A STUDY OF

THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND COMMUNICATION DYNAMICS

AT THE SCIENCE MUSEUM OF MINNESOTA

BY JULIE KING

In Partial Fulfillment Of The Requirements
For Departmental Honors

Communication Arts
Hamline University
Saint Paul, Minnesota

10 APR 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

This study is based on my internship experience at the Science Museum of Minnesota from May to October of 1988. I worked in the Public Relations department, and while that fell under the discipline of communications, I saw it as an opportunity to utilize the training of my double major of communications and anthropology. My goal was to research the communicational aspects of the organization as well as the cultural ones.

I believe if I had just gone in with the background of one discipline, I would have been looking for instances to support its "pet theories". Communication analysis of an organization typically look for messages, networks and relationships, and the use and the shared meanings of language (which include verbals and nonverbals, the use of signs and symbols, etc.,).

The communication analyst also falls back on one of three prevailing schools of thought as well. The "classical" approach looks at such questions as: How is the work divided? How many levels of authority and control exist? And what are the specific jobs of each person? The "human relations" school of thought looks at the human and social concerns by examining individual roles, status relationships and the type of groups that exist within the organization. Finally, the "systems" approach emphasizes the relationship of the parts to the whole, including individuals and goals[i].

On the other hand, anthropological studies of organizations tend to look for conceptual categories, group boundaries and criteria for inclusion and exclusion, power and status, positive and negative sanctions, and finally ideologies and cosmologies which help deal with the anxiety of the unexplainable and uncontrollable[ii].

These different elements of culture are then organized into the different levels of culture. The first level is known as the "artifacts" which is the most basic and visible level. Here is where physical space, concrete productions, written language and observable behaviors fall. The "values" level is next where beliefs of what `ought' to be are compared with what actually `is'. In other words, does the culture practice what it preaches? This can show itself in power and status behaviors, written and spoken language, etc.,. Finally, the last level is that of "basic assumptions" which deals with the organization's relationship to the environment, internal relationships, the nature of time, and the assumptions that actually guide behavior[iii].

I did come across one reference in my research where communication and culture were said to be combined for a study. The was an article by Ernest G. Bormann in <u>Communication</u> <u>and</u> <u>Organizations-</u><u>An</u> <u>Interpretive</u> <u>Approach</u>. It turned out to be not a true combination of communications and anthropology as I had thought. Bormann was using the "Symbolic Convergence Theory", which is a communications theory based on group fantasy[iv].

Hence, each discipline can be encompassing enough on its own as I showed. But I believe the extensive training of both academic departments left me neutral enough not to judge or categorize the implications of each piece of data at the time. I was able to keep an open mind and (hopefully) maintain unbiased observational attitude. Such a neutral approach gave me the freedom to sift back through the data <u>after</u> the study and find observations and answers from <u>both</u> disciplines that were relevant to the single analysis. Had I been coming from just one discipline, the data that didn't fit with it would probably been over looked as irrelevant. Hence, the study has a much broader and richer scope that otherwise may not have been attained.

The irony of my whole approach is that I had to turn to a <u>third</u> discipline for guidance! I came across this little gem of a book, <u>Analyzing</u> <u>Social</u> <u>Settings</u> by John Lofland, which turned out to be sociology based. I would be a participant observer which is defined as; "...the circumstance of being in and around an ongoing social setting for the purpose of making a qualitative analysis of that setting"[v]. Qualitative as opposed to quantitative in that quantitative is the measuring of variations among controlled variables. In social settings the necessary range of variation does not always occur in a given observation. Hence, it is important to keep in mind that my analysis would be based on observational data rather then numbers and statistics[vi].

Lofland also reports how the qualitative study of participant observation is a process of discovery:

Since a major part of what is happening is provided by people in their own terms, one must

find out about those terms rather then impose upon them a preconceived or outsider's

scheme of what they are about[vii].

I felt the statement supported my idea of going into the study with a neutral and open mind. This type of approach requires you to establish a relationship with an informant first who would then introduce you to the rest of the culture (and in some cases, act an interpreter). Thus, the process of discovery is two fold.

For my study, the Public Relations department would act as my 'informant' and serve as a good introduction to the rest of the museum.

An open mind, however, does not mean going in blind. Lofland accordingly offers three things to keep in mind as a focus for observation which is to ask; what are the <u>characteristics</u> of the phenomenon, what are its <u>causes</u>, and finally what are the <u>consequences</u>[viii].

Lastly, I had determined that my research method would be documented through the use of field notes, a journal kept of the entire experience and the collection of any relevant formal communication (that is, the written artifacts such a memos, newsletters, etc.,).

What will now follow is a preliminary analysis, then the setting of the study, the results and analysis found, a summary and implications, a conclusion, and finally suggestions for further research.

II. <u>PRELIMINARY</u> <u>ANALYSIS</u>

Before I go on, I think its important to define the major terms which are the basis of the study. Organization, organizational communication, organizational culture, as well as communication and culture together within an organization, are actually a mix of both disciplines and merit a closer look. I also want to distinguish between organizational <u>climate</u> versus culture as I found some people thought I was investigating the climate, which isn't the whole picture.

In researching an organization, it is easy to get climate confused with culture but there is an important distinction that merits clarification. Studying an organization's climate is concerned with whether people's expectation about what it <u>should</u> be like to work there are being met or not. Climate is actually another part of the whole culture. In other words, climate refers to whether the expectations are being met or not and culture looks at the nature of the expectations themselves[ix].

In a book of management, an organization is defined as:

a group of individuals organized for the achievement of a specific goal that is the importing of energy from the environment, the transformation of this energy into some product or service characteristic of the organization and the exporting of that product back into the environment[x].

In the case of the Science Museum, the obtaining and teaching of knowledge is the specific goal.

A simple definition of organizational communication is that which refers to the messages sent and received within the organization's formal structure and informal groups. Gerald M. Goldhaber provides a more explicit definition that better suited my research: "...occurs within a complex open system which is influenced by and influences its environment and involves messages, their flow, purpose, direction, as well as media within the context of interdependent relationships involving the people, their feelings and their skills"[xi].

The idea of organizational culture is an anthropological one. While I uncovered many definitions in my research, I found Edgar H. Schein's to be the best for my study. He describes it as being the pattern of basic assumptions, whether they are invented/discovered/developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel to those problems[xii]. The key to this definition is, "to be taught to new members", which is exactly what I was as an intern. Thus, I believe the culture I was "taught"

was a real one and not contrived since I was perceived as belonging to it as well. I have read several instances where anthropologists wonder if what they are observing is in fact the reality of a particular culture, or one the natives are 'staging' in hopes of pleasing the visiting researcher (especially when the anthropologist stands out so much, as in the case of the tall, caucasian Richard Lee among the petite, dark !Kung).

Next, I came across a reference that clarified a way to look at communication <u>within</u> an organizational culture from Pacanowsky. It pointed out how you should keep these two questions in mind: "1) What are the key communication activities, the unfolding of which are occasions when sense-making is accomplished? and 2) What is the sense members of any particular organization have made of their experiences?"[xiii].

All in all, I think it helps to define a clearer picture of the reasoning which established the study by looking at the major terms in depth. With such a foundation laid, I will now present the study itself.

III. <u>THE</u> <u>MUSEUM</u> <u>SETTING</u>

I found a brief history of the museum recounted in the museum's "Personnel Policy Manual" (see figure #1). It highlights the museum's desired image of prestige and growth with the various accreditation and the constant expansion. I was surprised such a glowing account is not found elsewhere as the manuals are generally kept in the manager's desk of each department. I had to go to personnel and for anything that had been written up for the history. Not only would other employees benefit from reading it, but the public would as well.

Every organization also has a mission statement which encapsulates the basic goals or purpose (see figure #2). This was found in the museum's "Front-Line Staff Handbook". My understanding of mission statements was that they encompass the entire organization and be accessible to everyone. As you can see, this one is geared only to the front-line staff. You would not know such a booklet existed unless you had attended the front-line staff orientation (which is not mandatory). I came across it because I went to personnel and asked for a copy of the mission statement and this is what they handed me. Maybe another one exists elsewhere and personnel just assumed I would only be interested in front-line staff's since I obviously wasn't management.

Mission statements and histories of an organization serve as an introduction to the organization. What I've read of the museum's <u>sounds</u> good, but I couldn't help thinking that these belie an attitude of "every man for himself" by the manner in which I had to obtain them.

Next, an organizational chart of the museum is in order (see figure #3). This is the one that existed at the time of my study[xiv]. The different boxes and listings in the structure actually represent one person who is in charge at that level. Also, the different levels of hierarchy have names for reference. The vice president level is referred to as the "Administrative Council", the division level is known as "PEMCo" (which stands for Project Exhibit Management Committee), and the various departments listed under each division is considered middle management.

The Public Relations division at the Science Museum has chosen to call itself "Community Relations" of which public relations is a part of along with Marketing department, Publications department, and the Graphics department (and will here after be noted as CR). It falls under the jurisdiction of the senior vice president along with the other divisions of Exhibits, Education, Omnitheater,

and the Science.

At this point, I should explain how the internship came about and give an understanding of my background with the museum. I have been a part time sales clerk in one of the stores for several years now (the Stores, of which there are three, are under the Finance and Administration division). The CR department did not have an internship program, but they were willing to take me on since I had been a museum employee (and, I believe they were curious to see how it would work with the idea of starting such a program).

As a sales clerk, I had come to know all of the front-line staff which are at the bottom of the hierarchy. The front-liners include the Maintenance department under the same division, the Box Office staff, and the Attendant staff which are part of the Operations department, the Volunteer department, the Theatre group in Interpretations (all of which fall under the Public Programs division), as well as the various instructors and coordinators under the Education division. All of these groups are seen as parts of departments who have supervisors over them and are not even listed individually as part of the entire structure. Thus, I like to refer to it as the unlisted "Grass Roots" level and one that I knew well.

The significance of my internship with CR is that it put me in middle management which is a much broader perspective then the grass roots one. Middle management should also be the pivotal point between the top and bottom of the hierarchy, so it was a good position to be in. Interestingly enough, each department in CR was at that point one person (except graphics, who did have an assistant). Even though they didn't have anyone below them, they still had middle managerial status within the hierarchy. The director of CR would oversee my internship and so I felt like a "free-floating manager" among the other managers (which is a far cry from a sales clerk)!

As an intern, I was able to do many projects that exposed me to each department within CR. It also gave me access to attend key meetings which became the bulk of my research data. The meetings were held every Thursday morning with one week being with the CR division and the alternate being Publicity-Promotions-Public Affairs meetings of middle management (here after referred to as 3PA).

IV. <u>RESULTS</u> <u>AND</u> <u>ANALYSIS</u>

Once an organization has been established, many changes are imposed on it over time in order to remain competitive and stay in business. The changes can be generated from within as a result of growth or they can be in response to the shifting environment it is a part of. Either way, failure to adapt to the changes can be detrimental to its success.

In reviewing my accumulated data from the Science Museum adaptation to change emerges as the key factor in organization. Looking at the cultural and communication variables revealed that some adaptation occurs on an informal level with implications that effect the day to day functions. However, the evidence of involution and the hard ceiling between senior and middle managment suggest the overall formal level has stagnated.

I have organized my study in terms of `environments' where the cultural and communication variables interact. I saw environment as being the better term instead of 'subculture' or 'subgroups' because it turned out that different subcultures and subgroups independently moved within the environments. It also allows for looking at the functional aspects involved as well. Keep in mind that the environments are the presentation of my data and are highly discriptive. Once that is in place, the definitions and implications of what it all means with my assertions will be discussed.

I would also like to note that out of respect for the organization which is still in operation within the area the names of the people involved have been changed.

<u>The</u> <u>Informant's</u> <u>Environment</u>

Before I started the internship, I did some preliminary research. The following is a reference that gave me an idea of what it was all about:

Public Relations is a distinctive management function which helps establish and maintain mutual lines of communication with in an organization and between an organization and its publics; involves the management of problems and issues; helps management to keep informed on and responsive to public opinion; helps management keep abreast of and effectively utilize change; and uses research and sound ethical communication as its principal tools[xv].

According to that text, community relations is a part of public relations, and not the other way around as the Science Museum has determined. But I think the definition fits with what the division wants to stand for.

My first day as an intern turned out to be a CR meeting day. A brief introduction was made as they had all discussed the incoming intern in the previous CR meeting. All the departments were present;

Roger Gordon- Director of CR
DeDe O'Neil- Public Relations
Gail Baldwin- Publications
Audrey Hardy- Marketing
Bob Stryker- manager of Graphics
Leslie Frazer- Graphics

This first meeting turned out to be very timely as the nitty-gritty of CR came out and it gave me an idea of some possible implications to look out for. No formal agenda had been established and so I tracked the discussion as follows[xvi];

1) Alice Grant, the manager of the stores (and was she surprised to see me!) came in a discussed the problem of CR giving away poster and such of the exhibits when they were being sold in the stores
2) the situation with management in terms of the possible merger of CR with Development and what to discuss about it with the upcoming meeting with the senior vice president
3) how the All Staff meetings, which is open to everyone in the museum, management and grass roots alike, have become disgusting. Their purpose is to update everyone on what is happening in the museum but they're turning into patting-each-other-on-the-back sessions. After the president has given the business, he opens the floor up. Certain vice presidents and division heads are jumping up and saying, "I'd like to thank ___ for their wonderful job on ___ project. Ever since they came to the museum, blah blah blah..."and go on and on for the rest of the time. The only people that show up now are the ones who know they're going to get their back patted. How can CR get them back to their original purpose of informing the museum? Several ideas were tossed around including that maybe CR should lead them. No consensus was reached and the topic was shelved for later discussion (however, it never did come again during my internship).
4) lack of communication between 'the upper echelon' and the rest of the museum is causing problems- we should be informing staff of what is going on, but we can't because we don't have the full picture (this was in reference to the situation with Chimera theatre, which occupied space in the east building, and one of the vice president's resignation/firing (more on that later).

All together there were nine CR meetings that I attended during my internship. Several major themes of analysis emerged over the period which I would like to give an account. These are the group's solidarity, group cohesion involving leadership and member's roles, and the we-they attitude of the division's perceived function.

<u>Solidarity</u>

Solidarity describes a culture's mechanisms of building cohesion. Several practices were followed to help build this up in the group. One was sharing a meal, namely breakfast as the meetings always took place first thing on Thursday mornings. So everyone would take turns bringing a treat such as donuts or bagels. And, of course, make coffee. The funny thing about these breakfast-meetings was that they were only to go from 8:30 to 9:30, but people didn't like to discuss business while they were eating, and so invariably they'd run until 10 or 10:15. This was an allowance that was made and actually made it fun.

The other solidarity builder involved the location of these meetings. About every season, someone would have the meeting at their house and prepare a full-blown breakfast. The whole morning would then be blocked off and the CR division would not be available until after noon or so. The fifth CR meeting for me turned out to be at Bob's house. We arrived there about 8 a.m. and sat around and eat until about 10 o'clock. I was surprised to find a lot was accomplished then after all the socializing, but it was all very enjoyable.

<u>Small</u> <u>group</u> <u>cohesion</u> <u>and</u> <u>leadership</u>

Right away it was apparent to me that the group's cohesion was due in a large part to the leadership abilities of Roger Gordon. Joseph A. Devito lists a number functions that need to take place for effective leadership:

> -maintain effective interaction
> -keep members on track
> -ensure member satisfaction
> -encourage ongoing evaluation and improvement
> -prepare members for the discussion[xvii]

Roger Gordon exhibited all of these functions. He maintained effective interaction by making sure every opinion was heard and, at the same time, not let anyone dominate and take over (which is easy to do when you're dealing with different departments with different needs). Keeping the members on track was accomplished by clarifying points made by others to ensure understanding, summarizing what all has been said on a given topic, and verbalizing consensus to conclude a topic so that we could go onto the next.

It creates a stifling atmosphere if a group has to maintain a 'business only' attitude. Roger was good about maintaining member satisfaction by allowing discussions to digress into a personal matters, particularly if someone had a problem that was affecting their work. A good example of this was when Gail's husband was very sick and it was becoming serious[xviii].

On going evaluation and improvement were always encouraged when problems would arise in a department. For instance, a major problem came up with the backlog of work Bob started experiencing in graphics because of last minute requests. This topic took place over several meetings until a solution was arrived at of communicating the importance of other departments to plan and request their graph needs earlier if possible[xix].

And finally, because they never prepared formal agendas up until CR #5[xx], Roger would verbally set an agenda at the start of the meeting. This would help prepare the members for the discussion. He would also square with people in advance if they were going to present something or if he wanted them to discuss something.

Cohesion and Group Roles

Roger's positive leadership allowed the task group to be a mature one. The seven basic roles of task leader, social-emotional leader, tension releaser, silent observer, central negative, information provider, and questioner had been all well established before I came in[xxi].

Roger, of course was the task leader and fulfilled the position as I described earlier. The position of social-emotional leader fell to Gail. Her role consisted of climate making and instigating self-analysis by frequently asking people what they felt or what their opinion was. She also shared the role of tension releaser with Audrey.

Both Gail and Audrey were good at telling little stories about different things they had observed in life or with their work. The tension releaser is also one who can energize the group when it starts to slow down. Interestingly enough, Audrey's other role was that of central negative. That doesn't mean that the role is negative. On the contrary, it is quite important. Audrey was good at instigating conflict and playing the devil's advocate, thus opening the door for other possibilities that might not have otherwise come up.

Bob was the quiet one of the group and fulfilled the role of silent observer. This role would also seem unimportant but it is not. Like the role is defined, Bob would simply watch and listen to the proceedings and let everyone else hash things out. Then, when it appeared the topic had come to a stand still, he would offer insights other people had over looked.

Because DeDe's department was public relations, she turned out to be the main information provider. She was good at keeping up with what was happening outside the museum. Also, she was the editor of the company's newsletter and thus knew what going on inside as well.

And last, but not least, Leslie was the questioner. She made sure everyone redefined their statements if they weren't clear and questioned proceedings as well.

Being human, however, the group is not without its problems. The high level of cohesion tends to get in the way of arriving at a general consensus with major issues, something which tends to irritate Roger. He best summed up the situation during CR #6 saying, "...we keep saying we're going to do something, but then we don't and then we just flounder along always"[xxii].

<u>We-They</u> <u>Attitude</u>

The high level cohesion is also contributing to a `we-they' attitude which could be considered a hindrance to the group's achieving their ideal goals. Such an attitude is actually best described as being one of "us against them" where they precieve themselves as being the good guys who are never at fault and everyone else is.

All communications should go through the CR department, whether it is internal or external in nature. It's their job to maintain and promote the best image possible for the organization. The such duties range then from knowing the organization's overall goals and mission to basic editing and lay outs[xxiii]. Not only is this the proper definition, but it is the ideal goal of CR.

However, the referrences I noted in my field notes indicated the ideal was not being realized. As I mentioned before, the very first meeting I attended they discussed how they <u>should</u> be in charge of facilitating major communications within the museum, which was not happening because of lacking vertical communication on several issues. This was creating problems on an internal level of misinformation and the inability of the higher-ups to correct it.

The notion came up again in CR #2 when the discussion turned to the topic of formulating publicity request forms to give to those departments such as Continuing Education and Development because, "any media communication from the museum should go through CR for proper editing and representation"[xxiv]. These departments, and a few others, had taken it upon themselves to write and print their own materials. Unfortunately, they did not do a good job and several major, widely distributed items went out with many lay out and typographical errors. The mistakes would have been caught and corrected had they gone through the people who are trained to look for such things. Such distributions reflect a very unprofessional image for the museum, and creates problems on an external level.

My point is that while they are not at fault for the actions of others, the we-they attitude might be a message the division is unconsciously sending to other people. It can create a barrier of being unapproachable and that would make them at fault. Maybe that is why they were not trusted with communicating important information from the higher-ups and why other departments are by-passing them with their distribution materials.

All in all, I would say the CR department proved to be a good informant. Despite the typical problems of high cohesion, it was good being a part of a mature task group and watching the effective leadership in action. The interaction with them proved to be a good basis for exploring the larger culture of the museum.

The Horizontal Environment

This environment constitutes the formal (they have to as part of their job) interaction across different departments which, in the case of this study, is middle management as shown on the organizational chart. Daft describes the interaction as consisting of, " 1) interdepartmental problem solving concerned with establishment of common tasks that can mutually benefit both departments in achieving company goals, 2) interdepartment coordination that facilitates the common tasks or joint projects, and finally 3) staff advise to line departments such as the finance department working on a budget for maintance"[xxv].

3PA, the middle management meetings I had mentioned earlier, had been established to promote the first two types of interaction listed above. During my internship I was able to attend seven of these

meetings of which I will present my findings there first.

Besides 3PA, I have some other factors that are significant to this environment as well. My observation of departmental isolation is one, and the other concerns the effects of differing attitudes involving two incidents I had experienced and documented. They will follow the discussion of 3PA.

3PA

3PA is open to anyone of middle management to attend. Part of Dede's job was putting together the minutes of the meetings in the form of a memo that is sent to everyone (see figure #4). As you can see, she lists everyone at the top in the form of an invitation (I omitted the names, however), and yet only a small percentage of these people regularly attended while I was there. Everyone from CR always attended and here are the 'regulars' who became a part of my study;

Dorian Lord- Special Projects/Visitor Services
Malinda Krammer- School Services
Brad Vernon- Geography
Dan Rooney- Paleontology

Unfortunately, the poor attendance is a reflection of the fact that it is a less then ideal task group with a tension filled atmosphere. This was the consensus of many of the people on the list who did not come who saw the tension as being a waste of time (as I had opportunities to ask them). In spite of the efforts of leadership, there are problems of negative followership and the effects of sanctions. There is one other factor that can explain this which transcends the task group per se and that is assumptions about peer relationships.

Roger also leads the 3PA meetings. I understood him being the leader of the CR meetings since he was head of the division, but someone else could run 3PA. I asked him about it and he said, "I just started running things and people supported me"[xxvi]. He is a very effective emergent leader as I had discovered in the CR meetings. However, 3PA, put his leadership skills to the test in dealing with negative followership behaviors and the sanctions of the group.

I had discussed group behaviors in conjunction with CR and how it effected their meetings. Negative followership behaviors, even if its just from one or two members, can affect the group's atmosphere and make it difficult for everyone else in a meeting.

Both Dorian Lord and Malinda Krammer exhibited and supported each other in dominating and blocking behaviors. Dominating does not mean 'taking over' per se, but actually not allowing others to freely express their opinion. Blocking is generally used to stop or delay decision making by a variety of behaviors including incessant procedural objections[xxvii].

Their behavior was actually a mix of the two forms. Dorian would slow things down and squelch people's opinions by saying, "we can't discuss this, or make this decision, unless ____ is here"[xxviii] when someone ventured outside of their department. I believe it was not that she was trying to defend other people's 'territory' because there was nothing to defend. They were simply making valid points or opinions. It appeared that she enjoyed the attention/power gained from dominating and blocking other people. Consequently, she did not stop herself from going beyond her realm and would substantiate speaking for someone else by saying, "I talked with ____ and we agreed on this"[xxix]. Malinda would back Dorian up by agreeing with her assertions. She also stifled opinions by jumping in on people or invalidating what they had just said[xxx].

One other interesting thing I noted is that the CR people didn't mind when others would venture into their realm and make CR suggestions. Often times they were good ones such as when Dan from Paleontology suggested some marketing strategies on an up-coming exhibit[xxxi]. Dorian or Malinda could not stop it since the CR people were right there. I can't help wondering what other people would have contributed to other departments if they had not been stopped.

Sanctions is a means of regulating behavior among cultural groups. Learning the reward system reveals fairly quickly what the important rules are that everyone is guided by[xxxii]. Sometimes the sanctions are determined by the leader and sometimes by group consensus. In the 3PA meetings, I learned the positive sanction for a job well done was being given the floor as a noted agenda item[xxxiii]. And, conversely, the negative sanction was being by-passed as I was in meeting #5[xxxiv].

There is also having the support of the group in discussion or being ignored as a sanction. I noticed a pattern where someone would make a statement and then everyone would kind of wait for a consensus if it was okay to discuss it or not (other then when Dorian and Malinda jumped on the person). If not, the person was ignored and the subject was changed. The topics that were not okay were the heavy duty, some-one-might-get-uncomfortable kind[xxxv].

The notion of assumptions with peer relationships deals with the degree of 'participation' considered appropriate in a culture and has been applied to corporate cultures by Schein. He distinguishes three different systems. The first one is the 'coercive system' in which peer relations develop as a defense against authority. This can alienate members and they will try to get out of the system if they can. Secondly, is the 'utilitarian system' where people will participate according to the norms of "a day's work for a day's pay". This typically reflects a kind of incentive system that management uses saying, "its your job". Finally, there is the normative consensus system which evolves naturally around tasks and in support of the organization.[xxxvi]

In the case of the museum, the first two systems can describe what is happening with 3PA. Members got out in defense against the 'authority' of the tense atmosphere (and the people who generated it) as described in the coercive system. Hence, the ones who stay may be under the assumption of the utilitarian system.

I have to say that meeting #3 substantiated for me that Roger was doing the best he could as a leader and was also why things got done in spite of the hindrances. He wasn't there. He had to go out of town that week and had designated Audrey to lead it. The atmosphere was even more tense and nothing was really accomplished because of lack of consensus. Essentially, Dorian and Malinda had 'free reign' and exhibited the most of their dominating and blocking behaviors[xxxvii].

Fortunately, the few people that do come, whether its by utilitarian assumptions or not, have found benefits from the meetings that make it worth putting up with the negative followership behaviors. The positive and negative sanctions also determine how the group operates, but as I said, tasks <u>do</u> get accomplished in 3PA.

<u>Department Isolation</u>

While the climate of the 3PA is not indicative of how the departments at large interact, it is somewhat of an analogy in that the departments that don't show up are off on their own. I say analogy because the departments off on their own from 3PA are not the ones that are actually isolated. A reference to the assumption of space can shed some light on this issue.

"Space has both a physical and social meaning. That is, for coordinated social action to occur, one

must share assumptions about the meaning of the placement of physical objects, and one must also know how to orient oneself in relation to other members of the organization"[xxxviii]. That statement from Schein aptly describes the situation at the Science Museum.

Departments had no control where they were located in the museum simply because as each department was created, they were placed where there was space. Development is located behind an exhibit hall which meant you have to go through the exhibit to get to it. Graphics is located in the basement, Education is in the Gallery building next door, and Exhibits in the building across the street. These departments are physically isolated from the organization, but not all of them are in a real sense. By that I mean social isolation.

I discovered that social interaction for departments depended on the manager's relationship with the division head, and the division head's with their vice president above them (more on this later in the vertical environment). The Social Isolates turned out to be Development, Membership, and Maintance[xxxix]. Development had the excuse that they were hard to get to, but then efforts should have been to go out and make connections. On the other hand, the remaining groups are all within easy access in the heart of the museum and connections weren't well either. Whether this is a personality issue among the principles or not, ultimately it is the grass roots level which suffers because they have no idea of what's going on above them let alone around them. (I'd like to point out that CR was well aware of the Isolates situation and was trying to remedy it. They can only do so much, however, if the managers and division heads are unapproachable.)

Differing Attitudes

Gareth Morgan explores this idea in his book, Images of Organization. He describes how the different professional groups can have a different view of the world and of the nature of the organization's business based on their perspective. The different professional groups tend to be the different departments. "Each group may have developed its own specialized language and set of favored concepts for formulating business priorities"[xl].

A good example of this was my first experience relating to the idea. I was more or less in charge of seeing to the opening of a new (and very small) exhibit which included putting together the informational

brochure that would go with it. I was given this packet to "extract" information from Continuing Education who was putting the exhibit together. "Extract" really meant paring down five pages worth of facts into five-hundred words or less.

After accomplishing that major feat, I deposited my five-hundred words or less in graphics and worked on a lay out with Bob. End of story. Or so I thought. Patrick Connors from Geography comes into the store while I was working and said he had been through graphics and saw the lay out. A fair number of my facts were wrong and that we needed to go over it. I figured that I might have gotten some figures wrong by a decimal point or two and that the corrections could be made on the lay out down in graphics. As it goes, several paragraphs needed to be rewritten which meant the lay out would have to be totally redone, which meant delaying printing of the brochures. He was very upset and said, "I should have seen the copy and given approval before you had turned it into graphics. Maybe you didn't realize as an intern- but authors like to see how their material is edited"[xli].   That instruction hadn't been communicated to me. So I went down to Dede in CR feeling like I had really blown it, and asked why. Dede was just as surprised by his reaction as I had been. No instruction was given because that's not the procedure. Once someone hands material to CR, then they've let go of responsibility. It's up to CR then to edit it and deal with it. That's CR's job. But its not like they just change everything at will, they try to maintain the facts. Dede had gone over my five-hundred words or less with the original material to make sure I kept the facts straight. There was something more to this going on then just simple editing and that is where the significance of the incident comes in. Unfortunately, I had to get back to work in the store and so Dede said she would look into it and let me know.

The first question was why was this so important to Patrick when this was C.E.'s exhibit? An hour later, Dede came in with the answer. She had dug back through all her notes from 3PA and found a reference back in March that Patrick was going to do all the research tied to the exhibit. No wonder he had been upset! It had been his project.

But then why did C.E. involved if it had been a Geography project and why did he keep to the background with this? So Dede left and then came back later saying that Mary in C.E. had gotten the funding for the research and the sculpture and felt that it was their project.

Schein also addressed this issue and added another dimension to my analysis. He relates how, "a

job is a person's 'turf', not to be invaded by others. Thus, a strategy of increased horizontal interaction heightened the probability that people's turf would be invaded by all kinds of new ideas, which would to some degree be viewed as threatening or insulting because they implied that the person needed help"[xlii].

 It could very well be that Patrick had been threatened or insulted that he couldn't get the funding for the project and had to relinquish it to C.E.. Thus, the differing attitudes came into conflict.

In the above situation, the only result of the conflict was the print delay of my brochure. However, I found with the next incident that such disparity can have more severe consequences.

 The museum experienced a tornado warning on 2 August, during my internship. The place was packed with people as it was in the afternoon, peak tourist time. I was working in the store at the time when the sirens went off. In my journal I wrote: ...Samantha (the security guard) comes running in saying we have to evacuate the store and head for the shelter. Well, Claudia (my manager) and I ended up helping Sam contain the crowd in the shelter because the attendants were absolutely worthless. They weren't helping at all! I couldn't believe it!   They weren't helping with the crowd![xliii] I have a first aid certificate and I've done volunteer rescue work with the Red Cross for several years. I know what the potential danger was for the people who would not stay in the shelter, visitors and staff alike. I couldn't just let the situation go by without doing something. I wrote out a statement (see figure #5) expressing the gravity of the potential consequences and then asked Dede if it could be put on the agenda for the next 3PA meeting. She agreed and it was put on. Remember the discussion earlier about negative sanctions? Guess what agenda item had gotten by-passed. I believe these middle managers saw me as a young intern up-start.

Aside from my personal feelings about the situation, I did find a relevant theme to the ideas of differing attitudes along with another angle of analysis to look at. This is the disparity between Security versus Operations being a case of involution.

The security people are part of Maintance and have been there from the very beginning when the museum first opened. As a matter of fact, their station is located in the old building. They are trained in security and their job description is to maintain the security of the building and the people inside it.

Operations, on the other hand, was established after the new building containing the Omnitheater opened. This is where the Attendant staff comes under. An attendant is located by each exhibit

entrance and by the Omnitheater. They have had no training other then being shown around the museum and where all the emergency exits are. I asked several of them what they thought their job was. The common answers where; "to make sure no one sneaks into the exhibits without an admission tag", "make sure kids don't run around and tear the place apart", and "let someone know if an exhibit breaks down or there are problems"[xliv]. That also describes how the rest of the museum perceives their function as well. However, the museum's Personnel Policy Manual states that Operations, "is responsible for the security of the museum and visitor safety"[xlv].

It would not be bad for an organization to have two security forces, if they supplemented or supported each other. In the case of the museum they do not. There is system of differing attitudes between the two departments as to who is in charge.

As I said above, the attendants have no training and therefore are not equipped to handle emergencies. They contradicted everything Sam was trying to do, as she has been trained for, which is seeing to everyone's safety. As the sirens went off, warning that a tornado had been sighted in the vicinity, she had ordered the Omnitheater to be evacuated as it is on the third floor of an outside wall. The Attendant Supervisor said she had no authority to make such an order. The Box Office (which is also under Operations) elected to run the show rather then issuing refunds. Such disparity between the two departments could have endangered the lives of three hundred people.

So whether it is a case of 'turf' invasion or not, departmental conflicts based on differing issues can be a serious problem. Some conflict between departments is good because they stimulate and challenge each other rather then letting the organization stagnate. However, as Morgan concluded, "Truly successful organizations observed by Peters and Waterman seem to have found ways of breaking down these functional divisions so that different professionals can guide their activities with reference to a common and integrated set of norms and priorities[xlvi].

The Vertical Environment

As the heading suggests, this environment refers to the interaction that crosses the levels. As you will see my analysis is eliminated in this environment, which in itself is an important piece of data. There are two different themes involved here as well. There is a definite ceiling between middle and senior

management as far as general interaction I will show referring back to 3PA. Also, as I said I would

earlier I will explore further the idea of access to senior management which is a more specific interaction

and involves the lines of chain of command.

3PA

I had assumed that communication and input was free flowing between the levels and that

everyone was working together. I discovered this was not the case;

"We better get someone in senior to okay this otherwise, they change it on us."[xlvii]

"Who up there would set this up for the summer during our peak tourist season? It should
have been set up for another time." (the reference was made in lieu of trying to figure out how
to promote an exhibit that won't appeal to the general audience of families with kids. The
museum banks on summer time being its greatest intake)[xlviii]

"Where does the decision come from up there for allotting just a 3,000$ budget for

advertising when they're expecting it to be such a big draw?"[xlix]

When such questions were thrown out, no one had the answers! This is middle management and they

genuinely have no idea what is going on above them.

The PEMCo and Administrative Council meetings are closed and those members are good about

keeping them confidential. No one knows what is done or said there other then that major decisions are

made. All the museum can do is follow the decisions which come out as policy.

Such incongruities between senior and middle management are common with organizations that

adhered to the military model of control directed from the top down. Despite the findings of behavioral

scientists- most organizations maintain detailed job descriptions of what is expected at each level with

absolute minimum of flexibility[l]. Senior management tend to base their decisions on the facts and

figures from reports, and while it might look good in theory on paper the practical reality might be a

different story. For example, senior management might have benefited from interacting with middle

management concerning the booking of a less family oriented exhibit at peak family season. Since

middle management knows from direct experience it may not be the big draw the museum needs and

could have advised other alternatives.

Access to Senior Management

How much your department was up on things depended on your managers relationship with the division head, and the division head with the vice president. Such a network of communication is best illustrated as the Y pattern. Devito describes this as being some what centralized and indicates clear leadership. The branching starts at the middle management level to the various supervisors within the department[li]. You should also note that the communication is two- way, as indicated by the arrows. The branching also stops at middle management and communication follows chain of command.

supervisors

department manager

division head

vice president

Referring back to the organizational chart, I found that the divisions and the majority of the

departments under the senior vice president and under the vice president of Public Programs were the

most informed of the museum's goings-on. The vice president of Finance tended to remain tight-lipped

and would only communicate what was necessary to carry out a job. The vice president of

Development was fired/resigned soon after I started my internship (more on that later) which actually

further isolated Development.

One implication to all that is the idea of span of control versus span of communication. This notion

means the larger the area of communication is, the larger the area of control is. Thus, because the

senior vice president and the PP vice president made it a point to communicate to as many people as

possible on an informal level, they were seen as being more powerful and influential. The Finance vice

president had only the influence accorded his position to give orders to those below him.

The Lateral Environment

Devito defines lateral communication as the messages that are sent to sent to equals such as

manager to manager or worker to worker.[lii] However, I am not restricting my study to just the

communication aspect as I found that subgroups, or clusters existed here. You would think then that

constituted horizontal interaction, but I chose to differentiate it from the horizontal environment for two

reasons;

1) This interaction is informal in that the persons do not have to interact as part of their job.

The interaction is chosen.

2) Because it is chosen, the interaction is limited to the particular cluster and it not meant for everyone. It is there to benefit the members.

One interesting aspect of the cluster idea is that should one of the members decide to share the information with the manager or supervisor below them, it can create the cluster grapevine. Daft recognized this phenomenon as being separate from the regular grapevine as operating on a completely different channel of selection.

The regular grapevine in an organization is well established and follows a regular pattern whose movement can be traced. The hub or the origin of the flow is usually the person whose job is to physically move them around the organization in a regular routine such as the mail person or the security guard. As that person picks a message up, they will carry it with them on their route. Thus, the first department to get it will be the next one on the stop and so on until the whole grapevine has heard.[liii]

Whether the cluster grapevine is created or not, the cluster groups help each other by supplementing what is not being communicated through the regular vertical (remember how important relationship to the vice president is) or horizontal channels.

Several cluster groups exist at the museum and I was able to observe one in action. This I will report on in the next section.

All The Environments In Action

This is where I finally discuss the firing/resignation of a vice president that I had mentioned several times earlier. I couldn't have asked for better circumstances in my internship if I had tried to plan how to trace how tricky information is passed through out the museum. It happened just after I started and I documented the whole situation. I will present the observation of this event in terms of how each environment handled it now that it has been established how they work. I have been saying fired/resigned together because the perception depended on who you talked to. I had heard from the regular grapevine in the store around the 19the and 20th of May that a vice president was gone.

The Informant's Environment

If you'll remember, the event had been a part of my first meeting with them on the 24th of May. By this time, the rumors and speculation had been flying through the grapevine and they should have been the ones to have set the record straight right from the beginning. But they had never gotten any official word as to exactly what happened right after it had happened[liv].

It is also in this environment that I feel I got the real story which was never communicated outside the group. Bob related as part of the small talk for CR #2 on the 9th of June that he had talked to the vice president the night before. They had been good friends since high school. He had been, "let go because the president felt he could no longer work with him as there was bad chemistry between them. VP was shocked and wasn't expecting it as he had just gotten a good grant for the museum"[lv].

The Horizontal Environment

The situation never came up in 3PA, but the regular members were all part of networks that knew about it. The event served for me the beginnings of investigating department isolation. I made it a point that week to go around and ask various people I knew both at the grass roots level and in middle management who were not 3PA regulars what they thought. That's how I found out how those departments I listed earlier were isolated, they didn't know.

The Vertical Environment

The situation was a good example of the hard ceiling between middle management and senior management. However, because the grapevine was so rampant and people were clamoring to know what the deal was, the president finally had to issue a statement (see figure #6). This was distributed to middle management, but the distribution was sloppy as some of them never got it or didn't realize its significance until much later[lvi].

Now compare that to figure #7. This refers to the resignation of another vice president that occurred later. This had been distributed to middle management and everyone got one. It looks more like a formal announcement the president was happy to give. The other interesting thing about it is the grapevine had heard of the resignation that morning. The memo was in the afternoon by 3 p.m.. Thus, there was only a couple hours time lag between the grapevine and the official word compared to the

couple of days which occurred with the other VP.

The Lateral Environment

This is also where I got to see a cluster group in action. This one consists of Gail in CR, Alice who is the managers of the stores and Henrietta in Operations. After the CR meeting where Bob had told us how he had talked to the VP, we all went to our respective offices to work. There is only a space wall between Gail's desk and Dede's where I was working. Thus, I plainly overheard her call Alice and give her the scoop. Then she called Henrietta as well[lvii]. As far as I can tell, the information never went beyond the cluster group, it was merely for their own curiosity.

V. <u>Implications</u> <u>and</u> <u>Conclusions</u>

    I can now discuss the implications that emerge and what it all means having presented all the cultural and communication variables from the bulk of my study.

    The few adaptations I found on an informal level actually occurred right after the set time of my internship. I was then back to working part time in the stores. However, with the experience I had gained from the field study, I was able to note the significance of the changes and realize their implications. Unfortunately, since I was no longer the 'free-floating manager' at the middle management level, I can't report on how or why or what was behind the changes. I can only report on what I saw.

    The museum went through major reorganization soon after I left CR (see figure #s 8 and 9). I circled the changes I spotted and have included the original chart here again for quick comparison. Starting from the top down and left to right, the first major change is the elimination of a vice president position cutting down the Administrative Council to three persons. There is the addition of a PEMCo office off of the senior vice president, but I have no idea what that means. Finally, they changed the last vice president to External Relations and have put CR under it with Development and Membership.

    At the PEMCo and middle management level there are some interesting changes as well. Public Programs has been changed to Visitor Programs. The School Services that use to be under there has become its own division so someone got promoted. New jobs were created there also as I see departments under it that aren't on the original chart. Special Projects was eliminated from Visitor Programs and there's a new department added called Theater. I see they also moved the Physical Science and Technology department to Science where it should have been in the first place. Finally, the change that really catches my eye is the movement of Operations to Finance and Administration. That puts it in the same division as Security which is part of Maintance. I really wonder if that was in response to the tornado emergency or not? I know the attendants have not gotten any more training and so maybe authority was conceded to Security. Only another big emergency will tell.

    The other big change worth mentioning is that the All Staff meetings have improved considerably. Now after the general business, a different department is featured at each one. The deparment is suppose introduce itself and all the people in it and then give a quick presentation on what exactly they do. To mean that seems like that would help the department isolation problem. The president still runs

them so I guess CR never got the chance to.

I believe that it is too much of a coincidence that the changes occured right after my study. I would like to think that since I had been keeping CR abreast of all my observations they were able to instigate some of these changes. However, while the reorganization seems like a major change, it really is not and that is why I considered it informal. Very little people are actually affected by it other then the few promotions and creation of new positions. Thus, it eased some of the functional problems on the day to day level.

The evidence of involution and the hard ceiling between middle and senior management, however, indicates that the overall, formal level of the organization has stagnated.

The idea of involution applying to cultures was originated by Alexander Goldenweiser back in 1936 in the field of anthropology:

> The primary effect of the pattern is to check development, or at least to limit it. As soon as the pattern form is reached, further change or growth is inhibited by the tenacity of the pattern.
>
> The inevitable result is progressive inward complication rather then the progressive outward development[lviii].

In another words, it is the intensified reinvestment of an existing system, or a "locking in", rather then the accommodation of change and expansion.

The situation with Operations versus Security is the best example of involution occurring. Once Operations came into existence with the formation of the attendant staff, the system has intensified itself rather then giving up the 'turf' each department has established and gained. Evolution, and change would mean that one department would have to give up authority and power to the other. Or one of the departments might simply be eliminated in favor of the other. Since the departments are now so well established and fairly large, no one is willing to be responsible for making changes. The evidence of involution doesn't stop here. There are many other indications as well.

The department isolation is another one. If you will remember how I said that as each department was created, they were placed where there was space rather then instigating a change that would revitalize the whole system. Once they were placed, they've been locked in to the existing system. Exhibits should be behind the exhibit hall, not Development. Development should be with Membership

in that corridor since their functions overlap and they are under the same VP. I believe the isolation problem would be remedied if the departments which overlap were together rather then being next to one where there is no common ground.

Finally, the assumptions of peer relationships described in the horizontal envirement is another indication of involution. The description of the utilitarian system of "a day's work for a day's pay" speaks of being locked in. It doesn't allow for the innovations and creative that can occur when people are allowed to strecth beyond their `job description'. The orignial goal of 3PA was to create an enviroment suited for this kind of `going beyond'. CR is able to encourage this on a small level when someone from Paleotology can make a Marketing suggestion. However, the locking in of job discriptions and turf don't allow for the other divisions to be bold and follow CR's example. I believe some of the negative followership behaviors are the symptoms of a situation where stretching is suppose to occur, but doesn't.

I also conclude that the cluster groups described in the lateral enviroment and the differing attitudes are the means of coping with the lock in feeling of involution. The cluster groups get around the involution somewhat but the differing attitudes actually feed into the system. The people become protective of the turf they have been locked into to gain some control and cope. However, it just makes change and evolution that much more difficult.

The other piece attributing to the stagnation in the overall organization is the hard ceiling between senior and middle management. Middle management should be the pivotal point between the upper and lower half of the structure but as the references made in 3PA of the vertical enviroment show this is not the case.

Another implication from the existence of the hard ceiling is that bad news is not handled in a professionl manner. The case of the vice president being fired demonstrates this. As you may think, the situation did not have serious ramifactions other then a temporary senior management blunder. However, it did have serious consequences in the museum's history with the saga of the Memorial Day Massacre. This is more data that I had uncovered after my study and I will relate it briefly here as I believe it is important to recount.

In the year of 1982, four years after the new president had come on with the opening of the new building and Omni theater, without warning one third of the entire museum was laid off. This action cut

horizontally across the majority of the _salaried_ staff. Those people picked up their pay checks that Friday and found pink slips in the envelope saying they could not report back to work the following Tuesday. It came without warning because the grapevine never got hold of the information. By the time the checks were distributed at 3 p.m., all of senior management had left for the day to start their holiday. Thus, no one was around to answer what was going on and why. The following Tuesday, the museum commenced to hire _hourly_ people to fill in the duties left vacant. Hourly staff do not receive benefits.

My informant had been the Personnel Director at the time and clued me into exactly what happened behind the scenes. In a senior management meeting back in January of 1982, the vice president of finance had made the statement that the museum was way below budget and would not be able to make payments for that year. Then nothing more was said in subsequent meetings. The reason the grapevine never got a hold of the information was because only two people knew of the decision to cut salary staff and save money. They were the president and the VP of finance. They _personally_ stuffed the pink slips in the pay checks that afternoon so that even the secretaries would not know. And then, of course, they left for the holiday before the checks were distributed[lix].

The ramifications to that saga are far reaching. One of the results could be the hard ceiling and the involution. I can imagine after all the bad publicity and ill feeling senior management insulating itself from getting too involved with the levels below it. Such insulating could even be a means of protecting _their_ turf. Also, because of the high level of mistrust the incident perpetrated, the lower levels would then be more then willing to reinforce the barrier. Thus, once the hard ceiling was in place the organization could lock itself into a system of involution to reinforcment.

I believe the involution is in the early stages and has not become apparent on a large scale. The organization has been able to flourish on a day to day basis. The incidents I have observed in my study are still seen as isolated problems that do not contribute to an overall picture, yet. Given time, however, as the system continues invert on itself by reintensifying the lock in, it can eventually led to a collapse from within. That is the consequence of involution.

I really believe this study has only uncovered the tip of the iceberg. Given more time and research internvention would be possible while the involution is in the early stages. Further investigation from either the communication or the anthroplogy field would generate more insights into the matter and allow the organization to grow and evolve as it should.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnett, George A. "Communication and Organizational Culture", in Handbook of Organizational Communication. Norwood: Ablex, 1988.

Bormann, Ernest G. "Symbolic Convergence- Organizational Communication and Culture", in Communication and Organizations- An Interpretive Approach. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983.

Cragan, John F. and David W. Wright. Communication in Small Group Discussions. St Paul:West Publishing, 1986.

Cutlip, Scott M, et al. Effective Public Relations. Englewood Cliffs:Prentice-Hall, 1985.

Daft, Richard L. Management. Chicago:Dryden Press, 1988.

Devito, Joseph A. Human Communication- The Basic Course. New York:Harper and Row, 1985.

Goldenweiser, Alexander. "Loose Ends of Theory and Involution in Primitive Society", in Essays In Anthropology. Berkeley:U of C Press, 1936.

Goldhaber, Gerald M. Organizational Communication. Dubuque:W.C. Brown, 1974 first edition and 1979 second edition.

Lofland, John. Analyzing Social Setting. Belmont:Wadsworth, 1971.

Morgan, Gareth. Images of Organizations. Beverly Hills:Sage Publications, 1986.

Schein, Edgar H. Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Pacanowsky, Michael E, et al. "Organizational Communication as Cultural Performances" in Communication Monographs 1983, 50.

Putnam, Linda L. and Michael E. Pacanowsky. Communication and Organization- An Interpretive Approach. Beverly Hills:Sage Publications, 1983.

ENDNOTES

i. taken from Gerald M. Goldhaber, <u>Organizational</u> <u>Communication</u> (Dubuque:W. C. Brown, 1974) pp 24-25.

ii. Edgar H. Schein, <u>Organizational</u> <u>Culture</u> <u>and</u> <u>Leadership</u> (San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, 1985), chart on p 66.

iii.<u>Ibid</u>., pp 14-18.

iv. Ernest G. Bormann, "Symbolic Convergence- Organizational Communication and Culture", in <u>Communication</u> <u>and</u> <u>Organizations-</u> <u>An</u> <u>Interpretive</u> <u>Approach</u>, (Beverly Hills:Sage Publications, 1983) pp 99-122.

v.   John Lofland, <u>Analyzing</u> <u>Social</u> <u>Setting</u> (Belmont:Wadsworth, 1971), p 93.

vi. <u>Ibid</u>., p 61.

vii. <u>Ibid</u>., p 4.

viii. <u>Ibid</u>., p 13.

ix. taken from George A. Barnett, "Communication and Organizational Culture", in <u>Handbook</u> <u>of</u> <u>Organizational</u> <u>Communication</u> (Norwood:Ablex, 1988), p 106.

x. Richard L. Daft, <u>Management</u> (Chicago:Dryden Press, 1988), p 104

xi. Goldhaber, p 11.

xii. Schein, p 9.

xiii. Michael E. Pacanowsky, et al. "Organizational Communication as Cultural Performances", in <u>Communication</u> <u>Monographs</u>, (1983) 50, p 124.

xiv. in order to remain healthy, organizations restructure responsibility periodically in order to keep abreast of the changing environment around them (taken from Daft, p 320). The restructuring comes from the top down and, frankly, it surprised me. I didn't think a lot of changing around would occur as you progress up the corporate ladder. What is even more remarkable is the employees below management are never aware of all the major restructuring that's going on above them.

xv. Scott M Cutlip et al, <u>Effective</u> <u>Public</u> <u>Relations</u> (Englewood Cliffs:Prentice-Hall, 1985), p 4.

xvi. taken from the very first journal entry of <u>24</u> <u>May</u>

xvii. Joseph A. Devito, <u>Human</u> <u>Communication-</u> <u>The</u> <u>Basic</u> <u>Course</u> (New York:Harper and Row, 1985), p 260.

xviii. field notes- CR#7, <u>25</u> <u>August</u>

xix. field notes- CR #5, <u>28</u> <u>July</u> and CR #6, <u>11</u> <u>August</u>

xx. that was my doing, I'm proud to say! Roger had started referring to my field notes for what had been said before as I had been tracking the discussions. It was such a good reference to fall back on that he finally asked me to prepare formal minutes of the meetings and include future agenda items of unfinished business.

xxi. John F. Cragan and David W. Wright, Communication in Small Group Discussions (St Paul:West Publishing, 1986) p 167.

xxii. field notes- CR #6, 11 August

xxiii. Cutlip, p 317.

xxiv. field notes- CR #2, 9 June

xxv. Daft, p 444.

xxvi. journal, 23 June

xxvii. taken from Cragan and Wright, p 164.

xxviii. field notes- 3PA #3, 7July, #5, 4 August, and #7, 1 September

xxix. field notes- 3PA #3, 7 July and #7, 1 September

xxx. field notes- 3PA #3, 7 July, #5, 4 August, #6, 18 August, and #7, 1 September

xxxi. field notes- 3PA #1, 2 June

xxxii. taken from Schein, p 79.

xxxiii. field notes- 3PA #3, 7 July

xxxiv. field notes- 3PA #5, 4 August

xxxv. field notes- 3PA #6, 18 August

xxxvi. taken from Schein, p 106.

xxxvii. field notes- 3PA #3, 7 July

xxxviii. Schein, p 96.

xxxix. field notes- CR #2, 9 June

xl. Gareth Morgan, Images of Organizations (Beverly Hills:Sage, 1986), p 127.

xli. journal entry, 5 July

xlii. Schein, p 31.

xliii. journal entry, 3 August

xliv. journal entry, <u>24</u> <u>August</u>

xlv. "Personnel Policy Manual", The Science Museum of Minnesota p 7.

xlvi. Morgan, p 127.

xlvii. field notes- 3PA #2, <u>16</u> <u>June</u>

xlviii. field notes- 3PA #6, <u>18</u> <u>August</u>

xlix. field notes- 3PA #7, <u>1</u> <u>September</u>

l. taken from Gerald M. Goldhaber, <u>Organizational</u> <u>Communication</u> (Dubuque:W.C. Brown, <u>1979</u> 2nd Edition) p 29.

li. Devito, p 284.

lii. <u>Ibid</u>., p 289.

liii. Daft, p 447.

liv. fieldnotes- CR #1, <u>24</u> <u>May</u>

lv. Field notes- CR #2, <u>9</u> <u>June</u>

lvi. journal, <u>25</u> <u>May</u>

lvii. journal, <u>9</u> <u>June</u>

lviii. Alexander Goldenweiser, "Loose Ends of Theory and Involution in Primitive Society", in <u>Essays</u> <u>in</u> <u>Anthropology</u> (Berkeley:U of C Press, 1936) p 99.

lix. field notes, <u>20</u> <u>Feb</u> <u>1989</u>.