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CHAPTER I

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION:
A REVIEW OF CONCEPTS AND RESEARCH

Introduction

We are caught up in organizations. Because many of us live in close proximity and because we want to get specific things done, we have structured - or organized - relationships among ourselves for convenience of accomplishment. The structure of our relationships is operationalized, to a large extent, via communicative behavior. Communication is the vehicle by which working relationships are established, personal and managerial styles are manifested, and tasks are accomplished.

The role of communication in accomplishing the goals of an organization surfaces another linkage between communication and organizations. As our society becomes increasingly mechanized and technologized, managers of organizations become more removed from the physical objects or products produced. Instead, their task is to work with the symbols that represent the objects or products. The communication role of organizations in our society, viewed as a symbol system, is widely recognized. Weick (1969, p. 40) and Katz and Kahn (1966, p. 233) clearly view organizing and organizations, respectively, as information processing and meaning transmission. Inasmuch as organizing is
enacted through communication and the goal of modern organizations is to pro-
cess information, we have a complex of means-ends relationships between com-
munication and organization.

The relationships between and effects of communication and organizing
processes is not clearly spelled out. For a society whose symbolic features
are so intimately connected to and defined by organizations it is surprising that
we should know so little about organizational communication. Granted, we have
a number of mid-range frameworks (e.g., communication networks, informal
communication grapevines) that are internally consistent. But there are few
over arching frameworks that generate and integrate data to answer questions
such as: (1) how do individuals communicate interpersonally in an organizational
setting? and, (2) what are the variables that influence the ways individuals com-
municate?

Two characteristics of these questions help make this point. First,
choosing to deal with interpersonal communication in the organizational setting
emphasizes the actual interaction between individuals. When the subject of anal-
ysis is a larger aggregation, such as multiple groups or an audience, it is sensi-
tible to make data from these aggregates manageable by some form of numerical
representation. But when the communication of two to six people in work groups
is the primary importance, and the relationships between the messages and
their originators are direct, the content of the exchange rises in importance as
the subject of the research. Second, acknowledging contextual variables places
emphasis on methods that account for multiple relationships between the communication behavior and the setting in which it occurs.

Focusing on the contextual influences of the sources and content of interpersonal communication in an organizational setting provides the starting point for this research project. The remainder of Chapter I reviews the literature in organizational communication that emphasizes communicative behavior, systematic explanation, and natural settings. This review demonstrates that a different set of methods and theories is necessary to address the questions posed above. Chapter II outlines the research questions and a strategy of qualitative research to answer them. This strategy, grounded theory, produces a description of interpersonal communicative behavior and develops a category system to explain it. Chapter III analyzes the data and produces a twenty-four category system of interpersonal communication drawn directly from the behavior of an organization in a field setting. Chapter IV draws relationships among the twenty-four categories into a single system. This chapter also offers testable hypotheses extrapolated from the qualitative research. Chapter V summarizes what was done, reviews ways the research method can be improved, and explores future research directions.

Research and Theory of Organizational Communication

In the introduction an interest was expressed in discovering how individuals communicate interpersonally in an organizational setting and in explaining
contextual factors influencing that process. Research in organizational communication has, in the main, been aimed at different research assumptions and priorities than those mentioned here. This is substantiated by a review of the four research and theory trends that characterize the literature of organizational communication. These trends are reviewed to clarify the status of organizational communication research and to build a case for the qualitative grounded theory research this dissertation pursues.

**Information Theory and Organizational Communication**

A number of disciplines study communication from a variety of approaches. Attitude-balance theories from psychology, syntactic theories from linguistics, symbolic interaction theories from sociology and anthropology, and information theory from engineering, to mention just a few. From this range of approaches, information theory has been the favorite selection for the study of organizations. The predominant use of this single theory gives the literature in organizational communication a special tone and direction.

Shannon and Weaver's (1949) information theory originates from the physical rather than the social sciences. Labels such as receivers, signals, transmitters and codes (pp. 7, 8) connote black boxes, circuits and wiring. Yet, the notion of linear message flow from box to box in information theory is similar to the lines and squares of an organizational chart. The isomorphism is
visual, not conceptual. The concepts are taken from information theory but their referents are frequently altered when applied to organizations.

Information theory has had an important role in the development of organizational communication as a science, but its value is restricted in ways that require recognition. First, there has been a lack of adherence to Shannon and Weaver's basic concepts. Information theory is postulational theory concerning the freedom of choice in constructing messages. The term "information" refers to one's freedom of available choices (what you could say) rather than what is actually communicated (what you do say) (Shannon and Weaver, pp. 8, 9).

The organizational communication literature shows a consistent use of the term information as occurring when a system is operating free of noise. According to Read (1963), random noise, "borrowed from the language of information theory, refers to annoying, disturbing, or irrelevant messages or signals which occur in any input-output system (p. 7)." Katz and Kahn's (1966) chapter on Communication uses information theory in much the same manner. They see organizations as providing needed constraints or structures for communication. Providing selectivity to channels is in their view a way of reducing noise in the system.

In both these cases, Shannon and Weaver's unique meaning for information and its relationship to noise is overlooked. For Shannon and Weaver, the introduction of distortions, errors, and other extraneous material leads one to
say that the received message, because of the noise, has increased uncertainty and increased information. The product of this confusion causes information theory to be a misused analogy to explain psychological and sociological concepts.

The second limitation of information theory, and perhaps the most important one in terms of our research interest, is its contribution to a view of communication indicted in the writings of Barnlund (1960), Berlo (1960), and Goyer (1970). The language of information theory describes a linear transmission of messages to a destination. The central notion of current authors' writings in communication theory is its processual characteristics; interacting, dynamic, and interdependent. Smith (1970) builds a strong case against the influence of engineering terms on the study of communication. He identifies information theory terminology as the primary contributor to mechanistic linear notions that those in the theoretical forefront urge us to discard. In the next chapter, an alternative communication theory will be introduced that responds to these limitations and assists in developing new perspectives of organizational communication.

**Classical Organization Theory**

Classical organization theory, developed by Taylor (1923), Gulick and Urwick (1937), and Max Weber (1947), focuses on individual responsibilities and effective functioning. These models are generally referred to as
mechanistic because of their underlying assumptions that blueprints, specifications, and parts can be fitted together to make an organization operate efficiently. Following are Katz and Kahn's (1966) account of five major concepts in classical theory:

1. Specialization of tasks - subdivided tasks are taught, executed and evaluated.

2. Standardized roles - performances are institutionalized and prescribed.

3. Unity and centralization of command - single individuals have more responsibility over supervisable members.

4. Uniformity of practices - behavior not accounted for in task standardization is controlled by design.

5. No duplicate functions - common needs should be met by one centralized section (pp. 71, 72).

The primary limitation of mechanistic organization models, for this research project, is that they do not consider informal relationships among people in organizational roles and the environmental effects on the internal structure of the organization.

To place classical theory in a field of alternatives, Scott (1961) appraises it in relation to its successor models. Classical theory was modified in light of findings of the influences of informal groups (e.g., the Hawthorne studies, Rothlisberger and Dickson, 1939). Concern for group norms, social control,
status, and informal leadership are a central part of neo-classical theory. Probably the greatest limitation of neo-classical theory was the absence of any single model to organize the many interesting, but unrelated findings. Modern organization theory, on the other hand, is characterized by its integrative ability. Modern organization theory treats organizations as total systems of mutually interdependent variables. Key among the questions it raises about organizations are: (1) What are the strategic parts of the system? (2) What is the nature of their mutual dependency? (3) What are the main processes in the system which link the parts together, and (4) What are the goals sought by the system?

Given this interdependent, dynamic property one might anticipate that modern organization theory is a popular model for the study of organizational communication. Despite this apparent isomorphism, most studies of organizational communication are couched in classical theory. Steil's (1971) synthesis of modern organization theory and organizational communication indicates such a tendency. His extensive review of articles, indices, convention papers, as well as other special sources, demonstrated a "rather significant neglect of the newly developed theoretical concept of modern organization theory" (p. 81). Steil's documentation on the predominant use of classical organization theory in organizational communication needs little expansion.

The impact of classical theory on organizational communication is demonstrated by frequent use of concepts such as "establishing communication
policies" and "procedural instructions" (Greenbaum, 1972). Yet Level (1959) and Spelling (1970) indicate that policies may have little effect on organizational behavior. The emphasis on policies and procedures points to the principal characteristic that limits classical theory as a contributor to this research project. Policies and procedures are the formal rules of behavior, yet the focus of this research is on the informal interpersonal communication behavior of organization members.

In Chapter II research questions are introduced that deal with Scott's questions of strategic parts, mutual dependencies, and linking processes. This theoretical background, combined with communication theory that accounts for variables in process, provides a breadth of scope that encourages the research this project hopes to accomplish -- the discovery of variables in a natural setting.

Organization as Laboratory Communication Networks

The original study of communication networks (the MIT experiments of Bavelas, 1950 and Leavitt, 1951) established a norm for the study of communication in organizations. From the criterion of volume, this research emphasis has exceeded any other single development in the field. One of the reasons for its popularity is its compatibility with the central issues of organizational behavior as a social science. Its implications for controlled (theory x) versus indirect (theory y) management styles, for tall versus flat organization
structures, for participative versus directive decision-making have influenced our knowledge and perspective of communication in organizations.

The bulk of the literature on communication in networks has been reviewed (Carzo, 1963; Cohen, 1962; Glanzer and Glanzer, 1961; Golembiowski, 1962 a. and 1962 b.; and Shaw, 1964). Network studies have been primarily laboratory based research. The approach here is to describe the strategy of network research, to review the findings from representative articles, and to evaluate critically the impact of network theory and research on our thinking about organizational communication.

The study of communication networks deals with the structural variable of communication channels. This structure varies in the patterns of and accessibility to communication channels. The following figure depicts three popular experimental structures.

![Network Structures](image)

**Figure 1 – Network Structures**

One individual may be allowed to communicate with everyone in the group and everyone else may be allowed to communicate only with him (wheel
net). In a less structured net all individuals have open channels to all members (all-channeled net). Networks have been structured in many ways: wheel, kite, chain, circle, all-channel, pinwheel, barred circle, etc. Within these combinations, the degree of constraint or centrality of the net is the independent variable.

Communication network research pre-structures relationships by designing communication patterns that cause some individuals to be in the center and others to be relatively isolated. A problem solving situation is introduced and measurements of success and satisfaction are obtained.

The original Leavitt (1951) and Bavelas (1953) research on communication networks found that wheel groups worked faster, needed a smaller number of messages, and made fewer errors than circle groups. In these experiments the task of the group was to identify, by means of written communication, a symbol held in common by all group members. The results were explained in terms of centrality as a measure of closeness of a single individual position to all other positions in the structure.

Shaw (1954) offered an alternative interpretation of network data. While his wheel groups were more efficient than circle groups at solving the simple identification problem, the reverse was true for a more complex problem.

These findings have been replicated on a number of occasions and a variety of structures have been tested. Yet the two original conclusions remain as the most significant contribution of network research: (1) The effectiveness
of the network is dependent upon the task, and (2) studies using more complex
tasks usually find the decentralized networks to be more effective; for simple
problems centralized networks are more effective (faster) (Shaw, 1964).

This perspective can be made more complete by considering some of its
limitations. Two factors stand out in this regard. First, the focus is on struc-
ture of communication in organizations. Evan (1970), in his overview of experi-
mental work in organizations, distinguishes between structure and process re-
search. Accepting the difficulty of gaining consensus on the meaning of these
terms, for his purposes, organizational structure refers to the relatively dur-
able properties of arrangement of subsystems and organizational process refers
to the recurrent activities that contribute to transaction between organizations
and their environments. Clearly, network studies contribute to the knowledge
of effectiveness and satisfaction of people in structured positions with stable
channels of communication. Input and output measurements are made but the
research is not designed to deal with the context of the communication. The
process of communication is an incidental and unstudied by-product.

Second, the communication situations used in network studies are dis-
tant from human communication behavior in organizations. The method of con-
trolling channels is usually accomplished by placing subjects in stalls and pro-
viding slots between them to exchange written messages on the task. This con-
trolling device does not allow salient contextual variables such as appearance,
verbal tone, and proximity (Duncan, 1969 and Mehrabian, 1969) to influence the
outcomes of the network groups. Abrahamson (1969) focused on these variables by creating face-to-face, verbally interacting groups in the wheel or star structure. He found that although the subjects were instructed to direct their messages to the central-position person, between ten and twenty-five percent of the time they failed to do so. He manipulated personality types in the experiment and concluded that partitions tend to exaggerate the influence of spatial position upon leadership because they control personality characteristics (p. 121).

Another characteristic of network research that raises validity questions is the amount of time given subjects to complete the decision making tasks within the experimental network. Browning (1972) points out that groups in natural organizational settings "rarely decide on issues or solve problems originally introduced to them thirty minutes or an hour prior to final completion (p. 4)." Centering on the same problem, Burgess (1968) infers that an undue concern for tests of significance has caused network researchers to incorporate large samples with short periods of observation (p. 327). Judging by the range of time necessary to accomplish the types of problems used in net studies, the life for a group ranged between fifteen and sixty minutes. This is scarcely time necessary for the group emergence phenomenon to occur (Tuckman, 1965, and Fisher, 1970).

Burgess addressed this problem by creating groups of the two extreme structure types, wheel and circle, and extended the group life to ten hours. During the first sessions there was a gradual, yet steady, acceleration in
solution rates; eventually all groups reached a steady state of response times for solution. More importantly, after the groups had achieved a steady state, there were no differences in solution rates for the two networks under investigation (p. 331). A conclusion suggested by Burgess is "that previously asserted differences in solution rates between communication structures in which there were no physical limitations favoring one network over the other, were a function of experimental artifacts (p. 335)."

Hampering the exhibition of interpersonal communicative behavior and the emphasis on structural variables means that network research does not provide the foundation needed for an approach to interpersonal communicative behavior in a natural setting.

Written Forms of Measurement

The fourth major identifiable trend in organizational communication is the consistent use of paper and pencil measures as the tool for collecting data. A review of such tools will develop the implications for this research; the different types of written measurements survey, standardized instruments, ECCO

---

1While written forms of measurement have predominated data collection in organizational communication, research trends have developed emphasizing other forms of data collection that merit recognition. (1) Case study observations producing broad scale findings (Evan, 1963 and Madden, 1968), and (2) anthropological and business-organization studies of interaction behavior (Burns, 1954, Melbin, 1954, Atteslander, 1954, Walker, Guest and Turner, 1956, Schwartzbaum and Gruenfeld, 1959, Sayles, 1964 and Rossel, 1970).
analysis and sociometry, and the semantic differential are reviewed. Following this review, the data produced by these instruments is related to the research interests of this project.

Survey Research

Survey research is the methodological cornerstone of field research and a contributor to the concepts related to management and organization (Katz, 1967). The use of survey research is explainable by its ability to minimize the problems of population size through the use of sample selection techniques. The problems of distance and geography are minimized by the ease with which questionnaires can be distributed (Knapp and McCrosky, 1966).

Another value of survey research is its modifiability to the issues that are relevant in any given organization. Differences in organizations can be responded to by changing the nature of the questions asked. Nilsen (1953, 1955) provides the procedures for collecting data and developing subsequent items to survey an organization effectively.

The technique of survey research also allows the investigator to collect comparative data on different population groupings or across time within groups. These designs have been widely used in organizational communication research as demonstrated by the following research: Simmon's (1961) comparison of high job performers with low job performers, Zima's (1968) study of factory and non-factory supervisors, Barrett and Frank's (1969) comparison of
different countries and nationalities, and Angrist's (1953) study of different levels of management and company size. Also included in this research is Wade's (1968) comparison of high communication initiators and low communication initiators, Willit's (1970) study of presidents of successful and unsuccessful companies and Raudsepp's (1968 a., 1968 b.) comparison of occupational differences. Studies adding the variable of message diffusion are represented by Rollins and Chaters' (1965) study of message reception and cohesion and Dahle's (1954) effectiveness study of oral only, written only, oral and written, bulletin board, and grapevine methods of communication. Excluded from this report on survey are articles reporting too little information to evaluate the research and articles written for specific industries' media (e.g., Iron Age, Mining Congress Journal and Chain Store Age). For a comprehensive annotated bibliography that cites these articles as well as the research articles mentioned above see Carter (1972).

**Standardized Instruments**

The form of written measurement that identifies closely with its industrial-personnel psychology antecedents is the communication test-instrument. This term generally refers to a data-gathering device carefully developed through creating and incorporating items into a scale that reliably predicts future behavior or performance through individual scores on that scale. With these types of instruments, data are collected longitudinally, norms are
developed for performance on the scale and it is published in booklet form.

This form of measurement includes such scales as Funk and Becker's (1952) scale to test organizational knowledge and Brown and Neitzel's (1952) scale on communication between supervisor and subordinate. According to Tompkins (1964), these scales "are primarily used to measure downward communication (p. 113)." An example of a scale to measure supervisory communication is the Kirkpatrick Supervisory Inventory on Communication which Dance (1966) submitted to a validation test. His test showed that although expert respondents answer the scale differently than layman, the validation is of questionable value since it was not completed with high and low performance supervisors.

Freshley (1955) and Pryon (1964) developed and validated forced choice scales to measure communication attitudes of management personnel and foremen. Freshley found significant differences in test scores by management personnel in companies of different size and by personnel at different levels of management. He found no differences for groups with different numbers of people under their direction. Pryon's scale development was much like Freshley's; both had initial item pools in excess of two-hundred and both refined the scale down to approximately thirty to forty items. Pryon's main criterion for sample division was high rated and low rated foremen. The scale results did not provide an overall correlation of high versus low foremen, although it was able to do so within some individual companies. Significant relationships were found between high scores on the communication inventory and
both supervisory seniority and formal education. The Pyron research, even with the extensive work on scale development, surfaces the major limitation of standard scales. They fail to account for varying situational differences in organizations, and they have a serious difficulty in breaching the distance between ability to perform on a test and actual performance with people.

**ECCO Analysis and Sociometry**

ECCO analysis and sociometry are similar methods and are discussed together. They both are based on the naming or identifying of individuals who are either in or out of the active message flow activity. ECCO analysis varies from sociometry in that it traces specific messages through a sequence or chain of individuals to determine the time and space movement of information through an organizational structure. The results of ECCO analysis permit the mapping of informal and formal flows of information. According to Davis, ECCO analysis can identify communication problems in organizations such as information isolates, and rumor patterns. It can also provide comparative and audit data for interplant or interdepartmental samples (1953, p. 310).

ECCO analysis has changed little since it was created in 1953. Davis' recent research (1969) on lower and middle managers shows more sources of information outside the chain of command than within; of those outside the formal chain, approximately one-half are horizontal and one-half diagonal. Another example of Davis' current work (1968) is almost identical to his
original study with an added test of written versus oral messages included. Other extensions of ECCO analysis by Davis' mentors (Sutton and Porter, 1968, and Sutton, 1969) compare individual personality data to ECCO findings. The studies following the original work on ECCO analysis have been replications with slight modifications.

Sociometry is research designed to gain qualitative measurements of interpersonal attraction. Individuals in a laboratory, or more frequently a field environment, are asked to indicate who they have a favorable or unfavorable feeling for by listing names following such questions as: "List the four people in your division you enjoy working with most (least)." The choices of individuals produce data that show central and peripheral figures in the organization. Highly chosen persons are frequently referred to as stars and individuals receiving few choices are termed isolates. (Secord and Backman, 1964, p.240.)

**Semantic Differential**

The semantic differential, originally designed to study the concept of meaning through a seven point scale with bi-polar adjectives (Snyder and Osgood, 1959), has been used as a research instrument in organizational communication. Weaver (1957, 1958) used the semantic differential to quantify the frames of reference between labor and management groups. His development of a semantic differential focused on the concepts of grievance, arbitration,
and seniority. His findings showed significantly different frames of reference, that management had a frame of reference in the process of changing that was not well understood and that the labor group had greater and more extreme stereotypes than the management group.

Korman (1960) did a similar study of concept meaning with a group of managers from different levels and produced similar conclusions. He found individuals at the same management level varying greatly on the relative importance they place on different concepts. He also found consistently greater differences between top and middle managers than between top and low managers. The semantic differential is primarily used in organizational communication to discover differences in cognitive frameworks for different groups.

The account of written forms of measurement offered here includes survey research, standardized instruments, ECCO and sociometric analysis, and the semantic differential. They have varying strengths and weaknesses, yet two important characteristics are shared in common: (1) They are essentially phenomenological. They focus on the subject's attitude, perception or meaning of reality. This statement does not question the validity or importance of social reality, for certainly it is the basis of human activity. But it does not recognize that the behavior of the individual - as coded, viewed, or evaluated, along some purported objective criteria - is also a part of the study of human communication. (2) They are source-receiver oriented. With the simplest Aristotelian model of speaker-message-listener as a paradigm for
communication, the written forms of measurement systematically fail to account for the component that connects the speaker and listener – the message itself. The written forms of measurements reviewed are static and historical. They account for an individual's attitude toward communication or a communication episode; they account for his competence in speaking and listening; they account for the individuals with whom he talks or ignores. Yet they fail to close the loop on the communication process and account for the interacting dynamics of the individual, his message, and his listener.

Summary

This review demonstrates that the predominant theories and methods in organizational communication are not designed to deal with the content of interpersonal communication and the variables that influence it in the organizational setting. To address this research interest, an approach to organizational communication is advanced based on (1) an interaction process theory of communication combined with a systems theory of organizations, and (2) a design executed in a field setting using a synthesis of observational and written methods. In the next chapter a strategy of qualitative research, called grounded theory, is outlined to integrate these theories and methods.
CHAPTER II
RESEARCH METHODS AND SETTING

In the introduction to Chapter I an interest was expressed in researching how individuals communicate interpersonally in an organizational setting and in identifying the variables that influence that process. These interests are offered as research questions in the following form:

1. What are the variables that influence the interpersonal communication process in the subject organization?

2. What are the relationships among those variables and how do the relationships explain the organization's communication behavior?

The review of major theoretical and methodological contributions in Chapter I demonstrated their limited applicability for these research questions. This chapter outlines a study in which communication variables are identified in a field setting via the collection of observation and interview data. The data are then analyzed to formulate variables and explanatory relationships.

Identifying the type of organizational research implied by our research questions and methods is useful here. Doing so gives the reader a reference point for understanding the contents of the chapter. Evans' (1971) typology of organizational research strategies includes the case study, the sample survey, the laboratory experiment, and the field experiment (p. 4). The use of
non-participant observation and interviewing in only one organization places this study in Evans' case study category.

The research methods offered in this chapter are consistent with the growing demand for more descriptive, systemic research in communication. Speech communication's movement is similar to one in psychology calling for more emphasis on the power to describe and understand rather than the power to predict and control (Lipgar, 1968, Vernplanck, 1970, and Bakan, 1972). For example, Borman's (1970) paper places considerable emphasis on description at the possible expense of less experimental testing. He references Michael Polaniyi who feels "we should lay aside the word science for the next decade or two and give people the freedom to find out that we need more knowledge (p. 215)."

Smith (1972) offers the most powerful substantiation for descriptive field research. Part of the strength of Smith's position is his point of departure. He begins with Newton's mechanistic position and Whitehead's process position for viewing the nature of the world. In doing so, he shows a philosophical move from determinism and predictability to change and flux. Next Smith documents an inconsistency in speech communication scholarship showing a conceptual commitment to Whitehead's concept of process but a research record showing near exclusive use of the linear deterministic model borrowed from psychology (pp. 176, 177). Smith follows his explication of the idea of process and its rarity in communication research with some specific recommendations
on how we might move toward achieving more process research through accepting the following methodological assumptions.

1. Instill richness of explanation as a measure of acceptance.
2. Stipulate influences that might affect observer bias in reporting.
3. Accept simultaneously differing explanations as a product of varying perspectives.
4. Accept simultaneously differing explanations from the same perspective through situation and context variation.
5. Employ more wholistic perspectives to develop more complete explanations (p. 179).

Smith's assumptions, especially those dealing with richness of explanation and a wholistic perspective, were accepted as a guide for this research project. To build upon these assumptions, section one will offer a brief description of how and why grounded theory is developed. Section two briefly reviews several organization and communication perspectives that are consistent with Smith's position. Section three outlines the field setting, the observation and interview methods, and the data analysis methods. The final section summarizes the chapter.

Grounded Theory

Grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) is a strategy developed to handle qualitative field data that increases its use and contribution to the
social sciences. It is best understood by contrasting it with the research methods concerned "with how accurate facts can be obtained and how theory can be more rigorously tested" (p. 1). Grounded theory addresses "how the discovery of theory from data—systematically obtained and analyzed in social research—can be furthered" (p. 1).

Grounded theory is based on the following assumptions: (1) Qualitative data is more useful than quantitative data for the discovery of variables, substantive categories, and hypotheses, while quantitative research is best used in further exploration and testing theory (p. 18). (2) Comparative analysis of data assists in generating theory by creating conceptual categories or their properties from evidence; then the evidence from which the category emerged is used to illustrate the concept. (3) A focus on the verification and testing of theory can easily block the generation of a more rounded and more dense theory, i.e., a theory that accounts for a larger array of variables. Too frequently we are presented with well tested theory fragments. Generating theory has as its goal the development of new theories based on purposeful systematic generation from data of social research (pp. 27, 28).

These assumptions identify grounded theory as a process of research as an ever developing entity rather than as a perfect product. A more concrete notion of grounded theory will develop as its constant comparative method of data analysis is offered in the methods section of this chapter. The grounded theory process is actually completed in Chapters III and IV.
Supporting Organization and Communication Theories

Since the goal of this research is to discover variables and develop hypotheses by explaining the possible relationships among them, we are not testing, in a formal sense, existing theories of organization and communication. There are theories that provide a supporting framework in searching for a system of multiple influences that affect interpersonal communication in the organization. These supporting theories now are recognized.

Systems theory and its branches, including modern systems theory (Buckley, 1967), social systems theory (Homans, 1950), open systems theory (Katz and Kahn, 1966), and general systems theory (von Beralanffy, 1956, Miller, 1971, 1972), all emphasize the dynamics within and among organizational subsystems and treat as central a system's responsiveness to changing conditions. The usefulness of systems theory in explaining the relationships among connected elements is demonstrated in Chapter IV where a particular branch of systems theory provides assistance in developing relationships among communication categories.

Communication theories providing a perspective that accounts for a range of variables in a natural setting include: Schein's (1969) process analysis from organizational psychology, and Burke (1962) and Duncan's (1968) dramatistic frameworks from rhetorical theory and sociological theory, respectively. Both theoretical strategies encourage research that accounts for exchanges among different numbers of people with a variety of variables in
in operation. The general guidance provided is useful when questions of the phenomenon being studied occur during the data collection and analysis process.

METHOD

The Field Research Setting

The data were collected as a part of a U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare funded project with the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC). This organization is a public land use and transportation planning agency serving Franklin County and adjacent counties in central Ohio. The commission members are officials and public leaders of the different townships, villages, and cities within MORPC's region. The Commission's working staff organization, the focus of this research project, is made up of city and regional planners, transportation engineers and administrative-clerical staff. A majority of work done by this staff consists of analysis, treatment and updating of research data and developing planning reports based on findings. In many ways it is similar to a research and development organization in terms of educational level, size, and type of product created.

MORPC was selected as a research setting for seven reasons. First, its Executive Director was supportive of research activity and provided us with the freedom and understanding necessary to gather data. This support from the Executive Director allowed the research team to communicate openly its role and allowed the team access to all individuals and activities in the organization.
Second, MORPC was located conveniently for regular contact. Third, MORPC provided grant money to supplement Housing and Urban Development support needed to conduct the research. Fourth, the staff of the organization was located physically in one place; they occupied two stories of a single building with directly connecting offices and work rooms. This close environment gave them enough proxemic contact with each other for interpersonal relationships to develop, change and become normative. This setting gave the observer a chance to go into the organization, move about, and view its occurrences. It was possible to observe the divisions of the organization on interrelated issues or problems with no time or space constraints. In short, it was possible to stay "on top of what is going on" and flow with the phenomenon of interest without losing it at a physical boundary. This single location is contrasted with organizations whose members operate singularly, primarily in small branch units, or primarily in the client's domain. Such dispersal does not provide the opportunity to observe communicative behavior beyond temporary relationships or to observe interaction among sub-units.

The size of the organization was a fifth criterion. With a membership ranging from thirty-eight to forty-four people, it was large and heterogeneous enough to have a complex, informal structure, i.e., a variety of cliques, sub-units, power relationships and grapevines. The formal structure of the organization was a three-division, three-tiered hierarchy. These structure and size characteristics in a single location made it possible to deal with and account
for the total system. It was possible to establish a relationship with all the members of the organization that afforded access to subtle behaviors and attitudes (Becker and Geer, 1957). The organization size and composition was similar to a model one might design for a simulated study in the laboratory: large enough to generate relatively "typical" organizational behavior, yet small enough to allow for near saturation data collection.

A sixth attractive feature of MORPC as a research setting was the nature of the work accomplished. Much of the field research done in communication, especially that having observational methods as a primary methodology, is done in a manufacturing setting where the organizational output is a physical object (Walker, Guest, and Turner, 1956). In these cases, communication is a contributor to accomplishing the goals of the organization, but less of a direct part of the final outcome. The MORPC product is an information processing output. The quality of meetings with citizens advisory groups, the Commission and township meetings, the clarity and acceptance of written reports, briefings, and formal MORPC policy positions are the end products of the organization. Studying an organization that has communication purposes from instrumental to expressive and from concrete to abstract provides a richer, more complex environment than found in an assembly line-manufacturing setting.

The seventh and final criterion MORPC satisfied as a desirable field research setting was its clear itinerary of projects, meetings and supervisory sessions. A regular schedule of these sessions was posted weekly, making it
possible to focus on a series of sessions and to compare formal meeting communication with informal conversations in routine settings.

The Interview Process

The interviewing program consisted of unstructured interviews with the total MORPC membership.

The interaction with the interviewees was guided by procedures developed at the University of Minnesota Department of Speech Communication (Putnam, 1972, and Smith, 1972). Following are the types of questions and techniques used to elicit responses:

Open-ended, general. "What can you tell me that you think will help me understand this place?" Or when this was too vague as an opener, it was a follow-up probe: "Can you think of anything else that..."

Open-ended, slightly directive. "What are people here concerned about?" "What did you first hear about when you came to...?"

Open-ended, directive, personal. "What do you like most about your job?" "What gripes you the most about the job?" "Was this true?"

Open-ended, topic directive. "How are decisions made around here?" "Can you give me some examples?"

---

2The interviewing and observing processes were accomplished separately by the two man research team. Dr. Leonard C. Hawes conducted the interviewing and Larry D. Browning completed the observations.
The interviewer moved the interview along providing enough structure to maintain the stimulation and interest of the reportee and concurrently to leave the situation vague enough to elicit the interviewee's choice in narrowing the area of discussion. To accomplish these partially conflicting objectives, the interviewer adhered to the non-directive style Rogers (1944) advocates to maintain high interest in the interviewee's comments and encourage him to define his own context. For example, if the interviewee said: "Do you mean this or that?" The interviewer would respond with: "Whatever you think is most important." The interviewer spoke only when necessary and then to generate clarification or elaboration.

Each day following the interview sessions the interviewer translated his written phrases and notes into a manuscript account of each interview (for an example of these interview notes, see Appendix A). These were compiled in chronological order and used as one of the two basic sources of data on the organization. At the same time the interview data was being collected, the other team member was collecting observational data of the organization.

**The Observational Process**

Observational data of communication were collected to provide a comparative base for the data produced via the unstructured interviews. The guide for completing the observational research was McCall and Simmons' *Issues in Participant Observation* (1969).
One of the first issues is the selection of communication events to observe. Unlike the procedures used in other behavioral research, designing and executing the observational samples in advance is difficult. Instead, the observer drew upon observations giving leads to further samples to pursue the emerging ideas (McCall and Simmons, 1969, p. 64). Nevertheless, some identifiable guides were used in this hueristic sampling process.

First, much time was spent in early observations with the communication centering on the executive director of the organization. From this contact, the observer worked through each division of the organization following formal leads or other meetings that appeared to be relevant. The dual goal was to cover the total organization yet center on situations that seemed critical. Flanagan’s (1954) critical incident technique serves as a guide. Critical incidents, as the term implies, are simply reports of the things that people did that were especially effective or ineffective in accomplishing their goals. This continual reformulation of what is salient responds to Redding’s (1968) call for the use of contingency logic to focus on organizational relationships and sets of circumstances operating in given cases (p. 105). This is what was done here. To account for the breadth of the organization periodic assessments of divisions and people were taken. Simultaneous attention was given to what was critical and who was involved in selecting behavioral samples.

When the observer arrived at a session he would acknowledge and greet those present, but would avoid extended conversations before the meeting.
started. The objective was to achieve an even balance and rapport with the individuals in the system. The observer did not want to be perceived as unfriendly or energetic in the meeting context. At each meeting the observer selected a seating position that was away from formal leaders, yet placed physically where all faces were visible.

Personal contact with organizational members was kept to a minimum during the observational phase of the research. Unlike other observational projects, there were no special informants from within the organization. Any special relationship, such as an informant, might jeopardize working with the total staff.

Another form of contact that merits reference was the continuous questions about the findings of the research. Levinson (1972) gives special attention to this and encourages researchers to respond cautiously to the questions each time they are raised to avoid premature disclosure of findings. This was a difficult balance to achieve, but was accomplished by giving partial and sometimes indirect responses.

After each day of observations the brief words and phrases recorded during the contact periods were elaborated on and written in manuscript form (for an example of these observation notes, see Appendix B). Field notes were three or four pages in length for a two to three hour period of observation. The total length of the observation and interview manuscripts was similar (18,750
and 18,000 words respectively). These two documents provided data for analysis. The next section treats the methods of analysis used.

**Data Analysis**

The source providing guidance and direction for analysis of the interview and observation manuscripts was McCall and Simmons (1969) section on qualitative analysis in social research (pp. 142-228) and Glaser and Strauss (1967) section on data analysis.

Different methods available for participant observation now are examined to explicate more completely the theoretical bases of the study. For example, most of the work done with developing descriptive systems proceeds by classifying the observation into personality types (e.g., C. Wright Mills white collar types: "glum men, old veterans, live wire and new entrepreneur" McCall and Simmons, pp. 174, 175). To follow this model and focus on individual types of behavior is inconsistent with our special emphasis on communication as interaction.

A step closer to the desired level of analysis is analytical induction. This method has the following steps (Robinson, 1969):

1. A rough definition of the phenomenon to be explained is formulated.
2. A hypothetical explanation of that phenomenon is formulated.
3. One case is studied in the light of the hypothesis with the object of determining whether the hypothesis fits the facts in that case.
4. If the hypothesis does not fit the facts, either the hypothesis is re-formulated or the phenomenon to be explained is redefined so that the case is excluded.

5. Practical certainty may be attained after a small number of cases have been examined, but the discovery by the investigator of a single negative case disproves the explanation and requires a re-formulation.

6. This procedure of examining cases, redefining the phenomenon and reformulating the hypothesis is continued until a universal relationship is established, each negative case calling for a redefinition or re-formulation.

Limitations of analytic induction originate from its demanding quest for universals. Pressing for generality, either through hypothesis modification or data reformulation, causes the "inadequate utilization of much valuable data" (Robinson, p. 216). As a response to this characteristic, Glaser and Strauss (1967) formulated the technique of constant comparison which emphasizes proliferating rather than restricting the properties of categories. This method combines the analytic procedure of theory formulation and the explicit coding of the hypothesis testing approach. The steps of the constant comparative method are as follows:

1. **Compare incidents applicable to each category.** Code each incident in the data into as many emergent or existing categories as possible. While coding an incident, compare it with previous incidents in the same category.

2. **Integrate categories and their properties.** As the coding continues the constant comparative unit of analysis changes from comparison of incident with incident to incident with properties of category. The theoretical possibilities develop and different categories and their properties tend to become integrated through constant comparison.
3. **Delimit the theory.** The theory solidifies as major modifications become fewer and fewer through comparison of the next incidents of a category to its properties. Categories become clearer by clarifying the logic, taking out non-relevant properties and the discovery of underlying uniformities. With these moves toward reduction the analyst starts to achieve two major requirements of theory: (1) parsimony of variables and formulation, and (2) scope in the applicability of the theory to a wide range of situations.

4. **Write theory.** At this stage the analyst possesses coded data, a series of notes, and a theory. The notes provide the content behind the categories which become the major themes of the theory. When the researcher is convinced that his framework is systematic, substantive, accurate and usefully formulated, he can report his results with confidence (p.105-113).

**Summary and Conclusion**

This chapter stated the research questions and described the theoretical and methodological approaches used. Glaser and Strauss' grounded theory was provided as a framework for data collection and analysis. Theories supporting the conceptualization of the study from organization and communication theory were reviewed.

The research was placed in a physical setting through a description of the organization under study. Procedures for collecting data via interview and observational methods were outlined. Finally, the constant comparative method for analyzing interview and observation manuscripts was offered. The contents of Chapters III and IV report the results.
CHAPTER III

A DESCRIPTION OF THE COMMUNICATION SYSTEM ELEMENTS

This chapter responds to the first research question of Chapter II; it identifies elements of the communication process in the subject organization. Since the communication elements are labels assigned to recorded behavior, they become operationalized by developing categories that describe the data via Glaser and Strauss' (1967) constant comparative method. This chapter is an application of that method.

This chapter follows the chronological steps involved in changing observation and interview manuscripts into a comprehensive description of the communication system. These steps include defining the units of analysis from the manuscripts, coding procedures applied to each datum in the analysis, and procedures to check reliability of the analysis. Each of the categories developed from the data is then described and presented.

Developing the Unit of Analysis

The goal of this research is to observe and describe interpersonal communication occurrences within an organization. It was necessary to divide the manuscripts into mutually exclusive units. The units produced are referred to as incidents (Zelditch, 1969, Becker and Geer, 1960), acts (Zander, 1951), and
single observations (Barton and Lazarsfeld, 1969). The term incident was used to refer to a datum.

Zelditch (1969) identifies the simplest event as a "single property of a single object at a particular time and in a particular place" (p. 7). From these elemental properties one may form a "configuration of many properties of the same object at the same time in the same place. This may be called an 'incident'" (p. 7). This definition gives the incident a quality of varying perspectives or viewpoints for a single situation. Barton and Lazarsfeld (1969) emphasize the uniqueness of an observation as the definitive characteristic of a unit and refer to the "surprising," "unexpected," and "striking" things that qualitative studies may produce. Becker and Geer (1960) give special attention to the comprehensiveness of units of data by describing them as "either complete verbal expressions of an attitude or complete acts by an individual or group" (p. 281). Zanders' definition (1951) requires the complete sequence of events to be included in a unit (p. 523). These definitions provide the criteria for an incident; it is a complete thought or act of behavior performed by an individual or group of individuals as viewed by an interviewer or an observer.

The observation and interview manuscripts were reviewed to divide the data into distinct incidents. This process yielded two hundred and thirty-three interview incidents and one hundred and ninety-three observation incidents varying in length from one sentence to one paragraph. The incidents were each numbered consecutively and labeled "OB" for observation and "IV" for interview.
A procedure Whyte (1951) suggested also was followed in dividing the incidents. He claims that interviewers and observers naturally tend to mix interpretations and observations in written records. His recommendation for identifying and discarding the interpretative notes was implemented. Each interpretative statement was bracketed and labeled "background material" by placing the letters "BG" beside the statement. One hundred and thirty-two items were background data and were not included in incident analysis.

Coding Procedures

Moving from two manuscripts of four hundred and twenty-six incidents to a category system describing the collected data was a pivotal activity. Because of its importance it is detailed to give the reader a complete picture of what was done.

Consistency of Analysis

A concern for consistency of analysis influenced the procedures for reviewing incidents. Since categories were to be generated from data, it seemed important that each incident have equal potential in being the source of a category. One factor potentially affecting this equality is the location of an incident in relation to others in the analysis process. One incident preceding another, especially in the early stages of analysis, appeared to increase its probability of being the source of a category label.
To respond to this concern for the chronology of the coding process, the following rules for reviewing incidents were developed: (a) **Systematically alternate between the observation and the interview data.** After reviewing five observation incidents, review five interview incidents, and vice versa. This gives consistent treatment to the two sources. (b) **Systematically sample from different chronological points of the data.** In alternating between manuscript sources, proceed through the total data pool by increments of ten percent at a time. This was accomplished by going through all incidents ending in the same last digit, e.g., 1, 11, 21, 31, 41. Following these rules gave consistent treatment between observation and interview incidents occurring early in the manuscripts and those occurring later.

**Category Development**

The categories were developed by reading each incident and identifying dimensions its contents suggested. The dimensions noted were used in developing descriptive labels (categories) for each dimension. These notes were analyzed until a decision was reached on forming a category, giving it title, and establishing a relationship between the category and the incident. The final step was recording the decision by placing the category label and incident number on a 5 x 7 card and writing a descriptive phrase or sentence to connect them. This process was completed with each incident and was most operative in the first twenty to thirty percent of the data when most of the categories were being
established. A perspective on the assignment of incidents to existing categories is offered below.

**Incident Assignment**

The continual process of creating categories and assigning incidents was achieved by reviewing each incident, recording its dimensions and determining whether its dimensions matched existing categories or merited assignment to a new one. Since the categories were not mutually exclusive, this meant that every existing category was reviewed and compared each time an incident was analyzed. The time required to complete this process varied from ten to forty minutes for each incident and between one hundred and one hundred and fifty hours to complete the four hundred and twenty-six incidents.

**Category-Incident Review**

Once the data analysis was completed, the data was checked to determine if the conclusions reached by the primary researcher could be verified by individuals not involved in the analysis. This was accomplished by assigning two judges\(^3\), who participated in earlier stages of the project, to the task of reviewing the categories and incidents assigned to each. The judges assessed the propriety of incident assignment to categories by choosing to eliminate incidents from categories or to reassign them to other categories. This process

---

\(^3\) The judges were Dr. Leonard Hawes who completed the interviewing and Patricia Mcullough who worked with a different aspect of the project.
eliminated sixty incidents and caused the reassignment of forty-nine incidents. The judges made additional suggestions on the accuracy of the category labels and expressed their impressions of the overall findings. These ideas were used to sharpen and improve the final alignment of the categories.

Description of the Categories

In describing the twenty-four categories developed from the data, each category will be comparatively located in relation to the others. This is done by describing each category's general properties and giving incidental examples of its contents. The amount of data the category accounts for will be given by listing the number of incidents and the percentage of the total each category represents. This combination of information is designed to give the reader an idea of what the category is about and how potent it is.

Category #1
COMMUNICATION FACILITATING...19 Incidents...4.5% of total

This label is given to incidents in which a decision is made or a behavior is demonstrated that encourages or allows people to speak or listen completely. This completeness refers to speaking or listening to all that is important in the specific situation. The most acute example of this category is a person listening carefully to a message he/she would rather not hear, or by responding un-defensively when challenged by suggestions, questions, probes, or disagreements. These behaviors encourage asking and answering difficult questions.
Representing the active form of this category are incidents that facilitate expressions from others. This includes behaviors expressing pleasure with answers, using points of another's idea to build a new point, and asking questions in response to a speaker who generates interest in an apathetic audience. This category has a time dimension represented by behaviors such as scheduling appointments flexibly to allow each client time to complete his purposes, being available to participate in lengthy discussions, and responding immediately to another's request for an opportunity to talk. At its most concrete level, facilitating communication occurs when a receptionist correctly matches an outsider's request for information with the individual in the organization who can respond to it.

Category #2
ADAPTATION-ADJUSTMENT... 6 Incidents... 1.4% of total

Included in this category are incidents dealing with individual's actions that are deviations from established norms or procedures. Also included are incidents of individual successes and difficulties in responding to changes or new occurrences.

Examples of the former type of adaptation-adjustment include "humbling one's self to get the job done rather than insisting that rank be considered," and going directly to the person who originated the work to get errors corrected rather than following the rule of going to their boss.
The success type in this category is represented by incidents which relate an individual who finds that her secretarial skills will not support her income needs and responds by successfully becoming a data processing technician. Difficulties in adapting are exemplified by requests for "things to be clearly laid out so he knows what is expected of him." More acute examples of adaptation-adjustment occur in incidents when individuals have extreme personal difficulty arriving at a new job and by a person, who upon becoming a supervisor, begins to exhibit nervousness.

Category #3
COMMUNICATION-INHIBITING... 94 Incidents... 2.2% of data

Coded in this category are incidents which tend to cause communication failure because of non-engagement or incidents which create conditions making on-going communication difficult and incomplete.

A number of incidents qualify for this category as behavior or values tending to create social distance among organization members. This includes status concerns and rank consciousness caricatured by the statement: "I have the authority," and by habitually sitting at the front of the room in meetings apart from employees. Distancing behavior is accomplished also by self-isolation, smugness, avoiding contact with others, appearing very busy, having little to say at important meetings, and overtly demonstrating apathy. Another set of behaviors included were incidents of individuals actively campaigning about others' limitations. These fault finding comments frequently were
unequivocal and tended to become simpler and more generalized as their life span continued.

Incidents that inhibited ongoing communication included letting one's voice trail off in a murmur when responding to difficult questions, presenting an idea flippantly implying that all who were not in agreement were stupid; it also included responding as if the last word has been spoken. Incidents showing listener response inhibiting communication include showing uneasiness when being addressed, passing off others' statements as pettiness, reluctantly accepting others statements: "I can't dispute that," refusing to acknowledge good ideas, interruptions, and avoiding eye contact and facial directness.

Category #4
CENTRAL FIGURE IN COMMUNICATION...13 Incidents...3.1% of total

This category is represented by incidents in which a single individual is given focus of attention by those participating in the meeting or event. The description of the central figure category will be formulated by offering the potential sources of central attention.

A major factor of central figure in communication is being a source of information to others. This is true especially if the subject matter is important to others, e.g., the details and figures of a budget report. The assertiveness of a person is outstanding in some incidents in this category and is manifested by expressing one's views pontifically, making demands on others' time, or asking demanding questions.
Centrality also is demonstrated by expressing an interest in one's sub-
ject that stimulates and energizes others. It also occurs when others who
usually share the focus are absent. It is bestowed when one is in trouble and
is placed "on the hot seat" by authority persons. It is related to being located
in a central position, but this is confused by the tendency of high power people
to sit in central locations. Responses to central figures include intent and
careful listening, admiration, compliance and accommodation.

Category #5
CLIMATE FOR GROWTH AND EXPANSION... 18 Incidents... 4.2% of data

Incidents coded in this context category center on the future potential
of the organization, its strong points, its needs, and the outside forces moving
the organization toward more expanded and influential levels.

Incidents on organizational strengths originate from a variety of posi-
tions, the most frequent being references to the Executive Director. He is
consistently characterized as an ambitious, growth conscious, and important
figure in the organization's future. This is coupled with organizational
strengths of seeking outside help in attaining growth, favorable public notoriety,
a history of continuous improvement, and a current demonstration of produc-
tivity.

Category #6
COALITION FORMATION... 36 Incidents... 8.5% of total

Incidents which show the supportive groupings of individuals in the
organization are coded in this category. These groupings of relationships vary in intensity from tight power blocks to loosely connected social relationships.

Incidents in this category include status or rank networks with supervisors talking more to each other than their respective staffs, public officials talking only to staff leadership, and chiefs preferring to be in one area with the "peons" in another. At lower levels, possibly in response to the rank and status networks, individuals form coalitions to develop power, for catharsis, and support. The category also includes identity, social needs, and interpersonal attraction.

This category includes sub-grouping behavior such as small-talk fragmentation that occurs when a meeting is boring or has lasted long enough to tire its members. Relationships that are developed to get a job done or to work as an effective team are a part of the relationship network incidents.

Category #7
RESPONSES TO CONFLICT...35 Incidents...8.2% of data

This label is given to incidents in which clear individual differences exist creating tension and anger. The responses recorded in conflict situations are included. These responses include behavior to avoid the conflict, to deal with it indirectly, to deal with it directly, and to intensify the conflict.

Avoidance behavior is represented by incidents in which individuals are faced with a problem but pretend it does not exist, e.g., "X said that everything
was going along smoothly and there were no real problems. He did say that Y in the accounting department was going to be fired..." Other forms of avoidance acknowledge the existence of conflict situations but discount them by glossing over complaints, leaving the problem to discuss other matters, overtly denying the existence of the problem, de-emphasizing the importance of the problem, defining oneself out of the focus, or pretending to operate above it: "Those who engage in conflict come and go, I do not take sides on issues or get into politics."

Responding to conflicts through indirect means is represented in incidents which a person is addressing the conflict, but to someone other than the real antagonist. These individuals who serve as surrogates include consultants, or organization members above or below the point of conflict. The indirect response can also occur when conflicting individuals are in each others' presence by referring to the differences through subtle cutting or humorous responses, referring to the person rather than talking directly to him, or waiting until the tension of the situation has subsided before responding.

Direct response incidents are characterized by confronting the person at the time a problem occurs. This includes confronting a boss who shouts at his workers, people openly disagreeing on issues in committees before voting, and taking unclear assignments back to superiors to get more details.

Responses that intensify a conflict occur when individuals personalize a disagreement: "How much of my land are you going to take?", by consciously
creating conflict "Let's hit him with a barrage of problems until he realizes that all is not well," and by organizing support for an individual conflict.

Category #8
CONTRAINTS... 49 Incidents... 11.5% of total

These are incidents which emphasize the limitations of the organization. This category does not encompass all constraints but rather focuses on traits, procedures, and similar variables of a more static quality.

Included here are individual limits to performance; "look, this is all I can do in one day," a young professional sensing he is dealing with a delicate matter and asking for advice from experienced people, or an individual being offered a higher level position and deciding not to take it for lack of training. This category also includes individuals who are doing activities for which they are overqualified: using research technicians to run errands; using a stenographer to do extensive xeroxing; using a division chief to deliver payroll checks; and chiefs doing telephone work their secretaries could handle.

A large part of the space in this category is occupied by incidents of a procedural nature: having to process time sheets one and one-half days prior to the work being done resulting in a great deal of guesswork and revamping. It also includes awkward request forms, unorganized research materials, tight control procedures, and limited office space for an expanding organization.
Category #9
DIRECT AND BRIEF COMMUNICATION ORIENTATION...15 Incidents...3.5% of total

This is the label given to statements that express the need for or demonstrate behaviorally a value for crisp speaking in communication situations. This category is a form of high task orientation. An elaboration of the category will clarify the occurrence of these incidents in the organization's communication.

A number of members made interview references to sketchy briefings about their job and then being expected to "take the ball and run with it," and being expected to operate a piece of equipment, but given no instructions on how to do so.

In meetings, there is a clear orientation toward direct and brief communication exemplified by abrupt openings of sessions. There is an absence of small talk and transitions with the frequent use of such opening statements as: "Well, Chief, what do you have?" "Let's get this over with," or "Let's go at it."

This category also includes incidents in which discontent with longer communication is expressed by relieved looks after long presentations.

This orientation is represented in incidents where individuals make value statements about themselves or others, e.g., "I talk fast because I like to get things done," or "I like the efficient way X runs meetings."
Category #10
EXPRESSION OF INDEPENDENCE...16 Incidents...3.8% of total

Included here are incidents which show an individual's assertion of independence, self sufficiency, and capability. Behaviors or values included are expressions of not wanting help or assistance, preferring to work alone, enjoying handling things in one's own way, and preferring not to work with close supervision. It includes ambitious behavior such as anticipating a supervisor's suggestion, following through on what seems to be needed, and working hard on a project. A special characteristic in this category is saying what is on one's mind and cutting through the organization structure by going straight to the person who can act. Such incidents were exclusively from individuals who are at lower level positions in the organization.

Category #11
EXPRESSION OF EXPECTATIONS...13 Incidents...3.2% of total.

Included in this category are incidents in which individuals express how they want others to perform in future situations. These are frequently supervisors' expectations of the people who work for them, but include some employees' statements of what they want from their supervisors. In some incidents the expectations are clear, e.g., a person takes over a new job and is told what he needs to do to perform well. In other incidents the expectations occur in retrospect, "I had hoped that X would set priorities for his division."

At an intense level, expectations are demands placed on others. In some
instances, individuals want expectations formalized, e.g., wanting guidelines for work submitted to a particular department, or wanting job descriptions clarified. When expectations are expressed by subordinates, the hopes usually focus on more help or better supervision.

Category #12
EXTERNALIZING...13 Incidents...3% of total

Incidents coded in this category are those in which individuals attribute forces outside themselves as causal. A majority of the externalizing incidents occur around problem situations, errors, individual troubles, etc. Acute examples of this category are those in which individuals place blame directly on others. Others choose to attribute problems to safer more ambiguous sources that cannot be held accountable such as low salaries and organizational pressures. Externalizing messages usually are addressed to power sources not directly involved in the problem.

Category #13
FOLLOW THROUGH ON COMMITMENT...15 Incidents...3.5% of total

Coded in this category are incidents dealing with achieving successful conclusions to activities or projects. The category focuses on responsiveness, closure, and getting things done.

Positive examples of such incidents include responding to a request for a specialized presentation of a slide show to a public group on short notice. In this example, individuals literally worked around the clock to get the work done.
Another example is a presentation to a local community group and feeling a strong sense of progress at the end of the evening. It also includes going through an agenda of commitments between a director and his chief to find that all of them have been accomplished.

Incidents demonstrating a failure to get things done or letting them fall short include being given a project and having nothing completed on it three months later. A number of failures appear to be attributable to unsound or unrealistic commitments that reduce immediate tensions. These include commitment to a disgruntled secretary that she would be moved to a new position when she was critically needed in her present job, or indicating that someone would be fired soon, when that action was not a realistic alternative.

Category #14
INEFFECTIVE DIRECTION... 24 Incidents... 5.6% of data

Incidents in this category are those which record a poor history of supervisor guidance through employee comments or through demonstrated behavior when in direct contact with workers. This category pulls together under a single label a variety of behaviors and attitudes from incidents that show ineffective direction.

Included in this category are incidents indicating chiefs are ineffective in motivating their men, giving too little guidance, technical help or orientation for expected work, appearing too busy to be asked a question, not being aware of what men are doing or seeing that work is being completed, not placing
confidence in men, giving too much assistance, discouraging initiative, not communicating expectations clearly, and being authoritative through demanding behavior.

Category #15
INEFFECTIVE PUBLIC COMMUNICATION... 9 Incidents... 2.1% of total

This is the label assigned to incidents involving a formal speaking role for staff members in public meetings that did not have positive outcomes. It involves behaviors pressing on to complete a report in the face of strong messages that the audience wanted to stop and discuss particular items. Also included are incidents dealing with preparation.

Other incidents that point toward ineffectiveness are the timing of release of information. In one incident an individual disclosed the contents of a controversial report to a group on one side of the issue and succeeded in destroying his confidence with the other group. In another incident, a staff member surprised a relevant audience with a set of recommendations and conclusions over which the group was expected to pass judgment.

Ineffective public communication also includes speaking skills such as not speaking clearly, speaking timidly and softly to the point of being inaudible, and elaborate, embellished politically oriented statements in a work committee environment.
Category #16
INFORMAL-CASUAL COMMUNICATION...7 Incidents...1.6% of total

This category includes incidents which show an easy style of communication comfortable for those who use it.

An example of this is an incident involving an important meeting that many individuals attended armed with thick manila folders of notes and figures. The individual who operated casually arrived with nothing in his hands, but did make a creative contribution to the meeting. Other examples include light conversation focusing on football, movies, etc. In a number of these incidents individuals joked and talked sociably over the phone with other professionals outside the organization.

Category #17
EXPRESSION OF DISTRUST...19 Incidents...4.5% of total

Incidents coded in this category are from situations in which organization members believe that their interests are not being considered. In its strongest form, this category included feeling threatened.

Conditions that surround expressions of distrust include having uncertainty about others' motivations: "I don't know what he is up to," or finding that others involved in a problem situation have worked out agreements which leave one feeling "set up." Closely related to this is the distrust elicited when one is bypassed on information in which he should be involved. It includes being under
the power or control of someone a person perceives as being quite different from himself.

Situations in which an individual or group's behavior is closely monitored or where accountability is strict frequently are related to feelings of mistrust. Being dependent upon others to complete activities that are important or for which he is responsible is the reverse of trust.

Category #18
PERSONAL ADVANCEMENT STRATEGY...12 Incidents...2.8% of total

This category focuses on individuals' attempts to advance themselves in the organization. The incidents have a persuasive, aggressive tenor and often involve manipulation.

In many cases actions related to personal advancement seemed closely integrated with organizational advancement; to grow with the organization as it grows. In other instances the ambition is more personalized: "X wants to develop a name, to have a written project well done." The personal advancement strategy can be counterproductive if one's personal advancement is perceived to be achievable only with the demise of another. It frequently involves developing power coalitions mentioned in Category #6. Conflict situations are an important variable in this advancement style.

The ambition implied in this category frequently manifests itself when an individual is in a trial period of a job. Because his status is probationary,
his energy is devoted more to representing himself than to getting work com-
pleted.

Category #19
POWER... 48 Incidents... 11% of total

This category codes the exercise of influence. It contains incidents rel-
ating sources of power, how power is used, and examples of the absence of
power.

Sources of power include the legitimate and formal power of approval and
disapproval, which in its strongest form includes the threat of firing and the
rewards of advancement. It includes the power of technical competence and
knowledge. It also includes a power akin to charismatic power, which is a
faith or strong feeling in another's abilities. The ability to anticipate problems
and future realities also is a form of power. It includes a sensitivity to prob-
lem timing (see category #23), to coalitions (see category #6), and to requests
for information (see category #21).

In these incidents, power is expended for the right to define how individ-
uals will perform in certain situations. It gives the ability to make demands, to
be directive, to ask another to account for himself.

Incidents showing low power centered on individuals whose field of al-
ternatives or choices were minimal. Examples of this are needing to work and
being unable to find another job, having no way to obtain needed materials but
through one person, and being finally responsible to see that a piece of work is
done.

Category #20
PRESSURE... 39 Incidents... 9.1% of total

Incidents in this category include situations in which individuals are over-
burdened and feel forced to work in a hurried, urgent fashion. Pressure in
these incidents originates from two sources: people and volume of work.

Examples of pressure from people include having to make important re-
quests from someone the subject does not know, or being coaxed by others to
achieve goals, to meet deadlines, and to expedite decisions. It includes the
absence of reinforcement, being asked difficult questions, and dealing with
complex political problems. It includes having to oppose a powerful person, to
comply with another's wishes, or to be bound by two powerful opposing forces.

The pressure produced from the volume of work clusters around a
conveyor-belt analogy: having work come in spurts, having a short time period
to get work completed, and having to deal with the overflow of the incomplete
work generated by pressures coming to bear on another person. It includes the
awkward placement of resources, a fast pace of work, to many varied things
to do, surprise deadlines, and at the end of these pressures having still more
work to be done.
Category #21
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION... 45 Incidents... 10.6% of total

Incidents coded in this category are interrogative. They are not totally explainable as situations in which one individual not having information requests it of someone who does. Giving examples from this category will demonstrate the array of question-asking behavior.

First are the simple requests for information from the unknowing to the knowing. These include calls from the public that are disseminated through the switchboard, a committee member's request for technical information from a staff person, and inquiries from one staff member to another on his specialized area of knowledge.

Demands or pressures on others are frequently formulated as requests for information: "When will the T-193 project be completed?, When will the letter of confirmation go out?, What are you going to do about the situation in your division?" This type of question can also be directed from subordinates to superiors: "When are you going to start keeping me informed about the activities in the division?"

Requests for information also can be used for the explicit purposes of evaluation. The clearest example of this is the job interview setting: "What is regression analysis?" and "What is the difference between a mean and a weighted mean?"
Requests for information are occasionally requests for approval: "Is this acceptable?" These questions are directed either at knowledgeable or powerful individuals.

Finally, requests for information can be deliberate attempts to leave lines of communication open to others: "Please keep me posted on what you find out. We need as many ideas and viewpoints on this decision as possible."

Category #22
STABILIZING FORCES...13 Incidents...3.1% of total

This category contains incidents pointing toward predictable forces. This context category is relatively small, but it surfaced as a contrast to the dynamics and uncertainty that characterize much of the data.

Included in this category are incidents showing that an individual has enough slack time to catch up on work. Also coded here are examples of clear and specific knowledge of what one's job includes. Other examples are promoting from within for new job openings and individuals not wanting to be promoted but liking what they are doing.

Category #23
TIMING...23 Incidents...5.4% of total

This category included incidents in which temporal variables are influential. The variable of time can be manipulated and used as a form of influence, but it has its own independent power represented by its expense, as demonstrated by an individual's activities or remarks being time consuming, or taking
two weeks to process paperwork to purchase equipment. It includes writing
notes slowly and holding up the progression of a meeting, or having no time to
collect needed research data.

When time is used as an influence, it it usually related to conditions of
success being better or worse at a particular time. In response to these condi-
tions, individuals attempt to accelerate the pace of decision making by present-
ing their position first to power figures. If conditions are unfavorable for a de-
cision, delaying action and tabling are used to protract the decision making time
span.

Category #24
EXPRESSION OF VALUES...16 Incidents...3.8% of total

This category includes incidents with axiological content. In their most
elementary form, they make reference to what is good. Another characteristic
of these expressions is their occurring without stimulation from the object or
phenomenon to which they refer. This eliminates immediate references to
values and attempts to isolate global views.

The most frequently occurring values are individuals' philosophies of
management: "You have to give your people plenty of freedom to do their job as
they see fit," or "One has to understand the difference between organization and
bureaucracy. You can be creative but you have to plug your results into a
larger endeavor," or "When people have problems, it is important to discuss
things without getting personalities involved."
Other value statements were testimonials for the agency: "If the complainers aren't happy with the organization let them leave. They don't know what the organization was like eight years ago and how much it has improved." Another example is: "This is a young aggressive organization. We expect a lot of the people who work here." Others see the organization as an agent of social change by opposing capitalist developers who buy cheap land from farmers in outlying areas.

Finally, there are incidents expressing personal social values: "The kind of people I associate with do not go to office parties. They go home and spend time with their wives and families," or "Spending my lunch hours out watching all the single girls go by is the most enjoyable part of my day."

**Summary**

These twenty-four categories represent the first step in the movement from concrete data to abstract theory. These categories have been extrapolated from the interview and observation data in a manner that makes them durable enough to withstand isolation, integration, and transfer. The category contents are varied but they do not suffer the vagueness that frequently accompanies variety.

The independence and clarity of these categories are critical for the step of integrating them into increasingly abstract cells and clusters until a total explanatory system is achieved. They must be distinguishable and
definable if an effective case for linking them together is to become a reality. In the following chapter a theoretical position is offered for integrating these concepts and developing a theory.
CHAPTER IV

A THEORETICAL EXPLANATION OF SYSTEM ELEMENTS

Introduction

This chapter deals with the relationships among the categories. In Glaser and Strauss' (1967) developmental sequence, these are the steps of delimiting and writing theory. Stated as formal research questions: What are the relationships among the category variables developed from the observation and interview data? How do the relationships explain the organization's communication behavior.

To answer these questions an approach to category synthesis is established through a review of literature. After introducing an approach to viewing the twenty-four categories, an explanation of relationships among them (theory) is offered. Finally, testable propositions that emerge from the theory are stipulated.

The framework for answering the research questions comes from a variety of sources including Glaser and Strauss' (1967) suggestions for category synthesis, the literature on social science theory and models, and the

---

4The term social science theory is used as a generic term to refer to the writings on epistemology and knowledge in the social and behavioral sciences. Systems theory and grounded theory are a part of that body of writings, but are referred to separately here for purposes of clarity.
literature on social systems. Glaser and Strauss' recommendations are most helpful because their statements on theory development are applicable to data generated through the constant comparative method. After sharpening the categories by clarifying their labels, taking out irrelevant properties, and developing a major outline of interrelated categories, the data are prepared for category reduction.

Glaser and Strauss define reduction as, "discovering the underlying uniformities in the original set of categories or their properties and formulating a theory with a smaller set of high level concepts. This step reduces both the terminology and the quantity of data and simultaneously elaborates upon the category system by abstracting from it" (p.110). In achieving this abstraction, the researcher is forced to develop ideas on a level of generality higher in abstraction than the qualitative material being analyzed (p.114). As the investigator searches for abstractions to account for clusters of categories and develops relationships among the abstractions, he is developing theory.

The social and behavioral science literature on theory development complements Glaser and Strauss' directions by clarifying the relationship between models and what they are designed to represent. This literature provides language for understanding theory and models through clarifying and distinguishing among different levels of abstraction in theory statements.

Modeling the communication behavior of the subject organization is an attempt to represent that behavior in a way that gives it special meaning.
Deutsch (1952) defines models as a "structure of symbols and operating rules which is supposed to match a set of relevant points in an existing structure or process to be understood; that is to say, to match it completely point for point" (p. 357). Lachman (1960) confirms the representational value of models and describes their role as "furnishing new ways of regarding or thinking about the empirical objects and events" (p. 114).

Given this definition, the process of modeling has operated at a number of points in this study. First, making a description of the behavior in the field setting was a form of representing it. Second, labeling behaviors into particular categories models the collection of descriptions. Now, by searching for abstract relationships among them, the categories are being modeled.

The language of theory and models provides some useful distinctions between different levels of abstractions in theory development. This assists in responding to Glaser and Strauss' encouragement to search for abstract relations among clusters of categories. The definitions of levels of theoretical statements provide information on the types of statements one can expect to make at a given level and the relationship of particular statements.

Gibbs (1967) clarifies the types of statements that are basic units of a theory. These statements are referred to as axioms, postulates, assumptions, theorems, propositions, and hypotheses without any apparent concern for uniformity in usage. Gibbs offers a typology of theory statements organized around three concerns: (1) whether the statement is relative and applies to a
designated finite universe, or universal and applies to an infinite universe; (2) whether the variables under study are observable, not observable, or partially observable; and (3) whether the statement is primary and formally reduced from a theory or derivative and not formally reduced. The matrix of statements offered in Table I gives some definition to the restrictions and liberties one has in developing relationships between theory and data.

The goal is to make three types of theoretical statements about the data. First is a semantical statement (Type II) about the relationships among categories extrapolated from some data. From the Type II statements, Type I statements, that are empirically testable, are drawn. These statements allow the derivation of formal empirical statements, which are Type IV statements or hypotheses. Following is the strategy for developing these three statement types.

To develop semantic statements, the researcher established relationships among categories. Since systems theory was recognized in chapters one and two for its assets in identifying relationships among elements of a system, it will be used. A particular subset of systems theory that addresses how system components are connected will be drawn upon. The original statement on this was done by Maruyama (1963) and further developed by Weick (1969). Their positions on the way sub-elements of a system affect each other are based on the following notions. (1) The elements within a system are mutual causal, i.e., the elements within a system influence each other simultaneously or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Statement (Applies to a designated finite universe)</th>
<th>Universal Statement (Applies to an infinite universe)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Statement</strong> (Not formally reduced)</td>
<td><strong>Derivative Statement</strong> (Formally reduced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Statement</strong> (Not formally reduced)</td>
<td><strong>Derivative Statement</strong> (Formally reduced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical Statement (All variables subject to observation)</td>
<td>Type I Statement&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantical Statement (Some variables subject to observation)</td>
<td>Type II Statement&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical Statement (No variable subject to observation)</td>
<td>Type III Statement&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible identification in conventional terms: 1 No conventional identification. 2 No conventional identification. 3 No conventional identification. 4 Hypothesis. 5 No conventional identification. 6 No conventional identification. 7 Proposition. 8 Postulate. 9 Axiom. 10 Theorem. 11 No conventional identification. 12 No conventional identification.
alternatingly. (2) The nature of the relationships of elements is either direct or inverse. If the relationship is direct, one element has a deviation amplifying effect on another; if the nature of the relationship is inverse, the element has a deviation counteracting effect on another. (3) The effect of deviation amplification or deviation counteraction is dependent upon the clusters of interconnected category-variables. The process of patterning relationships among variables develops Type II statements. In effect, the discussion that makes up the explanation of the clusters are the statements.

Once the clusters have been developed, Type I and Type IV statements can be achieved by implementing an approach to theory construction outlined by Blalock (1969) and related to communication theory by Monge (1973). They suggest that once variables have been identified and the relations between pairs of variables have been specified (including the direction of causality), a choice is made as to which of the variables are to be explained, i.e., which are dependent and which are independent. Following this, sets of regression or differential are equations constructed for each dependent variable as a function of all other variables in the system. Some of the other variables will not be directly related to particular dependent variables; hence their coefficients will equal zero and they will drop out of the equation. Finally, a solution is sought for the system of equations by analyzing each equation separately and combining the results to provide a theoretic interpretation (Monge, p.14). This chapter places the paired empirical statements following each
cluster explanation, and the formally derived hypotheses (Type IV statements) at the conclusion.

To integrate the use of grounded theory, social science theory, and systems theory, analysis of the categories is directed at reducing the data by developing more abstract relations. The abstract relations are achieved by developing postulates drawn from the data that show mutually influential clusters of relationships. The term cluster is used to refer to a collection of variables for which a pattern of direct and inverse relationships has been developed. A collection of variables that branches from the major cluster is called a sub-cluster.

In the next section, three clusters of relationships among categories are developed. Table II lists the twenty-four categories as a reference for the reader.

Cluster I

THE POWER-ADVANCEMENT CLUSTER

The subject organization is a Power setting where interpersonal influence is a primary attribute. The strong role of interpersonal power and influence is in contrast to other possible criteria of an individual's position in the organization, e.g., seniority, or performance on a standardized measure of achievement. The existence of Power as a dominating force is directly related to the occurrence of Personal Advancement Strategies. The way a person
| Category # 1 | COMMUNICATION FACILITATING |
| Category # 2 | ADAPTATION-ADJUSTMENT |
| Category # 3 | COMMUNICATION-INHIBITING |
| Category # 4 | CENTRAL FIGURE IN COMMUNICATION |
| Category # 5 | CLIMATE FOR GROWTH AND EXPANSION |
| Category # 6 | COALITION FORMATION |
| Category # 7 | RESPONSES TO CONFLICT |
| Category # 8 | CONSTRAINTS |
| Category # 9 | DIRECT AND BRIEF COMMUNICATION ORIENTATION |
| Category # 10 | EXPRESSION OF INDEPENDENCE |
| Category # 11 | EXPRESSION OF EXPECTATIONS |
| Category # 12 | EXTERNALIZING |
| Category # 13 | FOLLOW THROUGH ON COMMITMENT |
| Category # 14 | INEFFECTIVE DIRECTION |
| Category # 15 | INEFFECTIVE PUBLIC COMMUNICATION |
| Category # 16 | INFORMAL-CASUAL COMMUNICATION |
| Category # 17 | EXPRESSION OF DISTRUST |
| Category # 18 | PERSONAL ADVANCEMENT STRATEGY |
| Category # 19 | POWER |
| Category # 20 | PRESSURE |
Table 2—continued

Category # 21 - REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
Category # 22 - STABILIZING FORCES
Category # 23 - TIMING
Category # 24 - EXPRESSION OF VALUES
represents himself with powerful individuals is the determiner of his advancement rate in position, responsibility, salary, and influence.

Personal Advancement Strategies are frequently operationalized as campaigns which make use of sub-groups within the organization to support positions. Hence, Personal Advancement Strategies are directly related to Coalition Formations. Because sub-groups tend to develop internal cohesiveness but separate themselves from out-groups, Coalition Formation is directly related to Communication Inhibition by creating differential psychological as well as spatio-temporal distance among organizational members.

Since individuals who are operating at a distance from each other have less access to information about the reasons for each other's actions, and since individuals who develop internal power pacts become influence oriented, Personal Advancement Strategies, through the medium of Coalition Formation, is directly related to Expressions of Distrust.

The relations among the five categories are all direct and amplify one another. There is another sub-cluster of variables that counteracts the influence of the five variables described above.

Constraints in the organization are directly related to Stabilizing Forces. Expression of individual limits of performance, expression of caution about advancing faster than one's ability allows, combined with the limiting effect of awkward procedures, functions to offset the Climate for Growth and Expansion in the organization. Stabilizing Forces are inversely related to the Climate for
Figure 2. The Power-Advancement Cluster of Variables

+ signs indicate a direct relationship;
- signs indicate an inverse relationship
Growth and Expansion because the Climate for Growth and Expansion is directly related to growth factors, e.g., ambition and legal mandates for increasing the role of the organization.

Climate for Growth and Expansion is directly related to Personal Advancement Strategies because organizational advancement through a Climate for Growth and Expansion provides a stream of accelerated forward movement that will buoy individuals seeking advancement. The relationships among these category-variables with the primary category-variable of Personal Advancement Strategies provide a counteracting sub-cluster to balance the amplifying sub-cluster described previously. The postulates from the Power-Advancement Cluster suggest the following testable propositions:

1. As interpersonal Power becomes more salient, Personal Advancement Strategies will become more numerous.

2. As the Climate for Growth and Expansion expands, Personal Advancement Strategies will become more numerous.

3. As Personal Advancement Strategies increase, Coalition Formations will become more numerous.

4. As Personal Advancement Strategies increase, Expressions of Distrust will become more numerous.

5. As the occurrence of Coalition Formations increase, Expressions of Distrust will become more numerous.

6. As Personal Advancement Strategies increase, the more Communication will be Inhibited.

7. As Expressions of Distrust increase, the more Communication will be Inhibited.
8. As the Constraints become less numerous, the Climate for Growth and Expansion decreases.

9. As the Stabilizing Forces become less evident, the Climate for Growth and Expansion decreases.

10. As the number of Constraints increase, the Stabilizing Forces also increase.

**Cluster II**

**THE POWER-PRESSURE CLUSTER**

The Power-Pressure Cluster is a central organizational influence because it is the right of one person to define how another person will perform in certain situations. This form of power is manifested behaviorally through the Expression of Expectations. In short, a high-power person tells a low-power person what he wants him to do.

Expressing expectations is directly related to the occurrence of Pressure by adding to ones' burden and creating an urgency for accomplishment. The Expression of Expectations is directly related to Pressure in two ways:

1. It limits the field of alternatives the individual has to choose from in his response, and may exclude other possible correct avenues of achieving a particular end. (2) The Expression of Expectations frequently is a time benchmark which causes the pressured individual to not only have fewer approaches but also a schedule for accomplishment he considers unrealistic.

**Pressure** is directly related to Externalizing behavior. An individual experiencing Pressure may attribute difficulty to causes outside himself as a
form of defense or self-protection. To find causal fault with an external source provides relief.

An individual may respond to pressure by placing himself outside the sphere of the pressuring source. This is accomplished by defining oneself as a sufficient, independent entity not in need of guidance or supervision. Thus, Pressure is directly related to Expressions of Independence.

Pressure also is directly related to Adaptation-Adjustment behavior and creates changes either in the way work is done, or in individuals.

In addition to these direct relationships, there is a sub-cluster that triggers the following responses. Pressure is directly related to Requests for Information. If an individual is experiencing Pressure from another, he will ask for more definite and clearer information on what is expected of him. Requests for Information is directly related to Stabilizing Forces by providing expectational clarity. When one has a clearer notion of what another wants, he is more able to respond to it. His response capacity is partially determined by the Constraints that limit his responses to the pressure, which explains why Constraints are directly related to Stabilizing Forces.

The dimensions of predictability and dependability in Stabilizing Forces is directly related to the Follow Through on Commitment. Successful achievement represented in Follow Through on Commitment is inversely related to Pressure. The postulates from the Power-Pressure Cluster suggest the following testable propositions:
Figure 3. The Power-Pressure Cluster of Variables.
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1. As Power is exercised, Expressions of Expectations become more numerous.

2. As Expressions of Expectations become more numerous, individuals increasingly experience Pressure.

3. As an individual (or group) increasingly is able to Follow Through on Commitments he (they) experience less Pressure.

4. As Pressure increasingly is felt, individuals are more likely to offer Expressions of Independence.

5. As Expressions of Independence become more frequent, Externalizing behavior increases.

6. As Pressure increasingly is felt, Externalizing behavior increases.

7. As Pressure increasingly is felt, the Adaptation-Adjustment behavior increases.

8. As Pressure increasingly is felt, the Requests for Information increase.

9. As the Requests for Information increase, Stabilizing Forces become more evident.

10. As the Constraints become more numerous, Stabilizing Forces become more evident.

11. As Stabilizing Forces increase, individuals (and groups) increasingly Follow Through on Commitments.

Cluster III

THE CENTRAL FIGURE CLUSTER

The Central Figure in Communication category is influential in the organizational setting because the flow of messages toward a single source initiates responses from the Central Figure in Communication as well as those
who are directing attention toward him. Since the Central Figure in Communication is responding to a large number of messages he is forced to handle them in a rapid and condensed manner in order to get all the messages processed. Thus, Central Figure in Communication is directly related to a Direct and Brief Communication Orientation which has a general effect on Timing in the situation.

The combined effect of Central Figure and Direct and Brief Communication Orientation means the treatment of information is partial. The Central Figure's attempt to be responsible for the total information means that he can deal only with incomplete bits. This act gives the bits selected for attention greater relative importance. Since the information is incomplete, it becomes less predictable and more ambiguous. Central Figure and Direct and Brief Communication Orientation then is inversely related to Stabilizing Forces.

Because the environment is less clear and predictable, Stabilizing Forces is related inversely to Pressure. Pressure that has its origins in ambiguity is related directly to Requests for Information. Requests for Information are in the form of messages to the Central Figure in Communication. Thus, Requests for Information is related directly to Central Figure in Communication. The relationship among these variables demonstrates the sub-cluster of the Central Figure Cluster as an amplifying cycle.

The Central Figure in Communication provides the initial impetus for another sub-cluster of relationships. Because there is a central figure for handling messages that can treat only bits of data, decisions are made without
Figure 4. The Central Figure Cluster of Variables
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access to information. Non-central individuals operating in this environment learn it is possible that one's position on a situation can go unrepresented. When an individual senses the possibility of being excluded, he is more likely to be distrustful of those involved. Hence, Central Figure in Communication is directly related to Expressions of Distrust.

The distrust of others created by the way information is handled elicits a set of Responses to the Conflict. First, the individual is likely to become more manipulative by communicating his messages in ways that represent his position best. The impact is that messages become more narrow, personalized, and less representative of broader organizational interests. Another Response to the Conflict is the concern for primacy. To have one's message to the Central Figure in Communication before others becomes a high priority. Manipulation and primacy, are Personal Advancement Strategies. Expressions of Distrust, then, is related directly to Personal Advancement Strategies.

Another Response to the Conflict created by the competition for time with the Central Figure in Communication is to place one's self above the battle. This takes the form of Expression of Independence. Expressions of Distrust, then, is related directly to Expressions of Independence.

Responses to Conflict, Personal Advancement Strategies and Expressions of Independence remove information from the environment through selection and omission. In this manner, Responses to Conflict is related directly to Direct and Brief Communication Orientation by reducing the input. Since
the inputs are fewer and the environment is less stable, Direct and Brief Communication Orientation increases the saliency of the Central Figure in Communication. This sub-cluster of variables is amplifying. Central Figure in Communication increases Direct and Brief Communication Orientation and Direct and Brief Communication Orientation increases Central Figure in Communication.

The postulates from the Central Figure Cluster suggest the following testable propositions:

1. As communication is increasingly Centralized, the Orientation toward Direct and Brief Communication also increases.

2. As the Orientation toward Direct and Brief Communication increases, Stabilizing Forces decrease.

3. As the Orientation toward Direct and Brief Communication increases, Communication is increasingly Centralized around a single individual.

4. As Communication is increasingly Centralized around a single individual, a decrease in Stabilizing Forces occurs.

5. As Stabilizing Forces decrease, an increase in Pressure is felt.

6. As Pressure increasingly is felt, the number of Requests for Information increases.

7. As the Requests for Information become more numerous, the Central Figure in Communication becomes more important.

8. As Communication increasingly is Centralized, the Expressions of Distrust become more numerous.

9. As Expressions of Distrust increase, Responses to Conflict also increase.
10. As Responses to Conflict increase, the greater the Orientation toward Direct and Brief Communication.

11. As Responses to Conflict increase, the more numerous the Expressions of Independence.

12. As Responses to Conflict increase, the more numerous the Personal Advancement Strategies.

The Communication-Influence Map

The Power-Advancement Cluster and the Power-Pressure Cluster, combined with the Central Figure Cluster, indicate that interpersonal influence is the dominating force in the organization. Personal advancement is achieved by means of interpersonal influence, and influence also plays a major role in personal advancement. Power, of course, is the direct source of influence and appears to be saved for, and has its greatest value in, situations of pressure and conflict. The Central Figure is also primarily an influence-based cluster because power figures are focused on for conflict resolution and guidance.

Figure 5 is a display of the three clusters combined in one pattern. The Type I statements are reduced from thirty-three to thirty because of redundancy in the three cycles. The Type I statements are listed again below.

1. Requests for Information increase Stabilizing Forces.

2. Direct and Brief Communication Orientation decreases Stabilizing Forces.

3. Constraints increase Stabilizing Forces.

4. Central Figure in Communication decreases Stabilizing Forces.
Figure 5. The Communication-Influence Map
The Combined Power-Advancement, Power-Pressure, and Central Figure Clusters.
5. Stabilizing Forces decrease Climate for Growth and Expansion.
6. Constraints increase Climate for Growth and Expansion.
7. Climate for Growth and Expansion increases Follow Through on Commitment.
8. Follow Through on Commitment decreases Pressure.
9. Stabilizing Forces decrease Pressure.
10. Expressions of Expectation increase Pressure.
11. Pressure increases Adaptation-Adjustment.
12. Pressure increases Requests for Information.
13. Pressure increases Expressions of Independence.
14. Responses to Conflict increase Expressions of Independence.
15. Pressure increases Externalizing.
17. Requests for Information increase Central Figure in Communication.
18. Direct and Brief Communication Orientation increase Central Figure Communication.
19. The Central Figure in Communication increases Direct and Brief Communication Orientation.
20. Responses to Conflict increase Direct and Brief Communication Orientation.
21. Central Figure in Communication increases Expressions of Distrust.
22. Coalition Formations increase Expressions of Distrust.
23. Personal Advancement Strategies increase Expressions of Distrust.
24. Expressions of Distrust increase Responses to Conflict.
25. **Responses to Conflict** increase **Personal Advancement Strategies**.

26. **Power** increases **Personal Advancement Strategies**.

27. The **Climate for Growth and Expansion** increases **Personal Advancement Strategies**.

28. **Personal Advancement Strategies** increase **Coalition Formations**.

29. **Personal Advancement Strategies** increase **Communication Inhibition**.

30. **Power** increases **Expressions of Expectation**.

These thirty Type I statements (Gibbs, 1967, p. 79) identify relations among nineteen of the twenty-four variables. The remaining five categories were not included in the three clusters. Of the nineteen variables included, sixteen are dependent variables. Sixteen equations need to be developed that define the changes occurring in these variables as a function of others. Stated verbally, the regression equations take the following forms as Type IV statements (hypotheses).

H1. Stabilizing Forces = Requests for Information - Direct and Brief Communication + Constraints - Central Figure in Communication.

H2. Climate for Growth and Expansion = Stabilizing Forces - Constraints.

H3. Follow Through on Commitment = Climate for Growth and Expansion (statement of identity).

H4. Pressure = Expressions of Expectation - Stabilizing Forces - Follow Through on Commitment.

H5. Adaptation-Adjustment = Pressure (statement of identity).

H6. Requests for Information = Pressure (statement of identity).
H7. Expression of Independence = Pressure + Responses to Conflict.

H8. Externalizing = Pressure + Expressions of Independence.

H9. Central Figure in Communication = Requests for Information + Direct and Brief Communication Orientation.

H10. Direct and Brief Communication Orientation = Central Figure in Communication + Responses to Conflict.

H11. Expressions of Distrust = Central Figure in Communication + Coalition Formation + Personal Advancement Strategy.


These sixteen hypotheses provide interesting comparisons to existing research on group and organizational communication. Some would enjoy acceptability because they confirm previous research. For example, H7 and H8 are closely akin to Bion's (1959) concept of Fight–Flight. Bion feels that groups come together to express hostility and aggression (fight) or to avoid the problem and run away from the group (flight) as a basic technique of self preservation. H11 and H12 would be confirmed by Sherif and Sherif (1969) and Blake and Mouton (1964) research on intergroup conflict. Their research shows
that groups in conflict tend to increase cohesiveness with in-groups and increase
misperceptions and stereotypes of out-groups.

Other hypotheses provide new perspectives to established research areas. For example, H1, H9, H10, and H11 deal with the Central Figure in Communication and Direct and Brief Communication Orientation. Since the Central Figure in Communication is interpretable in terms of the laboratory research of communication networks, it would be possible to interject message length as a concommitant variable in centralized and decentralized network structures. Since all messages must be transmitted to the hub of a centralized network structure, the central person may give them a brief response. In an all channel-type decentralized network where there is no requirement to route messages to a particular person, a need for brevity may not exist. Hence, one could hypothesize that the average length of messages is shorter in a centralized network than in a decentralized network.

Still other hypotheses focus on variables that have not been included as significant points of concern in social science literature. Elements such as Follow Through on Commitment, Expression of Expectation, Requests for Information and Personal Advancement Strategies are included in H3, H4, H6, H13, and H14. These variables can be operationalized and tested more carefully. Some suggestions on how this development might be achieved are included in Chapter Five. These contributions, conformations of existing research, new
perspectives for existing research, and new variable formulation, are the primary assets of generating grounded theory.
CHAPTER V

REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter reviews the steps taken to generate a grounded theory of organizational communication. Section two of this chapter offers suggestions for improving the research methodology used. Since theory generation is a "first phase" activity in a longitudinal scheme, the final section identifies several alternatives for future development of this research.

The Process of Generating Grounded Theory

In the introduction of this study, an interest was expressed in how individuals communicate with each other in organizational settings. Specific interest was in the system of influences that shaped the organizational communication processes. The principal theories and methods of organizational communication were reviewed but did not shed much light on the matter. A major portion of the literature on organizational communication was a product of four theoretical and methodological influences. Information theory, the first major theory to conceive of human communication as a science, has been used consistently in discussing organizational communication. But, information theory was of limited use to this research because of its inability to account for the
various personal and situational influences. Second, classical theory has been used most frequently in conceiving how individual behavior is organized to communicate. Classical theory emphasizes blueprints, specifications, rules of operation, etc., which may or may not approach a one-to-one relationship with the behavior actually occurring in the organization. Classical theory did not appear to be a logical selection to guide a study of the relationships among variables in on-going communicative behavior.

Third, the laboratory research on communication networks is the area receiving the greatest attention in organizational communication. Network research treats responses of individuals with varying opportunities to talk in a group and how the structural limits and latitudes affect their task accomplishment. Since communication network research does not get at the process of interpersonal communication that occurs among individuals, it appeared to be inappropriate for this research.

Fourth, the predominant data-collecting device in organizational communication research is the paper and pencil measurement form. These include surveys, standard instruments, sociometric measures, ECCO analysis, etc. The common denominator among these instruments is that they report attitudes and sentiments on pre-structured dimensions. Such data collection is appropriate for research using internal variables as their hypothetical constructs. Paper and pencil measurement is less applicable to research focusing on the observable behavior of individuals in their natural setting. Since these
four predominant research and theory strategies did not provide a framework to approach the interests of this research project. Chapter II laid out a plan for generating data and theory of interpersonal communication in the organizational setting.

Exploring how individuals communicated interpersonally in the organization and what systemic influences affected this communication pointed this project to wholistic, descriptive research methods. Chapter II outlined a process of non-participant observation and in-depth interviewing as data collecting methods, and the constant comparative method of data analysis. These methods were embedded in a conceptual framework of interaction theories of communication and modern systems theories of organization. Developing a grounded theory was the objective of the study. Grounded theory involves an inductive developmental process that allows one to move from concrete data to categorical and theoretical representation of the data.

Chapters III and IV were an application of Grounded Theory method to the qualitative data collected in the subject organization. In Chapter III manuscripts produced by the observations and interviewing were divided into 426 units of analysis called incidents. The incidents were analyzed by coding each incident into as many emergent or existing categories as possible. Each incident was applied to existing categories and evaluated to see if additional categories were necessary. The application of this process to the 426 incidents
eventually produced a set of twenty-four categories. These categories were
given individual descriptions drawn from assigned incidents.

Chapter IV developed relationships among those categories by creating
variable maps which revealed clusters of amplifying direct and counteracting
(inverse) relationships. This combination of variables into more abstract pat-
terns produced three clusters which accounted for eighty percent of the cate-
gories. The relationships within the clusters were formally reduced to six-
teen hypotheses of relationships among variables. These hypotheses had the
multiple effect of confirming and questioning presently recognized findings,
and creating new relationships among variables.

**Limits of the Research Methodology**

The data collection and analysis phases of this study, completed by a
single investigator, are vulnerable to questions of reliability. Although two re-
searchers were involved in the project, they separated systematically inter-
viewing and observation efforts to avoid biasing or influencing each other's
perceptions while the data were being collected. The effect of this decision was
the generation of sets of observation and interview data produced by single in-
dividuals. Alternative approaches include dividing the volume of data by one-
half and having both researchers collect simultaneous but separate data on the
same behavior. This would allow the data to be subjected to both qualitative and
quantitative checks of reliability.
Another possibility would be to involve a third investigator whose role would be to process the interviews and observations with their respective collectors on a separate and periodic basis. To review carefully what is being discovered and described, its implications, and other areas deserving probing, could serve as an instrument both to refine and check the total data collection effort.

The development of the category system was also the product of a single investigator. Although this process was systematically checked by two associates involved in the data collection, it would be useful to have more than one person involved in the generation of categories. Moving from incident data to categorical representation is an inferential step involving many alternative choices. Having a team of investigators go through this process and integrate their codings would increase confidence in the category system.

There are limits to the categories and the relationships that were drawn among them. Some of the categories are broad in scope which creates a rich combination of behaviors within a single category, but create difficulty when developing specific relationships among categories. This was evidenced by the formation of several statements of identity. Part of one category may link with other categories, but fail to account for the remaining elements of its own contents. This occurs because the categories are multi-dimensional and are not mutually exclusive. The categories could be further refined by developing subtypes for categories that account for each dimension. This step would move
away from the simplicity of the twenty-four category system, but sub-types would allow for more precision.

The categories were treated as variables combined into relationship clusters of inverse and direct influence. The theoretical discussion of these categories treats them as if they were equal in their representation of data. In fact, there is a great deal of variety (1.4% to 11.5%) in the amount of data each variable represents. The issue is not critical in this study for two reasons: first, this is a search for possible relationships among variables, thus, we did not stress the quantity of occurrence of one category in relation to another. Second, there is no reason to assume that categories are equally potent. It is possible, for example, that 3.1% of Stabilizing Forces counteracts 9.1% of Pressure. The question, however, does deserve further attention in both laboratory and field research. How valid are assumptions about the equality of variable potency in a research study? Is variable potency constant from investigation to investigation.

This discussion of the limitations of the research methods is centered upon concerns for precision and verification. These are inherent limitations of qualitative research, but they can be responded to in ways that increase our confidence in the data they produce. The strength of qualitative research grounded in data is its concreteness and richness in generating relationships among communication variables. Given these assumptions, the possible future directions of this research deserve special attention.
Future Research

Since the data and theory presented here are from a single setting, data collection and analysis procedures used need to be replicated. This could demonstrate whether the categories identified are situation-specific or operate consistently in organizations with similar characteristics. Another perspective on replication is to see if different categories or variables can be identified. Replication of the grounded theory process is a scanning and searching device as well as a verifying device.

Because the categories developed from this constant comparative analysis were given sufficient detail to allow for their operationalizing, a number of additional research steps could be taken.

First, the twenty-four categories could be treated as an interaction process scale in a manner similar to Bales (1950). Coding observational and interview data onto a twenty-four category scale would allow the search for relationships between individuals and categories, between categories in patterns of occurrence, and between categories and specific conditions or phases within a group or organization.

A survey instrument could be developed for more carefully testing the twenty-four variables created from this project. The items could be drawn from the category description and refined through field testing. For both a survey instrument and a process scale, the investigator has the basic patterns of inverse and direct relationships among variables posited in Chapter IV from
which to work. In effect, the relationships among the variables identified in this research could be tested with these methods. Using survey research could search for relationships among variables, but not between the variable concept and the overt behavior in the organization. To account for both concerns, a mixed method of observation and survey would be necessary.

Another step in the direction of quantitative verification is to laboratory test relationships among these variables. The most obvious starting place for a laboratory test is a selection from the sixteen hypotheses derived in Chapter IV. Since we have data on the amount of observed behavior each category accounts for, it would be possible to treat the issue of variable potency mentioned above. The treatment of key variables in a laboratory setting drawn from data collected in a field setting would be a comprehensive treatment of a research idea that is seldom found in the social sciences.

Summary

Chapter V discusses the steps taken in this research program. In brief, an interest in interpersonal communication in an organizational setting was expressed; a review of the applicability of predominant theories and methods demonstrated that a different set of methods and theories were needed; and a program of qualitative data analysis based on observation and interview was undertaken. The methods produced a twenty-four category system of communication with a theory of possible relationships among variables.
Section II of this chapter was a critique of the limitations of the methodology used in this research project. Reliability problems created by the use of a single investigator on several phases were perceived as the principal drawback. Problems of broad categories were also discussed.

The final section of this chapter offered future directions for the present research. These included replication of the data and theory generation process, the use of the categories as standardized process analysis and survey instrument forms. The final suggestion was to use the categories as variables for laboratory experimentation.
EXAMPLE INTERVIEW INCIDENTS

IV 1. We then changed the subject and X said MORPC had two things going for it positively if they could be tapped. (1) potential for growth of the org and upward movement in MORPC; (2) there is a bill in the state legislature that would set up districts and do away with rural planning agencies in effect making MORPC a state planning agency.

IV 17. I asked X where his office was with respect to Y. He said the Division Chiefs were off in one area and the "peons" were in another area (see floor plan chart).

IV 26. X thinks there is a need for more information to present stronger cases to the Housing Committee. He says there is not enough time for research. Even some of the most obvious and fundamental research is not done because of lack of time and personnel.

IV 33. I asked X how much he socialized with the personnel. He said he associates with A, B, C and HUD and D. He said he does not attend any of the office parties and the people he associates with are not the kind of people to go to office parties. They go home and spend time with their wife and families. When he does associate with the above mentioned they usually talk about work.

IV 42. X said when he was brought in Y never formally briefed him on what his subordinates were doing. When X asked Y, Y said, "I wish you could tell me." Y never sat down with X and A and B to talk about strategies and priorities for project direction and completion. This X found frustrating.

IV 51. According to X, Y is not as communicative as he should be with him. For example, Y was going on vacation this week (July 24 - 30). X is left in charge. X asked Y on Thursday if there was anything he should be briefed on before Y left. Y sort of said they would get together but did not make a specific time appointment. X again stopped in Y's office Friday morning and asked again. Y again was unspecific and finally X said he would come to Y's office at 3:30 that afternoon. X
showed up and they talked about very general things and finally Y said there was nothing specific X should know and nothing important coming up. This morning (Monday July 24, Y's first day of vacation) an outsider called in for the report and recommendation that Y had promised. X knew nothing about it. He looked on Y's desk and found the report with a memo on it addressed to Y. Y had not begun it or briefed X. X now has to get familiar with the report and get back to this person this afternoon by 3:30. X indicated that this was typical behavior.

IV 57. X described himself as "an ambitious man".

IV 87. X began the interview by telling me that his apartment had just been burglarized and everything had been stolen. No insurance. That with the pressure of work has him very shook up.

IV 107. She does not feel as if she is overloaded. Her work comes in spurts. Sometimes the deadlines for projects fall due at the same time and she has a lot of work to do but at other times she has sufficient to catch up on her routine work.

IV 122. She said that if the younger planners are willing to talk this is where I should get a lot of information and suggestion. This is because none of the younger planners are really happy with their division chiefs, with the possible exception of X. She said this might be because they have equal education with their supervisors and want to operate independently. She said she has the impression that most of the people are kind of doing their own things.

IV 138. She said there was no official announcement of the re-organization which put her in the administrative division in the analysts pool. She said her job really hasn't changed much because she is still working on the same project for X that she was before the pool. She first heard about the change via rumor.

IV 147. X strikes me as a bitter person who does not get along particularly well with others. She does not like the "zealous pious" types who are "climbers" in the organization. She does not like those that "socialize" with their office mates. She said repeatedly that you have to stand back, be above all of that and laugh at it.

IV 171. The second piece of information is that X said everyone is out to impress Y. Consequently there is mistrust in the organization. When people go into Y's office he tells them they are the most important
person. As a result people walk out feeling good and thinking good things about Y but very little has been added to the efficient functioning of the entire operation.

IV 184. X was also very high on Y. He makes quick decisions, is very bright and ambitious, he works hard but is accessible. I asked X if he thought Y would stay at MORPC or if he thought Y would move on and up to another job. X said he didn't know but wouldn't be surprised if X moved up to another job in the near future.

IV 194. X said the surroundings didn't really make a difference because she enjoyed the work and the people she is working with. I asked her what the most satisfying part of her job was and she said the people.
APPENDIX B

EXAMPLE OBSERVATION INCIDENTS

OB 8. One note about X. I have noticed that he talks rather casually and frequently about firing people.

OB 16. Problems dealt with very directly. "Well X, what do you have?" followed by X's dealing with a series of problems he has prepared for previously. X avoided going in to one problem, apparently because visibly upset; his voice was a bit shakey. He was upset with the whole notion of rating forms and being rated. He was also upset with Y but did not go into much detail on it specifically, but treated it as if Z already knew his feelings on that subject quite clearly.

OB 37. He asked if I had difficulty understanding him. I indicated that I did at times. He indicated that he talks fast because he likes to get things done. He referred to a language test in the speech department that had been an unpleasant experience, so he simply "slowed down" to please the tester on the second trial and passed it.

OB 45. Another aspect of X's communication practices or style is his slow and reluctant acceptance of points or ideas that someone else originates. He tends to reform the statements of others in his own lenguage before they can be blessed with merit.

OB 54. The subject was a budget problem and there had apparently been little communication within Z's division about the problem. The people in the division seem to avoid contact with each other and because of this a few things get dropped through the crack.

OB 59. X takes detailed notes (says he has a poor memory) and writes rather slowly. This has a very significant impact on meetings. A discussion will occur then there will be a break in the action while X gets his notes down. This note taking really places X in control of the tempo of meetings. All members sit and watch, then Ray is ready to proceed again.

103
X is an evaluator. He is a person one takes ideas to. He accepts them somewhat reluctantly: "I can't dispute that."

X also asked questions, and the combination of his and Y's questions raised some important points about the findings that Z presented. Z accepted these points as valid and in need of clarifying if future work was done in this area.

As I sat in X's office prior to the meeting, he had an extended conversation over the phone with an individual from another agency regarding contracts. He was apparently an acquaintance of X's, for he talked very loosely and they both joked and lamented about the topsey-turvy, pressured, uncertain world of contracts and getting the work done the agreement calls for.

X described a project he was working on. He was genuinely excited about his subject and this seemed to stimulate others and give an otherwise dull administrative meeting a lift. There was a good deal of hitchhiking on the idea; one person would respond which would elicit a response from another, which in turn would elicit a response, etc. It moved toward open, creative communication session.

When the discussion centered on X, Y suggested that X be brought in to "shed some light on the subject." At first Z did not recognize the statement, but would continue as though nothing had been said. As Y repeated his desire to have X present, Z responded by saying that she "would be overwhelmed by the pressure." As a compromise a future meeting was set with Y, Z and X to continue the issue.

The relationships are friendly and mutually respectful in this division. X seems to be a central figure even though formally he is the junior man in the division and educationally he is not a planner. Yet, Y, Z and to some extent A, tend to bring questions to him, ask him for information and consult with him instead of the reverse.

X's role as the central figure in the organization is confirmed in staff meetings. This is manifested in his comments at staff meetings. He is always well informed and is always able to give suggestions and talk intelligently on any issue that arises. He is able to do this directly with almost any staff member.

The staff was not involved in this one on one exchange and were rather demonstrative about their apathy toward it. They fanned the
door to the office to get the smoke out and some fresh air in (it was stuffy in the room), and made small talk among themselves. X and Y gave no recognition to this, but continued with their talk about the projects.
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