and/or read over the transcripts for numerous times while interpreting the data, and generating and/or confirming the study findings.

Thus, there are definitely ways and means through which the trustworthiness of a qualitative study can be confirmed. As mentioned above, these techniques were used in establishing the trustworthiness of this study, and some of them will be discussed further in later sections.

Research Focus and Questions

The purpose of research at hand, as mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, is exploratory. The objective was to explore or discover and categorize the content and other properties of talk uttered by organizational actors in organizational meetings when such talk was interpreted to contain (to relate to) organization structure. The
discovery mode of inquiry should, therefore, utilize an inductive versus hypothetico-deductive method (e.g., Kidder, 1981). With a hypothetico-deductive method, "the researcher begins with a theoretical framework, formulates a hypothesis, and logically deduces what the results of the experiment should be if the hypothesis is correct. "Inductive research proceeds in the opposite direction, the research begins with data and generates hypothesis and a theory from the ground up" (p.103). The intention is to minimize the imposition of any pré-existing pattern or theory on the study, though it is being acknowledged that a given paradigm commitment is already imposed on the study (see chapter 3).

The exploratory nature of the study concerns the analysis of structuring talk at formal organizational meetings. The fundamental assumption of the study is that, the actions of organizational members, particularly talk, create, re-create, change, modify, and destruct organizational realities, including organizational structures. All human actions are communicative when they are presented in the presence of others - i.e., they communicate a message to the present other. Communicative actions are of two types: verbal vs. non-verbal actions. This dissertation research focused on verbal actions-organizational talk - at formal organizational meetings, as
talk is the central vehicle for social construction of reality (e.g., Berger and Luckmann, 1966).

However, talk that is likely to include structure was the focus of this study rather than any type of talk. In fact, a fundamental question for conducting research on structuring is: what is structuring and is not structuring? One way to answer this question is to define what structure is and then from that decide what structuring can be. Organization structure as an entity specifies the parameters of action (e.g., Barley, 1986), what can or cannot be done; it is both enabling and constraining in what an organizational actor can do in an organizational setting. Structuring, then is, any action that creates, recreates (i.e., maintains), eliminates, changes and modifies, the parameters of action. Thus, in conducting this dissertation research an occasion of organizational talk (i.e., each organizational actor's speaking turn) was considered an act of structuring given that it conveyed a sense of what can or cannot be done by organizational members in the minds of the meeting participants - and/or the researcher.

While the preceding served as a broad guideline for distinguishing structuring from non-structuring, occasions of structuring were also identified based on the traditional literature of organization structure. Based on the literature, occasions of structuring talk were identified when talk indicated an organizational actor's attempt at
differentiating and/or coordinating and integrating an organization's labor (Mintzberg, 1979; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967). From the preceding two themes highlighted above, the list of structuring talk appearing in Table 5 was prepared and used for focusing the analysis on the occasion of structuring vs. non-structuring. See Appendix B for an elaborated version of the list.

**Formal Organizational Meeting:** Organizational talk (structuring or not) is a feature of all organizational settings. Organizational members talk to one another in face to face meetings, group meetings and other settings. The type of meeting is either formal or informal. This study focused on studying organizational talk at formal organizational meetings without following up the meetings over time (i.e., one shot observation and collection of data in every organization).

The level and therefore, the internal and external environment of the meetings are assumed to be important and relevant only to the extent that they affect and influence the process of structuring. It means, in selection of meetings, the uniformity of organizational levels and environments was not a consideration, and were inevitably accounted for at the time of analysis; i.e., the analysis was performed on the process of structuring including whatever influenced it. Below are a number of reasons for
Table 5

List of Structuring Talk

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Talk that deals with differentiation (division) of labor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Talk that deals with integration of labor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Talk that relates the two together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Talk that gives form to the organization and constructs patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Talk that refers to routine pre-existing work procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Talk that attempts to maintain or change the way things work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Talk that focuses on an organizationally relevant issue and implies the meaning and connotation of the issue for the behavior and action of organizational members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Talk that mentions the parameters of conduct (e.g., rules).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Talk that mentions the organizational property(s) and its implication for organizational actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Talk that determines who does what, when, how, where, and for whom, and with whom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
choosing formal organizational group meetings as the focus of this study:

First, groups like organizations are a collection of people rather than being composed of only one individual person. Therefore, they possess both macro and micro properties. Lofland's (1976) description of group vs. organizational scale of focus is a helpful one and will be presented here.

Groups. Group-scale situations differ from role-scale situations in shifting from the point of view of a single class of 'role occupant to that of the point of view of multiple, interdependent persons. Thus three interdependent people play different roles relative to one another, and each deals with his own role-scale situation; but the three taken as a unit - as a group - must deal with a group-scale situation that is above and beyond the respective roles involved. Informal work groups, cliques, and families are prime illustrations of group-scale situations.

Organizations. Organizational-scale situations are the same as group-situations in the sense of employing the acting unit per se. They differ in typically existing for longer periods of time, having larger populations, and employing a wider range of equipment. They are also more formally organized and have clearer, often written goals, and procedures." (pp. 28-29) [emphases added].

Second, groups as inevitable facts of organizations reflect organizational properties and also symbolize them. The arguments of Helen Schwartzman (1985) provide the necessary support for this assertion. Schwartzman observes that organizational researchers have neglected the study of meetings, or have studied them "as an instrumental social form, although it may be that meetings are expressive forms that serve expressive functions much better than they serve instrumental ones." (p.244) [emphases added]. One such an
expressive function of group meetings may be that "individuals learn about their place in the organizational hierarchy" (p.244), i.e. vertical differentiation. Thus:

"Meetings are important social symbols for organizations because "they are or may become the organization writ small [emphasis original]...a meeting is a powerful and ongoing symbol for an organization because it assembles a variety of individuals and groups together and labels the assembly as 'organizational action.' In this way, a meeting does more than just symbolize the organization—it also may be the major social form that constitutes and reconstitutes the organization over time...organizations need meetings, because it is through meetings that the organization creates and maintains itself." (p.250). [emphasis added].

Another writer, John Bryson (1984), attempting to apply Giddens' theory of structuration to the theory and practice of organizational design and change, argues that organizational meetings, operating as forums, arenas, and courts, are responsible for the structuring of organization structure. The basic difference between the three forms of meetings is their emphasis rather than their content per se. In forums, the objective is that group members exchange views and discuss and argue points and counter points. In arenas, decision making takes place, and finally in courts, decisions and conducts of organizational members will be evaluated. While Bryson separates the three forms of meeting, it is reasonable to assume that a meeting can simultaneously be all of the three. Bryson proposes that organization structure is manifested through the operation of these meetings in organizations both as an interaction of members and also through the crystallization of its
structural features, signification, domination, and legitimation—Giddens' duality of structure.

Third, for many years, students of organization development have been using groups as the vehicle for creating change in organization (e.g., Beer, 1981). Apparently groups are considered to be a key variable in changing organizations. This long lasting emphasis on groups by the students and practitioners of planned organizational change indicate that indeed groups do symbolize organizations and exert powerful influence on its members.

Fourth, The choice of group meetings permits the research to have a focus for its structuring episode and therefore to impose the necessary level of control over the conduct of the empirical research; it permits the researcher to set a time limit (how long) and frequency limit (how many times) and size limit (number of groups) for the study. Furthermore, the choice of group meetings is appropriate for the conduct of a comparative research across a number of organizations.

Research Questions: The study of structuring talk at formal organizational meetings was conducted for finding answers to the following basic questions of the research:
1. How does the process of structuring talk unfold at organizational meetings?
2. Is there an evidence of structuring in organizational talk at organizational meetings?
3. What is the evidence of structuring? Can it be described and explained?
3a) Is there something in the content of organizational talk that refers to the structure of an organization? If yes, what is it - a word, a sentence, a long conversation, etc.- and what aspect of structure does that refer to?
3b) Is there any pattern to organizational talk concerning organization structure? If yes, can it be explained?
3c) Is there anything else - any other property - that characterizes structuring talk at organizational meetings?
4. Does the evidence of structuring obtained from one meeting recur in all or some of the other meetings?

Specific Research Method and Procedure

1) Sample

The focus of observation in this research was formal organizational meetings in various types of organizations (see the discussion of the unit of analysis in the previous section). The goal was to gain access to organizational meetings and observe and record - using a tape-recorder- the conversation and dialogue transpiring in the meetings.

A total of eight organizational meetings were observed, recorded and transcribed. The total sample of eight meetings was the combination of two sub-samples of five and
three meetings (see Table 6). The first sub-sample of five meetings was the core sample, and was used in the study for generating the research findings of the study as observed and interpreted by the dissertation author. The second sub-sample of three meetings was the verification sample. The meetings in the verification sample were observed by the dissertation researcher, but the data collected from them (i.e., transcripts) were interpreted and analyzed by five independent reviewers whose task was to establish the trustworthiness (i.e., the reliability and validity) of the research findings generated based on the meetings in the core sample.

The size of the core sample—five meetings—was essentially determined based on the grounded theory’s method of constant comparison. The method of constant comparison states: the analysis may reasonably stop at the point when no more new categories are emerging out of the data, and as the number of new categories diminishes considerably when more observations are made—i.e., as saturation of findings develops. Figure 6 depicts the diminishing number of structuring categories found in the analysis of talk in the meetings as the analysis moved from the first meeting to the fifth one.

This core sample was also an appropriate sample for a grounded theory research methodology as it was a diverse and varied sample. The sample’s diversity and variety emanated
Table 6
Samples of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Meetings Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Sample:</td>
<td>5 Meetings = Findings from these meetings were generated by the author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification Sample:</td>
<td>3 Meetings = Findings from the core sample were verified for their trustworthiness by five independent reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample:</td>
<td>8 Meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6

Number of New Categories Observed Per Meeting
both from the difference in the type of the organizations
the meetings belonged to, and from the level and type of the
meetings themselves. Moreover, the sample varied with
regard to the internal qualities and properties of the
meetings in terms of the topic of discussion, size, duration, and the length of the transcript.

Table 7 shows some of the meetings' characteristics. From the table, it can be seen that the sample included both for profit and not for profit organizations. The sample did not, however, include any manufacturing organization. This exclusion was not intentional and occurred as a number of target manufacturing organizations declined to permit the researcher to be present in their meetings.

The inclusion of organizations in the sample took place as they were first targeted and approached by the researcher, and as they accepted to permit the researcher to observe their meetings. The researcher began to target and approach many organizations with diverse types of activities all at the same time, and observed the meetings and analyzed their transcripts as soon as he was permitted to do so by some of the organizations. Many organizations approached by the researcher, declined to give permission to the author to observe their meetings due to the issues confidentiality and tape recording.

An arbitrary number of three additional meetings were observed, tape recorded and were subsequently transcribed
Table 7

Characteristics of Five Meetings in Core Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization (Abbreviation)</th>
<th>T/LM (F)</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>DM/M</th>
<th>NTT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work (SW)</td>
<td>Board of Directors (Monthly)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (H)</td>
<td>Heads' Status Meeting (Weekly)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital (C)</td>
<td>Continuing Education Committee (occasional)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Broadcasting (PB)</td>
<td>Executive (Weekly)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (R)</td>
<td>Task Force (Temporal)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:

T/LM: Type and/or Level of the Meeting (F): Frequency of the group meeting (# of times a year)
NP: Number of Participants
DM/M: Duration of Meeting/Minutes
NTT: Number of Transcript Turns

Important Note: Throughout the dissertation the abbreviations of the meetings will be used for referring to them.
for use as the verification sample. Table 8 shows the type of organization and the characteristics of the meetings. Again as shown, the sample was diverse, and it should also be noted that the meetings were considerably longer than the average meeting length in the core sample of five.

An issue about the sample size should be discussed. While the sample size is here referred to as the number of formal organizational meetings observed, an alternative sample size can refer to the number of transcript turns transcribed and analyzed. Because, practically it has been the analysis of over 2000 transcript turns from eight meetings that has been used to generate the findings of this study. Thus the alternative reference to the sample size should illustrate how the study might become unmanageable as the number of meetings increases (i.e., it is not just the addition of one meeting, but it is on average 300 more transcript turns to analyze).

2) Data

The researcher sat through each and every meeting and, while tape recording the meetings, wrote down the speaker’s name or code name for each turn of talk. Prior to the meeting, researcher had already listed a total of 500 transcript turn numbers for each meeting, and then at the time of meeting just filled out the name of the speaker in
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Three Meetings in the Verification Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization (Abbreviation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church (CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Stop (TS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:

T/LM: Type and/or Level of the Meeting (F): Frequency of the group meeting (# of times a year)
NP: Number of Participants
DM/M: Duration of Meeting/Minutes
NTT: Number of Transcript Turns
front of the turn number. Figure 7 shows a typical sheet of recording the meeting.

A transcript turn refers to an uninterrupted flow (sequence) of talk uttered by a speaker at a given time during the meeting. A turn is initiated when a speaker begins talking about an issue, and it ends when the speaker completes his/her talk on the issue, or is interrupted by another speaker before completing the talk, and when another speaker begins talking about the same or a different issue. In the transcripts a turn's length ranged from one word to several pages of sentences uttered by the same or different speakers at different times during the meeting.

The idea behind the recording of turn number, speaker's name and a word or two of the speaker's remarks was to enable the researcher to identify on the tape transcription, who said what, when. The first step of transcription of tapes was performed by a transcriber, who was only able to identify the speakers as female or male (i.e., a female vs. male voice is being heard). Then, in the second step of transcription, the researcher listened to the tapes and from the meeting sheet (e.g., Figure 7) wrote down the name and the identity of the speaker in front of the line/turn number. The second step by itself proved to be a time consuming activity, which was nevertheless very useful for providing the researcher with still more opportunity to re-observe the data (i.e., listening to the meetings over and
Meeting: Local Hospital Staff Meeting  
Date: August 1986  
Physical location of the speakers around the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kathy</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Helen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine</td>
<td>Donna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The researcher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn #</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>N (i.e. Nadine), (A Technician)</td>
<td>Today, I...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Dr. H (The Committee Chair)</td>
<td>Oh, O.K...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>...complicated...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Dr. H.</td>
<td>Let's move on...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7  
Matching the Speaker with the Transcript Turn Number  
(Note Taking by the Researcher While Observing the Meetings)
over). At the completion of all transcriptions, the raw data consisted of over 2000 transcript turns, which were subsequently analyzed.

Another set of data was collected from the meetings by administering a post-meeting questionnaire to the meeting participants of five of the eight meetings studied. Three meeting directors did not permit the researcher to administer the questionnaire. The objective of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) was to get a member’s check on the occurrence of structuring talk in the meeting, and also to indicate whether the structuring attempted in the meeting by some participants has resulted in changing other participants’ view of structure.

3) Analysis of the Core Sample: Mode, Methods, and Instruments

Analysis of the core sample was performed by the dissertation author (the principal researcher). The result of the core sample analysis was the generation of the research findings: structuring categories of content, strategies, and patterns. The basic mode of analysis was sense-making interpretation. The sequence of analysis and interpretation of transcripts, and generation of research findings took place in the following order.

Each meeting’s tape-recording was listened to once, while the researcher read over the corresponding meeting
transcript. This gave the researcher an overall view of the meeting anew, and also provided him with the opportunity for clarifying the ambiguities in the meeting and/or overcoming the mistakes in the transcript of the meetings. Next, the researcher began to re-read the transcripts turn by turn while re-listening to the corresponding portions of the meeting’s tape recording.

For each transcript turn the researcher performed two tasks. First, the researcher made a determination regarding the existence of structuring in the talk (of the turn) by answering the following question: "In this turn is there any sign or evidence of structuring?" A "no" answer to this question resulted in no further analysis of the turn’s talk. The second task was performed only when a "yes" answer was given to the above question. The "yes" answer was given if the researcher based on the structuring themes and talk list (see Appendix B) sensed (interpreted) the existence of structure and structuring in talk. After such an answer the researcher performed the second task on the transcript turn by analyzing and interpreting the talk to explain the evidence of structuring and to generate the findings of the study.

Though the list of structuring talk presented in Table 5 and detailed in Appendix B, was used as the basic guide for such determination, this research also attempted to determine any line as structuring vs. non-structuring
depending on its emergent and present properties and qualities. That is, though there was a guide, it was
designed to serve as a rigid and limiting set of criteria for determining the existence of structuring. The
researcher left himself flexible enough to determine anything as structuring as long as he had a sense of
structure from a given transcript line. This was because, the primary mode of inquiry in analyzing the first five
transcripts was the researcher's interpretation of the existence or non-existence of structuring, regardless of its
actual occurrence in the minds of other participants.

The flexible use of the guide to the determination of structuring was coherent with the objective of the research
as delineated in the previous chapters, in that, it provided both for explaining structuring based on the previously
existing concept of structure (i.e., relating this research to the previous research), and inventing or discovering structuring de novo. Once it was determined that structuring had occurred, it was then appropriate to analyze the transcript line(s) to describe and explain the process of structuring in meetings and discover the common themes and patterns across the organizational meetings in the core sample. All analyses, interpretations and explanations, were written down for later reference. Following a grounded theory methodology, the interpretations and explanations were immediately or eventually put in the form of emergent
categories of content, strategies, and patterns of structuring, which were further developed, and revised as the analysis proceeded from the first meeting to the last of the five meetings in the core sample.

Besides a grounded theory, ethnomethodological thinking also influenced the interpretation of the transcripts. Reiterating, ethnomethodology maintains that the talk of actors both contains and reports on their knowledge of social (organizational) structure. Thus for every turn analysis, the interpretation was made so it can account for the reporting of structure by the participants. Finally, the specific guide used in analysis and categorization of the findings was the socio-linguistic categorization form of Green and Wallet (1981). The Green and Wallet instrument is primarily designed for the analysis of verbal classroom interaction between teacher and the students. Because of its general nature, however, it is quite possible to use it as a guide for categorizing organizational talk. The categorization form appearing in Appendix C, as adapted from Green and Wallet, proved to be a useful guide especially for determining the structuring strategies and pattern stages involved in organizational talk. It should be noted that in adapting this instrument, some of the categories and section were eliminated or modified to make it more suitable to organizational analysis. The Green and Wallet form was particularly instrumental in finding the talk categories of
structuring. Using the preceding modes, methods and instruments, the end result of analyzing the core sample was the discovery of a set of structuring categories of content, patterns, and strategies of organizational talk in its final form.

4) Analysis of Verification Sample: Purpose and Methods

The purpose of conducting an analysis of the transcript meetings in the verification sample was to establish the trustworthiness of the research findings. The goal behind this was to see whether others, besides the researcher, were able to see the structuring categories found from the core sample in another sample. The verification analysis was performed by a total of five independent reviewers. The analysis was performed by the following methods:

I) The first method of verification was performed by two reviewers, who read the transcripts turn by turn and then based on the structuring talk guide in Appendix B determined whether or not there was an evidence of structuring in any given turn. The goal, here, was to verify the existence of structuring talk in non-core sample transcripts by independent observers.

II) In the second type of verification a total of 3 reviewers (two different reviewers for each meeting transcript) attempted to match the findings of the core sample to the transcripts' turns of the verification sample.
The reviewers were provided with a descriptive list of the categories along with a detailed guideline for the matching task as it appears in Appendix D. The researcher went over each and every line of the guideline with the three reviewers separately, and made sure that they had the basic same understanding of the guidelines and the categories.

The results were analyzed in terms of frequency of observation of each category by each reviewer for each meeting. An interobserver agreement test of correlation was performed for each structuring category, for finding the degree of similarity and difference of interpretation of the same transcript line in light of the existing structuring categories. The reviewers were debriefed to gain insight into the reasons for their matching. After the debriefing, the reviewers were each provided with their codings (indicating the match between a line and a given category) which was juxtaposed against the other reviewer's coding of the same meeting transcript, and then were asked to reconcile their differences with the other reviewer by answering the following two questions (see Appendix E for reconciliation instructions and form).

Question 1: Do you see (understand) why and how the other person has coded differently than you have done? Yes/No.
Question 2: If yes, would you change your coding or include the coding of the other reviewer in your coding, if you were to do it over?
Change: Yes/No
Include: Yes/No

The goal of this reconciliation was to determine what the reason(s) were for the difference in coding between the two reviewers of the same transcript. A "yes" answer to the first question, and an "include" answer to the second question would indicate a difference in the interpretation of the same transcript line, vs. a difference in the interpretation of a given category of structuring. Table 9 presents a summary of the research method, samples, procedure, and instruments, that were used in this research.

The results of the study are presented in the next chapter.
Table 9
Research Samples, Methods, and Procedure

Total Sample: 8 Meetings
All meetings were observed by the researcher
Each meeting was 1) tape-recorded
               2) transcribed
               3) administered a post-meeting questionnaire
Unit of Analysis for all meetings (was): transcript turn

Core Sample = The first 5 Meetings
All 5 Meetings were analyzed by the dissertation author
Mode of Analysis: Interpretative Sense-Making
Specific Methodological Guides: Grounded Theory and
Ethnomethodology
Specific Instrumental Guide: Green and Wallet Categorization
Form (Appendix C)
Purpose: Explaining the process of structuring at
organizational meetings
Result: Generation of three sets of categories of
structuring talk (Chapter 5)

Verification Sample: The last 3 Meetings
All 3 Meetings were analyzed by five different reviewers
Purpose: Verifying the existence of the structuring talk, and matching such a talk with the structuring
categories generated by the researcher from the
core sample
Mode of Analysis: Interpretation, Checking, and Matching
Specific Instructions/Instruments Used:
1) List of Structuring Talk (Appendix B)
2) Matching Instructions (Appendix D)
3) Reconciliation Instructions and Form (Appendix E)
Result: General verification of the categories generated
from the core sample meetings in the verification
sample meetings
Chapter 5

Research Findings:

Content, Strategies and Patterns of Structuring Talk

This chapter reports on the results of the study consisting of four separate, yet interrelated, sets of findings. The first set of findings shows the existence of structuring talk in organizational meetings' transcripts. The remaining sets of findings will then present categories of content, strategies, and patterns, which were discovered (or invented) from the data in order to describe and explain the process of structuring talk at organizational meetings. The second set of findings, content categories, describes the content of structuring talk. The third set presents a list of talk strategies employed by organizational actors for structuring their organization structures. And the fourth set of findings presents a general discourse pattern and the variations of it, which were displayed as structuring talk occurred in the meetings.

Existence of Structuring in Talk

The fundamental premise of this dissertation is that talk at formal organizational meetings contains structure. Therefore, the foremost important task of this research was
to show that indeed talk in the meetings contains structure. In order to accomplish this task, three types of analysis, as specified in the previous chapter (e.g., see Table 9), were performed on the research data.

Results from three types of analysis show the existence of structuring in talk uttered at organizational meetings. The first two types of analysis were performed by the researcher on the meetings' transcripts in the core sample, and by two other reviewers on the meetings' transcripts in the verification sample. The third type of analysis was performed on the meeting participants' answers to the first two questions of the post-meeting questionnaire.

For the first type of analysis, the author, using a list of structuring talk (see Appendix B), read and interpreted each meeting's transcript turn by turn for determining the existence of structuring in each turn (see pp. 125-129 for a detailed explanation of the procedure). Each turn was interpreted to contain structuring ("yes" coding), or not ("no" coding). Appendix F shows an excerpt of the author's interpretation of one meeting's transcript with the purpose of discovering and explaining structuring talk. Table 10 shows the frequency and percentage of structuring and non-structuring coding of the transcript turns for the five meetings in the core sample. Frequency numbers show that based on the author's interpretation most
Table 10
Frequency of Observing Structuring in Core Sample Transcripts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Meeting</th>
<th>Number of Turns Interpreted</th>
<th>Does Structuring Exist?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Broadcasting</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on author’s interpretation
of the talk in the first five meetings contained structuring (i.e., referred to organization’s structure).

The second type of analysis was performed by two other reviewers, using the same procedure as the author did for the first type of analysis (see Appendix B), in order to determine the existence of structuring in the talk of the three meetings in the verification sample (see pp. 129-131 for a detailed explanation of the procedure). Appendix F shows excerpts of the two reviewers’ interpretations of the three transcripts with the purpose of discovering the existence of structuring in each turn. Frequency results of the two reviewers’ interpretations (i.e., structuring and non-structuring coding) of the transcript turns appear in Table 11.

The ‘yes’ coding frequency numbers of each meeting’s transcript by both reviewers, with the exception of reviewer two’s (R2) coding for the church council meeting, show that based on the two reviewers’ interpretations the majority of the talk turns in the three meetings contained structuring. This result provides a strong support for the fundamental premise of the dissertation, i.e., that talk contains structure. Because, it shows that two other expert reviewers, besides the author, using the same procedure that the author did, were able to interpret the existence of structuring in talk turns of three transcripts other than the ones the author did. In short, different individuals’
### Table 11
Results of Two Reviewers' Coding for the Existence of Structuring in Verification Sample Transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer and Meeting</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1/Church Council</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2/Church Council</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1/Truck Stop</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2/Truck Stop</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1/Airline</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2/Airline</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:**

R1: Reviewer 1
R2: Reviewer 2
interpretations of different samples, using the same procedure, indicated the existence of structuring in talk.

Still further support for the premise of the existence of structuring in talk was provided by the third type of analysis. This analysis was performed on the answers given to the first two questions of the post-meeting questionnaire (see Appendix A) by the participants of five of the eight meetings in both core and verification samples (see p. 125 for an explanation of the purpose of the questionnaire). The frequency numbers appearing in Table 12 show that most of the meetings' participants related their specific meeting's talk to one or more of the general topics or items of structure (structuring) listed under the first question.

Basically items 1a-1j were in direct reference to an aspect of organizational structure as formally conceptualized in the field. For example, item 1b, with the highest observed frequency (F=24) was derived from both Mintzberg's and Lawrence and Lorsch's definition of organization structure as division and coordination (integration) of labor. Item 1c (F=14) referred to division of labor and job specialization (e.g., Daft, 1986). Item 1d and 1h (F=15, F=6) referred to organizational formalization and standardization (e.g., Daft, 1986). Item 1e referred to vertical division of labor and decentralization (e.g., Daft, 1986). Thus, the frequency results indicate, that the
Table 12
Post-Meeting Questionnaire: Results of Questions 1 and 2

Meeting Abbreviations:

CC: Church Council Meeting
TS: Truck Stop Meeting
C: Hospital (Committee) Meeting
R: Research Organization Meeting
H: Hotel Meeting

1) Which of the following general issues would you say were discussed in today's meeting?

1a. Creation of a new position, unit, division, operation, procedure:
(All=9), (CC=2), (TS=3), (C=2), (R=1), (H=1)

1b. Coordination (Cooperation) of work activity between personnel, units, division, shifts:
(All=24), (CC=9), (TS=4), (C=3), (R=3), (H=5)

1c. Description, establishment, clarification of job, position, work:
(All=14), (CC=7), (TS=1), (C=2), (R=2), (H=2)

1d. Specification of organizational rules, standards, procedures, paperwork:
(All=15), (CC=4), (TS=3), (C=2), (R=2), (H=4)

1e. Delegation of authority, responsibility, decision making power:
(All=11), (CC=7), (TS=1), (C=2), (R=0), (H=1)

1f. Employees' relationship with each other/with supervisors:
(All=10), (CC=2), (TS=0), (C=3), (R=1), (H=4)

1g. Reinforcement of existing work procedure:
(All=15), (CC=6), (TS=3), (C=2), (R=2), (H=2)

1h. Changing work requirements:
(All=6), (CC=1), (TS=1), (C=2), (R=0), (H=2)

1i. Elimination of a position, rule, requirement, unit:
(All=1), (CC=0), (TS=0), (C=0), (R=0), (H=1)

1j. The company's philosophy, values:
(All=9), (CC=5), (TS=1), (C=1), (R=1), (H=1)
Table 12 Continued

1k. The company's competition of outside challenges:  
(All=6), (CC=0), (TS=2), (C=1), (R=0), (H=3)

1l. The company's clients (customers):  
(All=16), (CC=6), (TS=4), (C=0), (R=2), (H=4)

1m. The company's work equipment:  
(All=14), (CC=5), (TS=4), (C=0), (R=1), (H=4)

2) Additional issues not mentioned:  
* Future meetings, activities (CC)  
* Health department inspections (H)  
* Building code (H)

* N: (All=26), (CC=9), (TS=5), (C=4), (R=3), (H=5)

* N: is the number of people who answered to the questionnaire, which in a number of cases was not same as the number of meeting participants.
participants themselves, also attested to the existence of structuring talk in their meetings.

In conclusion, the results of three types of analysis show that the meetings' talk contained structuring. From this conclusion, then, the author re-read and re-interpreted those core sample transcript turns, with an evidence of structuring, in order to explain the process of structuring talk. Based on the author's interpretation three sets of findings (process indicators), the content, strategies, and patterns of structuring talk, explained and described the process of structuring in five formal organizational meetings in the core sample.

Content Categories

Engaged in discovering the process of structuring, it was the author's interpretation that primarily something in the transcript turn itself gives a sense of organizational structure to the audience (i.e., the researcher). Occasionally this 'something' could be captured as one key word or an utterance in the statement, and at other times the whole statement (or turn), in a holistic sense, constituted that 'something'. As the analysis proceeded, it became discernible that the content of some transcript turns and/or words uttered by a given speaker during his/her turn, contained a direct or indirect reference/description of organization structure. It was, then, decided to define
this something as the content of the structuring talk, and to discover and develop a number of content categories which would be general enough to represent the content of most of the structuring talk (i.e., statements made by the speakers) observed in the core sample meetings.

Thirteen content categories were discovered/invented based on the analysis and interpretation of the core sample meetings and they will be presented below in the following order. First, each category and its observation frequency in both core (observed by the author) and verification (observed by two other reviewers) sample meetings will be presented (see chapter 4). It should be noted that the decision to present a category was not influenced by its subsequent number of observation frequency. Each category is rather presented below, as it was originally discovered (invented) by the author to explain the process of structuring talk in one (or more) of the five transcripts' turns.

Second, examples of the category from one or more of the transcripts in the core sample will be presented, and will be discussed. And finally, a conclusion section will briefly discuss the observation frequencies and significance of the content categories. Before proceeding, it is necessary to reiterate and underscore that the following content categories were developed by the author based on his
interpretations of the transcripts of the five core sample 
meetings (See chapter 4).

1) Members make statements in which they mention (i.e., talk 
about) the job and duties of an organizational member, unit, 
position, and how the job is supposed to be performed (what 
are the steps and procedure to be followed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Reviewers:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the language of the traditional literature of 
organization structure, the content of the statements 
corresponding to the content description of the first 
category, refer to/use the structural dimensions of job 
specialization and division of labor (who does what). 
Alternatively, it can be said that whenever the content of a 
speaker's statement corresponds to the description of the 
first content category, then, the plausible topics of 
structuring are job specialization and/or division of labor.

An example of this category was observed in the 
Hospital's Continuing Education Committee meeting:

077 K: We got to send out one sheet with them all (courses) 
listed and what hospitals [offer them] - a blank at the top 
to say how much to come ... we will send it to everybody so 
if a hospital isn't participating they will see what they 
are missing. They will be just listed like on the back here
- the dates, the titles and the programs and who is giving it. And that's it. Then before each one we will send out an announcement with a more detailed description of what description ...

In the above statement, speaker K, is telling her audience what they are supposed to do ("we got to send out one sheet with them all"), how they are supposed to do it ("we will send it to everybody so if a hospital isn't"). Also by using "we" she is making it clear who is supposed to do these things (i.e., "we" the members of the continuing education committee). Another example of this category was observed in the Social Work Board meeting:

055 R: Part of the problem that we touched on before was that it should really be the attorney who is representing the youth who should be protecting the privilege [i.e., who does what] he privilege is for our clients not to have us divulge that information. We are not really obligated to protect that the privilege - there is an obligation to protect it but they should be doing it.

Again, the example shows that the speaker is telling what is the duty/responsibility of the organization vis-a-vis its clients (delinquent youth). The issue at stake is who is supposed to protect the privacy of the client (who does what): the social work organization or the attorney? The speaker answers this question by saying who is supposed to do what: "We (who) are not really obligated to protect that privilege (what)" ... "it should really be the attorney who is representing the youth who should be protecting the privilege (what)". Thus, in one part of the statement, the
speaker says who does (should) not do what, and in the other part of the same statement the speaker says who (should) does what. The following two examples from two other meetings should further illustrate the message of the first category.

Research Organization meeting:

072 S: Would this include Markowitz fact sheets?
073 SH: (the chair): We don’t have any responsibility for those. That was a different (division’s).
074 S: Yea, because that included headquarters stuff.
075 SH: I don’t think we want to get in that.

In this example the meeting chair (SH) is stating what is not part of their division’s responsibility (job, duty).

Public Broadcasting meeting:

219 K: I don’t know [who schedules the vans] I really don’t know.
220 J: That would probably be good information for you to have. If somebody asks you for a truck/
.
.
.
235 J: It ought to be easier to know who to talk to. I don’t know - but I would think that he would know who was in control of those vehicles. You (meaning K) might want to find out that out and store it away.

In lines 220 and 235, J is indirectly determining what K is expected to know as the head of T.V. Like the previous examples, the speaker in this example is also stating who does what. In this case, who is the head of T.V. (K), and what is having knowledge and authority over who schedules the T.V. vans. Thus category #1 describes the content of
those structuring talks that include a direct or indirect reference to structural dimensions of job specialization, and/or division of labor.

#2) Members make statements in which they describe and present (their view of) organizational structure in terms of the structure’s "proper" or "existing" channels, routes, hierarchy, positions, paperwork, standardization, rules and etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency Reviewers:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above description the following topics of structuring can be said to exist: the existing (binding) structure: e.g., the current hierarchy set-up, positions, channels of communication, authority, and decision making, formalization, standardization. Thus, in terms of the traditional dimensions of structure, the structuring topics are: centralization in particular (who is the decision making authority) and vertical division of labor (what are the units and positions within the hierarchy level), formalization and standardization. The key to distinguishing this category from others that may come close was that the speakers who used this category seemed to present their view of the structure or aspects of it as they
viewed (perceived) it in their minds. It was their view of the current structure of the organization at that time.

In the following example, the general manager (J) of the Public Broadcasting Stations was describing to his executives how the stations can get approval from the parent Institution for buying land for its radio stations.

005 J: ... For instance there is a committee on land acquisition, this is after everybody has agreed to it. We now have to go to the committee and get their approval to purchase the land. They then approve it and they will recommend it to the board of directors. If the board of directors agrees, it then has to go to the Board of Overseers for land acquisition and then the Board of Overseers sends it to the controlling board. It is real cumbersome.

In this case, then, the general manager is presenting to the audience his view of organizational hierarchy (levels/ vertical division of labor), and the position of the stations within this hierarchy with regard to the land acquisition issue. As a result of this, the general manager is also indirectly referring to the decision making authority of the stations within the hierarchy with regard to the same issue. To illustrate the point, Figure 3 shows how, from the general manager's presentation, a member of the audience (e.g., the researcher) may form a mental picture of the current hierarchy and decision making authority within the Institutional organization.

In the next example from the Hotel meeting it can be seen how maintenance manager (B) presents his view of
Controlling Board

Board of Overseers

Board of Directors

Committee on Land Acquisition

Executive Committee of the Public Broadcasting Stations

Figure 8

A Proposed Mental Picture of Hierarchy and Decision Making Authority in the Meeting of Public Broadcasting Organization

(Based on Talk Content in Turn #005)
organizational structure in terms of its rules, and how his view is countered by the acting manager's view (T) of the current organizational rules (Explanations are highlighted).

155 B: I have spent a lot of time up here on the weekend for the past three weeks, not by habit - by choice. And I have noticed an awful lot of food being brought into the pool area. and drinks being brought into the pool area by the membership. One group of people last saturday evening/
156 M: Friday evening -
157 B: Friday evening. They came in with grocery sacks full of food, and set over by the kitchen. Are we losing money? Is this allowed? [Maintenance manager is presenting his view of hotel rules: they forbid such behavior (i.e., bringing personal food to the pool/bar area) by the members].
158 T(Acting General Manager): We don't really have anything against it. [T is countering B's view by stating his view of structural rules].
159 B: We don't!?  
160 T: We could, but we are going to take what we can get out of it. [Now, T is acknowledging ("we could") that the rules referred to by B in 157 exist in writing, but they are not the ones currently observed].
161 B: O.K. That was the question.

For another example, in the Hospital's meeting of the Continuing Education Committee, after the committee approved a requirement, the committee head implied that the committee's approval is final, and the requirement is going to be in effect and implemented. When she implied this, another committee member stated: "Debbie said it has to go the Lab Administration for approval", meaning that the final authority to implement the requirement does not rest with the Continuing Education Committee, but with the Lab Administration. In both cases, the members presented their view of organizational hierarchy and authority.
Thus, the second content category describes the content of those statements, whose speakers present their views of organization structure (or an aspect of it) as it currently stands in their minds.

3) Members make statements in which they mention changes in organizational composition (i.e., who is who), format, and set-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency Reviewers: 1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topics of structuring corresponding to this category are: organizational composition (who is who in the organization) and spatial division of labor (who is where in the organization). In terms of dimensions of organization structure, they are: complexity (vertical and horizontal division of labor) and to a lesser degree personnel configuration, who is where. That is when the speakers utter statements with their content corresponding to the description of the third content category, then they are referring to/using organizational complexity, spatial division of labor, organizational composition, and personnel configuration. Two examples of this category were observed in the Social Work Board meeting.
003 B: ...As you know, with regard to the next item on the agenda, which is the minutes, we have a departure of Elaine as the secretary for the board...

067 B: ...I am now going to turn the meeting over to R. As I do that I wanted to thank all of you for your support all year...

In turn 003, the speaker (B, Board's chair) is announcing a change in the personnel composition of the board, and in turn 067, he is formally announcing that R is going to be the new chair. He is, then, stating who is not there anymore and who is replacing who (who is who). It is noteworthy that in the first example, the chair, links the name to the position title, i.e., person (Elaine) is identified in relation to board's structure, position, which can be thought as a reference to spatial division of labor.

In the Research organization meeting the head of the task force made the following statement:

050 SH: ...We have just gotten JW to (work on it), and we have no control over that...JW works for JS. He is really going after it.

In the above example, the speaker is stating who (JW) is doing what (e.g., a project) and where, for whom (for JS). Thus, content category #3 describes the content of talk in which there is a reference to a personnel change in the positions of the organization.
#4) Members make statements in which they mention an organizational issue and situation and then based on that ask for or announce the need for organizational cooperation and/or coordination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Reviewers: 1</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The topic of structuring in this category was interpreted to be organizational cooperation, coordination and integration. It means that in the content of the statements corresponding to the description of this category, there is an explicit or implicit call for organizational cooperation/coordination. An example from the hotel meeting shows the issue of employees’ vacation is followed by the call for both coordination and formalization between the units of the organization.

178 s: I have got a couple of things, and one is on vacations—we have been giving them (employees) their vacation pay before they go on vacation. There has been a little bit of confusion between accounting (and the rest) and it is mostly our (other units) fault because [inaudible]. When we have to put their vacation check through, if they are going to go on vacation on the 14th, we have to know the payroll before we have to double up the regular pay and the holiday, their vacation pay [the message of this sentence is that there is a need for coordination (note: "if" statements)]. On any vacation request, put on the bottom of it if they want to please have the vacation check prior to them taking their vacation. Write a note at the bottom of it [Formalization: what procedure to follow].
Some people want it before they go and some people want it after they come back...We just need to get it cleared up...It will help me if you put a little note on it".

As highlighted in the example, the content of the turn indicates that the speaker, because of the confusion in advance vacation pay, is calling for coordination between the payroll unit and other operating units in the hotel, and is announcing a formal, standard, procedure for putting this coordination into effect. In another example from the hotel meeting, the speaker brought up the issue of upcoming interviews and based on that asked another member to coordinate with her. Relating to the traditional literature, this may be seen as an example of structuring coordination through mutual adjustment.

136 D: I am going to be starting interviews the first of next week for hopefully several people here part time [the issue].
137 T: (makes an inaudible comment).
138 D: And Shawn - I would like you to stick real close with me - especially just into [next week] (the call for coordination). I think that once we get there I'll be O.K. It [takes two weeks] roughly to say. Other than that, that is it.

Thus, content category #4 describes those statements with content calling for coordination/cooperation because of an existing organizational issue.
#5) Members make statements in which they report on their activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency Reviewers: 1 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>22 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>15 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>8 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>45 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When speakers made such a statement, then it was interpreted that the topic of structuring was job specialization. That is, members by reporting on what they did are telling their audience about their job duties/responsibilities/activities. Usually, organizational members report on their activity as another meeting participant asks them to do so. In the following example from the hotel meeting, the marketing manager (for conventions) reports on her week's activity.

029 M: I (met) here yesterday with a man who I believe is from the convention bureau for the Elks. His name is John, and he had said the information that I had sent him from last year - he had just booked 160 rooms for four nights...He said he would call me back on Friday ... I showed him four of the suites...So November 8, he booked 100 rooms for one night and he wanted to book a December meeting but we didn’t have the space - we are already booked up.

The content of this example corresponds to the description given by the category, because the marketing manager is elaborating on her activity and a particular
incident which is required from, and is expected in, her job/position.

#6) Members make statements in which they concede to (acknowledge) the existence of an aspect of organizational structure by making a confirmatory statement in response to someone else’s assertion regarding that aspect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency Reviewers:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this content description any aspect of organizational structure was interpreted to be a potential topic of structuring, e.g., hierarchy, paperwork, channels of communication, positions, etc. Some of the typical content words that signal an organizational member’s acknowledgement (or realization) of an aspect of organization structure are: right, yes, o.k. The following example from the Research organization meeting should illustrate this category.

032 M: ...Isn’t Sarah a part of the problem? Doesn’t a lot of it before it came over from her office?
033 SH: Her office will see some of these as a last step but she is not in the Black Hole (a department’s nick name).
034 M: Didn’t a great many of the reports that came flying over here - weren’t they trapped in her office or am I wrong?
035 SH: I don’t think that’s so.
036 M: That’s not so?, Oh, O.K.
037 SH: She had gotten a bunch from Roger W. for one.
038 M: Right, she is the final administrator.
From the example, it can be seen that the speaker in the last statement (038) concedes to Sarah's position as the final administrator, and thus realizes that the flow of operation does not go through Sarah's office, but ends in Sarah's office. In the case of this acknowledgement, the topic of structuring is organizational hierarchy, or the positions of people and offices in the hierarchy. By the speaker's acknowledgement, it is interpreted that the mental picture of the hierarchy in the mind of the speaker and the audience (i.e., the researcher) is revised from one which placed Sarah's office in the middle of the operations, to the one placing her office at the end of operations.

Another example of this category was observed in the Hospital's meeting. After members voted for passing a continuing education resolution the following dialogue took place:

040 Dr. H: So unanimous (Sounding that the Committee's resolution is now adopted).  
041 J: Debbie said that it has to go to the Lab Administration for approval.  
[Note: this was presented as an illustration of content #5 (presenting his view of organizational structure)].  
042 Dr. H: Yea, We'll make the recommendation and say it's unanimous...

In the example, Dr. H, by saying "Yea" and using the word "recommendation" acknowledges that the Continuing Education Committee does not have the final word on this matter, and is under the authority/jurisdiction of the Lab
Administration; i.e., the committee makes the recommendation and the administration approves it. Thus, from listening to the statements corresponding to the description of content category #6, the audience may affirm an aspect of organizational structure.

#7) Members make statements in which they mention their interaction with other persons, units, and levels within the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency Reviewers: 1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When this category's description corresponds to the content of a given statement, then the potential topics of structuring are interpreted to be: position of the speaker, or speaker's unit, within the organization, division of labor, coordination of labor; channels of communication. Because when a speaker reports on his/her interaction with others, the speaker is at the same time indicating the type of relationship that exists between him/her and others. The following example is from the meeting of Public Broadcasting Stations.

147 K: I sent you a memo requesting permission to put news 610 decals on [vans]/
148 J(the general administrator): I sent that to Sue (the
marketing manager). They told me that they won't do it, so maybe if she goes through the marketing staff maybe it will just go through.

In both turns, the speakers report on their interaction with one another or another person. In turn #147, K is reporting on his interaction (i.e., sending a memo) to the general manager (requesting permission). From the content of turn #147, it can be said that, in their relationship, K recognizes the authority of J. Also, J, in turn #148, mentions his interaction with the marketing manager, and from the content of the sentence it can be said that he is in the position (i.e., hierarchical) to ask Sue to do certain things for the organization. The next example for this category is from the Social Work organization's board meeting.

017 B: ...We have the treasurer’s report coming up next, M? 018 M: There is not anything that is remarkable about any changes that is in our report. I did review it with B (director for the center), and there are several variations but there all things that fairly reasonable things...

In turn #18, M mentioned her interaction with the director of the center, which then in effect showed that there is an organizational line between her as the treasurer and the director of the center. From the content, it can also be interpreted that on the financial matters and reports, there is coordination/cooperation between the director and the treasurer. Thus, category #7 represents
the content of those statements in which the speakers talk about their interactions with other people in the organization, and therefore position themselves within the hierarchy or functional units of the organization.

#8) Members make statements in which they mention differences or distinctions between units and levels of an organization and also between organizational members as individuals and their organizational roles/affiliations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency Reviewers:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential topics of structuring for this category are: division of labor, locus of decision making and authority, and impersonality of the office. The following example from the Public Broadcasting meeting shows how the speaker’s talk content makes a distinction between two units of an organization.

163 K: ...But if we come up with them on radio, they are going to pop up on television.

The content of the statement in the above example makes a clear distinction between "we" as "radio" people, and "they" as "television" people. The topic of structuring in the above example is division of labor (i.e., the statement’s content contains a reference to the division of
labor in the organization). The next two examples show how distinctions made between members as individuals and as organizational members. The first example is from the Public Broadcasting organization board meeting.

101 D(head of radio): You can put a cement block building up in a day.  
102 K(T.V. head): You probably could (stressing on the word "you", meaning you as person).  
103 J(general administrator): You can put up a [] building in an hour compared to a block building. [but] YOU - [not the] INSTITUTION.

In response to D's assertion that one can set up a cement block building in a day, both speakers, K and J, make a distinction between D as a person (i.e., what you as a person can or cannot do) and D as a member of the organization (Institution) who is subject to the authority of the organization. The distinction made contains an indirect reference to organizational locus of decision making (i.e., centralization). Thus, D is being told how much decision making he has (e.g., with regard to the issue of building construction). Another example of the category was observed in the board meeting of Social Work organization.

100 M (a member of personnel selection committee): "Those are our four candidates. They are proposals for members of the board, and I would like to present them to you for your approval."  
[Note: The key word here is the use of word "I"].  
101 R (the chair): Does that mean on behalf of the committee?
The example shows how R, the speaker, is making a distinction between M as a person, and M as a member of the personnel committee. He (R) is reminding M that she is only a member of the committee, and she is not the committee itself. The topic of structuring here is, impersonality of the office, i.e., that people come and go, but committees continue to exist.

#9) Members make statements in which they mention feasible/ permissible, and non-feasible/non-permissible organizational activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency Reviewers: 1 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>5 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>65 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>3 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>73 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the statements characterized by the description of this content category, the hearer essentially hears a content about what can or cannot be done within an organizational setting with regard to different work issues. Topics of structuring can be labeled as: parameters of actions, indicators of actions, limitations of/on actions, feasible organizational actions. From the list of traditional dimensions of structure, formalization, seems the closest dimension captured by this content category.
That is, when a speaker is seen to make statements commensurate to the content description of this category, then the speaker is said to be using the dimension of formalization, if he/she is using rules and regulation, or other formalization mechanisms, to state what a member can or cannot do. The first example of this category is from the **Hotel meeting**.

059 M: Mrs. Smith (a client) made a comment to me about when the party 71 was here, when, she [said] the rest rooms were just a complete mess.
060 B (Maintenance Manager): That's overcrowded.
061 M: That's exactly what I said to her. I said when there are 200 and some odd people over their guarantee, I said there is no way in the woman's rest room that you can keep it caught up. I said we don't have the manpower to be able to stand there and clean up after these people. She didn't realize that.

In this example, the feasibility issue is concerned with whether or not it is possible to maintain the cleanliness of the rest rooms when there are special parties going on. In turn #60 the speaker reasons that due to overcrowding, it was not possible (i.e., feasible) to maintain the cleanliness of the rest rooms. And the speaker in turn #61 (M), underscores what constitutes an overcrowded condition - i.e., "200 and some odd people over their guarantee". Thus, the audience listening to these two speakers (e.g., the researcher) is hearing about one of the conditions that results in the inability of the organization
to maintain the cleanliness of the rest rooms (i.e., what can or cannot be done).

The next example is from Public Broadcasting executive meeting.

089 D: I would like to have this building up this fall.
090 J: I can tell you now you are not going to have any building up this fall.
091 K: [I doubt it too].
092 J: None. You know when fall is – two months from now.
093 D: December 21 is the last day of fall.
094 K: I would bet you a steak dinner that you ain’t going to have no building up. We just went through/
095 DI: We sure did.
096 J: It took two years to build a metal building.
097 D: That was a pre-fab deal.
098 K: What you are talking about is probably the quickest structure that you could get up.
099 J: And it took two years.

... 108 J: With the other you stand up big sections of wall rather than block by block and brick by brick.
109 D: If you had the right company they could put the blocks in one day.

... 113 J: You would be lucky to get all the blocks up in a week. If you have got too many masons working on it – you think about children. It is a quick building if people’s attention is on it. It is not as quick as a butler building. I’ve had butler buildings. The university that I worked at in Texas – their temporary campus was all butler buildings. I’ve watched them put those things up in 30 days – from being a parking lot to being an air conditioned building in 30 days. I have never seen a block building go up like that. This is size structure. Both of them are quick if you get the right stuff. The tie up is not in the construction. It’s in all the bureaucratic crap that you have got to go through to start the construction.

... 118 D: That sounds legitimate.

In the above example, three meeting speakers (J, K, DI) talk to the fourth speaker (D – see turn #89) to make him realize that it is not feasible to construct a radio
building (D is the head of radio) in two months. From the content of the conversation it is interpreted that the two factors of time, and organizational bureaucracy (i.e., the bureaucratic crap) are the impediments which do not make it possible feasible, to have a construction done in few months.

Thus, the content of the statements corresponding to the description of this category, contain structuring, in that, they refer to what an organizational member can or cannot do vis-a-vis different situations and conditions.

**#10) Members make statements in which they mention organization as a whole, and then mention different parts (units) of the organization and how they relate to one another.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Reviewers: 1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statements uttered in this way, contained one or more references to both the whole organization, and the units within it. The interpretation (of the researcher) indicated that the topics of structuring for this category are: division of labor, coordination of labor; organizational integration. The first example of this category is from **Social Work board meeting.**
187 B: The next area is the program and what we tried to do - Bryan and I put some general goal in here that fits with the mission philosophy and then in the background the program committee had a long discussion and I think the essence of what their discussion came to was that we should continue to focus on the kind of kids that we are currently serving and that we should try to maintain the current program mix which is the three programs. We plan to explore and develop new levels of service to integrate the programs for the internal production and productivity and external acquisition of resources... That also means that we want to try to do more with the peer support program. Those are general terms. The third point is that the program committee really has to link with financial development in terms of getting the message across and has to relate to the Human Resource Committee as well in terms of getting people on the board and the advisory board and so forth to assist in those areas...

The following describes the components of this content category as observed in the above example:

1. The speaker engages in talking.

2. During the turn, the speaker engages in elaborating on an issue (e.g. organizational current activity or future plan).

3. In his/her elaboration the speaker makes certain statements which deal with the organization as a whole.

4. In his/her elaboration the speaker makes certain statements which deal with the units of the organization and the relationship between them.

Another interesting example of content category #10 was made in the Public Broadcasting executive meeting:

234 K (Head of T.V.): Yea. I don't want people to get possessive over things like vehicles - and (I want them) start thinking in terms of priorities. What needs to be done by the organization. At times when there are conflicts
there has got to be priorities and there have got to be organizational priorities and the stuff like that. And particularly the first line supervisors need to help pass that sort thing - I hate to see people - Football is a T.V. project. But I'm trying to explain like I was trying to explain to Larry - It is really a project of IRTV station. That the mode of delivery happens to be on T.V. We tried Radio but there is a contract and so we can't do it for that reason, and the Institution says the IRTV stations and particularly The IRTV Television station should be doing this.

In the example, as underlined, there are occasions that the speaker mentions both the organization as a whole (e.g., IRTV), and the smaller organizational units (T.V. and Radio). In terms of structuring, the speaker's talk content contains references to: division of labor within the organization (i.e., radio and T.V. within Institutional Radio and T.V. - IRTV), organizational integration (i.e., it is not television's project, but is IRTV's project), and coordination among units (i.e., it is a matter of priority that television does this and radio does that, and it is the job of supervisors to coordinate and integrate different units of the organization).

### 11) Members make statements in which they mention time (specific/general) - as a frame of reference - for specifying the short-term and/or long term organizational activity of members and or units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency Reviewers: 1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When a speaker's talk content contains a reference to time, then the topics of structuring are labeled as: time schedules; deadlines; who does what when. In the traditional concept of structure, time is not mentioned as a dimension of structure, and the closest dimension that can be thought of is the division of labor based on time (e.g., shifts). The hotel meeting had many examples of structuring talk, such as the one below, containing time and scheduling.

192 D: This is a bigy folks. Set up (the room at 2:00), and at 3 they are meeting, and at 4:15 they will (have their cash bar gathering).
193 T: Is there any possibility they might want more?
194 D: I doubt it. On Saturday there is West High and as Cheryl says there was a change and a switch. I probably will not (be here). Somebody is going to be sure and taking care of the (group).
195 J: They'll have tables.
196 S: Oh yes. All the isles, I take care of those.
204 D: On Sunday the Heritage Bibles and (their affiliate) and WCI. On Monday WCI again next week. They will be in (Palm Room) and the Oak Room for lunch. They will be in their meeting from 8-5, serve lunch at 12:15 - room 745 they would like a ( ). And they would like soft drinks available. At 7:30 that night in the Ohio room b and c. It is pretty much as usual. They always are (here) at 5.

In the example, the scheduling manager (D) is referring to time in the form of days and hours to indicate what needs to be done, by whom. One observation is that activity of the members is being organized primarily based on time. The second example is from the Research organization meeting.

044 SH: ... Go over it and say look here is one - here is three that we ought to get out and see if we can nail this
down so that they can get the reports within a month.
045 M: So then Steve will generate the reports periodically
weekly? [Steve is another meeting participant].

This example showed that the content of the talk contained a specific reference to time (weekly) for organizing the activity of an organizational member (i.e., report writing by Steve).

#12) Members make statements in which they mention/propose the need for, creating a new, or revising an old organizational action (procedure, response, program, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency Reviewers: 1 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>19 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>5 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>3 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This content category was more often observed when a speaker made an action proposal, or recommended an action response, or invited people to propose an action. The topic of structuring was interpreted to be organizational action, e.g., procedure, response; routine; program; etc. This category is the broadest one observed. Other structuring content categories with various forms, and other categories under the other two sets of findings: strategies and patterns of structuring, were observed and interpreted to take place in association with this category. Many of the categories already discussed can be taken as, or treated as,
the sub-categories of #12. However, content category #12, while including many of the previously mentioned categories, still remains to be essentially different from those in terms of its primary focus. The primary focus of this activity is on organizational action. The content of the statement reflects a need for instituting a new action/program/response. When examples of this category were observed, the researcher's interpretation was that the speaker is calling for a new organizational action/procedure.

Due to its length, the example for this category, from the Social Work board meeting, is presented in Appendix G. The example is a complex one which includes the operation or manifestation of many other categories (non-content categories) that will be discussed under the next two sections. For the present category the content of the example involves an implication of an organizational action by the director of the social work organization (i.e., what is organization supposed to do vis-a-vis subpoenas from the court). While reading the transcript, it was the researcher's interpretation that the director of the center was bringing up the issue of court subpoenas in order to formulate or organize action with regard to the issue. Thus, the category contains structure (i.e., is structuring) in that it refers to organizing/structuring a future organizational action vis-a-via a given issue.
Members made statements in which they expressed their feeling of/about structure of organization, or an aspect of it, expressive/qualitative words/terms/phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verification Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Reviewers: 1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative (e.g., subjective) descriptions and utterances of the organization structure were usually made after the speaker had first made a more objective (more rational) kind of descriptive statement concerning organization structure. This category can also be said to be one with judgmental content. The topics of structuring are: the type of organization (e.g., bureaucratic); the feel or sense for the form of organization; the value structure and belief system of the organization. It means that the speaker's qualitative statements reflect how they perceive the form, and type of structure e.g., liking or disliking an organization structure.

Most of the following expressive words are already mentioned as part of the transcript excerpts presented so far. The reader may want to refer back to some of the examples as indicated below to observe the timing and position of these words in the excerpts (e.g., to observe the harmony or contrast between these words and the more
objective description of the structure). Appendix H presents the complete list of expressive words observed by the researcher in the core sample meetings, and by other reviewers in the verification sample meetings. Below is a partial list of expressive words/phrases observed across the first five meetings.

"It is real cumbersome" [Public Broadcasting]  
"It's hectic" [Hotel]  
"It's a pain" [Hospital]  
"It's an aggravation" [Social Work]  
"It's all bureaucratic crap" [Public Broadcasting]  
"Opens a can of worms" [Public Broadcasting]

Taking the first example, the general manager of the Public Broadcasting Stations expressed his feelings about organizational structure of the parent organization ("It is real cumbersome"), after he presented his (objective) view of parent organization's hierarchy and units to his audience (see the example for content category #2). Thus, it was the interpretation of the researcher that statements contained structure to the extent that the expressive words uttered by the speakers reflected their feelings towards organizational structure or an aspect of it.

Significance of Content Categories

Through interpretation, the researcher developed thirteen content categories presented in the previous pages in order to describe the constant elements of the content of
different structuring statements that he observed (read) across the five meetings of the core sample. Each of these content categories presents an interpretative scheme for interpreting the structuring content of talk turn(s) at organizational meetings. When talk's content is more or less described by a given content category, then the talk is considered to contain structure, and its speaker is said to be engaged in structuring.

The significance of these categories lies in what they represent with regard to an organization's structure. If a statement is observed and/or interpreted to contain structure, then it is reasonable to suggest that the content of talk is potentially responsible for construction and destruction, maintenance and change of organizational structures in the minds of people - i.e., if talk contains structure, it can result in structuring. The frequency results indicate that, in general, most of the thirteen categories were observed to exist, at least once, in every meeting included in both core and verification samples. The observation frequencies show that based on researcher's interpretation each of the content categories was found to be applicable to the transcripts' turns in at least two of the five meetings in the core sample.

In the core sample meetings, total frequency numbers for all categories ranged from three for category #10 (p. 165) to sixty five for category #5 (p. 154). However, the
frequency size of a category does not reflect the degree of a category's importance and significance in the structuring processes of the meetings studied, nor does it reflect the theoretical significance of it. All a frequency size shows is the number of times a category was found to describe the structuring talk content of a given transcript turn. For example, category #10 (p. 164) represents a viable and complex structuring content, and remains to be theoretically significant, despite its low frequency (F=3). On the other hand, category #5 (p. 154) also represents a viable but simpler structuring content, whose high frequency (F=65) shows that the meetings' participants more frequently engaged in structuring by reporting on their activity.

The applicability of the content categories were further verified by observation frequencies obtained from two other reviewers' matching of the categories (developed from the core sample transcripts) with the meetings' transcripts in the verification sample. Thus, results of the observation frequencies show that the content categories when used, as interpretative schemes, by other reviewers in reading other organizational meetings' transcripts proved to be applicable and useful. There will be more discussion on the significance and verification of the findings in the next chapter.
Strategies of Structuring Talk

The mere content categorization of the meetings' talk was not adequate or sufficient to explain the process of structuring. Because while the content of structuring talk reflects what is (are) the content component(s) and topic(s) of the structuring talk (i.e., what aspect of structure is contained by the talk), it does not sufficiently describe how the speaker presents the content(s) and topic(s) of structuring -i.e., what techniques or strategies does the speaker use to present a topic of structuring to his/her audience. To give another contrast between the two, while the content of structuring talk communicates the substance of structuring (the what of structuring), strategies communicate the form of structuring (the how of structuring). Thus, through the author's interpretation a second set of process indicator, strategies of structuring talk, was discovered to describe and explain the process of structuring talk in the core sample meetings.

In fact, the use of Green and Wallet's talk categorization instrument (See Appendix C) for analyzing and interpreting the talk had already biased the researcher to search for the evidence of talk strategies (see chapter 4). The author, through interpretation and the guide provided by Green and Wallet's instrument, discovered that in uttering the content of their statements, the speakers employ a variety of different strategies. On many occasions, the
employment of these strategies seemed to result in more harmony between different parts of the same talk turn, or between different (but basically consecutive) talk turns. It is assumed that the strategies were employed so that they made the presentation of the content of structuring talk more effectively.

The main pre-condition for discovering structuring strategies in talk was that the content of the talk should have contained structure - i.e., a reference to an organization's structure. Thus, based on the researcher's reading and interpretation of the core sample meetings' transcripts a set of fourteen structuring talk strategies were discovered. Table 13 presents an abbreviated version of the structuring strategies' categories along with their observation frequencies in the first five meetings. The observation frequencies of the strategies from the verification sample (observed by other reviewers) are later presented in Tables 14-16 (pp. 196-198). These frequencies will be discussed at the end of this section.

The following is an individual listing of all strategies discovered along with examples for each from the original five meetings. It should be noted, that while some of the examples of each strategy may seem to be irrelevant to the structuring of organization structures, they were observed to be associated with the transcript turns that were interpreted to contain structure. The main reason that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1) Seeking Support:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2) Seeking Consensus:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3) Giving Support:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4) Reasoning:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4a) Inaction:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4b) Inadequacy:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5) Upholding Organizational Property(s):</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6) Expressing (Commenting):</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7) Stating (Re-Stating):</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8) Interpreting:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9) Re-Interpreting:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Opposing/Argumentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10) Persuading:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11) Clarifying:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11a) Seeking Clarification</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12) Being Ambiguous:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Uncertain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13) Determining:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Directive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14) Naming:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Labeling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on author's interpretation

**Abbreviations:**
- SW: Social Work
- H: Hotel
- C: Hospital (Continuing Education Committee)
- R: Research
- PB: Public Broadcasting
some examples may to some readers seem to be irrelevant to the structuring of organizations is that, for the sake of brevity and prevention of cumbersome presentation, the whole context (more preceding and succeeding transcript turns) are not presented. The significance of the structuring strategies will be discussed at the end of this section.

1 Seeking Support (Confirmation/Agreement) occurred when the speaker sought to obtain the support confirmation, of one or more of the meeting participants on a given statement or proposal made by him/her, or by somebody else. The statement or proposal was interpreted to contain structuring properties - e.g., consequence. In the following example from the Hospital meeting, the committee chair (Dr. H) while formalizing the committee's action for setting up an organizational rule (e.g., content category #12) confronted a dissident member of the committee by seeking her overt agreement with the adoption of the rule.

036 Dr. H: Anybody against? J. Seconded it. (SEeks CONSENSUS)
037 BT: I'm for it. (GIVES SUPPORT)
038 Dr. H: What about you BY? (SEeks AGREEMENT)
039 BY: I am not against it. (CONCEDES)

To explain the above example, it can be said that while Dr. H is presenting her topic of structuring in her statements' contents, she is enforcing her structuring intention (of getting the committee to approve the new continuing education requirement) by getting the approval of
all members, including the ones who do not agree with the rule.

#2 Seeking Consensus is a special case of the seeking agreement strategy. Seeking consensus was employed when the speaker sought to obtain a group consensus (i.e., the dis/agreement of all group members vs. an individual) on a given issue. Seeking agreement was more focused on an individual than the seeking consensus. However, it should be mentioned that the two are very similar, and indeed one may attempt at both simultaneously (i.e., seeking one’s agreement is a pretext for seeking everyone’s consensus). For an example, see transcript turn #036 in the previous page.

#3 Giving Support (Confirming/Agreeing) occurred when the speaker gave his or her support to someone’s assertion, or proposal, by confirming it, or indicating agreement with it. It was observed that this strategy was employed by a speaker both as a response to another speaker employing strategies 1 and 2, and more importantly, as an independent voluntaristic voicing of one’s support for another speaker’s assertion or proposal. An example for the former case (giving agreement in response) is seen in transcript turn #37 of the hospital meeting presented above. Examples for the latter (giving voluntary agreements) are given below.
Example 1:
016 D: It's legal, but whether it's fair is another question.
017 J: It definitely is legal.

Example 2:
089 D: I would like to have the buildings up this fall.
090 J: I can tell you now you are not going to have any building up this fall.
091 DI: I doubt it too. (GIVES SUPPORT)

In example 1 the speaker in turn #17 (J) confirms the legality of the proposed organizational action - i.e., buying land for the radio station from the friends' account funds' without being required, or one inviting him, to do so. So J's confirmation of the legality of organization's action comes as a voluntary action. The statements uttered in turns #16 and #17 contain structuring, since they both deal with the question of what can or cannot be done (what is permissible, content category #9) for buying land for the organization given the issue of legality. Thus, legality is interpreted to be a parameter of action, i.e., "if it is legal, then let's buy the land, and if it is not legal, then we cannot do it". The statement in turn #18 confirms the legality of organizational action - i.e., "we do not violate the legality rule of the structure if we buy the land from the friends' account funds".

In example 2, the content of structure concerns the feasibility of an organizational action/outcome (content
category #9). In turn #091, DI by supporting J's statement (in #90) further presents to D (turn #89) that she, too, thinks that it is not feasible to get a construction set up within two months - i.e., interpretation from other turns of the transcript was that organization structure: hierarchy and the concentration of decision making are the main impediments to the achievement of D's objective.

4 Reasoning occurred when the speaker engaged in giving reasons, justifications, and rationalizations for or against an assertion or a proposal made by oneself, or another speaker.

The first example is from the Hotel meeting.

139 B: ...I talked with the building inspector about two weeks ago about the screen doors back in the kitchen. He said the best thing to do - believe this or not - have them installed by a company - because it is against the code to have a screen door swinging inside. Both of the doors that we talking about swing out. It would have to swing in. That is against the code. and against fire regulations. So what the health inspector is going to say about that, I don't know. But we legally cannot put screen doors on those back doors. I think what he is going to say is keep the doors shut.

The example shows that the speaker is arguing for an organizational action (content category #12) with regard to the installment of screen doors in the kitchen, and he is reasoning for their installment one way or the other because of the legal environment (e.g., building code, fire regulations, health inspection) - i.e., "we need to do something because the legal codes and regulations are
binding". The content of the above statement also partly corresponds to the description of content category #9, the permissible and non-permissible actions. Thus, it can be said that the speaker is referring to what can or cannot be done (#9) in the organization by employing the legality reasoning.

The next example from the Hospital meeting shows the speaker's reasoning/justifying for why an organizational rule for requiring people to take continuing education courses must be adopted (i.e., content category #12).

007 Dr. H: That's why we want to make it mandatory, because people don't make time unless they have to. You work your 7 1/2 hours of 8 hours and go home, right? Everybody does, I know. But if you have to - but if you know that twice a year - and that is only two hours a year - I'm sure that everyone can find two hours a year.

Two special cases of reasoning strategies were discovered from the meetings. They were inaction reasoning and inadequacy or insufficiency reasoning.

#4a Inaction Reasoning occurred when the speaker mentioned the detrimental consequence of the organization's inaction toward resolving a given issue of concern (e.g., an organizational problem), and then mentioned of the need for an organizational action response. The speaker's strategy here is to reason that since inaction in response to an organizational issue is harmful, then the organization should do something in order to overcome this problem. For
an example of this strategy see turn #039 in the example of content category #12 in Appendix G.

4b Inadequacy or Insufficiency Reasoning occurred when the speaker engaged in reasoning that since the present organizational actions, policy, procedure, method, etc., is not sufficiently meeting the demands and requirements of the organization, or is not adequate for fulfilling the needs of the organization and/or its members, then there is need for a new, revised, or different organizational action response.

5 Upholding Organizational Property(s) occurred when the speaker mentioned of one or more organizational property(s) such as: philosophy, goal, mission, technology, device, standard, rule, policy, norm, term, and then indicated (e.g., gave a reason for) what is feasible, or non-feasible, or possible or non-possible, to do in the organization, or what can (should) be done regarding the issue. The structuring strategy here is to use an organizational property for achieving a desired structuring goal.

The description of this strategy closely corresponds to the description of content category #9. The two categories aim at defining the same structuring phenomenon with one describing the content of talk and the other describing the mechanism involved in presenting the content. Moreover, this strategy can be (as often was observed to be) employed by the speaker in conjunction with reasoning strategy
(strategy #4). That is, for example, organizational rules are used as the reasons for why people cannot make certain decisions within the organization. The first example of this strategy is from the Public Broadcasting Stations' meeting with the occasion of the use of strategy highlighted in bold.

167 J: What I'm trying to do [is] accommodate what both of you are saying and seeing if we can come up with a design (i.e., an organizational emblem to go on vans and cars of both T.V. and Radio stations).
168 D: That is consistent with other vehicles. (UPHOLDING organizational NORM or STANDARD of uniformity/consistency, i.e., the emblems must be consistent across the divisions).
169 J: And that we can get decals made from that design (which is consistent with other vehicles) which will help you more clearly identify what you are doing - and the design stuff ought to be more acceptable on Institution's premises because we have already got that design... (UPHOLDING continues)

In the next example from the Research organization's meeting, the speaker(s) is upholding a ninety day rule for obligating research project managers to put the real reports through the clearance cycle once they have given out the drafts of the report.

009 S: If the public wanted them, there is availability.
010 M: That is correct. But they would receive them with the word draft - there would be the word draft built into the number and with a disclaimer of some sort inside that says these are tentative results - this is subject to change. Built into that mechanism would be - would allow a project manager to shove something like this into the clearance cycle only if he or she understood that they are obligated to 90 days later - within 90 days - get the real thing into the cycle. The whole thing into the cycle. They
would be nagged mercilessly. (He is UPHOLDING an organizational RULE/POLICY).

#6 Expressing (Commenting) occurred when the speaker expressed one’s opinion, or belief, regarding an organizational issue, or for/against a proposed action. This was observed and interpreted as the most common strategy employed by organizational actors. Given the common sense, all of organizational actors would express their opinion, and would make comments about the issue discussed in a typical meeting in an organization - and of course if they are asked to speak or they choose to speak. The following example from the public broadcasting executive meeting shows how the head of T.V. expresses his opinion to others regarding having a written vs. verbal agreement between their organization and another agency.

075 E: I think that it becomes difficult - anybody - if they have the authority can just completely negate something, but it becomes a little bit harder for them to do it in good conscience if it is written down, and if they do it all of a sudden they may have a reputation for not honoring things and in the end you are the head of this department but that’s it. You are supposed to represent the philosophy and the direction of the department. You are not supposed to be the dictator of the department.

#7 Stating (Restating) occurred when the speaker stated and restated certain issues, facts, and information. Sometimes, it was the researcher’s interpretation that when the actor engaged in structuring (i.e., when actor’s
talk contained a reference to a topic of structuring), he/she stated or restated certain organizational issues, facts and information that were relevant to the topic of structuring contained in talk. In the following example from the Social Work Organization's meeting, the content of the speaker's talk contains direct reference to the scheduling of board meetings (i.e., content category #11). The speaker presents/utters this content by way of simply stating facts from the past (i.e., what we have been doing in the past), which becomes a basis for suggesting a future pattern of meeting scheduling (content category #12).

205 R: In terms of other things that I wanted to talk about today - one would be the meeting date. We have over the years switched from day to day and time to time - whatever - in the last six or eight months we have been on the fourth Tuesday of the month. Obviously, at least it appears from the people here, that, that is a conflict. Is that generally bad for anyone?...

#8 Interpreting occurred when the speaker interpreted, that is defined, elaborated on an issue or a situation, its consequences, its meaning, its implications, by giving one's perspective (way of thinking) on it via one's words. Again the basic meaning of this strategy, itself, is that when the speakers engage in structuring by presenting their structuring talk content, their mode or strategy or presentation is interpretation, i.e., if they are discussing formalization as the topic of structuring talk, they interpret its meaning, its implications, its consequences
for organizational members. The meeting example for this strategy will be presented within the example for the reinterpreting strategy - the next one.

9 Re-interpreting (Opposing, Argumentation) occurred when a speaker participated in an ongoing discussion by re-interpreting, arguing against or differently from, another speaker's previously presented interpretation, or argumentation. In general, re-interpretation was said to exist when a speaker presented a different point of view on discussing an issue, or a solution to it, from the one(s) presented by the other speaker(s). An example for interpretation and re-interpretation took place in the Public Broadcasting meeting. The opening discussion was on the issue of land acquisition for broadcasting facilities. The speakers then began debating whether it is appropriate to use funds from a special "Friends" account, while actually the parent organization becomes the owner of the land. The debate ensued on land acquisition issue, as the speakers each interpreted the matter of using funds from the "Friends" account from a different point of view. The opposing points of view revolved around the frameworks of legality vs. fairness of the use of funds. Below is an excerpt of the conversation.

006 DI: You were talking about purchasing the (land). Are we going to ask the Institution to purchase that?
007 J: I would like to.

...
012 K: If the Institution doesn’t insist on the money (/)
Is that (right) that the Institution have access to that
land? If it is Institution land - I know the argument all
the time was division of (funds) of money. [The speaker is
interpreting the issue based on the fairness of
organization’s action].
013 J: Right now every penny in the Friends account is in an
Institutional account/
014 D: The Institution (has it) whether they could (use) it
or not.
015 K: I understand that. That’s not my point. My point is
that in view of the argument about division of money and the
Institution’s support, is it (right) to have the Institution
own land that may be purchased by moneys raised other than
by the Institution. I’m not talking about I claim this land
in the name of Queen Isabelle.
016 D: Its legal but whether its fair is another question.
017 J: It definitely is legal. [Turns #16 and #17 indicate
the two speakers (D and J) are primarily re-interpreting (or
are differently interpreting) the use of funds from the
friends’ account based on the legality of the action].
018 K: Yes I understand that it is legal but is there a
manuever? That somebody could purchase land - give it to
the Institution - hold it and allow Institutional property
[ ].

The next example from the Research organization’s
meeting shows how the speaker in turn #32 engages in
structuring by challenging (i.e., differently interpreting)
an organizational action proposed by the speaker in turn #31
(content category #12: proposing of an organizational
action).

31 SH: I propose first of all that ST keep this list up to
date here. This list of everything that is over there...
032 M: Let me challenge that. SAS - the sub-contractors-
they kept these lists for a long time and recorded when each
report went to the technical person and periodically nagged
them - just telling them to do it. Now I admit that SAS
doesn’t have the same authority and I also don’t think that
this reminding is an answer. The second thing is - isn’t
Sarah a part of the problem? Doesn’t a lot of it before it
came over come from her office?
[He is opposing the proposal made in 031 by arguing against
it, and by re-interpreting it as the fault of Sarah (an administrator).]

#10 Persuading occurred when one or more of the speakers at the meeting tried to persuade, convince another person to accept or do something. Usually persuading was observed to exist over a multiple number of lines vs. a single line. It was the researcher’s observation and interpretation that in parts of the meetings’ transcripts the members engaged in structuring by attempting to persuade their audience. An example of this strategy was observed in the Public Broadcasting meeting when three of the four participants (J,K and DI) engaged in structuring (i.e., the topics of structuring contained in their talk content corresponded to content categories #9 and 11) by persuading the fourth one (D) that he cannot get his construction set up by fall (i.e., what can or cannot be done).

089 D: I would like to have the buildings up this fall.
090 J: I can tell you now you are not going to have any building up this fall.
091 DI: I doubt it too.
092 J: None, you know when fall is - two months from now.
093 D: December 21 is the last day of fall.
094 K: Yea, I would bet you a steak dinner that you ain't going to have no buildings up. We just went through/
095 DI: We sure did.
096 J: It took two years to build a metal building.
097 D: That was a pre-fab deal.
098 K: What you are talking about is probably the quickest structure that you could get up.
099 J: and it took two years.
100 K: You are probably going with the quickest way that you could get a building up.
Clarifying occurred when the speaker clarified an issue, a situation, or a point, for another meeting participant. Usually clarifying took place as a response to someone else's request (asking) for clarification (recorded as $11a$ Seeking Clarification when observing and coding the data).

Clarifying was related to structuring, in that it clarified an aspect of structure (e.g., what it is, what it means). The two complementary strategies of seeking clarification and giving clarification/clarifying create an opportunity for both of the actors (who clarifies, and who receives clarification) to present or review their respective views of their organization structure. Thus, when an actor seeks clarification, he/she is essentially asking for the correct or commonly understood version of organization structure. Clarifying is the act of giving that version to the actor who asks for it. In the example from the Social Work organization's meeting, the speaker in turn #42 asked for the clarification of the meaning of legality and the advance notice time that courts give to the organization for preparing its relevant cases. B's response in turn #043 contains structure, since it refers to the prescribed response pattern vis-a-vis the situation. The strategy of B in 043 is clarifying the response pattern (i.e., what to do to remain within legal or acceptable bounds) for K in response to her inquiry in 042.
042 K: What's the legal - do you have to (have) 48 hours or 72 hours?
043 B: Well technically as R has advised us before you should present them personally - to the person in their hand. This is an accepted thing. Something you go to a person's place of employment and give it to a secretary and people usually honor it

#12 Being Ambiguous (Creating Uncertainty) occurred when the speaker intentionally or inadvertently appeared and sounded ambiguous to those seeking to commit him/her (the speaker) to a given course of action, or to get him/her to accept a change, or something new. Saying it differently, resisting being committed to a new or different course of action as proposed by others was accomplished by the speaker as he or she created (again intentionally or not) uncertainty by making ambiguous and unclear statements about the situation.

The example for this strategy is from the Public Broadcasting Stations' meeting. The issue in the example is that when the head of Radio makes an inquiry about using one of Television's vans for one of its programs, the director of Television (K) does not give a definite answer to his inquiry. Interpretation of the content of the following example indicates that by being ambiguous, the director of Television is maintaining his authority over the resources and does not share it with the head of Radio, i.e., he is preserving his authority over the situation.
207 K: ...If the truck is available, in my mind you can use it.
208 J: Is it available?
209 K: I don’t know. I don’t handle the scheduling on that truck.
210 DI: Who handles that
211 K: I don’t know which truck you are asking for.
...
218 J: Who do you contact? Gene? (i.e., regarding the truck scheduling)
219 K: I don’t know. I really couldn’t tell you that.

It should be noted that as observable in the example, it is usually over a number of lines that the employment of ambiguity strategy by an organizational member becomes apparent.

#13 Determining (Directive) occurred when the speaker determined what should be the case (e.g., the solution) regarding an issue, situation, etc. The style of the speaker using this strategy was at times authoritative and at many other times non-authoritative. The example below is from the Hotel meeting.

139 B: ...I think what he is going to say is keep the doors shut.
140 T: Make sure that they are shut in the afternoon.

The speaker’s talk content in turn #140 refers to the responsibility of a person for keeping the doors shut in the afternoons, and thus it includes structure. The speaker is also determining what should be the pattern of behavior for
the kitchen personnel (i.e., to make sure that the kitchen
doors are shut in the afternoon).

#14 Naming (Labeling) occurred when one or more of the
following observations was made:
a) The speaker used the official and formal (i.e., non-
personal) names, titles of individuals, people, divisions,
units, positions instead of using anyone's personal name.
b) The speaker used formal labels and names in talking about
an issue, or someone. The examples of this strategy should
reflect its meaning.

____________________________________________________

Hospital Meeting
001 Dr. H: ...So we give recommendations to Lab
Administration.

Social Work Meeting
1) 017 B: ...We have the Treasurer's (vs. Mary's) report
coming up next. Mary?

2) 039 BR: ...But from a management (referring to himself)
standpoint, you are sitting there with an employee (vs. you
are sitting there with Jean)

3) 041 BR (The program director): Well yes. It becomes more
of a problem when we are talking about our program director
(referring to himself; note: he could actually say "when we
are talking about my job").

Public Broadcasting Meeting
1) 152 K: I think that is going to open a can of worms
because as soon as my people see - they are going to ask me
about IRTV (Institutional Radio and T.V.). I think that we
are going to get into some things that we can't answer.
They have got a van down there and they have got News 280 on
it why can't we put public TV or whatever on it and then we
have got to go back again.

2) 604 K: ...Other ideas should be spilling forth for IRTV
days at the zoo. It should not just be a Television
project.
Research Organization Meeting

006 M: A lot of reports have been held up for long periods because other reports referenced in the original reports don't get through the cycle. They don't get through the cycle because it just takes a long time for reports to get through and there is the Black Hole across the street and we haven't ever solved that. And so/

Naming is an important strategy, the usage of which, was interpreted to result in a sense of more division of labor, more formalization, and more impersonality of the office.

Significance of strategies of Structuring Talk

The significance of strategies can be presented by the following statement. Without strategies, the structuring talk has content, but no form; strategy adds verve to the topic of structure contained by the structuring talk. It is assumed, based on the author's interpretation, that the actors employ strategies so that they may more closely attain their organizational goals. For example, it is assumed that when a person employs strategy #5 (upholding organizational property), he/she intends to present to the audience how that property (e.g., an organizational rule) restricts or liberates action in organization (i.e., what are the structure's parameters of action).

The frequency figures for observing these strategies in the core sample's meetings by the researcher were presented in Table 13. The figures indicate that except for strategies of, seeking support and consensus(#1, #2),
persuading (#10), and being ambiguous (#12), the rest of strategies were observed (i.e., were interpreted to exist) in every meeting's transcript at least once. The strategies were further observed to exist in the three verification sample meetings based on the interpretation of three other reviewers. Tables 14-16 show the frequency results from the verification sample meetings. The figures indicate the utility of strategies in explaining the process of structuring talk in other meetings and for other observers.

Thus, like the content categories, the primary significance of the structuring strategies lies in their applicability to serve as interpretive schemes for explaining the process of talk structuring. A more thorough discussion of the strategies of structuring talk will be presented in the next chapter.

Patterns of Structuring Talk

Observation and interpretation of the core sample meetings by the researcher still indicated the existence of a third mechanism involved in the process of structuring talk, which was discovered to perform the crucial task of alignment between different sentences of the same transcript turn, and between different turns of the same transcript—i.e., tying together a number of utterances made by the same actor or a number of actors aiming at the same structuring
Table 14

Frequency of Observing Structuring Strategies
Verification Sample: Church Council Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1) Seeking Support:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2) Seeking Consensus:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3) Giving Support:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4) Reasoning:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4a) Inaction:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4b) Inadequacy:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5) Upholding Organizational Property(s):</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6) Expressing (Commenting):</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7) Stating (Re-Stating):</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8) Interpreting:</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9) Re-Interpreting:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Opposing/Argumentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10) Persuading:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11) Clarifying:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11a) Seeking Clarification:</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12) Being Ambiguous:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Uncertain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13) Determining:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Directive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14) Naming:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Labeling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14a):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14b):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15
Frequency of Observing Structuring Strategies
Veriﬁcation Sample: Airline Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1) Seeking Support:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2) Seeking Consensus:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3) Giving Support:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4) Reasoning:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4a) Inaction:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4b) Inadequacy:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5) Upholding Organizational Property(s):</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6) Expressing (Commenting):</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7) Stating (Re-Stating):</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8) Interpreting:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9) Re-Interpreting:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Opposing/Argumentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10) Persuading:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11) Clarifying:</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11a) Seeking Clarification:</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12) Being Ambiguous:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Uncertain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13) Determining:</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Directive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14) Naming:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Labeling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14b)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Frequency of Observing Structuring Strategies
Verification Sample: Truck Stop Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1) Seeking Support:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2) Seeking Consensus:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3) Giving Support:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4) Reasoning:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4a) Inaction:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4b) Inadequacy:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5) Upholding Organizational Property(s):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6) Expressing (Commenting):</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7) Stating (Re-Stating):</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8) Interpreting:</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9) Re-Interpreting:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Opposing/Argumentation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10) Persuading:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11) Clarifying:</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11a) Seeking Clarification:</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12) Being Ambiguous:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Uncertain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13) Determining:</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Being Directive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14) Naming:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Labeling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14a):</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14b):</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
topic. This mechanism was then called the pattern(s) of structuring talk at organizational meetings.

The Green and Wallet categorization form (see Appendix C) was the basic instrument guiding the interpretation of the core sample transcript turns for the discovery of structuring talk patterns. The patterns of structuring via organizational talk at organizational meetings were observed/interpreted to be unfolded through a number of distinct stages. Each pattern of structuring was separated into, and therefore was identified, in terms of a number of distinct stages.

While there were actually numerous number of patterns observed, all basically followed the same overall form, or were a variation (or derivation) of the general pattern of structuring. That is, as the form of the general pattern was observed and labelled in terms of a number of distinct stages, the variations or derivations of that general form also included all or some of the same stages.

The general pattern consisted of the following five stages: Focusing _ Discussion _ Proposing _ Resolution _ Closure.

It was observed that in almost all occasions of structuring, the speaker focused on an organizational issue, and then followed it up with one or more of the remaining stages. In the complete form of the pattern, then, the speaker(s) focused on an issue, discussed it, proposed an
action response toward the issue, and then when a resolution was established for the issue, a closure was set on discussing that organizational issue, and the speaker(s) moved on to focus on another issue. Each one of these pattern stages will be described below and examples of each will be given.

**Focusing** took place when the speaker began to talk about an organizationally relevant issue, or theme, for the first time. The issues focused on were primarily of the following general types: a *current* organizational problem or concern; an *old* and ongoing organizational concern; an environmental pressure, demand, threat, opportunity, etc. Focusing took place as the speaker either made a *factual statement* of affairs about the organization, or raised a *question* concerning the issue.

**Discussion** of/about an issue took place when the speaker who focused on an issue, and/or other speakers present in the meeting continued to talk about the issue focused on, by elaborating on it. In elaborating on an issue, the speaker(s) did such things as describing an issue, explaining the reasons behind its emergence (e.g., occurrence), giving facts about the issue, and providing background information on it. Discussion was observed to constitute a large percentage of organizational talk at organizational meetings. Furthermore, whereas focusing was primarily observed to occur in single lines for every
occasion of pattern observed, discussion was observed to be at many times, a multi-line, multi-speaker, occurrence.

**Proposing** took place as the speaker(s) explicitly or implicitly proposed, or offered, an action response - i.e., an organizational policy, procedure, or routine - for resolving the issue at hand. Proposing was observed from the transcripts whenever there was a feel for an indication of one or more of the speakers making propositions, suggestions, for what to do regarding the issue at hand.

**Resolution** was reached when a proposal from the stage of proposing was seemingly accepted or adopted by the meeting participants. Resolution was interpreted to exist, when the speakers gave their implicit or explicit support and approval or rejection and disapproval of a proposal (from the stage of proposing) for resolving an issue at hand. Also, a resolution was said to exist whenever from the conversation it was felt that the audience had come to know the answer to the "what to do question" regarding the issue focused on. Occasionally, resolution was made on a temporal basis (**temporal resolution**). That is, when the participants explicitly agreed or decided to postpone further discussion and or resolution of an issue or a proposal to a (usually specific) later time. If there was no explicit or implicit resolution of an issue at hand, then it was labelled as a **non-resolution** occasion.
Closure, was observed to be put on a sequence of structuring action when one or more of the following took place. 1) When a resolution was reached; 2) when there was no more discussion of an issue after its resolution; when after resolving an issue, the meeting participants turned their attention to a new issue. In many cases, resolution and closure took place at the same time. In general, closure was considered to be the very last statements or words of resolution. If there was an occasion of non-resolution, then it was said that the occasion has no closure (non-closure).

While, in the above, the complete pattern stages were presented in an orderly fashion, in actuality the pattern stages were observed to be displayed highly disorderly, and more than once during the same pattern sequence. This disorderly display was especially true for the discussion and proposing stages. Discussion of an issue was observed to occur both before and after the proposing stage and also after the resolution stage. Table 17 shows the variety of pattern sequences observed in the Hotel meeting.

A number of examples of patterns of structuring from the core sample meetings are presented below. The first example gives the reader a more detailed understanding of how the analysis for discovering pattern stages was performed.
Table 17

Variety of Patterns Observed in the Hotel Meeting

Abbreviations:  
F = Focusing, D = Discussion, P = Proposing  
FQ = Asking Question While Focusing  
R = Resolution  
C = Closure  
RF = Refocusing  
DQ = Asking Question While Discussing  
RA = Answering and Resolving  
DA = Answering While Discussing  
NR = Non-Resolution  
/ = Structuring Talk was interrupted by non-structuring talk  
- = End of a Speaker’s Turn

| F/ |
| F - D - P - D - R - C  |
| F - D - D - FQ - RA - D - (P) - D - FQ - RA - C  |
| F - D - C  |
| F - D - R - C  |
| F - D - P - (R) - D - FQ - RA - NR  |
| F - D - D - P - D - R - C  |
| F/ |
| F - D - D - P - D - D - P - D - D - D - R - C  |
| FQ - RA  |
| F - D - P - R - C  |
| F - D/  |
| FQ - RA - RA - C  |
| F - D - P/  |
| F - D - D - D - R/  |
| F - P - D - R - RF - P - R - C  |
| F - D - D - FQ - P (A) - D - C  |
| FQ/  |
| /D - D - D - D - D - D - D - D - D - D/  |
| F - D - P - R - C  |
Hospital Meeting

021 K: If you have a calendar and it is posted and everybody knows that they have to have two hours, then this is every month. They have more than one or two opportunities. They have at least one a week – or so it seems anyway. This is in addition to the teleconferences. We are going to have a string of those.

022 B: May I make a suggestion? Maybe like 10 minutes before an item on that calendar comes up, isn’t there a button up at the front desk, you push that button and all the classes [are indicated on the screen].

023 Dr. H: That’s always done. When we have outside—because I start showing film maybe five minutes before and nobody shows up. I always do that.

024 B: I guess I just never recall hearing it.

025 Dr. Helen: Well, I ask Jean, and she said that she would ask Betsy to ask Kathy. Did I ask you Kathy?

026 Kathy: I have done it with something.

027 Dr. Helen: A couple of people and actually Joan goes around and hollers.

028 Joan: Yes.

029 Kathy: The other thing too is that these [sessions-films] are quickly available and you could set up for a lunch or something like that.

030 Betsy: Yes, right.

031 Kathy: If you are really desperate, they could be set up at noon.

In the example presented, Kathy is the main speaker who engages in feasibility structuring (content category #9). In line 021 she suggests the use of a calendar (computer calendar) to enable the members to learn about the continuing education meetings as soon as possible, so that they can spare some time to attend the session(s) and fulfill the two hour monthly requirement of continuing education. In lines 029 and 031, Kathy mentions more specific time alternatives. Throughout these lines the structuring pattern unfolds in the following general order:
1. The issue of timing continuing education sessions manifests itself as an organizational concern.

2. The current organizational action, or practice, regarding the issue is presented and commented on by the speakers.

3. Alternatives to the current practices are suggested by the speakers.

4. A closure may or may not be set on the issue.

The sequence was, then, labelled as follows:

First: Issue Manifestation (i.e., what is at stake? - the topic of structuring)

Second: Discussion of the Current Practice

Third: Mentioning of Alternatives (Proposing)

Fourth: Closure / No Closure

Conclusion (Resolution): The structuring results in the member(s) learning what can or cannot be done (feasibility structuring).

In the next examples the pattern stages are matched with the transcript turns.

Social Work Board Meeting

017 B: ...Looking at the standard agenda format, we have the treasurer's report coming up next. M? FOCUSING

018 M: There is not anything that is remarkable about—any changes that is in our report. I did review it with B, and there are several variations but there are all things that fairly reasonable things - things that we had talked about. We have not...I did not have a chance to ask you B about the item 18. miscellaneous - in our conversation we skipped over that. I didn't know if that represented anything that was/ DISCUSSION

019 B: That probably represents more a poor estimate of miscellaneous in the budget than it does anything on my part. One of those items that is just always hard in the
first year of a facility to try and figure out what the heck you are going to do - what to dump there.
DISCUSSION/(PROPOSING)
020 M: It covered a lot of things that we threw into the miscellaneous pot but I didn’t know/ DISCUSSION
021 B: We have been breaking the capital out on a quarterly basis...Now in this fiscal year our budgets are separated and there will be two separate reports coming out. I was just going to ask your indulgence until we got through in June here and rectify things a little bit better.
DISCUSSION/PROPOSING/TEMPORAL RESOLUTION
022 M: Do you have any questions on this? CLOSURE

Hotel Meeting
178 R: [FOCUSBING:] I have got a couple of things and one is on vacations -
[DISCUSSION:] we have been giving them (employees) their vacation pay before they go on vacation. There has been a little bit of confusion between accounting (and the rest) and it is mostly our (other units’) fault because[ ]. When we have to put their vacation check through, if they are going to go on vacation on the 14th, we have to know - the payroll before we have to double up the regular pay and the holiday, their vacation pay. [PROPOSING/RESOLUTION:] on any vacation request, put on the bottom of it if they want to please have the vacation check prior to them taking their vacation. Write a note at the bottom of it. CLOSURE (there was no more talk about this issue).

Hospital Meeting
163 B: [FOCUSBING:] And the other point that I wanted to bring up - I found out the tentative schedule for when the computer system will be coming in. [DISCUSSION:] It sort of seems like there is going to be a lot of tech time in becoming educated with this program. Right around the time - even before the computer is installed. It seems like there is going to be a lot of meetings and people involved and those people will be off the bench and so the benches will be strained to some degree. [Proposing:] I think that again this year we might just want to go with a few students rather than having more for discussion. We need comments. I think that it is important that she not do away with it as we discussed last year. That it is important to not have students at all because it seems that we have gotten to be too comfortable and we decided that we don’t have to have them all. I got a lot of feedback from every body and two wasn’t too much of a strain.
164 Dr. H: We can do that. Go with two. And then we’ll talk about having maybe one more. Because it is a prestige. Portsmouth was commended formally. You got that, didn’t
Besides the general display of the pattern in various forms and sequences, a special case of the structuring pattern was observed across the first five meetings. This pattern consisted of two stages. In the first stage called, focusing by asking a question (Focusing/Q), or Question stage, the speaker focused/refocused on an issue by asking a question concerning that issue (e.g., asked a question in order to receive clarification on an aspect of organization structure). In the second stage, called resolution and/or answer (Resolution/A) stage, a second speaker gave an answer to (resolved the issue in question for) the speaker in the first stage. The sequence of this pattern is, then, as follows:

Focusing/Question Resolution/Answer

There were numerous occasions of observing this pattern throughout the original five studies. Some examples are provided below:

Public Broadcasting Meeting
218 J: Who do you contact? Gene? QUESTION
219 E: I don’t know. I really couldn’t tell you that. ANSWER

Research Organization Meeting
072 ST: Would this include Markowitz fact sheets? FOCUSING/QUESTION
073 SH: We don’t have any responsibility for those. That was different ("division’s" or "place"). RESOLUTION/A
Significance of Patterns of Structuring Talk

The above excerpts should show the complex nature of any attempt at capturing a structuring pattern as the discourse free floats in the meeting. However, the five components pattern of Focusing-Discussion-Proposing-Resolution-Closure if seen and conceived as non-linear, reiterative, and cyclical at times, can be used to represent a complex and multi-speaker act of structuring talk. Thus, the pattern may be seen as an attempt at organizing the anarchistic activity of structuring talk.

Frequency results on observing the pattern stages from both the core sample meetings (interpreted by the researcher) and the verification sample (interpreted by other reviewers) appear in Tables 18-21. In general, the figures indicate that, based on the interpretations of the researcher and other reviewers, the pattern stages were observed to be applicable to transcripts' turns. The figures also underscore the significance of the pattern
Table 18

Frequency of Observing Pattern Stages in Core Sample Meetings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focusing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing/Q</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Resolution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resolution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Closure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on author’s interpretation

Abbreviations:

SW: Social Work
H : Hotel
C : Hospital (Continuing Education Committee)
PB: Public Broadcasting
R : Research
Table 19

Frequency of Observing Pattern Stages
Verification Sample: Church Council Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focusing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing/Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Resolution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resolution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Closure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20
Frequency of Observing Pattern Stages
Verification Sample: Airline Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focusing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing/Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Resolution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resolution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Closure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer 1</td>
<td>Reviewer 2</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing/Q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resolution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Closure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stages as another set of interpretive schemes for organizing the flow of structuring talk into distinct modal points.

The discovery of pattern stages indicates that the content of the talk which contains structure (the structuring talk) is presented to the audience through a varying number of stages, and speakers, during which the speakers focus on the issue, elaborate on it, propose a solution, agree on it, and move to the next issue.

Conclusions

From the results of the study two conclusions can be made:

1) The meetings observed contained structuring.
2) The process of structuring talk at organizational meetings can be described and explained by the use of three sets of interpretative schemes: content categories, strategies, and pattern stages. These three sets of schemes were discovered or invented, primarily, as a result of the researcher’s interpretation of the five meetings in the core sample. The frequency results from the verification sample meetings indicated that other reviewers were also able to use the schemes by matching the content categories, strategies, and pattern stages with the transcript turns.

Although the three sets of findings (schemes) were presented separately, they are all part of the same process and at many times they were observed as three highly
interrelated, and intertwined mechanisms of structuring, which were then separated only for analytical reasons. All three sets of findings become much more meaningful when they are presented together. The example from the Social Work Meeting in Appendix G presents the simultaneous working of all three mechanisms. A more extensive discussion of the meaning and significance of the findings will be presented in the next chapter, and outline of a theory of structuring talk at organizational meeting will highlight the significance of the findings.
Chapter 6

DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS: TOWARDS A THEORY OF STRUCTURING

Two empirical goals of this dissertation were: first, to show that the talk at organizational meeting contains structure, and second, to describe the verbal process of structuring of organization structures at organizational meetings by interpreting and analyzing talk. The results of the study indicate that both of the study goals were accomplished. In this chapter, the meaning, significance, and trustworthiness (i.e., reliability and validity) of each the findings will be discussed, and then, an outline of a theory of structuring of organizational structures at organizational meetings will be presented.

Finding: Talk in the Meetings Contains Structuring

Organizational talk at organizational meetings was the unit of analysis for this study. The choice of talk was made based on the theoretical and methodological reasons mentioned in chapters three and four. A speaker's transcribed talk turn was said to contain structuring, and was called structuring talk, if the researcher's interpretation was that the talk contained an explicit or
implicit reference to an organization's structure (i.e., the whole structure or an aspect of it). The results of the analysis of the meetings' transcripts of the core sample show that, based on the researcher's interpretation, transcript talk turns in the first five meetings contained structuring (see Table 10 in chapter 5).

The finding of the existence of structuring in talk has a simple yet profound and significant meaning. It means that some of the talk uttered by organizational actors at organizational meetings conveys a sense of structure for some of those who listen to the talk (e.g., the researcher in the core sample meetings). The finding is significant, because it suggests that meeting talk is a source of structure. Results of the verification sample analysis by two other reviewers (Table 12 in chapter 5), and the meeting participants' answers to the questions of the post-meeting questionnaire show that the finding of the existence of structuring in talk and its suggestion are trustworthy.

The verification sample analysis showed that other reviewers reading other meetings' transcripts were able to interpret that some talk in those meetings contained structuring. The inter-reviewer agreement correlations appearing in Table 22 indicate that the two reviewers had a similar interpretation of the existence of structuring vs. non-structuring for a large number of the transcript talk turns. All Phi correlations (Ferguson, 1981, pp. 420-423)
Table 22

Inter-Reviewer Agreement Coding for the Existence of Structure: Correlations Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1/CC</th>
<th>R2/CC</th>
<th>R1/TS</th>
<th>R2/TS</th>
<th>R1/AL</th>
<th>R2/AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1/CC</td>
<td>.3071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2/CC</td>
<td>.3071</td>
<td>.1408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1/TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2/TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1/AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2/AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Phi Correlations (Ferguson, 1981)

Abbreviations:

R1= Reviewer 1  
R2= Reviewer 2  
CC= Church Council Meeting  
TS= Truck Stop Meeting  
AL= Airline Meeting
obtained were statistically significant (\( \text{Alpha} = \alpha < 0.001 \)), and, for an interpretative and exploratory study, their size (i.e., \( = \text{or} > 0.1408 \)) is considerable.

The results of the participants' answers to the first two questions of the post-meeting questionnaires (Table 12, pp. 139-140) showed that, organizational members too, saw (or interpreted, believed) that the their respective meetings' talk contained issues of structuring. For example, 24 respondents across all meetings said that "coordination (cooperation) of work activity between personnel, units, divisions, and shifts" (item 1b in Table 12) was one of the issues contained by the talk in their meetings. For another example, 15 respondents from all meetings said that two issues of "specification of organizational rules, standards, procedures, and paper work" (item 1d in Table 12) and "reinforcement of existing work procedure" were contained by the their meetings' talk. Thus, from these frequency examples, and the frequencies mentioned for other structuring issues, it is reasonable to conclude that the members themselves believed that some of the talk in their meetings contained structuring.

The answers to the remaining questions of the post-meeting questionnaire authenticate the suggestion that the meeting talk is a source of structure. The results of the respondents' answers to the third question appearing in Table 23 show that the members present at the meetings
Table 23
Post-Meeting Questionnaire: Results of Questions 3-6

Meeting Abbreviations:

CC: Church Council Meeting
TS: Truck Stop Meeting
C: Hospital (Committee) Meeting
R: Research Organization Meeting
H: Hotel Meeting

3) Did the discussion of the above issues checked or identified (written) by you cause any of the following to take place for you - in your mind - or in your understanding and perception? (Check as many as applicable).

3a. Change in work relationships/regulations/procedure/format:
   (All=9), (CC=2), (TS=3), (C=2), (R=0), (H=2)

3b. Clarification of work relationships/regulations/procedure/format:
   (All=14), (CC=7), (TS=0), (C=2), (R=2), (H=3)

3c. Reinforcement of work relationships/regulations/procedure/format:
   (All=16), (CC=6), (TS=3), (C=2), (R=3), (H=2)

3d. Change in channels of networks of communication/authority/responsibility/decision making:
   (All=3), (CC=1), (TS=0), (C=1), (R=0), (H=1)

3e. Clarification of networks of communication/authority/responsibility/decision making:
   (All=12), (CC=6), (TS=0), (C=3), (R=0), (H=3)

3f. Reinforcement of channels and networks of communication/authority/responsibility/decision making:
   (All=17), (CC=7), (TS=2), (C=2), (R=2), (H=4)

3g. Change in procedure for coordination/cooperation among company/organization members:
   (All=6), (CC=6), (TS=0), (C=0), (R=2), (H=1)
Table 23 Continued

3h. Clarification in procedure for coordination/cooperation among company/organization members:
   (All=8), (CC=3), (TS=1), (C=1), (R=1), (H=2)

3i. Reinforcement of procedure for coordination/cooperation among company/organization members:
   (All=8), (CC=3), (TS=1), (C=1), (R=1), (H=2)

3j. Change in your position/role/authority:
   (All=2), (CC=0), (TS=0), (C=1), (R=0), (H=1)

3k. Clarification of your position/role/authority:
   (All=2), (CC=1), (TS=0), (C=0), (R=0), (H=1)

3l. Reinforcement of your position/role/authority:
   (All=4), (CC=1), (TS=0), (C=1), (R=1), (H=1)

4) Did you talk about the issues discussed in this meeting with anybody prior to the meeting?
   Yes: (All=14), (CC=5), (TS=2), (C=2), (R=2), (H=3)
   No: (All=11), (CC=3), (TS=3), (C=2), (R=1), (H=2)

   If Yes, did you come to any resolution about the issues prior to the meeting?
   Yes: (All=7), (CC=2), (TS=1), (C=2), (R=0), (H=2)
   No: (All=7), (CC=3), (TS=1), (C=0), (R=2), (H=1)

5) Do your company (organizational) meetings usually involve discussions on one or more of the issues listed in question #1?
   Yes: (All=25), (CC=9), (TS=5), (C=3), (R=3), (H=5)
   No: (All=1), (CC=0), (TS=0), (C=1), (R=0), (H=0)

6) Do your company (organizational) meetings usually cause you to change your understanding of any of the things listed in question #3
   Yes: (All=21), (CC=6), (TS=4), (C=3), (R=3), (H=5)
   No: (All=4), (CC=2), (TS=1), (C=1), (R=0), (H=0)
stated (believed) that the discussion of the structuring issues listed under question one, resulted in one or more of the structuring (structural) outcomes in their minds. For example, 17 and 16 respondents mentioned that the following two outcomes were respectively caused in their minds by the talk containing structure: "reinforcement of channels and networks of communication/authority/ responsibility/decision making" (item 3f in Table 23), and "reinforcement of work relationships/regulations/procedure/format" (item 3c in Table 23). The remaining frequencies for other structuring outcomes also give credence to the suggestion that talk is a source of organization structure by structuring (e.g., creating, changing, modifying, reinforcing) it, and by being structured by it.

Results of respondents' answers to questions 4-6 in the post-meeting questionnaire provide more support for the finding and suggestion mentioned above. Respondents' answers to two parts of question 4 indicate significant and considerable support for the choice of organizational meeting as the setting for studying organizational talk. The frequency results indicate that while 14 of 26 respondents said that they had discussed the issues of the meetings with their co-members prior to the meetings, only 7 of them felt that they had come to any resolution with regard to the issues. Therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that most of the respondents considered meetings, as
the arena in which talk contains structuring issues, and in where those issues are resolved.

This conclusion is further supported by the respondents answers to questions five and six. Only 1 person from a total of 26 indicated that his/her organizational meeting usually does not involve a discussion of the issues listed under question #1 (question 5), and only 4 of 26 respondents did not agree that their organizational meeting is a source of structuring (question #6). From this finding, the research explored the structuring talk for the discovery/invention of the descriptive categories of the process of structuring.

Discovery: The Content, Strategies, and Pattern of Structuring Talk

This dissertation research primarily set out to explore organizational talk at organizational meetings for the discovery of some of the micro processes that shape the macro properties of organization structure. It was mentioned that the problem with the current state of knowledge on the topic of organization structure is that the field knows a lot about the properties and dimensions of structure, but is shallow in its knowledge of the processes that result in, or create, them. It was also argued that even contingency theory, because of its preference for cause and effect explanation of the relationship between contextual factors and organizational dimensions is unable
to explain, and/or fully account, for the process of structuring. Thus, the dissertation research here was initiated and designed so that it can find some leeway into the unknown and relatively untouched area of the processes that shape and reshape the structure of organizations.

After numerous iterations of analysis and interpretation of the core sample meetings by the researcher, it was discovered/invented that the structuring of organization structures via talk at organizational meetings is a highly intricate process which is consisted of three (analytically) distinct yet interrelated mechanisms. Content categories, structuring strategies, and pattern stages of talk, were discovered as three basic mechanisms (components) comprising the processes of organizational structuring.

To explain the process of structuring, then, it is proposed that the process of structuring is set in motion as an actor presents organization structure or an aspect of it as the topic of structuring by choosing an appropriate content (i.e., words, vocabulary) for uttering his/her talk. The topic of structuring then may go through part or the whole pattern stages of discussion, proposing, resolution and closure sequentially and orderly, or non-sequentially and disorderly, while other relevant contents may or may not be presented, and while the actor may employ a number of
strategies for enabling him/her to achieve his/her intended structuring goal.

In the following pages the overall meaning and significance of these three sets of the findings will be discussed and the relationships between the sets of findings, as process indicators, and the dimensions of structure (as traditionally conceptualized), as the products of structuring, will be proposed and elaborated.

1) Overall Meaning and Significance of the Findings:

Geertz (1973, p.5; cited in Tompkins and Mcphee 1986, p.9), writes: "Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture [or structure for this study] to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning". For this study too, it was indeed, the rule of sense-making interpretation that resulted in the discovery of all the content categories, strategies, and patterns (or pattern stages) of structuring from the core sample meetings. Therefore, the fundamental and ultimate significance and meaningfulness of the three sets of findings, and their contribution to the field of organizational theory and structure, lies in their usefulness as interpretative schemes for interpreting structuring talk at organizational meetings.
The issue of the usefulness of the findings as interpretive schemes is in many ways the same as the issue of trustworthiness of the findings (i.e., are the interpretive schemes of content categories, strategies, and pattern stages, useful for the interpretation of other meetings by other observers?). For two reasons of: a) the prolonged engagement of the researcher with, and his persistent observation and interpretation of, the data (i.e., the transcripts), and b) the results of the matching of the findings with the meetings' transcripts of the verification sample, it is concluded that in general the findings of the study are trustworthy (i.e., reliable and valid). These two reasons will be detailed in the following lines.

a) Prolonged Engagement and Persistent Observation: Lincoln and Guba (1985) list prolonged engagement with, and persistent observation of, the data as two methods for securing the trustworthiness of the findings of any qualitative research. Via prolonged engagement, Lincoln and Guba maintain, the researcher should gain a somewhat native view of the culture of the people and settings that he/she studies. The prolongation provides the researcher with ample opportunity for interaction with the people under study, and should give the researcher an intimate view of the situation. Thus, through prolonged engagement with the
people and settings under the study, the researcher is no longer a detached observer of the situation, and his/her study is not without the necessary content and context.

While this research was observational and the researcher was a silent participant in the meetings, he, indeed, did not engage with the people and settings on a prolonged basis. However, the researcher was involved with studying the research data on a prolonged basis. Since the data was tape-recorded, the meetings became live again each time that the researcher listened to the tapes after the first time observation of the meeting. This provided the researcher with the opportunity for prolonged engagement with and therefore persistent observation of the same meeting(s) over a period of one year.

Moreover, since the data were transcribed from the tapes, the listening was mostly combined with reading over the meeting transcripts, which still gave more depth to, and created a new dimension for looking into the data of, the study. Thus, prolonged engagement with the same meetings, via both reading and listening, combined with persistent (re)analysis and (re)interpretation of the transcripts on a line by line basis, provided the researcher with the opportunity for extracting credible findings and themes from the data.

The following list of activities performed by the researcher, should give the reader a view of the degree and
amount of engagement of the researcher with the data.
1) Each meeting was observed for the first time (i.e., once).
2) Tape of each meeting was once listened to without interruption.
3) Turn numbering, and speaker naming and correction of the transcripts were performed by listening to the tapes and comparing both of them to the field notes. This proved to be a lengthy process, which on average resulted in listening (while reading the transcripts) and re-listening to the entire tape of each transcript three times. For some portions of the transcript coding, the listening rounds went over 5-6 times.
4) Reading the transcripts for analysis of the talk and developing the categories of findings. This was performed based on a line by line reading and re-reading and analysis and analysis of the transcripts.
5) Re-reading and re-analyzing the transcripts (line by line) for revising the categories.
6) Re-reading the transcripts for frequency counting of the patterns, strategies, and content categories.

Thus, it is suggested that the aforementioned activities and steps involved in prolonged engagement with, and the persistent observation of the transcript lines, have resulted in the discovery of the set of findings that are
based on the transcripts (i.e., the data) and are, therefore, sound and reliable.

b) Verification of Findings by Other Reviewers: The frequency observation of the content categories, strategies, and pattern stages presented in Tables 12-21 (chapter 5) showed that in general, three other reviewers were able to match the three sets of findings with the transcripts of the verification sample.

Table 24 shows the inter-reviewer agreement percentages and correlations in matching the content categories, strategies, and pattern stages with the transcripts of the Church Council, Truck Stop, and Air Line meetings both before and after the reconciliation of the matchings.

Before the reconciliation, the size of correlations do not render a strong support to the trustworthiness of the study findings (i.e., their validity and generalizability). However, it renders moderate support, because the percentages of agreement to disagreement matchings of the transcripts with the three meetings show that the reviewers agreed on a large number of their matchings. Once, these correlation results were obtained, it was, then, necessary to ascertain the source of noise and error in the matching of the findings with the transcripts of meetings in the verification sample.
Table 24

Inter-Reviewer Agreement in Matching Structuring Categories with Transcripts from Verification Sample

1) Correlation Results Before and After Reconciliation Matching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>− 0.1467</td>
<td>+ 0.6662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0000)</td>
<td>(0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>− 0.1245</td>
<td>+ 0.6868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0000)</td>
<td>(0.0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>− 0.4485</td>
<td>+ 0.1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0000)</td>
<td>(0.0000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Ratios (Percentages) of Agreement (Same) to Non-Agreement (Different) Before and After Reconciliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(998/2314)</td>
<td>(1950/2314)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Stop</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1001/2402)</td>
<td>(2015/2402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(923/3657)</td>
<td>(2377/3657)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PHI Correlations (Ferguson, 1981)
Three types of errors were considered plausible:
1) matching mistakes, such as wrong matching, wrong applications of categories; 2) different interpretations of the same text by the two reviewers (e.g., missing a matching; 3) definition problems, such as unclear definitions, wrong definitions, too narrow or too broad definitions, and overlapping definitions. To discover the source(s) of the problem in the agreement matchings, a reconciliation matching was performed by the same reviewers who had performed the original matching.

In reconciliation of the matchings, each of the two reviewers basically re-matched the categorical findings with the transcripts by re-evaluating the original matchings of his or her own and the other reviewer (see instructions for reconciliation in Appendix E). An explanatory excerpt of the reconciliation matchings appears in Appendix E. In general, the analysis of reconciliation matchings indicates that type one and two errors, mentioned above, were the main reasons in obtaining the negative inter-reviewer agreement in the original matching. It was also found that the type three error, specifically too narrow or too broad, and overlapping or close definitions, caused matching disagreements. But, in no way was there any indication that the definitions were wrong, or generally inapplicable.

Correlation and percentage results of the inter-reviewer agreements after the reconciliation were shown in
Table 24 and compared to the original (before reconciliation) results. The size of correlations (> 0.18) and percentages of agreement (same) to non-agreement (different) coding (> 64%) after reconciliation are considerably larger than the original ones (i.e., $r > -0.4485$; percentage > 25.2%) and the correlations are ultimately significant (Alpha = 0.000). Thus, in general, the results of the reconciliation support the trustworthiness of the study. The following discussion of three types of errors should provide further support for the trustworthiness of the study.

**Type one error:** Committing type one error by the reviewers is justifiable due to the overload of the number of categories. A reviewer was supposed to learn and remember and then when matching apply the definitions and descriptions of 13 content categories, 19 strategies and sub-strategies, and 9 main and alternate pattern stages, a total of 41 categories and sub-categories.

The finding of large number of patterns, stages, and content themes is not surprising, and is sensible based on two more and less established grounds: the ethnomethodological thought, and the high variety nature of the language. One of the essential topics of study in ethnomethodology is the actors' "sense of social structure" (Lieter, 1980). Mehan and Wood (1975) believe that "The structuring seems to describe a property of all actions".
(p. 185) [emphasis added]. They then go on to present a list of seven structurings that human actions commit. The list of seven is presented in Table 25 on the next page for it illuminates the theoretical meaning and significance of many of the findings. Basically each of the Mehan and Wood's seven actions underscores the fact that every action is structuring, to the extent that it maintains and/or represents, the social structure of a setting.

The variety and large number of findings is also due to the complex nature of structuring via organizational talk. The verbal structuring of organizations, like the phenomenon of organizations themselves, is a process with high variety (Daft and Wiginton, 1979). A few generalizations of the process would not do justice to a credible explanation of organizational structuring. The large number of findings (i.e., categorical findings) would be supported by "the law of requisite variety which states "that for purposes of control, only variety can neutralize variety" (In Daft and Wiginton, 1979, p.182).

Type two error: Type two error not only does not threaten the trustworthiness of the findings, but it also shows the working of the paradigm commitment of this study in action (i.e., interpretative paradigm), and gives credence to the assumption of the study which maintains that structure is "in there, in the mind of the person vs. out there, somewhere in the organization (e.g., in the paperwork
1. The structuring of essential difference: The structuring seems to describe a property of all actions. It claims that these actions paint a world that is other than themselves. In understanding this claim, does not the reading of the structuring exhibit the essential difference as well? The structuring is not a valid description of action if it does not describe itself.

2. The structuring of essential glossing shows that this other is a priori other. Action illumines an other hitherto invisible. this other is simultaneously exposed to have been there all along. the practice does not create the other. It makes it manifest.

3. The structuring of essential indifference The other and prior realm appears only in particular social action displays, but this realm is nonetheless displayed to be independent of such displays.

4. The structuring of essential openness points to the more than than itself that lies beyond any particular social action. A social action marks a definite space, but this space is not ever exhausted by that single action.

5. The structuring of essential pairing Every social action attests to the possibility of equivalent social actions. Every social action testifies to the existence of other social actions that would mean the same as it. This is the structuring of essential pairing.

6. The structuring of essential incompleteness The world that a set of actions manifests is never exhausted by the actions. Every action thus makes visible its own incompleteness.

7. The structuring of essential irony The first four structurings uncover a world that is other, prior, independent, and more than the actions that make the world appear. These structurings testify to a world that is definite, constant, and finite...Structuring 5 and 6...indicate that social actions are indefinite, inconstant, and potentially infinite...The structuring of essential irony attests to every action displaying this relationship between actions and the world...The irony of the relationship between structures and structuring is evident. Meaningful actions display themselves as derived from the world. The world is there, yet our reality work constitutes the world.

(Adapted from Mehan and Wood, 1975, pp. 185-189)
organizational chart; see chapter 2). That is, the observation of type two error neither boosts nor undermines the validity of the findings. It shows that, interpretation, as the researcher's mode of inquiry has been an appropriate mode for the study. Indeed, a fundamental assumption of the social constructionist or interpretivist paradigm is that social reality is a construction of the individuals' minds and social interactions and may or may not be the same for all situations and all times.

**Type three error:** In general, type three error would have been potentially the one with the greatest amount of threat to the trustworthiness of the findings, if it were found that most of the definitions are inapplicable, and/or unclear, and/or wrong. However, it was mainly found that few of the definitions for structuring strategies were either too specific or overlapping. Those definitions are discussed below.

Structuring strategy #10, structuring by persuading, was reported to be too specific both to the sample it was discovered from, and to the interpretation of the author. Reviewers found it difficult to find a match between that category and the transcript turns. Though the meaning of the category is not ambiguous, it was apparently not so applicable. For its meaning, the persuading strategy proposes that the speakers engage in structuring by persuading their audience to do/accept an organizational
action/property that has a consequence for organizational structure (i.e., maintains it, shapes and/or reshapes it).

It was the researcher's interpretation that this strategy well described the one structuring process encountered in the public broadcasting meeting. It also makes sense to believe that organizational members come to accept an aspect of organizational structure, or do something to create or reinforce the structure, once they are convinced (persuaded) to do so. Thus, even though it is true that the discovery of the strategy was from a few lines of the public broadcasting stations' meeting, it is nevertheless a meaningful and significant structuring strategy.

The overlapping definitions were reported to be strategies #6 and #7, expressing and stating. Reviewing the matching results showed that the two reviewers often differed in matching strategies #6 and #7 for the same transcript turn -i.e., one wrote #6 and the other one wrote #7. This difference cannot be justified by the overlap between what the two definitions refer to. Definition for strategy #6 refers to the statements of opinion and belief, and definition #7 refers to the statements of opinion and belief. The difference, however, can be justified by the overlap between the labels of the two strategies, and to the overlapping interpretation of facts and opinions.
Debriefing indicated that the two reviewers felt that the two labels of "expressing" and "stating" were overlapping and basically referred to the same thing, even though the definitions did not. Secondly, it was found that the two reviewers differed in their interpretation of facts vs. opinions when reading the same transcript turn. From these two findings, two corrections can be made. First is to change the labels from "stating" and "expressing" to "statement of facts" and "statement of opinion and beliefs"; and the second correction is to combine the two strategies and present them as one with two sub-categories.

As they stand now, the two strategies are two simple, but basic and vital, ingredients of the process of structuring talk. For despite the overlapping labels, and the difference between the reviewers in applying them to the transcript turns, the interpretation of the author and two other reviewers verifying the existence of structuring in talk (not the matching reviewers) showed that organizational members engage in structuring by expressing their opinion or stating facts.

The conclusion of this section is that the three sets of findings, content categories, strategies and patterns of structuring are trustworthy, and are useful as interpretative schemes for interpreting the process of structuring of organization structures at organizational meetings.
2) Ethnomethodological Meaning and Significance of Findings

It has been sufficiently noted before that this study is in part ethnomethodological. Therefore, here, the meaning and significance of the findings, especially the content categories and strategies, will be discussed from an ethnomethodological perspective. In line with ethnomethodological tradition, this dissertation celebrated the everyday life of people in society by studying structuring talk at organizational meetings.

Ethnomethodologists believe that the study of everyday life of people is important and necessary because it reveals the critical nature and mechanism of the very actions and "methods people use to generate and maintain their experience of the social world as a factual object." (Leiter, 1980, p.25). The fundamental premise is that everyday actions of people in society (e.g., talk in organizational meeting) contain and present a "sense of social structure".

To a typical ethnomethodologist such as Cicourel and his students, "the ‘sense’ of social structure underscores the idea that the social world as a concrete entity is a social product of the very way we look at it and talk about it "[emphasis added] (Leiter, 1980, p.69). Thus, for an ethnomethodological study, the importance and significance of everyday actions (e.g., structuring talk) lies in their capacity to enable "members of society [to] use the sense of
social structure as a tacit resource for accomplishing their
everyday activities" (Leiter, 1980, p.104).

From above, then, the content categories representing
structuring statements, in particular, and all of the
findings in general, are significant to the extent that they
contain or present a sense of structure in their definition
/description. A reading of content categories #1-13, and
structuring strategies #14 & 18 should indicate that all or
almost all of these definitions convey a sense of structure.
Two experts in the field were asked to read a list of these
content categories and structuring strategies and then write
if each of the definitions gave them a sense of structure,
and what is that sense. The results appear in Appendix I.
Those results indicate that for each content category and
structuring strategies #14 & 18, at least one of the two
experts wrote that there was a sense of structure conveyed
by it.

One of the experts noted, "in these [definitions], you
either use the word 'structure' or some word which already
refers to structure (for example 'coordination'). Thus to
say that is a sense of structure is tautology". It is,
however, no tautology to conclude that organizational
members convey a sense of organization structure at
organizational meetings, through making statements with
their content and strategies corresponding to the
descriptions provided by these findings. Thus, it is true
that tautologically, the descriptive process indicators (e.g., content categories) of structuring talk must refer to the structure of organizations.

Meanwhile, ethnomethodologists maintain, that the critical and full significance of everyday actions (e.g., organizational talk) would not be seen and grasped unless/until the rules and structures governing those actions are vitiated (e.g., Garfinkel, 1967). The following discussion of content category #5, as an example, suggests that the significance of the findings of the dissertation can be more fully grasped by one thinking about the findings in paradoxical and contradictory terms.

Content category #5 states: members engage in structuring by making statements in which they report on their activity. It was suggested that the topic of structuring in this category is job specialization/role formalization. A speaker whose talk turn's content resembles the general description made in category #5, is already engaged in a simple yet critical and significant act of structuring. Because it is interpreted, that a member by reporting on one's activity is preserving a sense of structure in one's mind, and in the minds of the other participants about one's expected organizational role.

For as long as the member continues to report on his/her expected role, nobody will be surprised and everyone will use the old structure for placing the reporting member
within it. However, if a member suddenly ruptures the structure and begins to report on a set of activities which are not expected of him/her, or which are not considered within his/her sphere of specialization, then the other members would most likely lose their sense of direction, would not pay much attention to what the member says, and would try to make sense of the behavior of the member. Thus, the example suggests how the structuring talk (i.e., talk containing structure) may or may not maintain a current organization structure.

In conclusion, ethnomethodological significance and meaning of the findings lies in their capacity to convey a sense of structure to their audience. Thus, the findings of the dissertation are important and significant in and of themselves, because the results suggest that they are the very verbal actions that constitute and reconstitute an organization’s structure. In this way the results and findings provide an explanatory mechanism for the relationship between the micro actions of organizational members and the macro properties (i.e., dimensions) of organization structure.

3) Findings and Dimensions of Structure

It has been already shown that the talk in the organizational meetings studied contained structure. In the previous section, it was also suggested that the content
categories and two of the structuring strategies convey a sense of structure, and it was shown that two of the field’s experts verified the existence of a sense of structure in the categories and strategies they were presented with. In this section, the sense(s) of structure contained and conveyed by each categorical finding will be identified in terms of the traditional and new dimensions of organization structure. Thus, in this section, the connection between the micro processes of structuring talk and the macro properties (dimensions of) organization structure is discussed.

a) Content Categories and Dimensions of Structure

In the researcher’s interpretation, each content category is a general representation of the content and organization of different statements that contain a reference to the same aspect of, (or the whole) structure. In chapter five, based on the researcher’s interpretation, the topics of structuring, i.e., the macro properties of structure, for each content category were identified. Moreover, two experts in the field were asked to review all three sets of findings, and then for each categorical definition to decide which dimension of organization structure it refers to. Both reviewers were provided with the same list of dimensions and their definitions. The list was borrowed from Daft and it appears in Appendix J.
Table 26 shows the proposed relationships between the content categories and the dimensions of organization structure (traditional and novel), based on the agreement between author's interpretation and at least one of the other two experts. Except for five categories (C4, C6, C9, C11, C13), the author and at least one (mostly both) of the experts came up with the same structural dimension(s) for every content category. This means that, in general, the experts agreed with the author that when a speaker makes a statement described by one or more of the content categories, he/she engages in structuring of one or more of the dimensions of the structure.

The proposed relationship between the structuring talk content and the dimensions of structure is partially supported by the results of the post-meeting questionnaire presented in Table 23. From that Table it can be seen that many of the respondents state a change in, or reinforcement of, their understanding of their respective organization structures. Thus, the conclusion here is that the traditional dimensions (e.g., the feel for them, their intensity) are the products of the words (i.e., the content of talk) organizational members choose to talk about them.

The same conclusion would be made for the relationship between the novel dimensions of structure (9-12 in Table 26) and the relevant content categories. However a discussion of the novel dimensions of structure will be relegated to a
Table 26
Content Categories and Dimensions of Structure

The Results of Author’s Interpretation, and Two Experts Matching of the Categories With the Daft’s List of Structural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daft’s Dimensions:</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
<th>C11</th>
<th>C12</th>
<th>C13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Formalization</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Specialization</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Standardization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hierarchy of Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Centralization</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personnel Configuration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Novel (Author’s) Dimensions:

| 9. Coordination & Cooperation | A |
| 10. Issue-Action | A |
| 11. Time/Schedule | A |
| 12. Value of/Quality of Structure | A |
| 13. Any Dimension | A |

* means that at least two of the three reviewers (author and at least one of the two experts) agreed that the same dimension is represented (contained) by a given content category.

A means Author’s designated dimension for the categories with none specified for it from Daft’s list of dimensions (1-8).
later section. Also, it should be noted that dimension #13 is not actually a novel dimension. Any dimension means that depending on the topic of structure (e.g., organizational rule) the speaker making a category #6 type of statement would recognize the existence of an aspect of structuring by affirming the existence/reality of that aspect.

b) Strategies of Structuring Talk and Dimensions of Structure

From the list of structuring strategies, only two, #5 (upholding organizational properties) and #14 (Naming, Labeling) have been identified by the author and other experts to be related to specific structural dimensions of organization. The remaining strategies are appropriately employed by the speaker for structuring any dimension of organization structure, and therefore they do not relate to any specific aspect of structure. None of the four experts reviewing the list of strategies (two for the sense of structure: see Appendix I, and two matching the findings with the Daft’s list: see previous section) identified a specific dimension/aspect for the list of strategies except for #5 and #14.

In the author’s interpretation, the strategy of upholding organizational property(s), #5, is a micro process that produces the macro product of feasibility set. In traditional terms, formalization would replace feasibility.
Both formalization and feasibility refer to the existence of rules, norms, goals, and procedure, which give structure to the actions and behaviors of organizational members. The term feasibility, however, refers to both formal and informal conceptions of an organizational member of what can or cannot be done in an organization. Feasibility, then, is more inclusive than formalization in conceptualizing a dimension of structure.

The review results of other experts confirms the author's interpretation of a relationship between strategy #5 and the dimension of feasibility (or formalization). One of the experts referring to Daft's list of structural dimensions (See Appendix J) wrote that the upholding (#5) strategy relates to the dimension of formalization. Results of the experts' report on sense of structure conveyed by the structuring strategies (see Appendix I) show that both of the experts reported senses in the line of the meaning of feasibility dimension. Both experts, essentially, reported that the use of strategy #5 results in the establishment of organizational norms (e.g., cultural) and informal rules. According to feasibility dimensions, these norms and rules in turn would give structure to the actions and behaviors of organizational members by restricting and/or liberating the range of their organizational activities and practices, i.e., by presenting them with a scheme of what they can or cannot do.
Naming, strategy #14, was interpreted by the author, and was indicated by the experts to result in the production of structural dimensions of: formalization, personnel configuration, division of labor (complexity), and social distance including impersonality of the office. Two of the experts and the author indicated that naming results in formalization of organization structure. The observation and interpretation of the meetings support this indication. For example, there was more naming in the social work organization than there was in the hotel meeting. It was also observed and interpreted that members in the social work meeting seemed to be more formal toward each other than the hotel meeting participants.

Naming relates to complexity or division of labor, because when one is using the strategy of naming or is exposed to it, one learns and relearns of the distinctions between organizational members and units by their title/name differences. Since the dimension of social distance is considered a novel finding (invention) of this study, it will be discussed in a later section along with the previous novel dimensions of structure (see Table 26). It is necessary to note that since neither the author's interpretation nor the review of the other experts indicated a relationship between the pattern stages and any specific dimension of structure, the pattern stages of structuring
talk will not be discussed for their relationships with the dimensions of structure.

4) Novel Findings: New Structural Dimensions

From Table 26 and the discussion of the structuring strategies in the previous section, five new dimensions of structure were identified. Those five are: coordination/cooperation, issue-action, time/schedule, value/quality of structure, and social distance. These dimensions are presented here, for two reasons. First, based on the author’s interpretation these dimensions were structural products of the content and strategies of structuring talk. Second, the author proposed these dimensions to be the results of micro processes of structuring (i.e., content categories and strategies) when neither he nor the other experts were able to relate those processes to a traditional structural dimension from Daft’s list. Each of the novel findings will be briefly discussed below.

a) Cooperation and Coordination

A familiar observer of organization theory may wonder about the author’s reference to cooperation/coordination as a new dimension of organization structure. Indeed, the traditional literature on organization structure and design is replete with the term: "coordination" or "integration" (e.g., Mintzberg, 1979; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967). Based
on the research procedure, this dimension is proposed to be novel because the list of traditional dimensions of structure (e.g., Daft's List in Appendix J) does not contain any dimension that directly represents the existence of (or the need for) cooperation and coordination in organizations.

Apparently, the literature does not treat the issues of coordination/cooperation - or at least does not use these terms to refer to them - as distinct properties of organization structure. Rather, coordination has been vicariously referred to through the presentation of other dimensions such as formalization, standardization, and specialization (e.g., Pugh et al., 1968). However, the question is whether this vicarious reference to coordination/cooperation does sufficiently capture the conceptual essence of coordination/cooperation in real practices of organizational members (e.g., verbal practices). Evidently the answer to this question is negative.

The lack of direct and unequivocal representation of organizational coordination was evident when the two experts relating the content categories to Daft's list of structural dimensions did not identify any dimension for category #4 which clearly deals with the issue of organizational coordination and cooperation (see Table 26). This observation was further reinforced when the other two experts (see Appendix I), reading the categories in order to
indicate the sense of structure in them, noted that a sense of coordination is conveyed by category #4. Therefore, while two experts' interpretation indicated the existence of a sense of coordination/cooperation in category #4, two other experts were not able to match it with any of the existing structural dimensions from Daft's List (see Appendix J). It was then concluded that none of the existing dimensions sufficiently captures the practical essence of cooperation/coordination in organizations, and thus coordination/cooperation was proposed to represent a distinct dimension of organization structure.

A researcher, then, may go to an organization, and ask its members about the most important parameter of action (i.e., dimension of structure) in their organization, and finds out that most of the members state that cooperation with other employees inside and outside their units is the most important parameter of action. For example, a typical response to the researcher's question may be: "we are told, almost on every occasion, that cooperation with other members and units is the first thing we should think of, and do, in performing our tasks and projects". From this, then, an interesting question is posed to the traditional researcher of structure: do any one of the dimensions listed in the literature (e.g., Daft's) represent this dimension of structure in the above organization? Relying on the formal definitions of structural dimensions, the answer is
negative. The closest traditional term that may come to one's mind is "mutual adjustment" (e.g., Mintzberg, 1979). But, even mutual adjustment is rather a process description of coordination/cooperation than being a dimension of structure.

In fact, students and practitioners of organization development have always maintained and emphasized the need for more cooperation and collaboration within organizations (e.g., Beer, 1981; Weisbord, 1987). Interpreting this emphasis from a structural perspective, these organization development specialists are in practice trying to make cooperation and collaboration as salient parameters of action in the minds of client organizational members. Furthermore, Kanter (1983) distinguishes between innovating and non-innovating companies based on their structural segmentalism vs. integration. In segmented organizations, a deep sense (or dimension) of vertical and horizontal division of labor shapes the actions and behaviors of employees. In integrative organizations, on the other hand, a sense (or dimension) of cooperation and sharing (of information) shapes the actions and behaviors of employees.

Thus, there is enough evidence from the research study itself, and some other major work in the literature, to suggest that coordination/cooperation warrants treatment as an independent dimension.
b) *Time/Schedule*

In contrast to the mainstream literature on organization structure, the observation of time structuring (content #11) is a novel finding. It was novel to discover that the factor of time played such an important and almost omnipresent role in the structuring of organizational structures across the meetings studied. In general, some form of "time specification" of members' activities was used by various speakers to organize the short term and long term activities of organizational members in almost all of the meetings that were studied. It was also observable that in some organizations time as a structuring tool was mentioned and used more frequently than others. For example, the hotel meeting was replete with occasions where time was mentioned for organizing the future activities of organizational members.

While there is some reference in the traditional literature to the impact of time/timing on the structure of organizations (e.g., Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967), until recently in terms of life cycle implications (e.g., Kimberly et al., 1980) time has never been a dominant consideration in the studies of organization structure. Clark (1985, p.36&38) contends "that time is a central problem for organizational sociology", and that "the problematic character of time [structuring] is barely recognized and the issue of 'organizational times' is almost unknown" [emphasis
added]. Instead, researchers (e.g., Aston group) have primarily engaged in studying the timeless properties of organizations, such as formalization. In this pursuit, researchers have neglected to "explicate the hidden, sedimented, politically significant construction of time structuring" (Clark, p.50) [emphasis added].

This study of structuring, like the one conducted by Gersick (1988) is not handicapped by the same neglect, underscored above, due to its empirical finding of time structuring. In other words, this study of time structuring is significant because it empirically shows the influence of time in structuring of organizations. The finding provides indirect and tentative support to the first and last of the following three usages of the clockwise time in structuring of organizations as proposed by Clark (1985, p.47):

. to provide a common organizing framework for the synchronizing of activities within and between organizations.
. to commodify labor as a factor of production.
. to transpose the organization into a "temporal inventory" of temporal storage containers which can be used in varying ways.

The suggestion of a time dimension for organization structure raises a number of interesting research questions. For example, it is interesting to know if timetabling can serve as a dimension for classifying organizations, or if different time structuring in organizations results in different degrees of organizational effectiveness. Are there some organizations in which timing does most of the
necessary structuring? What is the influence of time flexibility on the actions and behaviors of organizational? Should timetabling of organizational members become less specific, and more emphasis to be given to the quotas or results? As Clark (1985) concludes too, the relationship between time and organization is vastly unexplored.

c) Value/Quality of Structure

Another novel dimension is suggested as a result of the process of structuring described by content category #13. This category indicates that the talk content, the particular vocabulary of the speaker, reinforces an already existing, or creates a different, structural reality and experience in the minds of the audience, and therefore, shapes the subjective value and quality of the structure. Quality or value dimension of structure means the value-based, qualitative, view of organization structure held by an organizational member. An example should illustrate the meaning and significance of this dimension.

In the public broadcasting executive meeting, the general administrator explained the bureaucratic channels of the Institutional organization (the parent organization) and called it "real cumbersome". Elsewhere, in the same meeting, he referred to the structure of the organization with regard to solving a problem as having to deal with "bureaucratic crap". It was interpreted that the general
administrator’s expressions are of negative connotation and would produce a negative and bureaucratic view of the organization (i.e., the quality of organizational structure).

In contrast to the above, the speaker (in the public broadcasting organization) could have alternatively described the organization structure as one involving a lot of levels and steps in performing a given task, and then could have concluded that all these steps are necessary for, and helpful to the organizational members. Had he referred to the organizational structure in a positive way, then the suggestion is that it most likely would had created a positive view or image of organizational structure in the mind(s) of organization member(s). Thus, the mere expression of one’s belief and opinion in words and sentences is a critical action because "words may [do] create alternative experiences as well as alternative interpretations of a common experience (cited from Moch and Fields, 1985, p.85).

The finding of a value dimension of structure is further significant since it casts doubt on the validity of conceptual separation between structure and culture. Jelinek, Simircich and Hirsh (1983) propose that the distinction between structure and culture is primarily metaphoric, with culture, as the new metaphor, turning our attention away from structure, the old metaphor. However,
from a sociological perspective, if all actions are structuring by nature (e.g., Mehan and Wood, 1975), and if structure and structuring are the central questions in sociology (e.g. Giddens, 1976), then the appropriate route is to integrate the two metaphors or concepts, rather than turn attention from one to the other.

The two concepts can be seen integrated if instead of thinking and studying culture vs. structure, one thinks and studies "structuring of culture", or "culturing of structure". To separate culture from structure, is analogous to emptying one's body of blood, and still claiming that the two are alive, it cannot be done. Thus, the discovery of value structuring suggests that culture may be just another dimension of organization structure.

d) Issue-Action

Issue-action structural dimension, primarily related to content categories #9 & #12, is another novel finding of the dissertation. This dimension while presented as one dimension, is actually a representation of the possibility that the number of dimensions of structure can increase to as many as there are distinct issues to which organizational members should attend, and should find an action response to deal with them.

Issue-action structuring means that the members engage in structuring of the activities of organizational members
by singling out an issue and organizing members' action with respect to that issue. In simple terms then as a result of issue-action structuring, a given issue emerges as an independent dimension of structure in the minds of the participants. The issue dimension then would shape, and/or would be reshaped by, the future actions of the participants.

Thus, theoretically, and even practically, there can be a large number of issues surfacing in the minds of organizational members liberating or constraining their actions (i.e., structuring them). This finding, then, questions the validity of any claims to closure on the number of structural dimensions (e.g., Child, 1974; Blackburn, 1982; Blackburn and Cummings, 1982). Therefore, the question of closure on number or structural dimensions cannot be answered but by the specific organization in focus. The range, number, and significance of structural dimensions in an organization is determined through the process of interpretation, enactment (Weick, 1979; Daft and Weick, 1984), and verbal structuring of issues and actions by organizational members.

Furthermore, it is plausible to suggest that it is through this mechanism that the issues of environment, technology, size and others enter the sphere of organization and influence the shape of its structure. For example, in the social work board meeting it was observed and
interpreted that the director of the organization was raising the issue of court summons as a problem, and was proposing an organizational response to this environmental issue (see the example for category #12 in Appendix G). The director was making the participants aware of the court summons issue, gave meaning to the issue, and implied some organizational action in response to it.

In conclusion, it is suggested that an organizational issue when raised and discussed (and interpreted) would become a structural influence on the actions and behaviors of the members when they have to deal with the issue, its meaning and implications, in practice.

e) Social Distance

Social distance is another dimension of structure which is not fully accounted for by the traditional dimensions of organization structure. Social distance suggests the existence of an essential macro property in the mind of the individual, which should constantly remind him/her that there is a difference between you (i.e., the individual) as a member of this organization or this unit within the organization, and the organization and unit as a formal entity.

A paradox is involved here. That is, while a given person is actually a formative human element of the organization and the unit within it, the organization and or
the unit takes on an identity separate from and beyond the identity of any person forming it. This is possible, only as the individuals construct (or are reminded to construct) a sense of social distance between themselves and the organizations they interact with. From the research, naming strategy primarily and content category #8 were interpreted by the researcher and were indicated by the experts to produce a sense of social distance.

Social distance is constructed between an individual and the following organizational properties: 1) the individual’s position and title, i.e., the position and title stay, but you may go any time, e.g., now comes the "treasurer's report; 2) the individual’s operating unit, e.g., "this not your report, this is purchasing committee’s report"; 3) the individual’s superiors, e.g., "when you write memos to Mr. Novak, do not forget to address him by his title, vice-president", or "we are not employees and employers, we are all associates here"; 4) the organization, "you are an individual who can do many things, but you are not the organization, the organization is very slow and wants to take its time, when it should make decisions".

This dimension is of profound importance, since it makes a critical distinction between the members as individual persons and their position titles, organizations and units. For an individual the existence of a sense of social structure makes his/her organization, unit, office,
and position an *impersonal* entity (e.g., Weber, 1946). They work in their positions and organizations, but they are not their positions and organizations. There is distance between who they are and what their positions and organizations are. Thus, the reality of social distance in the minds of people, is one major reason for organizations and positions outliving their occupants.

The findings suggest that naming is the most basic and obvious device in constructing a sense of social distance in organizational members. Paradoxically, while naming constructs a sense of social distance for individuals, it (e.g., a name) also gravitates them toward representing the assigned name, or living up to the name. From a psychological point of view, Harre’ (1978) proposes that one’s personality is, at least partially, shaped as one strives to live up to a designated name. Thus, it is suggested here, that organizational naming results in a mental separation between the member and the name (i.e., results in micro/macro distinction), while impelling the member to represent the name, and not himself/herself (i.e., personal vs. impersonal and/or formal vs. informal distinction). Indeed, practically, the naming device is the basic implementation device for dividing the labor into different forms of structure. Without the availability of a "naming" device, it is extremely difficult for organizations to instill a sense of new structure in the minds of their
members. For example, in a structural shift from functional to product divisionalization, an organizational member’s primary device for creating a sense of distinction between the old and new structure is the change of division names (e.g., from being an employee of Finance department to being an employee of Software division). Thus, the new departmental name becomes a tangible symbol to shift one’s loyalty from the old set-up to the new one. The new name represents a mental anchorage point for developing a new loyalty.

In the remaining part of this chapter, the dissertation findings will be discussed for other relevant issues that have not been covered above.

5) Findings: Proactive vs. Reactive Structuring Strategies

Another novel aspect of the study was its discovery of many structuring strategies which point out the proactive nature of the members’ activities. That is, the study showed that the members actively engage in (re)shaping the structure of their organizations, when they employ a certain number of structuring strategies. The finding of the proactive undertaking of certain actions by organization members is actually compared to the finding of the reactive undertaking of actions with similar meaning or consequence.

For example, seeking confirmation (or support or approval) is considered a proactive action, while giving
confirmation and support or approval is considered a reactive structuring response. On the other hand, the act of confirming without one asking for it is being seen as another example of proactive action strategy.

A study by Frost and Morgan (1983) shows the relevance of confirming as a proactive structuring action. "This analysis of activity [of talk] at the meeting suggests that 'a reality' is defined by those members taking a lead in the discussion, and is then endorsed [proactively or reactively; emphasis added] in varying degrees by others present (p.217)". They continue: "We find important roles being played by the presenter and the informal chairperson in structuring the form and content of discussion. They articulated ideas about a structure of organizational symbolism which had meaning for them. Once these ideas had been made explicit, many other people in the session then reconstituted the structure to shape understanding of their own concerns." (p.224).

While there are some of the structuring strategies that are more closely relevant to the topic of organization structuring (#5, and #14), all the remaining strategies are general speech acts that are nonetheless indispensable for the completion of structuring acts, and the accomplishment of structuring goals. Stubbs (1983, p.189) writing on the meaning and importance of speech acts (from a general perspective) states:
alignment, convergence, and endorsement are important for another reason. They deal directly with interaction and communication between speakers. That is, they deal directly with signals of when speakers think they are on the same wavelength (cf. chap.3). This involves serving the meta-interactional function of accepting utterances into the ongoing discourse. Also, endorsements are a way in which mini-topics are established, sustained and defined for a speech event. What endorsements do is ratify or legitimate particular points, to help to ensure that remarks do not slip by unnoticed. To say that’s a point is explicitly to define a contribution as being relevant and worth talking about.

Thus, it is suggested here, that the structuring strategies discovered have profound impact upon the eventual formation of structure and or its dimensions in the minds of participants, who may employ the strategies proactively and/or reactively.

6) Findings: Patterns of Talk and Structuring

The discovery of patterns showed the talk stages that organizational members go through for structuring of organization structures at organizational meetings. This discovery highlights the fact that the structuring of organization structures via organizational talk takes place through the micro processes (pattern stages) of focusing, discussing, proposing, resolving, and setting closure, asking questions and giving answers.

A complete pattern stages sequence was considered to be the one beginning with focusing and ending with closure, with discussing, proposing, and resolving in between. Not all the talk in the meetings were observed and interpreted
to follow the complete sequence of the pattern stages. Organizational meetings also differed with respect to the frequency of displaying one or more pattern stages. For example, it was observed that more issue action structuring via extended periods and large frequencies of discussion took place in the public broadcasting executive meeting than in the hotel meeting.

The observation of differences between meetings in following the complete vs. part pattern, and displaying vs. not displaying question and answer pattern, brings up an important future research question. The question also highlights the significance of the talk patterns to the study of organizational structuring. The question is: Does the difference between organizations in following the pattern stages, and the frequency of displaying the pattern stages and question-answer pattern, result in the creation and maintenance of qualitatively (e.g., innovativeness) and quantitatively (i.e., the number of dimensions) different organizational structures?

The findings showed that the structuring talk consisted of pattern stages. However, despite their necessity for, and relevance to the structuring of organization structure, the pattern stages are in the first place the pattern stages of talk. This statement is not surprising since the instrumental aid (Green and Wallet's in Appendix C) used for
tapping into the pattern stages of talk has been used by the educational researchers, in educational settings.

The existence and significance of talk patterns, in general, is recognized discourse analysts such as Stubbs (1983). He argues: "that conversation is polysystemic: that is, its coherence depends on several quite different types of mechanisms such as repetition of words and phrases, structural makers, fine synchronization in time, and an underlying hierarchic structure relating sequences of discourse acts." (p.10). And more specifically he mentions that some speech acts"...therefore have to do with local organization of sequences of utterances: initiations which require responses, [beginning, exchange structure, ending, etc.] and the like." (p.149).

Despite the fact that pattern stages of talk are basically the same from setting to setting, their emergent and dominant sequence and intensity of use varies from setting to setting. For example, Mehan (1978) studies the process of structuring school structure by noting that the process of schooling has not been investigated by school researchers and instead "The school has, in effect, been treated as a 'black box' between input and output factors" (p.34). From his study Mehan finds the three stage structuring pattern of: Initiation-Reply-Evaluation, as his predominant observation. The following is an example of this pattern (p.41):
A comparison between Mehan's pattern of schooling and the general pattern discovered by this dissertation research shows both similarity and difference. The two are basically similar in including similar pattern stages (e.g., Initiation and Focusing). The two are different with regard to the number of stages observed and the their sequence. In conclusion, while the patterns of structuring talk are similar to the general patterns of talk, they are particularly meaningful in the context of organizational meetings.

7) Findings and Reproduction of Organization Structure: An Interpretation based on Giddens' Structuration

Many of the content categories, and structuring strategies discovered describe the processes that result in the maintenance and reinforcement, rather than the change or modification of an organization structure. It was interpreted that most of the content categories and structuring strategies result in the reproduction of organization form and structure. In the following pages,
Giddens' work on structuration will be presented for interpreting and justifying the reproductive nature of the findings (process indicators) of the dissertation.

Giddens' work is supportive of the findings of this dissertation in two ways. First for its argument of intentionality of human actions; and second for the essence of his theory of structuration: "the duality of structure". In describing his theory, Giddens (1976, 1979, 1984) criticizes all of the previous sociological accounts of social structure including the phenomenological and ethnomethodological theories for their negligence of the centrality of intentionality in the conduct of human actions and the creation and recreation of social structure. "The theory of structuration begins from an absence: the lack of a theory of action in social sciences." (Giddens, 1979, p.2).

Giddens' intentionality argument states that when people act they do not act in vain, merely for the sake of doing something without any purpose. People act in order to accomplish something from their action. Giddens considers this action as "praxis - the involvement of actors with the practical realization of interests" (1976, p.53). To the actor what is accomplished or realized is not necessarily a change or no change in structure; it is, however, something that regardless of its nature reinforces or changes the prevailing social structure. In this manner, then, one can
see why so many different actions, and strategies are labeled as structuring categories and patterns. A discussion of structuration should elucidate this argument further.

Giddens defines structuration as "the constitution of social life as the production of active subjects." (1976, p.120). Of central interest to Giddens is accounting for the process of social reproduction. Giddens argues:

The proper locus for the study of social reproduction is in the immediate process of the constituting of interaction [original emphasis]. On the other hand, just as every sentence in English expresses within itself the totality which the 'language' as a whole, so every interaction bears the imprint of the global society: This is why there is a definite point to the analysis of 'everyday life' as a phenomenon of the totality" [emphasis added]. (1976, p.122).

In this everyday reproduction of social structures (e.g., organization structures) via 'everyday life' - e.g., in organizational meetings - the structure itself is both constituted and constitutive. In structuration terminology this double property of structure is called "duality of structure". "By the duality of structure I mean that social structures are both constituted by human agency, and yet at the same time are the very medium of this constitution." (1976, 121). Thus, according to Giddens a sense of structure is present and manifests itself in any structuring attempt of the social participants. From this, then, it should not be surprising that, most of the observations made throughout the meetings and the patterns and categories
constructed for explaining them mainly showed the process of reproduction of structure (i.e., restructuring) rather than the total creation of a new structure (i.e., de novo structure).

Compatible with Giddens theorizing, a plausible theoretical proposition follows: The process of the structuring of organization structures is primarily restructuring, that is the reproduction of an already existing structure. In this way the production of different, and new, organization structures is incremental; that is in most structuring attempts a pre-existing structure serves - is used - as the basic framework from which changes are made incrementally.

This conclusion does not in any way weaken the worth of the study. It just gives support to the pre-dominant nature of structuring as it was observed in the research, and it also indirectly points to the fact that de novo structuring is a rare occurrence in organizations, which may by itself explain the lack of innovation in many organizations. So far Giddens' work has been discussed in terms of its support for the general nature and the overall findings of the study. Giddens' structuration can be also used for supporting some of the specific findings of the study. One of those specific findings was the structuring action/strategy of naming - i.e., structuring via naming and
labeling. The concept of duality of structure can render credence to this finding.

It was said that naming / labeling is a strategy via which organizational actors create, and recreate (reproduce) division of labor (specialization), organizational integration, and social distance between the person and his/her organizational title and divisional affiliation (i.e., impersonality of the office). In the social work organization for example the program director used the labels "management" and "employee" and "program director", which clearly reproduced an already divided labor (management vs. employee) in his mind and in the minds of others present, and also organized the hierarchy of the organization in terms of the importance of its occupants (i.e., management occupies a higher position than the employee, and the management job is much more important than non-management). The point is that the director resorted to the strategy of naming while he was attempting to structure a new organizational response to the environment (i.e., court). Below is an excerpt of his talk:

039 B(Director of the organization): ...the only other item that I want to bring up is that the enhancement subpoenas are beginning to be a pain...from a management standpoint you are sitting there with an employee talking about the things that happened and she gets a call from court and says get down here and you are going to testify and in fact she wasn’t even given advance notice...The case workers aren’t so bad but Rose is a management person who I need and we are continually talking...

040 J: I object to it with the case workers too.
041 B (Director): Well yes. It becomes more of a problem when we are talking about our program director

The naming strategy employed above can be better seen and felt and if one notices that the director could in fact, in many of the above occasions substitute a person's name for the position title or the general label used (e.g., in line 041 saying my job vs. our program director). In terms of Giddens structuration the example above (naming strategy) shows the operation of communication and signification. For in structuration structure is analytically decomposed into a duality of interaction and structure which are mediated by the modalities of structure (see Figure 1 in chapter 1).

Giddens (1976, p.122) writes: "the communication of meaning in interaction involves the use of interpretative schemes by means of which sense is made by participants of what each says and does. The application of such cognitive schemes, within a framework of mutual knowledge, depends upon and draws from a 'cognitive order' which is shared by a community; but while drawing upon such cognitive order the application of interpretative schemes at the same time reconstitutes that order." From this, it can be said that at the interaction level B (the director) is talking about an organizational issue, in which he uses the interpretative scheme of a management position and time and responsibility and he contrasts it with that of an employee or a case worker in order to enable the participants to make sense of
the situation. The interpretative scheme used by the director is one which is already a commonly shared signification of organization structure (management, employee, program director as acceptable signs). By using this signification as part of his interpretative scheme in his communication with organizational members, the director is enabling the participants to relate to what he is talking about and he is also reconstituting the signification structure by reproducing it.

In short then, Giddens' work supports the findings of this study by considering structuring as: 1) an outcome and medium of intentional human action, 2) mainly being of reproduction nature, 3) the relationship between interaction (communication) and structure (signification) mediated by a modality (interpretative scheme).

Towards a Theory of Structuring

Based on the observation, interpretation and analysis of eight organizational meetings, the findings of the study and their discussion, and the literature support for the findings, an outline of a tentative grounded theory of organizational structuring at formal organizational meetings will be presented in the next few lines. The attempt here is not to suggest that there is one general and all inclusive theory of structuring. It is rather to present the findings of the study in a more coherent and integrated
manner so that one may be able to make a theoretical sense out of the findings of the study. The presentation of a theory based on the findings provides a framework so one can put an understanding of the findings in the context of the theory. Lastly, a tentative theory while providing the logical positivist researchers with a formal mechanism for disproving the theory, should be seen as only one and an incomplete theory of a multitude of possible theories of structuring by the interpretivist researchers.

As an important style note, it should be mentioned that the foundation and the source of the assumptions and propositions made below are not discussed at length, since they have already been discussed above. However a brief reference to the source and foundation and occasionally the place for their discussion within the dissertation is made following the presentation of the assumption and propositions.

A) Assumptions of the theory:

1. Actors in the meetings have intentions. i.e., they go to the meetings in order to do something, such as learning, listening, informing, changing something, fulfilling a duty, reporting on one's activity, etc.

This assumption is based on the theoretical arguments of action researchers (e.g., Giddens, 1976, 1979, 1985; Harre' et al., 1986; see above for a discussion).
2. Structure is primarily a property of the individual actors which may also be shared by other organizational members fully or partially.

This assumption is based on the interpretivist paradigm commitment of the study (e.g., Burrell and Morgan, 1979), and follows the theoretical assertions of thinkers such as Boulding (1956) who asserts that image (or any aspect of the world) is not the property of organization and is the property of the individual person.

2a. The more sharing of structure exists between many vs. few organizational members, the more it becomes a property of a collection of individuals. And the less the sharing of structure exists between many vs. few organizational members, the less it becomes a property of a collection of individuals.

This assumption is based on deductive reasoning. That is if the structure is the property of an individual person, then the more sharing of structuring between individuals holding a view of it, the more collective a phenomenon it becomes.

2b. The more overlap between actors' view and understanding of structure exists the less the number of organization structures. The less overlap between actors' views and understanding of structure exists, the more the number of organization structures.

The foundation for making such an assumption is the
same as 2a.

2c. A structure does not exist for a person, unless it is mentally and experientially realized by that person. Thus, it is believed that structure is in there vs. out there; it is in the minds of organizational actors vs. being somewhere out there in the organization (e.g., on an organizational chart).

This assumption is based on the interpretivist assumptions of the study (see chapters 2 and 3).

3. Every actor in the meeting is a potential structuring agent; i.e., is a source of organization structure.

This assumption is based on the dissertation's view considering an active role for human beings in constructing their organizational phenomena (e.g., interpretivist/cultural paradigm).

3a. Every actor is involved in maintaining the social structure of the organization. Every actor's action and even non-action counts as a potential source of and/or contribution to, the maintenance, change, demolition of a given social structure.

This is based on the observation and interpretation of the meetings and their transcript (see the presentation and discussion of the findings). Ethnomethodology as discussed in chapter 3 and earlier in this chapter is also a prime reason for making this assumption (e.g., Leiter, 1981, and
Mehan and Wood, 1975: see above for a discussion of their work).

B) Outline of the theory of structuring:

1. Organizational actors express (talk about) their intentions (e.g., things done, to do, or being done) in the meetings to other participants explicitly/directly and/or implicitly/indirectly.

   This proposition is based on the observation and interpretation of the meetings, the post hoc questionnaire, and as an observed evidence of the first assumption.

   1a. Intentions are expressed via means that are comprehensible to others. For example, this may be the use of a common organizational language, and terminology.

   This is a proposition based on observation of the meetings, and it is also a common sense knowledge.

   2. Actors begin to present their intentions by expressing them in the form of an issue. The issue may include but not be limited to one or more of the following possibilities: an organizational issue, a previous concern of the organization, an organizational problem/opportunity, an environmental demand/pressure/opportunity. The issue is expressed in the form of a question, a simple factual or expressive statement, a comment, an objection, etc.
This proposition is based on the observation and analysis of the meetings (see the presentations and discussions in chapters 5 and 6).

3. By expressing an issue the actors initiate a pattern of structuring. The pattern goes through the complete or partial forms of the following two general pattern forms in an orderly or non-orderly fashion.

Form A) Focusing (Initiation)-Discussion-Proposition-Resolution-Closure

Form B) Question-Answer-Resolution

This proposition is based on the findings presented in chapter 5 and discussed in earlier in this chapter. The patterns of structuring was one of three major sets of findings of the study.

3a. The unfolding of pattern may include one person (only for pattern A), or may include dyads (e.g., pattern B) or multiple participants (pattern A or B).

This proposition is based on the observation and frequency counting of the meetings.

Hypothesis 3a. The more complete the use of pattern A, and the larger the number of participants involved in completing the pattern, the greater is the possibility of revising old structures and creation of new structures (de novo structuring).

This hypothesis is based on the qualitative observation of organizational meetings under the study. It was observed in various meetings that as the participants went through
the complete sequence of the pattern, reiteratively, and with the discussion stage being displayed often during that sequence, then there was more of content category #12 observed. Content category #12 is the one that deals with creating, modifying, and changing new and/or old organizational actions and routines.

Hypothesis 3b. The more the question and answer pattern is initiated and controlled by one person (or specific individuals) in the meeting, the more use and recreation of the old structure takes place, and the less innovation (i.e., the structuring of new actions) will take place.

It was observed that in certain meetings, most notably the truck stop meeting, the authority figures engaged in structuring by enlivening the pattern of question-answer-resolution. That is, they basically asked a question which apparently was expected to receive a set answer negatively or positively.

4. Going through the complete or part of one of the above patterns, the actors carry out their intentions by expressing it (i.e., their purpose) via choosing a certain vocabulary and grammar. The vocabulary chosen contains the message of the actors' structuring intentions. The vocabulary is the content of structuring. The content clarifies the topic of structuring - i.e., what in the structure is the actor attempting to maintain, change, or eliminate. To say it differently, the composition of the talk content, the choice of words, is the vehicle used by
the actor for aligning the verbalized message with his/her purpose and intention of structuring.

This proposition is based on the observation of content categories 1-13. The presentation, verification and discussion of these categories of findings took place in chapter 5 and the present chapter.

4a. The choice of words may be conscious vs. unconscious, habitual vs. non-habitual, and trained vs. non-trained.

This proposition is based on the intentionality assumption made in assumption #1 of the theory (see above).

Hypothesis 4a: The choice of words by an organizational actor influences (has an effect) the perception of organization structure by those actors listening to these words.

This hypothesis is based on the observation and interpretation of the content categories 1-13, and as proposed in proposition 4.

4b. The content of talk is either informative (descriptive, objective) vs. expressive (prescriptive, subjective, qualitative words, opinionated).

This proposition is based on the observations made of category #13 and its frequency count (see chapter 5).

Hypothesis 4b: The qualitative (judgmental) statements or words (their message, impact, implication) - when uttered by an actor at the end of or during his/her talk turn - creates a different sense (of reality) or meaning for the structure or any aspect of it, which stands in contrast to the meaning
or sense which would have been otherwise created because of factual statements made about structure or any aspect of it—uttered before or after the qualitative words or statements.

This hypothesis is made after the observation of content category #13 (see chapters 5, 6).

4c. The talk content aims at structuring one or more aspects of the following aspects of structure:
(numbers in parentheses refer to the content category number).

-Job specialization (#1,#5,#6)
-Division of labor (#1,#10,#6,#7,#8)
-The existing binding structure: e.g., the hierarchy, positions (#2)
-Status quo structure (#2)
-Organizational composition (#3)
-Spatial composition (#3)
-Organizational coordination / cooperation (#4,#7,#10)
-The position of the speaker within the organization (#7)
-Locus of decision making and authority (#8)
-Impersonality of the office (#8)
-Parameters of action (#9)
-Feasible organizational actions (#9)
-Organizational integration (#10)
-Time Schedules / deadlines (#11)
-Organizational action / procedure / response (#12)
-The type of organization (#13)
The feeling for the form of organization (#13)
Value structure (#13)
Social distance

This proposition is based on observing content categories #1-13 (see chapters 5, 6, and Table 26 in this chapter).

5. The speakers use certain communicative or structuring strategies for communicating their talk content in order to accomplish their structuring intentions. The strategies used by the speakers are:
Seeking agreement (consensus/confirmation)
Confirming/Giving support, confirmation, agreement
Upholding organizational property(s) e.g., philosophy, goal, mission, tool, technology
Reasoning: rationalizing, justifying, introducing facts (inaction, insufficiency, inadequacy reasoning)
Expressing: stating, restating, informing, commenting, interpreting, defining
Opposing: re-interpreting, redefining, objecting
Applying an organizational standard, policy, norm, rule, term
Persuading
Determining
Naming, Labeling
Being ambiguous: creating uncertainty
.Confirming: giving support
.Clarifying

This proposition is based on the findings of categories of structuring as presented, verified, and discussed in chapters 5, 6.

6. Every structuring episode which is composed of the content categories, one or more of the structuring strategies unfolds through the stages of a given pattern, and involves the participation of one, two, or more of organizational members.

This proposition is based on the findings presented and discussed in chapters 5, and 6.

6a. An actor (one participant) engages in one-way structuring as he/she reports on an aspect of organization structure with or without any change implication for the present (i.e., pre-existing) structure, and as he does not receive any reaction from the audience.

This proposition is based on the observation and interpretation of the meetings (see chapters 5&6)

Hypothesis 6a. In one-way structuring the speaker does not receive any reaction from his/her audience because of one or more of the following reasons:
I. The restructuring is reproducing an already acceptable structure.
II. The structuring consequence is non-critical for the audience. i.e., the consequence does not threaten anyone's status, interest, etc.
III. The structuring agent is powerful (the audience is not as powerful) and the issue is a political one and any opposition to it would result in conflict with the agent
with undesirable consequence for the audience or any one of its members.

This hypothesis was partly (I&II&III) made based on the observation and interpretation of the transcripts, and was partly (III) made based on the power and politics literature (e.g., Pfeffer, 1981) and the work of Giddens on structuration (e.g., 1976). The researcher's interpretation of the content of transcripts as non-critical and structuring as reproduction vs. the first time production was the key to proposing this hypothesis. The power position of the participants and the use of their power, and the reactions to the use of power by power holders, through the researcher's inferences and interpretations were responsible for mentioning the third possible condition under this hypothesis.

6b. An actor engages in self-structuring, when he/she does either one of the following two:

I. Reports on his/her activity (recreates his/her job and organizational specialization for himself/herself and/or for others), in response to one's (mostly) or no one's question (rarely).

II. Asks a question on an aspect of organizational structure (e.g., how do I coordinate with the department of accounting?), and receives a clarifying answer. i.e., an actor receives a structure which did not exist for, or was not clear to, him/her.
This proposition is based on observation of the relevant content category, and the pattern of structuring (see their presentation and discussion in chapters 5, and 6).

Hypothesis 6b(II). In self-structuring by asking a question, the actor who answers the question engages in de novo structuring of the questioning member.

This hypothesis is based on observational and interpretative inferences of the researcher, as also partially supported by the observation of pattern B mentioned above. The hypothesis is also based on theoretical assumption #2.

7. Organizational actors engage in the structuring of organization structures by performing ad hoc and proactive (coherent/incoherent) actions of structuring such as:
   . Giving support (without anybody having asked for it)
   . Giving examples (Without being necessary in the context)
   . Posing relevant or irrelevant questions (without being invited to do so).
   . Signaling their understanding or confusion without it being necessary to do so.
   . Other unaccounted actions (e.g., choosing to remain silent and not interject, non-verbal strategies).

This proposition is based on the observations and interpretations of the meetings, as some are reflected in the findings of the study, such as the structuring strategy
of confirming. And as some are discussed in this chapter, such as proactive actions of structuring (see the novel finding of the study section in this chapter). This proposition concludes the presentation of the theory of structuring organizations at organizational meeting by talk.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, the findings of the dissertation were discussed and interpreted. The dissertation findings were: 1) in the meetings studied, talk contained structure and structuring, and 2) three mechanisms of content categories, strategies and patterns were discovered as the process indicators of structuring talk (i.e., talk that contains structure). These two findings were considered significant since they showed to be useful tools for interpreting structuring talk at organizational meetings when others used them. Both of the findings were found to be trustworthy.

From an ethomethodological perspective, the findings were shown to be significant because two experts were able to specify a sense of structure in most of the content categories and two of the structuring strategies. A comparison between the traditional dimensions of organization structure, and the interpretation of the author and two other experts' opinions resulted in presenting the dimensions of cooperation and coordination, social distance,
value/quality of structure, time/schedule, and issue-action structuring, as the novel dimensions of structure.

The study findings were interpreted in light of Giddens' theory of structuration, and they were organized into a tentative theory of structuring.
Chapter 7
Summary and Implications

The research study reported in this dissertation was undertaken to discover the micro processes that constitute the reality of organization structure as a macro entity in the minds of organizational members. A problem of knowledge of organization structure was observed to be the lack of any considerable work on the actual actions - i.e., the processes - that give rise to the existence of organization structure. The main research question for the study was: How does structuring take place? What are the processes of structuring?

The literature review in the second chapter indicated that the field of organization theory in general and organization structure in particular is dominated by a Weberian thought and tradition (Clark, 1985). The Weberian legacy was traced into three major area of conceptualization and empirical work on organization structure. The three areas are: 1) the conceptualization of organization structure as a multi-dimensional structure, 2) the search for one best way to design, 3) the contingency approach to organization structure.
Organization structure as a multidimensional entity in its current state of knowledge has basically set a closure on the three structural dimensions of complexity, centralization, and formalization (e.g., Ford and Slocum, 1977, Blackburn, 1982). There have been numerous studies, the results of which culminated in the recognition of those three as the dimensions of organization structure. All three dimensions, fully or partially have the imprint of Weber's legacy on them (Clark, 1985).

The debate on one best way to design (or structure) organizations began since Weber's bureaucratic model was introduced as an ideal structure for organizations. The proposal against bureaucracy was counter-bureaucracy. Burns and Stalker (1961), relabeled the ideal and opposite sides of the structural continuum as mechanistic vs. organic. Since Burns and Stalker, a long lasting search for the conditions and contingencies that cause an ideal structure of mechanistic vs. organic in an organization has continued to the present.

The main elements of the contingency model causing the emergence of the dimensions of structure are: environment (e.g., Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967), technology (e.g., Woodward, 1958), and size (Pugh et al., 1968; Blau and Schoenherr, 1971). Beginning with Chandler (1962), in recent years there has been a new perspective theorizing and empirically testing for a relationship between strategy and
structure (e.g., Miles and Snow, 1978). The essence of contingency theory is that the type and kind of contextual factors cause the emergence and the intensity of organization structure.

The problem with the above studies is not in what they studied (i.e., the structure), but is in what they did not study (i.e., structuring). They studied the end result—the structure—or the contingencies that cause the different forms and degree of the end result. None of the three areas studied the processes of organization structuring. However, major progress towards studying the process of structuring was made when researchers began to consider the role of decision makers in choosing an organization structure (e.g., Child, 1973; and Bobbitt and Ford, 1980). While the argument for the decision maker's role in the choice of organization structure highlighted the role of human beings in the process of structuring, it, nonetheless, did not describe the process of structuring.

With the advent of Giddens' work on structuration (1976), organizational scientists began to import his theoretical insights into the study of organization structure and structuring (Ranson et al., 1980). This theoretical breakthrough was followed by a number of researchers undertaking empirical work to study the processes of organization structuring (e.g., Riley, 1983; Bartunek, 1984; Barley, 1986). The study by Barley came
closest to the real study of organization structuring by studying organization technology as an occasion of structuring. While his study is insightful and innovative, it falls short of approaching the process of structuring in a comprehensive format, and rather focuses on the structuring consequence and patterns of the change of technology on organization members.

This dissertation study, then, was pursued as an original attempt at unraveling the complex nature of organization structuring. For undertaking such study, it was argued in chapter 3 that a different world view or paradigm commitment than the one adopted by the dominant literature on organization structure should be adopted. The alternative to the functionalist view of organization structure as adhered to by the traditional literature was argued to be an interpretivist or social constructionist paradigm. The social constructionist paradigm assumed that the nature of reality is not hard and objective (i.e., the functionalist paradigm), and is rather subjectively constructed via the social interactions of organization members (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). It was said that it is the study of these social interactions that should render an insight into the social processes that shape and reshape organization structures.

In chapter 4 it was made clear that the focus of the research will be on the study of verbal structuring of
organizational structures at organizational meetings. Talk at organizational meetings became the center of analysis as social construction of social realities and facts in society and organization were presented to be primarily based on the verbal use of language by social actors (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). Formal organizational meetings were chosen as the unit of analysis, as they made it possible to undertake a comparative investigation across the various organizations studied, and as they are an inevitable fact of organizational life which symbolically represent the organization (Schwartzman, 1986).

Given the ontological and epistemological assumptions of the social constructionist approach to learning about organizations, in chapter 4, a qualitative research methodology was presented and discussed as an appropriate choice for the conduct of the inquiry. Observation and interpretation of eight different types of meetings across eight different organizations constituted the primary mode of investigation. The observation and development of the research findings were performed according to the method of constant comparison as suggested by the grounded theory methodology of Glaser and Strauss (1967).

Three sets of findings were discovered and developed as representing the process of organizational structuring: patterns, strategies, and the content of structuring. The most micro were the patterns of structuring via
organizational talk, which were displayed by a number of stages and following a general sequence presented below:
Focusing - Discussing - Proposing - Resolution - Closure.
The patterns observed, then, were composed of the stages shown above, following them orderly or disorderly, and presenting each stage once or a number of times reiteratively. The other pattern observed was that of Question-Answer-Resolution format. However, what made the pattern stages meaningful and relevant to the structuring lay in the actor's employment of structuring strategies and/or content(s).

Fourteen structuring actions or strategies were observed: seeking support, seeking consensus, giving support, reasoning, upholding organizational property(s), expressing, stating, interpreting, reinterpreting (opposing), persuading, clarifying (seeking clarification), being ambiguous, determining, and naming. Assuming the actors used these strategies consciously, then, the strategies aided the actors in their attempt at reaching their desired structural outcomes. When used unconsciously the strategies still were observed and interpreted as having structuring qualities and consequences, as they created or recreated a sense of structure in the minds of the audience.

Content themes of structuring were separated into thirteen categories with each having one or more of the following as its main topic and/or periphery topic of
structuring: social distance, job specialization, division of labor, the existing (binding) structure, status quo structure, organizational composition, spatial composition, organizational coordination/cooperation, the position of the speaker within the organization, locus of decision making and authority, impersonality of the office, parameters of action, feasible organizational actions, organizational integration, time schedules/deadlines, organization action/response/program, the type of organization (configuration), the feeling for the form of structure, value structure.

The observation and interpretation of the meetings indicated that the structuring sentences and statements in transcripts are different with respect to the content (i.e., the topic) of structuring. Thus, as a general observation, it was seen that an organizational member in order to structure the structure of an organization or any aspect of it does the following three things: 1) chooses an appropriate content which relays a message regarding or concerning organizational structure to the audience; 2) employs structuring strategies that can aid the speaker to better tune his/her intended structuring goal with his/her act of uttering a message verbally; 3) displays his/her structuring content via appropriate stages of a structuring pattern.

The findings as presented and exemplified in chapter 5, were essentially considered as trustworthy by the techniques
of credibility in chapter 6. The following techniques were used and their results were discussed in chapter 6: post-meeting questionnaire administered to the meeting participants; frequency counts of the findings over the first five meetings; interpretation and evaluation of two reviewers to verify the existence of structuring in the sample of three additional meetings (i.e., the verification sample); matching of findings with the verification sample transcripts; reconciliation of the coding of the two coders for the matching stage of verification. For an exploratory and interpretative study the results were generally supportive.

Also in chapter 6, the findings were discussed in terms of their significance to the literature, and in terms of achieving the goal of dissertation which was set out to be the illumination of one of the many possible structuring processes. It was discussed and argued that the findings represent the micro processes that result in the macro properties of organizational structure. The findings were also shown to be an empirical verification of the theoretical arguments of ethnomethodologists (e.g., Garfinkel, 1967), and Giddens on structuration (1976).

The findings were put in perspective by presenting them in a number of propositions and hypotheses which at the same time constituted an outline of a theory of structuring at formal organizational meetings via organizational talk.
Retrospectively, this dissertation is different from the previous works on organization structure in a number of aspects. First, it studied the processes of structure vs. the properties of structure. Second, it primarily subscribed to an interpretivist (social constructionist) point of view vs. a dominant functionalist paradigm commitment of the field. Third, the research methodology was a qualitative discourse analysis of structuring vs. a dominant positivist quantitative analysis of the structure. Fourth, it aimed at uncovering the relationship between micro and macro processes vs. dealing with macro properties only. The research is also different from the traditional works on structure in terms of its different research and practical implications. The final section of the dissertation is devoted to a discussion of those implications.

Research and Practical Implications

The foremost research implication of this study is to suggest that there is a worth and importance in studying processes involved in the creation of organizational properties such as structure. In fact the study may be a suggestion that the field should re-evaluate its definition of what it calls process theory - e.g., expectancy theory of motivation as a process theory. The process as taken up by this dissertation means the study of the actual way in which
people live and work in organizations: their talking, thinking, and even walking etc.,

The study shows how the adoption of a different world view can create opportunities and provide insights into studying the topics which would otherwise be missed (Morgan, 1984). There are many other areas of organizational studies which can benefit from being studied from a social constructionist - or even radical humanist or radical structuralist (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) - point of view. Thus, the researcher should also study motivating vs. motivation, leading vs. leadership, grouping vs. groups, doing power vs. power; and in short, researchers should as often study the "ing" of organizations as they do its "tion" or "ship" (Weick, 1979). It should be pointed out that indeed a growing number of researchers have already begun doing so. For example Barely (1986) studies technology as an occasion of structuring, and describes the patterns and processes involved in the transformation of a hospital unit structure in light of a change in technology.

One orientation would help the researchers to focus on the "ing" of organizations and that is an emphasis on finding patterns of organizing versus variables and conditions existing in organizations (Daft and Wiginton, 1979). There is a dearth of studies dealing with the patterns of action in organizations with few notable recent exceptions (e.g., Bennis and Nanus, 1985). Along this line,
the research methodology of this study is another automatic implication for the field, that is, while qualitative research is difficult and cumbersome, it can be done and should be done. The findings and results of the qualitative research can be verified by the use of a number of other reviewers as was done in this study. The grounded theory approach of this research enabled the researcher to propose an outline of the theory of structuring at organizational meetings. Theorizing is a rare occurrence in organizational studies. More effort at this is necessary.

Another general implication of the study is that the field should make a distinction between behavior and action (see Harre' et al., 1985 for a general distinction). Organizational behavior (including organizational theory) treats the behavior of people as passive, as reactive only, and at the mercy of managerial actions. It has created a passive identity for the organizational members; e.g., the actors are being structured, motivated, led, etc. Actions on the other hand represent a quality of intention within them. This may be especially so as the recent authors and philosophers expounding upon the process and nature of actions represent it as intentional, conscious, and both proactive and reactive. A simple but profound suggestion is to replace our labels; make it organizational action instead of organizational behavior.
Besides the above general implications, there are a number of more specific suggestions for students of structure and structuring. These suggestions can also be seen as future research agenda towards completing the task set out by this dissertation. The suggestions are:

1. Replication(s) of the study.
2. Diversifying the sample in general, and particularly including manufacturing organizations in the sample.
3. Focusing on one organizational meeting over time.
4. Focusing on many different meetings in the same organization.
5. Including non-verbal actions into the observation and analysis of structuring.
6. Including the observation of verbal and non-verbal actions of structuring which occur outside the organizational meetings – i.e., non-meeting settings.
7. Studying structuring at informal organizational meetings.
8. Diversifying the methods of analysis and verification of findings.
9. Studying the design of organizations by designing the spoken language in those organizations.
10. Studying the language (i.e., the process) of politics, decision making, motivation, and leadership via a similar kind of analysis.
11. Studying the linkage between the structuring method used by organizational members and the effectiveness of those
organizations. i.e., which structuring actions and methods result in an effective organization.

Practical Implications: The foremost and the basic assertion of this research for practitioners is: "what you say to your employees, colleagues, managers - and any other organizational member - has an effect on the way in which that person (the hearer) perceives the reality of work and acts upon it". An organizational member then is told to be conscious and then selective about what he/she says.

The findings of the study, the content, patterns, and strategy categories, all can be used by organizational members for creating and recreating organization structures. The research then shows the members of organizations how their language is a tool for construction, maintenance, change and destruction of organizational structure. Thus, language can be used as an organizational tool. For example, the managers should engage in practices of and training in which they can master the usage of their language for the purposes of constructing organizational structures, motivating employees and etc.

As a specific point, organizational members should be trained to increase their vocabulary. There are already many organizations and many programs that are designed to do just that. For example a company called "Achievement Dynamics" is currently advertising its vocabulary tapes for sale to business people by emphasizing that one’s
personality and effectiveness is evaluated by one's possession of a vast vocabulary and knowledge of its meaning and the context in which it should be used. Regardless of the authenticity of this claim, it has been noted that human beings' ability to construct various images, worlds, perceptions, and realities is to a great extent limited by the language they use (e.g., Silverman, 1971; Pondy and Mitroff, 1979; Miller and Johnson-Laird, 1976). One's language knowledge and mastery then becomes the source of one's feeling of alienation and/or freedom; it becomes both enabling and constraining (e.g., Giddens, 1976).

Another important implication of the research is to underscore the importance of consciousness of organizational members in their commitment of actions. Indeed, one fundamental task of social science is to bring the realities of social practice to the level of consciousness. For it is through being conscious about one's activity and its effects on others that makes a person think whether or not one wants to commit or repeat that action, or what should be one's next action. The suggestion, as offered by Schon (1983, 1987), that it is through consciousness and reflection in action "(the 'thinking what they are doing while they are doing it', 1987, p.xi) that the practitioners become more effective in what they do.

Schon (1987) proposes that professional schools should revise their program and curriculum so that they can educate
and graduate a "reflective practitioner" vs. "knowledgeable practitioners". In the same line, a practical implication of this dissertation is to suggest that business schools should give more attention to the communication skills of their students. For example as it is already being practiced in some business schools, special courses can be set up so that students can use the theories of organization via the verbal practice of them. In that manner, the students can be videotaped so that they can watch themselves and reflect on their communicative actions.

Text book authors can also participate in this endeavor by presenting the language of the methods, techniques, and the theories of organizational management in a section following the discussion of each topic. Below is a list of specific structuring suggestions for organizational members:

1. Choose the content of your talk (the words in a sentence) consciously, so that you can ascertain that it reflects the meaning that you intended, and so that it refers to that aspect of structure that you intended to act on.

2. When describing organization structure to members take an example issue and describe how the resolution of the issue took place (by the parties debating on its resolution) by going through the organizational levels, offices, positions, etc. Examples help the members to perceive themselves in the experience recounted.
3. To maintain a sense of division of labor and specialization, ask the members to report on their activities, even if it is often unnecessary.
4. Overtly confirm one's statement whenever you feel it is describing a proper structure, and overtly reject it, whenever you feel one's statement is not describing the proper structure. If you remain silent, it may be interpreted either as approval or rejection of one's statement.
5. Use the technique of naming and labeling to create a sense of formal vs. informal organization. For example:
   a. Refer to a person by his/her title to create a more formal structure, and use his/her first name to create a sense of more informal structure.
   b. Refer to committees and divisions by their formal name and not by their members. This also strengthens a sense of division of labor within the organization.
6. For overall integration and coordination engage in providing overall and specific individual statements in which you would mention the organization as whole and then position the divisions within this organization, and show how the divisions relate to one another. Use organizational goals and strategies and future plans for talking about your organization and its sub-parts.
7. Be sure to specify a time and place for the activities of people. This provides a more concrete sense of structure (what to do, when, where), than otherwise.

8. Your qualitative descriptions of an aspect of organizational structure influences the hearer’s perception of the overall nature of the structure. Make sure to align (make it coherent with) your qualitative description with the preceding or subsequent description of organization structure, and make sure it reflects your view and aids you in achieving your intended structural consequences.

9. For structuring a new organizational action, be sure to focus on an issue relevant to the topic of structuring, give a reason why you are talking about that issue, discuss the issue with other members, propose an action and seek a resolution for your proposition.

10. Create an atmosphere of comfort so that the members feel comfortable about asking any kind of question on organizational structure. The more questions they ask on structure, the more opportunity you have for creating a given sense of structure in them.

11. Seek verbal commitment of people in establishing new organizational structures.
APPENDIX A

POST MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE
POST-MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear participant please take few minutes to answer the following questions:

1) Which of the following general issues would you say were discussed in today's meeting? (check as many as applicable)
   -- Creation of a new position, unit, division, operation, procedure
   -- Coordination (cooperation) of work activity between personnel, units, division, shifts
   -- Description/establishment/clarification of job, position, work
   -- Specification of organizational rules, standards, procedure, paperwork
   -- Delegation of authority, responsibility, decision-making power
   -- Employees' relationships with each other/with supervisors
   -- Reinforcement of existing work procedure
   -- Changing work requirements
   -- Elimination of a position, rule, requirement, unit
   -- The company's philosophy, values
   -- The company's competition or outside challenges
   -- The company's clients (customers)
   -- The company's work equipment
   -- Some of the above were discussed, but there were other issues also which are not listed here (If you check this please go to question #2)
   -- None of the above were discussed (If you check this please go to question #2)

Note: Answer question #2 only if you have checked the last two items on the above list. If you have not checked any one of those two items, then go to question #3.

2) List any issues that were discussed in the meeting but were not presented in the list.

   --
   --
   --
   --
3) Did the discussion of the above issues checked or identified (written) by you cause any of the following to take place for you - in your mind, or in your understanding and perception? (check as many as applicable)

-- Change in work relationships/regulations/procedure/format
-- Clarification of work relationships/regulations/procedure/format
-- Reinforcement of work relationships/regulations/procedure/format
-- Change in channels and networks of communication/authority/responsibility/decision-making
-- Clarification of channels and networks of communication/authority/responsibility/decision-making
-- Reinforcement of channels and network of communication/authority/responsibility/decision-making
-- Change in procedure for coordination/cooperation among company/organization members
-- Clarification of procedure for coordination/cooperation among company/organization’s members
-- Reinforcement of procedure for coordination/cooperation among company/organization’s members
-- Change in your position/role/authority
-- Clarification of your position/role/authority
-- Reinforcement of your position/role/authority
-- If none of the above are applicable, please write down what changes/clarifications/reinforcements if any took place in/for you as a result of this meeting.

4) Did you talk about the issues discussed in this meeting with anybody prior to the meeting?

Yes ( )
No ( )

If yes, did you come to any resolution about the issues prior to the meeting?

Yes ( )
No ( )
5) Do your company (organizational) meetings usually involve discussions on one or more of the issues listed in question 1?

Yes ( )
No ( )

6) Do your company (organizational) meetings usually cause you to change your understanding of any of the things listed in question #3?

Yes ( )
No ( )

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS TO CODERS FOR IDENTIFYING THE TRANSCRIPT TALK THAT CONTAINS STRUCTURING
INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS FOR THE CODERS OF TRANSCRIPTS

Dear coder, your basic task is to read every transcript line by line and code the lines in the following order and manner:

1) For every line (*) you should determine whether any structuring (or the use of structure is evident in that line. You should simply ask yourself: "In this line, was there any mention of structure, or did any structuring take place?" If your answer is yes you should write (yes) for that line number and you should then proceed to the second step. If your answer is no, then you should write (no) for that line number and then move on to third step. In order to assist you to determine whether any structuring or the use of structure is taking place in a transcript, please refer to the definitions and guidelines on the "Determination of Structuring" sheet.

2) If you said yes to the question posed in step one, then here you should explain your answer by writing what you believe was being structured, or what aspect of structure was mentioned and/or used by the speaker of the line. Alternatively you may want to write down what you believe is the "topic of structuring" in a line. When doing this, please write down the key words, utterances, sentences or any other thing for that matter which led you to believe that an aspect of structure was being used, was created.

(*) A numbered transcript line refers to the whole talk uttered by a speaker during his/her talk turn. Any speaker’s turn may actually, then, consist of more than one literal line. However, for the purpose of discourse analysis at hand, every speaker’s turn is treated as one transcript line.

"DETERMINATION OF STRUCTURING/THE USE OF STRUCTURE"

Your answer to the "structuring" question should be yes if the transcript line seems to suggest a (yes) answer to any of the following general questions:

1) Does the line involve any talk mentioning of/dealing with/intending at giving form, or constructing patterns, to/for the way in which organizational members go about doing their work and job in the organization?
2) Is there a reference to an already existing routine work procedure and format in the line?

3) Does the line contain any indication of an attempt to change or maintain the present work procedure and routine?

4) Does the line contain the act of focusing of participants' attention by the line's speaker on an (or more) aspect of the work and organization with the subsequent implicit/explicit attempt of the speaker to organize present and/or future actions/behaviors of organizational members around that aspect?

5) Does the line involve any mention of/attempt at dividing the labor by the speaker? Division of labor or differentiation can be in terms of organizational aspects such as: space, function, quality, time, alternatives, options. (Please note the list is a limited one and is given for illustration purposes only).

6) Does the line involve any mention of/attempt at coordinating the labor in the work place? e.g. how two work units, divisions, persons should work together and what are the criteria involved?

7) Does the talk involve any mention of existing/attempt at creating new, rules, norms, parameters of conduct in the work organization?

8) Does the speaker refer/use/take on an (or more) aspect of organization's internal or external environment, technology, goals, mission, and philosophy to limit what organizational member can/should do now or in the future, or to justify what took place before and what is taking place now or what will take place in the future?

9) Does the talk indicate an attempt by the speaker(s) to create/draw boundary(ies) for/around organization and its issues/aspects/units/jobs/etc. For example, the talk making a distinction between organization and environment by pointing out to the distinctive characteristics of an organization is an attempt at creating boundary for an organization by separating it from its environment. Or for example the talk indicating what organizational units and jobs are/are limited to, and what members should/can do (and why) are other attempts at boundary creation.

10) Does the line involve any indication of "who does what, when, how, where and for whom and with whom"?
Two Caveats:

first) While these definitions can help you to determine the use of structure or the occurrence of structuring, you should not feel limited by them. You should feel free to call whatever structure vs. non-structure, or structuring vs. non-structuring as long as you can provide me with your justification (whatever it may be).

second) When looking for the evidence of structuring in every line of the transcript, be aware of the fact that while there may be no such an evidence in one line, it may not necessarily indicate lack of structure or structuring; the absence of the evidence may be due to the fact that a line may be a response to or a continuation, or clarification of an already attempted structuring/or the use of structure, and therefore is part of the structuring/the use of structure. The idea is simply to remind you that while at times there are utterances and statements made at random and in isolation from the rest of conversation, in general the conversation parts are interrelated.
APPENDIX C

TALK CATEGORIZATION FORM

(ADAPTED FROM GREEN AND WALLET, 1981)
Talk Categorization Form

Line #: Write transcript line number
Speaker: Write the name or the identity code of the speaker as on the trans.
1) N/A: Check mark this column if the transcript line is too brief or irrelevant. If you check this column, do not check the rest of categories. However, check this column only if it is absolutely necessary.

Form:
2) Introduction: usually the beginning of the meeting or a new issue.
3) Comment: Plain talking/elaboration on an issue or subject of discussion.
4) Question
5) Response +
6) Response -
7) Response 0

STRATEGIES:
8) Focusing
9) Ignoring
10) Confirming +
11) Confirming -
12) Continuance
13) Extending
14) Raising
15) Clarifying
16) Editing
17) Controlling
18) Refocusing
19) Restating
20) Defining
21) Concluding
22) Summarizing: when the speaker offers a summary of the talk so far in the transcript
23) Dis/Crediting
24) Establishing Facts
25) Consolidating

Level:
26) Factual
27) Interpretive
28) Applicative
Talk Categorization Form (Continued)

Unit of Reference: What is the main theme(s) of the speaker's talk
29) Individual job
30) group/unit/division
31) organization
32) Environment: both internal (in.) and external (ex.)
33) Technology (Tech.) or Equipment (Equip.)
34) meeting

----------------------------------------------

Unit Resolution:
35) [resolved : 35; initiated and ongoing: 0]
36) [unresolved : 36]

----------------------------------------------
APPENDIX D

MATCHING INSTRUCTIONS
Instructions for Matching

1. Familiarize yourself with the materials that you should read and use as you do the matching. They are as follows:

Transcripts: You have three transcripts which are numbered as 1, 2, and 3. Please begin working on the transcripts based on the numeric order. (Note: these transcripts are not provided in this appendix).

A List of Content Categories: 12 content categories present generalizations of the talk content. Part of your task is to see if these generalizations represent the content of the talk in the transcripts lines that you should read.

A List of Strategies: a list of strategies presents the possible communicative strategies that an organizational member may employ when he/she is talking in the meeting. You will use this list to identify the strategy(s) employed by the speakers in the transcript lines.

A List of Patterns: a list of patterns of talk presents the stages involved in beginning to talk about an issue and making a conclusion about that issue. The key terms representing the stages are defined. As you will be reading the transcripts you will be identifying the relevant stage(s) of each pattern to a particular line.

A List of Expressive Words/Phrases: a sample (representative) list of words and phrases are provided. You will later use this list as a sample for observing a similar or alike usage of such words and phrases by the speaker of each transcript line. (Note: this list is provided as content category #13 in the following presentation of the lists).

Note: In order to familiarize yourself with the lists and concepts, definitions, and their meaning, you should read the lists a few times before you begin the matching.

2. Read each transcript once before beginning to do the matching. This provides you with an overall feel for the transcript content and makes your second time reading easier.

3. Begin to do the matching of each transcript by re-reading it line by line.
4. Use the matching form for recording your matching observations. For each line of transcript, write down the transcript line number and the name of the speaker. Then from reading the transcript line specify each of the following under the appropriate column heading.

**Content Category #**: Using the list of the content categories, specify which content category(s), if any, fits the content of the transcript line. Write zero (0) if none of the categories apply to the line.

**Strategy #**: Using the list of the strategies, specify which strategy(s), if any, is present (is observable) in the transcript line. Write zero (0) if none of the strategies apply to the line.

**Pattern Stage**: Using the list of patterns and its stages, specify which stage(s) of pattern is being displayed by the line speaker. It is important to note that a line may display one or more of a pattern stages, or may by itself contain the display of the whole pattern (i.e., all stages). If you cannot distinguish the stage of the pattern in a line write "NI" - not identifiable.

**Words/Phrases**: Referring to the list of words and phrases, write down the words and/or phrases, if any, that are being used by the speaker of the transcript line. Leave blank for the line which does not have any expressive words/ phrases. (Note: this is same as content category #13 in the following presentation).

**Note**: You may have more than one item from each list applying to a given transcript line, and indeed it is the case regarding many of the lines. In that case, then, write as many as applicable. e.g., you may observe that more than two strategies are being used by a speaker in a given line, which means you should write them both.
The List of Content Categories

#1) Members make statements (i.e., talk about) in which they mention the job and duties of an organizational member, unit, position, and how the job is supposed to be performed (what are the steps and procedure to be followed).

Examples: "We got to send out one sheet with them all (courses) listed and what hospitals [offer them] - a blank at the top to say how much to come ... we will send it to everybody so if a hospital isn’t participating they will see what they are missing. They will be just listed like on the back here - the dates, the titles and the programs and who is giving it. And that’s it. Then before each one we will send out an announcement with a more detailed description of what description ...".

"Your job is to take care of the room arrangement."

#2) Members make statements in which they describe and present (their view of) organizational structure in terms of the structure’s "proper" or "existing" channels, routes, hierarchy, positions, paperwork, standardization and etc.

Example: 005 John: ... For instance there is a committee on land acquisition, this is after everybody has agreed to it. We now have to go to the committee and get their approval to purchase the land. They then approve it and they will recommend it to the board of directors. If the board of directors agrees, it then has to go to the board of Overseers for land acquisition and then the board of Overseers sends to controlling board. It is real cumbersome.

#3) Members make statements in which they mention changes in organizational composition (i.e., who is who), format, and set-up.

Example: Bob: "As you know, with regard to the next item on the agenda, which is the minutes, we have a departure of Elaine as the secretary for the board".
Bob: "I am now going to turn the meeting over to Steve. As I do that I wanted to thank all of you for your support all year...".
#4) Members make statements in which they mention an organizational issue and situation and then based on that ask for or announce for organizational coordination (the need for).

Example: "I have got a couple of things, and one is on vacations - we have been giving them (employees) their vacation pay before they go on vacation. There has been a little bit of confusion between accounting (and the rest) and it is mostly our (other units) fault because [inaudible]. When we have to put their vacation check through, if they are going to go on vacation on the 14th, we have to know the payroll before we have to double up the regular pay and the holiday, their vacation pay. On any vacation request, put on the bottom of it if they want to please have the vacation check prior to them taking their vacation. Write a note at the bottom of it. Some people want it before they go and some people want it after they come back...We just need to get it cleared up...It will help me if you put a little note on it".

#5) Members make statements in which they report on their activity. Usually members report on their activity as someone asks them to do so.

Example: Assistant manager in charge of convention arrangements: "I (met) here yesterday with a man who I believe is from the convention bureau for the Elks. His name is John, and he had said the information that I had sent him from last year - he had just booked 160 rooms for four nights...He said he would call me back on Friday...I showed him four of the suites...So November 8, he booked 100 rooms for one night and he wanted to book a December meeting but we didn't have the space - we are already booked up".

#6) Members make statements in which they concede to (acknowledge) the existence of an aspect of organizational structure by making a confirmatory statement in response to someone else's assertion regarding that aspect.

Example: 032 Mike: ...Isn't Sarah a part of the problem? Doesn't a lot of it before it came over from her office?
033 Shirley: Her office will see some of these as a last step but she is not in the Black Hole (a department's name).
034 Mike: Didn't a great many of reports that came flying over here - weren't they trapped in her office or am I wrong?
035 Shirley: I don't think that's so.
036 Mike: That's not so?, Oh, O.K.
037 Shirley: She had gotten a bunch from Roger W. for one.
038 Mike: Right, she is the final administrator.

#7 Members make statements in which they mention their interaction with other persons, units, and levels within the organization.

Example:
147 Kith: I sent you a memo requesting permission to put news 610 decals on [vans]/
148 John (the general administrator): I sent that to sue (the marketing manager). They told me that they won’t do it, so maybe if she goes through the marketing staff maybe it will just go through.

#8 Members make statements in which they mention differences or distinctions between organizational members and units and levels, via various means and references.

Examples:
"The telephone bill will probably have to come out of Laboratory funds rather than Education (different departments)."

"...But if we come up with them on radio, they are going to pop up on television."

101 James (head of radio): You can put a cement block building up in a day.
102 Kith (T.V. head): You probably could (stressing on the word "you", meaning you as person).
103 John (general administrator): You can put up a [ ] building in an hour compared to a block building. YOU - [not the] INSTITUTION.

#9 Members make statements in which they mention feasible / permissible, and non-feasible / non-permissible organizational activities.

Examples:
"There is no way that we can get a description of all the programs on one sheet".

Marj: Mrs. Smith (a client) made a comment to me about when the party 71 was here, when she [said] the rest rooms were just a complete mess.
Bob (Maintenance Manager): That’s overcrowded.
Marj: That’s exactly what I said to her. I said when there are 200 and some odd people over their guarantee, I said there is no way in the woman’s rest room that you can keep it caught up. I said we don’t have the manpower to be able to stand there and clean up after these people. She didn’t realize that [].

#10) Members make statements in which they mention organization as a whole and then mention of different parts (units) of the organization and how they relate to one another.

Example: "The next area is the program and what we tried to do - Bryan an I put some general goal in here that fits with the mission philosophy and then in the background the program committee had a long discussion and I think the essence of what their discussion came to was that we (i.e., the organization) should continue to focus on the kind of kids we are currently serving and that we should try to maintain the current program mix which the three programs. We plan to explore and develop new levels of service to integrate the program for the internal production and productivity and external acquisition of resources...That also means that we want to try to do more with the peer support program. Those are general terms. The third point is that the program committee really has to link with financial development (a committee) in terms of getting the message across and has to relate to human resource committee as well in terms of getting people on the board and the advisory board and so forth to assist in those areas ...".

#11) Members make statements in which they mention time (specific/general) - as a frame of reference - for specifying the short-term and/or long term organizational activity of members and or units.

Example: Diane: On sunday the Heritage Bibles and (their affiliate) and WCI. On Monday WCI again next week. They will be (Palm room) and the Oak room for lunch. They will be in their meeting from 8-5, serve lunch at 12:15 - room 745 they would like a ( ). And they would like soft drinks available. At 7:30 that night in the Ohio room b and c. It is pretty much as usual. They always are there at 5.
12) Members make statements in which they mention the need for, creating a new, or revising an old organizational action (procedure, response, program, etc.). This may be observed as a speaker may make an action proposal, or recommends an action response, or invites people to propose an action, etc.

Examples: "I believe we must do something about the court problem"
"Let's try to institute a new rule for evaluating people based on their performance"
* Also see example given for category #4. Indeed that category
  is a special case of this category in which "cooperation"
  is called for as a specific action.

13) Members utter expressive/qualitative words and phrases as they talk about an organizational issue. This expressive/qualitative phrase/word is a value oriented, subjective, expression of someone about somebody, something, and or a situation. These words/phrases are usually uttered after a more objective (e.g., factual) kind of description of the situation, issue, etc.

Below is a sample list of expressive words:

"It's cumbersome"
"It's hectic"
"It's a pain"
"It's an aggravation"
"It's interesting"
"It's all bureaucratic crap"
"It's so exciting"
"It's so nice"
"What a people, they are great"
"It's boring"
List of Strategies

#1 Seeking Support (Confirmation/Agreement) occurs when the speaker seeks to obtain the support, confirmation, of one or more of the meeting participants on a given statement or proposal made by him/her, or by somebody else.

Examples: "Are you for it Steve?"
"Are you against it?"
"What's your thought on this proposal Betty?"

#2 Seeking Consensus occurs when the speaker seeks to obtain a group consensus (i.e., the dis/agreement of all group members) on a given issue.

Examples: "Does everybody agree with this?"
"Anybody opposing?"
"I believe there is no one against it, is there?"

#3 Giving Support (Confirming/Agreeing) occurs when the speaker gives his or her support to someone’s assertion, proposal, by confirming it, or indicating agreement with it.

Examples: "I agree with what you just said"
"Yes, I agree"
"No, I don’t have any problem with that"
"I think what you are suggesting is fair, our department has been already trying your idea and it is working well for us"

#4 Reasoning occurs when the speaker engages in giving reasons, justifications, and rationalizations for or against the assertion or proposal of oneself, or someone else’s.

Examples: "It is necessary to undertake this project, because, otherwise, we are going to have to deal with the health inspectors"
"We cannot counter the court power, they have legal jurisdiction over us, and we cannot reject their authority"
"It is understandable why we should accept Dan’s proposal, because otherwise our marketing department will be in shambles"
#4a Inaction Reasoning occurs when the speaker mentions of the detrimental consequence of the organization's inaction toward a given issue (e.g., a problem) of his/her or organization's concern, and mentions (and also may propose) of the need for an organizational response. The speaker's strategy then is to reason that since inaction toward an existing organizational problem (an issue) is harmful to the organization, then it should do something in order to overcome this problem.

Examples: "It is getting to a point that if we don't do anything about the waiting line issue, it will hurt our business over time."
"Something needs to be done, or else we will lose control"

#4b Inadequacy or Insufficiency Reasoning occurs when the speaker reasons that since the present organizational actions, policy, procedure, method, etc., is not sufficiently meeting the demands and requirements of the organization, or is not adequate for fulfilling the needs of the organization and/or its members, then there is need for a new, revised, or different organizational action, response, policy, etc.

Examples: "Our present promotional activities do not meet the needs of our organization, we should ask the marketing division to coordinate its activities towards a more concerted effort towards promoting our programs"
"It is not enough to train the employees once they are in the organization, that does not teach them everything, we need somebody who supervises them all the time, until they are past their critical period of early employment"

#5 Upholding Organizational Property(s) occurs when the speaker mentions of one or more of organizational property(s) such as: philosophy, goal, mission, technology, device, standard, rule, policy, norm, rule, term, and then indicates (e.g., reasons) what is feasible, or non-feasible, or possible or non-possible, to do in the organization, or what can (should) be done regarding the issue.

Examples: "Our philosophy indicates that we should respect the customer"
"But, don't forget that we are a public, non-profit, organization, we cannot engage in the same kind of activities that private organizations do"
"The rules are clear regarding this case, we cannot operate after 10 p.m."
"Terms of office call for election every other 2 years, therefore we should prepare to hold the elections in a short while"

#6 **Expressing (Commenting)** occurs when the speaker expresses one’s opinion, belief regarding an organizational issue, and/or for and against a proposed action.

**Examples:**
"I believe that it is to our advantage to hire Sue"
"It’s my feeling that everything will do well once we launch our marketing campaign"

#7 **Stating (Restating)** occurs when the speaker states and restates certain issues, facts, and information.

**Examples:**
"Let me give you some information on the new members of the board...Steve is..., he has been the head of...for the past several years..."
"I would like to talk to you about the need for a new director for our center"

#8 **Interpreting** occurs when the speaker interprets, defines, elaborates on an issue or a situation, its consequences, its meaning, its implications, by offering one’s perspective (way of thinking) on it via one’s words.

**Examples:**
"The situation as I see it warrants our immediate attention. It is a situation of grave consequence to our sales. As I see it, Mr. President needs to think about the consequence of the situation more thoroughly"
"To me, we should be more concerned about the legal ramification of disclosing our confidential files in the court, if this disclosing happens then it means a real disaster for us"
9 Re-interpreting (Opposing, Argumentation) occurs when someone enters the discussion and opposes, argues, with another speaker who has employed strategy #8 by re-interpreting, redefining, or elaborating, on an issue, situation from a different/opposing point of view (perspective).

Examples: "Unlike you, I don’t think that the situation points to a grave consequence for our sales. It is more of a production rather than sales problem. It is the production that is the pulse of our business"
"While I agree with you on the legal ramification of disclosing our files in the court, there is not much we can do, in order to prevent the courts from doing that. We should look at the situation from a practical point of view. I think we can avoid the disaster by contacting the judges on an informal basis and letting them what we feel about the situation."

10 Persuading occurs when one or more of the speakers at the meeting try to persuade, convince another person to accept (i.e., to do) something.

Example: Speaker #1: "I believe that you should get hold of him for this position"
Speaker #2: "But he does not seem to have the necessary qualifications".
Speaker #1: "Over time he’ll learn everything, he is an intelligent person"
Speaker #3: "Yea, I believe so too, he is intelligent"

11 Clarifying occurs when the speaker clarifies an issue, a situation, or a point, for another meeting participant. Usually clarifying takes place in the form of a response to someone question for clarification (#11a Seeking Clarification).

Example: Speaker one: "What’s this portion of the policy for? I don’t understand it"
Speaker two: "It’s for those people who are absent, you see it"
Speaker one: "Yea, I see it now"
#12 Being Ambiguous (Creating Uncertainty) occurs when the speaker intentionally or inadvertently appears and sounds ambiguous to those seeking to commit him/her (the speaker) to a given course of action, or to accepting a change, or something new. Resisting to be committed to a new or different course of action as proposed by others may be accomplished by the speaker as he or she may create uncertainty by making uncertain and ambiguous and unclear statements of facts or else about the situation.

Example: "Steve, who is in charge of the machine handling in your division"
"I don't have any exact idea"
"What do you mean? you're the boss"
"But it is a decentralized system that I use"
"Agree, but we need to know who is in charge so that we can use him occasionally at our division"
"As of now, I don't really know who is in charge, it might be Dan,"
"Will you check on that"
"I'll try"

#13 Determining (Directive) occurs when the speaker determines what should be the case regarding an issue, situation, etc. The style of the speaker may be overtly authoritative and directive -though it is not a necessary condition for the display of this strategy.

Examples: "We have no other choice, we must perform on Friday, let's prepare for it"
"I expect this done as soon as possible, O.K."
"With regard to that customer here is what we should do, give him the extra service he needs"
"Let me conclude by saying that each one of us is a member of this organization and should contribute to it as much as one can"

#14 Naming (Labeling) occurs when one or more of the following observations is made:

a) The speaker uses the official and formal (i.e., non-personal) names of individuals, people, divisions, units, positions instead of using anyone's personal name.

Examples: "Now comes the Treasurer's report vs. Now comes Steve's report"
"This is not your report, this is your committee's report, right?"
"The marketing division has informed me that they would cooperate with us vs. John and Jerry (from marketing) have informed me that they would cooperate with us"

b) The speaker uses **formal labels** and **names** in talking about an issue, or someone.

**Hint:** In this case, usually two names are contrasted.

**Examples:** "You are first a GM employee and then you are a finance department employee"
"From a management and employee point of view such relations between them is not good"
"The people in T.V. department told me that the people in Radio are not cooperative."
List of Pattern Stages

The stages comprising a talk pattern are one or more of the following:

Focusing: The speaker focuses on an issue or theme for the first time.

Examples: "There is a problem with regard to the vacation dates"
           "I would like to talk to you guys about the situation of Debbie"
           "Do you know anything about the crowding incident?"
           "whom do I report to?"

Proposing: The speaker proposes something to be done regarding the issue at hand. e.g., an action, a policy, a strategy, etc.,

Examples: "Let's hire a vacation scheduling coordinator"
           "Debbie should be re-trained"
           "Why don't we cut-down on the number of seats for overcoming the crowding issue?"
           "What about Mrs. Jones?, report to her"

Discussion: The discussion takes place when the speaker who focused on an issue and/or others in the meeting, engage in elaborating on the issue by describing it further, by providing background information on it. The discussion may take place both before and/or after proposing. In discussing a speaker reasons, justifies, and does other kinds of elaboration. The discussion may be pursued by one or more of the participants other than the one who raised the issue (focused on it).

Examples: "As you know vacation dates have always been a problem area for us. In the past we have dealt with the problem of vacations by scheduling, but we cannot do that anymore."
           "Debbie has been our employee for the past several years, and she has been doing a credible job."
           "I have heard about this incident, in fact, a number of people have told me that it is getting to a point that it is not any longer tolerable."
           "I disagree with the idea of reporting to anyone, based on practical reasons."
Resolution: Resolution is reached when a proposal (from the stage of proposing) is seemingly adopted by the participants. Resolution is also said to be reached when a suggestion or a proposal that is made for resolving the discussion of an issue receives explicit or implicit support and approval of others, and/or does not receive the rejection and disapproval of others. In other words, one can say that an issue is resolved when there is a feel for, or when it can be observed that, the "what to do" question with respect to that issue is answered for the meeting participants. The "what to do" question may be handled on a temporal basis, as the participants may agree or decide to postpone the further discussion of an issue to a specific later time. In this case a temporal resolution is said to be reached. But if the "what to do" question is not answered, or participants seem to be at disagreement with each other regarding "what to do", and there is no specific procedure to follow for resolving the issue later on, then it is a case of non-resolution.

Examples: "O.K., It seems that hiring of a scheduling coordinator is our best bet."
"Therefore everyone agrees that Debbie must receive retraining. Those agree say Aye...Ny..., so approved."
"Apparently nobody knows enough about the conditions leading to overcrowding. So let's make a decision about it when we have the facts. Why don't we talk about it with the facts next time."
(note: this example indicates a temporal resolution being reached - i.e., a resolution is reached).
"I really don't know whom can you report to, it is getting late anyway, let's get to the next issue."
(note: this is an example of non-resolution).

Closure: Closure is put on an issue, when one or more of the following is observed: 1) when a resolution is reached; 2) when there is no more discussion of an issue after its resolution; 3) when after resolving an issue, participants turn their attention to a new issue. In general, closure is the last word(s) of the resolution. It is in many cases the very last statement of resolution. Similarly then, a situation of non-closure appears, when an issue is not resolved either totally or temporally.
Examples: "Any other questions on the hiring issue? Let's move to the next item."
"Those agree say aye, anyone disagrees? so unanimous."
"Why don't we talk about it in the next meeting [no-one objects]."
(note: this is an example of closure on a temporal resolution).
"I don't have an answer for you on that, let's get to the next item."
(note: this is an example of non-closure).
APPENDIX E

RECONCILIATION CODING INSTRUCTIONS AND EXCERPTS
Coding Reconciliation Instruction Sheet

Dear reviewer, please perform the following steps as carefully as possible:

1) Read the corresponding transcript line for each of your selected coding.

2) Compare your codings with the codings of the other reviewer for the same transcript line.

3) Based your observation from #2, answer the following questions for those codings that do not match.

Question 1: Do you see how and why the other reviewer has coded differently?

Yes/No/ NA: write this if your codings are the same

Question 2: Would you change your coding or include the other reviewer’s codes in your coding, if you were to re-do this transcript coding.

Change/Include (add)/ Do not change

Note: Answer question 3 only if you have coded and your coding is different from the other reviewer’s coding.

Question 3: Would you retain your coding since it is different from the other reviewer’s coding?

Yes/No

Thank you for your cooperation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Whose Coding?</th>
<th>Coding Type: e.g., Content</th>
<th>Answer to question #1</th>
<th>Answer to question #2</th>
<th>Answer to question #3</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M=Mine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O=Other's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpts of Reconciliation Coding: Reviewers 1 and 2

Church Council Meeting:

LN#: 001  S: A  R2C: C11  R1Q1: Yes  R1Q2: No
R2R: Should not be there, I was wrong
Reconciliation: Wrong Coding

LN#: 002  S:M  R2C: S10  R1Q1: No  R1Q2: No
R2R: Yes, "It is persuading" (i.e., she does not change her coding)
Reconciliation: Unclear definition of persuading; different interpretation of the same act;

LN#: 039  S: L  R1C: S11a  R2Q1: Yes  R2Q2: Yes
R1R: My coding should remain the same as before
Reconciliation: Coder Two missed it at the time of first coding / sees it now (her remarks).

LN#: 048  S: A  R2C: S13  R1Q1: No  R1Q1: No
R2R: should remain the same/ i.e., no change
Reconciliation: Different interpretations of the same line of transcript.

Abbreviations:
LN#: Transcript Line Number
S: Speaker
R2C or R1C: The coding of Reviewer 1 or Reviewer 2 (RC = Reviewer Coding) that was not the same as the other reviewer's.
RQ= Reviewer's answer to Questions 1 or 2 in Exhibit 3
RR= Reviewer's remarks regarding keeping or changing his or her prior coding in light of the comparison.
APPENDIX F

EXCERPTS OF INTERPRETATION OF TRANSCRIPTS BY AUTHOR AND OTHER REVIEWERS
Social Work Organization:

001 Yes the speaker is suggesting the use of certain labels or words for certain processes within the organization; he is defining. He is structuring by establishing names and labels for processes, and by establishing definitions. He gives reasons: "because ... if".

011 Yes the speaker refers to the existence of organizational units, committees, and links committees to their sphere of responsibility. He is checking to see if everything is in order (i.e., is within the structure). Category: Structuring by the use and reinforcement of the existing structure: the speaker engages in structuring by mentioning the present organizational set-up in terms of responsibility, accountability, specialization, and re-establishes them as legitimate by asking others to approve his/her view of the present structure.

013-016 No

Hospital (Continuing Education Committee):

013 Yes Dr. H. is countering the solution implied by Kathy by redefining the usefulness of the calendar as an organizing device (i.e., calendar is fine, but it does not get people to attend the meetings).

016-019 Yes These turns are the continuation of the same theme manifested in turn #15. Besides calling this category structuring by asking question, it may be more appropriate to call it structuring by seeking and receiving clarification.

Research Organization:

070-071 Yes, structuring by asking a question and receiving an answer to it. (i.e., clarifies one’s view about structure).

072-079 Yes, Some division of labor or organizational specialization takes place as the speakers (mainly SH) answer the questions of other speakers (e.g., "we don’t have any responsibility for those".
Excerpts of Reviewers’ Interpretation and Coding of Transcripts in Verification Sample

Church Council Meeting:

001 A: M has the opening tonight.
R1: No (i.e., Structuring does not exist - is not evident)
R2: No

019 D: The offering for June were $... the offering for July $...
R1: No
R2: No

020 A: Summer Slump?
R1: No
R2: Yes / a pattern of member conduct is suggested, i.e., members don’t attend in summers.

177 (A long talk turn; several pages long)
R1: Yes / Focuses and Clarifies boundaries of responsibility for "A"; when to decide.
R2: Yes / (long speech) bottom of the p.21 about what it means to be a member, what can one expect?

236 M: ...If we don’t agree that $35 is enough, then we shouldn’t get involved in it because a lot of it is state standards and we don’t have control of some of that.
R1: Yes/ Defines who sets limits of activity.
R2: Yes/ Mentions external constraints and standards on the church’s willingness to help.

Truck Stop Meeting:

001 B: The first order of business is good news and I guess my good news is this Appleworks program. Don’t give the bad news yet. The Appleworks program - I’m still getting real excited about it. I’ve still got a couple of flaws and I’ve got some more news on that later but as I’ve said in the past couple of weeks F has been working with it and she has finally got me working with it. And I think that it is exciting.
R1: Yes / Past & present work procedure.
R2: Yes / mention of a new technology used.
Truck Stop Meeting:

342 B: O.K. (in response to the previous speaker)
R1: Yes / Accepts what to be done
R2: No

430 J. Jones was talking with me yesterday, Thursday and in the past year they had the opportunity offered whether they wanted to be long sleeve or short sleeve. He turned it over to me and I said find out from your people whether they want to keep their long sleeves all year round or short sleeves.
R1: Yes / How people will dress on job (i.e., dress code).
R2: No

Observational note: The author, himself, is in agreement with the interpretation of R1. Because dress code is an aspect of organizational formalization and therefore it is part of the structure.

Commercial Air Line Meeting:

001 M: ...
R1: Yes/ Discusses future work activity and specific new policy procedures
R2: Yes/ she refers to a no-show policy and how it relates to probation and termination.

045 H: They are always going to complain. There is always going to be somebody that is going to complain.
R1: No
R2: No

Observational Note: Author's interpretation is that the line contains an evidence of structuring. H is structuring the minds of his audience by suggesting that since they are always going to complain, then, the Air Line staff members should care less about people complaining - i.e., they should ignore complaining - or should expect this to happen. The essence of structuring, here can be summarized as, constructing a way of member's conduct vis-a-vis complaining people.
APPENDIX G

EXAMPLE OF CONTENT CATEGORY #12
039 Bryan (Director of the organization): ...The only other item that I want to bring up is the fact that the enhancement subpoenas are beginning to be a pain again. [Focusing: an environmental demand/pressure]. For example, Rose was in my office this morning and we were beginning to discuss things that were going to happen. We get a phone call - is Liz going to be in court in a few minutes to answer a subpoena which was just laid in our window this morning and wanting to know whether she was going to be down to court. I started asking her about it a little bit more. She said it hasn’t been just a matter of us appearing and verifying that the child has been through the program but subpoenaing our confidential records on the kid. [Discussion: Elaborating on the issue by giving an example, and interpreting the issue in terms of its relevance and effect on the organization - its operation]. You know the problem that we had with Judge Jones before. She doesn’t really want to say too much about it because she kind of got black-eyed the last time she had a problem. I asked her if the defense attorneys or public defenders have been objecting to this and she said that they don’t say anything. [Discussion continues: he is giving more details on the issue]. I guess more than anything else I would like to discuss it with the program committee or someone to see what kind of strategy - whether we should do anything or what [Proposing: he is mentioning (implying) of the need for an organizational action]. But from a management standpoint you are sitting there with an employee talking about the things that happened and she gets a call from court and says get down here and you are going to testify and in fact she wasn’t even given advanced notice. They don’t even present them in your office. [Discussion: he gives more details and reasons for the need of an action]. It is one of those kind of things that I have brought up before the board before. I think that we decided to live with it as long as they weren’t asking for confidential stuff or that it didn’t become a real nuisance to the organization and drawing our staff people. [Focusing and Discussion: he refocuses on the issue, and this time he presents it as an old (previous) concern to the members, and then gives more reasons for why should members want to do something about it]. The case workers aren’t so bad but Rose is management person who I need there and we are continually talking, and here we are in the board, in the morning and talking to her about things that we are going to be discussing today and having these kind of interruptions from court. [Discussion: elaborates more, and mentions of the organizational consequences inaction toward the issue - i.e., if it remains as it is,
these problems and interruptions for the organization are to continue recurring].
I think that we need a little bit more consideration in terms of advance notice when she is to appear so that we can make arrangements. [Proposing: he is stating what should be the action response to the court telling that they must give the organization advance notice for court appearances]. As it happened she put herself on call that if she really was needed she come on down. [Discussion: mentions of the consequence of inaction toward the issue].
I thought I do want to bring that up with one of the committees although I know that they have got a lot of other things going on. It is quite an aggravation. [Discussion: he interprets the issue (attributes the meaning of) aggravation to it.].
040 Joyce: I object to it with the case workers too. [Provides support for the need for action for resolving the issue].
041 Bryan: Well yes. It becomes more of a problem when we are talking about our program director. With little notice - saying are you going to appear in court? There is my meeting disrupted and things like that. I don’t think anybody else in any other situation would tolerate those kinds of things but I guess we are expected to tolerate this kind of thing. We try to run as efficient an organization as anybody else does. [Discussion: Defines the problem as one of short advance notice, and mentions of its disruptive consequence for the organization, especially the key positions, and upholds the efficiency criteria as a reason for the need of an action response].
042 Karen: What’s the legal - do you have to (get) 48 hours or 72 hours?
[she is seeking clarification. refers to the issue as a legal matter - i.e., she is using the "legality" frame of reference in interpreting and seeking an action response toward the issue].
043 Bryan: Well technically as Randy has advised us before you should present them personally to the person in their hand. This is an accepted thing. Sometimes you go to a person's place of employment and give it to a secretary and people usually honor those and don’t say anything about it. [Discussion: gives unsolicited details].
044 Joyce: But isn’t there a time? [seeks clarification-refers to legality frame of reference - the question asked in line 042].
045 Bryan: We would certainly like to have a 24 hour or 48 hour notice. We didn’t even know when this was delivered. All we know is that it was laying on the little window. [Proposing how much advance notice should be there].
046 Karen: It was to her personally?
047 Bryan: One was to her personally and one was to Rod, but Rod was no longer employed here, so we just ignored that one. [Discussion: Giving details].

048 Randy: Part of the problem that I think we have got-from when we talked about it before, Bryan, even though they may not doing what they legally obligated to do — do we want to incur their wrath by giving — O.K. you haven’t served the subpoena properly and therefore we are not going to appear. Or you haven’t tendered witness fees and we are entitled to witness fees and therefore we are going to appear. There are ways we could avoid/ [Discussion: Randy is blocking the action structuring attempt by Bryan by mentioning of the negative consequence of such an action. And then mentions that the confrontation with the court could be avoided. While he is interrupted by the next speaker, but as he implies in these lines and subsequent lines — via using statements such as "incurring their wrath" — he is leading the audience to believe and see that the confrontation with the court is futile and is wrought with negative consequences for the organization].

050 Joyce: I like that one.

051 Randy: /...want to pick that up. But we put a budget item in there. But the problem I think is a more practical one. We have to live with the court. We have to work with the court and if we don’t to a degree cooperate with the court then we may have problems in the future. But I think when we talked about it before that there was need to pursue it any further at that point and now may be the time and I don’t know who is in the prosecutor’s office/[Discussion: Randy is offering a practicality vs. legality frame of reference for interpreting the issue. He elaborates on the reasons why the organization should not confront with the court on the ground of legality].

052 Bryan: At that time too they weren’t subpoenaing records. [Elaborates - however by introducing (reminding of) this fact, Bryan may have the intention of justifying his current concern and call for an action response].

053 Randy: Right.

054 Bryan: Not to be an attorney but if I can remember the state law that was passed when they talked about social work licensing, part of that particular law says that the social worker would begin to be treated (as) who have a confidential relationship with their clients — would begin to be treated as priests and attorneys were in having to divulge confidential information. So we didn’t cause much of a hassle when because they weren’t asking the same thing. But when they begin to have to read records off in court on kids, and I think again maybe we might have to talk about something informally — can we work out something — maybe some of the judges aren’t aware of the way things are being...

... the way their bailiffs or whoever brings up the
subpoenas.

[Discussion and Signaling Agreement with the proposed action by Randy. Bryan elaborates on the issue via the legality frame of reference by talking about the law protecting the confidentiality of the organization's main activity. However towards the end of his discussion, he also shows signs of conceding the practicality frame of reference.]

055 Randy: Part of the problem that we touched on before was that it should really be the attorney who is representing the youth who should be protecting the privilege. The privilege for our clients not to have us divulge that information. We are not really obligated to protect it but they should be doing it. [Discussion: Randy takes the legality issue raised by Bryan in line 054 and shows how even on the legality grounds, the organization is not obliged to protect the client's privilege. By this discussion, Randy is presenting more evidence for the appropriateness of using his practicality vs. legality frame of reference for interpreting the issue and its consequences.

056 Bryan: They should be objecting to it.

057 Randy: If the public defender or the lawyer isn't doing it then it puts us in an awkward position where at least we have to be raising that. [Discussion: here Randy is presenting why it is impractical to go with Bryan's proposed action - i.e., stepping in the territory where the organization shouldn't.]

058 Bryan: Again, I think our stand needs to be giving them some advice - Randy went through a whole thing with the staff before on how to present themselves on the witness stand. And that was a lot of help. [Resolution: As the reader may observe too, Bryan's position (only as it is visible in the lines, without making any assumptions about his actual state of mind) has evidently softened. He concedes to the practicality frame of reference in dealing with the problem - giving advice vs. taking up the law and requiring them to comply with the advance notice deadlines.]

059 Randy: Maybe it is a situation where we talk to judge Adam or Judge Rose if we are having problems with that. The other possibility is that judge Adam is running for court of appeals - (many talking at the same time) - kick him upstairs. [Resolution: As Bryan concedes to Randy's proposed approach, Randy is now proposing how in practical ways this situation can be handled.]

061 Joyce: Oh good. Oh wonderful.

062 Bryan: I have nothing else to report. [Closure].
APPENDIX H

THE LIST OF EXPRESSIVE WORDS (CONTENT CATEGORY #13)
Social Work Organizational Meeting:

"It is getting to be a pain again"
"It is quite an aggravation"
"Do we want to incur their wrath?"
"We have four wonderful new candidates"
"I think she will be a wonderful addition"
"I was looking for somebody who would pick up the ball and do some things in some of those areas"

Hotel Meeting:

"It is Horrendous"

Hospital (Committee) Meeting:

"I think it is really easy"
"It is a really good idea"
"I am sure...(that it is a good idea)"
"I think it sounds good"
"Good"
"Well, everybody is busy"
"That is a pain in the neck"
"I was really surprised at how many..."
"I am looking forward to it"

Public Broadcasting Meeting:

"It is real cumbersome"
"I am not talking about I claim this land in the name of Queen Isabelle"
"How prudent it is"
"Your are supposed to represent the philosophy and the direction of the department, you are not supposed to be the dictator of the department"
"Bureaucratic Crap"
"That is going to open a can of worms"
"It is pain"
"To get storm into my office"
"The Institution in all of its dumbness and inability to perceive"
"I was not too big on it"
"I think that would be fun"
Research Organization Meeting:

"There are horror stories of things being out there for years"
"I think they rattled some cages over there"
"I get a little nervous about that"
"I would be real interested in that"
"I am nervous about..."
APPENDIX I

THE SENSE OF STRUCTURE IN STRUCTURING CATEGORIES: EXPERTS' OPINION
The Sense of Structure in the Findings
Results of Experts Opinion

Content Categories:

#1) Members make statements in which they mention (i.e., talk about) the job and duties of an organizational member, unit, position, and how the job is supposed to be performed (what are the steps and procedure to be followed).
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Formalization, Rules, Procedure, Behavioral Norms
Expert 2: Job Specialization, Procedure

#2) Members make statements in which they describe and present (their view of) organizational structure in terms of the structure's "proper" or "existing" channels, routes, hierarchy, positions, paperwork, standardization, rules and etc.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Hierarchical Relationships, What is in the Statement
Expert 2: What the Statement contains

#3) Members make statements in which they mention changes in organizational composition (i.e., who is who), format, and set-up.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: hierarchical relationships
Expert 2: format, set-up of organization

#4) Members make statements in which they mention an organizational issue and situation and then based on that ask for or announce for organizational cooperation and/or coordination.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Coordination Issues
Expert 2: Coordination

#5) Members make statements in which they report on their activity.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: No Sense of Structure
Expert 2: Formal vs. Informal Structure

#6) Members make statements in which they concede to (acknowledge) the existence of an aspect of organizational structure by making a confirmatory statement in response to someone else's assertion regarding that aspect.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: None
Expert 2: What the aspect is
#7) Members make statements in which they mention of their interaction with other persons, units, and levels within the organization.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Informal
Expert 2: Informal Interaction

#8) Members make statements in which they mention differences or distinctions between units and levels of an organization and also between organizational members as individuals and their organizational roles/affiliations.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: None
Expert 2: Roles, Complexity

#9) Members make statements in which they mention feasible/permissible, and non-feasible/non-permissible organizational activities.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Informal vs. Formal
Expert 2: Permissible Actions

#10) Members make statements in which they mention organization as a whole, and then mention of different parts (units) of the organization and how they relate to one another.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Structural Relationships, Systemic
Expert 2: Units, Divisions, Division of Labor

#11) Members make statements in which they mention time (specific/general) - as a frame of reference - for specifying the short-term and/or long term organizational activity of members and or units.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: None
Expert 2: Time alone no; time as related to task, yes; time as Lawrence and Lorsch’s orientation, yes.

#12) Members make statements in which they mention/propose the need for, creating a new, or revising an old organizational action (procedure, response, program, etc.).
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Standard, Formalization, Standard, Flexibility, Change
Expert 2: Probably organizational procedure, program
#13 Members make statements in which they express their feeling of/about structure of organization, or an aspect of it, expressive/qualitative words/terms/phrases.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Interpretation of it
Expert 2: Feeling about structure

Strategies:

#14 Upholding Organizational Property(s) occurred when the speaker mentioned of one or more of organizational property(s) such as: philosophy, goal, mission, technology, device, standard, rule, policy, norm, rule, term, and then indicated (e.g., gave a reason for) what is feasible, or non-feasible, or possible or non-possible, to do in the organization, or what can (should) be done regarding the issue.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Cultural Level, Ecological Structure
Expert 2: Yes, what is in the statement

#15Expressing (Commenting) occurred when the speaker expressed one’s opinion, or belief, regarding an organizational issue, or for/against a proposed action.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: No
Expert 2: No

#16 Interpreting occurred when the speaker interpreted, that is defined, elaborated on an issue or a situation, its consequences, its meaning, its implications, by giving one’s perspective (way of thinking) on it via one’s words.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: No
Expert 2: No

#17 Being Ambiguous (Creating Uncertainty) occurred when the speaker intentionally or inadvertently appeared and sounded ambiguous to those seeking to commit him/her (the speaker) to a given course of action, or to get him/her to accept a change, or something new. Saying it differently, resisting to be committed to a new or different course of action as proposed by others was accomplished by the speaker as he or she created (again intentionally or not) uncertainty by making ambiguous and unclear statements about the situation.
Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: No
Expert 2: No
#18 Naming (Labeling) occurred when one or more of the following observations was made:
a) The speaker used the official and formal (i.e., non-personal) names, titles of individuals, people, divisions, units, positions instead of using anyone’s personal name.
b) The speaker used formal labels and names in talking about an issue, or someone.

Sense of Structure:
Expert 1: Degree of Formalization, Power Distance (high), Hierarchy
Expert 2: Yes
APPENDIX J

DAFT'S LIST OF STRUCTURAL DIMENSIONS

(Adapted from Daft, 1986)
Daft’s List of Structural Dimensions
(Daft 1986, pp. 16-17)

1. **Formalization** pertains to the amount of written documentation in the organization. Documentation includes procedures, job descriptions, regulations, and policy manuals. These written documents describe behavior and activities. Formalization is often measured by simply counting the number of pages of documentation within the organization. Large universities, for example, tend to be high on formalization because they have several volumes of written rules for things as registration, drop an add, student associations, dormitory governance, financial assistance, and even the use of bulletin boards. A small family-owned business, in contrast, may have almost no written rules and would be considered informal.

2. **Specialization** is the degree to which organizational tasks are subdivided into separate jobs. If specialization is extensive, each employee performs only a narrow range of tasks. If specialization is low, employees perform a wide range of tasks in their jobs. Specialization is sometimes referred to as the division of labor.

3. **Standardization** is the extent to which similar work activities are performed in a uniform manner. In a highly standardized organization, work content is described in detail, so similar work is performed the same way across departments or locations.

4. **Hierarchy of authority** describes who reports to whom and the span of control for each manager. The hierarchy is depicted by the vertical lines on an organization chart. The hierarchy is related to span of control—the number of employees reporting to a supervisor. When spans of control are narrow, the hierarchy tends to be tall. When spans of control are wide, the hierarchy of authority will be shorter.

5. **Complexity** refers to the number of activities of subsystems within the organization. Complexity can be measured along dimensions—vertical, horizontal, and spatial. Vertical complexity is the number of levels in the hierarchy. Horizontal complexity is the number of job titles or departments existing horizontally across the organization. Spatial complexity is the number of geographical locations.
6. Centralization refers to the hierarchical level that has authority to make a decision. When decisions are delegated to lower organizational levels, the organization is decentralized. When decision-making is kept at the top level, it is centralized.

7. Professionalism is the level of formal education and training of employees. Professionalism is considered high when employees require long periods of training to be job holders in the organization. Professionalism is generally measured as the average number of years of education of employees, which could be as high as twenty in a medical practice and less than ten in a construction company.

8. Personnel configuration refers to the deployment of people to various functions and departments. Personnel configuration is measured by ratios such as the administrative ratio, the clerical ratio, the professional staff ratio, or the ratio of indirect to direct labor employees. A configuration ratio is measured by dividing the number of employees in a classification by the total number of organizational employees.
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