Chapter 2

Organizational Communication – Past and Present Tenses

W. Charles Redding and Phillip K. Tompkins

ABSTRACT

This chapter presents a long-range perspective from which to view the historical evolution of the field. After recalling selected antecedents going back to antiquity, the chapter proposes two frames of reference: the first, applicable to the period 1900-1970; the second, 1970 to the present. Organizational communication concepts and proto-theories are shown to be derivatives of three primary sources: (a) traditional rhetorical doctrine, (b) the older version of "human relations" theory, and (c) various components of management-organization theory. Two themes are identified as broad categories of "conceptual foundations" up through the 1960s: the individual-behavioral, and the systemic-operational. These became translated, during the 1940s and 1950s, into three conceptual frames of reference (roughly parallel to three chronological phases): (a) the formulary-prescriptive, (b) the empirical-prescriptive, and (c) the applied-scientific.

For the more recent years (beginning around 1970), three other orientations—analogous to, but different from, the frames of reference for 1900-1970—are suggested as fruitful ways to understand modern theory and research in the field: (a) the "modernist," (b) the "naturalistic," and (c) the "critical." Each of these is explicated in terms of 11 dimensions, or "defining characteristics," differentiated across all three categories. The eleven dimensions are discussed under the following labels: (a) goals, (b) ontology, (c) epistemology, (d) form of knowledge claim, (e) perspective, (f) rationality, (g) causality, (h) levels/boundaries, (i) root metaphor, (j) organizations, and (k) communication. The chapter concludes with recommendations for researchers of the future.

As an academic field of study, organizational communication is obviously a relative newcomer upon the scene. Indeed, in the 1980s disputants are still wrestling with such fundamental questions as: (a) Can the field even be identified? and (b) Assuming that it can be identified, where does it belong? For example, should the study of organizational communication be assigned to departments of (a) speech communication? (b) communication(s)? (c) English? (d) business communication (in business schools)? (e) organizational behavior (also in business schools)? Leipzig and More (1982), for instance, attempt to delineate boundaries among organizational communication, organizational behavior, and business communication. They suggest that organizational communication deals primarily with "communication theory as applied to organizations" and only "secondarily (through Business and Professional Speaking) with the development of oral skills"; organizational behav-

ior, with "the theoretical foundations of how individuals behave within and between organizations"; and business communication, with "the development of written skills for business" (p. 78).

Three writers have gone so far as to conclude that something called "managerial communication" is an "emerging" new discipline (Smeltzer, Glab, & Golen, 1983, p. 77). However, they find themselves unable to provide an answer to the question: "Should the course and faculty be housed in management, business communication, or the speech/communication department?" This is not surprising, since:

> Managerial Communication is a hybrid . . . Knowledge of rhetoric, linguistics, small-group dynamics, grammar, business administration, psychology, and sociology should hypothetically be required. . . . Few such faculty individuals exist. (Smeltzer et al., 1983, p. 76)

We can agree with Leipzig and More (1982) that, to date, "no systematic integration" of subject matter in our field has yet emerged:

> Consequently, while we have multiple bodies of knowledge about similar phenomena, the conceptual boundaries of organizational communication remain unresolved. (p. 78)

It should be remembered that the label "organizational communication" is itself of recent vintage, not having replaced "business and industrial communication" until the late 1960s or early 1970s (Redding, 1985) — although it had appeared sporadically in the 1950s (Bavelas & Barrett, 1951; Argyris, 1957; Zelko & O'Brien, 1957). In view of the eclectic and ill-defined character of the field — a situation existing as these words are being written — we find it virtually impossible to single out certain dates or events permitting us to declare, with an air of confident finality, "Here is where it all started." Indeed, in a disturbingly large number of instances, it has been difficult to decide whether or not a specifc publication "really belongs" to organizational communication. Despite these perplexities, we nevertheless have devised a Schema (see Exhibit 1) to identify what we perceive as the major themes characterizing the field — up to about 1970. For the years after 1970, we propose a different set of categories (see Exhibit 3).

We suggest that the modern study of organizational communication — although not under that label — dates from 1942, the year that Alexander R. Heron's book *Sharing Information With Employees* appeared. This is the first book-length publication addressed explicitly and exclusively to management-employee communication. However, beginning around 1900, writers and teachers had been dealing with "business English" and "business speech" instruction (the Era of Preparation). These pioneers were obviously focusing almost exclusively on narrow subdivisions of the field as we recognize it today. To be sure, there were those with a broader perspective, especially the ones who made major contributions in 1938 and 1939. We have in mind those few business managers and social scientists who perceived communication as a subsidiary — albeit important — topic within the fields of management theory, industrial sociology, or social psychology; for example, Barnard (1968), Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) and Roethlisberger & Dickson (1939).

In their perceptive, although brief, review of the literature in organizational communication, Sincoff, Pacilio, Blatt, Hunt, and Anton (1975) believed that they could discern three "eras": the Prescriptive, the Descriptive, and the Predictive. The basis of partition was apparently methodological, although the authors were rather vague on this point. Events,

they said, could be "categorized both by their nature and the chronological sequence in which they occurred" (p. 4); but the word "nature" tells us little. Hay (1974), addressing himself to the history of organizational communication "through the 1940s," also used the term "era." He proposed just two: the Pre-Behavioral and the Human Relations (mentioning, in a footnote, that a third — "The Behavioral Science Era — would include that period of time from 1955 to the present" [p. 10]).

We view the evolution of the field, since the turn of the century, in terms of three major periods:

1. *The Era of Preparation: About 1900 to About 1940* (Transition Years: 1938–1942)
2. *The Era of Identification and Consolidation: About 1940 to About 1970* (Transition Years: 1967–1973)
3. *The Era of Maturity and Innovation: Since About 1970*

During the Era of Preparation the groundwork was laid, in both academe and the business world, for singling out communication processes and skills — especially skills — as organizational phenomena worthy of special study. During the Era of Identification and Consolidation, both practitioners and academics began to shape the contours of a new subject-matter area, generally called "business and industrial communication." During the Era of Maturity and Innovation, there has occurred a proliferation of empirical research, accompanied by innovative efforts to develop concepts, theoretical premises, and philosophical critiques.

Historical Perspective: The Illusion of Novelty

As the mathematician Kline (1980) has suggested, "The origins of any important idea can always be traced back decades and even hundreds of years" (p. 127). We know that organizations resembling modern bureaucracies flourished in ancient times, in such empires as the Egyptian, the Babylonian, the Persian, and the Roman (George, 1972, pp. 1–27). Without attempting the absurdity of recapitulating thousands of years of history, we can still profit from examining a few illustrations of historical continuity.

The illusion of novelty is a perceptual impairment associated with historical innocence. It can induce, for example, the supposition that the concepts studied by contemporary researchers — empathic listening, accuracy of serial transmission, superior-subordinate relations, and the like — are inventions of the twentieth century. It is chastening, therefore, to reflect upon such passages as those that follow. They are from a self-help manual addressed to a young man expecting to assume an official position in a governmental bureaucracy (many centuries before Christ):

> If thou art one to whom petition is made, be calm as thou listenest to what the petitioner has to say. Do not rebuff him before he has swept out his body or before he has said that for which he came. It is not [necessary] that everything about which he has petitioned should come to pass, [but] a good hearing is soothing to the heart. (George, 1972, p. 6)

> If you are the guest of a superior, speak only when he addresses you, for you do not know what will offend him.

> If you carry a message from one noble to another, be exact in the repetition.

Avoid stirring up enmities by the perversion of truth; nor should you violate confidences – [something which] is abhorrent to the soul.

If you speak in the presence of an expert, you may be deeply embarrassed. But if you know what you are talking about, speak with authority, and avoid false modesty.

If you have done someone a favor, do not hasten to remind him of it the next time you meet him. (Gray, 1946, p. 452)

These are only a few of the recommendations to be found in what has been called "the oldest book in the world," the *Precepts* of Ptah-hotep, Vizier to one of the Egyptian Pharaohs of the Old Kingdom. The original manuscript – from which innumerable copies were produced over a span of centuries – may have been composed as early as 2700 or 2600 B.C. (Gray, 1946). It happens to be the earliest extant text in a long series of similar manuals, all of them intended for the guidance of aspiring bureaucrats (Gray, 1946; Garraty & Gay, 1972, pp. 77–78). A persuasive argument can be made that the world's first bureaucracies – staffed as they were by armies of scribes generating untold thousands of written records – were the administrative organizations established under the pharaohs of ancient Egypt (Gray, 1946; Garraty & Gay, 1972, pp. 77–78; George, 1972, pp. 4–9).

Especially noteworthy is the fact that the oldest surviving literary work should be a book on communication and human relations in the organizational context: the *Precepts* of Ptah-hotep. Indeed, we shall be so bold as to nominate Ptah-hotep as the "Dale Carnegie of ancient Egypt." After all, given (a) the antiquity of organizationial structures, and (b) the fact that, as Barfield (1977, p. 63) has remarked, "There is not much that is more important for human beings than their relations with each other," one should hardly be surprised to learn that writings on communication and human relations in the organization are almost as old as civilization itself.

The truth, notwithstanding illusions of novelty, is that a *very* large proportion of "modern" concepts and principles associated with organizational communication have long histories. Thayer was right when he observed, "The record of our understanding of the processes of communication has been one of constantly reinventing the wheel" (1968, p. 307). A worthy enterprise awaits the scholar who would document in explicit detail the historical sources of theoretical principles promulgated by twentieth-century researchers. For example, it was a social scientist, James G. March, who arrived at the conclusion that:

In many respects, Dale Carnegie appears to have been rediscovering the truths of Machiavelli. And if one reads a treatise on management by a modern-day successful manager, one is frequently struck by the extent to which Aristotle probably said it better and apparently understood it more. (March, 1965, p. xiii)

No claim is being made, of course, that the early writings constitute neatly systematized sets of formally stated, experimentally validated propositions. With the outstanding exception of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (fourth century B.C.), the literature relevant to our field, at least until the end of the nineteenth century, consisted primarily of rules-of-thumb, derived in turn from everyday experience and observation. And, as Kline reminds us, "labelling [a] rule of thumb a principle does not improve its logical structure" (1980, p. 160).

In the brief compass of the present chapter, it would be inappropriate to devote more space to writers of antiquity. We shall not, therefore, labor the profound influence of Aristotle's masterwork, the *Rhetoric*. We find social scientists of the 1980s declaring that "it seems fair to assert that much of the conceptual and substantive fabric for contemporary

study of persuasion was woven by Aristotle" (Miller, Burgoon, & Burgoon, 1984, p. 401). Nor is it feasible to explore the insights of Machiavelli, who may, for example, have been the first to articulate advice on utilizing upward communication – see *The Prince*, Chapter XXIII. What Machiavelli produced, according to Kenneth Burke (1950, pp. 158–159), was an "administrative rhetoric." And, not too long ago, Antony Jay's *Management and Machiavelli* (1967) was a popular item on the reading lists of executive development programs.

Only historical innocence could induce one to suppose that more "sophisticated" or "scientific" methods of supervision are exclusively twentieth-century inventions. Such communication concepts, for example, as treating subordinates with "consideration" (see Fleishman, Harris, & Burtt, 1955) or providing them with "feedback" about their job performance (see Cusella, 1980) were parts of the managerial repertoire long before social scientists examined them in the years following World War II.

An early – albeit harsh – version of "Zero Defects" strategy is exemplified in the methods used to accomplish quality control in the famous "cloth factories" of seventeenth-century France. Jean Baptiste Colbert (1619–1693), the celebrated Controller General of Finance to Louis XIV, is regarded by some historians as the founder of "modern" bureaucratic methods. To assure excellence in the quality of cloth, Colbert created elaborate sets of rules and regulations, among which were the following:

Each piece had to bear the name of the workman who made it; defective pieces were to be seized by government inspectors and exposed on a post with the name of the responsible workman in full view. In the case of a second offense, the careless workman was to be publicly censured by the members of his guild; for a third offense, he himself was to be tied to the post with a sample of his defective workmanship attached to his neck. (Garrett, 1940, p. 296)

A more humane application of the same techniques was instituted by the famous industrialist and social reformer Robert Owen (1771–1858), as early as the first decade of the nineteenth century. In his highly profitable factory at New Lanark, Scotland, the practice was that:

a little cube of wood was hung over each employee, with a color painted on each side denoting, according to shade from light to dark, the different grades of deportment: white for excellent; yellow, good; blue, indifferent; black, bad. (George, 1972, p. 62)

Moreover, Owen adopted an "open door" policy, whereby "anyone could complain to him about any rule or regulation" and "could inspect the deportment book and . . . appeal if he felt he had been unjustly rated" (George, 1972, p. 62). Frequently called "the father of personnel management," Owen devoted many years to a vigorous advocacy of an employer-employee relationship that "reached the threshold of much modern thinking" – especially that of Elton Mayo more than a hundred years later (Merrill, 1970, p. 10). The remarkably profitable "success of his labor policies attracted wide attention," says Merrill, "but little imitation" (1970, p. 10).

In an essay written in 1813, Owen stressed two major themes: (a) that the entire workforce, combined with the physical plant and equipment, shold be regarded "as a system composed of many parts"; and (b) that it would be both morally right and financially advantageous if factory owners would pay as much careful attention to "the more delicate, complex living mechanism" as they customarily bestowed upon their "inanimate ma-

chines." A central premise was that workers should be treated "with kindness," and an important corollary, that employers could "prevent an accumulation of human misery, of which it is now difficult to form an adequate conception" (from "An Address to the Superintendents of Manufactories," excerpted in Merrill, 1970, pp. 11-13). Owen carried his crusades to the United States, where he became famous (or notorious) for attempting to establish a communal mode of living at New Harmony, Indiana (1824).

It is interesting to observe that the official statement of purpose, announced by the American Management Association (AMA) when it adopted that name in 1923, included the following passage:

> The day when American management can afford to treat the human factor as "taken for granted" has gone by and today emphasis must be laid on the human factor in commerce and industry and we must apply to it the same careful study that has been given during the last few decades to materials and machinery. (Quoted in Bendix, 1956, p. 288, Footnote 61)

Then, more than a quarter of a century later, came the manifesto *Human Relations in Modern Business*, issued in 1949 by a consortium of leaders in business, industry, religion, labor, and academe. (This document is sometimes called the Magna Carta of Human Relations.) Thus, echoes of Robert Owen's argument, first propounded in the early 1800s, kept reverberating in books, articles, and public lectures of the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s.

Since, of course, most of the methods for supervising people and managing organizations have long ago been tried and — depending upon circumstances — found to be successful or unsuccessful, we should not be surprised to discover that the "human relations" component of modern organizational communication contains a large proportion of rule-of-thumb principles originating in past centuries. This fact holds whether we are referring to the academic versions of human relations — such as those identified with the Harvard Business School and the Institute for Social Research at Michigan — or to the popular expositions associated with such names as Dale Carnegie.

The conceptual linkages between traditional rhetorical theory and modern human relations doctrine are numerous and powerful. Admittedly, it is difficult to discern boundaries between these two intellectual domains. However, primarily since World War I, what are designated as Areas A and B in Exhibit I have developed identifiably separate literatures — even though the enormously influential popularizer Dale Carnegie (whose first important book came out in 1926, ten years before *How to Win Friends and Influence People*) exemplified an amorphous mixture of ideas from both rhetoric and human relations.

It seems safe to assert that the first "prototheory" to emerge as a systematic articulation of abstract principles was rhetoric. And, in fact, virtually all the textbooks in "business English," "business speaking," and "persuasion," published up through the 1930s, were watered-down derivatives of classical rhetoric. In the present context, "rhetoric" denotes the study of formal, structured public discourse — either written or oral — with special emphasis upon persuasion.

This is intentionally a narrower conception of rhetoric than such modern definitions as "the art of symbolic inducement" (Ehninger, 1972, p. 10), or "the rationale of informative and suasory discourse" (Bryant, 1953, p. 404). Not that we quarrel with the broader definitions; in fact, quite the contrary. We incline toward agreeing with Conrad's (1985) sweeping assertion that, "in essence, communication in organizations is rhetorical communication" (p. 172). However, viewed historically, the textbooks and treatises commonly labeled "rhetoric" — almost without exception those published before World War II — dealt

with a narrower domain than "symbolic inducement" or even "informative and suasory discourse." They dealt, in fact, with the principles governing effective speeches and their written counterparts (the Aristotelian triad of forensic, deliberative, and epideictic, later supplemented by sermons). Hence, Area A in Exhibit I is designated: "Structured discourse (oral or written), emphasizing a speaker or writer addressing an audience." It is associated with "traditional rhetorical theory."

Area B in Exhibit I refers to "informal, interpersonal interaction, in dyads and small-group situations (primarily oral)," typically identified with "human relations." Naturally, these two areas overlap; and modern views of rhetorical theory would no doubt make the claim that all kinds of human symbolic interaction are rhetorical:

> Today . . . [the assumption is] that rhetoric not only is inherent in all human communication, but that it also informs and conditions every aspect of thought and behavior; that man is inevitably and inescapably a rhetorical animal. (Ehninger, 1972, p. 9)

Conrad, in his recent college-level textbook, exemplifies this position when he declares that organizational communication always has "an *instrumental* purpose" and that "it is *rhetorical communication* which allows organizations and their members to succeed and which helps them to fail" — hence, "Effective organizational communication depends on the rhetorical skills of employees" (1985, p. 172; emphasis in the original).

In our view, then, the academic field of organizational communication can trace most (but not all) of its conceptual roots to three sources: (a) *traditional rhetorical theory* (as modified and truncated in business writing and business speaking texts), (b) *human relations models* (actually, mini-theories and prototheories rather than full-blown theories), and (c) *early versions of management-organization theories* (again, prototheories would be a more accurate designation). What finally emerged in the 1940s and 1950s — typically under such labels as "business and industrial communication" — was a vaguely defined amalgam of subject matter drawn from these three bodies of knowledge. But all three had in common a firm allegiance to a pragmatic, utilitarian philosophy. More specifically, the overriding concern was with understanding the means whereby *effectiveness* (of the individual, of the organization) could be achieved. A frequently recurring synonym for "effectiveness" was "success" — there was even an inspirational, self-help magazine, published from 1897 to 1924, under the name *Success* (Huber, 1971).

Starting primarily in the late 1960s and early 1970s, when "organizational" was replacing "business and industrial" as the accepted modifier of "communication" (see Redding, 1985), specialists in the field made significant paradigm shifts, utilizing a much broader range of concepts drawn from contemporary rhetorical theory, the social sciences, and philosophy of science; hence, the Era of Maturity and Innovation. However, the bright glow of sophisticated research during the 1970s and 1980s should not blind us to this important fact: The dominant impulse behind the study of organizational communication has always been pragmatic — attempting to discover how individuals or organizations, or both, can be made to function more effectively. With some exceptions in recent years, this impulse has characterized our "scientific" research as well as the massive body of literature providing readers with prescriptions on how to get "results." One thinks, for example, of the "scientific" studies on "overcoming resistance to change" (Coch & French, 1948), on "measuring the effectiveness of industrial communications" (Funk & Becker, 1952), on "how to choose a leadership pattern" (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958), on "quantifying the frame of reference in labor-management communication" (Weaver, 1958).

A PANORAMIC VIEW: CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS (1900–1970)

The two main headings in Exhibit 1 represent themes postulated to underlie the main corpus of teaching and research in organizational communication through the late 1960s or early 1970s. (The year 1970 is, of course, no more than a convenient and arbitrary marker, actually symbolizing a span of several years, roughly 1967–1973.) Theme-I we have designated the "individual-behavioral"; Theme-II, the "systemic-operational." Brief definitions are provided in Exhibit 1.

The distinction between Themes I and II is an important one. Teaching and research carried out in the individual-behavioral spirit of Theme-I positions the individual as figure and the organization as ground. The systemic-operational approach of Theme-II reverses this, regarding the organization as figure and the individual member as ground.

Historically, publications (especially textbooks) governed by Theme-I thinking have sometimes gone so far as to ignore the organizational context altogether; at the same time, many titles associated with Theme-II thinking have treated the organization as an impersonal, disembodied entity, populated by faceless blobs. Admittedly, these are the extremes. But they exist. Examples of the first are to be found especially in those early "business and professional speaking" texts, where the only acknowledgment of an organization consisted of an uncritical acceptance of the overarching "business culture." Examples of the second type are to be found in some of the mathematically-based investigations of communication networks, whose "nodes" are mere points on a geometric plane.

More commonly, teaching and research dominated by Theme-I have been concerned with skills and attitudes believed to make the individual organizational member a more effective communicator on the job (especially when the communicator occupies a supervisory or managerial position). Thus, attention has been focused upon such topics as persuasion (in both speaking and writing); gaining credibility; participating in decision-making groups; giving orders or instructions; writing letters and reports; building "cooperation," "loyalty," and "teamwork" among subordinates; making sales presentations; conducting interviews; and, in general, creating "good human relations" in the work place. In contrast, teaching and research reflecting Theme-II thinking have been concerned with the organization qua organization (the term "organization" includes sub-organizational units such as departments and work groups). Hence, attention has been focused upon topics like these: reporting and feedback methods; communication aspects of reward systems; communication networks; readability of in-house publications; the differential uses and effects of upward-directed, downward-directed, and horizontal channels; the dimensions and effects of "communication climate," especially "managerial-communication climate"; relationships between information diffusion and employee morale; correlates of "communication satisfaction"; and the communication dimensions of various managerial "styles."

Obviously, any single publication may—and frequently does—include elements of both thematic orientations. However, regardless of overlaps and gray zones, concepts related to *Area A* (see Exhibit 1) have historically been derived from rhetorical theory; those related to *Area B*, from one or another version of human relations theory (itself an amalgam of clinical psychology, social psychology, sociology, antropology, etc.); and those related to *Area C*, from a mixed bag of management and organization theories. (We recognize the differences between theories of management and theories of organization. But the two share so many areas of communality—displayed, for example, in Barnard's classic *Functions of the Executive*—that we have chosen, for present purposes, to group them together.)

Exhibit 1. Schema: Major Themes Underlying the Study of Organizational Communication (With primary reference to the period 1900–1970)

Over-all frame of reference for teaching, theory, and research:
Pragmatic and Utilitarian (Effectiveness)

THEME I – *The Individual-Behavioral:* Understanding the sources of effective communication performance on the part of individual organizational members –

All members in general, or (more often) managers in particular

With central concern for:

AREA A – Structured discourse (oral or written), emphasizing a speaker or writer addressing an audience (taken as a unitary group)

Salient body of knowledge providing concepts and principles: Traditional rhetorical theory

(Familiar derivatives: Business English, Business Speech, Business and Professional Speaking, Salesmanship, Persuasion)
[In part: Industrial Journalism[a]]

AREA B – Informal, interpersonal interaction, in dyads and small-group situations (primarily oral)

Salient body of knowledge providing concepts and principles: "Human relations"

1. Proto-human relations, antedating "scientific" research.
2. "Scientific" human relations: primarily associated with Harvard Business School (Mayo, Roethlisberger); and Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan (Likert)

(Familiar derivatives: Group Dynamics, Small-group Communication, Sensititivity Training, T-groups, Encounter, Interpersonal Communication, Interviewing, Superior-Subordinate Communication, Conference Leadership)

THEME II – *The Systemic-Operational:* Understanding the sources of over-all organizational effectiveness, without reference to individuals per se, as such effectiveness seems to be related to communication phenomena; hence, involves such topics as media, modalities, channels, networks, policies, corporate planning, etc.

With central concern for:

AREA C – Internal communication; i.e., those communication events and policies having to do with operations occurring inside the (arbitrarily defined) boundaries of the organization.

Salient body of knowledge providing concepts and principles: Management-Organization Theory (supplemented by *Journalism,* both print and electronic)[a]

(Familiar derivatives: Administrative Communication, Corporate Communication, Communication Management, Managerial Communication, Industrial and Labor Relations, Employee Publications, Industrial Journalism.)

AREA D – External communication; i.e., those communication events and policies having to do with two-way interaction between the organization and its environment (especially, however, messages directed from the organization to "outsiders")[b]

Salient body of knowledge providing concepts and principles: Public Relations; Advertising[b]

(Familiar derivatives: Salesmanship, Employment Interviewing)

NOTES
[a] At the level of the individual reporter or editor, the principles of journalistic writing are essentially adaptations of rhetorical doctrine; but such matters as layout, headline writing, typography, etc., are specialized topics commonly taught in schools or departments of journalism.

[b] Until very recently—perhaps ten years ago—external communication received no more than cursory attention from specialists in organizational communication. Theoretically, external phenomena cannot be divorced from internal. Indeed, communication staff personnel (including industrial editors) are frequently housed in corporate departments of public relations. On the other hand, public relations and advertising are usually assigned to separate units. The fact remains that, before the early 1970s, Area D could not, realistically, be considered a significant subdivision of organizational communication. (However, courses in business English and business speech typically included exercises focused upon public relations situations.)

13

Area D—External Communication—requires special comment. As the broken line in Exhibit 1 is intended to suggest, topics relating to boundary-spanning communication—with two exceptions—have generally received little attention from specialists in organizational communication. The two exceptions are (a) salesmanship, and (b) employment interviewing. But even these topics, as everyone knows, have long been the object of study in fields other than communication (see, for example, Jablin & McComb, 1984, on research in employment interviewing). If we look at some of the earliest textbooks in business speech (Phillips, 1908; Hoffman, 1923; Sandford & Yeager, 1929), we find that sales presentations were among the most prominent topics. However, dating from the 1920s, industrial psychologists and other social scientists have produced a large body of empirical studies—as well as "practical" textbooks—dealing with both sales and interviewing techniques.

As the study of organizational communication became more "scientific" in the 1950s and 1960s, researchers became preoccupied with "internal" communication phenomena, relegating the study of "external" communication to the periphery of attention. Meanwhile, starting around the time of World War I, two new fields rapidly evolved into major specialties: public relations and advertising. These are the fields that have dealt explicitly with communication between organizations and their environments—that is, with external communication. Thus, specialists trained in public relations or advertising almost never identified themselves with organizational communication. Over the years, administrative arrangements (and campus politics) have contributed to the separation of organizational communication from journalism, public relations, and advertising.

Especially after the close of World War II, organizational communication became progressively dichotonized along two dimensions: (a) the academic vs. the nonacademic, and (b) the internal vs. the external. Thus, relatively autonomous bodies of literature came into being, with an especially wide gulf separating the academic from the nonacademic. For instance, *Communication World* (published by the International Association of Business Communicators) and the *Public Relations Journal* (published by the Public Relations Society of America) have little in common with such academic journals as *Communication Monographs, Human Communication Research*, or *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

The Special Case of Journalism. From the 1920s to the 1970s, the overwhelming majority of practitioners in the field of organizational communication have been journalists. Two facts account for this. In the first place, journalists (understandably) are generally the ones hired to edit in-house publications ("house organs"). Until the widespread adoption of closed-channel television—a fairly recent development—virtually all formal, structured management–employee communication depended upon print media. As early as 1921, one survey reported a total of 334 employee magazines being published (National Industrial Conference Board, 1925, p. 3). In the second place, journalists also formed the backbone of the new profession called "public relations," which emerged primarily during the period 1915–1925. Thus, journalists became entrenched in work related to both internal and external communication. Moreover, with the rapid expansion of journalism schools and departments (the first professional school of journalism was established at the University of Missouri in 1908), journalism graduates have typically been products of a specialized education bearing little resemblance to course work in organizational communication. It is true, of course, that most of the basic principles of journalistic writing can be regarded as derivatives of traditional rhetorical doctrine. But, in all other respects, journalism education—until relatively recent times—represented no substantial overlap with curricula in other communication-related fields. It is also undeniable that, by its very nature, journal-

ism has always encouraged a one-way, downward-oriented approach to corporate communication practices; and this fact, we believe, has had a profound impact upon the way in which most managers view employee communication.

It is still true, in the late 1980s, that the most appropriate "entry jobs" for organizational communication graduates are likely to be in the area of employee publications, an area where journalists occupy a majority of the positions (according to annual surveys conducted by the International Association of Business Communicators). In the light of all these circumstances, one can readily understand some of the reasons why organizational communication has yet to solve its identity problem.

The Identity Problem: 1940s–1960s

From its beginnings, organizational communication has been an assemblage of data and concepts derived in large part (some critics would say entirely) from a variety of other academic fields. To be sure, the accidents and the politics of academic administration are partially responsible for this state of affairs. But more profound forces have been at work. The important point to be made here is that, until a recognizable cluster of concepts is identified—regardless of its location on an academic map—theoretical progress will be stunted.

Thus, it must never be forgotten that it was only as recently as the 1940s that "industrial" or "business" communication began to be seen as a potentially autonomous subject of inquiry, worthy of study in its own right. Even so, the area was viewed from a number of different perspectives, as investigators with different academic (and nonacademic) orientations carved up the subject matter in a variety of ways. In the 1940s, for example, industrial psychologists were evaluating the "readability" of corporate publications (Paterson & Jenkins, 1948; Colby & Tiffin, 1950); specialists in the Industrial Relations Section at Princeton were analyzing media and channels of information diffusion (Baker, Ballantine, & True, 1949); and corporate managers were conducting surveys to assess the effectiveness of a wide range of communication practices (Heron, 1942; Peters, 1949). Moreover, prior to the 1940s, as we have earlier noted, there were the crucial conceptual contributions of (a) the corporate executive, Chester Barnard (1938/1968); (b) the social psychologists working at Iowa with Kurt Lewin (Lewin et al., 1939); and (c) the human relations group at the Harvard Business School, assembled by Elton Mayo (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939).

Despite the recognition of industrial communication as a researchable entity, the overwhelming majority of investigators actually doing the empirical research typically treated communication either as a subtopic in an established discipline or as one variable—among many others—in a larger conceptual domain, such as social psychology, industrial psychology, business administration, or organization theory. Through a curious combination of circumstances, however, it was in departments of speech—rather than in any of the social sciences or in a business school—that *formally designated, sustained programs* of study were organized, at the Ph.D. level, dealing *explicitly* with "industrial communication." Reasons for this turn of events have been discussed in an earlier paper (Redding, 1985) and will not be recounted here.

It happens that the first Ph.D. dissertation specifically addressed to a topic in industrial communication was completed, in 1952, in personnel administration, a department of the business school at Ohio State University. The author was Keith Davis, and the title was "Channels of Personnel Communication Within the Management Setting." Davis became widely known for inventing (in his doctoral research) the "ECCO" technique for analyzing

grapevine messages in an organization (see Davis, 1952, 1953). The Davis study remained a unique event. No sustained doctoral program in the business school materialized. However, in another department at Ohio State – the department of speech – a Ph.D. program in industrial communication, directed by Franklin H. Knower, was getting under way at about the same time that Davis was working on his research in the business school.

What happened is this: Shortly after World War II, on a handful of campuses, a few speech professors saw the possibility of undertaking doctoral-level research as an extension of undergraduate work in (a) "basic communication skills," a product of military and industrial training programs established during the war; and (b) "business speech." The result was the completion, in 1953 and 1954, of a small number of Ph.D. dissertations in "industrial communication" at four universities: Northwestern, Ohio State, Purdue, and Southern California. By the end of the fifties, a modest total of around 15 to 18 dissertations had been produced by speech departments. But it was not until after 1960 that any universities other than the original four began to account for significant additions to the list.

Meanwhile, from 1948 until the end of the 1950s, social scientists representing a variety of academic affiliations were publishing empirical studies dealing in one way or another with "industrial communication." Especially productive programs included those affiliated with the Harvard Business School, the Institute for Social Research (University of Michigan), the Industrial Relations Center at the University of Minnesota, and the Leadership Studies program at Ohio State. To the best of our knowledge, the sole example of a *formally organized* research entity *explicitly* designated as an "Industrial Communication Research Center" was the one established within the speech department at Purdue (in 1952) by Paul Emerson Lull. However, important annual conferences were sponsored by speech departments at Penn State (starting in 1950), Kent State (1952), and Ohio State (1952); the directors were, respectively, Harold P. Zelko, James N. Holm, and Franklin H. Knower.

Although not an annual event, the Centennial Conference on Communications at Northwestern, held in 1951, brought together Fritz Roethlisberg of Harvard, the psychologist Carl R. Rogers, and Irving J. Lee (of the Northwestern School of Speech). This event made possible a significant linkage between two influential centers of theory and research in our field: one, under the direction of Lee, representing a speech/General Semantics orientation; the other, under the direction of Roethlisberger, a social science/human relations orientation. (For a more detailed account of the period discussed in this and the preceding paragraph, see Redding, 1985.)

It was probably not until 1958 or 1959 that the field – almost always referred to as "business" or "industrial" communication, it must be remembered – had crystallized to the point where at least those who were studying it could identify what they were studying. Redding (1985) has arbitrarily designated 1959 as the "Year of Crystallization." True, the Zelko and O'Brien text (mentioned earlier in the chapter) had appeared in 1957; but it was predominantly concerned with prescriptive advice for improving a manager's oral communication skills. In 1958 there appeared the revised edition of Redfield's *Communication in Management.* Although this book was also intended to help practicing managers meet their communication responsibilities, it contained many features of a comprehensive treatise, covering all aspects of the field as the field was then defined. And 1958 was also the year that saw the publication of the first anthology (albeit restricted in scope and tilted toward written communication skills), the *Business Communication Reader* (Janis, 1958).

Then, in 1959, two publications appeared upon the scene, symbolizing the fact that (at least in the eyes of a cadre of social scientists) industrial communication was finally being identified as a recognizable entity: (a) a monograph published by the Foundation for Re-

search on Human Behavior (loosely affiliated with the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan), *Communication in Organizations – Some New Research Findings;* and (b) the first literature review to appear in an academic journal, under the label "business communication" (Sexton & Staudt, 1959). A total of 178 entries appeared in the Sexton and Staudt review. Almost all of these – including the "scientific" studies – were utilitarian or prescriptive in basic orientation. By our estimate, no more than 60 (or about a third) of the 178 titles could have met accepted standards of scholarly work, whether conceptual/theoretical or empirical/scientific. The vast majority fell into the category of informal, anecdotal, or impressionistic essays, sometimes carrying such jazzy titles as "Management's Story – 32 Million Times" or "Words Are Dynamite." We also estimate, however, that Sexton and Staudt omitted as many as 25 or 30 items that would easily have satisfied scholarly criteria; for example, studies authored by social scientists at such places as the Harvard Business School, Ohio State University, and the University of Michigan, in addition to a dozen or more doctoral dissertations completed in speech departments.

If "crystallization" had been achieved by 1959, general acceptance (in academe) of a field to be designated "organizational communication" did not arrive until at least 1967 or 1968. By 1965, Guetzkow had published his less-than-comprehensive, but perceptive, review of the theoretical and empirical literature, under the title "Communications in Organizations." Significantly, this appeared in the *Handbook of Organizations* (March, 1965), rather than in a volume devoted to communication. Guetzkow took occasion to deplore what he called the "dearth of studies about [communication in] organizations, either from the field or laboratory" (1965, p. 535). However, such an assertion can be challenged. In his bibliography of 134 items, Guetzkow included no mention whatever of studies associated with the Harvard human relations program, the Ohio State leadership group, the Industrial Relations section at Minnesota, or the dissertations completed in speech departments; and he cited only two or three publications from the Institute of Social Relations (Michigan). But there can be no quarrel with Guetzkow's hypothesis that communication research had "lagged behind studies concerning other features of organizational life, such as authority, division of work, and status" because of the *contingent* nature of the findings" (1965, p. 569; emphasis added). He concluded his review by raising two provocative questions:

Do we find in communications [sic] in organizations an area of study in which there is special richness in contingent, interactive effects? Or is it merely that a clarifying perspective . . . remains hidden? (1965, p. 569).

Although the field has yet to find – and probably never will find – a magic "clarifying perspective," the first book-length bibliography, published two years after Guetzkow's review had appeared, contained 315 entries – all categorized as "organizational communication" (Voos, 1967). Moreover, in 1967 the Marshall Space Flight Center (a branch of NASA) convened its "Conference on Organizational Communication" at Huntsville, Alabama (see Richetto, 1967). Featured at this meeting was a paper by Tompkins (1967) presenting the first "state-of-the-art" review of empirical research in the history of the field. The word "empirical" is important. The Tompkins paper was restricted to those studies that met two criteria: (a) they had to be "conducted in real-world [vs. laboratory] organizations," and (b) they had to utilize "controlled observation or quantification" in data collection. Despite these constraints, Tompkins was able to locate approximately 100 titles (Tompkins, 1967).

A quick review of the major headings under which Tompkins categorized the research

literature will convey to modern readers a sense of what was meant by "organizational communication" in the late 1960s (see Tompkins, 1967, pp. 5-21):

Formal channels of communication
     Downward-directed communication (including hypothesized relationships between downward-directed communication and "morale")
     Relative effectiveness of different media
     Upward-directed communication (including feedback)
     Horizontal communication
Communication, supervision, and human relations (with an emphasis upon "interpersonal trust")
Measuring and data-gathering instruments
Informal channels of communication

Finally, there appeared in 1967 Lee Thayer's monograph, "Communication and Organization Theory," perhaps the first serious effort to formulate a theoretical frame of reference for the field (Thayer, 1967). The following year Thayer expanded his ideas into a book, *Communication and Communication Systems* (Thayer, 1968). (We also could mention, in passing, that in 1968 the Organizational Communication Division of the society now known as the International Communication Association was inaugurated.)

Considering all these events, we conclude that, by 1967 or 1968, "organizational communication" had finally achieved at least a moderate degree of success in two respects: (a) breaking out from its "business and industrial" shackles, and (b) gaining a reasonable measure of recognition as an entity worthy of serious academic study.

Development of Theory and Research, 1900-1970: Three Phases

Earlier in the chapter, we identified three "eras" to describe, in broad terms, the strictly chronological evolution of the academic field "organizational communication." To be placed alongside this triad of eras, we now offer another way of analyzing the evolution of our field. This time, the focus is more on the conceptual than on the chronological (although the latter does not disappear from view). Our concern is to characterize what we believe to be the dominant approaches — or orientations, if you will — that have governed the production of serious theory and research during the period roughly marked off by the years 1900 and 1970. Since these approaches seem to have appeared upon the scene in an identifiable chronological sequence, we have chosen the term *phase* as a label for each category.

The basis of partition is primarily methodological — but methodological taken in the broadest sense: *the means whereby evidentiary warrants are established* (or the bases upon which they are justified). By "evidentiary warrants," we refer to the kinds of data adduced, either explicitly or implicitly, to support findings, conclusions, principles, propositions, or recommendations. We emphasize that the term *phase* does not represent a rigid, time-bound compartment, with sharply defined beginning and ending. Although it is true that the three phases correspond to an approximate chronological ordering, more importantly they represent three frames of reference for doing scholarly work. Whatever chronological sequentiality can be attributed to our scheme applies only to the order in which each phase *got started*. None of the phases — including the first — has yet ended. Each, in varying degrees, is still with us in the 1980s. Exhibit 2 displays, in outline form, our view of these three phases.

Exhibit 2. The Three Phases of Organizational Communication: Approximately 1900-1970

Phase I. The Formulary-Prescriptive

Description: Predominant dependence upon "common sense" principles and or traditional lore passed down through the years and incorporated in school rhetorics or their equivalents. The term "formulary" denotes a marked tendency to promulgate formulas — sets of rules; "how-to-do-it" recommendations, etc. The term "prescriptive" is probably self-explanatory, indicating that publications in this phase have as their central objective the giving of direct advice: Do this, don't do that, and you will be successful.

Approximate period of major influence: Turn of the century through the 1940s, but a continuing theme thereafter. ["the overwhelming bulk of activities in the field (even to date) are of the prescriptive variety . . ." Sincoff et al., 1975, p. 4.]

Examples of key ideas: The general ends of discourse — clearness, impressiveness, belief, action, entertainment (Phillips, 1908); the fundamental qualities of effective oral presentation — sense of communication, sincerity, animation, good health (Sandford & Yeager, 1929); formula for "winning people to your way of thinking" — "think always in terms of the other person's point of view" (Carnegie, 1936, pp. 162, 165); basic principles of good business writing — organized, simple, short, concrete, familiar, palatable (Zelko & O'Brien, 1957).

Representative contributors: Phillips (1908), Hotchkiss and Drew (1916), Saunders and Creek (1920), Sandford and Yeager (1929), Borden (1935), Monroe (1935), Carnegie (1936), Huston and Sandberg (1943), Whyte (1952), Zelko and O'Brien (1957).

Commentary: This first phase is most prominently represented in that massive body of literature designated as "self-help," more particularly under such labels as "business English," "business and professional speaking," "winning friends and influencing people," and the like. In a critical review, one of the authors several years ago identified the following major themes in the "business speech" textbooks of the period, roughly delineated by the decades of the 1920s, 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s (Redding, 1977):

- focus upon one-way communication and influence
- concern for message-sender's "success" (usually in the business sense)
- emphasis upon platform (public) speaking — but with increasing attention to dyads (especially interviewing) and small-group conferences
- application of traditional public speaking (rhetorical) doctrine to dyadic and small-group settings ("Whether the audience numbers two or two hundred, it's still public speaking . . ." [*Supervisional Training — Communications*, workshop syllabus, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co., 1953])
- nearly complete omission of topics having to do with dissent, controversy, union activity or the like; stress on harmony, teamwork, cooperation
- assumption that managers — or those aspiring to become managers — rather than rank-and-file employees are the really important individuals
- virtually no recognition of such organizational realities as hierarchies of status and power, roles and role expectancies, functional division of labor, and the like; consequently (with a few exceptions), no recognition of concepts associated with General Systems thinking

Note: Business English. During the period roughly delineated by the years 1915-1935, the courses and textbooks in both "business speech" and "business writing" drew upon the same basic conceptual source: traditional rhetorical theory. Frequently, the course work in speaking and writing was taught by the same instructors, typically affiliated with departments of English or of business writing. Since the textbooks in business English, especially before World War II, were highly repetitious in thematic content, and since they remained almost exclusively prescriptive in their rationale, no attempt will be made here to include them among our documentary references — with the exception of the pioneering and highly influential books by Hotchkiss and Drew (1916) and Saunders and Creek (1920). For a concise account of the origins of curricula in business writing, see Weeks (1985).

Phase II. The Empirical-Prescriptive

Description: Predominant dependence upon anecdotal and case-study data, later supplemented by surveys (including polls and questionnaires); generally descriptive statistics, if any. Objectives remain primarily prescriptive, although a few rather neutral, descriptive studies crop up occasionally. (Readability studies occupy a kind of grey zone between Phases II and III, in that the data themselves are basically objective; however, the goals of the writers almost always are clearly prescriptive.)

Approximate period of major influence: Chiefly the decade of the 1950s, with a few studies having been completed in the late 1940s; a few more in the early 1960s; relatively infrequent today.

ories of organizational communication — Bormann (1983); Tompkins and Cheney (1985) — also belong in this category. We may note, in passing, that the earlier naturalistic case studies contained a strong prescriptive element, whereas the more recent ones make it a point to exclude any hint of evaluation.

As it is encountered in the work of Deetz and Kersten (1983) and Conrad and Ryan (1983), the critical orientation, like naturalism, appears to be a new development. But, again, one could establish a genealogy reaching back to Whyte's *Is Anybody Listening?* (1952). More recent exemplars are Scott and Hart's *Organizational America* (1979) and Redding's (1979) critique of ideological assumptions in communication research.

With this brief overview as a general introduction to the three orientations, we now propose (see Exhibit 3) the defining characteristics for each category.

1. The *goals* of the modernist empirical approach historically have been (and for some, still are) prediction and control. The linear model of inferential statistics is the traditional mode of prediction, if not control. The goal of control sounds a bit more ominous in 1985 than it did in the methods textbooks of the 1950s and 60s, perhaps in part because of intervening critiques of social scientific practice. In any case, the ambitious goal of prediction has not yet been achieved, and as time goes by it appears to be increasingly elusive. "Unexplained variance" has proved to be a stubborn foe. McCloskey (1985) has proposed what he calls the "Ten Commandments" of "modernism in economics and other sciences":

Exhibit 3. Three Orientations to Inquiry in Organizational Communication : 1970s and 1980s

	Modernist	Naturalistic	Critical
1. GOAL	Prediction and control	Understanding and anticipation	Consciousness-raising and emancipation
2. ONTOLOGY	Objective reality as given	Reality as socially constructed	Material interests as determinant
3. EPISTEMOLOGY	Logical positivism	Language and other forms of symbolic action	Dialectical Materialism
4. FORM OF KNOWLEDGE CLAIM	Nomothetic	Ideographic	Critique
5. PERSPECTIVE	Management	Pluralism	Workers
6. RATIONALITY	Privileged	Multiple	Dialectic of rationalities
7. CAUSALITY	Manipulative	Reciprocal	Coercive/Hegemonic
8. LEVELS/BOUNDARIES	Differentiated	Permeable	Dichotomous
9. ROOT METAPHOR	Machine	Organism	Conflict/struggle
10. ORGANIZATIONS	Purposive, goal-seeking	Cultures, language communities	Instruments of oppression
11. COMMUNICATION	Tool	Negotiated Order	Distortion

1. Prediction and control is the point of science.
2. Only the observable implications (or predictions) of a theory matter to its truth.
3. Observability entails objective, reproducible experiments; mere questionnaires interrogating human subjects are useless, because humans might lie.
4. If and only if an experimental implication of a theory proves false is the theory proved false.
5. Objectivity is to be treasured; subjective "observation" (introspection) is not scientific knowledge . . .
6. Kelvin's Dictum: "When you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind."
7. Introspection, metaphysical belief, aesthetics, and the like may well figure in the discovery of an hypothesis but cannot figure in its justification . . .
8. It is the business of methodology to demarcate scientific reasoning from nonscientific . . .
9. A scientific explanation of an event brings the event under a covering law.
10. Scientists . . . ought not to have anything to say as scientists about the oughts of value, whether of morality or art (McCloskey, 1985, pp. 7-8).

McCloskey, himself a distinguished econometrician, notes that the positivistic philosophy undergirding modernism has been abandoned by philosophers. He recommends Scott's (1967) rhetoric-as-epistemic as the postmodernist theory of knowledge for the field of economics.

The goals for the naturalistic tradition are a bit more modest: understanding and anticipation — or the "*anticipation* and *interpretation* of human communicative action" (Tompkins & Cheney, 1983, p. 142). These goals are closer to the aims of historical or anthropological inquiry than to those of quantitative empiricism. The much discussed "thick description" of Geertz's (1973) cultural approach is consistent with these goals.

The critical approach seeks a kind of consciousness-raising among, if not emancipation for, organizational members themselves. As with the empirical modernists, however, the critical theorists (and others of a similar stripe) still assume that there is a "truth" out there to be discovered. The critical theorists act as if their version of the truth will set workers free, while the positivists use another version of the truth to effect control. Both groups appear to be more interventionist in their objectives than do the naturalists.

2. *Ontologically,* the modernists tend to view the "substance" of organizations as objective reality, a reality that is given. Even when that reality is conceded to be subjective, it can be measured objectively by means of such psychometric techniques as questionnaires and rating scales. The naturalistic approach assumes that reality is largely a function of social construction, hence its emphasis on gaining an insider's subjective understanding (*Verstehen*) of the organization-as-lived-experience. The critical theorist would see organizational reality at least in part as the reflection of material interests and resources, the latter usually being distributed unequally among owners, managers, and workers.

3. The *epistemological* assumptions of the modernist approach have been more precisely and elaborately defined — in the rationale of logical positivism — than have those of the other positions, but the philosophical premises of positivism have also come under withering attack from all directions. After decades of unquestioned acceptance of positivism as *the* philosophy of science (social as well as physical), this may well be an overreaction. The naturalists would place language and other forms of symbolic action at their epis-

Exhibit 2 (Continued)

Examples of key ideas: Communication skills (speaking, listening, writing) important for supervisory or managerial effectiveness in "leading men"; concepts borrowed from General Semantics (and other versions of semantics), emphasizing barriers to "understanding," factors producing "distortion," etc.; "good" communication widely regarded as essential precondition for employee morale; early "network" concepts, based upon descriptive studies of relatively small populations in field settings (prescriptive component, although present, not greatly stressed), demonstrating that formal organization charts fall far short of depicting all the important communication channels and activities occurring in an organization.

Representative early contributors: Especially important here, Ph.D. dissertations, e.g.: Davis, 1952 (Ohio State); Angrist, 1953 (Ohio State); Nilsen, 1953 (Northwestern); Lewis, 1954 (Southern California); Ross, 1954 (Purdue); Freshley, 1955 (Ohio State); Piersol, 1955 (Purdue); Level, 1959 (Purdue); Sanborn, 1961 (Purdue). Also, the Harvard group of case studies, e.g.: Ronken and Lawrence, 1952; Lombard, 1955. Influential surveys, e.g.: Paterson and Jenkins (1948); Baker, Ballantine, and True (1949); Peters (1949); Jacobson and Seashore (1951).

Commentary: As the years went by, methodological sophistication increased. These studies provided, in most instances, unusually detailed "in-depth" information, much of which is still highly useful. A few even positioned the case study as a quasi-test of commonly accepted principles or hypotheses – especially those associated with the then popular "human relations" paradigm (derived especially from the Harvard-supervised studies in the Hawthorne plant of Western Electric). Although the emphasis in doctoral dissertations understandably downplayed prescriptive advice to practicing managers, there was always a strong current of prescription – at least in the conclusions. Two pioneer network studies, conducted in the field rather than in the laboratory, were those of Keith Davis (1952) – in which he developed the ECCO technique – and Jacobson and Seashore (1951). Although these were primarily descriptive, it is easy to detect evaluative and prescriptive implications in the published reports.

A considerable number of the studies classifiable under the next heading (Phase III, The Applied-Scientific), although featuring sophisticated experimental designs and statistical analyses, could also be listed here, since the prescriptive component was indisputable. As examples we may note some of the studies at Michigan supportive of Likert's "System 4" style of management: Morse and Reimer (1956); Indik, Georgopoulos, and Seashore (1961), and Bowers and Seashore (1966).

Phase III. The Applied-Scientific

Description: Predominant dependence upon "objective," "scientific" data, typically obtained in (a) experimental, or quasi-experimental, studies; (b) correlational and comparative-analytic studies; (c) psychometric, sociometric, and content-analytic studies (e.g., construction and validation of questionnaire instruments, network analyses using advanced mathematical methods, stylistic and readability analyses); and (d) "explanatory" (vs. descriptive) surveys.

Approximate period of major influence: Except for a few precursors in the 1930s (such as the famous Hawthorne studies), chiefly in the period 1948 through the early 1970s; still a dominant theme in the 1980s.

Representative – early, pioneering – studies: Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939); Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939); Coch and French (1948); Katz, Maccoby, and Morse (1950); Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, and Floor (1951); Bavelas and Barrett (1951); Pelz (1952); Dahle (1954); Freshley (1955); Funk (1956); Morse and Reimer (1956); Lawrence (1958).

Commentary: This phase represents basically the widespread use of "traditional" scientific methods, those commonly associated with measurement theory, logical positivism, variable-analysis, and hypothetico-deductive designs. The Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, established in 1946 and directed for many years by Rensis Likert, was responsible for a preponderance of the pioneering work, especially during the period 1948–1956. In the early 1950s, speech (later Speech Communication) departments at Ohio State and Purdue began producing conventional-scientific investigations, almost always reported as Ph.D. dissertations. [Note: Likert (1955) has observed that the basic research design, utilized in many of the earlier studies of supervisory leadership and communication at Michigan, was simply "to measure and examine the kinds of leadership . . . being used by the best units in the organization in contrast to those being used by the poorest." This nonexperimental strategy was essentially the kind of communication research program proposed years before by the literary scholar I. A. Richards (1936, p. 3): we should be investigating, said he, "how much and in how many ways may good communication differ from bad?"]

Admittedly, the line between the "empirical-prescriptive" and the "applied-scientific" phases is a fuzzy one. Nevertheless, we believe that the difference is real and that it is crucial. In the former phase, investigators were

Exhibit 2 (Continued)

concerned primarily with solving organizational (especially managerial) problems, and with demonstrating that certain preferred solutions were supported by "scientific" findings. But in the third phase, although prescription was still a component of most of the research being done, the investigators clearly presented themselves (whether accurately or not) as neutral, "objective" scientists. The decade of the 1960s probably exemplifies the applied-scientific rationale in its heyday. Note, for instance, the numerous studies of superior–subordinate relations and "organizational-communication climates" (cast, to be sure, in an ideological frame of reference derived, in modified form, from earlier "human relations" doctrine): Indik, Georgopoulos, and Seashore (1961); Fleishman and Harris (1962); Read (1962); Tompkins (1962); Maier, Hoffman, and Read (1963); Pyron (1964); Bowers and Seashore (1966); Cook (1968); Lawler, Porter, and Tennenbaum (1968); Schwartz (1968); Sutton and Porter (1968); Allen and Cohen (1969); Minter (1969); Richetto (1969); Sincoff (1969).

We have identified, then, three phases in the evolution of the field – (a) the formulary-prescriptive; (b) the empirical-prescriptive; and (c) the applied-scientific – for the approximate period 1900–1970. We emphasize that the second and third phases never fully supplanted the first. Each phase is with us yet. We maintain our selection of 1970 as an arbitrary marker between the "older" and "newer" periods in the academic field of organizational communication. As will shortly become clear, however, the theory-and-research orientations of the 1970s and 1980s do not represent a complete break with the past.

ORIENTATIONS TO INQUIRY IN THE 1970s AND 1980s

Exhibit 3 is our attempt to display the important characteristics of three basic orientations to theory and research that became visible in the study of organizational communication during the 1970s and 80s. The three column headings – Modernist, Naturalistic, and Critical – were created in the interest of expanding somewhat Putnam's (1983) dichotomy of functionalist–interpretive approaches. Only in retrospect did we see the similarities between Habermas' (1971) three methods of inquiry – empirical-analytic, historical-hermeneutic, and critically-oriented – and Putnam and Cheney's (1983) use of Habermas' categories in a critical review of organizational communication. In defense of our categories, we believe they have the virtue (perhaps also the defect) of having emerged from *within* the study of organizational communication rather than from an externally-defined philosophical system. They should therefore be judged by how well they describe the former rather than the latter. The characteristics defined across the three approaches are of our own creation and are designed parsimoniously as a propaedeutic for enhancing critical reflection on theory and research.

The modernist or empirical orientation, as we have shown earlier in the chapter, is, of course, a very old one in organizational communication. We illustrate this tradition by subdividing it into several categories. One is the psychological, exemplified by the research on the superior–subordinate dyad summarized by Jablin (1979). Another is the sociological, exemplified by the network analytic research of Richards (e.g., 1985). Other examples, if not orientations, will be introduced below as we discuss the defining characteristics.

The naturalistic orientation has recently manifested itself in a "new" way by the cultural approach of Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1982, 1983), although it is similar in some ways to the case studies directed at Purdue by Redding in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Tompkins' studies of NASA (1977, 1978) followed this case-study tradition (see also Yin, 1981), and can be fairly called theoretically-oriented naturalism. The "rhetorical" the-

temological base, assuming that symbolism is more or less identical with "culture." Verbal reports, interviews, even "conversations" (see Kaufman, 1960) have been the essential research methods of naturalistic scholars, combined often with the researcher's role as participant-observer, a role that can only be played after one has acquired the "native" language of the organizational actors. The epistemological position of critical theorists is more difficult to label. Some scholars have been influenced by phenomenological thinking: an example is Weick's (1979) reliance on Schutz. Other scholars of this orientation follow some versions of Marxism (whether of the "early" or "late" Marx), sometimes indicated by the prefix *Neo-*.

A difficulty here is that Marx did not, either early or late, write a theory of knowledge or epistemology; at least, none is available to us. We can infer, however, that dialectical materialism does have profound epistemological implications. The material Marxist world, including organizations, is taken as *real*, without reservations. Dialectic adds to this the interconnectedness of things – often in the form of oppositions – which is not unlike some of the assumptions of "systems" theory. Dialectical materialism would also imply that organizations must be investigated historically, in order to understand (a) the current state of affairs and (b) the trends or directions of change produced by the inherent dialectics or contradictions within the current state of affairs. An exemplar is Edwards's *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in America* (1979). The title suggests historical changes in American organizations produced by the "contest" for control by the opposing forces of workers and owners (later joined by managers). As Tompkins and Cheney (1985) have pointed out, Edwards has couched his analysis of control in *essentially communicative terms*. To recapitulate, many critical theorists seem to operate (ironically) from a tacit epistemology of dialectical materialism which, aside from its emphasis on historical methods, is remarkably similar to the one espoused by positivists (in their insistence upon a "received" world).

4. The *forms of knowledge claims*, or research outcomes – admittedly clumsy phrases – attempt to describe the *idealized* types of knowledge claims each group of scholars aspires to produce. The modernists' aim is nomothetic or nomological, the production of law-like regularities. The goal of the naturalists appears to be ideographic, or Gestalt-like, knowledge of wholes, or a hermeneutic understanding of part-to-whole and vice versa. For example, the superior–subordinate research cited above sought to develop generalizations or laws concerning such dyadic interaction, while Kaufman's study (1960) – cited for its use of "conversation" as a research method – sought to describe the U.S. Forest Service as an entity, a system of communication (i.e., identification) responding to the centrifugal forces of fragmentation. A representative of the critical orientation would produce a research report or critique designed to convince its readers that either the basic theories (Zey-Farrell & Aiken, 1981) or the practices of organizations (Edwards, 1979) are oppressive; hence, people ought to be convinced of a need for change – or even for emancipation. We shall argue below that all three of these forms of knowledge claims, or research outcomes, are necessary to a mature social science of organizational communication.

5. In order to do organizational research, one must have a place to stand, a *perspective* from which to "see" organizational communication in action. The modernists have in general taken the managerial perspective, asking questions about communication "effectiveness" clearly derived from managerial concerns. Redding (1985) has shown how this biasing perspective has been present from the very beginning of the field of organizational communication. The naturalists have leaned toward a pluralistic perspective, wanting to hear from all organizational actors, regardless of hierarchical position. For example, in

their separate yet coordinated studies of NASA, Tompkins (1977, 1978) concentrated on top and middle management of the Marshall Space Flight Center, while Richetto (1969) studied the rest of the hierarchy reaching down to the level of laboratory workers. Critical theorists for the most part adopt the perspective of the worker. What is crucial here is not the taking of *a* perspective – intelligible research is impossible without one – but that perspectives (biases) *not be concealed*. In organizational communication, as with almost all social science, the modernism of the 1950s and '60s assumed that its perspective was neutral, objective – in short, scientific. But in fact its biases were obscured. Indeed, "consulting" with top managers about how to improve productivity among workers was probably seen by some as a logical extension of scientific inquiry.

6. Closely related to this hidden managerial bias are the assumptions of organizational *rationality*. To the extent that modernists have been in the grip of a managerial bias – and we believe this to have been widespread in the past and still prevalent today – they have tended to view organizations as purposive, goal-seeking – in short, rational – instruments. Managers, better than any other organizational actors, were assumed to possess this rationality just as naturally as they should possess the key to the executive washroom. Naturalists have been more willing to see rationality as a plural term. Managers, board members, clients, and even workers are seen as capable of rationality. These several rationalities are regarded as equally valid, differing only in regard to the premises undergirding the conclusions. The critical theorists, as might be expected, have tended to favor the workers' rationality, or in some cases they see history as a dialectic of opposing rationalities.

7. In considering the criterion of *causality*, we see some strong similarities between the polar positions in relation to the middle position. Modernists have assumed causality in the language of "dependent and independent variables" (despite the more reserved stance of technical terms like *correlation* and *function*), and much effort has been devoted to showing – unsuccessfully, alas – that high morale is correlated with (read: *causes*) high productivity. This determinism was perhaps an unavoidable assumption in the commitment to positivistic social science. The naturalists, on the other hand, tend to assume organizational actors to be capable of voluntarism, able to exercise the ancient concept of "free will" if you will, stressing human action (a result of choice or decision) over human motion (a result of causal forces or vectors). This is consistent with naturalism's closer proximity to the humanities and to the attendant assumptions about persons as human beings responsible for their choices by virtue of reason, bounded by emotion and values. This rationale can be illustrated by an entire issue of *Administrative Science Quarterly* (December, 1979) given over to qualitative research in organizations, including Manning's (1979) use of Kenneth Burke's "master tropes," a kit of humanistic tools, in his study of a police department. Like the modernists, the critical theorists also assume a determinism in the interconnected world of organizational life; indeed, they would see life in capitalist organizations as largely coerced (see Afanasyev, 1971).

8. The naturalist and critical theorists have in recent years raised a new criterion for evaluating organizational theory by questioning the validity of *levels and boundaries* of the organizational domain (see Zey-Ferrell & Aiken, 1981). That is, where the positivists have seen clear levels of differentiation in the hierarchy (Barnard thought nearly all organizations had eight or ten hierarchical levels) and clear boundaries marking domains internal and external to the organization, the naturalists have posited a set of more permeable membranes – or, to shift metaphors, organizations whose order, levels, and boundaries are negotiated in communication. The critical theorists would call these distinctions meaningless if not misleading, and would reduce society and organization to the dichotomy of

owner (manager) vs. worker, or to processes of hegemony and legitimation in which organizations participate.

9. If one accepts our claim that some perspective is necessary in order to do theory and research in organizational communication, one has already accepted the corollary that all theorizing about organizations is *metaphoric*. In any case, we find metaphors for organization lurking in the terms of all the schools and approaches. For the positivists, we see the machine, a metaphor consistent with the view of communication (to be developed below) as a tool. The machine is designed for a purpose, a rational purpose, and can be predicted with law-like regularity to perform as ordered. By contrast, the naturalists – favoring an organic metaphor – see truth as ideographic, perceiving the organization as an entity permeable in relation to its environment. The critical theorists would view the capitalist organization metaphorically as a field of warfare: *"contested terrain,"* the locus of class conflict.

10. As can easily be inferred from what has been developed above, the concept of the *organization qua organization* varies across orientations. The modernist view is of the organization as purposive, goal-seeking. Naturalists are more comfortable examining an organization as a culture, each one as exotic as if found on a remote Pacific atoll, or as a unique language community: this orientation would place more stress on the consummatory or social aspects than would modernism, less stress on its instrumentality. Critical theorists would again be, in their view of organization, closer (albeit ironically) to the modernist than to the naturalist position, granting the instrumentality of organization. Indeed, organization could well be labelled an "instrument" of oppression.

11. Although our analysis up to this point has assumed that communication (whether implicit or explicit) is the figure against the ground of organizational theory and research, we consider now the different conceptions of the communication process associated with the different orientations. Modernists have seen communication as a tool of considerable force, primarily when handled by management. Communication conceived as a tool promulgates rational organizational goals, gives orders or directions to achieve those goals, and disciplines workers on the basis of their compliance with them. Upward communication, only lately discovered, was viewed as a tool useful to management, for example, in such manifestations as suggestion systems. It may be that modernists, owing to their worldview, have accorded too much causal force to communication as a management tool. Such was the point of Whyte's question, posed in 1952 after adding up the millions of dollars spent on management-to-employee-publications (*Is Anybody Listening?*, 1952). This positivist view implies a linear and mechanical model of communication in which it is assumed that pressing the right buttons will set workers in the proper motions.

Naturalists see communication as constitutive of organization, and they see order as negotiated through communication. Barnard had advanced a "constitutive" view of organizational communication as early as 1938:

> An organization comes into being when (1) there are persons able to communicate with each other (2) who are willing to contribute action (3) to accomplish a common purpose. The elements of an organization are therefore (1) communication; (2) willingness to serve; and (3) common purpose. These elements are necessary and sufficient conditions initially, and they are found in all such organizations (Barnard, 1968, p. 82).

Barnard not only made communication the first among three prerequisites for organizations, but his analysis of the second element – willingness to serve – made clear that no organization could be activated without communication, more specifically persuasion, in some cases "propaganda" (Barnard, 1968, pp. 150–151, 152, 156). Barnard's third element,

common purpose, must also be communicated, whether in verbal or nonverbal messages. One could argue, then, that Barnard was an early proponent of the position that communication constitutes organization; or, put another way, that communication is the necessary condition of organization and facilitates its two sufficient conditions. The naturalistic researches of the Tompkins (1977, 1978) case studies of NASA, and the Tompkins and Anderson (1971) case study of Kent State University during its crisis, were ideographic in nature, explicitly employing the "constitutive" view of organizational communication as first articulated by Barnard in his organic theory of organization in 1938.

The critical theorists tend to view communication as a method of "falsifying" the material realities of organization. That is, the owner/manager's interests are falsely joined with those of the worker in ideological communication which creates a "false consciousness." Notice the irony: in attributing the creation of false consciousness to communication, the critical theorists, like the positivists, have granted to communication a powerful, perhaps hyperbolic, causal status. This ability of organizational leaders to control employees' decisions by controlling the premises from which choices flow, has been featured in recent essays on organizational communication by Poole (1985), McPhee (1985), Tompkins and Cheney (1985) and Conrad and Ryan (1985) in McPhee and Tompkins (1985). In the "Introduction and Afterword" to the volume embracing those essays, Tompkins and McPhee (1985) call this process "microhegemony."

By explicating our matrix of approaches in terms of defining characteristics, we may have given the reader the impression that we entertain grave objections to the modernist approach, in favor of the other two. Some explanation of this unavoidable (and accurate) impression is called for. First, both of us were educated in the positivist tradition at a time of unquestioned acceptance – in academe – of its philosophic and methodological assumptions. But each of us, at different times and in different degrees, has come to question positivism's "received truth." Second, the long dominance of modernism has provided a convenient target for others to shoot at, and our essay in large part reflects the cumulative criticism mounted by others. We predict that criticism of the other approaches will rapidly accumulate, and that the result will be a healthier environment in which to do organizational communication – in a more reflective and philosophically self-conscious way than has been true in the past (see Tompkins, 1983).

We now wish to set aside our acknowledged bias and argue (from a more analytic perspective *outside* our matrix of categories) that *all forms of inquiry* are vital to continued progress in the study of organizational communication. Let us illustrate this by reference to one of our defining characteristics – knowledge claim or research outcome.

Although we have observed that the modernists have not yet produced the "laws" that were promised, even an incomplete attempt at nomothetic explanation is still useful. Indeed, the ideographic aim of explication of wholes cannot proceed without certain nomothetic assumptions. That is, before approaching the study of any organization in terms of communication, one must first assume that *all organizations engage systematically in communication*. Similarly, generalizations produced by the nomothetic approach will only be meaningful, will only come alive, for organizational actors when richer data are available as the result of naturalistic research and "thick description." In like manner, without the idealized models of organizational communication inherent in the critical approach, conventional organizational research can provide us only with *what-is*, but seldom (if ever) with *what-might-be*.

This coda to our essay should not, however, be read as a plea for unfettered relativism. Mindless replication of research – by whatever orientation or method – will not bring

automatic progress; at best it will bring mere repetition. All orientations and methods must be grounded in rigorous conceptualizations and appropriate evidentiary warrants. We have noticed with alarm that some students appear to be attracted to "interpretive," "cultural," or "critical" approaches because they entertain the misguided notion that such approaches are somehow "easier" to implement than the modernist-empirical. A major aim of this chapter is to insist on the indispensability of rigor for *all* approaches — much in the spirit of Rychlak's (1977) plea for a "psychology of rigorous humanism." (We also concede the wisdom of Kline's [1980] warning: "There is no rigorous definition of rigor" [p. 315].) We suggest that a good way to promote research that meets the highest standards of rigor (however rigor may be defined) is to devote careful reflection to "defining characteristics," such as those shown in our matrix (Exhibit 3). This means identifying and analyzing the ontological and epistemological assumptions underlying one's theory and methodology.

And after each trip to the field, any researcher should evaluate his or her findings against a set of defining characteristics and criteria — either those proposed in our matrix or others derived from an analogous base. We will feel some small measure of satisfaction when all research reports in our field routinely identify the philosophic assumptions underlying their constructs and methods.

REFERENCES

Afanasyev, V. G. (1971). *The scientific management of society*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Allen, T. J., & Cohen, S. I. (1969). Information flow in research and development laboratories. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 14*, 12-19.

Angrist, A. W. (1953). A study of the communications of executives in business and industry. *Speech Monographs, 20*, 277-285.

Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and Organization*. New York: Harper.

Baker, H., Ballantine, J., & True, J. (1949). *Transmitting information through management and union channels*. Princeton, NJ: Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University.

Barfield, O. (1977). *The rediscovery of meaning and other essays*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Barnard, C. I. (1968). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Originally published 1938.)

Bavelas, A., & Barrett, D. (1951). An experimental approach to organizational communication. *Personnel, 27*, 366-377.

Bendix, R. (1956). *Work and authority in industry*. New York: Wiley.

Borden, R. C. (1935). *Public speaking — As listeners like it!* New York: Harper.

Bormann, E. G. (1983). Symbolic convergence: Organizational communication and culture. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 99-122). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 11*, 238-263.

Bryant, D. C. (1953). Rhetoric: Its functions and its scope. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 39*, 401-424.

Burke, K. (1960). *A rhetoric of motives*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Carnegie, D. (1936). *How to win friends and influence people*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Coch, L., & French, J. R. P., Jr. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations, 1*, 512-532.

Colby, A. N., & Tiffin, J. (1950). The reading ability of industrial supervisors. *Personnel, 27*, 156-159.

Conrad, C. (1985). *Strategic organizational communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Conrad, C., & Ryan, M. (1985). Power, praxis, and self in organizational communication theory. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 235-257). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Cook, D. M. (1968). The impact on managers of frequency of feedback. *Academy of Management Journal, 11*, 263-278.

Cusella, L. P. (1980). The effects of feedback on intrinsic motivation: A propositional extension of cognitive evaluation theory from an organizational communication perspective. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 4* (pp. 367-387). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.

Dahle, T. L. (1954). An objective and comparative study of five methods of transmitting information to business and industrial employees. *Speech Monographs, 21*, 21-28.

Davis, K. (1952). *Channels of personnel communication within the management group*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Davis, K. (1953). Studying communication patterns in organizations. *Personnel Psychology, 6*, 301-312.

Deetz, S. A., & Kersten, A. (1983). Critical models of interpretive research. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 147-171). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Edwards, R. (1979). *Contested terrain: The transformation of the workplace in the twentieth century*. New York: Basic Books.

Ehninger, D. (1972). Introduction. In D. Ehninger (Ed.), *Contemporary rhetoric* (pp. 1-14). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Fleishman, E. A., & Harris, E. F. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personnel Psychology, 15*, 43-56.

Fleishman, E. A., Harris, E. F., & Burtt, H. E. (1955). *Leadership and supervision in industry*. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University.

Foundation for Research on Human Behavior (1959). *Communication in organizations*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Freshley, D. L. (1955). *A study of the attitudes of industrial management personnel toward communication*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Funk, F. E. (1956). *Communication attitudes of industrial foremen as related to their rated productivity*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Funk, H. B., & Becker, R. G. (1952). Measuring the effectiveness of industrial communications. *Personnel, 29*, 237-240.

Garraty, J. A., & Gay, P. (Eds.) (1972). *The Columbia history of the world*. New York: Harper and Row.

Garrett, M. B. (1940). *European history: 1500-1815*. New York: American Book.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

George, C. S., Jr. (1972). *The history of management thought*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. (1953). *Goodyear supervisional training, 1952-53 sessions: Communications*. Akron, OH: Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.

Gray, G. W. (1946). The "Precepts of Kagemni and Ptah-hotep." *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 32*, 446-454.

Guetzkow, H. (1965). Communication in organizations. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations* (pp. 534-573). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hay, R. D. (1974). A brief history of internal organization communication through the 1940s. *Journal of Business Communication, 11*, 6-11.

Heron, A. R. (1942). *Sharing information with employees*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hoffman, W. G. (1923). *Public speaking for businessmen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hotchkiss, G. B., & Drew, C. A. (1916). *Business English, principles and practice*. New York: American Book.

Huber, R. M. (1971). *The American idea of success*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Human Relations in Modern Buiness — A guide for action by American business leaders. (1949). New

York: Prentice-Hall. (Also known as "The Robert Wood Johnson Report.")

Huston, A. D., & Sandberg, R. A. (1943). *Everyday business speech*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Indik, B. P., Georgopoulos, B., & Seashore, S. (1961). Superior-subordinate relationships and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 14*, 357-374.

Jablin, F. M. (1979). Superior-subordinate communication: The state of the art. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 1201-1222.

Jablin, F. M., & McComb, K. B. (1984). The employment screening interview: An organizational assimilation and communication perspective. In R. Bostrom & B. Westley (Eds.), *Communication yearbook 8* (pp. 137-163). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Jacobson, E., Seashore, S. E. (1951). Communication practices in complex organizations. *Journal of Social Issues, 7*, 28-40.

Janis, J. H. (1958). *Business communication reader*. New York: Harper.

Jay, A. (1967). *Management and Machiavelli: An inquiry into the politics of corporate life*. New York: Bantam Books.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., Gurin, G., & Floor, L. G. (1951). *Productivity, supervision and morale among railroad workers*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Katz, D., Maccoby, N., & Morse, N. (1950). *Productivity, supervision and morale in an office situation: Part I*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Kaufman, H. (1960). *The forest ranger: A study in administrative behavior*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.

Kline, M. (1980). *Mathematics — The loss of certainty*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lawler, E. E., III, Porter, L. W., & Tennenbaum, A. (1968). Managers' attitudes toward interaction episodes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 52*, 432.

Lawrence, P. R. (1958). *The changing of organizational behavior patterns: A case study of decentralization*. Boston, MA: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Leipzig, J. S., & More, E. (1982). Organizational communication: A review and analysis of three current approaches to the field. *Journal of Business Communication, 19*, 77-92.

Level, D. A., Jr. (1959). *A case study of human communications in an urban bank*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271-299.

Lewis, I. G. (1954). *A survey of management's attitudes regarding oral communication needs and practices in large industries of Los Angeles County*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Likert, R. (1955). *Developing patterns in management*. General Management Series, No. 178. New York: American Management Association. [Reprinted in E. A. Fleishman (Ed.). (1961). *Studies in personnel and industrial psychology* (pp. 338-355). Homewood, IL: Dorsey.]

Lombard, G. F. F. (1955). *Behavior in a selling group: A case study of interpersonal relations in a department store*. Boston, MA: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

McCloskey, D. N. (1985). *The rhetoric of economics*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

McPhee, R. D. (1985). Formal structures and organizational communication. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 149-177). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McPhee, R. D., & Tompkins, P. K. (Eds.) (1985). *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Maier, N. R. F., Hoffman, L. R., & Read, W. H. (1963). Superior-subordinate communication: The relative effectiveness of managers who held their subordinates' positions. *Personnel Psychology, 16*, 1-11.

Manning, P. K. (1979). Metaphors of the field: Varieties of organizational discourse. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*, 602-611.

March, J. G. (1965). Introduction. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations* (pp. ix-xvi). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Merrill, H. F. (1970). Introduction. In H. Merrill (Ed.), *Classics in management* (pp. 1-8). New York: American Management Association.

Miller, G. R., Burgoon, M., & Burgoon, J. (1984). The functions of human communication in changing attitudes and gaining compliance. In C. Arnold & J. Bowers (Eds.), *Handbook of rhetorical and communication theory* (pp. 400-474). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Minter, R. L. (1969). *A comparative analysis of managerial communication in two divisions of a large manufacturing company [4 vols.]*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Monroe, A. H. (1935). *Principles and types of speech*. Chicago, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Morse, N., & Reimer, E. (1956). The experimental change of a major organizational variable. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52*, 120-129.

National Industrial Conference Board. (1925). *Employee magazines in the United States*. New York: National Industrial Conference Board.

Nilsen, T. R. (1953). *The communication survey: A study of communication problems in three office and factory units*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

Owen, R. (1970). An address to the superintendents of manufactories. In H. Merrill (Ed.), *Classics in management* (pp. 11-15). New York: American Management Association. (First published, 1813; republished, 1825; reprinted, 1970.)

Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1982). Communication and organizational cultures. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46*, 115-130.

Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983). Organizational communication as cultural performance. *Communication Monographs, 50*, 126-147.

Paterson, D. G., & Jenkins, J. J. (1948). Communication between management and workers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 32*, 71-80.

Pelz, D. C. (1952). Influence: A key to effective leadership in the first-line supervisor. *Personnel, 29*, 209-217.

Peters, R. W. (1949 and 1950). *Communication within industry*. New York: Harper.

Phillips, A. E. (1908). *Effective speaking*. Chicago, IL: Newton.

Piersol, D. T. (1955). *A case study of oral communication practices of foremen and assistant foremen in a mid-western corporation*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Poole, M. S. (1985). Communication and organizational climates: Review, critique, and new perspectives. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 79-108). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Putnam, L. L. (1983). The interpretive perspective: An alternative to functionalism. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 31-54). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Putnam, L. L., & Cheney, G. E. (1983). A critical review of research traditions in organizational communication. In M. S. Mander (Ed.), *Communications in transition* (pp. 206-224). New York: Prager.

Pyron, H. C. (1964). *The construction and validation of a forced-choice scale for measuring oral communication attitudes of industrial foremen*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Read, W. H. (1962). Upward communication in industrial hierarchies. *Human Relations, 15*, 3-15.

Redding, W. C. (1977). *Business and Professional Speaking: Corpse, ghost, or angel?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC (December).

Redding, W. C. (1979). Organizational communication theory and ideology: An overview: In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 3* (pp. 309-341). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Redding, W. C. (1985). Stumbling toward identity: The emergence of organizational communication as a field of study. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 15-54). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Redfield, C. E. (1958). Communication in Management (rev. ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Richards, I. A. (136). *The philosophy of rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Richards, W. D., Jr. (1985). Data, models, and assumptions in network analysis. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 109-128). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Richetto, G. M. (Ed.) (1967). *Conference on organizational communication: August 8-11, 1967*. Huntsville, AL: George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Richetto, G. M. (1969). *Source credibility and personal influence in three contexts: A study of dyadic communication in a complex aero-space organization*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the worker*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ronken, H., & Lawrence, P. R. (1952). *Administrative change: A case study of human relations in a factory*. Boston, MA: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Ross, R. S. (1954). *A case study of communication breakdowns in the General Telephone Company of Indiana, Inc.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Rychlak, J. F. (1977). *The psychology of rigorous humanism*. New York: Wiley.

Sanborn, G. A. (1961). *An analytical study of oral communication practices in a nationwide retail sales organization*. Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Sandford, W. P., & Yeager, W. H. (1929). *Business and professional speaking*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Saunders, A. G., & Creek, H. L. (1920). *The literature of business*. New York: Harper.

Schwartz, D. F. (1968). *Liaison communication roles in a formal organization*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Scott, R. L. (1967). On viewing rhetoric as epistemic. *Central States Speech Journal, 18*, 9-17.

Scott, W. G., & Hart, D. K. (1979). *Organizational America*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Sexton, R., & Staudt, V. (1959). Business communication: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Social Psychology, 50*, 101-118.

Sincoff, M. Z. (1969). *An experimental study of the effects of three "interviewing styles" upon judgments of interviewees and observer-judges*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Sincoff, M. Z., Pacilio, J., Jr., Blatt, S. J., Hunt, G. T., & Anton, P. (1975). Organizational communication: Perspectives and prospects. *Ohio Speech Journal, 13*, 3-18.

Smeltzer, L. R., Glab, J., & Golen, S. (1983). Managerial communication: The merging of business communication, organizational communication, and management. *Journal of Business Communication, 20*, 71-78.

Sutton, H., & Porter, L. W. (1968). A study of the grapevine in a governmental organization. *Personnel Psychology, 21*, 223-230.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review, 36* (March-April, No. 2), 95-101.

Thayer, L. (1967). Communication and organization theory. In F. Dance (Ed.), *Human communication theory* (pp. 70-115). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Thayer, L. (1968). *Communication and communication systems*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Tompkins, P. K. (1962). *An analysis of communication between headquarters and selected units of a national labor union*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Tompkins, P. K. (1967). Organizational communication: A state-of-the-art review. In G. M. Richetto (Ed.), *Conference on organizational communication: August 8-11, 1967* (pp. 4-26). Hunts-

ville, AL: Marshall Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Tompkins, P. K. (1977). Management *qua* communication in rocket research and development. *Communication Monographs, 44*, 1-26.

Tompkins, P. K. (1978). Organizational metamorphosis in space research and development. *Communication Monographs, 45*, 110-118.

Tompkins, P. K. (1983, November). *On the desirability of an interpretive science of organizational communication*. Paper presented at annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Tompkins, P. K., & Anderson, E. (1971). *Communication crisis at Kent State: A case study*. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. E. (1983). Account analysis of organizations: Decision making and identification. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 123-146). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. E. (1985). Communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 179-210). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Tompkins, P. K., & McPhee, R. D. (1985). Introduction and afterword. In R. D. McPhee & P. K. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 7-13). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Voos, H. (1967). *Organizational communication: A bibliography*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Weaver, C. H. (1958). The quantification of the frame of reference in labor-management communication. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 42*, 1-9.

Weeks, F. W. (1985). The teaching of business writing at the collegiate level, 1900-1920. In G. Douglas & H. Hildebrandt (Eds.), *Studies in the history of business writing* (pp. 201-215). Urbana, IL: Association for Business Communication.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Whyte, W. H., Jr. [and the Editors of *Fortune*]. (1952). *Is anybody listening?* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Yin, R. K. (1981). The case study crisis: Some answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26*, 58-65.

Zelko, H. P., & O'Brien, H. J. (1957). *Management-employee communication in action*. Cleveland, OH: Howard Allen.

Zey-Ferrell, M., & Aiken, M. (Eds.). (1981). *Complex organizations: Critical perspectives*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

SECTION 1

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND CONCEPTUAL ADVANCES IN ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION

The first section of this volume describes the diversity of theoretical perspectives and recent conceptual advances in the field of organizational communication. This variance of opinion has resulted for many reasons. Communication scholars have come from many disciplines – speech, journalism, philosophy, education, information science, and the social sciences, including sociology, anthropology, management, political science, and psychology. As these scholars entered the new discipline of communication, they brought with them the particular paradigms and theoretical perspectives of their original fields. Another reason is the perceived inability of systems theory to capture certain aspects of the communication process deemed important by those who study organizational communication.

Scholars almost universally agree that organizations are social systems (Thayer, 1968; Rogers & Agarwala-Rogers, 1976; Farace, Monge, & Russell, 1977; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Goldhaber, Dennis, Richetto, & Wiio, 1984). A system is a set of interdependent components or parts. These components may be individuals, groups, or machines. Together, the sum of these parts produces a set of emergent properties which could not result if the components behaved independently. One emergent property of the components' interaction, and which is the focus of this book, is the organization itself. Organizations are goal-seeking systems. The components' interdependent (coordinated) behaviors make it possible for the organization to achieve goals such as the continued manufacturing of products or the performance of services. These products or services are also some of the emergent properties of organizations.

Another focus of this volume is the role communication plays in social systems. Indeed, it is communication which makes possible the interdependency and, thus, the achievement of system goals. Communication facilitates the coordination of the components' activities through mutual adjustment of the behavior of the individual parts. Further, in more complex social organizations (those with managerial heirarchies), communication is the control mechanism which regulates individual activities. By providing direct supervision, feedback to ongoing behavior, and socialization of new members, management can direct the system toward its goals (Hage, 1974; Mintzberg, 1983).

Despite the obvious relevance of systems theory to organizations, its abstract nature has made its application to communication processes difficult. General systems theory emerged as an attempt to unify the ever-increasing specialization which characterized the natural and social sciences (von Bertalanffy, 1956). Its goal was to identify those common elements which could be generalized across all scientific specialities. Communication

among the disciplines was to be facilitated through the shared understanding of these common principles. This would result in further scientific advancements. The problem was that the underlying principles became very abstract, in order to accommodate the unique principles of each speciality.

General systems theory brought together two types of scientific explanation, teleology and positivism. Without attempting to provide an in-depth discussion of these types of explanations, let it suffice to describe teleology as primarily descriptive — things are the way they are because that is as they should be. In an organizational context, management consciously designs organizations. Over time, a system evolves to look like it does because that is how management wants it to be (Schein, 1983). Thus, it is important to describe the organization as it is and how it is understood by its members. By doing so, insights may be gained about how and why the organization operates as it does and the role communication plays in these activities.

Organizations are conscious goal-directed systems. This compels some organizational scholars to view communication as a human activity guided by individual intentions. (For example, see Cushman, King, & Smith, Chapter 4).

Others view organizations mechanistically or organically with communication acting as the causal force which makes the interdependency possible (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Hage, 1974; Woelfel & Fink, 1980; Rogers & Kincaid, 1981). This second type of explanation, positivism, stresses the causal relations among components. By examining the influences of the components (including the environment) upon one another, and the time-ordered changes within the organization, insights may be gained about how to manipulate certain variables to help the organization more effectively and efficiently achieve its goals. Positivism has been the more frequent epistemic approach.

Communication scholars, however, have tended to examine organizational activities from either orientation rather than both. This has resulted in theories that reflect only one of the orientations.

Thus, what is seen in this volume is an abandonment of systems theory in favor of less general fields of knowledge. While the task is less ambitious, it may prove more fruitful in understanding social organizations and the role of communication in the activities of these human products. This is not to suggest that systems theory is dead, although certain chapters in this section may leave that impression. For example, network analysis (see Wigand, Chapter 14) is an outgrowth of the systems theory. This approach describes the structural aspects of organizational communication. What appears to be happening is the emergence of theories of the "middle range" (Merton, 1957) rather than "grand theories" that might be suggested by the systems paradigm. These theories are somewhat narrower and less abstract being based on empirical research. As a result, they are more managable. This may facilitate an understanding of communication's role in organizational activities, and may guide research and the management of social organizations. Indeed, in the future, the systems perspective may reemerge as a grand theory combining a number of the perspectives in this volume.

The first chapter in this section is a discussion among Leonard Hawes, Michael Pacanowsky, and Don Faules. It presents three different approaches to the study of organizations — "pluralism," "criticism," and "interpretivism." Pluralism is taken to be all methods from statistical modeling of management science (structural-functionalism) to ethnographies of cultural anthropologists. Interpretivism is a gloss for organizational research, ranging from ethnology and ethnography, through ethnomethodology, hermeneutics, and phenomenology, to literature — fiction, in particular. Criticism is used in two ways: (a) the production of coherent readings of texts, and (b) the negative dialectic that underlies conventional meaning. This thought-provoking discussion is timely, and suggests that there is value in the investigation of communication activities from a variety of perspectives.

Donald Cushman, Sarah King, and Ted Smith explore the utility of studying organizational communication from the rules perspective. They discuss in detail the philosophical and theoretical development of the rules perspective, providing cogent arguments in support of a theoretical approach which accommodates human intentions. They review the research of communication scholars who have employed a rules perspective, and, finally, they present a case study of an organization using one approach to rules research.

The next three chapters in this section focus on the role of symbolic language and its place in organizational communication. Particular emphasis is placed on the relationship between language and organizational culture. In "Organizational Communication: Contingent Views," Osmo Wiio suggests that the best predictor of organizational communication is a contingency model. One factor in this model is the culture of the society in which the organization is embedded. Rather than using a rational statistical model, he suggests the examination of the values as they are manifest in the communication or language of the organization. He describes how an examination of Japanese values help one understand Japanese organizational communication. He concludes that communication scholars could gain insights from the use of semiotic/cultural models.

George Barnett discusses communication and organizational culture, and develops a model of the sort suggested by Wiio. He defines culture from the symbols-and-meaning perspective, i.e., as an emergent property of the members' communication activities which in turn acts to restrict future communication. The chapter then defines organizational culture, and discusses the role of communication in the process of formulating and changing organizational culture and the procedures for examining and altering organizational culture. The chapter concludes with a case study in which these procedures are applied to describe an organization's culture.

The chapter which follows, Eric Eisenberg and Patricia Riley's, "Organizational Symbols and Sense-Making," continues this focus on symbols and symbolic processes by organizational members. They suggest that it is through the use of symbols that organizations create, maintain, and change organizational realities. They describe the leading theoretical perspectives on organizational symbolism — negotiated order theory, dramatism, cultural approaches, structuration, and information theory. Next, the role symbols play in constituting organizational reality is explored, followed by symbolic approaches to organizational change. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the issues for future research on symbols and symbolization in the organizational context.

At this point, the emphasis of section one changes from its focus on theoretical perspectives to place greater stress upon conceptual advances based upon the knowledge gained from empirical resarch. The change is not clear-cut. The chapters that follow do not simply report research findings, but discuss them within conceptual frameworks. For example, Raymond Falcione and Charmaine Wilson discuss socialization processes in organizations. They describe various models and perspectives for examining organizational socialization, placing particular emphasis on communication sources and strategies for the socialization process. Next, they relate socialization to organizational outcomes, and present a model of the organizational socialization process. They conclude by offering recommendations for future research. This chapter provides an excellent transition between the discussion of language and organizational culture presented above and the chapter on organizational outcomes which follows.

Cal Downs, Phillip Clampitt, and Angela Laird Pfeiffer review the research of communication scholars in their attempt to specify the relationship between communication processes and outcomes of organizational activities. They conclude that communication impacts upon job satisfaction and productivity, but not in a uniform manner. These relations are not highly correlated. They are contingent upon many factors, including the communication strategies in which the organization is engaged.

Peter Monge and Katherine Miller discuss participative processes in organizations. They review the concept of participation and the diversity of participative systems that have been developed and implemented in Europe, Japan, China, and the United States. Next, they examine the behavioral theories and empirical research studies that incorporate participation and communication. Finally, they suggest future research to investigate the relationship between communication variables and their role in participative processes.

Along the line of Monge and Miller, Lee Thayer examines the concept of leadership from the perspective of a communication scholar. Thayer has been one of the most influential systems theorists in organizational communication. Thus, it is with special attention one should read "Leadership/Communication: A Critical Review and Modest Proposal." In this narrative essay, he challenges the prevailing notions about leadership, communication, and organization as held by positivist scholars. He suggests that both are abstracts that have meaning only in terms of the individual stakeholders: those who behave in reference to the organization which they enact. He reviews the current theories about leadership, and concludes that leaders and their followers create and maintain their relationship through communication.

The final chapter in Section 1 is by Roger D'Aprix, who grounds it in the observations of a communication manager. He considers the lack of trust as the major problem facing corporate management at the end of the twentieth century. Three major developments, international competition, deregulation, and a more highly educated work force, point to a change in employee communications. These changes necessitate an increase in trust. Foreshadowing Section 3, which discusses organizational communication in the information age, D'Aprix argues that designing new communication systems will facilitate organizational survival and employee communication. He suggests that three elements should be considered: communication strategy, accountability, and communication training. Combined with shared leadership, organizations should survive and prosper.

REFERENCES

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The management of innovations.* London: Tavistock.

Farace, R., Monge, P., & Russell, H. (1977). *Communicating and organizing.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Goldhaber, G. M., Dennis, H. S., Richetto, G. M., & Wiio, O. A. (1984). *Information strategies: New pathways to corporate power* (rev. ed.). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Hage, J. (1974). *Communication and organizational control: Cybernetics in health and welfare settings.* New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lawrence, P., & Lorsch, J. (1967). *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merton, R. (1957). Patterns of influence: Local and cosmopolitan influentials. In R. Merton (Ed.), *Social theory and social structure.* New York: Free Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structures in fives: Designing effective organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rogers, E., & Agarwala-Rogers, R. (1976). *Communication in organizations.* New York: The Free Press.

Rogers, E. M., & Kincaid, D. L. (1981). *Communication networks.* New York: Free Press.

Schein, E. H. (1983). The role of the founder in creating organizational culture. *Organizational Dynamics, 12,* 13-28.

Thayer, L. (1968). *Communication and communication systems.* Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1956). General systems theory. *General Systems, 1,* 1-10.

Woelfel, J., & Fink, E. L. (1980). *The Galileo system: A theory of social measurement and its application.* New York: Academic.