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ABSTRACT

A KUMIAI PROJECT:
LEADERSHIP AND SOCIAL INFLUENCE IN RESPONSE TO A COMMUNITY CRISIS

by Carolyn Kyyhkyinen Lee

August 2007

Despite recent scholarly endeavors in leadership and crisis communication as well as numerous actual instances of tragic or embarrassing and incompetent crisis leadership, little research has addressed the question: How did leaders effectively influence constituents' reality and reactions associated with a crisis? Consequently, the purpose of this study was to investigate, identify, and explain the rhetorical features and strategies enacted by constituents as they attempted to manage the meaning (Pearce & Cronen, 1980) of a community crisis. In particular, this study investigated the means by which Chief Influence Agents® as leaders affected the process of making sense of events, shared experiences, and related with constituents in an attempt to cope with and survive a potential community crisis. Community leadership discourse during an actual meeting convened to consider the impacts of the declaration of war by President G. W. Bush on Iraq in 2003 was the specific setting for the investigation of social influence and crisis management.

The study concluded chief influence agents as leaders should use natural rhetorical devices such as dialogic discourse to prime enthymemes, frame constituents' reality, and direct the collective construction of a new social reality for community development, crisis management, and community sustainability. In particular, the art of framing discourse is a useful rhetorical technique to address significant topics, construct master themes, assign and manage meaning, and co-create a meaningful and acceptable rhetorical vision for shared reality.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

*Much power lies in the capacity to define and shape reality.*
Smircich, 1983

*During the stage of crisis preparation, a goal leaders might consider . . .
establishing and promoting common understanding.*
Klann, 2003

The intent of this study is to illuminate a specific communication event and provide insight into the effective use of communication in preparation for a potential community crisis. The objective of this study is to identify and explain the rhetorical features enacted in discourse by members of a community attempting to make sense of a community crisis. The theoretical significance of this study is to provide a comprehensive investigation of leadership based on socially influenced sense-making. The practical significance is to suggest how leaders can facilitate and shape “emerging patterns of communication so that multiple voices and perspectives are honored” (Pearce, 2002, p. 10).

Despite recent scholarly endeavors in leadership and crisis communication as well as numerous actual instances of tragic or embarrassing and incompetent crisis leadership, little research has addressed the question: How did leaders effectively influence constituents’ reality and responses associated with a crisis? Consequently, the purpose of this study is to investigate, identify, and explain the rhetorical features and strategies enacted by constituents as they attempted to manage the meaning of a community crisis (Pearce & Cronen, 1980). In particular, this study investigates the means by which Chief Influence Agents® as leaders affected the process of making sense of events, shared experiences, and related with constituents in an attempt to cope with and survive a potential community crisis. The goal of this investigation is 1) to add to the body of knowledge of the leadership as a social influence/social construction...
process, 2) to provide an actual example of naturally occurring skillful rhetorical leadership, and 3) to provide practical wisdom regarding crisis leadership communication.

This study features actual “language of leadership” that framed discourse and engaged and empowered constituents (Conger, 1989, 1991; Soder, 2001). Community leadership discourse during an actual meeting convened to consider the impacts of the declaration of war by President G. W. Bush on Iraq in 2003 was the specific setting for the investigation of social influence and crisis management. Analyses of diverse “natural groups” (Frey, 1994a; Frey, 1994b) may provide useful information for skillful leadership communication and crisis management, as well as challenge popular yet ethnocentric leadership theory. Implications of this rhetorical analysis may be applicable from interpersonal influence to public relations (Heath, 1994), including community/corporate communication planning (Cragan & Shields, 1992), empowerment leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1988), co-leadership (Hennan & Bennis, 1999), and the management of leadership language (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996).

Fostering bona fide dialogue®, especially during situations involving threats, diversity, and community building, can be challenging (Heath, 1998; Heath et al., 2002); thus, analyzing such events may be useful. Zuniga and Nagda (2001) suggested “careful attention needs to be given to how people come together and engage with each other in a dialogue group” (p. 311). Understanding the significance of framing messages with relevant topics, themes, and social interaction orientations may enhance our understanding of effective leadership. Utilizing a rhetorical analysis (Condit & Bates, forthcoming) allows the identification and elaboration of rhetorical features, such as frames, enacted in actual dialogic discourse that influenced “the organization of experience” (Goffman, 1974) and social convergence (Rogers & Kincaid, 1981; Kincaid, 1987). Significantly, this study identifies and explains symbolic convergence (Bormann, 1986) enacted during an extraordinary community meeting convened in an attempt to make sense
of a community crisis through the concept of *kumiai*, a form of group interaction that transpired as a form of collaborative social interaction and collective community sense-making.

This study is complexly constructed from ideas offered by theorists of sense-making methodology (Dervin, 2003), social construction of reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1967; Watzlawick, 1976), social convergence (Kincaid, 1987), framing (Entman, 1993; Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996; Tannen, 1993), dialogue (Bakhtin, 1986; Bohm, 1985, 1992; Cissna & Anderson, 2004; De Turk, 2006; Stewart, 1998), discourse (Ellis, 1999; Grant, Keenoy, & Oswick, 1998; Mulholland, 1991; Putnam, 1998), leadership (Bowers & Scashore, 2003; Deetz, Tracy, & Simpson, 2000; Hersey & Blanchard, 1988; Heifetz, 1998; Lipman-Blumen, 1996), community building (Arnett, 1986; Depew & Peters, 2001; Pearce & Pearce, 2000b; Shepherd & Rothenbuhler, 2001); and crisis studies (Heath, 2004; Klann, 2003; Mitroff & Pearson, 1993; Ulmer, Sellnow, & Seeger, 2007). The intent of this research is to identify simple yet elegant features of social influence as leadership communication in general and during an instance of crisis management in particular.

Significantly, personal reality and collective reality (common sense) are influenced by two major effects. These effects include 1) people who set or guide the patterns, coordination, and intervention of social interaction and social coherence (Pearce, 1989) and 2) by "premises" or frames of references derived by previous personal and social experiences and interpretations (Watzlawick, Beavin-Bavelas, & Jackson, 1967). According to Pearce (1989), coherence refers to the creative process of interpreting our experiences from socially constructed frames of reference by which to comprehend or "make sense" of our world. When coherence is lacking, the experience may be interpreted as "nonsense," or misunderstanding may occur. Coordination refers to framing social interaction practices that represent behavioral expectations, protocols, and rules as well as common sense of "visions of the good, the desirable, and the expedient" (Pearce, 1989, p. 20). These rules or protocols function to prevent conjoint enactments of what
inter-actors “envision as bad, ugly, and obstructive” (p. 20). When coherence and/or coordination are lacking, inter-actors are likely to experience frustration, anxiety, anger, confusion, chaos, or disorganization.

For some collectives, “the individual is allowed to frame or co-frame conversation” (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998, p. 71), consequently effecting social interaction coherence and coordination. Mumby (1994) believed “this process of articulation and sense-making is ideological when certain meaning formations are legitimated to the exclusion of others . . . [thereby] serv[ing] the vested interests of a particular group to frame organizational reality” (p. 93). People who direct and manage social interaction coordination and message coherence may play a significant role as chief influence agents. They influence the construction, organization, and acceptance of beliefs, attitudes, knowledge and understanding, collective reality, common sense, and the development of groups into teams, organizations, cultures, and communities (Delia, O’Keefe, & O’Keefe, 1982; Deal & Kennedy, 1982, 1998; Deetz, 1995; Shepherd & Rothenbuhler, 2001). Chief influence agents significantly affect the development of common assumptions, meanings, conclusions, norms, values, rules, social/task roles, and expectations among constituents.

In many cases, a chief influence agent as a leader has the greatest impact (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996). A leader directs or guides collective beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors by “showing the way” (Webster’s College Dictionary and Thesaurus, 2005). Hoyt, Goethals, and Riggio (2006) contended “effective leaders are typically, consciously or unconsciously, masters of social influence” (p. 104). Leadership communication essentially functions as social influence and may be based on other basic functions of communication such as understanding their world and relating with others (Gamble & Gamble, 2005). Accordingly, leadership effectiveness may be dependent upon the level of knowledge and understanding of a situation, the style of relating with constituents, and the specific framing of messages.
Leaders may influence constituents' beliefs, collective identity, and coordinated behaviors by means of framing discourse (Deal & Kennedy, 1998; Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996; Mumby, 1994). Frames provide a parameter and structure of significance to establish definitions, understandings, and attitudes regarding sensed situations and experience (Wood, 2004). Leaders “most frequently characterize the framing of organizational reality” (Mumby, 1994, p. 93). Klann (2003) asserted “the power of influence would seem to be a useful leadership skill” (p. 11) and the ability to frame and articulate a compelling version of reality may be a significant means for social influence (Mumby, 1994). According to Bennis and Nanus (2003) among others, effective leaders must strategically direct framing and guide the co-construction of shared experience. Synthesizing social reality, articulating a compelling vision of reality, and focusing attention on relevant topics are available means for effective leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 2003).

Communicating effectively may require leaders to frame their messages to convey a sense of ethos; orientate to, and if possible identify with constituents’ diverse and shared values, versions of reality, and visions; enact care and concern for constituents; gratify constituents’ emotional needs; and coordinate constituents’ responses (Bennis, 2003; Gubman, 2003; Klann, 2003; Lipman-Blumen, 1996; Murphy, 1941; Murphy, 1993; Zenger & Folkman, 2002). Leaders may stimulate constituents’ social-emotional energy by allowing constituents to contribute to the co-construction of reality (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998) and appreciate contributors’ perspectives. Chief influence agents as leaders may develop shared values and shared frames of references among constituents and consequently developing “common ground” and providing guidelines for collective decision-making and social behaviors (Clyne, 1994; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Heath, 1976; Heifetz, 1998; Hofstede, 1980, 1983, 1997; Sternbergh & Weitzel, 2001).

Research suggests meaningful interdependent relations and relationship satisfaction may be cultivated by rhetorical tactics and styles enacting accurate co-orientation, concern for and
understanding of other/s, and/or concern for the relationship (Berry, 1999; Misumi, 1985; Nakanishi, 2003, Papa & Pood, 1988; Sinha & Tripathi, 1994). For example, Papa and Pood (1988) revealed co-orientation accuracy “plays an important role in the selection of effective conflict tactics, satisfaction with the process of conflict interaction, and satisfaction with conflict outcomes” (p. 22). Bantz (1993) suggested that effective social influence attempts are characterized by gathering information about the situation, adapting to the circumstances, building social and task cohesion, identifying different and common values and preferred outcomes, as well as developing consensus.

In sum, leadership is about seeking to influence constituents through the creation of a rhetorical vision of the future and through facilitating the process collaboratively with autonomous, active, and willing followers (Tate, Munsell, & Love, 2006). The abilities to develop trust, analyze and assess situations, define reality from a variety of perspectives, and prescribe appropriate reactions for common and unique problems are key to successful leadership (Tate, Munsell, & Love, 2006). Leadership is a social influence process based on collective sense-making and leadership effectiveness is an outcome of communication in/competence (Hackman & Johnson, 2004). Leadership involves the creation and manipulation of symbolic messages to influence the social construction of reality, the development of relationships, and priming constituents’ responses/reactions. Research findings (Stogdill, 1974) suggest that leadership results from a transactional relationship between the leader/s and other group members (constituents), and this relational process may be observed in social interactive behaviors (Jago, 1982) enacting distinct patterns of symbolic interaction (Hackman & Johnson, 2004). The following basic research question was posed: How do leaders attempt to influence constituents in an actual instance of leadership?

Specific research questions were developed to obtain more knowledge about the actual communication methods used by leaders and the effects. Studies have revealed that self-reports
by leaders do not adequately represent actual practices (Heath, 2003; Howard, 1998). Generally, “highly effective” chief influence agents, such as exemplary teachers, do not know which behaviors actually make them highly influential (Hurt, 1984; Roloff & Kellermann, 1984). Since naturally occurring leadership behavior can be observed, recorded, and analyzed (Jago, 1982), this type of leadership “behaving” (Dervin, 2003) may be more useful and applicable for theory development.

Recently, researchers have encouraged a relational perspective for communication and leadership theory development (Barge, 2004; Dervin, 2003; Krippendorff, 1987; Lipman-Blumen, 1996). A relational inquiry toward social influence focuses on the way of thinking and acting socially and is responsive to the emerging communication context (Cotter & Cotter, 1999). Analyzing individuals sharing their knowledge and concerns, relating with one another and the group, and influencing each other addresses the transactional and transformational aspects of communication (Barge, 2004) and leadership (Lipman-Blumen, 1996). Barge (2004) noted “within relational inquiry, this moves persons to make choices of how to act in ways that are relationally [connected and] responsible” (p. 7) at local and global levels. Relational research has been significantly limited due to cultural bias and preferences in communication theory development (M. Kim, 2001, 2002) and leadership theory development (Lipman-Blumen, 1996). For traditional theories, leadership is conceptualized as “leaders versus followers” involving “a dyadic exchange between the person in a position of authority and individuals called followers” (Drath & Palus, 1994, p. 17). A contemporary pragmatic significance must be addressed: How do people actually attempt to make sense of situations with diverse others and how do they react to social knowledge or the lack thereof? Current research must complement culture-specific perspectives and feature a more global or “cosmopolitan” understanding. In a global context, the universal processes of social sense making and relating may be essential elements of a universal leadership communication theory.
Community has been defined as a connection of “multiple, diverse, interdependent populations of organizations” (Rosenkopf & Tushman, 1994, p. 410-411). Aristotle (1991) addressed the significance of community, the essential factor of civic discourse, and the basic notion “that communities are welded together by communication” (Depew & Peters, 2001, p. 3). Through civic discourse, humans “reveal the useful and the harmful, and the just and unjust” (Depew & Peters, 2001, p. 3-4). Even though Arnett (1986) provided a discussion twenty years ago regarding communication, ethics, and community, only until recently has an interest in community-building emerged from the field of Communication. For example, the Southern States Communication Association’s 75th Annual Convention theme focused on “Communication, Dialogue, and Community” (2005). Communication Yearbook 28 (Kalbfleisch, 2004) featured the issue “Communication and Community.” Heath and Frey (2004) acknowledged that collaboration as a relational process has “become a central feature of organizational and community” research and “communication scholars are in a unique position to illuminate the central principles and processes that enable collaboration [and community-building]” (p. 193). Another recent book entitled Communication and Community (Shepherd & Rothenbuhler, Eds., 2001) suggested community communication research should focus on enactments as constituents attempt to make sense of “our cooperative lives” (p. ix).

Natural and man-made disasters have created, are creating, and will create crisis situations. Weick’s (1988) and Theus’s (2004) research suggested inadequate collaborative sense-making of crisis situations promotes negative feelings and disorganization among constituents as well as may cause additional tragic events. Moreover, both concluded any forms of misleading or misinforming constituents that “the situation is under control” will eventually create mistrust, anger, and/or resentment. Ulmer, Sellnow and Seeger (2007) warned “[constituents] . . . are likely to be stunned, frightened, and depressed when enveloped by a crisis” (p. 4) and thereby weakening the organization’s or community’s sense of security,
confidence, and ability to sustain. Heath and Millar’s (2004) research acknowledged constituents generally depend upon “responsible parties” and leaders “to control actions or to create actions that reduce the harm of the crisis” (p. 9). Heath was concerned with a basic human need for and the development of shared understanding and civil order during crises events. He believed this process for “order is a rhetorical exigency” (Heath, 2004, p. 167). Preparedness is a key element of crisis management and gives the impression of order and control. A perceived crisis raises concerns among constituents “about the ability of the organization to plan and operate in ways that maintain or restore [operations] (Heath, 2004, p. 177).

Research focusing on effective actual, naturally occurring crisis management is rare. Case studies addressing poor crisis management are abundant. Specific descriptive theory and natural empirical research linking leadership communication behavior and social influence consequences are also limited (Snowden & Gorton, 2002) and, as a result, restrict leadership theory. Heath raised the research question: “What narrative structure leads through a set of events—past, present, and future—to transform the organization from an apparent or actual loss of control to the implementation or regaining of control?” Heath (2003) encouraged researchers to offer answers to the above question as well as investigate actual effective crisis management enactments.

Research Questions

Organizations, communities, and nations often “operate in uncertain, sometimes chaotic environments that are partly of their own creation; while leaders do not control events, they do influence how events are seen and understood” (p. xi). “The way” leaders facilitate and shape this process “creates certain opportunities and constraints for meaning making and action” (Barge, 2004, p. 4). Thus, this investigation is an attempt to analyze and discuss constituents’ discourse as they construct social reality, coordinate and manage meaning (Cronen, 1995; Pearce
& Cronen, 1980), and converge (Kincaid, 1987) during a public meeting convened to address
disaster preparedness.

The following three research questions were posed:

**RQ1:** What topics and themes structured ongoing meeting discourse?

**RQ2:** What frames did the leaders as chief influence agents use to influence constituents’
sense-making in an attempt to manage the meaning of a community crisis?

**RQ3:** How did assembled constituents of a community in crisis seek to achieve social
convergence?

**Preview of Chapters**

Literature associated with communication and the social construction of reality,
leadership as social influence, community building including the concept *kumiai*, and crisis
management are reviewed in Chapter II. The central theme of the literature review is leadership
communication as a means to influence constituents subtly or significantly by using discursive
messages to guide collective sense-making, develop social convergence, and manage a
community crisis. Methodology is discussed in Chapter III. This study focused on discourse
associated with symbolic social interaction and social construction. A rhetorical analysis (Condit
& Bates, forthcoming) of discourse focuses on the enacted social influence strategies and styles.
Three types of analyses are used in the investigation: a theme analysis (Bormann, 1986), frame
analysis (Goffman, 1974), and social influence/compliance style orientations analysis
(Nakanishi, 2003). Findings of the analyses are reported and discussed in Chapter IV. The
concept *kumiai* that emerged from the findings is addressed as well. Finally, conclusions,
limitations of the study, and suggestions for theory and philosophical development are provided
in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

*Communication is at the very heart of the leader-constituent relationship.*
J. Gardner, 1990

*People become leaders through the ability to manage meaning.*
Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996

Humans have an innate need to make sense of what happened, is happening, and will happen. Humans also need to relate with and influence others in order to survive, strive, and thrive. Consequently, from preaching to teaching and parenting to politicking, humans by nature and by design make sense of, relate with, and affect the knowledge, feelings, and behaviors of others (Barnlund, 1979; Casmir, 1994; Watzlawick, Beavin-Bavelas, & Jackson, 1967). Communicating through dialogic discourse is an agency for such activities (Bakhtin, 1981; Barge, 2001; Baxter & Montgomery, 1996; Bohm, 1990; Gudykunst & Kim, 1984). Dialogue provides a means to make social connections, collectively make sense of experience, and coordinate social interaction especially during times of crises. For communities that experience a crisis event, dialogic discourse may be an especially useful form of communication to understand, relate with, and influence others for community survival and sustainability. Leadership, as a group interaction and relational process, (Hackman & Johnson, 2004) may significantly influence sense-making, relationships, knowledge, feelings, behaviors, and the development of shared reality and sense of community among constituents. The key to successful leadership may be dependent upon directing sense-making through dialogic discourse.

We cognitively process stimuli, construct meaning, and structure reality in comprehensible, sensible, or useful ways (Casmir, 1994). However, we need and obtain starting points and guidelines to help us make sense of our worlds with others. Collective sense-making is an essential feature of groups such as families, organizations, communities, and nations. Collective sense-making involves co-creating and co-structuring social reality and is a means for developing collective identity, group security, and social confidence (Casmir, 1994). The
formation of a collective identity, common understanding, and coordinated action are "explicitly a product of discourse" (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998, p. 80). The symbolic representations and structures of reality as "organizational discourse functions to articulate contexts of meaning through which members are able to perceive and make sense out of their organization" (Mumby, 1994, p. 92-93). When constituents are encouraged to contribute to collective sense-making, it may create "emotional energy" (Westley, 1990), social appreciation (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1994, p. 72), a "we-attitude" (Tuomela, 2003, p. 1), an impression that the communicator regards the relationship (Nakanishi, 2003) and/or positive identification with the collective group (Cheney & Christensen, 2001).

As a complex system, communicating is a consequential transactional process (Cronen, 1995) that develops "structures of expectations" among participants and observers (Tannen, 1993, p. 15). Social construction is a theoretical approach that regards reality as being constructed from interactions with others and our environment; thus, reality is essentially based on a social context (Crotty, 1998). Casmir (1994), Mumby, (2004), and Weick (1995) suggested communication scholars should focus on ways organization members collectively engage in sense-making and construct their reality through symbols such as discourse. From an "archaic" definition, discourse was defined as "the process or power of reasoning" (answers.com, 2007). Currently defined as a noun, discourse is "a formal, lengthy discussion of a subject either written or spoken" and as a verb "to converse or narrate" (answers.com, 2007). A social construction perspective focuses on discourse features, patterns, processes, and products that arise from social interaction systems and recognizes symbols as a fundamental tool for constructing and changing social knowledge (Allen, 2005). Essentially, languages are tools created and crafted by humans that may be used to represent and elaborate concepts, organize shared experience, and chart the course of social reality. Discourse imposes order, coherence, and consistency as participants attempt to make sense of our social and physical world (Casmir, 1994).
Theoretical Concerns

Barry and Watson (1996) raised three significant issues pertaining to social influence research and theory development: existing social influence models have yet to integrate fully the mutual transformational effects of "agent" and "target" interaction; existing social influence models do not delineate tacit situational factors that affect the influence process; and finally, existing models of social influence address strategic episodes rather than the role of unconscious motivation and automatic responses. Research based on intentional, strategic, and rational orientations and one-way messaging limit our understanding of social influence and theory development. Barry and Watson (1996) suggested that social influence is a complex process, and intentional and unintentional, strategic and automatic, rational and intuitive, social and individual, and contextual factors should be acknowledged.

Leadership has been considered a special form of group influence but rarely from a communication perspective. However, communicating is the fundamental means by which to direct and influence others. Communication and leadership scholars Hackman and Johnson (2004) offered the following features of successful leaders: sensitive to clues and cues from their physical and social-cultural environments, adept at cognitively processing these clues and cues, soliciting and appreciating feedback, listening actively and processing messages accurately, establishing and maintaining relationships, and developing resourceful networks. According to Hackman and Johnson (2004), effective leaders "strike a balance between logic and emotion" because both are essential (p. 26). They suggested theory development associated with the enactment of emotional intelligence is necessary.

A persistent tradition is to frame communication theory from a rational, strategic perspective, rather than an intuitive and spontaneous interaction perspective. Kellermann (1992) suggested communication may be strategic; yet, it is primarily automatic and based on learned heuristics. In general, social influence research has been framed from a Euro-American, logical reasoning focusing on functional concerns such as individual goal-oriented and control of others.
From this persistent perspective, social scientists have a substantial history of studying communication processes by which humans attempt to persuade others and obtain behavioral compliance (Fillmore, 1981; Wheeless, Barraclough, & Stewart, 1983). For over fifty years, the dominant paradigm influencing persuasion research has been attitudes and attitude changes that precede behavior and behavior changes (Heath & Bryant, 1992). This study will provide an alternative perspective and highlight features of Eastern, Euro-American, and indigenous orientations that may be useful for social influence.

Another theoretical concern regards the complexity of dialogic communication enacted during common adult social influence gatherings such as meetings. Meetings as “acts of coming together” (Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 2000) are universal to groups, organizations, communities, and nations and include “talking circles,” state and school assemblies, association conferences, and tribal councils. According to Woodilla (1998), the most common language-based “institutional practices of Western organizing is the meeting” (p. 42). Studies suggest the meeting is a popular tool for accomplishing administrative tasks, collective decision-making and problem-solving as well as organizing sense-making (Woodilla, 1998). Meetings also provide opportunities to enact the organization/community/nation’s basic assumptions, values, vision, conceptualizations, rules, roles, and expectations (Brockstra, 1998). Meetings “generate the appearance that reason and logical processes are guiding discussions and decisions [and] facilitate . . . relationship negotiations, struggles, and commentary” (Schwartzman, 1989, p. 42). Public meetings, however, offer a “wild card” factor, the audience (McComas, 2001).

Successful public meetings have been equated with successful social interaction processes such as “knowing the audience” and custom-designing social interaction styles and rhetorical tactics to complement constituents’ needs, objectives, and expectations (McComas, 2001). A relational and task performance perspective suggests that genuine dialogue, improving relations, enhancing credibility, and collective sense-making/decision-making characterize
meaningful group meetings (McComas, 2001). Despite this knowledge, little research of actual practices illuminates this process.

For over fifty years, research supported the notion that social influence processes and outcomes such as leadership are dependent upon social behavior such as communicating (Back, 1951; Festinger, 1954; Kelley & Volkart, 1952; Rommetveit, 1953). The following basic research question—How do leaders attempt to influence constituents in an actual instance of leadership?—guided the literature review. The conceptual focus of this study is leadership as social influence behavior for directing/guiding interactive collective sense-making activities and collective action by discursive processes. The qualities of social influence/directing behaviors include language as manifest discourse and dialogue as sharing and listening to latent personal meanings that structure, connect, constrain, enable, and enact social influences and directed sense-making.

The literature review focuses on two major sections: 1) sense-making and social construction of reality by communicating and 2) leadership associated with community crisis management. Under the first section, the topics include Weick’s and Schein’s theories of organizing sense, Dervin’s sense-making methodology, frames of reference, co-orientation, communication competence, rhetoric, framing, and symbolic convergence. Under the second section, the topics include leadership theory, leadership competence, and effective leadership communication for community-building and crisis management. The literature review is representative of the deep and comprehensive investigation necessary for complex theory development and concept explication.

Collective Sense-Making and Social Construction of Reality by Communicating

_reality is a social construct, and language is its primary vehicle._
Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996

Humans have an innate need to make sense of their world, themselves, and others (Gamble & Gamble, 2002; Wheatley, 1998). Sense-making allows us to organize sensory stimuli for a sense of personal and social balance and functionality (Cialdini & Trost, 1998; Wheatley,
A fundamental means of making sense is through referential-perceptual processing (Nelson, 1985). The learning and use of symbols such as words allows the development of referential systems by which to make sense of stimuli and to share our understanding. We all acquire symbolic systems that permit the development of meaning (Whorf, 1956), the sharing of understanding (Conrad, 1983, 1990) and the development of social reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). According to Conrad (1983, 1990), symbolic systems allow us to define, describe, and explain events as well as structure worldview perspectives, provide cognitive orientations such as frames of reference and attitudes, and develop self-concepts. An essential, pervasive feature of human symbolic action is the construction of reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966).

Kreps (1990) defined reality as “a mediated construct derived from a subjective interpretation of phenomena that people create for themselves, based on their individual perceptions and cultural orientations” (p. 31). Reality can be defined as “an individual’s conceptions of the world” (Hawkins & Pingree, 1982, p. 224). An individual’s reality is an outcome of depth and diversity of constructs, classifications, frames of reference, interpretation, “cognitive path processing,” (Poole & Roth, 1989) and evaluation. Mumby (1994) explained, “a taken-for-granted social reality is created . . . through the continuous movement back and forth between sense and nonsense” (p. 10). Coping with this dynamic and constantly changing field of reality, interactors “develop consensual meanings among members, such that there is a shared sense of [structured, social] reality” (p. 10). Consequently, “social actors must frame ambiguous information in terms of what they already know ‘makes sense’” (p. 10). Common sense is derived by experiential learning such as enculturation/acculturation (Borden, 1991) or assimilation (Jablin & Kron, 1987). By sharing beliefs and “ways of responding to events and people” (Conrad, 1990, p. 8), constituents engage in collective sense-making of day-to-day situations.

Sense-making within social relationship systems, including communities and cultures, establishes, perpetuates, and transforms social reality, common sense, and perspectives that provide frames of references. Constituents of communities and relationships may be considered
diverse or identical depending upon the congruency and strength of shared reality (Conrad, 1990).
Sutcliffe (2001) concluded “organizations survive by making sense of and giving sense to their
environments” (p. 197). Consequently, constituents are motivated to attempt to change and/or
converge their diverse realities for the common good. Weick (1979) defined an organization as “a
body of thought thought by thinking thinkers” (p. 42). Van Maanen and Schein (1979)
conceptualized organizational socialization, or enculturation, as a process by which constituents
learn the values, norms, and required behaviors that permit them to participate as a member of an
organization. A sense of reality is acquired by patterns of day-to-day experiences as enactments
that reinforce policies and practices of the organizational culture (van Maanen & Schein, 1979).
Moreover, the creation of a particular reality is usually defined by those in authority and other
chief influence agents (Jablin, 1982; van Maanen, 1977). In sum, organized groups of individuals
“are constructed through the articulation of meaning as produced in communication” (Mumby,
1994, p. 21).

Weick's and Schein's Theories: Organizing Common Sense

preference for making sense, organizing chaos, eliminating nonsense, and managing uncertainty
for continued group survival, strival, and thrival. Effective communication is vital for personal
satisfaction as well as organizational success such as groups, teams, societies, bureaucracies, and
nations. Moreover, “effective communication is also relevant to managing rapid organizational
change” or crises (DiSanza & Legge, 2000, p. 16). Changes in the meaning of events, such as a
potential organizational crisis, usually stimulate attempts to acquire shared meaning or the
satisfaction of ambiguity (DiSanza & Legge, 2000).

Weick (1985a, 1985b, 1988) accentuated the continuous sense-making process groups
and organizations perform in order to cope with day-to-day situations. Sense-making complexity
and ambiguity are inherent to organized social systems. An organizing system requires adjusting
to changing or questionable conditions. Weick’s model of organizing described how constituents of an organizational system attempt to cope with equivocality.

Humans in a particular organizing system interact by communicating in cycles as an attempt to adjust and react to spontaneous sense-making activities. Weick (1979, 1995) offered a basic act-interact-double interact behavioral cycle. A message is conveyed intentionally or unintentionally; a receiver responds to the stimuli, and then the initial sender responds to the interactor. Thus, Weick (1979, 1995) hypothesized that members will attempt to make sense from each communication “act, interact, double-interact” cycle, thereby transforming their reality, developing and managing common sense, making decisions, and solving problems.

Weick (1990) acknowledged the significance of sense-making processing. For example, when sense-making becomes chaotic or nonsensical, accidents and mis-coordination of interactions can produce serious consequences. Weick (1990) reviewed analyses of large-scale disasters such as “Bhopal,” “Three Mile Island,” and “the Tenerife Air Disaster.” He noted the lack of knowledge or common sense created small failures in communication that ultimately became linked and multiplied. As a result of ineffective “common sensing” producing social system stress, crises were experienced. Weick’s research (1985a, 1985b, 1988, 1990) suggested that when human network systems become “tightly coupled,” the social interaction system regresses to habituated or familiar ways of responding as well as breakdowns of coordinated speech-exchange are noted. Misrepresentation of the situation and misunderstanding among interactors produced additional “man-made disasters.” Psychological stress, limitations of reaction repertoires, and individuation rather than collective sense-making greatly constrain options for considering, coping, and responding effectively to problems and threats. These problems and threats may advance to serious dilemmas as crisis situations. In short, “there is a breakdown of coordination” (Weick 1990, p. 124) of collective sense-making, collaborative interaction, and effective reaction.
Weick (1990) contended "organizations are built, maintained, and activated through the medium of communication. If meaning is misunderstood, the existence of the organization itself becomes more tenuous" (p. 126) and functionality may become unreliable. The lack of a common and correct understanding among constituents may become a significant weakness for sensing, adjusting, or managing situations, as well as a basic threat to the survival of the organization. Weick (1990) concluded that in the absence of awareness and understanding, "people must wait until some crisis actually occurs before they can diagnose [and solve] a problem, rather than be in a position to detect [and prevent] a potential problem" (p. 117).

Weick and Sutcliffe (2001) noted a key characteristic of a highly reliable organization (HRO) is the effective management of the unexpected. Another characteristic of HRO's is the enactment of complex collective sense-making and coordinated performance. During a nonsensical or crisis event, constituents have the authority to make sense of the situation and make decisions. Mindful autonomy is an important characteristic of an HRO (Weick, 1987). Organizations are mindful if they "notice the unexpected in the making" (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001, p. 3). Constituents converse about how to prevent or decrease the impacts of the events that may harm the organization (Horsley, 2005). In short, "HRO's notice issues early when they are still small and manageable" (Horsley, 2005, p. 6) and attempt to understand and explain the implications and impacts.

Weick's model of organizing intrigued Kreps (1980). As a result he tested the validity of Weick's hypothesis and confirmed the significance of "human communication . . . [as] a crucial organizational process in the performance of organizational tasks and the accomplishment of organizational goals" (p. 397). Kreps (1980) suggested that further study, such as content analysis into message variables, content features, as well as message patterns, may lead to "more in-depth conclusions about the nature of organizational communication in response to informational inputs" (p. 397) and crisis management. Bantz and Smith (1974) suggested that Weick's model of organizing may be useful for a general theory of communication because 1) a single set of
variables may be applicable at all levels of communicative behavior, 2) a single unified model can be created that will describe communicative behavior in a variety of contexts, 3) communicating behavior as well as structure may explain the communicative process, and 4) communicative acts are fundamental to social influence.

Similar to Weick’s philosophy, Schein (1985) reasoned that “the process of becoming a group is simultaneously 1) the growth and maintenance of relationships among a set of individuals who are doing something together and 2) the actual accomplishment of whatever they are doing” (p. 65). Developing a common language code representing shared conceptual categories promotes common understanding and consensus (Schein, 1985). Moreover, group boundaries established by inclusion and exclusion criteria, power and status, rewards and punishments, ideologies and missions provide qualities of group identity (Schein, 1985).

In particular, spirituality, hope, and religious ideology provide cognitive guidelines on “how to manage the unmanageable and explain the unexplainable” (Schein, 1985, p. 79). Narratives supporting values and underlying beliefs and assumptions provide evidence of articulated ideology (Meyer, 2003). Schein (1985) acknowledged group assumptions offer “a set of filters or lenses that help us to focus on and perceive the relevant portions of our environment” (p. 83). Moreover, “without such filters and lenses, we would experience overload and uncertainty” (p. 83) likely causing anxiety and confusion. The development of common frames of reference stabilize the sense-making process for constituents, thereby “solv[ing] external survival and internal integration problems . . . and reduc[ing] the anxiety inherent in any new or unstable situation” (p. 83).

Schein (1985) stated “a key part of every culture is a set of assumptions about what is ‘real’ and how one determines or discovers what is real” (p. 88). Generally, “a social definition becomes the only sound basis for judgment. It is in this area that we are most susceptible to discomfort and anxiety if we do not have a common way of deciphering what is happening and how to feel about it” (p. 91). Assumptions and expectations of human relationships are associated
with "assumptions about human nature, the nature of the external environment, and the nature of truth and reality" (p. 104). For example, the nature of human activity may be predominately based on a "proactive doing orientation," a "reactive being orientation," or a "harmonizing being-in-becoming orientation" (Schein, 1985, p. 133). Western as Euro-American cultures have been characterized as "doing"-oriented, autonomous, and controlling nature and others. Eastern cultures as "being"-oriented and harmonious with nature and others (Hofstede, 1980, 1997). Indigenous cultures may be characterized as "reactive-being"-oriented, subordinate to nature, and communal.

Groups such as families, organizations, communities, and nations may be defined and evaluated as healthy, reliable, and functional by the language constituents used to characterize their reality (Hogan, 1998a). These groups are organized and nourished by rhetorical discourse and may become unified or divided by rhetoric and the absence of rhetoric (Hogan, 1998a). Schein (1985) asserted an organization’s communicative "adaptive coping cycle" affects the "health" of the organization system. He suggested that organizations must develop the ability to make collective sense, share that sense at an appropriate time, and "make the necessary transformations in strategy, goals, and means" (p. 104) for organizational unity and survival.

In particular, the nature of human relationship is "at the core of every culture" and determines "the proper way for individuals to relate to each other in order to make the group safe and comfortable" (Schein, 1985, p. 104). In particular, Schein (1985) recommended leaders must be adept at coping with crisis by engaging in proper ways for constituents to engage with each other and use the proper language to make collective sense and make the necessary adjustments to decrease the negative impacts of a crisis.

Cultural Reality Preferences

As common as sense-making occurs, there is no universal common sense. From a Western perspective, Gioia and Chittipeddi (1991) conceptualized sense-making as the reciprocal exchange of beliefs for strategic information seeking, meaning ascription, and action. Drucker
(1974) differentiated Western and Eastern conceptualizations of sense-making. In general, Westerners prefer reducing sense-making to problem-solution decisions whereas Easterners prefer expanding sense-making from a complex cyclic understanding. He explained:

In the West, the emphasis is on the answer to the question. Indeed, our books on decision-making try to develop systematic approaches to giving and answering. To the Japanese, however, the important element in decision-making is defining the question. The important and crucial steps are to decide whether there is a need for a decision and what the decision is about (pp. 466-467).

Japanese aim at attaining consensus about the situation before they attempt to make decisions or solve problems. Thus, “the whole process is focused on finding out what the decision is really about, not what the decision should be” (Drucker, 1974, p. 467)

Skillful use of messages for intended effectiveness in the context of diversity can be challenging. However, the skillful use of symbols can increase reality and relation convergence according to Bormann, Burke, and Fisher (Cragan & Shields, 1995). When people are interacting by association, they are forming a system or subsystems (Cherry, 1961). Systems adjust and adapt for survival (Bertalanffy, 1968) and thus are responsive, interactive, and dynamic within themselves and with their environment (Harris, 1993; Tubbs, 2001). Blumer (1966) suggested human relations are like a system whereby “the participants fit their acts together, first by identifying the social acts in which they are about to engage, and second, by interpreting and defining each others’ acts in forming the joint act.” (p. 540).

Recent research suggested that social reality and reactions can be strategically engineered (Dervin, 2003) by “utilizing economic, communication, and educational strategies” (Kotler, Roberto, & Lee, 2002, p. 19). Kellermann and Lim (1989) warned that “message producers have the ability to create the very knowledge structures that will provide the inferences in processing future messages” (p. 122) and may be accomplished by “priming” (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999; Price, Tewksbury, and Powers, 1997), “structuration” (Poole et al., 1996) and
“framing” (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2002). For example, messages addressing similarity of two different and not directly associated phenomena can create incorrect inferences and could have serious consequences (Kellermann & Lim, 1989). Managing the “flow of ideas” for sense-making can be accomplished by a “local management approach to message design (O’Keefe & Lambert, 1995, p. 54).

_Dervin’s Sense-Making Methodology_

For Dervin (2003) among others, the agency of communicating is considered “at the very cutting edge of the study of the human condition” (p. 103). Dervin (2003) addressed communication as a verb associated with sense-making and dialogic interaction. Dervin’s sense-making methodology identified communicating as a fundamental function of human interaction for structuring sense-making, relating with others, and motivating actions. Dervin acknowledged the significance of message effects, influenced sense-making, and consequences of “gaps in knowledge.” Sense-making methodology focuses on “articulated realms of . . . being” (Dervin, 2003, p. 143) which reveal the dynamics and differences featured in “our inner and outer worlds of existence” (Foreman-Wernet, 2003, p. 7). Sense-making methodology focuses on “the flow of events” (p. 141) whereby “ordinary human beings are . . . theory makers” (p. 143) who attempt to develop a “new kind of understanding” for specific contexts or a communication episode as “specific situated moments in time-space (p. 113). Sense-making methodology focuses on how people make sense of their world in different as well as common communicative ways.

For Dervin (2003), communication is a “cognitive and behavioral event occurring within a cultural/societal system that is primarily the product of past and present cognitive/behavioral events” (p. 55). Through dialogue, individuals attempt to “wholly engage,” “flow,” or integrate their reality with others. As a result, communicating may converge individual realities and create a common shared reality. Dervin (2003) claimed “the universal human mandate [is] to make meaning” (p. 54). Significantly, the phenomena of making meaning can be “generalizable across contexts” (Dervin, 2003, p. 55). Since experienced life is inherently changing, reality is
constantly changing as well. The individual attempts to make “new sense” from new information and knowledge, old sense, nonsense, as well as someone else’s sense. Key factors influencing the sense-making process and consequential beliefs and behaviors include sensory and cognitive ability as well as willingness and motivation to obtain and use knowledge.

Research should focus “on acts of connecting and disconnecting, constructing and deconstructing, imagining and changing, on the communicatings which connect and disconnect individuals, culture, institutions, society” (Dervin, 2003, p. 170). Moments of conveying and interpreting meaning “[are] actualized in behaviors” (p. 170). These sense-making behaviors are invented by humans to serve their needs such as socially and cognitively adjusting and co-orientating to particular times and places (Dervin, 2003). For example, meetings provide a set of conventions, routines, and are frequently ritualized. Investigating common connecting and sense-making acts such as meetings may prove productive and useful. The systematic identification of communicative behavings may prove fruitful for the understanding of social influence in general and collective sense-making in particular. Dervin (2003) suggested that an understanding of how interactors systematically facilitate pluralistic input may be useful and important to communication theory development.

Reality is significantly shaped by socially influenced learning in the form of enculturation (primary learning) and acculturation or re-education (secondary learning) that provide shared “mental programming” (Hofstede, 1997). Social reality fosters shared understanding or common sense by aligning individual realities for shared sense of the world and practical common sense. Attempting to construct a common sense of reality with others creates a sense of communion and may develop a community (Arnett, 1986).

As common and complex as sense-making is, “everyday sense-making is not a matter of trying to make total sense of everything . . . [and] it’s not usually conscious and deliberate” (Wallemacq & Sims, 1998 p. 121). Making sense is an idiosyncratic, cognitive phenomenon.
involving perceptual selection, attention, interpretation, evaluation, and drawing conclusions. This complex process is significantly influenced by communication within and with others.

**Social Cognition and Communication**

For many communication scholars including Roloff and Berger (1982) "social cognition is a particularly important process involved in all types of communication phenomenon" (p. 9). Basically, social cognition “is thought focused on human interaction” (p. 11) and results from people attempting to understand their environment and experiences. Jablin (1982) suggested research exploring and explaining “communication and social cognition in organizations might benefit from focusing more on how organizations, particularly managers [and leaders] manipulate the ‘stuff’ of thought” such as symbols, frames, themes, and co-orientation “to create socially shared realities and facilitate organizationally desired outcomes” (p. 280). According to Kreps (1990), “communication is a symbolic activity that people engage in to help interpret and influence their social world . . . understand diverse phenomena and increase the predictability of life” (p. 13). A shared reality allows collectives to construct a feeling of control and management of their lives (Conrad, 1990, p. 8) and an organized sense of self, others, and their world.

Most definitions and conceptualizations of communication either explicitly or implicitly address sense-making processes. For over four decades, McCroskey (2001) has maintained a basic definition of communication as the “process of one person stimulating meaning in the mind of another by means of a message” (p. 21). For Beebe, Beebe, and Ivy (2004), “human communication is the process of making sense out of the world and sharing that sense with others by creating meaning through verbal and nonverbal messages” (p. 5). Listening to sensory stimuli such as spoken and unspoken expressions and environmental conditions are essential to sense-making. Functionally, perceiving and interpreting messages provide a degree of organized sense and organized reality that enables us to understand and relate with natural and supernatural experiences.
Making sense of our experiences is a dynamic, ubiquitous achievement (Wallemacq & Sims, 1998). When we communicate with others, our sense of reality may slightly or significantly transform (Hewes, 1995; Shank, 1982). When communicating with others, we activate meaning-making and sense-making as micro-cognitive processes and attempt to construct a shared interpretation of reality as a macro-cognitive process. Consequently, communicating with others affects our sense-making activities, thereby developing a unique version of reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). However, to some extent, constructing shared meaning is dependent upon "a momentary, partially shared interpretive frame" (O'Keefe & Delia, 1985, p. 68).

An intriguing communication effect is the formulation of an individual's sense of reality which limits or frames reality for subsequent "common sense" making. Social reality is an individual's sense of the world influenced by social interaction. Construction of reality and knowledge is ongoing and is "the product that results as a person interprets the behavior—verbal and nonverbal—of another" (Heath & Bryant, 1992, p. 50-51). Through mutual understanding and/or the acknowledgment and acceptance of similarities and differences in shared meanings, coordinated behavior is possible (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996).

Fundamentally and functionally, humans prefer to construct satisfying meanings to cope with their physical surroundings, social-psychological situations, and circumstances (Duck, 1994). Communicating activates the meaning-making and sense-making process that generates one's personal reality as well as for collective groups. Moreover, communication is an "adaptive mechanism for humanity . . . [which] helps people to respond to threats to their existence" (Kreps, 1990, p. 18). By communicating, humans can collectively solve problems, make day-to-day decisions, form, perform, and transform organizations, as well as "enabl[e] the organization leader to direct the organization . . . chang[e] tasks, conditions, and environmental constraints" (Kreps, 1990, p. 19). Fundamentally, communication affects cognitive processing, provokes feelings, and activates behaviors. In short, communication affects interactors subtly and significantly. Beebe, Beebe, and Ivy (2004) acknowledged "the ever-present potential for
misunderstanding” of expressions can be diminished by effective and appropriate communication that is “other-oriented” and acknowledged “the perspective of others not just the creator of the message” (p. 5).

**Frames of reference.** During acts of communicating sense and meaning, people interpret messages from particular tacit frames of reference. Redding (1972) postulated humans respond to messages based on selective perception and personal frames of reference that influence interpretations and meanings. Thus, individual receivers may interpret the same message differently by selecting, rejecting, or disregarding particular messages as well as interpreting the message from different and preferred frames of reference (Bormann, Knutson, & Musolf, 1997; Liebes & Katz, 1986; McLwraith & Schallow, 1983; Schutte & Ciarlante, 1998). For example, multiple effects of a single message, such as “that blouse is very becoming to you” may be interpreted as a compliment, sexual harassment, or pleasant flirtation (Bingham, 1991). Witte (1995) concluded people process the same message from different frames of reference, thus explaining variations in persuasion effectiveness and research findings. Witte (1995) suggested that a “danger control” framed message is effective for some receivers but not all. Among high self-efficacy receivers, they interpret messages from personal susceptibility and threat severity frames of reference. Whereas, receivers who predominantly are low in self-efficacy, insecure, or perceive a high threat are more receptive to messages that focus on ways to avoid, prevent, or cope with the threat.

Furthermore, sense-making is frequently driven by heuristic frames of reference such as expectations, familiarity, and plausibility rather than elaborated likelihood accuracy (Di Vesta, 1974; Weick, 1995). For example, Jablin and Kramer (1998) suggested that transferred employees develop different knowledge and assessments of organizational reality based on met or unmet expectations of organizational support and sense of community. Negative assessments were based on unmet expectations and “less knowledge” of “task communication strategies” or lack of community. Moreover, transferred employees who limited their exposure to
organizational dialogue and discourse or who had unrealistic expectations associated with their employment were less successful adjusting to their new social reality. Whereas, transferred employees who accepted and adopted social reality associated with employment dialogue and discourse generally had a more successful adjustment to their new social reality and an easier time adapting to the new organizational community.

Co-orientation. Research by Eisenberg, Monge, and Farace (1983) offered a means to bridge diverse frames of references. They suggested that co-orientation to another’s frame of reference may activate sense-making convergence. Co-orientation acknowledges another’s reality and attempts to identify differences in reality as well as accurately identify “common ground” and “common sense.” According to Kim (1982), cognitive co-orientation can be conceptualized into three major areas related to frames of reference: quality or characteristics of form and function, meaning, and evaluation. Therefore, for co-orientation, individuals must attempt to accurately assess another’s reality based on the other’s interpretations of these basic criteria. Co-orientation can be examined from both an antecedent and consequent of speech communication (Kim, 1982) and for the evaluation of relationship dis/satisfaction (Heath, 1994). It has been applied in topics such as public policy (Hesse, 1976; Neuwirth, 2000), interpersonal communication (Fields & Schuman, 1976, Purnine & Carey, 1999; Steeves, 1984) and organizational conflict dynamics (Papa & Pood, 1988).

An interesting form of co-orientation is Eisenberg’s conceptualization of “jamming.” Eisenberg (1990) contended that “jamming,” as “fluid behavioral coordination unhindered by expectations of self-revelation” (p. 146), encourages harmonious collaboration for effective social coordination, cooperation, and individuation. Rather than the use of multiple musicians who attempt to harmonize, jamming could be considered the harmonious use of multiple dialogues attempting to harmonize. Instead of musical language, instruments, and scores, Eisenberg’s “jamming” uses dialogue and non-scripted discourse. Social convergence by means of jamming may also be considered a capitalization of shared “fund-a-mentals” or a collection of realities.
This is especially beneficial when interacting with diverse individuals (Eisenberg, Monge, & Farace, 1983).

Moreover, Eisenberg (1990) claimed “diversity need not impede effective organization; coordinated action can often be more important than coordination of beliefs” (p. 145). Eisenberg (1990) concluded that “either too much or too little consensus can be dysfunctional” (p. 144) and that “effective organization . . . requires management of a dialectic between autonomy and interdependence” (p. 145). From a humanistic perspective, Eisenberg (1990) suggested “the ultimate measure of communicative success is the degree to which members establish and maintain a balance between autonomy and interdependence and consequently secure a sense of meaning and [common] purpose” (p. 160). Consequently, by sharing a common orientation, constituents who do not agree on particular perspectives, boundaries, problems, issues, solutions, and beliefs can experience some sense of bond and agree to a common end state.

Co-orientation or simultaneous orientation of one’s own reality orientation with another’s reality orientation, or lack thereof, may affect the perception of communication competence and subsequent reality convergence or divergence effectiveness.

*Howell’s Levels of Communication Competence*

Howell (1982) theorized that the sense-making process can be deliberate and conscious but is more likely subconscious and intuitive (Howell, 1982). He contended humans generally rely on intuition to interpret meaning from messages as well as convey meaning from messages. Howell (1982) defined intuition as “the production of answers without conscious processing of data” (p. 7). In short, intuition may be regarded as “out-of-awareness rationality.” Intuitive reasoning may be affected by feelings, attitudes, and moods such as fear, anger, surprise, frustration, loneliness, optimism, stress, and sense of efficacy. He concluded “communication that produces desired results and causes participants to feel good about the experience and the outcome is both pragmatic and humane” (1982, p. iii). Well-developed or resourceful communicators effectively influence others by intuitively conveying meaning by messages,
interpreting meaning from messages, and responding with "wise spontaneous responses." Howell (1982) suggested the necessary resource for extraordinary communication competence is intuitive sense-making and responding. He concluded that social "interactive skills" are developed from non-scripted communication and unique experiences rather than scripted communication and routine experiences.

Howell (1982) offered five levels of communication competence based on different levels of conscious cognitive processing, sense-making and understanding, and communicative behavior: unconscious incompetence, conscious incompetence, unconscious competence, conscious competence, and subconscious super-competence. The fifth level, super intuitive competent communication, features confidence, empathy, harmonious integration, and skilled interaction as "flow," "out-of awareness" reasoning, "disciplined spontaneity and unscripted interaction," thus enabling the communicator "to respond quickly and sensibly to unexpected developments" (Howell, 1982, p. 41). Howell concluded communication competence is ever present, situational, and significantly associated with leadership and fellowship. For over two millennia's, communication competence study and practice has traditionally been associated with rhetoric.

Theories of Rhetoric

Rhetoric has been interpreted to mean "the faculty of discovering, in any given case, the available means of persuasion (Aristotle, 1991, p. 36) and "the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols" (Burke, 1966). For over twenty-five hundred years, Aristotle's Rhetorical Theory has proved its merit. According to Oliver (1971), "a widely accepted encapsulated definition of rhetoric is 'the function of adjusting ideas to people and people to ideas'" (p. 6).

Aristotle provides insightful knowledge of the human condition and behaviors that allow humans to collectively survive, strive, and thrive. Aristotle's theories and ideas have provided the framework for scientific logic, theory building and delivery, concept development and
elaboration, cognitive processing, and effective social influence. He was particularly astute regarding the strategic construction of reality and social influence. Aristotle approached rhetoric from a social psychology perspective and advised communicators to discover the relationships that may be manifested among the reality of the matter under consideration, the motives and goals of the communicator, and the needs, susceptibilities, emotions, attitudes, and limitations of the listeners. Motive appeals must make sense to the listeners and be accepted as relevant and possible.

Aristotle warned “rhetoric is a combination of analytic knowledge and knowledge of characters and that on the one hand it is like dialectic, on the other like sophistic discourses” (1991 p. 53). Aristotle conceptualized civic discourse to be designed for practical and specific purposes. He also promoted the appreciation of its strategic value to discuss everyday questions, concerns, issues, conflicts, and crises requiring social coordination of meaning and cooperative action. From Book 1, Aristotle addressed topics of interest that may be advantageous for effective deliberative rhetoric. From Kennedy’s translation of Aristotle (1991), “the most important subjects on which people deliberate and . . . which deliberative orators give advice in public are mostly five in number and these are finances, war and peace, national defense, imports and exports, and the framing of laws” (p. 53). As resources for human survival and thrival, these topics refer to basic physical, safety-security, and social support needs.

model is high-context focused (particular individuals at a particular point in time involving particular circumstances) and is holistic. Rhetorical “form, substance, and matter cannot be separated” (p. 27). Cheng (1987) explained, “[s]ymbolism illuminates our human interpretations of experience at a given point in time, our sequential experiences of similar events tend to enrich our understanding of the [multiple meanings possible] of the symbolism” (p. 43). Experience and symbolism are interdependent, incomplete, and limiting and yet can provide “entry points” for “our enlightenment.”

According to Moss (1995) “[r]hetoric has been said to have had its origin in the Greek word meaning to flow” (p. 132). Moss’s discussion argued that a rhetor directs the flow of thought and speech. Carbone offered fundamental rhetorical positions including the proper manner of approaching a subject is by providing a definition of the term/s for elucidation (Moss, 1995). The perceived cause is the power that creates effects. Causes are complicated systems of internal materials components, formations, end states, and external agents. According to Cicero, when internal systems are activated by external conditions “[t]he result is an effect, an event” (Moss, 1995, p. 134). Carbone interpreted Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric as “the power of seeing what can be persuasive in any subject matter; or the power whereby one perceives what is probable in any subject matter” (Moss, 1995, p. 135). Moreover, Moss extended Carbone’s interpretation of Aristotle’s rhetoric by offering the significance of “the intuitive character” of rhetoric (p. 146).

Asian cultures are motivated and expect unity and harmony whereas Euro-American cultures are motivated and expect supremacy and competition. Asian cultures favor reality by interrelated entirety whereas Euro-American cultures favor “truth” by comparative analysis. Asians prefer a systems approach and Euro-Americans an identifiable, division approach. Asian cultures characterize a speaker’s ethos as competent, rectitude, sincerity, mindful, and benevolent. Ethical appeals speak to the common good and on the desire to prevent psychological, social, and physical harm to others. For people who value social relations and social harmony, concern for
other's and the relationship or collective are in their minds. Whereas for people who value autonomy and competition, concern for self and defeating another or others are their primary preferences.

According to Aristotle, an effective rhetor must identify, intuitively, or mindfully, the best available options to influence a particular group of individuals that is experiencing a particular situation for a preferred shared outcome. Oliver (1971) attempted to address contemporary rhetorical theory as Euro-American and Christian biased. He acknowledged “the kinds of ideas that interest or move people and the reasons why they accept or reject them are not universals; they are particular attributes of specific cultures” (p. 7).

Enthymemes. Aristotle (1960, 1966, 1973, 1991) realized that language is related to the process of thought and the communication of ideas, attitudes, and feelings. Aristotle examined a variety of possible evidence or proofs. He acknowledged the most influential determinants of human sense-making are the mental models which exist in the minds of the audience and not necessarily in the minds of the rhetor. Translated, enthymeme literally refers to “in thy minds.” In essence, Aristotle intended enthymemes to refer to pre-existing belief systems and cognitive heuristic devices that provide basic common reality assumptions that are used as frames of reference. Green (1995) argued that the error of misinterpreting Aristotle’s enthymeme “has been corrected before, and the correction has been ignored” (p. 19). This error is “the mistake of thinking that Aristotle’s enthymeme is a rigidly deductive form of inferential reasoning” (p. 19). Green (1995) supported his interpretation by beginning with Aristotle’s single reference to this basic but abstract cognitive concept. Green (1995) stated “in Prior Analytics at 2.27, 70a10, he calls the enthymeme ‘a syllogism from probabilities or signs’” (p. 21).

Enthymemes, as “in the mind” frames, are rhetorical inductions of the listener. Enthymemes may be used to direct the activation and processing of sense-making and thus are efficient available means for social influence. The contemporary study of memes as memetic theory or memetics is a resurrected scholarly interest in enthymemes as cultural truisms. The
study of memes is "the study of 'cultural evolution,' the spread of ideas, tunes, fashions, engineering method, etc., and the failure of some to propagate" (Underwood, 2003, p. 1) as well as the transformation and termination of cultural truisms. Memes are associated with social influence as in the forms of priming and propaganda. The study of memes is the study of culture's common sense or basic assumptions on the macro level and the study of individual intelligence and semantic space on the micro level.

Using examples that are familiar to a particular social-cultural group and cultural belief truisms can be effective artistic proofs. Aristotle suggested that the evaluation of proofs is assessed by the goodness or badness test. This assessment is based on human values such as wisdom and expediency for usefulness and goodness of knowledge; virtue as excellence and aesthetics; and goodwill and fair-mindedness. The arguments an orator or communicator selects should appeal to reason (logos), emotions and psychological needs and motivations such as pleasure (pathos) and credibility and goodwill (ethos) as well as human external compulsion, misfortune, and individual character, habits, concerns and contemplation's, and impulses.

In short, constructing new knowledge and changing existing knowledge may be accomplished by framing an "enthymemic" or "pre-programmed" topic present in the mind of the audience and connecting it with new information. Consequently, enthymemes are an especially significant factor of social influence and a useful means for persuasion.

Aristotle's topics. Aristotle (1991) suggested the importance of discovering the existing concerns and issues associated with the audience and thereby allowing the rhetor to frame discourse with common, popular, and/or relevant topics. In Book II, Chapter 12-17, Aristotle discussed human characteristics such maturity, wealth, and fortune including good upbringing, education and enculturation, power, and status. For effective social influence, a communicator must adapt to the characteristics of the receivers. In particular, the characteristics related to chronological age and maturity (youthful, prime, and elderly), frame of mind as frames of knowledge reference, and reasons why particular beliefs and feelings are present.
Frames of reference are based on *koina* or discerning conditional assessment dimensions such as 1) happening: possible or impossible, 2) significance: more or less, 3) goodness or badness. In particular, the attribution of goodness or badness is relevant to outcomes of happiness or sadness, justice or injustice, health or ill, beauty or ugly, wealth or destitute, friendship and love or foe and hatred, pleasure or pain, honor or disgrace, competence or incompetence, and disadvantages to enemies or advantages to enemies. Moreover, “evils that bring men together when the same thing is harmful to both groups” is judged good unless it is in excess and then it is bad (Aristotle, 1991, p. 65). For example, a war may be regarded as good or bad.

On war and peace, Aristotle contended “know . . . with whom there is probability of war . . . for the security of the state it is necessary to observe all these things (national defense, food supplies, exports, and imports) but not least to be knowledgeable about legislation for the safety of the city is in its laws” (Aristotle, 1991, p. 54). Practical wisdom is based on the common sense to achieve outcomes that are productive and protective for human survival. Practical wisdom is “good” and the comparison of good is based on the productiveness for “the greater good” (Aristotle, 1991, p. 69). Effective social influence is based on the assessment of the three dimensions above as well as broad basic assumptions ranging from paradigms, maxims, and syllogism.

Aristotle addressed cognitive complexity. He acknowledged a broad, deep-based knowledge system is a means for communicator resourcefulness, attribution of intelligence, and essential aspect of effective social influence. Knowledge of a society’s “common sense” is necessary for effective social affairs and influence. Aristotle addressed appeals for various human feelings, human characteristics such as age, status, physical appearance, and moral qualities. He suggested that the orator should immediately develop a common understanding with and among the audience by addressing concepts and definitions, enthymemes, and conditions of possible-impossible, significant-insignificant, and good-bad. Aristotle also warned that premises must be
in accordance with the audience’s view of the world or the group’s “common sense” in order for the arguments and appeals to be understood and accepted.

Numerous rhetoricians and the social construction perspective have addressed the significance of symbols. Ancient Greeks such as Isocrates and Aristotle addressed the power of language. From a social construction perspective, Deetz, Tracy, and Simpson (2000) argued “the power of language instruments (missions, metaphors, stories, etc.) lies not only in their rhetorical ingenuity but also in their power to constitute and normalize reality” (p. 74). The rhetorical power of language may function as an “insidious type of [social] control” (Deetz, Tracy, & Simpson, 2000). Social control includes “clan and cultural” beliefs, values, norms, and social practices as social reality and ideologies (Deetz, 1997).

Language

Language has been defined as “a unified system of symbols that permits a sharing of meaning” (Gamble & Gamble, 2005, p. 114). Generally, language is regarded as “nonrandom verbal symbolization” (Stohl & Redding, 1987, p. 452) that “affects our lives powerfully” (Burgoon & Miller, 1985, p. 199). Whorf (1956) regarded the power of language as representing an individual’s reality as well as the “mass mind.” Moreover, for Whorf and others, “language is the factor that limits free plasticity and rigidifies channels of development” (p. 156).

Burke (1969; Burke & Gusfield, 1989) considered the use of language as a distinguishing quality of the human condition in particular because it is “emotionally loaded” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005), signifies personal motives, and attempts to persuade (1969). Burke conceptualized rhetoric as “the use of language to form attitudes and influence action” (Bizzell & Herzberg, 1990, p. 989). For Burke, rhetoric was a form of symbolic action and “is rooted in an essential function of language itself... the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation” (Foss, Foss, & Trapp, 1991 p. 173). Burke regarded the power of language as a means for expressing motives and stimulating action, and for others social integration and social convergence (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000; Bormann, 1986; Deetz, 1995; Kincaid, 2002).
Another aspect of the power of language is constructing “an effective community of minds” by forming a shared frame of reference (Foss, Foss, & Trapp, 1991, p. 124). For example, English language words such as *dog, love, grapevine, bar, gay,* and *clean* may have multiple meanings as well as positive and negative evaluations. For Bonvillain (1997) among others, “Cultural realities and ideologies provide frameworks for understanding the physical and social worlds we live in. These models are implicitly and explicitly transmitted through language . . . [and] reveal underlying assumptions, interests, and values” (p. 74) and expectations. Language may be considered powerful as “a strategy for encompassing a situation” (p. 177) as well as a influencing impressions of powerful and powerless communication style (Hosman & Siltanen, 1994) and leadership style (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996). Moreover, the use of language may be powerful because it permits identification with another and segregation from another (Burke, 1969).

For Hosman (2002), “persuasive messages contain various elements, but one of the most critical is language” (p. 371). Hosman (2002) addressed the complexity of language such as lexical diversity as “vocabulary richness or vocabulary range” (p. 374), language imagery, vividness, intensity, equivocality, and powerful and powerless language. Hosman (2002) suggested two avenues for language theory development. One addressed the process of impression associated with sense-making and language. The other is “to conduct more theoretically grounded research” of language message effects that provide cognitive explanations. Both research avenues focus on the fundamental process of sense-making and suggest that language variables activate dual cognitive processing such as biasing and elaborating. Hosman (2002) recommended focusing on how language elements and variables influence cognitive changes among listeners. In short, Hosman (2002) suggested the need to investigate and develop a general language theory explaining how language influences interpretations, impressions, and the construction of reality.
Framing

According to Tannen (1993), “ever since its introduction by Gregory Bateson in *A Theory of Play and Fantasy* (1972), the concept of framing has been researched from a variety of disciplines and perspectives including anthropology (Bateson, 1972; Hymes, 1974), communication (Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967), sociology (Goffman, 1974, 1981), sociolinguistics (Fillmore, 1976; Gumperz, 1982), social psychology (Kahnemann, 1984; Rhoads, 1997), artificial intelligence (Minsky, 1975; Schank & Abelson, 1977), political science (Nelson, Oxley, & Clawson, 1997; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000), and mass media (Iyengar & Simon, 1993; Reese, Gandy, & Grant (Eds.), 2001; Scheufele, 1999). It has been described as a fractured paradigm (Entman, 1993); nevertheless, the commonality among researchers of framing is the notion of “structures of expectations” (Tannen, 1993). D’Angelo (2002) contended “there is not, nor should there be, a single paradigm of framing. Rather, knowledge about framing has accumulated because the research program encourages researchers to employ and refine many theories about the framing process under the guidance of distinct paradigmatic perspectives on the relationship between frames and framing effects” (p. 871).

Kaufman, Elliott, and Shmueli (2003) explained frames “as cognitive shortcuts that people use to help make sense of complex information. Frames help us to interpret the world around us and represent that world to others. They help us organize complex phenomena into coherent, understandable categories. When we label a phenomenon, we give meaning to some aspects of what is observed, while discounting other aspects because they appear irrelevant or counter-intuitive. Thus, frames provide meaning through selective simplification by filtering people's perceptions and providing them with a field of vision for a problem” (paragraph 1).

From a social psychology perspective, Rhoads (1997) defined “a frame [as] a psychological device that offers a perspective and manipulates salience in order to influence subsequent judgment” (p. 1). Perceived information is “organized and resized to fit within the parameters established by the frame. The frame not only contains, but constrains” (Rhoads, 1997,
p. 1). From a mass media perspective, Crowder (2004) described framing “as the way events and issues are organized and made sense of, especially by the media and its audience” (p.1). Weick and Ashford (2001) associated framing with learning. They contended “learning is shaped by interpretations driven by particular frames of reference” (2001, p. 723) which can hinder or enhance organizational learning.

Bateson suggested frames allow individuals to focus on “the level of abstraction at which any message is intended” (Tannen, 1993, p. 18) for efficient learning, critical thinking, and theory building. Discourse scholars Putnam & Fairhurst (2001) described framing as referring to “worldviews, fields of vision, or perspectives for managing meaning” (p. 90). Studies by Tversky and Kahneman (1981) examined how trivial changes in the framing of information can substantially alter sense-making and decision-making due to the application of judgmental heuristics. Frames “play a crucial role in creating and normalizing [constituents’] experience” (Deetz, Tracy, & Simpson, 2000, p. 67-68).

Framing and its effects are generally considered significant factors related to social-influenced sense-making and social-reality construction. Aristotle and Cicero recognized the significance of framing and referred to this rhetorical technique as “stasis” (Pratkanis & Aronson, 1992). Status or stasis refers to “a series of steps or questions to ask which [frame] the heart of the matter” (Kennedy, 1972, p. 117). Framing as a rhetorical technique was suggested by Aristotle (1991) in the form of topics “as strategies of argument” (p. 45). Aristotle (1991) suggested framing civic topics by “finances, war and peace, national defense, imports and exports, and the framing of laws.” For ethical topics, he suggested framing discourse with “the constituent parts of happiness, such as friendship, good children . . . virtues of the body [health, beauty, strength, stature, athletic prowess], reputation, honor, good luck, and virtue” (p. 15). Aristotle (1991) also recommended the use of topics associated with “good” such as natural talent, knowledge, the ability to speak and act, justice, courage, wisdom, self-control, gentleness, honor, life and “the
greater good" (p. 16). Aristotle's framing list may be interpreted as universal and significant to indigenous, Asian, and Euro-American realities.

Entman (1993) described "framing" as selecting "some aspects of a perceived reality and mak[ing] them more salient in a communicating text in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation (p. 53). Frames locate and formulate perceptions and interpretations by classifying and labeling the flow of social reality (Goffman, 1974). When message frames are accepted and repeated by receivers, social identity and social reality may converge. Functionally, shared frames allow basic heuristic development or enthymemes for shared social reality.

*Dialogic Discourse*

Dialogue involves multiple vocalized realities and may be revealed analyzing dialogic discourse. Dialogic discourse is a natural and significant social interaction process associated with social organizing (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998; Wetherall, Gallios, & Pittam, 2001). The study of dialogue is considered a useful means to investigate naturally occurring sense-making, communicating, and social influencing. Dialogue as social interaction and exchange of realities or how human constituents share their realities and collectively make sense and establish a common sense of a developing situation.

Dialogue and discourse are the tools by which to engineer, maintain, and transform social entities such as cultures and communities (for discussions see Cushman & Kincaid, 1987; Shepherd & Rothenbuhler (Eds.), 2001; Wosinska, Cialdini, Barrett, & Reykowski (Eds.) 2001). Dialogue involves two or more individuals who are engaged in discourse for a meaningful exchange of thoughts and beliefs (Zuniga & Nagda, 2001). Discourse is a common means for engaging in collective thinking and inquiry and provides an opportunity to discover and develop shared meaning and understanding. Fostering meaningful dialogue, especially during situations involving threats, diversity, and community building, can be challenging.
Discourse study involves the “study of the [symbolic] ways in which people make sense of their life-situations and the ways in which they go about their activities, in conjunction with others” (Prus, 1996, p. 10). Discourse analysis is a common type of language-in-use analysis (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Associated theory building is concerned “with both the act of communication and the action that is occurring” as well as “the unique elements” associated with the individuals involved, such as subconscious norming and embedded values (Faules & Alexander, 1978, p. 15).

The sharing of personal experiences, tacit knowledge, and the collective reflection of this communicative process is dialogue. Dialogue is associated with multiple realities or perspectives, and people express and represent these realities by symbolic means such as language. Stewart (1998) articulated dialogue as “a term for the co-creation of meaning through and among up to 30 or 40 interlocutors” (p. 337). Stewart (1998) believed dialogue is at the core of meaning and response, relative and indeterminate, and features unity/fusion and difference. Dialogue is situation-dependent and fundamentally relational. Dialogue is “attunement of the other” or co-orientation of perspective setting and perspective taking. Tacit knowledge is exchanged by sharing experience through dialogue (Broekstra, 1998).

According to Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) “dialogue is a means by which to articulate hidden tacit knowledge that is otherwise hard to communicate” (p. 71). By means of dialogue, “socialization yields . . . ‘sympathized knowledge,’ such as shared mental models and technical skills” (p. 71). From an Asian perspective, Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) asserted that knowledge is generally not explicitly or consciously communicated. Rather, experience and reality are conveyed intuitively, imitatively and automatically. They concluded “the key to acquiring tacit knowledge is [social] experience” (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995, p. 63). Besides the usefulness of sharing knowledge, dialogue may also be useful for generating new knowledge especially during chaos or crisis events (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995).
Opportunities for the transformation of perception and reality through dialogue include situations that experience “breakdowns” of routines, habits, predictability, and sensibility (Winograd & Flores, 1986). During dialogue, another’s point of view is legitimized as well as constituents are “connected with others to determine what counts as knowledge and how it is valued” (Putnam, 1998, p. 149). Dialogue may transform individual reality through social-influenced interaction. Dialogue may reinforce social connections and converge understanding. Putnam (1998) metaphorically referred to dialogue as the process of community-building.

The context of dialogue is “conceptualized, usually implicitly, as a kind of container in which the phenomena resides” (Dervin, 2003, p. 112). Context can be regarded as acknowledging the abstract situation or setting represented without text. Examples include professional, personal, cultural, and crisis or chaotic situations. Significantly, discourse context “is a necessary source of meaning” (Dervin, 2003, p. 117). For some researchers, “every context is by definition different, an intersection of a host of nameless factors” (Dervin, 2003, p. 113) and thus are not addressed in research findings.

The study of discourse is comprised of diverse perspectives (see Jasinski, 2001; Grant, Keenoy, & Oswick, 1998; for review see Mumby & Clair, 1997). Lemke (1995b) conceptualized principles of discourse analysis as embodying a theory of meaning-making that is nearly co-extensive with a theory of human behavior and human culture. Fundamentally, discourse analysis involves the careful and systematic examination and interpretation of an “organized and/or structured unit of language larger than a sentence (Jasinski, 2001, p. 170). Discourse analysis of organizations is “an emerging focus of interest in current management literature and thinking” (Grant, Keenoy, & Oswick, 1998, p. 1). However, discourse analyzers must assume discourse does not represent a “definitive meaning” (Grant, Keenoy, & Oswick, 1998).

Putnam (1998) argued that a focus on discourse will advance organizational communication theory. She suggested that discourse analysis could be useful for analyzing social interaction performance as well as “voice” (1998). A discourse analysis may reveal sequences,
patterns, and meanings that stem from exchanging verbal and nonverbal messages” (p. 147). A discourse analysis may also reveal “voices” of who can speak, who spoke, when, with whom, and how (style). Discursive collective sense-making and organizing may be considered multiple voices or as Putnam (1998) metaphorically referred to a “chorus” as collective action. The leader as the conductor of the chorus plays an essential role as he or she has a significant impact on the group’s identity” (p. 82) and readiness for and performance of collaborative action. In particular, the collective identity may significantly indicate the “interorganizational level of cooperation more closely than the interpersonal level” (p. 82). Understanding collaborative social interaction “requires attention to both process and content” (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998). The analysis of this “discursive and nondiscursive” process has both theoretical and practical applications.

Mumby and Clair (1997) suggested discourse analysis should focus on the organizing of social reality, social roles, and resources as a useful approach. They asserted “discourse is the principal means by which organization members create a coherent social reality that frames their sense of who they are” (p. 181). “The principal goal of this research [approach] is to demonstrate the connection between the shared norms and values of an organization . . . and the means by which these norms and values are expressed” (p. 183). Discourse is an expression and creation of organizational networking and norming. Woodilla (1998) also suggested focusing on discourse and its contribution to organizational sense-making processes. In particular, the identification of a “dominant discourse” and how that dominant discourse emerged, was sustained, and controlled competing viewpoints. Moreover, Mangham (1998) and Mangham and Overington (1987) contended the explicit or implicit reference to feelings and underlying drama should be identified. As Aristotle suggested and recent scholars argued “practical reasoning unaccompanied by emotion is not sufficient for practical wisdom” (Grant, Keenoy, & Oswick, 1998, p. 6).

Yet, “the question remains as to exactly how do shared understandings, created by conversational narrative and interaction, lead to action” (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998,
Dialogue provides conversational content and conversational activity primarily through discourse. Research (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998) suggested social interaction shapes personal identities and self-concepts, generates social reality including social roles, rules, and behavioral expectations, develops skills through learning and experience, and activates emotions. In combination, these factors prime or prepare individuals for collective action for a common cause (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998). Hardy, Lawrence, and Phillips’s model of “talk and action,” hypothesized “for an ability to be enacted as a culturally valuable skill, it must be consistent with the participant’s identity and be motivated by appropriated emotions” (p. 80). Zuniga and Nagda (2001) suggested “careful attention, therefore, needs to be given to how people come together and engage with each other in a dialogue group” (p. 311).

Discourse represents a range of possible instantaneous and retrospective interpretations by different receivers. As we organize sense-making (Weick, 1995), responding interactors react to internal or external stimuli. By acting, reacting, and double acting (Weick, 1995), this social interaction sequence provides further meaning for a synoptic meaning analysis or social construction analysis rather than a moment-by-moment dynamical meaning analysis (Lemke, 1995a). Lemke (1995b) warned that “units of meaning can have fuzzy boundaries” especially regarding conversations. However, coherence chains can provide important clues. Topic continuity may be mapped to reveal a thematic pattern of meaning that may be repeated or varied, and represent different levels of abstraction (Lemke, 1995b). Topic and theme combinations and theme convergence may be considered foundations of rhetorical visions (Bormann, 1986).

**Symbolic Convergence Theory: Enacting a Shared Vision of Reality**

Symbolic convergence methodology, as a broad construction and specific interpretation approach to social interaction, is an extension of symbolic interaction meaning development, maintenance, transformation, and exchange (Bettinghaus, 1963; Monaghan & Martin, 1968; Nwafo-Nwanko, 1971; Nwanko, 1973; Jackson & Jacobs, 1981; Wood & Pearce, 1980; Chesebore, 1984), Bormann’s (1970) small group decision-making case studies, Bales’ (1970)
research of natural groups, and Jackson and Jacobs' (1981) study revealed naturally occurring social convergence by means of symbolic interaction. Symbolic convergence theory has been considered a useful theory for group communication such as shared culture and values (Infante, Rancer, & Womack, 1990). The theory acknowledges “that individuals’ images of reality are guided by stories reflecting how things are believed to be” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005, p. 157). These stories, as fantasy themes, “are created in symbolic interaction within small groups, and they chain out from person to person and group to group” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005, p. 157).

Symbolic convergence is dependent on shared symbols, meanings, communication rules, and expectations (Berlo, 1977). Berlo contended, “communication processes are subsets of information processes in that they consist of symbolic informational activity” (1977, p.23). When analyzed, discourse and dialogue can reveal symbolic activity such as fantasies and rhetorical visions.

Convergence theory. Convergence refers to “a speaker’s conscious or non-conscious desire for social integration, seeking or showing approval, identification, or communicative effectiveness with another” (Street & Giles, 1982, p. 205). Kincaid (1987) offered a convergence theory of communication to “overcome many of the biases that have become evident in the traditional linear, transmission models of communication” (p. 209). Two key assumptions of this theory is communication is a dynamic process of convergence and social systems are networks of interconnected individuals who are linked by patterned flows of interpretation and understanding. Kincaid (1987) defined speech communication as “a process in which information is created and shared by two or more individuals who converge over time toward a greater degree of mutual understanding, agreement, and collective action” (p. 210).

Humans may have a natural propensity for convergence as “coming together or sharing cognition” (Littlejohn & Jabusch, 1987). Convergence enhances social validation, approval, appreciation, communion (Duck, 2002), and common sense (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005). Many speech communication studies have researched meaning and social convergence (Kincaid, 1987,

Kincaid’s (2002) research suggested “a convergence theory of communication predicts that audience members who perceive the change in characters with whom they closely identify will be influenced to change their behavior” (abstract, p. 136). Moreover, Giles, Coupland, and Coupland (1991) asserted the propensity of convergence and divergence is made evident in the use of “accommodating” or “non-accommodating” discourse. Analyzing actual and naturally occurring communication episodes allows an investigator to address interactor similarities and differences (Heath & Bryant, 1992), pro-social and antisocial behaviors (Zuniga & Nagda, 2001) as well as indication of social convergence and divergence (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). Numerous studies have provided evidence of convergence and divergence among individuals by means of communicative patterns during inter-group and between group dialogue (Bormann, Cragan, & Shields, 1994). Regarding convergence dialogue, Hurtado (2001) concluded “the need for cooperation among members of different groups is paramount if we wish to build . . . our communities” (p. 33).
Bormann’s Symbolic Convergence Theory, Fantasy Themes, and Rhetorical Visions

Bormann’s (1986) term “fantasy” represents “the creative and imaginative shared interpretation of events that fulfills a group psychological or rhetorical need” (p. 211). Notably, symbolic convergence enactments unify diversity. When an interpersonal relationship or a group of diverse people “share a fantasy,” they “are attributing events to human action and thus make sense out of what may have previously been a confusing state of affairs . . . thus we envision . . . our world in similar ways” (Bormann, 1986, p. 222). For relationship cohesiveness, diverse individuals must “come to share a common sentiment or emotional involvement and a commitment to symbols” (Bormann, 1986, p. 223). Bormann’s (1986) fantasy theme analysis identifies “the creative and imaginative shared interpretation of events that fulfills a group psychological or rhetorical need” (p. 211). Organizational communication influences the development or the lack thereof organizational culture and symbolic convergence (Bormann, 1983).

As a general communication theory, Bormann’s Symbolic Convergence Theory (SCT) has provided a useful frame for many applied research investigations (Cragan & Shields, 1999). SCT explains that meanings, emotions, values, and the motives for action are in the rhetoric that is co-created by people trying to make sense out of a common experience such as a crisis (wikipedia, 2007). As a coalescing process, symbolic convergence creates a symbolic culture and reality system that allows interactors to achieve empathic communion as well as “a meeting of the minds” (Bormann, 1985). SCT is especially useful for “the study of a community’s shared consciousness” (Bormann, 1985, p.131) referred to as a “rhetorical vision.”

SCT regards fantasy themes as components or subsystems of a larger abstract system referred to as a rhetorical vision. Bormann (1986) identified key components of successful fantasy chaining. Chaining is the process of repeating, paraphrasing, and expanding/elaborating ideas of another (Bormann, Cragan, & Shields, 1994). Chaining involves the connection or coherence of messages and the consequential messages. Bormann (1986) explained the
psychological processes of being connected and engaged in a drama as follows: the discourse involves interactors in a sequence of interrelated incidents such as speaking turns or communication episodes; a listener shares a previously addressed fantasy by addressing one or more of the leading topics or characters; resulting in the arousal sympathy for or empathy with another or others; when listeners relate emotionally they also become involved in the "storyline" and the outcome; and "those who share the fantasy do so in an appropriate tone and with appropriate feelings" (p. 225).

Fantasy theme analyses have revealed and explained the constructing, sharing, and transforming of social reality and how individuals of a society or rhetorical community coordinate, cooperate, co-orientate, become cohesive, and sustain (Bormann, 1970; 1972; Bormann et al. 1984; Jackson, 2000; Lee & Hoon, 1993; Stone, 2002; Thomson, 2003). For example, research investigating the development of fantasy theme chaining of the U.S. militia movement by cyberspace communication suggests the Internet is an effective means for creating, sharing, and maintaining a shared group consciousness (Meador, 1996).

Additionally, fantasy theme analysis has been utilized to identify and test market-based motives and behaviors (Bormann, 1985; Bormann et al., 1984; Endres, 1989; Stone, 2002). For example, Stone’s (2002) research utilized a fantasy theme analysis identifying master’s degree students’ decisions to enroll at a United States graduate university. The study identified a popular theme: “It had a program and curriculum that I need professionally.” Other fantasy themes associated with selecting a professional master’s degree program included personal growth in skills and knowledge, program rigor, friendliness of faculty and staff, and location and class access convenience. A factor analysis revealed two rhetorical visions: “Better Program, Quality University” and “Small Campus, Big Opportunity.”

Particular fantasy themes have been identified (Bormann, 1986; Cragan & Shields, 1992) as well as preference for these themes have also been suggested. Representing a Euro-American perspective, Cragan and Shields (1992) hypothesized that three rhetorical visions exist:
pragmatic, social, and righteous oriented. Littlejohn and Foss (2005) explained that these master analogues guide human beliefs and behaviors. Pragmatic analogues/rhetorical visions frame “how to do things” or suggest practical and efficient decisions or solutions to problems. Social analogues instruct us how to relate with others; righteous analogues guide the evaluation of human activity as good and bad, right and wrong decisions, as well as the expected consequences if one does not abide by these moral rules. In short, rhetorical visions “have a deep structure that reflects and influences our sense of reality” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005, p. 158).

By combining a variety of fantasy themes that appear repeatedly from person to person (chaining) (Littlejohn & Jabusch, 1987), a rhetorical vision is constructed and may be considered an umbrella by which diverse constituents converge for a sense of common ground (shared circumstance) or common sense (shared understanding and significance of reality). According to Littlejohn and Jabusch (1987), “convergence occurs as more and more themes come to be shared” (p. 209). The sharing of fantasy themes and rhetorical visions, connect and converge diverse individuals and “gives them a sense of identification with a shared reality” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005, p. 158) and “reflects shared elements in the cognition systems of communicators” (Littlejohn & Jabusch, 1987). Fantasy themes direct collective attention, may attract individuals with preferred and familiar frames of reference, and build consciousness and familiarity among constituents.

Rhetorical visions are master ideologies that are developed over time and “form the assumptions on which a group’s knowledge is based, structuring a sense of reality” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005, p. 157) and community (Littlejohn & Jabusch, 1987). The length of time of a rhetorical vision greatly varies. It may develop during an extended instance of dialogue such as a meeting, over multiple communication episodes, among several communication events, and among new generations. Regardless of the longevity, rhetorical visions sustain five stages (Bormann, Cragan & Shields, 2001): invention and sharing, consciousness-raising by chaining, consciousness-sustaining by knowledge sharing, vision deterioration or transformation, and
vision implosion or termination. Through out the existence, rhetorical visions represent a collection of tacit beliefs, emotions, and attitudes shared by members. Rhetorical visions are constructed of several themes evident in discourse. Organized relationships and groups may express a variety of vision types and may include sagas. Sagas are “retold stories relating to personal, group, or community achievements” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005, p. 158).

In sum, fantasy themes represented by constituents in relationships and groups are evident in everyday interpersonal and group conversation, formal meetings, and public statements. Fantasy themes and rhetorical visions may be significant factors associated with social influence. Cragan and Shields (1992) suggested rhetorical “visions may exist on a continuum from pure to mixed with the result that the more pure the vision, the fewer the participants; the more mixed the vision, the greater the number of adherents” (p. 214). Therefore, selecting appropriate messages for a particular type of people will result in a shared rhetorical vision for all. Whereas, constructing a variety of messages deemed appropriate for a variety of people will develop a collective rhetorical vision.

Leadership

At its center, effective crisis leadership is comprised of three things, communication, clarity of vision, and caring relationships... it's all about connecting with the people.
Klann, 2003

We all will make inferences; one aspect of leadership concentrates on minimizing our tendency to drift apart on how we assign meaning.
Ayers, 2002

Leaders play a significant role as sense-guiders, constructors and articulators of reality, and organizers and managers of collective sense-making. Leaders may develop a strong culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1998) and highly reliable organizations (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001) by developing a widely shared sense of reality including accepted values and visions as well as clarifying social roles, rules, and expectations. By converging perspectives, co-orienting with diverse perspectives, framing phenomena, and managing meaning via messaging, leaders may enhance their effectiveness. Consequently, as chief influence agents, leaders may skillfully guide
the process of developing a meaningful framework for understanding the nature of phenomena as well as developing effective reactions to environmental situations and responding to others. To shape and change realities or ideologies, leaders must guide “sense-making and meaning construction of others toward a preferred reorganization” (Sutcliffe, 2001, p. 219).

Effective leaders, be they elders, teachers, preachers, “momma”s, or kahunas, (Hawaiian advisors) are far-reaching social influencers. For millennia, leadership as social influence has been pondered, prescribed, and philosophized. The ancient Polynesians, Greeks, Egyptians, and Chinese addressed key qualities of effective leaders. For the Euro-American world, “the study of leadership can be traced back to Aristotle (Northouse, 2001, p. 8). However diligent our attention to leadership, the universal and situated nature of leadership remains elusive. Qualities such as justice, good judgment, wisdom, fair counsel, vigor, shrewdness, goodwill, credibility, and cleverness have been suggested by Homer, Plato, Aristotle, and Quintilian. For example, Quintilian asserted that “a good man speaking well” was an admired and powerful social role. Contemporary attributes include integrity, charismatic, and transformative. For others, a sense of humbleness is revered. Obviously, the ability to influence others’ beliefs and behaviors is fundamental to leadership.

**Conceptualizations and Definitions**

Ancient wisdom of Lao Tzu suggested that highly effective leaders influence by guiding constituents in a humble, caring, compassionate yet secure and straightforward manner. Moreover, Lao Tzu theorized developing and maintaining a sense of wonder and trust among constituents are essential for cohesive, cooperative, and productive organizations. In *Tao te Ching* (Lao-tzu, 1988), leaders do not “try to be powerful; thus [they are] truly powerful.” Master leaders are characterized as “living in the moment,” “profound and subtle,” their wisdom “unfathomable”; they are careful, alert, courteous, fluid, shapeable, receptive, tolerant, patient, and clear-minded. Master leaders are particularly aware of their resources and “utensils” and are mindful of the complexity of the situation (Chapter 28). They are content with themselves and do
not need the validation or approval of others. Attempting to control or dominate people or situations is unwise “for every force there is a counterforce, violence even well intentioned, always rebounds upon itself” (Chapter 30). To be a great leader, “you must learn to follow the Tao. Stop trying to control. Let go of fixed plans and concepts” and ideologies. Life will naturally govern, prosper, and provide safety, security, and serenity. Finally, practical wisdom is offered; “For governing a country well there is nothing better than moderation” (Chapter 59). “When the Master governs, the people are hardly aware that [he/she] exists” and they lead effectively by not preaching or politicking but by their honorable actions (Chapter 17).

According to Clutterbuck and Hirst (2002), “there are more books, articles, and dissertations on leadership than any other topic of management” (p. 351). From different areas of the social sciences, Bass (1990a) acknowledged the diverse approaches provide a variety of theories regarding leadership. From “transactional to transformational,” approaches include leadership as group processing, personality and effects, acts or behavior styles, goal achievement, interaction effects, power role/relations, and initiating structure (Bass, 1990a). Metaphorical approaches include leadership as “leading learning” (McGill & Slocum, 1994), “transactional” (Burns, 1998), “engaging” (Gubman, 2003), “stewardship” (DePree, 1998), and “transformational” (Bass, 1990a; Bass & Avolio, 1998). The most persistent research focus has been with personality trait-based approaches (Aristotle, 1991; Stogdill, 1974).

Heifetz (1998) acknowledged “the first theory of leadership—and the one that continues to be entrenched in American culture—emerged from the nineteenth-century notion that history is the story of great men and their impact on society” (p. 345) and concluded “women were not even considered candidates for greatness” (Heifetz, 1998, p. 345). Heifetz (1998) concluded the “trait approach places values on the historymaker” (p. 345).

Traditionally, leadership has been conceptualized as “the process of influencing others to facilitate the attainment of organizationally relevant goals” (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1999,
p. 409) with an emphasis on group goals. Leadership has been approached as a shared social influence phenomena or as a specialized role (Yukl, 2002) and conceptualized either as a rational and information/decision-making process or an emotional and inspirational-motivation process (Yukl, 2002). According to Yukl (2002), theory development should provide knowledge "relevant to the entire range of definitions" (p. 7). Yukl (2002) defined leadership as "the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives" (p. 7).

Many studies have conceptualized leadership as a function of a situated social process (Murphy, 1941) such as power relationships (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Raven & French, 1959), goal achievement (Drucker, 1974, 1994a, 1994b; Evans, 1996; Locke, 2003), social or leader-member exchange (Festinger, 1954; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), persuasion (Soder, 2001), personality traits (Bass, 1990a; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Stogdill, 1974; Yukl, 2002) and styles (Blake & McCanse, 1991; Carthcart, Samovar, & Henman, 1996; Misumi, 1985; Smith & Foti, 1998). For example, Soder (2001) argued "persuasion works because of the acknowledged and legitimate character of the persuader" (p. 6). Moreover, "persuasion is an inherent part of leadership, an inherent part of constructing knowledge and viewing the world so to make it acceptable to others" (Soder, 2001, p. 16).

Leadership genres include team leadership and human relations managers, symbolic leadership (e.g. "First Ladies," religious and deity representatives), "servant" leadership (e.g. altruists, public service), and organizational/political leadership (Pierce & Newstrom, 2003). Specific research programs address team leadership (LaFasto & Larson, 2001), strategic leadership (Dess & Miller, 1998; Hambrick, 1982), symbolic leadership (Smircich & Morgan, 1982), knowledge leadership (Capshaw & Koulopolus, 1999), adaptation leadership (Barge, 1994; Cronshaw & Ellis, 1991; Kotter, 1988), heroic leadership (Murphy, 1993), and extraordinary outcomes (Zenger & Folkman, 2002). Currently, community leadership (Hickman,
1998), charismatic leadership (Howell & Avolio, 1998), global leadership (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005), complexity (Gibson, 2000; Uhl-Bien, Marion, & Hanges, 2006) and a general theory of leadership (Wren, 2006) are of interest to scholars and practitioners.

Over two hundred definitions for leadership have been offered (Rost, 1991). Most definitions commonly regard leadership as a sociological management or goal attainment process associated with influencing others’ beliefs and behaviors. Examples include the following: “the behavior of an individual . . . directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal” (Hemphill & Coons, 1957, p. 7); “the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement” (Rauch & Behling, 1984, p. 46); “articulating visions, embodying values, and creating the environment within which things can be accomplished” (Richards & Engle, 1986, p. 206); and as “a sociological phenomenon (a process) involving the intentional exercise of influence exercised by one person over one or more other individuals, in an effort to guide activities toward the attainment of some mutual goal” (Pierce & Newstrom, 2003, p. 8). A commonly cited definition is “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve common goals” (Northouse, 2001, p. 3).

From a social construction view, leadership is approached as a shared or participative meaning-making/sensing-making process . . . in a community of practice.” Drath and Palus (1994) contended visioning, framing, developing frameworks, setting goals, “arguing and engaging in dialogue,” theory-building, storytelling, acquiring agreements and contracts, and decision-making are sub-processes of leadership meaning-making. Leadership is conceptualized as a “social sense-making process that creates interpersonal influence” (Drath & Palus, 1994, p. 5) and engages constituents. Consequently, Drath and Palus (1994) defined leadership as “the process of making sense of what people are doing together so that people will understand and be committed (p. 4).

The vast majority of research and writing has been concerned with “objective determinants of leadership effectiveness” (Pavitt et al., 1995, p. 243). Thus, studies regarding
leadership traits, behavioral styles, situations/contingencies, as well as training models and prescriptions have centered on leadership effectiveness. Leader effectiveness, as a Euro-American cultural value, is associated with goal attainment and productivity and has been a strong and thriving research goal. Leadership effectiveness has been measured in terms of a leader's contribution as perceived by followers or outside observers as well as by accomplishment of goals such as profits, growth, innovations, and organizational transformations (Pierce & Newstrom, 2003).

The association of group task performance and group social maintenance functions has been considered since Bales' pivotal work in 1950 addressing equilibrium action. More recently, a study by Kolb (1996) found that highly successful team performances compared with unsuccessful and average successful team performances vary from the following leadership variables: receiving external support and tolerating uncertainty. His research suggested that high performance teams that receive “support” from the leader as well as constituents were able to tolerate uncertainty. The attribution of leadership competence is not based upon if the leader is highly liked but rather is admired for their innovation and insight (Aronson, 1995). Moreover, leaders are perceived as causally responsible for organizational performance in general and the evaluation of good or bad outcomes in particular. Thus, society regards leaders as accountable for leadership outcomes (Lord & Maher, 1991) regardless of perceived competence.

Leadership Competence: Engagement and Enactment

Much research suggests a strong association between personality traits or “being” characteristics and naturally competent leaders. Leadership characteristics have been described as adaptable to situations, alert and aware to environmental conditions, ambitious, achievement-oriented, assertive, cooperative, decisive, dependable and reliable, energetic and self-confident, committed to initiate and maintain good relations, responsible and accountable, teamwork oriented, vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals, venturesome and originality in problem-solving and visioning (Mann, 1959; Yukl, 2002). Generally, leaders are characterized by the
following features: intelligent, creative, clever, diplomatic and tactful, articulate and eloquent, organized and system-oriented, socially and emotionally sensitive, able to cope with interpersonal and environmental stress and uncertainty, construct and connect social systems, and influence other persons’ beliefs and behaviors.

Kirkpatrick and Locke’s (1991) research suggested competent leaders are characterized by the following specific traits and abilities: internal motivation and desire to lead, honesty and integrity, cognitively complex, reflexive and critical thinker, self-confidence, and specific expertise in relevant areas. These traits are suggested as increasing the likelihood of competence but not guaranteeing group success. Richmond and McCroskey (1992) claimed the “ideal leader” possesses versatility and enacts consistent characteristics. The ideal leader “can be adaptable to situations and people while at the same time being firm and predictable on decisions” (p. 76). For Bennis (1997), leaders of effective groups provide direction, meaning, and meaningfulness to constituents, generate trust, favor pro-activity and productivity, enact risk-taking, and develop a sense of hope among constituents. Such leaders may be formally recognized or not.

Leadership as a social-relations process may be a result of social learning and an inherited capacity to gain satisfaction for constituents from particular stimuli or experiences (Bouchard et al., 1990). Leadership competence has been associated with engaged constituents who enact a vision, credibility, and communication competence (Harris & Sherblom, 2002). Harris and Sherblom (2002) explained “vision provides the direction for the group process, credibility, the reason for the group to follow the direction, and communication competence, the means for communicating that direction to the group” (p. 259). Leadership competence is expected during “turning points” or crisis situations. At such times, “leaders must be able to communicate their overall vision, the credibility of their power base, and their trustworthiness in the situation” (Harris & Sherblom, 2002, p. 261).

According to Csikszentmihalyi (2003), effective leadership involves the enactment of “flow” as optimal fulfillment and engagement that produces the feeling of satisfaction. Flow is a
complex process involving the use of resources, skill, situational challenges and constraints resulting in "an optimal experience." When addressing a complex situation, such as a crisis event, successful leadership involves the effective processing of information, gaining useful knowledge from others by listening to the opinions, perspectives, and points of view of constituents and consultants; considering "what if" scenarios; acknowledging intuitive thoughts and feelings; making effective decisions; and constructing reasonable sense or practical wisdom, thereby satisfying constituents’ needs.

Moreover, competent leaders must be system-sensitive and able to relate with their environment as well as with constituents. Competent leaders “see the big picture” of how their organization is or will be affected by internal and external environmental conditions. Kelley (1998) contended competent leaders enable talented, resourceful, competent constituents to network and “put their heads together and come up with significant products or progress” and problem-solve (p. 199). Competent leaders guide the process of acknowledging, interpreting, making sense, and adjusting to changes or potential changes in their environment. Kelley (1998) suggested that the best leaders act as role models and relate with constituents during this adaptation process with exemplary skills.

**Building and Maintaining Relationships**

One of the most influential leadership skills is the ability to relate to constituents. Research suggests that high-relationship orientation and ability to relate to constituents are significantly related to effective leadership outcomes (Misumi, 1985). This is especially significant in collective cultures that highly value social relationships as well as high performance (task) outcomes (Misumi, 1985; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Researchers have focused on how leaders direct and behave toward followers. Focusing on activities of leaders, two dimensions associated with behavioral styles emerged from Ohio State and Michigan University leadership studies. Selzer and Bass (1990) contended that personal goal productivity (task) and social-relations consideration (social) are “the fundamental measures of consequence” (p. 693) and
currently define management and conflict styles (Blake & Mouton, 1984). The two dimensions reflect the tensions between concern for personal goals versus concern for other/s. A three-dimensional perspective representing concern for self, concern for other/s, and concern for the interdependent relationships associated with the organization has been suggested by Nakanishi (2003).

Bowers and Seashore's (2003) research investigated supportive leadership. According to Yukl (2002), "supportive leadership helps build and maintain effective interpersonal relationships" (p. 70) and develops "emotional ties," thus "making it easier to gain cooperation and support from people on whom the manager [leader] must rely to get the work done" (p. 70). A supportive leadership style may reduce stress, help constituents cope with stress and uncertainty, as well as encourage higher leader-constituent relationship satisfaction (Yukl, 2002). Bowers and Seashore (2003) identified four dimensions significant to leadership engagement and enactments: support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis, and work facilitation. Support was conceptualized as "behavior that enhances someone else's feeling of personal worth and importance," interaction facilitation as "behavior that encourages members of the group to develop close, mutually satisfying relationships," goal emphasis as "behavior that stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting the group's goal or achieving excellent performance," and finally, work facilitation as "behavior that helps achieve goal attainment by such activities as scheduling, coordinating, planning, and by providing resources such as tools, materials, and technical knowledge" (Bowers & Seashore, 2003, p. 170). Bowers and Seashore (2003) argued "substantial improvement" of organization effectiveness and constituent satisfaction may be achieved by combining leadership behaviors.

From a relation-centered approach, constituents co-create the vision, mission, and basic assumptions of the organization, although some constituents may have more influence. As collaborators, they share the risks, rewards, and responsibilities of everyday organizational life.
Moreover, as collaborators, they must engage in dialogue through discourse to realize and relate with each other as well as demonstrate concern for others, concern for the partnership, and concern for self (Nakanishi, 2003). Kelley (1998) warned “when leaders develop a strategy without the help of followers, they are asking for trouble” (p. 196). Kelley (1998) suggested that leaders present through discourse a “straw model” or framework so that through dialogue “followers [and the leader] can react, modify, and build upon it” (p. 196). Such a strategy gives the impression constituents are considered valued partners. In particular, “exemplary followers prefer leaders who stand with them on the front line of adversity” (Kelley, 1998, p. 197).

Kelley (1998) suggested that leaders serve as “synergy catalysts” that create and develop networks and resource management systems. Synergy creates a collaborative relationship that transcends any single culture, group, or individual. According to Moran and Harris (1982), synergy “occurs by necessity” when diversity among constituents is evident and collective action is required for social system survival. The awareness and sensitivity of diversity, empathy, and the development of a shared version of reality and a shared vision of goals enhances the construction of synergy (Stohl, 2001). Synergy promotes a blended and shared new common sense of reality. Synthesis and accommodation may be key factors related to synergy (Stohl, 2001). Leaders may play a significant role influencing the development of group synergy. By guiding the process of dialogue and enacted discourse, leaders may develop synergy and a common sense among diverse constituents.

Empowerment of partners as “power with partners” can create effective and satisfying relationships and competent and meaningful organizations. Howard’s (1998) model of Empowerment Leadership Roles addressed the significance of partners leading a variety of roles such as “discovering the way,” “lighting the way,” “enabling the way,” “smoothing the way,” and “encouraging the way.” Constituents judged “modeling trust” (consistent in words and actions) as the most important leadership factor. Trust has been traditionally conceptualized as “stability of character,” level of consistent competence, and reliable pattern of judgments (Albrecht & Bach,
or behavioral congruity and predictability. Nevertheless, Howard (1998) offered the following benefits of empowered partnerships: motivation, learning, stress and ambiguity tolerance, greater relationship commitment, role identification and satisfaction, less role overload, organizational flexibility and adaptability, organizational connection and communication, organizational productivity and cohesiveness.

*Team Approach*

LaFasto and Larson (2001) reasoned that a team approach encourages extraordinary leadership outcomes. A team approach is based on collaborative rather than competitive relations among constituents and the directed pursuit of a common goal. LaFasto and Larson (2001) recommended a collaborative-team perspective may be more relevant and useful for contemporary Western cultures. A team perspective prefers “people with different views and perspectives coming together, putting aside their narrow self-interests, and discussing issues openly and supportively in an attempt to solve a larger problem or achieve a broader goal” (p. xvii).

Competent team leaders were characterized as focusing on the goal and setting priorities, ensuring a collaborative climate and rewarding collaborative behavior, building “fairness,” confidence, and trust among constituents, demonstrating sufficient technical knowledge and application, and guiding and managing task and problem-solving performance (LaFasto & Larson, 2001). LaFasto and Larson (2001) suggested team leaders must establish and maintain a “good environment produc[ing] clarity, confidence, and commitment” (p. 159) because “clarity drives confidence; confidence drives commitment” (p. 159). Additionally, commitment drives culture and conviction motivates action.

*Directing Organizational Culture and Civility*

O’Hair, Friedrich, and Shaver (1995) asserted “organizational culture provides a portrait of the actions, norms, motives, and philosophies that an organization [learns to] value” (p. 25). Organizational culture propagates “shared meaning, shared understanding, and shared sense
making” and sense of purpose (O’Hair, Friedrich, & Shaver, 1995, p. 25). According to the Center of Creative Leadership (www.ccl.org, 2006), many scholars and theorists now regard leaders as playing a prominent role in the creation of an organizational culture as well as “team spirit and performance.” A research study sponsored by Center of Creative Leadership suggested the technique of “embedding” values via leadership. Giberson (2005) suggested “organizational leadership and culture are highly related aspects of organizational life; both provide an organizing mechanism to guide behavior, reduce ambiguity, and bring order out of potential chaos” (p. 3). Moreover, Giberson (2005) cited numerous researchers including Schein (1992) and Selznick (1957) and concluded “leaders are believed to be the primary influence on the creation and development of organizational culture” (p. 3). Leadership and shared meaning are both dependent upon semantics (Ayers, 2002).

Fundamental to the cultural approach is the significance of value-clarification. DePree (1998) maintained “leaders need to be concerned with the institutional value system, which, after all, leads to the principles and standards that guide the practices of the people in the institution” (p. 131). Leaders must clarify the social system’s values and the significance of the values, teach by mentoring the values, and motivate constituents’ acceptance and manifestations of these values. In particular, Schein’s (1992) theory of culture and leadership suggested leaders should embed their values, assumptions, and expectations in the organization through several mechanisms such as framing discourse and framing criteria used to make decisions. Another method is to articulate and reinforce their reality in the construction of organizational structures, network systems, and task and social processes.

Conceptualizing and constituting a culture is a significant task for leaders. Constructing and developing a shared understanding of the group and a shared reality among constituents are vital. According to Selznick (1957), a leader’s function is “to define the ends of group existence, to design an enterprise distinctly adapted to these ends, and to see that the design becomes a living reality” (p. 37). Smircich and Morgan (1982) contended “leadership, like other social
phenomena, is socially constructed through interaction . . . by leaders and the led” (p. 22). They also asserted “leadership is realized in the process whereby one or more individuals succeeds in attempting to frame and define the reality of others” (p. 22). Thus, Smircich and Morgan (2003) contended “leadership lies in large part in generating a point of reference against which a feeling of organization and direction can emerge” (p. 23). Process involves “defining reality in ways that are sensible to the led” (p. 23).

DePree (1987) suggested “special” leaders are effective at “roving” within and outside the culture. By experiencing various atypical, disorganized or chaotic situations, roving leaders can begin organizing the sense-making process and coordinating behaviors for cultural-system balance and community productivity. Roving leadership involves developing, expressing, and defending organizational values by which to base civility. Civility includes appreciation of “healthy” qualities such as the “beauty of ideas,” the power of partnership, empowerment of individuals and the appreciation of their constituency. Civility also is characterized by a sense of hope and optimism of survival. DePree (1998) asserted “only a group of [individuals] who share a body of knowledge and continually learn together can stay vital and viable” (p. 131). Leaders must develop practical common sense among constituents for civility, continuity of culture, and a “propensity to survive” (Takamura, 1992).

Stewardship and Management Leaders

DePree (1987) conceptualized leaders as reality artists and leadership as an art involving invention and stewardship. DePree (1987), as well as Senge (1998) and Greenleaf (1998), conceptualized leadership as stewardship. Key areas of stewardship include identifying, providing, and perpetuating assets and promoting group legacy. Legacy is regarded as a foundation of social reality, meaningfulness of existence, and sustainability. DePree (1987) contended competent leaders must be responsible for qualities associated with the organization including values, beliefs, sense of social and task continuity, connections, and vitality, and it is suggested that leaders should provide “gifts” of freedom, grace, and beauty. DePree (1987)
asserted that developing and guiding a sense of reasoning, as *whats* and *whys*, providing momentum or motivation, as *hows*, *whens* and *by whoms*, and resourcing as with *what available means* are the challenges and championship of leadership. Resourcing is associated with DePree’s (1987) concept of giving and receiving “gifts” such as ideas, openness, dignity, joy, healing, and inclusion.

By virtue of their status, management leaders (Mintzberg, 1994) may have connection to other leaders and managers who are the “nerve centers of their own units”; therefore, leaders may have access to privileged forms of information and multiple perspectives. To lead and manage constituents competently, Mintzberg (1994) suggested leaders should spend considerable effort sharing information and processing sense-making collectively and personally. Management leaders should encourage and support constituents to “take the necessary actions” for collaborative and cooperative collective sense-making and support the distribution of collective knowledge. Mintzberg (1994) concluded that competent leaders “develop systems, design structures, and impose directives” (p. 14) associated with collective beliefs and actions.

**Situational Theories**

Research suggests “leadership effectiveness is a function of various aspects of the leadership situation” (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1999, p. 417). Yukl (2002) summarized “the situational approach emphasizes the importance of contextual factors in the influence the leadership process” (p. 13). Thus, different behaviors will be effective in various situations. Also known as “contingency” models and theories, studies address the social dynamics and diversity found in many leadership situations. Only a few offer an integrative model that addresses fundamental socio-psychological factors as well as diversity and multiplicity of basic situational variables (Yukl, 2002) such as relationship development and individual skill development.

Hersey and Blanchard’s (1982) Situational Leadership Theory is an exception. The theory is significantly based on relationship behaviors and varying ways how leaders engage in two-way communication. Their model provides an explanation why research indicates leadership
effectiveness varies across task and relationship dimensions: it depends upon situational conditions related to the leader’s assessment of follower task competence and self-confidence. If the leader correctly understands follower maturity or development and relates to them using appropriate messages such as telling, selling, participating, or delegating, the leader will be regarded as competent. The popular Situational Leadership Theory may offer a relationship approach as well as a foundation for a social influence and communication style leadership model.

Related to Situational Leadership Theory, Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (1998) described “task behaviors” or communication messages associated with “telling people what to do, how to do it, when to do it, and who is to do it” and “relationship behaviors” or communication messages “associated with listening, encouraging, facilitating, clarifying, and supporting” (p. 141-142). Unfortunately, actual communication-relational styles of leadership have been noted to differ from espoused styles (Fairhurst & Chandler, 1989), thereby perpetuating troublesome validity of self-report measures (see discussion Burleson et al., 1988).

Leadership as Guided Social Influencing

According to Pierce and Newstrom (2003), leadership is a social influence process that involves a constituent or constituents directing social interaction between two or more people who are dependent upon one another for the attainment of certain mutual goals and bound together within a group situation. Leadership as social influence may be best achieved by accommodating to situational and relational conditions (Bowers & Seashore, 2003; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Northouse, 2001). Although “influence is crucial to good leadership” (Baldwin & Grayson, 2004), little research explains actual and natural episodes associated with leadership social influence (Snowden & Gorton, 2002). Social influence tactics, outcomes, and power are closely related on a theoretical basis to leadership (Yukl, 2002); however, limited research exists regarding communicative behaviors and the exercise of influence (Snowden & Gorton, 2002).
Research regarding leadership communication as directing constituents' sense-making through messaging is clearly not being addressed. However, some theories may provide useful clues.

Social influence refers to the intentional and unintentional social interaction effect/affect upon others. Effects include the shaping, reinforcing and changing of symbol systems and meanings, beliefs, values, priorities, motivations, assumptions, and behaviors. Affects include psychological feelings, emotions and attitudes. Fairhurst (2001) reviewed social influence tactics associated with leadership. Factors associated with social influence tactics include directional differences, objectives and goals, cultural expectations, leadership style and traits, and situational constraints. Currently no leadership theory explicitly addresses leadership as a social influenced sense-making phenomenon associated with social relations engagement and communicative behaviors, although some researchers offer good starting points. For example, Northouse (2001) conceptualized leadership as a significant social influence process that guides the social reality of a group of individuals in an attempt to achieve a common reality and collective reaction as well as maintain meaningful social relationships.

Research findings by Stogdill (1974) suggested that leadership results from an interactional-influence relationship between the leader/s and other group members (constituents). Conley (1989) conceptualized leadership as mutually influencing the construction and shape of social reality and decision-making through informal and non-authoritative means. Social influence tactics include logic and sense-making appeals, emotional appeals, fear appeals, and cooperative appeals (Aristotle, 1991; Baldwin & Grayson, 2004; Seiter & Gass, 2004). However, Seers, Keller, and Wilkerson (2003) defined leadership as "a social influence process that must include at least two individuals acting in interdependent roles . . . one individual must act in a follower role, and at least one individual must act in a distinctly influential (leader) role" (p. 78). Yet, for a genuine level of shared understanding, commitment and conviction, rather than polarization, resistance and/or compliance, mutual influence in the form of dialogue rather than rhetorical debate may be necessary.
The engagement of bona fide dialogue® (Lee & Conville, 2006) may be considered mutual social influence for shared understanding. Dialogue requires a positive relational environment characterized by establishing rapport, developing mutual trust, openness and acceptance among constituents, and cooperation (Redding, 1972). Essentially, dialogue is about self-reflection and self-awareness as well as about the reflection and understanding of the other. For Freire (1994), dialogue requires humility, love, faith, and hope. Dialogue is the foundation for making collective sense and knowledge, activating coordinated actions, and promoting the development of a shared understanding about situations and challenges (Dixon, 2001; Drath & Palus, 1994). Through the enactment of dialogue, constituents “engaged in a common activity create shared knowledge and ways of knowing” (Drath & Palus, 1994, p. 1). Leaders may play a significant role guiding this highly influential process.

Senge (1990a, 1990b, 1998) also conceptualized leadership as social influence in general and as directed learning in particular. One important role and function of the leader is to propagate ideas and beliefs and support active learning among constituents (Senge, 1990a, 1990b, 1998). Senge’s perspective focused on assisting people to achieve empowered views of reality by “surfacing” or identifying “mental models” and reinforcing and/or changing them. Sharing and critiquing personal beliefs or “mental models” through group dialogue creates a collective or blended perspective of reality and a shared foundation for decision-making and problem-solving. Senge’s perspective addressed leadership as crafting and directing social reality and collective action strategies. Senge’s learning perspective implied a relational, sense-making process.

Similar to leadership as directed learning, Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) suggested that leaders direct and manage knowledge creation and sharing. They contended manager-leaders “direct confusion toward purposeful knowledge creation” (p. 15). Leaders provide the visionary ideals but must competently diffuse these ideals and ideologies and converge constituents’ knowledge. Nonaka and Takeuchi’s theory of organizational knowledge-creation management is basically a sense-making model. They claimed:
It is through the development of shared meaning and understanding that the cycles of structured behavior themselves become sensible and meaningful. Organized actions occur in the face of various interpretations and dissensions around one dimension of meaning, as long as there is consensus around another (p. 40).

Moreover, “reaching convergence among members characterizes the act of organizing and enables the organization to interpret the convergence as a system” (p. 40).

Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) suggested that “creative chaos” is the critical element for the process of organizational knowledge creation and construction. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), however, do not suggest how this is accomplished. Yet, they allude to the significance of Scheflen’s (1982) “interaction rhythms” that feature social interaction patterns and influential discursive structures. Scheflen (1982) argued communication is the agency for sharing and relating awareness, knowledge, and understanding. Highlighting in their notes, Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) acknowledged “communication is a simultaneous and contextual phenomenon in which people feel a change occurring, share the same sense of change, and are moved to take action” (p. 92n). Moreover, Hogg and Abrams (1993) surmised “group behavior might be motivated by a search for meaning and a coherent self-concept” (p. 189), collective identity, and common sense.

Noteworthy, a leader’s ability to exert social influence may be based on attributions associated with referent influence, reward influence, and expertise influence. Based on French and Raven’s (1959) power categories, referent influence is associated with attributed “authenticity,” similarity, trustworthiness, charisma, and members’ loyalty to a respected and liked leader (Gorton & Thierbach-Schneider, 1991; Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Blase, 1988). Referent influence is associated with member’s commitment and group cohesion (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1999; Kellerman, 1981a; Kellerman, 1981b). Reward influence is associated with the capacity to distribute valued and relevant physical, social, or psychological rewards such as
positive reinforcement for accomplishments (Podsakoff et al., 1986; Snowden & Gorton, 2002). Expertise influence is associated with relevant specialized knowledge and/or skill.

Coordination of group social and task efforts requires a leader or leaders (Howell, 1982). Even undesignated or leaderless groups feature chief social influence agents who lead others because of competence or compulsion (Howell, 1982). The group prefers to follow the person who guides the group’s focus and energy on a productive and socially rewarding path (Howell, 1982). Heifetz (1998) contended “leaders not only influence followers but are under their influence as well” (p. 345). Leaders are most affected by the followers’ expectations of them as well as preferred expectations of the present and future.

Heifetz (1998) defined leadership as a social influence activity to mobilize constituents and distinguished effective leadership as directing situations that mobilize constituents to learn how to adapt successfully to changes and challenges. Leaders must direct the critical strategic decision-making process by which to select “who should play a part in the deliberations” (p. 348) of decision-making and problem-solving. In particular, leaders should select constituents who provide “competing values” or different perspectives that “may be essential to adaptive success” (p. 348). Heifetz (1998) claimed “the hardest and most valuable task of leadership may be advancing goals and designing strategy that promote adaptive work” (p. 348). Heifetz (1998) concluded the fundamental roles of effective leaders are “the act of giving clarity and articulation to a community’s guiding values” (p. 348) as well as articulating the struggles and hopes of constituents. Influencing people requires knowing their habits, needs, interests, desires, values, and goals and communicating within the frame of these motives (Howell, 1982). Leaders continue to be influential by validating and satisfying organizational values (Heifetz, 1998).

**Network system and networking.** Murphy (1993) suggested “genius” leaders develop a complex network system enabling them to “communicate on many levels.” According to Murphy (1993), Chief Sitting Bull developed “a comprehensive network among individuals and groups that tied together the cultural and strategic pieces of his organization . . . this network
encompassed the whole Sioux ‘world’ and made possible a collective response to danger” (p. 120). Moreover, according to Murphy (1993), Chief Sitting Bull and other “genius” leaders were able to communicate effectively by developing a comprehensive network and networking with resourceful and valued constituents. Chief Sitting Bull constructed a strong bond among diverse tribal cultures by acknowledging shared struggles and threats, developing trust and commitment, increasing and sharing resources, bestowing beneficence, generosity, and compassion, supporting community healing and unity, and realizing visions.

Yukl’s research (2002) also highlighted the significance of a well-developed network system for effective social influence and networking. Networks may be developed by talking with people before, during, and after meetings, ceremonies, and social events; participating or leading special committees, group, and task forces; joining civic, social, professional organizations; and/or attending workshops, conferences, and special events honoring colleagues. His research findings suggested “cooperative relationships are established and maintained by showing respect and positive regard, offering unconditional favors, and showing appreciation for favors received” (p. 24). Networking is a perpetual process and essential for developing and distributing group missions, visions, goals, and sustainability.

Visioning. For long-term organizational survival, strival, and thrival, strategic visioning may be a necessary factor (Collins & Porras, 1998; Fairhurst, 2001). Fairhurst (2001) broadly defined vision as “envisioned future.” Vision generally refers to a preferred and practical dream of the future. Visions may be based on a leader’s preferred future version of reality or a blended version representing multiple features of constituents’ visions. Collins and Porras (1998) conceptualized vision as constituting “two major components—a guiding philosophy that, in the context of expected future environments, leads to a tangible image” (p. 236). A philosophy, ideology, or culture is constructed of basic assumptions as acculturated ideals including core beliefs, core values, status roles, behavioral expectations, and a vision.
Articulation of vision may be framed by values and moral justification, collective identity, history and heroes, positive worth and efficacy of constituents and/or the collective, as well as practical and meaningful relationships (Fairhurst, 2001). Visions may be basic or complex but must represent ultimate intrinsic desires (Senge, 1998). Essentially, Gini (1998) suggested “visions and values of leadership must have their origins and resolutions in the community of followers, of whom they are a part, and whom they wish to serve” (p. 369). As perceived by the leader and other constituents, the vision should be plausible, possible, and practical. Collins and Porras (1998) concluded “without vision, organizations have no chance of creating their future, they can only react to it” (p. 249).

Moreover, masterful leadership may involve learning and enacting a sense of genuine connectedness, compassion, and commitment to a vision (Senge, 1998) as well as building a shared vision with constituents (1990). Situations that provide opportunities for collaborative construction of shared visions may “advance the collective good of the [constituents] involved” (Gray, 1998, p. 471).

Managing leadership messages. Terry (1993) asserted “leadership is the courage to bring forth and let come forth authentic action in the commons.” All of these qualities of leadership are dependent upon messaging. In order to motivate and activate constituents’ behaviors for adaptation, leaders must use messages skillfully. Message effectiveness may be dependent upon listeners’ receptivity as well as frame of reference associated with beliefs, needs, values, and emotions. Messages can be used to stimulate meaning and emotions in the mind of others, express empathy, compassion, and understanding, as well as motivate people to personal and collective action or activism. Through effective messaging, leaders can mobilize constituents to adapt to changes in their surrounding environment, changes in reality, and changes within the system. These messages must be relevant and understandable “within the society’s own frame of reference” (Heifetz, 1998).
According to Faules and Alexander (1978), there are two basic types of messages: product and interactional. Product messages are strategically invented and delivered with little effect by the receivers; interactional messages are spontaneous and may be significantly influenced by responses of receivers. Interaction messages are based on the process of organizing and converging sense-making messaging and meaning among participants. Research by Zorn (1991) suggested that cognitive differentiation (assessing the communication situation's unique and complex characteristics) and person-centered messages (crafting messages associated with sensitivity of receiver's personal needs and perspectives or "other-oriented" messages) were positively correlated with effective transformative or adaptive leadership.

The "management of meaning" may be considered the ultimate function of leaders (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996). Framing communication messages is the most basic process of managing meaning (Deetz, Tracy, & Simpson, 2000). Leaders, in essence, guide interpretations and shape reality. Deetz et al. (2000) asserted "[framing] refers to the ways leaders can use their language to shape or modify particular interpretations of organizational events, thereby directing likely responses" (p. 67). Framing is presented in everyday leadership messages (Deetz et al., 2000). Fairhurst and Sarr (1996) identified discursive framing tools such as metaphors, stories, traditions, slogans, jargon and figurative language, artifacts, contrast, and "spin." Metaphors can be considered "the most complex and important framing tool" (Deetz et al., 2000, p. 76) because metaphors relate a unclear or complex concept with another more familiar concept. According to Eisenberg (1984), metaphors can unify diverse meanings and result in the assumption of shared reality. Narrative stories frame a current situation with a vivid and memorable past event. Narrative stories add an entertainment quality, reflect interesting and relevant experiences, and embed values. Traditions also frame reality by providing consistency, "rites of passage," and embed values. Slogans, jargon, and "catchphrases" as frames reflect specialized language associated with a particular group.
Leaders who possess multiple mental modes or cognitive complexity may be better at managing messages especially when communicating with diverse constituents and may be more competent at spontaneous social interaction (O'Keefe, 1990; Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996). Classic scholars of rhetoric recognized the significance of “multiple knowledges,” including knowledge of the subject, knowledge of human nature, and knowledge of the liberal arts (Gaines, 1995, p. 48). Cicero contended effective orators are able to deliver effective messages about many “matters copiously and diversely . . . to the immediate subject and audience” (Gaines, 1995, p. 47).

Leaders naturally and strategically use messaging tactics to subtly and significantly influence constituents when adapting to day-to-day situations as well as expected or unexpected changes in the organizational system. Messages that integrate relational values, shared goals, and expected task performance may be the most influential (Sypher, 1991). Research suggests that other person-centered messages, intended and/or perceived as concern for other and/or the relationship, more often achieve multiple goals and relational satisfaction whereas personal-centered messages do not (Applegate, 1990; O'Keefe & Shepherd, 1989; Nakanishi, 2003; Sypher, 1991). Additionally, Smircich and Morgan’s (2003) research found individuals “emerge as leaders because of their role in framing experience in a way that provides a viable basis for action” (p. 22). Framing experience and shaping social reality, especially during or after a crisis or chaos, can be accomplished by suggesting meaning, articulating, and defining what has previously remained implicit or unsaid, inventing images and meanings that provide a focus for new attention, and by consolidating, confronting, or changing prevailing wisdom or expectations (Peters, 1978, 1987; Pondy, 1978). Smircich and Morgan (1982) contended leaders “can frame and change situations, and in so doing enact a system of shared meaning that provides a basis for organized action” (p. 259).

Hart (1998) called for the need to “examine how the language of leadership interacts with [constituents] and give[s] citizens the courage to stay connected” (p. 121). Hart suggested leaders

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
should appeal to constituents' "heart to continue as citizens" (p. 121). He speculated that leaders may effectively influence constituents by managing messages that convey "feelings of heart" such as empathy, compassion, honor, and hope. Effective leaders define missions, visions, values, and meaningful relationships (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996). Moreover, effective leaders must "define issues in the midst of problem-solving and so contribute in a direct fashion to purposeful organizational behavior" (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 14). This "requires [leaders] to have a high level of flexibility and to take the initiative" (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 15). Framing leadership messages guides collective interpretation and closely aligns social reality and thus constituents are able to perceive events in a new, more interesting, and useful way (Deetz et al., 2000).

Research studies have provided clues as to how messages serve to frame relevant issues such as group members' need for power, social harmony, creation and maintenance of the social environment, and collective sense-making (Hirokawa & Salazar, 1999). Yet, Hirokawa and Salazar (1999) acknowledged "relatively little work emanating from this perspective has focused on group performance . . . [which ] is unfortunate, for this perspective clearly has the potential to increase understanding of the link between group communication and group decision-making, and ultimately why some groups perform better than others" (p. 178).

Leaders use language to manage meanings, to direct relations among constituents and with out-group members, and to "engage in conversational performances that are interactional, contextual, episodic, and improvisation" (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001). Obviously, chief influence agents such as teachers, preachers, parents, and political leaders who craft messages that skillfully manage meaning and relationships may be more satisfied in their communication efforts. They may also be perceived to be more competent leading the organization and handling challenges and crises. Furthermore, they may establish more satisfying and meaningful relations among constituents. It all boils down to the content, context, and process of communication.
Leadership Communication

Bennis and Nanus (2003) suggested that “an essential factor in leadership is the capacity to influence and organize meaning for the members of the organization” (p. 37) by means of communication. Communicating is the act of one person intentionally or unintentionally “stimulat[ing] meaning in the mind of another by means of verbal and nonverbal message codes” (Hurt, Scott, & McCroskey, 1978). Moreover, Rosen (2002) acknowledged “communication is about having something in common” (p. 33). Communication implies transference of meaning and the potential for relating, influencing, and converging understanding and expectations as well as coordinate action (Gamble & Gamble, 2005; M. Kim, 2002). Competent communication by leaders, as well as by constituents, is essential for group cohesiveness, satisfaction, and effectiveness. Through communication, constituents exchange information, form understanding, coordinate activities, influence others, socialize with others, as well as generate, maintain, and transform a system of basic assumptions, social rules, roles, and expectations. Leadership communication which effectively guides constituents’ sense-making, decision-making, problem-solving, conflict resolution, and management of crises are more likely to use conscientious-reflective thinking, engage in dialogue, have fewer problems with constituents, manage negative behaviors and conflict, chaos, and crisis better, and build on the strengths of constituents (Dixon, 2001; Hirokawa & Rost, 1992; Jarboe, 1996; Poole & McPhee, 1985; Ulmer & Sellnow, 2002).

Leadership communication may play a dominant, but not a sufficient, role in the creation and transformation of group reality (Heath, 1994). Poole (1998) asserted “the small group [is] the locus for the construction of social reality, with its associated ways of thinking, evaluating, and acting” (p. 94). Leaders who guide small group dynamics may play a significant role in the development of social reality. Thayer (1988) explained:

[A leader] alters or guides the manner in which his [or her] followers ‘mind’ the world by giving it a compelling ‘face.’ A leader . . . is one who give others a different sense of the meaning of that which they do by recreating it in a different
form... The leader is a sensegiver... [he/she] embodies the possibilities of escape from what might otherwise appear to us to be incomprehensible, or form what might otherwise appear to us to be a chaotic, indifferent, or incorrigible world—one over which we have no ultimate control (pp. 250, 254).

Successful leadership communication is dependent upon constituents’ perceptions of the leaders, especially the attributions of credibility (Kouzes & Posner, 1993; 1998), trustworthiness (Carrillo, 2002; Sypher, Shuler, & Whitten, 1997), and goodwill (McCroskey, 2001). Developing a psychological environment of safety, trust, competence, and goodwill or ethos allows leaders to supervise constituents’ sense-making activities and the construction and convergence of constituents’ beliefs. In particular, communicating and supervising “what is real” and “how to get things done” are crucial (Sypher, Shuler, & Whitten, 1997). Seiter and Gass (2004) contended “[b]eing an effective persuader is part and parcel of being a competent communicator” (p. 5). Weick (1995) compared leaders to storytellers: they invent, sequence, animate, and orient people by filtering and framing communication episodes. Plausibility rather than accuracy is essential. Soder (2001) asserted “if you cannot persuade others of the [plausibility] of your proposals and your view of what needs to happen, you will not be an effective leader” (p. xv). A leader’s attributed role as a legitimate leader and the skill of collective sense-making through communication competence may be essential for successful leadership.

Key to developing meaningful human relations is adapting communication for meaningful engagement with diverse others (Duck, 1994). Significantly, diverse constituents interact by means of collaboration. Collaboration is the “constructive management of differences” (Gray, 1998, p. 467) and implies relationship and productivity interdependency, diversity, joint agreement, acceptance, commitment, and collective responsibility for future consequences (Gray 1998). A sense of collaboration encourages meaningful engagement, maintains a sense of teamwork, and avoids competitiveness and social disconnection (Heckscher, 1995). From this
foundation, diverse constituents can interact more cohesively and cooperatively as well as share knowledge and learn from each other (Gossett & Tompkins, 2001; Stamps, 1997).

Heath (1994) suggested that Bormann’s symbolic convergence theory is applicable to leadership communication. When a leader directs the symbolic convergence enactment, the leader can develop the group’s rhetorical vision as well as the rhetorical community. Citing Eisenberg (1986), Heath (1994) discussed the significance of leaders guiding or directing communicating processes by the use of frames, metaphors, and ambiguous language which encourages constituents to “focus on a sense of community, while at the same time preserving unique beliefs and interpretations” (p. 133). Converging emphasizes common ground, interdependent and/or complementary relations rather than focusing on constituents’ diversity and dissension.

Taylor (2005) contended an “organization is constructed out of people’s experience, but it also enfolds and makes sense of it” (p. 214). Therefore, leaders can play a significant influence role by managing new experiences with existing personal and collective values and shared past experiences (Heifetz, 1998). Using such methods, a master leader “mobilizes people to face problems” (Heifetz, 1998, p. 344) and provokes “communities [to] cope with challenges, adapt to changes, and solve problems because leaders encourage [constituents] to do so and [leadership communication] helps them in this process” (Heifetz, 1998, p. 344). In essence, leadership communication involves a leader/s guiding a group’s attempt to frame and define their reality and actions. Similar to Weick’s enactment model, leaders manage meaning through language and the social interaction process of action, interaction, double interaction. They refer to leadership communication as a transactional phenomenon involving the construction and management of meaning. Smircich and Morgan (2003) reasoned that the goal of leadership communication is to guide and organize collective sense-making for effective social influence. They concluded that leadership communication “is a process of power-based reality construction and needs to be understood in these terms” (p. 25).
Community-building. Community, as a collective or organized group of individuals connected by interdependency and shared experiences, can be distinguished by the crucial quality of relatedness among diverse individuals (Barrett-Lennard, 1994; Rothenbuhler, 2001). In short, community is shared-unity. Hogan (1998b) acknowledged “Communities may unite around common life experiences or shared visions” (p. 292) and may be fragmented by diverse life experiences, lack of shared vision, and hate. Communities are defined not just by demographics and common experiences and needs but enacted by engaging diversity, dignity, and social justice.

Diversity among community constituents can pose challenges to a community leader. Banks (2000) contended, “dialogue is both the defining principle and the mechanism for conducting . . . relationships within [multicultural] communities” (p. 57). Significantly, “communication is the tool that we use to forge the gap between each other, and communities are sites where this interaction can occur” (Gossett & Tompkins, 2001, p. 114). Smircich and Morgan (1982) suggested over twenty years ago that leadership basically is the management of meaning for a sense of community. Smircich and Morgan (2003) believed “leaders symbolize the organization situation in which they lead. Their actions and utterances project and shape imagery in the minds of the led, which is influential one way or another in shaping actions within the setting as a whole” (p. 25). Particularly when the setting involves an imminent crisis.

Kumiai. A form of community-building for community sustainability is the concept of kumiai. Literally translated from Japanese it means “group-join.” Similar to “co-operatives,” the group’s shared mission is driven by constituents’ needs and by “your friends’ deeds” for the people and by the people (International Co-operative Alliance, 2006). Members value sharing, caring, social responsibility, power of the people, and solidarity. Values of kumiai include pluralism mutuality, individual autonomy, distributive justice, and a collective orientation (Davis & Donaldson, 1998). Leaders and senior managers of kumiai are expected to be professionally skilled, ethical and humble, and enact a “cooperative heart” (Takamura, 1992). Membership is generally open and diverse. Constituents are considered responsible for the welfare of other
members and their duty to help themselves and others. As an autonomous community, constituents unite voluntarily to satisfy their interdependent economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a collectively-vested and democratically-controlled community. *Kumiai* provides a significant social identity and an appropriate and effective form of social interaction during crises.

Modeled after the traditional Japanese *buraku*, an important social unit between the nation and family unit, Hawai’i island *kumiai* were initially formed in plantation camps and other rural settlements. According to Stephenson’s research (1979), “*kumiai*’s [sic] may be considered formal voluntary associations for they have an explicit leadership structure, a natural proper name, clear group boundaries, and each is spatially separated and autonomous” (p. 75). Degree of social openness and inclusion may vary. Most *kumiai* “were moderately responsive to the social environment, and low in responsiveness to the physical environment because they make no effort to alter it” (Stephenson, 1979). The reliance on a written document reflecting rules and procedures are characteristic of *kumiai*, and they may be considered instrumental organizations rather than social organizations. By tradition, *kumiai* have been led by adult Japanese males but the ever-increasing membership of female head of households and people from various racial, ethnic/cultural backgrounds who share a common local residence have transformed leaders to be more diverse.

Officers of the organization serve without compensation, and some members may never receive monetary support until their death. Leadership is rotated among all members and members are expected to cooperate in all manners and especially to provide support to members in emergencies. The *kumiai* and individuals provide monetary gifts and donations of service and materials in times of disasters. *Kumiai* may be considered highly altruistic.

Currently, only one published article has addressed contemporary *kumiai* in Hawai’i (Stephenson, 1979). According to Stephenson, (1979), *kumiai* are voluntary neighborhood or community associations found primarily among rural and urban residents on the island of Hawai’i.
of various ethnic, racial, and cultural backgrounds with Japanese ancestry predominate. During the early 1920s, Japanese immigrants "found it necessary to try to establish community organizations to provide what they felt were essential extrafamilial functions" (Stephenson, 1979). The function of the *kumiai* was to support members socially, emotionally, and monetarily during death and disasters.

*Crisis management.* When valued collective resources are endangered or when an organized system is threatened, a community crisis is likely to be experienced. A crisis is defined by a disturbance to a whole system coupled with the challenges to the basic components of that system (Pauchant & Mitroff, 1992). For humans, a crisis can have detrimental, debilitating, or terminal consequences. A crisis may threaten important needs, values, practices, and productivity. Hamblin (1958) defined a crisis as "an urgent situation in which all [constituents] face a common threat" (p. 322). When an organization's or community's identity, credibility or legitimacy, relationships, and/or resources are threatened, a crisis will be experienced.

By nature, all impending crises or disasters provide warning signs, and some humans are more sensitive to these warning signs than others (Mitroff, 1994). Because community crises have a severe affect upon constituents and their resources, scholars suggest community leaders should spend time scanning their environment for warning signs, "thinking about the unthinkable," constantly monitoring potential threats, preparing for crises, and managing civility (Coombs, 1999; DePree, 1998; DiSanza & Legge, 2003; Mitroff et al., 1996).

When a potential crisis disaster is detected or after a crisis has been experienced, leadership responses are regarded as crisis communication (Heath, 1994). Crisis communication is an attempt to collectively make common sense of unbelievable phenomenon or chaotic experiences as well as address safety and security issues. Common emotions experienced during and after a crisis or disaster include shared shock, horror, anger, insecurity, sympathy, and compassion. Shared concerns include future attempts, safety and security preparedness, financial, economic, and political implications, and leadership reactions and responses.
Making sense may be a fundamental process of the human condition; making sense of a crisis event or potential crisis or disaster event is crucial for competent leadership. Coombs (1999) acknowledged crises may be real but "cris[e]s are symbolic" as well. Constituents may be unaware of an imminent crisis, disagree if an event is a crisis, and may not recognize a crisis has occurred (Coombs, 1999). However when a crisis is detected, constituents generally expect the leader to provide crisis identification, description, and explanation as well as provide direction and assurance (Coombs, 1999; DeSanza & Legge, 2003; Heath, 1998; Klann, 2003; Mitroff, 1988, 1994; Mitroff et al., 1996). Communication enables a leader to influence constituents for adaptation to changing conditions by guiding constituents' beliefs and directing new behavioral patterns during crisis situations. Effective crisis communication should establish some level of common reality among constituents for the purpose of coordinating a collaborative response of recovery.

Those affected by the crisis comprise a unique community. The interdependent goals of crisis communication are to protect constituents and resources and to mobilize coordinated efforts to restore the community system. These goals can be reached by establishing some common sense out of nonsense, "unreal" drama, and horrific shock. Klann (2003) offered sound advice: communicating with constituents before a potential crisis occurs will reduce anxiety, confusion and anger. Klann (2003) acknowledged "face-to-face contact remains the most effective means of communication because it promotes the emotional connection" (p. 28) and personal engagement. By allowing constituents to question, voice concerns, and share their perspectives, leaders may guide the development of common understanding and a sense of common ground among and with constituents.

Klann (2003) also recommended that leaders "follow a rule of three R's: review, repeat, and reinforce" (p. 29) their messages and meanings, thus promoting common understanding. A shared understanding creates "a consistency across the organization at all levels as to the clarity and usefulness of procedures and directives that the organization will bear when a crisis
develops” (p. 29-30). Making connections with constituents and communicating genuine care and concern are essential (Klann, 2003). By clarifying the plausible, possible, and practical benefits gained by establishing and maintaining pro-social attitudes and actions, leaders are perceived as competent. A leadership style that “displays loyalty and confidence” (King, 2002, par. 40) is generally regarded as effective. The key is to be clear, concise, and consistent with communication messaging (Klann, 2003).

King (2002) proposed that the effectiveness of crisis management is influenced by leadership style. “The crisis leader must possess and demonstrate strong interpersonal skills, which will motivate team members and employees to work towards the organization’s goals . . . and must emotionally inspire self-confidence in all group members” (par. 40). Klann (2003) surmised “it’s all about connecting with the people.” During a crisis, the public statements of organizational leaders are particularly important in structuring meaning (Seeger et al., 2001), clarifying sense-making and visioning, and conveying caring relationships (Klann, 2003). Klann (2003) concluded “because of its intense nature, crisis triggers emotions, which signal a threat to one or more basic human needs. These needs include such things as safety, security, and self-esteem” (p. 69). Thus, leaders must be aware of these connections and respond in a competent manner that guides constituents’ beliefs and behaviors toward positive and balanced action for community survival and recovery.

During times of community crises, hope, as a positive expectation, is a crucial resource for maintaining healthy individuals, relationships, and communities (Barge, 2003; Bennis, 1997; Freire, 1994; Hart, 1998). Barge (2003) asserted “hope is a form of discursive practice that involves co-creating discourse with others that generates new images of possibility for social arrangements and mobilizes the moral and affective resources necessary to translate image into action and belief while balancing creativity and constraint” (abstract). By identifying “asset maps” involving positive aspects, such as resources and capabilities rather than negative aspects, leaders create a sense of hope.
Hope can be “sensed” through the enactment of affirmative, relational, generative, and imaginative “sensibilities” (Barge, 2003). A frame of affirmation “notice[s] and inquir[es] into the life-generating moments of excellence within the community” (p. 79). A relational frame reflects shared “unique historical and social circumstances” and possible futures (p. 79). A generative frame addresses proactive, reactive, or active practical operations. And finally, an imaginative frame is an abstract, creative, and innovative catalyst for social and functional activities. An imaginative frame “involves creating events that inspire one’s imaginative abilities” (Barge, 2003). Barge (2003) believed “the articulation of hope and commitment to hope is important to community life” (p. 80). In conclusion, when communities experience chaos, confusion, and crises, constituents turn to the leaders within the organization for meaningful frames of events such as hope (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996).

Synthesis, Definition of Terms, and Research Questions

The ability to influence others is one of the most important tools for adapting to life’s situations (Mehrabian, 1970). Social influence is a common, however complex, phenomenon. Social influence events such as leadership feature a multiple of circumstances and qualities and are difficult to distinguish and analyze. The literature review addressed a mosaic of concepts such as the significance of social reality, communication, enthymemes, language, framing, and leadership for community building and crisis management. The intent of the literature review was to develop a theoretical and methodological framework for a social influence and leadership communication model and to develop specific research questions focusing on how leaders influence constituents in actual and naturally occurring ways.

In particular, this study is concerned with the complexity, creativity, and co-ordination of social reality construction during an instance of community building and crisis management. The following section will synthesize presented literature as well as provide working definitions for key concepts addressed in the investigation. Derived from the literature review, specific research questions were constructed.
Definition of Terms

Fundamentally, communicating involves connecting with another and making sense from messages acquired from that connection. Making sense is an essential human function. Communicating helps us make sense of our world, ourselves, and others. **Sense-making** will be defined as the cognitive process of perceiving sensed stimuli, attributing meaning, and ascertaining that the stimuli are congruent with meaning. Sense-making is conceptualized as using available means for sensing and interpreting meaning. If sensed stimuli are determined to be congruent with meaning, “it makes sense”; if not, it may be considered a mistake, nonsense, no sense, unrealistic, or confusing.

Based on the literature review, communication is fundamentally a sense-making activity that assists human to understand, relate to, and influence others and themselves. Generating and attributing meaning by a semiotic process are common to most definitions of communication. **Communication** will be defined as the semiotic, sense-making process of generating and conveying thoughts, ideas, and feelings in meaningful ways, thereby facilitating sense-making and reality construction, human relations, and social influence. Key to this perspective is the inclusion of intrapersonal and interactional processes, recognizable behaviors associated with connecting or engaging with another or others, and the activation of sense-making. Most of these factors may be necessary but not sufficient for meaningful relations and effective social influence.

Social influence is the capacity or power of persons to produce psychological effects on others by intangible/tangible or indirect/direct means as well as to motivate, inspire, or impel a person to some action (Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 2000). Social influence will be conceptualized broadly as social interactions whereby interactors and observers are affected by another’s behavior. **Social influence will be defined as the intentional and unintentional effect/s and affect/s associated with communication.** Effects include the shaping, reinforcing, and changing of symbolic systems and meanings, beliefs, values, priorities, motivations,
assumptions, and behaviors. Affects include feelings, emotions, and attitudes. Common to symbolic interaction, social construction, and language and social interaction paradigms, communication is a cognitive, social, and behavioral transaction and transformational process and product, a significant means for social influence, (Gass & Seiter, 2003; Mehrabian, 1970) and “central to the social construction of reality” (Hewitt, 1991, p. 15).

Reality is derived from “a subjective interpretation of phenomena that people create for themselves, based on their individual perceptions and cultural orientations” (Kreps, 1990, p. 31). Reality is “individuals’ conceptions of the world” (Hawkins & Pingree, 1982, p. 224) and may be considered tacit knowledge based on the cognitive processing of experienced cues of information. Berger and Luckmann (1966) defined knowledge as “the certainty that phenomena are real and that they possess specific characteristics” (p. 1). Social reality will be defined as a socially mediated construct derived from collective sense-making of phenomena that prepares and structures constituents’ identity, beliefs, emotions/attitudes, behaviors, and expectations. Social reality shapes and converges individuals’ sense of reality resulting in a common sense of reality. A shared reality is an essential process of meaningful social relations and a motivating factor for collective action. Meyer (2003) acknowledged “through a process of one message following another, people create their social reality. As messages are attempted and responded to, certain fragments of meaning are agreed upon and shared” (p. 2). The creation and sharing of symbols such as language through interaction is a “foundational perspective for studying communication” (Meyer, 2003, p. 2). By using meaningful symbols, two or more individuals can attempt to convey, exchange, and relate their perceptions and conclusions as well as express concerns and questions about reality. Thus, the process of communicating with another, others, and ourself essentially shapes, reinforces, and changes our reality and is a common means for converging realities with diverse others for common sense and understanding.

Research suggests humans have a preference for organizing chaos or eliminating nonsense and uncertainty; ambiguity, though, may be tolerated for cognitive comfort. Weick’s
Theory of Organizing (1990) and Theory of Sense-making (1995) addressed humans’ innate need to attempt to organize sensory data provided by social interaction. If humans cannot comprehend or understand messages, are unable to interpret meaning, gain knowledge, or make sense from those messages, they may not organize sense from the information, and may be misinformed or mislead. If they are confused or cautious, they may engage in social interaction with the messenger or with others to clarify meaning, organize sense, and attempt to reveal “what is real” or “the truth,” and construct meaningful reality. Weick (1990, 1995) suggested humans engage in a behavioral cycle for social interaction sense-making. His “act-interact-double” interact pattern is a means to enhance the organization of collective sense-making. Weick (1995) concluded that individuals of a collective depend upon communication for creating a sense of identity and duty, collaborating common sense and social reality, and coordinating responses/reaction to new experiences, chaos, crisis, or nonsensical events.

Frames of reference, as structured mental models of receivers, provide a mechanism for interpreting sensory stimuli and guide the process of interpretation and reactions. Frame of reference is “the sum of a person’s knowledge, experience, goals, values, and attitudes” (Lucas, 2001, p. 17). Frame of reference will be defined as “a structure of concepts, values, customs, [and] views [of reality] by means of which an individual or group, perceives [and] evaluates data, communicates ideas, and regulates behavior” (Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 1995, p. 528). Tacit frames of reference are similar to Aristotle’s (1991) concept of enthymeme. Social reality, based on personal and social experiences, fosters shared understanding by aligning and framing sense-making for similar frames of reference. Significantly, frames of references are the foundations for encoding and decoding messages as well as converging cognitive processing and social understanding. Frames may be considered the building blocks to construct frames of reference.

Social convergence is accomplished by processes of belief and reality adjustments, adaptations, coordination, negotiation, and reciprocity for conversation conformation,
understanding confirmation, and social coordination. **Social convergence** will be defined as **social reality confluence and coordination**. Social divergence, or lack of social reality confluence and coordination, can be accomplished by demonstrating the insufficiency of the above processes. Shotter (1993) asserted that “our reality is often a much more disorderly, fragmented, and heterogeneous affair than we had previously thought... thus uncertainty, vagueness, and ambiguity” (p. 18) may be associated with social interaction. During social interaction, constituents’ (participants and observers) realities are “a developed and developing event” (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 40). Shared experience and shared circumstances may be influential means for developing social convergence and similar understanding as well as awareness and appreciation for common ground, common sense, common good, and social cohesion and social collaboration.

O’Keefe and Delia (1985) asserted “the ability to take the perspectives of others also underlies the human ability to engage in joint action... [and] coordinate their respective lines of action” (p. 50). Communicative behavior as “joint action” is an attempt to make sense, share sense, and express sense. Shotter (1993) suggested “joint action produces unintended and unpredictable outcomes” (p. 39) and “nonetheless, has an intentional quality to it; it seems both to have a ‘content,’ as well as to ‘indicate’ [reality]” (p. 39). Social communicative behaviors are based on personal realities, “but in order to construct acts which express the joint orientation and goals shared with coparticipant[s], the individual must be sensitive to the others’ definitions and interpretations” (O’Keefe & Delia, 1985, p. 50) in order to influence effectively other/s and develop convergence.

Papa and Pood (1988) asserted the significance of co-orientation. The concept of co-orientation addresses the social relation process of acknowledging that others have different frames of reference and reality and the attempt to become more accurate of the others’ point of view. The process of co-orientation and coordination of reality for a common reality or common sense creates a similar acknowledgment of the situation and each other’s role in that situation.
Co-orientation may be essential for social convergence of diverse constituents. For co-orientation, social convergence and effective social influence, a leader may need to regard the diverse realities as well as the common sense of constituents. According to Shotter (1993), Vico suggested a rhetor’s reasons and reality are accepted by listeners “not because... [rhetors] supply a demonstrable proof, a full syllogistic structure which listeners are passively compelled logically to accept... [Rather], in their incomplete, enthymemic structure, [rhetors] offer initially unconnected premises that most of the audience will be able to connect up—and feel that it is they who have ‘seen’ the point!” (p. 56). This social influence effect is accomplished by “the available means of *topoi* in the *sensus communis* already existing between” interactors (Shotter, 1993, p. 56). The effectiveness of behaviors influencing others’ reality is fundamentally dependent upon the art of selecting relevant topics for making sense and converging multiple realities and thus creating and constructing common sense.

Significantly, ambiguity or the awareness of multiple meanings derived by a common message may also enhance the process of social convergence. Heath (1994) suggested that ambiguity may naturally encourage social cohesion and cooperative action even when constituents have very different interpretations of reality because constituents have in common the need to establish meaning and make some sort of sense. The strategic use of ambiguity is suggested by Eisenberg (1984) to orient to the different goals of constituents as well as to maintain relations. For example, cultivating a positive attitude and expectations, or a general sense of hope, may be perceived differently for each constituent depending upon what each specifically wants to accomplish in the future. However, a sense of group unity is created with a collective positive attitude or faith in the future. Moreover, ambiguity may encourage consensus for “doing the right thing” even though the specific “right thing” varies among constituents. Ambiguity may encourage pro-social behaviors such as agreeing to disagree. Hence, the general concept transcendentally motivates collective action for “the collective good.”
The exchange of personal logics or realities for the collective good may be considered dialogue. Dialogue is assumed to involve sharing speaker’s beliefs, reality, intent, strategies, and meanings by means of enacted discourse behavior. Dialogue will be defined as the flow of meaning resulting from relational enactments involving constituents connecting and engaging with one another by mutually disclosing their beliefs, feelings, and attitudes, and sharing their reality by symbolic means, as well as attempting to understand another’s reality. Dialogue assumes diversity of reality; yet, dialoguers accept and appreciate commonalities and differences. Dialogue may require maturity and mutual acceptance as well as a genuine attempt to commune and cooperate with other/s. Dialogue may essentially require prosocial behavior. Dialogue develops shared meaning and common ground (Bohm, 1985). Enacted dialogue through discourse is central to Weick’s and Schein’s theories of social organizing, collective sense-making, and adapting to crises. Through a simple pattern of “act-interact-double” interact, humans may attempt to converge for common understanding. Dialogue and discourse are means by which to structure, shape, and derive meaning for shared understanding. Personal definitions, conceptualizations, connotative meanings, and inferences are basic elements of the sense-making process and are represented in discourse.

The actual language behaviors as discourse is a medium for social interaction (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000) and a mechanism for social influence. Discourse is defined by Random House Webster’s College Dictionary (2000) as “communication of thought by words” (p. 378). For this study, discourse will be regarded as the directed structure of “symbolic human utterances” (Burke, 1969). Details of language in use and social interaction process are central concerns of discourse analysts (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Frames are a significant discursive device. Framing messages by codes, needs, values, emotions, and metaphors are common tactics associated with social influence such as leadership (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996). Frames will be defined as topics, themes, and ideas/ideologies that constitute and structure discourse. Moreover, frames will be conceptualized as a psychological device enacted by symbolic
representation that offers a perspective and manipulates salience in order to influence subsequent interpretation and perceived reality. Framing is a means for managing meaning and social reality. Frames are also the building blocks for theme development and representation. Hence, messages are "organized and resized to fit within the parameters established by the [selected] frame."

A "frame not only contains, but constrains" (Rhoads, 1997, p. 1). Framing involves referring to some salient aspect of perceived reality. Framing limits perceptual selection by focusing on particular concepts and not others. Framing selects and focuses attention, identifies, labels, stereotypes, and pre-evaluates phenomena, thereby influencing the interpretation of reality. Framing effects result in salient attributes of a message that activate particular thoughts used for future evaluation of phenomena (Price et al., 1997) and possible future reactions. A significant strategy and tactic of framing is to co-orientate to listeners' frame of reference and provide frames that guide or direct the social construction of reality and manage meaning. When interacting with diverse constituents, framing may be challenging but, if crafted appropriately, can be very effective. Framing may be enacted strategically or automatically, consciously or subconsciously (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996).

It may be especially practical for leaders to influence reality of constituents for social convergence. Who creates the applied symbols, identifies, names and labels experiences as well as frames reality for knowledge construction has considerable power and influence shaping the reality of others. Sense-making can be affected significantly by social influence strategies and tactics used by crafty chief influence agents, social marketers, and distinguished leaders. Analyzing enacted social interaction discourse may provide clues and cues to representations of "plurivocal realities," as diverse frames of reference, themes, and social influence styles that frame symbolic interaction and construct symbolic convergence (Cragan & Shields, 1992).

Leadership is a significant social influence process that guides the social reality of a group of individuals in an attempt to achieve a common reality, meaningful social relationships, and coordinated actions to survive, strive, or thrive (Northouse, 2001). Interestingly, in
Metaphysics, Book XII, Chapter 10, Aristotle (1973) addressed the significance of leaders. Aristotle (1973) asserted that an organized group of people is qualified as “good” based on “order and in its leader and more in the latter” (p. 327), for the order depends on the leader. Even “fish and fowl” develop a system of order and collective behavior. Alphas usually emerge as leaders but leadership may be shared. These organic systems are connected to other systems “for all are ordered together to one end” . . . survival (Aristotle, 1973, p. 327). Aristotle also addressed that “all [humans] must at least come to be dissolved into their [natural] elements” as well as be identified by similar principles “in which all share for the good of the whole” (p. 327).

In particular, leaders can subtly and significantly influence constituents and are expected to influence constituents positively. Leaders may guide the development of highly reliable organizations and functional systems. Leadership will be defined as a social influence process and outcome derived by effecting the sense-making processes of conceptualizing and constituting a culture or community, conveying and conducting a social reality and common sense, and championing and coaching a common vision among constituents. The leader’s organization, or community is developed and constructed from learned, shared, and emerging assumptions, beliefs, values, ideology, conventions, conformity, and common sense. To be successful, designated, elected, and emerging leaders must convince constituents to accept and agree to a common understanding, behavioral expectations, and cooperative actions for the common good. Leadership may involve providing a vision as foresight and purpose, creating valued opportunities, protecting valued resources, managing meaning and understanding of unfamiliar and unusual events, and building confidence in the realization of a shared reality and ideology.

According to Schein (1992), “[l]eaders do not have a choice about whether or not to communicate. They only have a choice about how much to manage what they communicate” (p. 253). By means of communicating, leaders can significantly influence others. Leadership communication will be conceptualized as using meaningful symbols as messages to influence
and manage constituents' sense-making for common understanding, coordinate environmental and social adaptation, relate with constituents, as well as to motivate constituents. Leaders may be expected to communicate with constituents to direct attention, guide interpretations, shape reality, provide a mission and vision, as well as to motivate, prescribe, and support actions. Verbal and nonverbal symbolic messages are the tools by which leaders can enact leadership communication, and dialogue may be a useful form of leadership communication. Leadership communication enables and enacts the management of attention, management of meaning and common sense, as well as manages common ground/identity among constituents (Clutterbuck & Hirst, 2002). Leadership communication is dynamic and may be dramatic. Nevertheless, "effective leaders are also effective communicators"; however, the reverse is not necessarily true (Clutterbuck & Hirst, 2002, p. 351).

Leaders may significantly influence constituents' learning (Senge, 1990a, 1990b, 1998, Weick & Ashford, 2001). Schein (1985) suggested five fundamental strategies through which leaders might teach social reality and cultural learning. First, leaders must identify what should be considered significant and not. By embedding gradually and consistently assumptions and especially values, leaders create a sense of expected and preferred reality. The enactment of congruent mission, vision, goals, structures, norms, and conventions are key features of effective leadership. Effective leaders need "both vision and the ability to articulate it and enforce it" (Schein, 1985, p. 317). Second, leaders should effectively manage problems, issues, and crises that disrupt or are incongruent with established sense-making assumptions or social reality. Moreover, effective leaders must be aware of common emotions associated with the crisis such as insecurity, fear, frustration, resentment, anger, empathy, and compassion. Effective leaders must "create order out of chaos, and are expected to provide their own assumptions as an initial road map into the uncertain future" (Schein, 1985, p. 318). Schein (1985) asserted leaders must "provide temporary stability and emotional reassurance" (p. 318). Third, leaders must role model preferred beliefs and behaviors such as courage, loyalty, self-sacrifice, service, perseverance,
humbleness, and morality. Fourth, leaders must appear to manage and protect resources and provide rewards appropriately; and in particular, fifth, recruit and instill constituents who will exemplify preferred ideas, values, skills, and behaviors.

Schein (1985) recommended five basic tactics for accomplishing the above strategies. These include 1) designing the organizational structure, network systems, and facilities associated with the organizational culture's policies, procedures, and practices, 2) narrating stories and legends that promote and exemplify cultural values and assumptions, 3) narrating historical events that remind constituents of common experiences or circumstances, common ground, and common sense, 4) strategically providing public formal discourse and public dialogue that strategically manages social reality, relations, and reactions, and 5) enacting informal spontaneous dialogue with constituents for collective sense-making.

Language may be considered "powerful" because, if recognized, it activates social influence and provides a structure and "path" for human sense-making and meaning-making. Discourse is structured by language use as well as a consequence of symbolic social interaction. Thus, leaders who manage language and messaging increase their ability to influence others. According to Fairhurst and Sarr (1996), the "management of meaning" through the use of symbolic messaging is the ultimate function of leaders. When leaders frame an event, it influences what receivers may focus on and may direct interpretations and conclusions. By "isolating the issue and framing it so everyone understands it and its relevance" (Raffoni, 2002, p. 3), leaders significantly influence constituents sense-making and response activities. Framing communication messages is the most basic process of leadership communication and may be the most effective means to influence others. Deetz et al. (2000) asserted framing "refers to the ways leaders can use their language to shape or modify particular interpretations of organizational events, thereby directing likely responses" (p. 67). Framing is a means for managing meaning, learning, and social reality as well as satisfying constituents' needs and values.
Hart and Burks (1972) argued that a rhetorical approach is the best perspective “to facilitate human understanding and to effect social cohesion” (p. 75). They suggested “because social interactants are multifaceted, the rhetorically sensitive person tries to accept role-taking as part of the human condition” and “tries to understand that an idea can be rendered in multi-form ways” (p. 76). As a rhetor, a leader must be sensitive to the particulars and peculiarities of the evolving situation. Hart and Burks (1972) concluded a successful rhetor must “not deal with social interactions on an ad hoc basis” (p. 80); if so, the rhetor “will be rhetorically unproductive and interpersonally naive” (p. 79). Appealing to the values, common experiences, circumstances, and/or common sense of constituents may be a form of “rhetorical sensitivity.”

Wheatley’s (1998) “current belief is that . . . one of the most potent shapers of behavior in organizations, and in life, is meaning” (p. 163). Meaning patterns beliefs and behaviors and occasionally in predictable ways. Our need to reduce, manage, or tolerate uncertainty (Berger & Bradac, 1982) and make some sort of sense (Weick, 1995) activates new meaning-making and sense-making and “serves as a point of reference” (Wheatley, 1998, p. 164). However, during times of “non-sense” or unfamiliar situations and extraordinary circumstances, constituents may need to create a new sense of reality to guide motivation and direction. The new meaning may “transcend present organizational circumstances” (p. 164). Consequently, Wheatley (1998) suggested a new “discernible pattern or shape to [their] lives” (p. 164) emerges. Leaders may play a subtle or significant role in the organizational process such as providing a vision.

Rhetorical visions (Bormann, 1986) constructed of collective values and expectations provide a future belief orientation for collaborative, coordinated action. Rhetorical visions are based on fundamental values, missions, functions, and organizational structure or form. Visioning is a specific basic assumption that directs the progression or transformation of an organization’s philosophy or ideology, values, mission, goals, and objectives (Deetz et al., 2000). Future-oriented frames and “visions” shape, reinforce, and change organization’s culture and social
reality. The construction and structure of rhetorical visions are enacted by communicator's using symbolic means such as discourse.

In light of overall research constraints and Western-biased conceptualizations and preoccupations, the concept of leadership as relational and communicational offers a positive and constructive alternative basis for leadership theory (Snowden & Gorton, 2002). Leadership is a function of a situated social influence process rather than a series of personality traits or psychological states of a particular individual (Carthcart, Samovar, & Henman, 1996).

Research suggests leadership styles associated with social engagement are generally more successful than directive, authoritarian, or "concern for self" styles. Identifying the most effective style such as telling, selling, supporting, and delegating (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988) and concern for other/s, concern for relationship, and concern for self (Nakanishi, 2003) is an intuitive skill of competent leaders. From a relational approach, leadership involves social relations. From a functional approach, leaders may use dialogue and discourse as tools for managing meaning for constituents, relating with constituents, and influencing constituents. Coordinating realities and reactions are central to leading social systems of individuals such as families, organizations, communities, and nations.

For community-building, "communication is the social force that enables individuals to [function] cooperatively toward achieving mutually recognized goals" (Kreps, 1990, p. 5). Communication is a symbolic activity that people engage in to help them interpret, influence, and adapt to their environment (Kreps, 1990). These functions are related to recognizing and responding to threats to human existence, an organized system, or a community (Kreps, 1990). Thus, the core function of leadership may involve guiding and structuring social-group reality for community/organization adaptation by means of communicating. Analyzing actual "language of leadership" which engages constituents (Conger, 1989, 1991; Soder, 2001) may advance our knowledge of the social influence process of leadership and the significance of leadership communication.
The goal of this investigation is 1) to add to the body of knowledge of the leadership as a social influence/social construction process, 2) to provide an actual example of naturally occurring skillful rhetorical leadership, and 3) to provide practical wisdom regarding crisis leadership communication.

**Research Questions**

This study provided an analysis and interpretation of how a particular community with a preferred cultural reality attempted to cope with a potentially harmful world event by the words of its chief influence agents and members from the public. The research question—*How do leaders attempt to influence constituents in an actual instance of leadership?*—guided the literature review. The conceptual focus of this study was leadership as social influence behavior for directing/guiding interactive collective sense-making activities and collective action by discursive processes. The qualities of social influence/directing behaviors include language as manifest discourse and dialogue as latent personal meanings that structure, connect, constrain, enable, and enact social influence and directed sense-making. This study sought to uncover this leadership process as it unfolded during a crisis situation that called for leadership from members of the group at and following its meeting. To study leadership as social influence, the following three research questions developed from the literature review:

**RQ1:** What topics and themes structured ongoing meeting discourse?

**RQ2:** What frames did the leaders as chief influence agents use to influence constituents' sense-making in an attempt to manage the meaning of a community crisis?

**RQ3:** How did assembled constituents of a community in crisis seek to achieve social convergence?

Communication is the means by which individuals can attempt to make sense of their world with other, share common sense, and share differences in their reality through dialogic discourse. A communication perspective and a communication analysis can deepen our understanding of the process of leadership.
Conceptual Model

The following research model provides a conceptual map and a definition of key terms.

![Leadership Communication Model](image)

**Figure 1. Leadership Communication Model©**

**Sense-making:** The cognitive process of perceiving sensed stimuli, attributing meaning, and ascertaining that the stimuli are congruent with meaning.

**Communicating:** The semiotic, sense-making process of generating and conveying thoughts, ideas, and feelings in meaningful ways, thereby facilitating sense-making, reality construction, human relations, and social influence.

**Social influence:** The intentional and unintentional effect/s and affect/s associated with communication such as symbol systems, beliefs, feelings, attitudes, behaviors, knowledge, frames of reference, reality and common sense.

**Leadership:** A social influence process and outcome derived by effecting the sense-making processes of conceptualizing, co-constructing, and constituting a culture or community, conveying and directing social reality and common sense, and championing and coaching a common vision among constituents.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Like a good detective, the researcher is confronted by a confusing pattern of clues that is meaningful in both an immediate and a deeper, sometimes hidden sense. To unravel the mystery, the detective (researcher) must probe and order this "reality." Poole & McPhee, 1985

The demonstration of sense-making and convergence in natural settings by bona fide groups was the focus of the study. This study analyzed a real time, naturally set, actual social interaction event involving a bona fide group (Putnam & Stohl, 1996). A bona fide group is a naturally occurring group characterized by permeable boundaries and interdependent with the psychological, social, and physical environment. Heath (1994) suggested that meaning and the sense people make of themselves, their circumstances, and their actions and reactions are worthy of comprehensive and rigorous study. Moreover, Eisenberg (1986) concluded that organizations, communities, and personal relationships are best understood "as the ongoing evolution and negotiation of meaning" (p. 88). This negotiation of meaning is enacted in dialogue and cohesive discourse (Fairhurst 2001; Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001; Mabry, 1999; Weick, 1988). Research regarding "natural groups" (Frey 1994) suggested "the majority of a group's interaction has nothing to do with decision-making but focuses, instead on information sharing" and sense-making (Poole, 1999, p. 59) which is performed through the use of discourse. Discourse language "structures social interaction, shapes understanding, and makes things happen" (Wetherall, Gallios, & Pittam, 2001).

Dervin's, (2003) Sense-Making Methodology focuses on "the flow of events" (p. 141) whereby "ordinary human beings are . . . theory makers" (p. 143) or sense-makers. Collective sense-making and social reality are associated with relating realities with others by communicating. Dervin suggested a method by which to study "communicating." As a "behaving" analysis (Dervin, 2003), the method focused on revealing distinct relational-orientation behaviors associated with socially influenced sense-making. A "behaving analysis"
emphasizes how the message is enacted for social connections, shared understanding, relating with another or others, and ultimately influencing others. Messages are enactments of human experience that can be analyzed to reveal "realms of reality" as well as sense-making strategies, techniques, and patterns.

Significantly, Sense-Making Methodology assumes that human behavior analyses cannot be "fully instructed or determined a priori" (Foreman-Wernet, 2003, p. 8). A broad range of messages, social interaction features, and interpretations are assumed possible and equally significant (Dervin, 2003). In particular, each communication episode must be acknowledged as featuring situation-defining enactments associated with "relating" including: an individual relating to self, an individual relating with another, others, and/or a collective, as well as a collective relating to self, a collective relating an individual, and a collective relating with another collective/s. Thus, each communication episode will feature a unique combination of situation-defining enactments and generate unique and equally significant interpretations by interactors, observers, and analysts. Common to all communication episodes, events, and communities is the sense-making process, an innate human behaving process for and product of making collective sense.

Analyzing an Extended Instance of Leadership

This study was an exploratory investigation of how leaders, in an extended instance of leadership, influenced constituents "in a day of a community." The enactment of communicative behaviors in the form of verbal messages as discourse was the focus. To understand leadership communication better, this study described observable communication behaviors of interactors naturally engaged in social construction of reality and the manner in which leader/s influenced this sense-making process. Barge (1985) contended that a descriptive methodology or field study is an appropriate vehicle to examine the social construction of leadership and organizational enactment. His research suggested that effective leaders communicate differently than ineffective leaders. These differences include constructing different forms/styles of communication, levels of
domination, as well as crafting effective and appropriate messages. Barge (1985) concluded the enactment of successful social influencing as effective leadership may enhance the possibility of constituting and directing constituents’ reality and responses for desired consequences.

This study provided a rhetorical analysis of leadership communication and crisis management for a community in Hawai‘i. This study investigated the social dynamics of a collective as they co-constructed their social reality, attempted to make sense of a potential community crisis, and managed their social relationships during a bona fide meeting. In particular, the study investigated how leaders influence civic discourse by framing. The study of enacted language is considered a useful means to investigate social connection, interaction, and convergence/divergence (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998; Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001; Tracy, 2001). Discourse as connected texts may be studied to reveal the linguistic devices used to accomplish social functions such as understanding, relating, and influencing others, and constructing and managing social reality and social convergence.

**Discourse and Rhetorical Analyses**

Language expressed in discourse provides a map of the construction and management of meaning. Discourse is considered a way of sensing, knowing, and organizing contextual life. By analyzing discourse, a researcher may “determine what is figure and ground in the framing of organizational events” (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001, p. 79). Discourse may be defined as “communication of thought by words” (*Random House Webster’s College Dictionary* 2000, p. 378) in connected texts. Discourse analysis is a common type of language-in-use analysis and is considered a message-centered methodology (Alvesson & Karreman, 2000; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Tracy, 2001). Details of language in use and social interaction processes such as social reality construction are central concerns of discourse analysis (Potter, 1996; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001). The basic goal of discourse analysis is to analyze symbolic representations and the construction and management of social reality (Lemke, 1995a).
Understanding collaborative social connection and interaction “requires attention to both process and content” (Hardy, Lawrence, & Phillips, 1998). For example, Mumby and Clair (1997) suggested discourse analysis should focus on the organizing of social reality, social roles, and resources. They asserted “discourse is the principal means by which organization members create a coherent social reality that frames their sense of who they are” (p. 181). “The principal goal of this research [approach] is to demonstrate the connection between the shared norms and values of an organization . . . and the means by which these norms and values are expressed” (p. 183). Putnam (1998) stated a discourse analysis may reveal “sequences, patterns, and meanings that stem from exchanging verbal and nonverbal messages” (p. 147). A discourse analysis may also reveal “voices” of who can speak, who spoke, when, with whom, and how (style). Discursive construction of collective sense-making and organizing (Fairhurst & Putman, 2004) feature multiple voices or as Putnam (1998) metaphorically referred to a “chorus” of collective interaction. The “convenor” or conductor as leader of the chorus is particularly important as he or she potentially has a significant impact on the group’s identity, social reality, as well as readiness for and performance of collaborative social interaction.

Discourse is an expression and creation of organizational networking and norming. Woodilla (1998) suggested focusing on how discourse impacts organizational sense-making processes such as the identification of a “dominant discourse” and how that dominant discourse emerged and was sustained as well as the presence of differing viewpoints. Moreover, Mangham (1998) contended the explicit or implicit reference to feelings in discourse should also be identified since “practical reasoning unaccompanied by emotion is not sufficient for practical wisdom” (Grant, Keenoy, & Oswick, 1998, p. 6). Mapping discourse can indicate the pathway, flow, and progression of communicative behaviors by language. The qualities of a particular discourse event provide clues to content, social influence tactics, as well as features of relationships.
Discourse analysis is useful for identifying content, frames such as topics, themes, fantasies, and rhetorical visions (Cragan & Shields, 1992). Frame analysis provides considerable insight into the ideological dynamics of organizing chaos, opposition, mobilizing constituents, and “sustaining cohesion necessary for successful collective action” (Steinberg, 1998, p. 846). Frame construction is an emergent and dynamic process influenced by the dialogic interaction between interactors (Steinberg, 1998). A frame analysis was used to discovery of “master frames” (Benford & Snow, 2000) and “know how” topics enacted to construct consensus prior to collective action (Steinberg, 1998).

In particular, a fantasy theme analysis (Bormann, 1972, 1986) focused on the manifest content of social reality. Suggested by Bales (1950, 1970), groups may construct fantasy chains to develop common culture, common ground, and common sense and develop social realities. The fantasy themes become “the main explanatory systems for the events” and serve “to sustain the members’ sense of community” (Bormann, 1972, pgs. 398-400). Fantasy themes provide a cognitive coping mechanism to make sense of experience and adapt to the stresses of man-made and natural disasters, crises, and social conflict. The process of symbolic convergence “occurs when individuals share group fantasies” (Infante, Rancer, & Womack, 1990, p. 122).

Significantly, Bormann argued (1980) all past, present, and future communities or collectives share group fantasies. Bormann (1986) asserted “[t]he power of symbolic convergence theory stems from the human tendency to try to understand events in terms of people with certain personality traits and motivations making decisions, taking actions, and causing things to happen” (p. 221-222). From the process of symbolic convergence, a common sense is developed and provides a necessary condition for interactors to make practical and/or proper decisions and actions. Bormann argued a “common consciousness should insure that [interactors] agree on what will count as legitimate forms of reasoning, good evidence, and sound decision-making procedures” (p. 222).
For applied research purposes, symbolic convergence theory frames, identifies, compares and contrasts qualities of communication features, explains communication phenomena, and provides a congruent research method (Fantasy Theme Analysis) by which to analyze communication phenomenon. Moreover, symbolic convergence theory frames the interpretation of findings and has practical use in social, professional, and public situations; thus it is useful for the investigation of global or universal rhetorical visions and communities, understanding human interaction processes, and the identification, creation, and transformation of social reality and reform.

However, since 1977, critics have complained about clarification and limitations of case studies of small groups and the validity and usefulness of symbolic convergence theory and Fantasy Theme Analysis. Bormann, Cragan, and Shields (1995) clearly addressed these criticisms. For example, logical positivists struggle with the term “fantasy” and deem the methodology insignificant to scientific inquiry. For others, Fantasy Theme Analysis is perceived as a form of rhetorical criticism. Nevertheless, Bormann’s theory is an elegant tool for investigating and explaining the development of interpersonal or group rhetorical vision and its effects, as a vertically integrated research system providing coherence among method of analysis (Fantasy Theme) and theory (SCT) (Cragan & Shields, 1992; 1995; 1999).

Fantasy themes feature qualities constituents identify with and symbolize guiding philosophies and “form patterns that recur throughout the text” (Frey et al., 1991, p. 211). Fantasy themes will be distinguished by types: pragmatic, social, and righteous/moral oriented (Cragan & Shields, 1992). Symbolic convergence theory may provide a broader understanding of what constitutes human diversity associated with preferred fantasy themes and types as well as how diverse individuals attempt to converge different realities by creating a common reality. A Fantasy Theme Analysis provided the analyst an opportunity to reveal a “community’s social reality and analyze the meanings, emotions, and motives contained in these rhetorical visions” (Cragan, 1981, p. 69). In particular, fantasy themes enacted in discourse are frames constituents
use to explain the past and project an imagined future (Bormann, 1986). Thus, “fantasy themes are the ways in which groups order their experience by talking about it” (Anderson & Ross, 2002, p. 172).

A rhetorical vision represents the basic overarching feature of a particular version of the social reality. The words may represent artificial and authentic realities (Bormann, 1972). Rhetorical visions may emerge from fantasy themes either from a collection of monologue discourses or from fantasy themes emerging and chaining from dialogue. Chaining may be enacted by repeating, reinforcing, elaborating, and questioning the theme. When individuals unite or converge their themes into a collective rhetorical vision, the rhetorical vision becomes the basis for dialogue and social reality and may be considered a powerful means for constructing social convergence (Bormann, 1972). In short, a rhetorical vision is a unified collection of themes portraying a broad and encompassing view of collective reality (Bormann, 1983).

Mapping who introduced, continued, and acknowledged fantasy themes reveals the process of chaining. Thus, fantasy theme and rhetorical vision analyses are useful methods for analyzing discourse associated with social reality construction and social convergence. Utilizing a rhetorical analysis allows the identification and elaboration of constitutive rhetoric (Jasinski, 2001) enacted to influence the construction of “the organization of experience” (Goffman, 1974) and social convergence. Constitutive rhetoric attempts to create an image of constituents, generate the conditions of possibilities of reality and an ideology, and attempts to identity and generate conditions for continuity (Jasinski, 2001). A constitutive rhetorical investigation focuses on “the activity and art of constituting character, community, and culture” (Jasinski, 2001) represented in discourse.

The rhetorical analysis of naturally occurring discourse focused on enacted social influence techniques. Three types of rhetorical analyses were used in the investigation: a topic frame analysis (Goffman, 1974), a theme analysis (Bormann, 1986), and a social influence/compliance style orientations analysis (Nakanishi, 2003).
Research Design and Units of Analysis

Discourse of a bona fide group meeting associated with a community crisis and the subsequent newspaper article were considered representative of the phenomenon under investigation. Texts derived from a transcription of an electronic document (videotape) of the actual community meeting and the subsequent newspaper article were the units of analysis. The units of data analysis were each speaker's turn as documented by the transcription. The transcription constituted one hundred and fifty discreet units and the newspaper article consisted of one. The three recording units (Holsti, 1969; Krippendorf, 1980) were words or phrases that delineated 1) topics, and 2) associated themes discovered in the meeting discourse and newspaper article and 3) social relations orientation frames in the meeting discourse.

Background: Data Collection

During the early hours of February 3, 2003, Mayor Kim of the county of Hawai‘i (Hawai‘i Island), Governor Lingle, state legislature members, other mayors of Hawai‘i, the Hawai‘i County Civil Defense Organization, among others, received a communication from Homeland Security that President G. W. Bush, with approval by U.S. Congress, had declared war (lethal intent) on Iraq and that within 48 hours may begin military operations into Iraq. Within hours, Mayor Kim had assembled and briefed senior administrators about the situation. By 11:00 a.m. that same day, the chair of the Hawai‘i County Council Committee on Finance called a special meeting allowing Mayor Kim to present the "county's level of preparedness in the event of a war in the Middle East" (meeting announcement, February 3, 2003), to explain the possible impacts regarding "man-made disasters such as war and terrorism" (meeting transcription Mayor Kim) and to answer any questions from constituents. In short, the public meeting was called in an attempt to make sense of a potential world crisis event impacting the people of Hawai‘i County. The researcher was notified of the meeting and attended as a member of the public. Other members present at this meeting included Hawai‘i Mayor Kim, Committee Chair Chung, council members Elarionoff, Holschuh, Jacobson, Leithhead-Todd, Safarik, and Arakaki, Police Chief
Mahuna, Deputy Fire Chief Wery, county Civil Defense Director Davis, Research and Development Director Testa. In addition, approximately twenty community members, local newspaper reporters, and various county employees were notified of the meeting and attended. The attendees of the meeting constituted a diverse group including U.S. citizens with Asian, native-Hawaiian, Portuguese, and “mainland” or Euro-American haoles. Age range was approximately 30 to 80 years of ages. Occupations included unemployed, retired, student, teacher, lawyer, physician, administrator, mayor, reporter, writer, realtor, and most common, business owner. Sixteen different speakers included 12 adult males and 4 adult females.

From the meeting discourse, word frequencies were calculated and significant data summarized, such as the most frequent and commonly used words and key concepts. A word processing program was used to provide word frequencies. Word frequencies provided a preliminary investigation of dominant topics and themes. Each speaking turn was labeled by turn number and speaker identification. Each constituent’s discourse per speaking turn was analyzed for topics then themes.

Data Analyses Procedures

To answer RQ1: What topics and themes structured ongoing meeting discourse? manifest and latent frames were identified from the data. For each speaking turn, topics were identified on an index card and placed in sequential order on a large surface as an attempt to discover topics, map topics, the flow of topics, and the chaining of topics. From the index cards, associated topics were grouped into corresponding themes. Topics were operationally defined as subject/s of messages. Themes were operationally defined as a unifying topic or dominant topics. Associated topics that were predominately chained (continued, reinforced, questioned or elaborated upon) among speakers were classified as themes. For example, the theme “disaster preparations for infrastructure security” was identified from the associated topics identifying and responding to bio-terrorism; protecting and defending the water supply, inter-government communication relay system; research and mitigation of economic impacts; and development of
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county-wide community network as Project *Kumiai*. Another master theme, "impacts/negative effects and concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters", was identified from the associated topics such as transportation delays or loss of service, community infrastructure and systems vulnerability, communities being “cut-off” or isolated from outside world, insufficient federal law enforcement, and fear and anxiety of man-made and natural disasters.

On an Excel spreadsheet, the indication of themes was tabulated for each speaking turn #1-#150. (Appendix 3). The entries were triple-checked by the researcher for possible errors in entry as well as for theme reconsideration. From the spreadsheet, the frequency of chained themes were calculated then rank ordered.

Next, the researcher considered if the themes represented righteous, social, and pragmatic master analogue visions (Cragan & Shields, 1992; Littlejohn & Foss, 2005). Righteous master analogues emphasize the correct, proper, superior, moral, and just ways of doing things. Concern for virtuousness is primary. Social master analogues emphasize the value of social relations and components of social relations satisfaction such as social trust, cooperation, coordination, cohesiveness, caring, inclusion, harmony, and community. Concern for other, the relationship and/or collective is primary. Pragmatic master analogues emphasize practicality, utility, expediency, efficiency, effectiveness, and proficiency. Concern for productivity is primary.

Then, social relations orientation style messages were identified and tabulated. Social orientation style was defined as message impressions associated with 1) concern for self, 2) concern for other/s, 3) concern for relationship (Nakanishi, 2003) and concern for collective. Concern for self was operationalized as overall message impression of speaker’s attention to himself or herself. Concern for other/s was operationalized as overall message impression of speaker’s attention to another person. Concern for relationship was operationalized as overall message impression of speaker’s attention for the association with another constituent. Concern for collective was operationalized as overall message impression of speaker’s attention to residents of Hawai‘i county.
To answer RQ2: What frames did the leaders as chief influence agents use to influence constituents' sense-making?—leaders were designated by who convened and chaired the meeting (Leader A) and who was the main guest speaker (Leader B). From the spreadsheet, the theme frequencies were calculated from Leader A’s speaking turns then for Leader B’s speaking turns. The themes were rank ordered and representational pie charts were constructed for the each leader.

To answer RQ3: How did assembled constituents of a community in crisis achieve social convergence?—the development or lack thereof a rhetorical vision was determined. Themes, as predominate frames chained in the meeting discourse and represented in the newspaper article, were considered the building blocks that constructed the rhetorical vision.

This study was an exploratory investigation of how leaders, in an extended instance of leadership, influenced constituents “in a day of a community” by means of meeting discourse. Leadership involves the management and convergence of meaning for constituents by means of discourse (Fairhurst, 2001; Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996; Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001). A discourse analysis setting up a word frequency analysis, a frame analysis involving topics, themes, and social-orientation styles, and a rhetorical vision analysis are appropriate and useful methods for advancing our understanding of leadership communication. Consistent with the research questions of the study, the methodology was based on techniques to identify and analyze collective sense-making and the impact of social influence by leaders. This study sought to reveal natural communication patterns and significant topics and themes that may have developed a collective social reality or common sense.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

There is more than meets the eye when it comes to studying social phenomena.
Corman, 2005

A rhetorical analysis permitted the identification of frames enacted in discourse that
influenced social convergence of reality among diverse individuals at a bona fide meeting.
Significantly, the rhetorical analysis identifies, discusses, and explains the rhetorical features,
strategies, and effects of communication enacted by members attempting to make sense of a
community crisis. This chapter reports and discusses the results of the rhetorical analysis that
answered the following research questions: RQ 1: What topics and themes appeared in ongoing
dialogue at the meeting? RQ 2: What frames did the leaders as chief influential agents use to
influence constituents' sense-making? And RQ 3: How did assembled constituents of a
community in crisis achieve social convergence?

The analysis began with the collection of evidence. This included obtaining a copy of the
videotaped proceedings of the meeting, a transcription of the meeting dialogue (Appendix A ),
and a copy of a newspaper article (Appendix B) addressing the meeting proceedings. Word
patterns were identified to discover and describe the topics, themes, and rhetorical vision that
were featured in discourse.

Dialogue Discourse Topics: Word Frequencies

First, a modified content analysis was performed to identify manifest topics and provide a
preliminary investigation of latent themes to address **RQ 1: What topics and themes appeared**
in ongoing dialogue at the meeting? From the meeting discourse which included 150 speaking
turns and approximately 10,700 words spoken, words were ranked by frequencies (with the
exclusion of commonly spoken words, such as the, there, of, and, to, a, in, for, that, it, with, on,
of, at, this, from, have, or, by, had, has, what, all, were, was, it, are, be, and as) and
represented by Table I.
**Table I**

*Discourse Word Ranking and Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>transportation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>you/r</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>actually</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>know/n</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9-1-1/9-11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>probably</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>our/selves</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>aware/ness</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>what/ever</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>feel/s/ing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>like/same</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>weapons/try/WMD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>thank/s/ you (mahalo)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>agenda</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>God/forbid/ungodly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>capable/capabilities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ready/prepare</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>citizens</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>war</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>why</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>concern</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hawai’i</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>plans</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>speak/ing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>system</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>resources</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>certain/sure</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>whole</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>organization</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>needs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>question/s</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>civil defense</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>chair/man</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>infra/structure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>terror/ism/ists</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>council</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>communicate/ion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>way</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>event/s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>sustain/ability</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly, the word most commonly spoken by almost all speakers was the word *we* (ranked #1) spoken 245 times. According to *The American Heritage Word Frequency Book* (Carroll et al., 1971), *we* is the sixth most frequently spoken word with the exclusion of the
commonly spoken words listed above. The frequency of the word we indicated a collective group preoccupation. Members of a collective-oriented group, such as Asian cultures, generally emphasize a we identity as an in-group affiliation indicator. People from Asian cultures "often have a tendency to use the pronoun we to express not only group views but also personal ones" (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998, p. 73). We may also indicate the acknowledgment of a shared experience. The second most frequently spoken word in the dialogue was I and was spoken predominately by the Mayor, a Korean-American, (60 of the 219 times) and may skew the rankings. Only two other constituents predominately spoke the word I: a Caucasian council member, Dr. Holschuh, used the word 30 times and a Caucasian member of the public used the word 14 times. You and your ranked third. In comparison, with the exclusion of the commonly spoken words listed above, you or your is commonly ranked as the most spoken word/s; he, second; his, third; they and their fourth and fifth; and we, sixth.

The words know/n ranked fourth and think ranked fifth. Because ranked sixteenth and certain/sure ranked eighteenth. The predominance of these words may indicate the explicit nature of making sense of the situation. Our/selves was the sixth ranked word in comparison to being ranked in the 75-100 most commonly spoken words (Word Frequency List, 2001). Whatever ranked seventh; like and same, eighth; they, ninth, and words associated with thank tenth. The words thanks, thank you, and mahalo (Hawaiian word meaning thank you) were spoken significantly more than in standard American discourse. These words do not rank in the top 1,000 commonly spoken words (Hiebert, 2005). The use of these words suggests constituents appreciated other members and their efforts and may encourage a collaborative climate.

The words associated with thank you and the word Mr. tied for the tenth ranking. The use of these words may indicate a sense of congeniality, acknowledgment of professional or status position, and respect of another or others. The words right (ranked sixteenth, spoken 28 times) and okay (ranked twenty-first, spoken 21 times) were spoken to indicate acknowledgment, affirmation, acceptance, and agreement.
A theme began to become apparent with the frequently spoken words ready/prepare, war, time, as well as Hawai‘i/ian, community, county, government, system, how, organization, and people. The word county was ranked eleventh and was associated with the word government, which ranked twenty-seventh. Of the 15 times spoken, the County Mayor used it 13 times. Additional themes emerged with the words impact and needs; Civil Defense, infrastructure and terrorism; public, emergency, event and security; and sustain/ability. From word frequencies, a theme associated with the word hope (ranked eighteenth) was identified. The words how, questions, communicate/communication, good, way, government, and water were common words. Noteworthy, safety, crisis, reality, and make sense were rarely spoken.

The transcription consisted of a total 150 speaking turns, approximately a total of 10,700 words spoken, with a range of 1 to 1910 words spoken per turn, an average of 65 words per speaking turn, and a mode of approximately 90 words. Sixteen different speakers included 12 adult males and 4 adult females. Of the committee, five members spoke during the official meeting (beginning with speaking turn #3) and two did not. From the county administration, the Mayor, Police Chief, County Research and Development Director, Deputy Fire Chief, and County Civil Defense Director spoke. The County Manager was present but did not speak. From approximately 15 members from the public and media attending, five members spoke. A statement from another public member who was not in attendance was not read but was entered into the meeting minutes’ record.

The Committee Chair enacted the most number of speaking turns with 41 and 1,245 words (12% of total words spoken). His greatest number of words spoken in one speaking turn was 240 words. The Mayor enacted 31 speaking turns and spoke approximately 3,470 words (32.5% of total words spoken). His greatest number of words spoken was in his first speaking turn with 1910 words. Thus combined, the Committee Chair and the Mayor spoke 45 percent of the words and council members, department chiefs, and a few members from the public spoke the remaining 55 percent of the words. Dominating the number of speaking turns may be an
indication the Committee Council Chair was a chief influence agent. Dominating the words spoken may be an indication the Mayor was the chief influence agent.

Dialogue Discourse Themes from Associated Topics

Themes and Master Themes of Meeting Discourse

To identify themes and associated topics that appeared in the ongoing dialogue at the meeting (RQ 1), each speaking turn was enumerated and topics (specific subjects) were identified. Nine themes emerged from the meeting discourse. The nine themes (columns) enacted for each of the 150 speaking turns (rows) were entered. The presence of a theme/s was indicated rather than the predominance or frequency of the theme/s for each speaking turn. A few speaking turns did not enact any of the nine themes, such as “Oh! We are actually taping this. Oh, I didn’t know that” (speaking turn #2) and speaking turns #146-150. The entries were triple-checked by the researcher for possible errors in entry as well as for theme reconsideration. For each speaking turn, the number of themes represented range from 0 to 8. Most speaking turns addressed more than one theme.

From the spreadsheet, the themes were rank ordered. Table II represents the rank order of the nine themes and the associated topics enacted in the meeting discourse. The themes in rank order include 1) Congenial/civil society: acknowledgment, affirmation, appreciation of the other/s agreement with the other/s, proper politeness; 2) Disaster preparations for infrastructure security, 3) Impacts, negative effects, and concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters, 4) Community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibility for social security and Project Kumiai, 5) War drama, 6) Ethos of the Civil Defense Organization, the Mayor, and his administration, 7) Hope, peace, and spirituality, 8) Hawai‘i County’s sustainability for community security and survival, 9) Hawai‘i County’s history of surviving and adjusting to disasters and crisis events.
**Theme Orientations**

From Cragan and Shields' research (1992), all of the themes represent pragmatic, social collective relations, and righteous/spiritual orientations. The themes disaster preparedness, impacts, negative effects, and concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters, Hawai‘i Island's sustainability, and Hawai‘i County's history of surviving and adjusting to disasters/crisis events may be considered pragmatic themes. The themes congenial/civil society and community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibility may be considered as social or collective relations themes. The theme hope, peace, and spirituality may be considered a righteous/spirituality theme. And finally, the theme ethos may be regarded as a combination of the pragmatic and social relations themes. The theme Hawai‘i County's history of surviving and adjusting to disasters/crisis events may be regarded as a saga (Littlejohn & Foss, 2005).

**Table II**

**Themes of Meeting Discourse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Master Themes</th>
<th>Associated Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Congenial/civil society</td>
<td>Acknowledgment/affirmation/appreciation of other/s, agreement with other/s, concern for other/s, greeting, thank you, address other/s by personal name or professional title, yes/yah, okay, sure, right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Disaster preparations for infrastructure security</td>
<td>Identifying and responding to bio-terrorism, protecting and defending water supply, inter-government communication relay system, research and mitigate economic impacts, development of county-wide community network (Project Kumiai), planning county personnel adjustments especially “essential” positions, first responder-hospital coordination, community relations to minimize anxiety, promote county’s trustworthiness to respond to disasters, awareness of limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Impacts/negative effects/concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters</td>
<td>Transportation delays or loss of service: import/export goods and services, economy especially tourism industry, telecommunications limitations, infrastructure and community systems vulnerabilities: power, fiber optics, water, roads, telephone and cable, siren warning; community isolation, being “cut off” from outside world, insufficient federal law enforcement to protect and secure international borders from illegal aliens and terrorists, terrorism especially bio-terrorism events; fear and anxiety of man-made and natural disasters, community vulnerabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Community engagement, involvement, co-operation, and responsibilities for social security

Social support networks, services, and organizations, i.e., government agencies, non-profit organizations, Red Cross, labor unions, Community Emergency Response Team (CERT). Project Kumiai: social network and utilization program to keep community constituents connected, well informed, and supported during man-made and natural disasters.

5. War drama

WW II, “Bush agenda,” effect/event “of war” “military call-up,” “an attack,” “Afghanistan,” “this type of turmoil”

6. Ethos:

Civil Defense Organization, County Mayor and his administration

Credibility, competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill, proactive, experienced, prepared, monies obtained for WMD and community preparedness, considering scenario “A to Z,” awareness of limitations and situations “not in our control” but will mitigate any impacts; open communication among members and with the public.

7. Hope/peace/spirituality

Want, prefer, and hope for non-military conflict, have faith we will survive because we are prepared and experienced, sense of spirituality, hope for peaceful resolution, pray and envision peace.

8. Hawai‘i Island’s sustainability for community security and survival

Agriculture, i.e., rice production, catchment water systems, road/trail systems, bio-fuel, Hawai‘i best place to be for survival.

9. Hawai‘i county’s history of surviving and adjusting to disasters/crisis events

Floods, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, WW II, dock strike, barge grounding, collapse of sugar can industry, 9/11

The following pie chart illustrates the predominance of the congenial/civil society and disaster preparedness themes.
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*Figure II. Master Themes*
The most predominant themes were congenial/civil society and disaster preparedness with frequencies of 83 and 80 and represented approximately 50% of the themes calculated. These themes were also represented by most speakers throughout the meeting discourse. From speaking turn #6 through speaking turn #19, the theme disaster preparedness was continuously chained. Another sustaining chain was from speaking turn #23 through #33. An example of chaining the disaster preparedness for infrastructure security, Committee Member Safarik stated in speaking turn #18 “How are we prepared? Or is there any way to prepare for the economic impact... ah negative impact that we’re going to struggle through?” There was a six-second pause, and then the Mayor responded in speaking turn #19:

A really tough question, Mr. Safarik, in regards to... because I don’t know what the impact is. I think if naturally a good portion of the State of Hawaii economy is dependent on tourism. And 9/11 was a very rude awakening to the total impact overnight. But, however, there are other industries that were greatly affected, especially if any kind of a transportation system is affected. Like a FedEx, which curtailed activities for a few days... where all the flower growers could not ship out. Again, we... we will try to make sure that Research and Development work very closely with DBEDT to make sure they have a good assessment of an impact, hopefully before it is a total impact, and hopefully we can take whatever mitigating measures we can.

From speaking turn #28 through speaking turn #37, the theme congenial/civil society was continuously chained. For example, congenial/civil society was chained by the following example. The Committee Chair acknowledged a committee member’s indication to speak. In speaking turn #22, Committee Chair Chung stated “Dr. Holschuh,” and Dr. Holschuh responded in speaking turn #23 “Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks, Mr. Mayor, for being here today.” And later in speaking turn #31 “Okay, thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.” In speaking turn #32, the Committee Chair stated:
Thank you and you know, Dr. Holschuh, in response to that as well, we did check with the Department of Water Supply, because that is an area of concern. About three years ago, I do know, that they informed us on of their... their persons from the Operations division, actually went up to Nevada for I think it was a one-week program on weapons of mass destruction. So you know, they are on top of it. I'm not saying they are on top of it as they should be... I really don't know what the level is. But, they're aware of it and you know, they're taken steps to try to address... try to learn about the potentials that may be inherent in operating a water system in these times. Mr. Jacobson.

In speaking turn #33, Committee Member Jacobson stated:

Mayor Kim, thank you so much for coming before us today. I think all of us know that what we all should be working to avoid war. But, obviously we must prepare in case that we have any war or terrorist threats. And along those lines, I commend you and Jane Testa for developing this project Kumiai. And I imagine that you are going to be working with community groups and all those volunteer fire, emergency preparedness committees in each of the subdivisions, churches, and things, and some sort of method of communication to not only our people in the community so they know what's going on but so that those of us who are making decisions and those of the people who are emergency workers have some way of dealing with this. I think that even you might want to include labor organizations in with this because many of the workers are so tied to that. And they are really full of volunteerism. So, thanks so much for letting us know and just let us know if there are things we can do to help.

The congenial/civil society theme was chained in speaking turn #34, “Thank you;” speaking turn #35, “Mr. Elarionoff;” speaking turn #36, “Thank you, Mr. Mayor, good morning;” speaking turn #37, “Good morning.”
The least presented themes with a frequencies of 8 for history of surviving crisis, 9 for community sustainability, and 11 for hope for peace were enacted persistently from speaking turns #4 through #144. The theme history of surviving disasters was addressed by the Mayor in speaking turns #4, #19, and #48 but was not chained by a council member until speaking turn #75. History of surviving crises was chained by members from the public audience in speaking turns #142 and #144. The sustainability theme emerged from Leader A, Council Committee Chair, in speaking turn #43 and was immediately chained by the Mayor in speaking turn #44 and chained again in #45, #48, and #49. This theme was also chained by other members of the council committee (speaking turns #69 and #109) and members from the public audience (speaking turns #142 and #144). The theme hope for peace emerged early in the discourse, speaking turn # 4 by the county Mayor and was chained particularly by speakers from the public audience.

None of the themes were represented in speaking turns #2, #89, #90, and #146-150. For example, in speaking turns #89 and #90, the emergency siren system was activated and startled members of the meeting. Council member Dr. Holschuh was speaking at the time and after hearing the siren for about three seconds responded in speaking turn #89, *Boy! What an . . . WOW!* (smiles, chuckles) and committee member Safarik responded with humor #90 “*Times up!*” (other members laugh). For speaking turns #146-150, the meeting was brought to a close. Committee member Leithead-Todd stated in speaking turn #146, “*So moved.*” Committee member Safarik responded, “*Second.*” Committee Chair Chung stated in #148, “*All in favor say aye.*” All committee members responded in #149 with “Ayes.” The sound of the gavel is followed by the Committee Chair ending with #150, “*Meeting adjourned.*” This brief but functional discourse exchange, however, exemplifies the congenial/civil society theme.

Chief Influential Members’ Themes and Dialogue Framing

To answer **RQ 2—What frames did the leaders use to influence constituents’ sense-making of the potential crisis?**—the discourse from the Council Committee Chair (Leader A) and the main guest speaker County Mayor (Leader B) was examined. From the spreadsheet,
Leader A's (Council Committee Chair) and Leader B's (County Mayor) speaking turns were distinguished. In rank order based on frequencies, Leader A enacted the following themes. Tied rankings are indicated by sub-enumerations \( a \) and \( b \) (i.e., 3a).

1. Congenial/civil society: acknowledgement/affirmation/appreciation/agreement/concern with other/s
2. Disaster preparedness for infrastructure security
3a. War drama
3b. Community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibilities, and Project Kumiai for social security
4. Impacts/negative effects/concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters
5. Hope/peace/spirituality
6a. Ethos of Civil Defense Organization, Mayor, and his administration
6b. Sustainability for community survival and security

Leader A did not address the theme history of surviving and adjusting to disasters and crisis events. In rank order, Table III represents the frequency of themes enacted by Council Committee Chair (Leader A).

**Table III**

*Themes: Leader A, Council Committee Chair*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency of 41 speaking turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congenial/civil society</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster preparedness for infrastructure security</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War drama</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement, involvement, coordination, and responsibility;</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Kumiai for social security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts/negative effects/concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope/peace/spirituality</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethos: Civil Defense Organization, Mayor and his administration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability for community survival and security</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of surviving and adjusting to disasters and crisis events</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following pie chart illustrates the predominance of the congenial/civil society theme.

Figure III. Themes Percentages: Leader A, Council Committee Chair

Notably, Leader A, Council Committee Chair, encouraged all constituents present to engage in dialogue. He began the meeting by acknowledging council committee members present and acknowledged and allowed all committee members and constituents the opportunity to speak. Although he spoke only 12 percent of the words, he exercised considerable control over who-spoke-when and about what during the meeting indicating he was a chief influence agent. He significantly influenced that the purpose of the meeting was disaster preparedness, which topics needed to be addressed such as negative impacts of war and Project Kumiai, and which topic was taboo. The Council Committee Chair as designated leader of the meeting clearly stated, “I’m not going to (allow) debate [of] the President’s agenda at all” (speaking turn #125). He did not allow the theme “the President’s agenda” to frame the meeting dialogue when two members, including the Mayor, attempted to address the issue. Both agreed instead to focus on “the people that are supposed to take care of the population” in the “unfortunate event of war.” Nevertheless, the Council Committee Chair and four council committee members voiced their preference for peaceful relations. For example, the Council Committee Chair began the meeting stating, “In the
event of a war in the Middle East and certainty none of us want to see something like that happen” (speaking turn #3) and toward the end of the meeting reiterated, “I think everybody wants peace. And I think that’s a given” (speaking turn #141). His initial message was reinforced by a council member who stated “for the edification of the viewing public and the people in the audience . . . this Council is not supporting or condoning war” (speaking turn #136).

Six of the nine themes that framed the social interaction dialogue were first addressed by Leader A, the Council Committee Chair, in speaking turn #3. In chronological order and with representational quotes, these themes were congenial/civil society (“I’d like to introduce members of the committee”) disaster preparedness (“the purpose of the meeting today is to allow the Mayor to give a presentation . . . outline of the County’s level of preparedness”), war drama (“in the event of war in the Middle East”), hope/peace/spirituality (“and certainly none of us want to see something like that happen.”). He continued by reinforcing the disaster preparedness theme (“I think it would behoove us to try to be prepared as we can”) and moved on to the impacts and negative effects theme (“Mayor, what you could do today is explain what some of the possible impacts could be to the County in the event of war”) and closed his opening dialogue with the ethos theme (“I’m sure you are the best person to answer those questions as you know . . . you really have made your reputation as a person who is . . . prepared.”). Thus, the meeting’s agenda and constituents’ attitude had been substantially framed at the beginning of the dialogue as represented by Leader A’s opening discourse:

The purpose of our meeting today is to allow the Mayor to give a presentation . . . outline of the County’s level of preparedness in the event of a war in the Middle East and certainly none of us want to see something like that happen, but at the same time I think it would behoove us to try to be prepared as we can . . . the Mayor will . . . explain some of the possible impacts could be to the County in the event of a war (speaking turn #3).
During speaking turn #43, the Council Committee Chair focused the Mayor's discussion on three general areas that would likely be created by the declaration of war with the Middle East. The first topic was what if Hawai'i was "actually attacked"; the second was possible negative economic impacts; and third, "in event that transportation lines are affected ... how can we sustain ourselves during a long drawn-out war?" (speaking turn #43).

Leader A, the Council Committee Chair, complimented the County Director of Research and Development regarding Project Kumi'ai; however, he spoke primarily to make sense of the project's purpose, proposed activities, and implementation time. He clarified for himself and listeners that "it's like a community utilization program" for man-made and natural disasters (speaker turn #58).

Leader B, the County Mayor and the invited guest speaker, began addressing the importance of communicating with constituents regarding disaster preparedness and thanked the Council Committee Chair for convening the special meeting. Then he stated, "I would say my greatest hope is that this is all academic, and we don't [go to war]. And I hope and pray for that every single minute of every single day" (speaking turn #4); thus, he initiated the themes hope, peace, and spirituality, and expressed negative feelings associated with military confrontation and likely negative effects to the people of Hawai'i. He directly addressed "fear of terrorism" and security limitations associated with terrorist attacks (speaking turn #30).

Next, Leader B chained the ethos theme with the statements "some of the statements made may sound a little boisterous ... and so be it. I think we know that on that awful day of September 11, the Hawai'i County Civil Defense Organization ... probably were the first in the United States to organize." He continued, "I know the State of Hawai'i, made up of its four counties, is the only government structure in the entire United States that has a paid organized civil defense structure in every county of the State. I am proud of that ... it was initially set up for war because of a very bad history of how war has impacted this territory" (speaking turn #4). He then briefed listeners about the Hawai'i County Civil Defense Organization and stressed the word...
“organization.” He stated, “It is not a Civil Defense Agency” (speaking turn #4) inferring that it was not under direct supervision under the federal government but rather “it is an organization under the Governor of Hawai`i” to handle man-made and natural disasters (speaking turn #4). This statement tacitly sets the precedence of local and state community involvement and responsibility regarding disasters rather than federal responsibility. He referred to “the Hawai`i Revised Statutes of Chapter 128” that “clearly define the responsibility of the State government and the County government and its authority” (speaking turn #4) regarding “unfortunate” crisis events including man-made and natural disasters such as terrorism. Leader B used the word response or responsibility six times.

Leader B spent considerable time briefing the listeners about the County’s preparedness and answering questions about specific topics associated with all of the nine themes. One statement succinctly addressed the themes impacts of disasters; hope, peace, and spirituality; disaster preparedness, and community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibility: “I think during all emergencies, and God forbid those of war, one of the greatest responsibility of [County] government is to ensure a very close, well-knit coordination with the community at large” (speaking turn #4). He concluded his opening dialogue with the statement “Our only responsibility here is to make sure that . . . our scenario prepares for the whole scenario” and closed with the statement “I open myself to any questions, Mr. Chung” (speaking turn #4). After a series of questions from a council member, Leader B responded:

I promise you this, Mr. Safarik, if the scenario does evolve into a war of some kind where we are affected, the Council is part of the Civil Defense Organization, as we promise to . . . work with you, with all agencies under that structure. And the main mission obviously is to make sure we mitigate what we can, be pro-active where we can, and to make sure we communicate all of this to the community (speaking turn #21).

His statements highlighted the significance of community engagement, involvement,
cooperation, and responsibility during crisis events and emerged as a key theme of the meeting dialogue. The word crisis was spoken only twice during the entire meeting's discourse, once by Leader B in speaking turn #39 and followed by Leader A in speaking turn #54.

Regarding the sustainability theme, Leader B stated, "As far as self-sustaining, of all the states, I cannot . . . and I don't want to sound that selfish again, but of all the states, I cannot think of a better place to be" (speaking turn #48). Referring to the eldest council member, he combined the theme of surviving crisis events, "He knows how this County, this State, the Hawai'i Island do band together as a community when we need to whether it be a dock strike, whether it be natural disasters, or the ungodly events of World War II" (speaking turn #48).

During speaking turn #114, Leader B addressed constituents' emotional responses associated with disasters such as fear and anxiety and the significance of communication with and among community constituents:

\[
\ldots \text{post 9-1-1 . . . emergency responders were just inundated with calls regarding anthrax. That projected the fear element. I think what we do in this County regards to communication and level . . . hopefully a degree of trust that we will be there to respond, to coordinate, to minimize the type of unnecessary anxiety that will develop in case of the scenario war does happen.}
\]

Leader B's last statements (speaking turns #121 and #123) were responses to a public audience constituent's statements "regarding . . . our spirituality and in reaction to Mr. Bush's intent on creating war . . . I can't see how the County should even consider supporting the President's moves. Why do we have to continue in following his regime?" (speaking turn #120). Leader B asked Leader A, Mr. Chair, can I respond to him?" (speaking turn #121). Leader A's response was "No, no, no, no, No!" (speaking turn #122). Leader B replied, "Okay" (speaking turn #123). This was his last statement of the meeting dialogue and was a rather dramatic moment. Although the Mayor was not allowed to address specifically "President Bush's agenda," the dialogue created drama associated with the speculation of war on Iraq.
Leader B addressed all nine master themes in the following rank order with tied frequencies indicated by sub-enumerations a and b.

1a. Congenial/civil society: acknowledgment/affirmation/appreciation/agreement/concern for other/s

1b. Disaster preparedness for infrastructure security

2. Impacts/negative effects/concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters

3a. Ethos: Civil Defense Organization, Mayor, and his administration

3b. War drama

4. Community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibilities, and Project *Kumiai* for social security

5. Hawai‘i County’s history of surviving and adjusting to disasters and crisis events

6a. Hope, peace, and spirituality

6b. Sustainability for community security and survival

In rank order, Table IV addresses the frequency of themes enacted by the County Mayor Chair (Leader B).

Table IV

*Themes: Leader B, County Mayor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency of 31 speaking turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congenial/civil society</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster preparedness for infrastructure security</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts/negative effects/concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War drama</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethos: Civil Defense Organization, Mayor and his administration</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement, involvement, coordination, and responsibility: Project <em>Kumiai</em> for social security</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of surviving and adjusting to disasters and crisis events</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope/peace/spirituality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability for community survival and security</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following pie chart illustrates the predominance of the congenial/civil society and disaster preparation themes.

Figure IV. Themes Percentages: Leader B, County Mayor

Leader B, the County Mayor, responded (speaking turn #4) by chaining the six themes introduced by Leader A and presenting two new themes: first community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibility and then history of surviving and adjusting to disasters and crisis events. First, he addressed the congenial/civil society theme: “I thank Mr. Chairman for calling this, and I do think it’s important we do [discuss] the state where we are and things.” Next he presented the community engagement, involvement, cooperation and responsibility theme: “The people of Hawai‘i County know where we are and open ourselves up for any kinds of questions you may have now or later.” His next message chained the hope/peace/spirituality theme: “Before we go on, I find it very sad that we are here for this purpose and openly I would say my greatest hope is that this is all academic and we don’t get there. And I hope and pray for that every single minute of every single day.” Imbedded in this statement is the war theme as represented by the phrase “we don’t get there.” His next statement chained the ethos theme with humbleness: “Some of the statements made may sound a little
boisterous and so be it . . . [we] were the first in the State to organize . . . probably the first in the United States to organize . . . and I am proud of that.”

Later in this speaking turn, he addressed the history theme of surviving and adjusting to disasters and crisis events with the themes of war and impacts/negative effects/concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters by stating [the Civil Defense Organization] “was initially set up for war. Because of a very bad history of how war has impacted this [former] Territory and State of Hawai‘i.” He addressed the community engagement, involvement, cooperation and responsibility theme with the statement: “I’m sure Council members are aware of it, of the Hawai‘i Revised Statutes of Chapter 128, because it clearly defines the responsibility of the State government and the County government and its authority . . . in the event of natural disasters as well as man-made disasters of war as well as terrorism.” He emphasized this statement by presenting a copy of the statutes book to council committee members. This is the only visual aid used throughout the meeting dialogue. Moreover, in speaking turn #4, the Mayor again imbedded multiple themes with his oral messages:

In regards to kumiai of community . . . and the purpose of it is a mechanism to bring together the appropriate leadership in a community to focus on engaging citizens in Homeland Security for promoting community preparedness and family safety . . . I think during all emergencies, and God forbid those of war, one of the greatest responsibility of government is to ensure a very close, well-knit coordination with the community at large.

Most of the leaders’ subsequent speaking turns were framed by one or two themes. For example, the Council Committee Chair stated, “What are the possible impacts that we’re looking at and how can we sustain ourselves during a long, drawn-out war?” Then in speaking turn #48, the Mayor framed his dialogue by embedding the themes of history of surviving and adjusting to disasters/crisis events with community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibility:
Mr. Arakaki knows how this County, this State, the Hawai‘i Island [people] do band together as a community when we need to. Whether it be a dock strike, whether it be natural disasters, or the ungodly events of World War II.

Responding, the Council Committee Chair artfully embedded six themes: community engagement, involvement, cooperation and responsibility; congenial/civil society; ethos; impact/negative effects of crisis events; war; and sustainability in this short dialogue:

And I’m assuming that Project Kumiai . . . I think that is a real appropriate name, Jane [Research and Development Director], I congratulate you. So, it’s a community-based type of program, and it’s going to encompass any of these areas that I just brought up. You know, whether there is an attack [creating impacts] on economic side and sustainability side (speaking turn #49).

The Council Committee Chair framed his dialogue throughout the meeting with multiple themes. Speaking turn #113 is the last substantial social interaction dialogue he has with the County Mayor. After most council committee members had spoken, the Council Committee Chair addressed five themes including ethos, community, and disaster preparedness.

All right. Anyone? If not, I think that’s pretty much it. Thank you very much, Mayor, I . . . you know as I said earlier, it’s really hard for us to anticipate, you know . . . exactly what kinds of impacts we are to be facing. But I think it’s important for the public to know that at this level . . . at the County level, I know it’s a multi-tiered thing with the State and the Federal government all working together, but at least at the County level we’re working, we’re preparing, and I guess the theme of all of this is that the program that you folks are developing is going to be one that is based on communications and maintaining or developing networks. I think that’s very important (speaking turn #113).
Subsequently in speaking turn #114, the County Mayor chained the disaster preparedness and community engagement, involvement, coordination, and responsibility themes and addressed the war theme.

*On that, Mr. Chairman, I think...* post 9-1-1 where if you take a look... an analysis as far as this State as well as other states, emergency responders were just inundated with calls in regards to anthrax. That projected the fear element. I think what we do in this County [in] regards to communication and level... hopefully a degree of trust that we will be there to respond... to coordinate, to minimize the type of unnecessary anxiety that will develop in case the scenario of war does happen.

The Council Committee Chair again focused on the theme of community engagement, involvement, cooperation and responsibility, by which the County Mayor did not chain and asked the question *"If anybody wants to volunteer or provide suggestions... where can they call?"* The County Mayor responded by chaining the theme and addressed the contacts for the Project Kumiai and Civil Defense Organization as well as promoted the enactment of *kumiai*.

Council Committee Members’ and Department Chiefs’ Themes and Dialogue Framing

All nine themes were chained by council committee members and/or the department chiefs from the Mayor’s administration (Police, Fire, Civil Defense Organization, and Research and Development). Table V provides the frequency for each theme out of a total of 61 speaking turns. Significantly, Theme 1, disaster preparedness for infrastructure security, was evident in many of the speaking turns. Theme 2, congenial/civil society, was also predominant among speaking turns followed by Theme 3, community engagement, involvement, cooperation and responsibility and Project Kumiai; Theme 4, impacts/negative effects/concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters; Theme 5, war drama; Theme 6, ethos; and Theme 7, hope, peace, and spirituality. The least addressed themes were equally represented—Theme 8a, history
of surviving and adjusting to disasters and crisis events, and Theme 8b, sustainability for community survival and security.

Table V represents the frequencies for themes addressed by Council Committee Members and Department Chiefs.

Table V

Themes: Council Committee Members and Department Chiefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency of 61 speaking turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster preparedness for infrastructure security</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congenial/civil society</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement, involvement, coordination, and responsibility;</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Kumiai for social security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts/negative effects/concerns regarding man-made and natural disaster</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War drama</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethos: Civil Defense Organization, Mayor and his administration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope/peace/spirituality</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of surviving and adjusting to disasters and crisis events</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability for community survival and security</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure V. Themes Percentages: Council Committee Members and Department Chiefs

Members from the Public Themes and Dialogue Framing

Six members from the public audience accepted the opportunity to engage in dialogue and their statements were entered into the meeting record as part of the agenda. All nine master
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themes were chained by the public statements; however, the themes congenial/civil society; community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibility; and war drama were dominant. Also addressed were the themes impacts/negative effects, concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters; ethos; sustainability; and hope, peace, and spirituality. Notably, the theme disaster preparedness for infrastructure security and the theme history of surviving disasters were the least addressed. For example, the first speaker from the public audience addressed the underlying event provoking the special meeting:

This is in regards to our spirituality and in reaction to Mr. Bush's intent on creating war. I think we have the opportunity to step back and I don't think we have to support his energy in this endeavor. Us here on the island, we've got all these different spiritual people and ways of life. I can't see how the County should even consider supporting the President's moves. Why do we have to continue in following his regime? (speaking turn #120).

Later, another speaker from the public audience complimented the county council members, the Mayor, and his administration for convening the special meeting. He stated:

I think it's very wise for you to do this because you know, like you said, we don't really have a choice about what happens. I mean the choices were made you know some time ago. And people don't seem to want to change their minds...you know better than I on that...I wish you luck...We need to take responsibility [of our vulnerabilities]. So thanks again for the time. Mahalo

(speaking turn #138).

The next speaker from the public audience chained multiple themes with her statements and highlighted her concern for the community as “we maintain our integrity as a community.” She addressed the fact that the Mayor is a Korean-American and expressed her perceptions of his attitude regarding the war issue and the notion of a missile attack by North Korea:
Mr. Mayor and people of the audience and the County Council, I'd like to thank the country of Korea for birthing people who are of very strong intent and very strong peaceful motivations . . . [we are] two minds and one people . . . If we just envision the end result of what we want, which is peace, and understand we do have the right to defend ourselves, I think we'll reach the happy medium that we all need to reach, so that we maintain our integrity as a community. So please, all of the folks that I know in Pahoa who are demonstrating for peace and saying no to war, that's what we're feeling in our hearts. But brothers and sisters . . . I know Harry [Mayor Kim] has a very strong motivation for peace in his heart . . . Let's envision peace and if we have to fight to maintain it, which is a contradiction in terms [and] that's as far as we have gotten in this human condition. Let's progress further . . . Let's envision peace and let's change the reality with our blueprints of our thought and energies. So thank you (speaking turn #140).

Leader A, Council Committee Chair, responded to this dialogue by stating, "Thank you so much, I think everybody wants peace. And that's a given. Thank you so very much. Sir, I'm going to consider [these] statements from the public on the agenda . . . Go ahead" (speaking turn #141). The next speaker from the public audience chained the sustainability and ethos themes. He also combined the themes disaster preparedness and impacts/negative effects, concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters.

I just wanted to buttress up to Bob's [council member] statements about self-sustaining. Because I mean this is what frightens me here . . . I'm really proud of you know, Gary, [council member] and the others thinking about transportation in our district . . . it's our most vulnerable part of our society. I'm tired of supporting the [automobile/oil-based industries] . . . this type of nonsense . . . I
hope we forge ahead with the preparation of self-sufficiency. Thank you so much (speaking turn #142).

The final speaker from the public audience also chained multiple themes including congenial/civil society; ethos; community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibility; and in particular, community sustainability. She also explicitly addressed the extraordinary nature of this meeting:

Good morning, members of the Council, Mayor, members of the administration.

I think this a wonderful exhibition of why Hawai‘i Island is the most wonderful place in the world to live. About eight years ago during the Hamakua closure . . . of the sugar plantation . . . the most awful movie in the world was made . . . it was called Waterworld . . . anybody remember it? It was terrible. And it was the best awful movie ever made for Hawai‘i Island because it brought about $40 million into this Island’s economy in a time when we really needed it. It gave people hope . . . it allowed a lot of truck drivers and plumbers to become part of the movie industry, and it kind of changed people’s minds. But it also spoke to what Mr. Jacobson was speaking about and that is sustainability. We definitely have enough to sustain ourselves. But over time . . . you know you look at how will the rest of the world will be proceeding. And what would we do to make our very solid examples . . . the opportunities for the rest of the world to emulate. So I hope Chairman Chung and . . . and the other members of the Council that we do start thinking that way. I think that’s the way Mayor Kim thinks. And, I believe the business community feels that way too. So we’re all in this together and again I thank you very much for convening this special opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Jacobson, for bringing up sustainability (speaking turn #144).
An observer who watched the meeting on videotape noted that “the public attendees were not in target [with] the agenda, but had their own agenda” (Lansford, 2006). Another observer remarked that “most of the public speakers seemed to be in their own zone of meaning and did not really add anything to the discussion” (Spinola-Campbell, 2006).

In summary and answering RQ 2, Leader A and Leader B initiated and continued the discussion of nine master themes in an attempt to make sense of a potential community crisis (potential military conflict and terrorist attacks). The leaders influenced the development of master themes to frame the sense-making process and to promote dialogue associated with these themes. The predominant framing of sense-making emerged from the theme analysis. The following themes were established early in the discourse (speaking turns #3 and #4) and continued throughout the discourse by the vast majority of speakers: Congenial/civil society as acknowledgment, affirmation, appreciation of other/s, agreement with other/s and concern for other/s; the ethos of the Civil Defense Organization, Mayor, and county administration (credibility, competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill); disaster preparedness for infrastructure security; impacts, negative effects, and concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters; war drama; community engagement, involvement, cooperation, and responsibilities via such methods as Project Kumiai; and a collective sense of hope, peace, and spirituality.

Newspaper Article Themes and Framing

Eight themes framed the newspaper article discourse written by a newspaper reporter who attended the meeting (Armstrong, 2003). In chronological order, the master themes included “County readies for war: Mayor briefs council on preparations made and planned” (article title); sad situation and somber faces; war will probably create an “extreme hardship” to the Hawaiian community especially the tourism industry; county government has prepared for likely negative impacts including economic and terrorism attacks; Hawai‘i Civil Defense Organization is experienced and responds fast to disasters (quoting Mayor Kim “first to respond to 9/11”); County will use over $590,000 for weapons of mass destruction response and $95,000 for public...
participation in emergency response planning and implementation; Project *Kumiai* is intended to distribute quickly “vital information to communities county-wide, especially rural areas”; protecting/defending water service and other essential facilities and services; and “hope that a military conflict will be avoided” (Armstrong, 2003) and “everyone wants peace” (quoting Council Committee Chair).

Table VI

*Themes: Newspaper Article*

| 1. County readies for war: plans and preparations |
| 2. Sad situation; somber faces |
| 3. County has prepared for many likely negative impacts |
| 4. War will create extreme hardship to Hawai‘i |
| 5. Monies for WMD and community emergency response |
| 6. Project *Kumiai* |
| 7. Protecting and defending water system and other essential facilities and services |
| 8. Hope military conflict is avoided, “everyone wants peace” |

In short, the newspaper article broadly framed the communication episode; Hawai‘i County is planning and preparing for war yet wants peace.

Social Convergence

Through the enactment of pro-social behavior and dialogue, the assembled members of this Hawaiian community in crisis sought to achieve social convergence. Though the Island of Hawai‘i is considered one of the most diverse counties in the United States (U.S. Census, 2000), it is generally influenced by Asian (Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Filipinos) and Pacific Islander cultures. Social communication is characterized by a collective orientation and social motivations. Thus, humbleness, preference for harmonious relations, non-confrontational conflict style, “saving face” strategies (Gudykunst et al., 1996) and the values *kokua* meaning social support or help and *ohana* meaning extended family (Kanahele, 1996) are prevalent and thereby encourage social convergence, community, and consensus. For example, the use of honorifics such as *sir, Chief, Mayor,* and *Mr.* framed the situation with a respectful attitude. Constituents were generally greeted by name or professional title, i.e. *Chief, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, Ms.*
Mr., and Dr. followed by one’s last name and included title of respect such as “sir” to subordinate positions. The use of titles may be considered indicative of respectful, cooperative, professional relations and may enhance social convergence.

An observer commented, “... the Council was very congenial, suggested a good working relationship” and “there was a high level of confidence among the invited guests who were very well prepared” (Lansford, 2006). Another observer elaborated:

The Mayor because of his past experience already had the confidence of the County Council members before he spoke. The Mayor introduced most of the topics that were discussed in the meeting in his turn #4. After the Mayor spoke, the questions put to him were clarifying questions, so consensus was achieved from the beginning. It seemed to me that the Mayor laid the foundation and the questions acted as building blocks [for common understanding]. There did not seem to be any tough questions put to the Mayor, no one was adversarial, and the speakers were satisfied with the answers they received (Spinola-Campbell, 2006).

Moreover, she perceived that

... speaking about [disaster preparedness] tended to give the speakers’ comfort that they thought the County was excellently prepared for any contingency. Yet most of it demonstrated that we’re thinking about it, we’re working on it and we’ve come up with great ideas for workable programs (Spinola-Campbell, 2006).

The above indicators suggest the group enacted social convergence and developed consensus.

Social Orientation Styles

In particular, the social influence/social compliance styles of concern for self, concern for other/s and concern for relationship (Nakanishi, 2003) were evident. Table VII indicates the
frequency of the use of this social influence styles. Explicit indicators such as the use of the
words, *I* and *me*, *you* and *your*, and *we* and *us* as well as the implicit meaning of the message
were the criteria for identifying the type of social orientation styles that framed messages.

Table VII

*Frequency of Social Orientation Style*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th># Speaking Turns</th>
<th>Concern for Self</th>
<th>Concern for Other/s</th>
<th>Concern for Relationship</th>
<th>Concern for Collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader A</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader B</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of the social orientation style concern for self include: “I would like to call this
special meeting of the Hawai‘i County Council Committee on Finance to order” (speaking turn
#3); “I say that openly and I say that with a lot of pride” (speaking turn #4); “I feel a little bit
better because . . .” (speaking turn #20); “I have two questions. Let me ask them separately, if I
may” (speaking turn #23); “I couldn’t get home that night” (speaking turn #75); and “I’ve been
out of the loop for some time now” (speaking turn #99).

Examples of the social orientation style concern for other/s: “So if you have any questions
now or later” (speaking turn #110); “did you want to talk?” (speaking turn #111); “if you can
imagine” (speaking turn #112); “thank you very much, Mayor” (speaking turn #113); “and you
don’t feel that” (speaking turn #126); and “if those are the kinds of things you want to bring up,
you may be my guest” (speaking turn #133).

Examples of the social orientation style concern for relationship include: “I can speak for
myself and for the people in my district” (speaking turn #20); “thank you so much for coming
before us today” (speaking turn #33); “those of us who are making decisions and those of the
people who are emergency workers have some way of dealing with this” (speaking turn #33); and
“I’m talking about my friends in Pahoa” (speaking turn #140).
Examples of the social orientation style concern for collective include: [Are we] “Ready?” (speaking turn #1); [We need] “to ensure a very close, well-knit coordination with the community” (speaking turn #4); we have to be prepared” (speaking turn #135); “we’re not sitting here all in favor of this” (speaking turn #136); “we don’t really have a choice about what happens” (speaking turn #138); “all of us have to understand” (speaking turn #140); “we can get by” (speaking turn #142); “we definitely have enough to sustain ourselves” (speaking turn #144).

The overall predominant social orientation style enacted in discourse was concern for collective (41.5%) followed closely by concern for other/s (32.5%), then concern for self (21%), and concern for relationship (5%). Of Leader A’s speaking turns, the predominant social orientation style was concern for other/s (42.5%), followed by concern for collective (32%), concern for self (21.3%) and concern for relationship (4.2%). Similarly, of Leader B’s speaking turns, the predominate social orientation style was concern for collective (46.7%), followed by concern for self (26.6%), then concern for other/s (21.3%), and concern for relationship (5.3%).

As a collective, other speakers including department chiefs and members of the public predominately oriented their speaking turns with concern for collective (42.2%), concern for other/s (36.7%), concern for self (15.5%) and concern for relationship (5.5%). Notably, the social orientation style concern for relationship was minimally represented in discourse and consistently concern for collective and concern for other/s were the predominant social influence styles among leaders and other constituents.

Development of a Rhetorical Vision

A rhetorical vision often emerges when group members respond emotionally to a dramatic situation and proclaim some commitment or consensus to an attitude and/or motivation (Bormann, 1972). A rhetorical vision “is constructed from themes that chain out in face-to-face interacting groups, in speaker-audience transactions, in viewers of television broadcasts, in listeners to radio programs” (Bormann, 1972, p. 398). A rhetorical vision may emerge from groups of people who experience directly or indirectly a collective drama and consequently create
a collective symbolic reality. Among the nine themes that emerged from the meeting discourse and chained in the newspaper article, a rhetorical vision emerged: **Hawaii County readies for war in the Middle East by preparing for likely negative impacts and developing community involvement as Project Kumiai yet hopes for peace.**

Consequently, the enactment of social convergence through the chaining of fantasy themes promoted the construction and development of a collective understanding of the current situation and a shared projection of the future. The creation and significant influence of the rhetorical vision began with dialogue framing by Leader A. He established confidence in the Mayor’s ability to prepare and withstand man-made and natural crisis disasters and focused the meeting’s agenda to dialogue regarding crisis preparation to mitigate fear and anxiety associated with military confrontation and terrorist attacks. Essentially, Leader B initiated the ethos theme of the Civil Defense Organization and the County administration. He had initial credibility associated with crisis preparation and then artfully created derived credibility during the dialogue by sharing his knowledge and answering constituents’ questions. Many of the constituents’ statements indicated an appreciation and respect for the Mayor, thereby indicating he had terminal credibility after the dialogue (Lucas, 2004). His promise to involve community constituents in crisis response was an effective method for creating goodwill. After Leader B presented key topics, the questions directed to him were clarifying questions rather than confrontational. The speakers appeared satisfied with the explanations the Mayor and his department chiefs provided, thus giving the impression of shared understanding, acceptance, and experience as “common sense.”

Even though the theme congenial/civil society was not chained in the newspaper article, it was predominate during the meeting discourse. Leader A utilized this theme the most. He indicated acknowledgment, affirmation, appreciation or agreement and concern for others during 28 of a total of 41 speaker turns. Leader B utilized this theme 16 of a total of 31 speaker turns. A significant majority of the other speakers did as well. Of the 150 speaking turns, 83 speaker turns...
enacted the congenial/civil society theme. Thus, the meeting’s discourse exemplified significant group orientation, harmonious relations, and “sensitivity to face” (Kim, 2001).

Constituents established common ground among fellow constituents by identifying themselves with shared values, emotions, and experiences. These included the concepts we/our, security, ready/prepare, fear and anxiety, and disasters/crises. Moreover, engaging into dialogue about crisis preparation tended to give the speakers (and listeners) comfort because they appeared to believe the Civil Defense Organization was aware of and to their best ability prepared for most contingencies associated with terrorism and war. The dialogue among constituents created the impression for most listeners that “the people who are supposed to take care” (speaking turn #128) of our welfare are thinking about it, working on it, and coming up with appropriate ideas for workable community programs and practices; consequently, we will survive another disaster.

The rhetorical vision addresses the concept *kumiai*. *Kumiai*, a Japanese word meaning voluntary community union, is considered a community cooperative with a social mission “we care we share” for group sustainability. *Kumiai* may be considered strong cultures and highly reliable organizations if carefully constructed, skillfully lead, and with constituents genuinely cooperating. In short, the group harmoniously exists, functions, and operates for the benefit of constituents and the enterprise. Constituents pool their perspectives, skills, and resources, and confer for the benefit of its members and the coalition. Leaders and managers “are encouraged to trust their employees and permit them to participate in important decisions” (Hamilton, 2001, p. 41) and collective sense-making. The enactment of *kumiai* may be considered an effective tool for individuals to acquire social support and social security and as a tool for group system sustainability. Because *kumiai* are governed by a democratic and equal voice, members have the ability to avoid control by an elite member. Nevertheless, some constituents may have more influential impact.

The word *kumiai* was stated first by Leader B the Mayor in speaking turn #4 “Research and Development have drawn up a program . . . she calls it . . . I think it’s interesting . . . (smiles)
Project Kumiai. And for those of you of this State or this island in regards to kumiai of community. " Then it was addressed again by a council member: “Jane Testa’s Kumiai project which is kind of a neat idea. I like that" (speaking turn #24) and by another council member in speaking turn #33.

I commend you and Jane Testa for developing this Project Kumiai. And I imagine that you are going to be working with community groups and all those volunteer fire, emergency preparedness committees in each of the subdivisions, churches, and things . . . I think that even you might want to include labor organizations in with this because many of the workers are so tied to that. And they are really full of volunteerism. So, thanks so much for letting us know and just let us know if there are things we can do to help.

Kumiai is addressed by Leader A, Council Committee Chair in speaking turn #49:
I’m assuming that Project Kumiai . . . I think that is a real appropriate name, Jane, I congratulate you (smiles). So it’s a community-based type of program, and it’s going to encompass any of these areas that I just brought up. You know, whether there is an attack on the economic side and sustainability side.” And again in speaking turn #52, Project Kumiai would encompass all of those general areas that I brought up. I mean, I know it’s a community-based system.

Ms. Testa, Department Chief of Research and Development explained:
We would determine a process to increase the collaboration between the first responders, emergency management community volunteer groups and organizations, and other people. And we would determine outreach and public education campaigns to promote community preparedness and family safety measures. And then we would develop a communications network to keep the information flowing to and from communities (speaking turn #63).
The final discussion was presented by Leader A, Council Committee Chair, “If anybody wants to . . . like volunteer or provide some suggestions . . . where can they call?” (speaking turn #115). Leader B, County Mayor, responded, “In regards to the program of Jane Testa’s, obviously Jane. In regards to Civil Defense Organization, obviously Mr. Bill Davis. But as far as volunteers, I would take this opportunity to emphasize programs of Red Cross and those of volunteer type of programs are always out there short of volunteers” (speaking turn # 116). The theme community involvement for social security during man-made and natural disasters is representative of the goal of Project Kumiai. Project Kumiai was initiated by Hawai’i County’s Prosecuting Attorney’s Office as the Community Empowerment Organization (CEO). Community volunteers from a wide-range of backgrounds, skills, and interests obtained grants from the U.S. Department of Justice to empower communities affected by the insurgent of crime in neighborhoods which was considered a crisis for the county at large.

Answering RQ3—How did assembled constituents of a community in crisis achieve social convergence?—social convergence was constructed by a variety of methods including the enactment of congenial, civil, competent, comfortable behaviors that created the impression of “good working relations;” the initiating and chaining of themes that framed the dialogue; the use of messages that enacted concern for other/s and concern for collective social orientations rather than predominately a concern for self orientation. The collective construction of a rhetorical vision provided a sense of consensus among constituents of a shared vision of the future. The enactment of kumiai, as an attempt to collaboratively cooperate during times of disasters, indicated constituents’ efforts to develop and support the network system and achieve community sustainability. The Committee Chair emphasized the fundamental need for functional and effective community communication system. “We’re working, we’re preparing, and I guess the theme of all of this is that the program that you folks are developing is going to be one that is based on communications and maintaining or developing networks. I think that’s very important” (speaking turn #113). And the County Mayor responded, “I think what we do in this County
regards to communication and level . . . hopefully a degree of trust that we will be there to respond . . . to coordinate to minimize the type of unnecessary anxiety that will develop in case the scenario of war does happen” (speaking turn #114). In short, appropriate and effective communication may reduce uncertainty, anxiety, and fear among community constituents as well as establish, maintain, and promote trustworthiness of the county administration.

In summary, it appears that the constituents were motivated to form sensible perceptions of reality and react accordingly, to develop and preserve congenial and meaningful social relationships, and to maintain a favorable group identity. By taking a proactive, harmonizing, and communal approach to their natural world, this community may be considered a truly global community exemplifying Western, Eastern, and indigenous characteristics. The enactment of kumiai as a volunteer community union with a social mission “we care we share” for group sustainability was clearly evident by this public meeting. The group’s shared mission was driven by constituents’ needs and “our friends’ deeds” of this Hawai‘i island community for the betterment and sustainability of their community.

This meeting significantly enacted a collective orientation. In particular, the leaders as chief influence agents provided a clear agenda, relevant discussion of disaster preparedness for community sustainability and the impacts of the declaration of war on Iraq, and maintained a concern for collective and/or concern for other/s orientation, thus enacting kumiai. The key chief influence agents, as the committee chair and the County Mayor, enacted resourcefulness by giving and receiving ideas, openness, dignity, healing, and inclusion. The management leaders as the Chief of Police, Deputy Fire Chief, Director of Hawai‘i Island Civil Defense Organization, and the Director of Research and Development are the “nerve centers” of their own units. All appeared knowledgeable, capable, and competent and provided information to and considered information from constituents.
This meeting is an excellent example of how diverse constituents of a community under considerable stress can reach convergence by enacting *kumiai* and to interpret the convergence as an interdependent and highly reliable system. Like Sitting Bull, these leaders constructed a bond among diverse constituents by acknowledging shared struggles and threats, developing trust and commitment, increasing and sharing resources, bestowing beneficence, generosity, and compassion. Moreover, they supported community crisis management through unity and directed the collective construction of a satisfying vision for the future.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The role of a leader is twofold: define reality and provide hope.
D. Sampson
Assistant Secretary U.S. Economic Development Agency, 2001

Leadership is about creating a domain in which human beings continually deepen their understanding of reality and become more capable of participating in the unfolding of the world.
J. Jaworski, 1998

Synthesis

Leadership influences constituents through the creation of a rhetorical vision of the future and through facilitating the process collaboratively with autonomous, active, and willing followers (Tate, Munsell, & Love, 2006). The abilities to develop trust, analyze and assess situations, define reality from a variety of perspectives, and prescribe appropriate reactions for common and unique problems are key to successful leadership (Tate, Munsell, & Love, 2006). Leadership is a social influence process based on collective sense-making by means of effective communication (Hackman & Johnson, 2004). Leadership involves the creation and manipulation of symbolic messages to influence the social construction of reality, the development of relationships, and priming constituents' responses/reactions. This study confirmed leadership is enacted as a transactional social influence process between the leader/s and other group members (constituents) that was observed by their discursive, social interactive behaviors.

The intent of this research quest was to identify simple yet elegant features of social influence in the form of leadership communication. This study was constructed from ideas offered by theorists and practitioners of sense-making methodology, social construction of reality, social convergence, rhetoric, framing, dialogue, discourse, leadership, community building, and crisis management. The practical significance of this study is to suggest how leaders can facilitate and shape emerging patterns of communication to influence social reality. The theoretical significance is to provide a comprehensive investigation of leadership among constituents based on socially influenced sense-making. For this study, the phenomenon of analysis was a bona fide
group of constituents from a community in Hawai`i as they attempted to make collective sense of a community crisis. This actual instance of leadership occurred naturally during a special public meeting that lasted approximately sixty minutes, consisted of 16 speakers and 10 attending observers, and involved 150 speaking turns and approximately 10,700 words.

Collective sense-making and leadership as social influence are dependent upon communication enactments. Key concepts applied in this study included sense-making, dialogic discourse, framing, symbolic convergence, public meetings, social influence style orientations, chief influence agents as leaders, community building, and crisis management by kumiai. Taken for granted factors such as a collective congenial attitude, cooperative behaviors and social relations orientation styles were addressed. Responding to numerous recommendations to “move away from studying isolated, zero-history, laboratory groups” (Stohl & Putnam, 1994, p. 285) and to focus on real life episodes as case studies (Gouran, 1994), this study illuminated a specific communication event and provided insight into the distinct patterns of symbolic interaction such as framing messages and the co-construction of a rhetorical vision. What they communicated and how they rhetorically developed “a way of having something in common on which to base their coordinated enactments” (Heath, 1994, p. 11) were discussed. Mapping discourse construction and development indicated the actual pathway and progression of discursive communication behaviors. Identifying qualities of the meeting discourse event provided clues to content, social influence tactics, as well as social relationship orientations.

**Dialogue**

Fostering *bona fide* dialogue, especially during situations involving threats, diversity, and community building, can be challenging. Thus, analyzing such events is useful. Careful attention was given to how these constituents came together and engaged with each other in a dialogue group. In Hawaiian tradition, sharing one’s reality with friends and colleagues is termed “talk story” (Stanford-Blair & Dickmann, 2005). Since ancient times, this social act has traditionally created new understandings and social convergence. Through dialogue, constituents may develop
a shared consciousness. Bormann’s theory acknowledges “symbolic convergence occurs when group member’s symbolic worlds incline toward and overlap each other by means of symbolic interaction” (Lesch, 1994, p. 58). Dialogue may be an especially useful and productive form of community communication addressing shared problems and threats (Cissna & Anderson, 2004).

Through controlled dialogue in the form of a public meeting, group members discussed multiple realities associated with the crisis, engaged in collective second-order learning, and reorganized their sense of reality. The Council Committee Chair played a significant role influencing the development of group synergy by guiding the process of dialogue enacted through discourse. The Council Committee Chair did not force a traditional pattern (i.e. Robert’s Rules of Order), but he did significantly direct social interaction. He adapted and adjusted to the emerging social connections and interaction patterns, acknowledged all members who wanted to speak, and directed that all discourse be entered as public record. Both leaders, the Council Committee Chair and the County Mayor as the invited guest, provided a social connection and interaction framework that constituents reacted to and leaders modified, thus giving the impression dialoguers were considered valued group members. For this instance of leadership, this form of dialogue was a useful process and product of communication to collectively attempt to comprehend, understand, and prepare for a potential community crisis event. It appears that it was an appropriate and effective means for this community.

Framing

By utilizing frames and artfully framing dialogue, leaders can play a significant role as sense-guiders, social reality constructors, and articulators of reality. Understanding the significance of framing messages with relevant topics, themes, and social interaction orientations contributes to our understanding of effective leadership. Framing involves the process of selectively focusing attention, identifying, and describing an event. Frames are cognitive heuristics that are used to help make sense of complex information. Framing “involves the construction of interpretive frames and their representation to others” (Kaufman, Elliott, &
Shmueli, 2003, paragraph 3). Frames also provide value guidelines. For this group of constituents, the following values were explicitly and implicitly addressed: *kumiai*, as a caring community, *kokua* as participative help, and *ohana* as supportive extended family. These frames oriented to the audience’s common frames of reference and common ways of deciphering what is happening, how to feel about this experience, and what to do about it. The act of framing significantly affects the interpretation and reactions to a perceived threat.

When effectively enacted by chief influence agents, framing may significantly direct constituents’ thoughts and actions and may develop a sense of understanding, certainty, and predictability. Some constituents may require higher levels of cognitive closure than others. “The need for closure may arise where predictability or [future] actions seem important” (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994, p. 1049). Cognitive closure may create feelings of security, a sense of understanding, and peace. Framing a crisis event is useful for making sense of the relevance and significance to one’s self, for another, others, and a relationship or organization such as a community. Many factors affect how people frame a crisis such as personal interests, needs, and values as well as one’s personal reality of concepts, experiences, probabilities, preferences, and experiences. The way a collective frames a crisis event is important for several reasons. It identifies whether constituents sense a situation as a crisis, how they attempted to interpret and comprehend the crisis, and what reactions/responses can be performed.

During this instance of crisis leadership, the leaders framed constituents’ sense-making by framing discourse with themes including congenial/civil society, disaster preparedness for infrastructure security, expected impacts and negative effects of crisis events, community engagement for social security, war, ethos, hope/peace/spirituality, Hawai‘i sustainability, and Hawai‘i’s history of surviving man-made and natural disasters. Noteworthy, the constituents were very congenial during a stressful social situation suggesting a collaborative and cooperative relationship, and there was a high level of confidence and competence among the invited guests.
Exemplifying rhetorical sensitivity, the chief influence agents as leaders appeared to co-orient to constituents’ reality, concerns, and emotions.

**Communication and Leadership Competence**

Communicating effectively requires leaders to frame their messages to convey a sense of ethos; orientate to, and if possible identify with constituents’ diverse and shared values, versions of reality, and visions; enact care and concern for constituents; gratify constituents’ emotional needs; and coordinate constituents’ responses. Effective leaders must strategically direct framing and guide the co-construction of shared experience. Synthesizing social reality, articulating a compelling vision of reality, and focusing attention on relevant topics are available means for effective leadership communication.

According to Dwyer (1991), “our frames, our ways of understanding, eventually determine the patterns of our behavior, and the patterns of our behavior determine our effectiveness” (p. 2). The language used to express or exclude topics, themes, and social orientation styles have message effects. Constructing a shared identity and acknowledging shared experiences among diverse people establishes a sense of social convergence (Hobbs, 2003). For this instance of leadership, most speakers framed their discourse with common and relevant topics and preferred social orientation styles concern for collective and concern for other.

As Schein (1985) recommended, this instance of leadership appeared effective at coping with a crisis by connecting and engaging constituents in the proper way through public dialogue and to ensure necessary adjustments to decrease the negative impacts of a crisis. As Smircich and Morgan (2003) suggested, this instance of leadership constructed and managed a sense of community (consensus and commitment of a common group purpose) for group survival and sustainability. Depicting a “true” or *bona fide* collaborative community, this group of individuals accepted diversity, appreciated common experiences and values, acknowledged interdependency, and established constructive management of individual differences and group commitment. As a highly reliable community, constituents identified and valued their resources, accepted
vulnerabilities, pro-actively prepared for negative effects, and considered the likely impacts of the declaration of war by President G. W. Bush on Iraq in 2003. Constituents discussed practical, social, and emotional topics including community resources, safety and security, healthy environmental conditions, and basic to sophisticated social services. They enacted pro-social behavior such as empathy, concern for other/s and concern for relationships, and respect of fellow constituents. The explicit or implicit references to feelings were acknowledged, thus encouraging practical reasoning for practical wisdom. Significantly, effective crisis leadership requires good communication, a clear vision, and a caring- and sharing-oriented set of values.

From Howell’s levels of communication competence, the chief influence agents in this case (the Council Committee Chair and the County Mayor) appeared to be highly competent communicators. By relying on intuitive messaging (conveying and interpreting), they enacted social influence styles of concern for the other and/or concern for the collective orientations, confidence and credibility, and discipline. These chief influence agents appeared to be effective communicators and leaders because they responded effectively to unscripted messaging from a variety of constituents regarding a variety of issues.

Moreover, as skilled framers, they seized the opportunity to “make maximum use of high-impact opportunities” (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 152). As Fairhurst and Sarr (1996) recommended, the leaders framed messages to link relevant and meaningful topics and to develop cognitive cohesion and continuity. Relevant and meaningful topics including disaster preparedness, community engagement, and the negative impacts and concerns associated with man-made and natural disasters. Fairhurst and Sarr (1996) recommended leaders should “get to the heart of the matter” (p. 153). In this case, that heart was disaster preparedness. The leaders craftily avoided the “Bush agenda” topic which could have dividing and polarizing effects among constituents. Interestingly, the word why was rarely spoken—only four times in the entire meeting. Thus, the discussion of why the community may have a crisis was avoided.
Addressing "the missing puzzle piece" as the "very sensitive subject" of "the . . . relationship between the police, INS, and illegal aliens (speaking turn #97), the Mayor responded, "I'll let the Chief respond specifically to your question, sir" (speaking turn #100). The Chief of Police responded "I think the INS, local law enforcement, FBI . . . US Customs, Border Patrol, all have increased their level of awareness, their . . . they've also increased their level of detection of intrusions of unwanted aliens. They have not . . . profiled any specific individuals or any specific race . . . races as of yet."(speaking turn #102). These responses addressed the unstated concern of terrorists and racial profiling. Many of the constituents are non-Caucasian immigrants or have descendents who were affected by WWII internment.

The leaders enacted considerable effort sharing information and processing collective sense-making in a congenial and credible manner. Both significantly enacted a collaborative, supportive, ethical style among constituents. A sense of hope and confidence was attempted. During this community's "turning point," the County Mayor in particular addressed his administration's ethos as competence, credibility, and goodwill. Although the County Mayor enacted more "concern for self" orientation than any other speaker, both leaders attempted to relate or be concerned about the other/s, their relationships, and the collective. "Concern for other/s" and "concern for collective" social relationship orientations provide the impression the leaders are supportive and thus may reduce stress which helped constituents cope with uncertainty and insecurity, encourage collaboration and co-construction of reality, as well as promote higher leader-constituent relationship satisfaction. A collaborative/supportive leadership style may also promote referent influence and expertise influence. Research suggests expertise influence is particularly expected in co-operatives or kumiai (Takamura, 1992).

This community recognized the importance of developing a comprehensive community network and networking with resourceful and valued constituents in the form of Project Kumiai. Networking is essential for developing and distributing information, knowledge, understanding,
expectations, goals, and visions, as well as developing and promoting a shared frame of reference and social reality. Collaborative co-construction of social reality in general and a collective vision in particular enhances group synergy and civility but may also promote groupthink and a faux group legacy.

Overall, both leaders appeared sensitive to and adept at sensing clues and cues from this diverse social-cultural environment, soliciting and respecting feedback, actively listening, maintaining congenial relations, and developing a resourceful network of constituents. Social harmony and a “we” attitude were enacted. A potential community man-made disaster was identified, described, and discussed. Discussing the threats associated with declaration of war on Iraq transformed constituents’ social reality. Most constituents appeared to enact emotional sensitivity by acknowledging and accepting the sense of confusion, anxiety, frustration, fear, and anger associated with world events that may negatively affect their community. These beliefs and social behaviors stabilized the sense-making process for individuals as well as for the collective. As a result, the community appeared effective solving external survival problems as well as internal integration processing. By taking a proactive, harmonizing, and communal approach to their natural world, this community may be considered an authentically global community exemplifying western, eastern, and indigenous characteristics.

The leaders seized the opportunity to use this instance of leadership to significantly influence constituents’ sense-making processing and collective learning. During this special public meeting, constituents became aware of and developed their shared understanding of a potential crisis situation rather than taking a “wait and see” approach. Leaders appeared to notice the unexpected in the making, conversed about the implications and how to prevent or decrease impacts that may harm the organization, and effectively managed unexpected responses. The constituents constructed a faith and hope theme as a guideline to manage the unmanageable. As a result, this community may be considered a highly reliable organization due to effective leadership.
Rhetorical Vision

The power of leadership language resides in the framing effects that encompasses a situation and constructs and forms “an effective community of minds as a shared frame of reference” (Foss, Foss, & Trapp, 1991, p. 124) or shared consciousness (Lesch, 1994). The framing efforts of the leaders (Council Committee Chair and County Mayor) clearly indicated discursive attempts to develop a satisfying rhetorical vision. Constructing a rhetorical vision “implies that meanings are managed about the future” (Wendt & Fairhurst, 1994, p. 181). A rhetorical vision provided an implicit or explicit “common agenda” among constituents and the chief influence agents skillfully guided this process.

From a fresh approach to Bormann’s social convergence theory, a rhetorical vision was identified. The rhetorical vision emerged from the convergence of themes enacted in the meeting’s discourse and represented in a newspaper article. Of the nine themes that emerged from the meeting discourse, two major themes were evident: disaster preparedness and congenial/civil society. The themes of man-made and natural disaster impacts and community engagement were also persistent. These “discursive resources” significantly framed the discourse and the construction of social reality. Discursive resources like interpretive repertoires are “recurrently used systems of terms used for characterizing and evaluating actions, events, and phenomena” (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 149). Other discursive resources included the acknowledgment of community empowerment, competency, and resilience. The congenial and civil society theme encouraged constituents to respect others’ opinions and to pray for or envision peace.

The leaders appeared to effectively direct dialogic discourse and thus constructed a preferred rhetorical vision of the future: Hawaii county readies for war in the Middle East by preparing for likely negative impacts and developing community involvement as Project Kumiai yet hopes for peace. For this instance of leadership, the rhetorical vision may be broadly represented as *kumiai*. The enactment of *kumiai* provided the foundation for the group’s knowledge, sense of identification with each other, and a shared social reality. The rhetorical
vision subjugated competing viewpoints and was a basis for collective learning and social reality transformation. The leaders framed collective sense-making and the co-construction of social reality and attempted to enhance social convergence, community-building and crisis management.

**Social Convergence and Kumiai**

Leadership structures the opportunities and constraints for others to contribute to community building (Couto & Eken, 2002). As a social interaction process and product, *kumiai* has a social mission of "we care we share" for group sustainability. The group’s cooperative mission is driven by constituents’ needs and by constituents’ deeds for the people and by the people. Constituents pooled their perspectives, skills, and resources for the benefit of its members. Rather than depending upon the federal or state government to manage the local crisis "in the event of war," the leaders facilitated and supported collective and collaborative sense-making, problem-solving, and coordinated action immediately. The leaders empowered and entrusted community responsibilities and acknowledged community accountability for their unique needs, circumstances, survival, and for their sustainability.

Because of the dialogic and relatively unscripted nature of the meeting’s discourse, harmonious and cooperative co-orientation occurred in the form of "jamming" and was a beneficial way to encourage social convergence among diverse individuals. According to Eisenberg (1990), “the ultimate measure of communicative success is the degree to which members establish and maintain a balance between autonomy and interdependency” (p. 160), secure a sense of meaning, common understanding, and common purpose. The leaders effectively guided the “jamming” process by providing direction, information, meaning, and meaningfulness to constituents. They also appeared to generate a sense of ethos, pro-activity and productivity, and essentially developed a sense of hope. Constituents were recognized and their input respected. Consequently, by sharing a common orientation of a shared threat as common ground, constituents who do not agree on particular perspectives and attitudes, boundaries, problems,
issues, solutions, and beliefs can experience some sense of common bond, agree to a common end state, and participate in the co-construction of a rhetorical vision.

As the encompassing theme, *kumiai* transpired as a form of collaborative social interaction and collective community sense-making. The County Mayor introduced the theme by stating "for those of you of this State or this island in regards to *kumiai* of community" the purpose of Project Kumiai "is a mechanism to bring together the appropriate leadership in a community to focus on engaging citizens in Homeland Security for promoting community preparedness and family safety" (speaking turn #4). For extraordinary as well as everyday events, leaders may develop a sense of *kumiai* as a viable and appropriate means of social connection and interaction for group satisfaction, survival, and sustainability. Generally we expect our leaders to direct, inspire, motivate, and comfort constituents during times of crisis or significant change. These leaders facilitated the process of recognizing, realizing, and responding to a community crisis by directing group dynamics in general and dialogic discourse in the form of *kumiai*.

In summary, leadership is a social influence process based on collective sense-making and leadership effectiveness is an outcome of communication in/competence (Hackman & Johnson, 2004). Agreeing with Watson (1995), rhetoric is a key factor of human cognition, communicative processes, and leadership. Rhetoric is about discovering and effectively enacting the available means such as framing to influence others’ beliefs, values, emotions, attitudes, expectations, and behaviors. The construction and convention of discourse and the enactment of social influence are ways in which social reality is created, constructed, organized, transformed, terminated, and recovered.

**Conclusions**

This instance of leadership provided an extraordinary example of how crisis/threat management among diverse constituents can be collaborative, meaningful, successful, and satisfying because constituents acknowledged interdependency and thus related with others for
the collective good. A supportive leadership style and relation-centered approach appeared appropriate and effective for the conditions of this community.

Discourse can be a powerful means of influencing a preferred shared reality among constituents of a community. Revealing the development of meaning and reality may provide insight to the significance of communication processes and practices. These processes and practices are likely to be primarily subconscious and automatic rather than conscious and deliberate. The communication process involves enthymemes, frames of reference, emotions and attitudes. Communication practices involve symbols, framing, and other behavioral dimensions that may be taken for granted, but play an essential or significant function.

Leaders should use natural rhetorical devices such as dialogic discourse to prime enthymemes, frame constituents' reality, and direct the collective construction of a new social reality and rhetorical vision for community development, crisis management, and community sustainability. In particular, the art of framing dialogic discourse is a useful rhetorical technique. Rhetoric is “part of the process whereby human beings negotiate realities with others through the cultural medium of [dialogue and] discourse and through which they justify and make sense, to themselves and others” (Watson, 1995, p. 815). Rhetoric can be approached from a variety of perspectives including feminist, religious, and cultural (Asian, Euro-American, Afro, and Latino).

In the final analysis, no symbol system can completely encompass or describe external reality and internal experiences; yet, humans will continue to use rhetorical devices to develop some sense of reality and to manage that reality (Meyer, 1996). This study concluded emergent themes and the absence of other themes framed the collective sense for these constituents as they attempted to manage the meaning of a community crisis.

Limitations

This study is limited to the analysis of one instance of leadership. The development, construction, interpretations and findings are limited by the researcher’s reality and technical analysis methods and skills. Even though the researcher attended the meeting, had a common
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basis of understanding with the constituents under study, and was an active and valued member of the community for six years, she may be considered an “outsider.” She was not familiar with the term *kumiai* and had not experienced most of the previous disasters addressed.

The analysis is not a comprehensive content analysis that could provide inter-coder reliability and stronger operational validity. The word frequencies analysis is limited by the lack of current word frequency studies. In addition, acknowledging the complexity of group dynamics, a practical technique for analyzing human behaviors as dynamic systems remains elusive. Statistical and visual multi-dimensional methods for modeling human dynamics would enhance findings by revealing the complex and multiple sub-processes that emerge and evolve. A three-dimensional representation of the emergence of group dynamics including mapping constituent connections and pathways, flow of discourse as speaking turn progression and pace, and the development of themes would greatly enhance visual representation of this instance of leadership and additional case studies.

**Suggestions**

Leaders and other chief influence agents should consider the opportunities 1) to direct the development of a sense of community as collaborative, cooperative attitude and meaningful engagement among constituents, 2) to direct the development of a strong and functional network and awareness and appreciation of system interdependence, 3) to direct the development of teamwork, group synergy, and flow, 4) to discourage or eliminate constituents who enact behaviors deemed self-serving, competitive, contentious, and obstinate, or enact social disconnection or disassociation.

Dialogic discourse is a natural device to develop and construct a sense of community and shared consciousness. Burkhalter, Gastil, and Kelshaw (2002) suggested public deliberation as competing perspectives should be replaced with public discussion and dialogue because public discussions “accommodate significant differences in speaking and reasoning traditions”(p. 407) Dialogic discourse may be especially useful with diverse communities and for global relations.
Fairhurst and Sarr (1996) addressed the effective management of spontaneity during communication events such as meetings and everyday conversations. To develop priming, as the development of enthymemes and frames of reference, they recommended leaders should purposely become conscious of a collective goal or vision, envision it, retain this belief in their memory, and then, subconsciously enact those goals or vision. Priming beliefs and attitudes is reinforced by repetitively communicating the beliefs and enacting the attitudes with oneself and others. Developing message repertoire is essential. Canary and Stafford (1994) suggested leaders must develop and maintain a strong network and strong relationships in order to easily share these messages and hone their skills of priming through strategic and routine social interaction (Canary & Stafford, 1994). Heath (2004) suggested, and this study confirmed, dialogic discourse may be an especially useful rhetorical device to manage crises.

When a crisis is detected or a potential crisis suspected, leaders must provide effective crisis notification, identification, description, and explanation as well as provide direction (where we are going), flow control (how fast we will move) and the assurance of community rebuilding and recovery. In most situations, the sooner the better to consider the “what ifs,” the concerns, emotions, and attitudes of constituents, and the limitations as well as to prepare and respond in a timely and functional manner. Making connections with constituents and communicating effectively with genuine care, concern, and compassion and developing a sense of hope are essential. Reiterating Barge’s (2003) conclusions, “the articulation and commitment to hope is important to community life’ (p. 80).

As a result of this study, further research development needs to be addressed several areas including conceptualizations and effects of trust, stress, *kumiai*, and other forms of cooperatives, communalism as a fundamental dimension of culture (Moemeka, 1997; 1998), the role of culture in strategic problem definition (Mukherji & Hurtado, 2002), common meeting practices (Myers, 1986), knowledge leadership (Capshaw & Koulopoulos, 1999), and complexity theory as a leadership framework (Gibson, 2000). For example, Shamir and Lapidot (2003) and
Dean (2007) acknowledged trust is an essential component of leadership and may be a fundamental quality of social relationships. Research addressing the concepts trust, stress, and problem need to be discussed from a variety of cultural perspectives (individualism, collectivism, communalism). The nature of stress, types of stress, and methods for arousing and relieving stress should be investigated (Lindsey, 2004). Research regarding the concept *kumiai* needs to be developed since documented research is lacking.

Concerning methodological improvements, the fields of international and comparative education offer ideas how to map social perspectives and pragmatics (Paulston, 1996) and international relations and intelligence (Central Intelligence Agency, 2005) offer methods to analyze ideologies and social movements. In particular, a three-dimensional model representing multivariate social cartography, the mapping of complex relationships as a system, and Markov system analysis are of interest to this researcher.

In closing, this exploratory study provided a pragmatic foundation for developing a better understanding of leadership episodes. Any instance of leadership is worthy of analysis. This study focused on a single representational instance of social influence as leadership at an actual and naturally occurring public community meeting addressing a crisis. This study addressed taken-for-granted factors such as meetings and congenial and collaborative attitudes as useful methods for creating and constructing meaning, developing and sustaining meaningful relationships, and prescribing sensible action. Dialogic discourse, as a natural rhetorical device, may provide insight and practical wisdom to chief influence agents such as parents, teachers, preachers, politicians, and leaders who desire to build a sense of community and group sustainability.

Sarles (1985) acknowledged theory as "meaning is not merely what words or ideas or language mean, but how humans construct, sustain, and act within that notion of meaning" (p. 7). The field of communication can provide unique and important contributions to social influence agency, leadership, and crisis management theory development.
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PARENTHESES INDICATE NONVERBAL MESSAGES

Speaker A: Male/Committee Chair Chung
Speaker B: Female/Council Member Leithead-Todd
Speaker C: Male/County Mayor Kim
Speaker D: Male/Committee Member Safarik
Speaker E: Male/Police Chief Mahuna
Speaker F: Male/Committee Member Holschuh
Speaker G: Male/Committee Member Jacobson
Speaker H: M/Committee Member Elarionoff
Speaker I: Female/County Research and Development Director Testa
Speaker J: Male/Deputy Fire Chief Wery
Speaker K: Male/County Civil Defense Director Davis
Speaker L: Male/Unidentified member from the public audience
Speaker M: Male/member from the public audience McMett
Speaker N: Female/member from the public audience Falina
Speaker O: Male/member from the public audience Smith
Speaker P: Female/member from the public audience Paula

Speaking Turn/Speaker

(Gavel pounding)

1/A. Good morning. Ready?

2/B. Oh! We’re actually taping this. Oh! I didn’t know that.

3/A. I would like to call this special meeting of the Hawaii County Council Committee on Finance to order. Before proceeding I’d like to introduce members of the committee who are present this morning. Starting to my left with Mr. Bob Jacobson, followed by Dr. Fred Holschuh and Mr. Lenigrad Elarionoff. And to my right is Councilman Gary Safarik followed by Bobby Jean Leithead-Todd and to my immediate right is Council Chairman James Arakaki. Ah, the purpose of our meeting today is to allow the Mayor to give a presentation... outline of the County’s level of preparedness in the event of a war in the Middle
East and certainly none of us want to see something like that happen, but at the same time... I think it would behoove us to try to be prepared as we can. And Mayor... will... what I’d hope you’d do... um you could do today is explain what some of the possible impacts could be to the County in the event of a war. And ahh... and what the County is doing. As well as what the State’s doing. I’m sure you’re the best person to answer those questions as you know... you... really have made your reputation as a person who is... who is prepared. So Mayor... could you please take it away?

4/C. Ah... first of all, I thank you, Mr. Chairman for calling this, and I think it’s important we do open the ah... state where we are and things because judging from what has been occurring on the State Legislative level and the Governor’s office in regards to preparedness, and organizations of different things. Ahh... the people of Hawaii County know where we are and open ourselves up for any kind of questions that you may have now or later. First of all, before we go on that I find it very sad that we are here for this purpose, and openly I would say my greatest hope is that this is all academic, and we don’t get there. And I ah hope and pray for that every single minute of every single day.

In regards to where we are, first of all some of the statements made may sound a little boisterous and so be it. I think we know that on that awful day of September 11th, the ah Hawaii County government... let me retract that... Hawaii County Civil Defense Organization... which is made up of your State, Federal, county and private organizations, were the first in the State to organize. And I think if you look in the time structure, probably the first in the United States to organize. I say that openly and I say that with a lot of pride... that the Civil Defense structure made up of Federal, State, County and private organizations in this County of Hawaii was there to respond as best as they can, in that early morning hours of September 11th, and to coordinate activities in regards to this Island and to coordinate with the State. I suppose where we are today... I need to bring out couple of things here. ....... and I know it sounds a little boisterous but I’ll continue on that line... that the State of Hawaii has in place a Civil Defense Organization... and I’ll keep stressing the word organization. It is not a Civil Defense Agency. It’s an organization under the Governor of Hawaii. The person directly under her that is in charge of this known as the TAG, or the Adjunct General. Under that structure are the Vice Director and the Civil Defense organizations of every County. I think this... I know the State of Hawaii, made up of its four counties, is the only government structure in the entire United States that has a paid organized civil defense structure in every county of this State. And I am proud of that. Naturally the reason for it... it was initially set up for war. Because of a very bad history of how war has impacted this territory then, and State of Hawaii. However, as time passed, that same structure was maintained, was... has grown and now expanded into... to handle natural disasters as you may know... as well as man-made disasters... man-made disasters. And unfortunately the man-made disasters as defined in the Hawaii Revised Statutes of 128 and the County Emergency Operations Plan does state of terrorism, and does state of war also. I would like to bring this to the attention of the Council members and the public... I... I’m sure Council members are aware of it, of the Hawaii Revised Statutes of Chapter 128, (shows copy of the book to Council members) because it clearly defines the responsibility of the State government, and the County government, and its authority, unfortunately, in the event of natural disasters, as well as man-made disasters of war, as well as terrorism. In regards to where we are now... first of all on projects. At some time ago, I think in the summer of past... the year 2002... the Office of Justice program has passed down to various jurisdictions... and Hawaii County government being no different... the purpose of it was the... a grant... of congressional funding to prepare for potential consequences of weapons of mass destruction’s threat to the State of Hawaii. The County government of Hawaii was allocated the sum of $591,000 and an odd $51 for Hawaii County government. Again, for this purpose... potential consequences of weapons of mass destruction threat to the State of Hawaii. We have itemized here what we had submitted to the State of Hawaii for approval of that money. It was a no match grant situation, and all of those monies were... have been dedicated to the... primarily to the police and fire department in regards of equipment... for their responsibility as far as weapons of mass destruction. Again, that is on your Office of Justice program. We started this in the summer of the year 2002. The second element as far as projects and monies is the Homeland Security project. We are presently working on that. The sum of $95,176 was dedicated to the County of Hawaii for... I read... preparing for the potential consequences of a terrorist incident or threat to the State of Hawaii. And again, that is through the FEMA grant system, and again, $95,176 have been dedicated to the County of Hawaii. With that, Civil Defense coordinating how to spend this money, I think at this point these monies have not been received... these monies are in the... we are in the process now... we’re trying to develop a
program under what would be best as far as assisting Hawaii County Government for that purpose. They
gave us three categories that possibilities in regards to funding approval: . . . they are developing and
enhancing County emergency operations planning. . . Secondly, establish a citizens’ corps council, thirdly
develop a community emergency response team, also known as a CERT program. What we are looking at
to do is see if we can combine those three things into one program, because the sum is not that much. . .
$95,000 and what that . . . we hope to do. . . and Ms. Jane Testa on the Research and Development have
drawn up a program. . . she calls it. . . I think it’s interesting. . . (smiles) Project Kumiai. And for those of
you of this State or this island in regards to kumiai of community. . . and the purpose of it is a mechanism
to bring together the appropriate leadership in a community to focus on engaging citizens in Homeland
Security for promoting community preparedness and family safety. We do have a program in place. . . what
it is piggyback and elaborating on that program with staff. I think during all emergencies and God forbid
those of war, one of the greatest responsibility of government is to ensure a very close, well-knit
coordination with the community at large. And we hope to use this mechanism for that purpose. Again, this
. . . we’re in the writing stage of this right now. . . this has not been approved, although hopefully we’ve. . .
in Bill Davis’ communication to the State Civil Defense, who are the people funding through this grant, it
seems that we can combine these three for that one program. . . of developing a community type
organization in response to war time. . . as far as this island. . . I . . we should know. . . say within a week or
two whether this will be granted to us. Again, these are all non-match grants so we do not have to come for
special funding on these.

In regards to County preparedness, other things. . . the Department of Civil Service was asked to work with
all departments to identify all those personnel that may be called up for active duty. We do have a complete
list here if any of the Council members would like to view that there. . . this is just for each department to be
well aware of all those who are on Reserve or do the. . . on the Guards. And to make sure they have
contingency plans in case these people are called up. And right now for the County government of Hawaii,
the total is 46 for the key line agencies of. . . for the fire department are 16 and for the police department . . .
there are 19 personnel who are in the Reserves, the Coast Guard or the National Guard. In regards to other
preparedness, the Department of Research and Development have been instructed to. . . and they have been
doing it for a while now. . . because their responsibilities will be the economic impact to the County of
Hawaii. . . to coordinate with the State agency of DBEDT, as far as any type of response coordination in
regards to economic. I feel. . . I think that most of us do feel and obviously hope for, that if there is any
kind of war, it will be short. If there is any kind of war, the only consequences to this State and to this area
will be of economic impact. I know that is selfish, but obviously that is what we hope for. Judging from
other consequences of war, in regards to Desert Storm, of 9-1-1, that we all understand that the economic
impact can be severe. I think we all know, so at this point that everything seems to be in limbo as far as
what will or will not happen, what kind of war. Our only responsibility here is to make sure that we. . . our
scenario prepares for the whole scenario. I open myself to any questions Mr. Chung.

5/A. Okay. Mr. Safarik

6/D. Thank you, Mr Chairman. And thank you Mr. Mayor for. . . for bringing this forward. I think it’s been
kind of on everybody’s mind which direction we’re headed but. . . you know specifically for some of these
grants, we’re working. . . I know with the police department, right now. . . on radio compatibility for
agencies that let’s say have to travel to this island if we have some type of an emergency. . . is there any
funding that we could use for this particular initiative where we could. . . like let’s say for example the
PACMERE system. Is there anything that we could use, or maybe the Chief might know?

7/C. I’d like to. . . the Chief has been the assigned personnel prior to. . . he became Chief. . . to Regarding to
the police communication system. I think what we’re referring to is our goal someday regards the 800
megahertz system. We kind of talked about and a hope wish list. . . that keep our eyes and ears open in the
event that any kind of funds become available, because these funds. . . in regards to the 800 system, we are
talking a large amount of money.

8/D. Too much to talk about right now.

9/C. Chief, what is the amount for the 800 system?
10/E. 25 million

11/C. $25 million and that system as you said Mr. Safarik was a primary purpose of an 800 system. Where you could have agencies of different jurisdiction talk to each other. At the present time, on the County system, that is not possible. And hopefully, if something do come on board as far as availability of funds... I guarantee you the Chief knows how important it is because we know we're not going to get it out of our budget.

12/D. Right

13/C. And I will... we will look for it and we will seek it if it does become available.

14/D. Thank you Mr. Mayor. I think that is probably one of the issues that we really don't think about at the start of a preparedness. But if you go back to when to... on Kauai with Iniki, it was a real problem for all the different agencies that needed to communicate with each other. But I think you have it well in hand.

15/D. I, I would say this to Mr. Safarik... so the public can understand... this is a handicap that the agencies here have been working on for the past many, many years, and they have developed a system where they can communicate, even though some of it is a relay system. For example, during the fires, or when the military comes in to help on helicopters, they communicate through the County Fire Dispatch, who consequently relays...

16/D. Right.

17/C. And so the system to supplement that is in place. Obviously, it would be much better if we had an 800 system.

18/D. Right. Harry what about... you know... God forbid that we're going to go to war... it looks like we're hell bent on that path, but I think we can always hope for some kind of peaceful resolution but in the event of war... how... how are we prepared? Or is there any way to prepare for the economic impact... ah negative impact that we're going to struggle through?

Pause

19/C. A really tough question Mr. Safarik in regards to... because I don't know what the impact is. I think if naturally a good portion of the State of Hawaii economy is dependent on tourism. And 9-1-1 was a very rude awakening to the total impact overnight. But however, there are other industries that were greatly affected, especially if any kind of a transportation system is affected. Like a FedEx, which curtailed activities for a few days... where all the flower growers could not ship out. Again, we... we will try to make sure that Research and Development work very closely with DBEDT to make sure they have a good assessment of an impact, hopefully before it is a total impact, and hopefully we can take whatever mitigating measures we can.

20/D. I know... I can speak for myself and for the people in my district, but... I think with... with your expertise in this area, I feel a little bit better because... you know... you... you've been doing this in one fashion or another for a lot of years. And I just hope that we can all work together to make sure that this County is... is safe as we can make it. But the... the issues that we're talking about, I think are way beyond... what one person or even a whole agency can do... so let's just hope for the... for the best, but I do appreciate the... the informational content that we're going to be... you know, listening today and maybe some of the other Council members want to weigh in on that... so I'll... yield the floor Mr. Chairman.

21/C. I promise you this Mr. Safarik, if the scenario does evolve into a war of some kind where we are affected, the Council is part of the Civil Defense Organization, and we promise to... you know, work with
you, with all agencies under that structure. And the main mission obviously is to make sure we mitigate what we can, be pro-active where we can, and to make sure we communicate all of this to the community.

22/A. Dr. Holschuh

23/F. Yeah, Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thanks Mr. Mayor for being here today. I... I have two questions. Let me ask them separately, if I may. You mention... Jane Testa’s Kumiai project which is kind of a neat idea. I like that. And... the $95,176 funding that will be utilized, is there any way to or... or does it make any sense or can you use some of the $591,000 grant... or is that only for bio-terrorism and that sort of stuff. I mean is there any way to use that if necessary?

24/C. I do not think so because of the way the funding came down that it was primarily used for equipment purchase for the preparedness and response of weapons of mass destruction.

25/F. So that’s... more specifically for things like the Hazemat and bio-terrorism and that...

26/C. That’s correct.

27/F. And I know the Fire Department’s been very active with the ER’s and the hospitals and so forth. That’s what that’s about?

28/C. Yes, sir.

29/F. Okay. The other question is and you know certainly all of us hope we don’t as you eloquently suggested, we don’t go to war but... even without that we obviously have a threat of terrorist attacks, and I was wondering about the water supply. And whether we’ve done specific things since 9-11. I probably should know this and I may have read it but, actually as you mention it right now in terms of preparedness, are we... do we do something specifically to protect our water supply at this time?

30/C. Dr. Holschuh, because of your personal experience in EMS and other things, one of the... I was going to say fallacies of, but it’s not... one of the elements of living the way we do in a democracy, that prior to fear of terrorism, so many of our things like power plants, like our communications system, like our water system, were developed and structured with security minimum... outside of contamination, especially of the water. Because of 9-1-1, the Department... of the supply and security of the water supply system... is critical. As difficult as it may be... it is critical. And the coordination of resources... the Police Department and other resources are high priority in regards to coordinating that in the event it becomes necessary. But I would say openly the... I think we all know throughout the United States this is a difficult thing.

31/F. Okay, Thank you very much. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

32/A. Thank you and you know, Dr. Holschuh, in response to that as well, we did check with the Department of Water Supply, because that is an area of concern. About three years ago, I do know, that they informed us on of their... their persons from the Operations division, actually went up to Nevada for I think it was a one week program on weapons of mass destruction. So you know, they are on top of it. I’m not saying they are on top of it as they should be...I really don’t know what the level is. But, they’re aware of it and you know, they’re taken steps to try to address... try to learn about the potentials that may be inherent in operating a water system in these times. Mr. Jacobson.

33/G. Mayor Kim thank you so much for coming before us today. I think all of us know that what we all should be working to avoid war. But, obviously we must prepare in case that we have any war or terrorist threats. And along those line, I commend you and Jane Testa for developing this project Kumiai. And I imagine that you are going to be working with community groups and all those volunteer fire, emergency preparedness committees in each of the subdivisions, churches, and things, and some sort of method of communication to not only our people in the community so they know what’s going on but so that those of us who are making decisions and those of the people who are emergency workers have some way of
dealing with this. I think that even you might want to include labor organizations in with this because many
of the workers are so tied to that. And they are really full of volunteerism. So, thanks so much for letting us
know and just let us know if there are things we can do to help.

34/C. Thank you.

35/A. Mr. Elarionoff.

36/H. Thank you Mr. Mayor, good morning.

37/C. Good morning

38/H. You know in this military call-up you talked about Reserve, National Guard. . . I'm not really familiar
with how they operate. But when they do call our Reserves, is everybody in one unit. . . or . . . like for
instance if they were to activate Reserve from this area, will everybody be in the same unit like in the
police department, fire department, and essential. . . you know occupations that we have. . . you know
essential needs. Will all they be taken at one time? Or how is it work?

39/C. The Federal Government, Mr Elarinoff, I think judging from the past. . . I . . . I do not see any change.
. . activates by critical MOS or by so called Divisions. . . whether it be a certain Battery or in the National
Guard, Army Reserve or Coast Guard. I'm pretty sure they'll basically will do the same so they will. . . I do
not anticipate any situation, if you look at this list, we do have some that belongs to Army, Reserve, Coast
Guard, Air Guard, and National Guard. So I cannot see a situation. . . unless God forbid a . . . a crisis where
everybody's activated because of the state of affairs, but if things follow scenario past, then they will be
individually activated based on unit assignment or MOS.

40/H. Okay, so, supposing worse case scenario come up and we lose 19 police officers are taken out and 14
firemen. . . whatever the case may be. Is there a plan for redistribution of personnel to make sure we can
still function?

41/C. For this question I have been asked, I do have the Chief of Police and the Fire Chief here. So are the
Civil Defense that can elaborate on this, but yes, they were told, the dependency on . . . absolutely relies that
they do have a contingency plan in case all of their personnel are activated.

42/H. Okay thank you very much. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

43/A. Any one else? Mayor. . . you know, as I see this thing, there are three general areas. . . that could be
impacted. One would be in the event that we were actually attacked. And I. . . I think that’s remote. Most
people realize that but. . . there’s that area of concern. The other one is as you touched upon . . . economic.
And there’s also I think the final area which would be our ability to sustain ourselves in the event that
transportation lines are affected and, and, and such. Could you touch upon first of all that last one. What are
the possible impacts that we’re looking at. And how can we sustain ourselves during a. . . a long drawn out
war. I know it’s very. . . it’s. . . I know any time you discuss the impacts of war, it’s very difficult. Because
you don’t know what kind of permutations are going to come out. And you know, basically, we’re going to
be in reactive mode. There’s no question about that. But what do you foresee?

44/C. First of all as far as any kind of impact our goods are a factor. . . the only scenario I think that could
affect us to that degree, would be a situation where all shipping would be affected. To go to that scenario as
a war consequence of a magnitude where to be short of rice or toilet paper is inconsequential, to be quite
frank about that.

(Chuckles)
But I do want to say that I . . . that’s the only scenario where I can see where our goods coming into Hawaii
would be affected.

45/A. Umm hum.
I think economically our greatest impact will be naturally of that where this State depends so heavily on... and that is our tourism. Naturally for all of the smaller industries, no disrespect on the size, but on smaller industries as far as dependency by the State, like the flower growers or cattle industry, naturally it's on a demand side of that. And I do understand that obviously in times of war, or negative consequences of economic impact on the other receiving side, naturally things like flowers and those things become you know a lower priority.

Right.

And naturally those will also be affected. As far as self-sustaining, of all the States, I cannot... and I don't want to sound that selfish again, but of all the States, I cannot think of a better place to be, in regards to be self-sustaining. And if you want to be cruel about it, in regards to the water, in regards to our element of food, in regards to the weather, and not being worried about the extremes, not making light of it, but in economic impact, yes it would pose a extreme hardship to people. But we're talking about people to survive... in isolation... outside of the difficulty... (smiles) I'm trying to see who's as old as I am... I don't see anybody, but that's okay

(Chuckles)

I think you know that... Ah! Mr Arakaki's a little... not in my age bracket, but I mean... he's there.

(Chuckles)

He knows how this County, this State, the Hawaii Island do band together as a community when we need to. Whether it be a dock strike, whether it be natural disasters, or the ungodly events of World War II.

Okay. And I'm assuming that Project Kumiai... I think that is a real appropriate name, Jane, I congratulate you (smiles). So it's a community based type of program, and it's going to encompass any of these areas that I just brought up. You know, whether there is an attack on the economic side and sustainability side.

I think I would like to ask Ms. Testa to come up and briefly summarize that program for us. Jane... please.

Your question again, I'm sorry.

(Smiles) Project Kumiai would encompass all of those general areas that I brought up. I mean, I know it's a community based system... but what... what's the purpose? Is it to maintain lines of communication?...

Primarily... during crisis situations. Okay. So it would work all the way around then?

Yeah. And it... I think the specifics of how this would work will be finally drawn up by each community's response...

Umm hmm.

Because it's going to be from the community that we get our cues. But it will be an overall mechanism, a system whereby communication can get out and back in an appropriate time. We see this as a three prong approach. First is we know that Civil Defense, Fire, Police have the network ready to respond to emergencies right away, and to gather all the agencies and necessary groups together to respond from that perspective. We know that some of the industries that we talked to have their own plans in place, to respond to either natural disasters or something like a war... and the effects of war. But the community piece... I think what we need to do is make sure that we can be in coordination with Civil Defense's role and with the industry, and work together so that the communities will feel that they can get the appropriated information that they need in a timely manner, and know what to do... in smaller neighborhoods, as well as the larger communities.
58/A. So maybe it's not so much a community based type of program, because you said there are other
levels existing out there, it's like a community utilization program, perhaps.

59/I. Some of . . . we'll get some of our cues from some models that are already out there . . .

60/A. Uhh huh.

61/I. . . . from communities that have already been starting on their own to come with ways that they feel
they can be most responsive.

62/A. Uhh huh.

63/I. Let me just share with you the . . . some of the concepts of the how . . . what we're thinking is the how
this would happen. There would be an establishment of a citizen's corps council. There would be a county-
wide strategic planning, coordination piece for structure. We would facilitate the community’s ability to
respond to local emergencies, especially in the very rural and remote areas. We would determine a process
to increase the collaboration between the first responders, emergency management community volunteer
groups and organizations, and other people. And we would determine outreach and public education
campaigns to promote community preparedness and family safety measures. And then we would develop a
communications network to keep the information flowing to and from communities. Now all these come
out of what is the primary descriptors in the Homeland Security requirements as well. So we . . . what we
plan to do though is to have this in place not just to respond to possible war things. But for other disasters.
Because it . . . we feel much of it might be the same.

64/A. And when will all of these things be in place? . . . these community groups. And I know it's hard . . .
you know, we're working against the clock but ah . . .

65/I. I think to some degree . . . in a certain way . . . we're ahead of the curve in that . . . you know, we are
fortunate to have many community groups that are already in . . . working hard at doing different things,
that would probably want to be a part of it. The Prosecutor's Office also has the Community Empowerment
Organization that has been working in the various communities, and their charge was to begin to create this
communication network. So there are different pieces that seem to be in place and I think we just need to
do somewhat of a . . . kind of an assets map to see what is already in place and then to make contact and
then ask the groups if they would like to be a part of this. And then we need to also respond to make sure
that we know how we can better help them in the effort.

66/A. Can you get us a copy of that thing you just read.

67/I. Yah, sure

68/A. Mr. Safarik

69/D. Thank you, I just had a . . . just was thinking about as you mentioned, Mr. Mayor, that I wouldn’t
want to be any place else but in Hawaii. If we’re going to go through this type of turmoil. But has the
police or have we thought about the vulnerability that we have as a target in these various areas like the
power, Verizon, and the telephone system, our water system. My colleague Mr. Holschuh if you guys run
out of water, you can come into Puna anytime. We have plenty over there (smiles)

70/F. (Chuckles) Catchment!

71/D. Yah. Can’t pollute everybody’s water! But are we subject, do you think to some type of a terrorist
action? In Hawaii? I mean I know . . . I know this is some kind of a stretch question, but somebody that in
our organization must be thinking about those types of possibilities because it does exist. And we can’t
think we’re out of the reach of some of these despots that would do these kinds of heinous things. But, I
hope that I’m wrong. But have anybody thought of that?
Unfortunately when you work in a Civil Defense Organization, you are forced to establish scenarios from A to Z. If you take a look at the County Emergency Operations Plan, terrorism was identified and included in the necessity for a government and community planning. And like you say, unfortunately, yes, it has been identified. Regards to your first part of your question, in regards to identifying infrastructure of high priority, yes, that was also done.

Okay so we have maybe a way of protecting as best that we can with the resource we have, some of these critical plants like Helco’s power generation plant, Puna Geothermal, some of these other areas such as the phone system, maybe even our siren warning system. I'm not sure where that would come into play, but seems to me that we’re vulnerable in critical areas. And now you tell me that we’re thinking about it. That’s a good enough answer I think. That’s the most we can do. Thank you. Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Holschuh

Ya, Thank you Mr. Chairman. You know, I actually wanted to ask Ms. Testa a specific question. Let me just make a comment first. I have been through and obviously Mayor Kim and Civil Defense has been through a load more than I have with these natural disasters and some of the problems we’ve had. Kalapana obviously with the lava and the tidal wave and earthquake in ‘75. Which, although thank God didn’t cause a lot of human casualties per se certainly disrupted life and rescue operations and things for awhile such as communication. And probably the best example of isolation, which I think I heard you (points to Ms. Testa) address, was the big floods. I shall never forget the big floods of November because you and I and Keiko had our final debate that night of the rain storm (smiles). And I think that was some ushering in Harry Kim as [our next] Mayor an act of the heavens or something. But it was interesting!

(Most constituents laugh)

I couldn’t get home that night. Honokaa as a matter of fact and... (laughs)

Remember, I asked you not to go. (laughs)

But on a serious note, that’s interesting how that flood isolated people in Kau. And I remember talking to some of them and talking to the medics and figuring how we were going to do medical evacuation. And then all the Fire Department and police were on top of that. But that’s probably one of the best example we’ve had in recent time of a community really isolated. And I’m glad to hear that the CEO is involved. Because I think the CEO, the Community Empowerment Organizations, is a really good mechanism of communities coming together. And I guess, specifically, I have been to a couple of the Federal meetings on bio-terrorism as a physician and that’s probably the biggest, most scariest thing of all. Actually, I don’t think we are in danger. I mean anything can happen, but I can’t imagine we’re in danger of a direct attack from the air other than biological weaponry. And that’s terrifying. And I know that part of the whole Homeland Security thing is to get on board with that. And I know the hospitals and the State and local level are very much involved. A specific question, Jane, if I may ask you... you mentioned in your list of things, which Mr. Chung asked if we could see at some point, the formation of this citizens’ committee. Has that actually been done yet, or is this something that’s going to take a bit of time? Have you put this together on the ground actually...this committee?

Think that should come in the next two or three weeks. There’s a smaller committee that’s meeting right now to set everything up. And then it’s going to be expanded hopefully within the next two weeks.

Okay so you have enough organization in place anyway even, heaven forbid, if something happened very quickly in the next week or so. You still...it sounds like you have a handle on things for the emergency preparedness side.

Yeah, with Civil Defense and what they have in place and the kinds of structures that we already have...it’s just going to be getting everybody together and tweaking it. We’re kind of in still the research stage, that’s why we’re pulling all the information we can together. We still need to contact some of the
major groups like the Red Cross and Salvation Army, and many other groups, the VOAD groups, the
groups that have been in place for CD all these years. So, there's still a lot of contacts we need to make.

81/F. If I could just, Mr. Chairman, ask one other question...

82/A. Sure

83/F. Thank you (Ms. Testa) for that answer... about the bio-threat and maybe Chief Wery maybe you
could answer this or should... I don't know I don't want to pick on the Mayor specifically too much.
(Smiles) But are we... do you think State-wide and EMS wide and Health Department wide, are we
prepared as well as we should be? Are we prepared on par with other states, for instance. Or better than
other states? I've heard sometimes we are probably a little more prepared than some other states. What's
your sense of that? Because that scares the heck out of me!... frankly the bio-terrorism thing, whether it is
anthrax or small pox or all of the above. Those are really horrendo scenarios.

84/J. I hate to guess as far as comparing us to other States but I really... since 9-11, I think we've
... State-wide with the Civil Defense, we've upped our capabilities as far as bio-hazard identification
capabilities throughout State-wide. We don't have to ship it out to the CDC in Atlanta any more to get any
kind of feedback from them. So I think we're much more capable state-wide as well as on the Island. We,
well we already... we're kind of limited to anthrax as far as our capabilities as far as identification. So we
don't have an expansive capability right at this point in time. But we are much better prepared.

85/F. We have at least the plan to do isolation

86/J. Right

87/F. Infectious disease isolation, I presume.

88/J. Yeah, we...

UNEXPECTED, THE CIVIL DEFENSE SIREN GOES OFF and continues for 60 seconds as indicated by
X's
X (Laughs)

89/F. X Boy! What an... WOW! (Smiles, chuckles)

90/D. X Times up! (laughs)
91/F. X That's chicken skin. Thank you Mr. Chairman... I'll keep quiet at that point. Thank you very
much.

Most constituents chuckle and smile)

92/A. X Mr. Elarionoff. Would you like to want to wait until the siren goes off?

93/H. X Or do we want a moment of silence? (laughs)

94/A. X No... (laughs). ... Why don't you ask your question. Go ahead.

95/H. X Okay, Mr. Mayor coming to a very sensitive subject yuh.

96/C. X I'm sorry, say again.

97/H. X Switching gears to a very sensitive subject. And I say sensitive in that most of us in this room,
have our roots in foreign countries. And in the light of terrorism, what is the... relationship between the
police, INS, and illegal aliens? What's happening in that line?
98/C. X In regards to any kind of INS change of regulation and those things?

99/H. X Being more specific, changing their attitude.

(Five second pause as siren winds down.)

See I’m out of the loop. I’ve been out of the loop for some time now. So... I remember in the old days, that it wasn’t a concern. Has the concern changed? Has it improved. Has it gotten better with the police and how they listen to the police now, or is it the same like before?

100/C. I’m not aware of any real specific changes for us locally with the INS and the police, but I’ll let Chief Mahuna respond to that. But as far as the national, I think the entire system is reviewing in regards to our immigration policies because of some of the huge gaps in it as far as what was pointed out I think publicly, the ease of coming through Canada. But, I’ll let the Chief respond specifically to your question sir.

101/H. Yahyah,

102/E. I think the INS, local law enforcement, FBI... U.S. Customs, Border Patrol, all have increased their level of awareness, their... they’ve also increased their level of detection of intrusions of unwanted aliens. They have not... profiled any specific individuals or any specific race... races as of yet. As was depicted a few days ago, the flow of any type of illegal aliens through the Canadian and even the Mexican border is relatively easy. I think that’s due to a large part, because of the fact of our freedom of movement and our belief in taking the needy, the wanted, you know, the ones in wants... the people that want to make a better life for themselves. I, by the same token, I think that they have also increased their level of awareness as to the types of certificates and papers that are utilized by these individuals that are making their way through our borders especially through the Canadian border. I think is probably the easiest border to cross over from and is... investigations have shown, the major impetus for an increase in the level of security is along Canadian border especially on the eastern seaboard.

103/H. No, I’m more interested I think in the relationship between our State and as you being Chief of our Island, I’m sure that you’re in, you know, in a conference with other chiefs of police in the separate islands and your relationship with the INS as far as a... in light of terrorism, because we are you know of many different nations here.

104/E. Yes.

105/H. And we blend in very well sometimes with people that are not of here. And at one time the relationship between the INS and the police department here in Hawaii was kind of along the... on the line of being little bit on the vague side. But with this, after 9-11, I was just interested if there is a little bit more awareness, that we do exist. And we have our illegal alien problems. Is INS aware of that. Have you established a better relationship with them?

106/E. Oh by far a better relationship! Since 9-11... I mean pre-9-11, I think our relationship with INS was based on strictly the removal of illegal immigrant workers and their investigations into a large brokering of migrant workers to the State. Post 9-11, that has shifted to the potential that these immigrants are not just immigrating for legitimate working purposes but for other activities such as acts of terrorism. So I think... that post 9-11, I think our relationship with INS, in fact with all Federal law enforcement, has increased a hundred fold.

107/H. Okay thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

108/A. Mr. Jacobson.

109/G. I think that Mayor Kim, it would be really good for all of us, lawmakers, public and your administration to view this problem not as a problem but an opportunity as the Chinese method of thinking.
That I think that security does really equal enhanced sustainability. That we can take care of ourselves, we’re going to be a lot more secure. So whether it would be Jane’s problem... not her problem, rather her organization, that she’s been working with, or with what we do in terms of policy, it’d really be nice to take a look at food, energy, and transportation. All these things are really crucial to the way our lives are going right now. So in each one we should focus on sustainability whether it be the transportation... focus on improvements in public transportation, so should be have problems with importation of fuel problems, we should deal with that a little bit better. Whether it be human power transportation or the trails. I’d like to see more of that. And I think that would go a long way towards meeting some of our needs. Also our food. We should get more into distributing food for ourselves. I just brought in some bananas for my colleagues today. Or I have a larger group of people that actually focus on sharing and gathering food that is not going to people to eat right now... some of it’s spoiling. I think there is a whole lot of foods like that in our County right now. Not only with our homeless programs, but just with you and I and our colleagues, we just try to share some of these things. We should just generally promote self-sustainability. And as far as energy, we should be working aggressively in developing bio-diesel sources in this island just so we don’t have so much solid waste problems. That’s one really good method, whether we use bio-diesel in public transportation, we’d have the fuel at hand at all times. And we should work more towards developing solar and other energy that we can produce locally, so whenever we can, I think these methods of sustainability will enhance our security. Thank you.

110/C. Mr. Chair, I’d like to go back to a question asked in regards to our critical infrastructures. Bill Davis is here and has been working with Civil Defense in identifying the critical infrastructures on this island and actions that may have to be taken in the event it does become a threat. So if you have any questions now or later, Bill Davis would... has the answers for that.

111/A. Okay Bill, did you want to talk?

112/K. Just to let everyone know that this process was identified some time ago, right after 9-11. We’ve identified the critical infrastructures on the entire island. We basically know what resources will be need to protect these critical infrastructures throughout the island. And to the point where even if we have to defend them. Those are... have been considered. We’re finalizing who’s going to do what but on the top of the list, if you can imagine, is water. Majority of the information is confidential, but I’d be happy to share this information with you at any time.

113/A. All right. Anyone? If not, I think that’s pretty much it. Thank you very much, Mayor, I... you know as I said earlier, it’s really hard for us to anticipate, you know... exactly what kinds of impacts we are to be facing. But I think it’s important for the public to know that at this level... at the County level, I know it’s a multi-tiered thing with the State and the Federal government all working together, but at least at the County level we’re working, we’re preparing, and I guess the theme of all of this is that the program that you folks are developing is going to be one that is based on communications and maintaining or developing networks. I think that’s very important.

114/C. On that Mr. Chairman, I think... post 9-1-1 where if you take a look... an analysis as far as this State as well as other states, emergency responders were just inundated with calls in regards to anthrax. That projected the fear element. I think what we do in this County regards to communication and level... hopefully a degree of trust that we will be there to respond... to coordinate to minimize the type of unnecessary anxiety that will develop in case the scenario of war does happen.

115/A. If anybody wants to... like volunteer or provide some suggestions... where can they call?

116/C. In regards to the program of Jane Testa’s, obviously Jane. In regards to Civil Defense Organization, obviously Mr. Bill Davis. But as far as volunteers, I would take this opportunity to emphasize programs of Red Cross and those of volunteer type of programs are always out there short of volunteers.

117/A. Uh humm. Okay. Very good. Anybody else? If not, thank you very much. Let’s see, do we have any statement from the public on this item? Would anybody in the audience wish to speak. Yes sir.
118/L. I would like to.

119/A. Yes sir, please come up. (Gestures toward side podium).

120/L. This is in regards to our spirituality and in reaction to Mr. Bush's intent on creating war. I think that we have the opportunity to step back and I don't think we have to support his energy in this endeavor. Us here on this island, we've got all these different spiritual people and ways of life. I can't see how the County should even consider supporting the President's moves. Why do we have to continue in following his regime?

121/C. Mr. Chair, can I respond to him?

122/A. No. no...no...no. No.

123/C. Okay.

124/L. How come Harry can't respond?

125/A. Well... the purpose of this meeting today is not to debate the merits of the President's agenda so to speak. We're here to see what the County government is prepared to do in the event and I say unfortunate event that we go to war. Like anything else we have to be prepared. I'm not going to debate the President's agenda at all.

126/L. Okay. And you don't feel that we're already at war?

127/A. Whether we're at war, going to war, at this point, it's inconsequential for the purposes of our meeting and our discussion today.

128/L. Well this meeting, I think is for... the people that are supposed to take care of the population.

129/A. Right

130/L. In the event of like say the earthquake that's coming. When the highway is closed from Puna to Keaau. . .

131/A. Right

132/L. That's going to create a big bottleneck over there. And most likely the casing on the well will snap and will be. . . all of Puna will be dosed with hydrogen sulfide.

133/A. If those are the kinds of things you want to bring up you may be my guest. But we're not going to talk about the President's agenda.

134/L. Well, my suggestion for everybody is to pray.

135/A. Okay. Thank you. And I would mention that we also have a letter from Jim Albertini, as you know he is a peace advocate and we certainly respect his views on the matter. But, I think the same thing holds true. You know, we have to be prepared. We're looking at preparedness right now. Okay. Some things are really out of our hands. Mr. Safarik.

136/D. Mr. Chairman, you know, I think just for the edification of the viewing public and the people in the audience that this Council is not supporting or condoning war. We're simply looking at what we're going to do if...if it does happen. I think everyone needs to recognize that we're not sitting here all in favor of this, because it's going to impact this State quite negatively. And so I think that everybody needs to know that. But I agree. We shouldn't be debating the President's policy at this stage.
137/A. Okay. We have another speaker, Mr. Mark McMett.

138/M. Yeh, thanks. I think it's very wise for you to do this because... you know like you said we don't really have a choice about what happens. I mean the choices were made you know some time ago. And people don't seem to want to change their minds. So, the last time I checked, the planning on a national level... which was quite some time ago... the local officials and the Federal officials... you know have plans made to save them, protect the, preserve them, however you want to call it. The County... which most places the County isn't the only government like here. I mean every other place I lived you've got the County, the municipalities, the local school boards, which we may get. So you may be considered local here, I don't know. You know better than I on that. But, I think since the U.S. Military Pacific Command has been moved away from Hawaii to the West Coast of the United States, that indicates to me that we're in range and targeted by more enemies than previously. Okay. And this happened in what... in the past year or year ago. You know... it's the... it's the innocent people that are going to suffer here as well as everywhere. I mean with Afghanistan... small businesses were closing right and left. And a lot of them haven't reopened. The landlords are petitioning over in my neighborhood, Waiakea-Kai... you know these vacant buildings. They haven't been re-rented... not fully. I don't know. You know, I know... I wish you luck. That's about all I can say because you know, I think ah... just like when Afghanistan, our economy was hurting and you know I think we make ourselves vulnerable by the corporate welfare for the tourist industry and some other industries and you know, to that extent you know we... we needed to take responsibility. So thanks again for the time. Mahalo.

139/A. Thank you very much. Okay anyone else? Okay... Oh... Joyce Alberta Falina. Either one (points to table microphone next to Mayor Harry Kim or side podium)

140/N. Mr. Mayor and people of the audience and the County Council, I'd like to thank the Country of Korea for birthing people who are of very strong intent and very strong peaceful motivations. We saw the Korean cultural festival and it was my first chance to see [traditional] Korean dress and Korean people in as much of their own setting as we could manufacture here in Hawaii. And it touched me so deeply... two minds, one people. And I think that's what all of us have to understand. And I'm talking to my friends in Pahoa right now. And I'm talking to Harry Kim, and I'm talking to all the peace activists as well as the big world-wide money conglomerate that really controls us. But do they? If we just envision the end result of what we want, which is peace and understand we do have the right to defend ourselves, I think we'll reach the happy medium that we all need to reach, so that we maintain our integrity as a community. So please, all the folks that I know in Pahoa who are demonstrating for peace and saying no war, that's what we're feeling in our hearts. But brothers and sisters, if somebody comes over and clobbers your kid you're going to take care of them. And I know Harry has a very strong motivation for peace in his heart. His family's been through stuff, My family's been through stuff. My family immigrated from Europe. I won't tell you the stories they told me... I think the secret, which is not a secret, is to remember we have our divine natures. Let's envision peace and if we have to fight to maintain it, which is a contradiction in terms. That's as far as we've gotten in this human condition. Let's progress farther. If we have to fight, we'll fight. If we have to defend, we'll defend. But let's envision peace and let's change the reality with our blueprints of our thought and energies. So thank you.

141/A. Thank you very much, I think everybody wants peace. And I think that's a given. Thank you very much. Sir. I'm going to consider this statements from the public on the agenda... as being part of statements from the public. At the very end I'm, going to just combine them all together. Go ahead.

142/O. Hi, I'm Greg Smith and I just wanted to buttress up Bob's (Holschuh) statements about self-sustaining. Because I mean, this is what frightens me here. And I'm a long-time seaman. I've had to live on very little, you know. And it's just a way of life for us. You know this, you know to have ninety percent of our food imported in this State, you know is just totally ridiculous. You talk about insecurity. I mean, yes, we can get by. No one, at least particularly on the Big Island is going to starve. That's not the problem. The point is that you know... we have an attitude of complacency and security for me is like... you know I'm very proud to see that yeah we have a lot of people that are growing gardens and we're having a lot of people doing... But the other thing is I'm really proud of, you know, Gary and the others thinking about transportation in our district. But another thing I would like to say... is that on public transportation... is
that transportation is our lifeblood of our local economy as well as the greater and the fact is that to be totally auto based is just ridiculous. And I would hope that this body as well as the Mayor and others would really consider finding Federal funds, which I assume are still in the pot somewhere up in the Federal level, to get a real rail system. . . you know that if we do have a shortage of fuel we can actually keep moving around the island, we could keep shifting our goods, we can keep transporting our people to their jobs. And remember something that much of what we have as far as auto based, is mostly an ego stroker. . . it’s not really needed. And the interesting thing is that it’s our most vulnerable part of our society. . . it’s the transportation. And if you notice now, how much even in Hilo town has changed from being a pedestrian and. . . you know a closed society where everybody was in walking distance of what they needed, now it’s going . . . it’s going out to be an auto based. And what’s really insane about being an auto based transportation is this sixty percent of our planet area used for human habitation is dedicated to the automobile. Right. So you know the point is that I’m tired of supporting this type of nonsense. Almost every country in the world is putting their transportation dollars into mass transit. For very good reasons. . . it’s more efficient. They can’t afford the luxury of SUV’s and stupidity. And this is particularly potent to me on this island. You know, I don’t rightly care myself, because we’re fairly self-sufficient ourselves. But to the people who are dependent on going to work every day. . . a community that is like our economy can be shattered just by fuel shortage or a barge going in ashore at Laupahoehoe as it did the first year I was on this island. We had seven days of food left on the island. So any way. . . thank you, and I hope that we forge ahead with the preparation to self-sufficiency. Thank you so much.

143/A. Thank you so much. Anyone else? Paula.

144/P. Good morning members of the Council. Mayor, members of the administration, I think this a wonderful exhibition of why Hawaii Island is the most wonderful place in the world to live. About eight years ago during the Hamakua closure. . . of the sugar plantation. . . the most awful movie in the world was made. . . it was called Waterworld. . . anybody remember it? It was terrible. And it was the best awful movie ever made for Hawaii Island because it brought about $40 million into this Island’s economy in a time when we really needed it. It gave people hope. . . it allowed a lot of truck drivers and plumbers to become part of the movie industry, and it kind of changed people’s minds. But it also spoke to what Mr. Jacobson was speaking about and that is sustainability. And from that time, I actually sat down and did a little chart. What would it take? Hawaii island was the only place that was left in the world that had land. And where did they go? Waipio Valley. . . and what did they use to grow in Waipio Valley. It was rice. And you could grow three crops a year. Four crops a year, though, it’s about three month rotation. And I sat down and actually did a very short study which I’d be happy to share informally. This is nothing. . . certainly not hard science. . . of what it would take for sustainability for a hundred and fifty thousand people plus sixty thousand de facto tourist residents. So you get two hundred thousand people if we were all stuck together. It’s not so bad. We definitely have enough to sustain ourselves. But over time. . . you know you look at how will the rest of the world be proceeding. And what would we do to make our very solid examples. . . the opportunities for the rest of the world to emulate. So I hope Chairman Chung and . . . and the other members of the Council that we do start thinking that way. I think that’s the way Mayor Kim thinks. And, I believe the business community feels that way too. So we’re all in this together and again I thank you very much for convening this special opportunity. Thank you Mr. Jacobson for bringing up sustainability.

145/A. Thank you, Paula. Anyone else? If not, we’ve come to the end of the agenda. Can I have a motion to adjourn.

146/B So moved.

147/D. Second

148/A. All in favor say aye.

149/Multiple Responders. (Ayes)

150/A. (Gavel pounds) Meeting adjourned.
County readsies for war: Mayor Kim briefs council on preparations made and planned

Recent history has shown that Hawaii’s tourism-based economy likely will suffer if the U.S. goes to war, Mayor Harry Kim told County council members Monday.

Accompanied by several of his senior administrators, Kim made the comment during his 20-minute presentation of what local government is doing to prepare for possible war with Iraq.

“I find it sad that we are here for this purpose,” he said while speaking before the council’s Finance Committee.

Operation Desert Storm more than a decade ago and the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks created an “extreme hardship” for Hawaii residents due to the immediate drop in tourism, Kim said.

While the county is working with state officials to reduce the financial impact of a new war, much of its focus is aimed at dealing with the possible threat of a terrorist attack, he said.

Noting Hawaii County’s Civil Defense Agency was the first in Hawaii to organize following the Sept. 11 attacks, Kim said the agency has received $591,051 from the U.S. Justice Department to prepare for the potential use of weapons of mass destruction.

The county will use the money to buy specialized protective gear, communication devices and decontamination equipment, according to a worksheet Civil Defense Administrator William Davis compiled.

Also, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has agreed to give the county $95,176 to improve its emergency-response plan through increased public participation Kim said.

A main goal of “Project Kumiai” is the fast distribution of vital information to communities island-wide, especially rural areas, said Jane Testa, Department of Research and Development director.

Neighborhood groups will be asked to propose specifics on how best to implement the project “because it will be from the community that we get our cues,” she said.

A citizen’s counsel also will be set up as a way of dealing both with the impacts of a possible war and natural disasters, Testa said.

Lawmakers asked Kim various questions, including if steps have been taken to protect the island’s waters and other essential facilities.

“We can’t think that we are out of reach of some of these despots that would do some of these heinous things,” Puna Councilman Gary Safarik said.
Kim said although the county’s infrastructure was designed with minimum security, officials know what key facilities they need to defend.

Deputy Fire Chief Desmond Wery told lawmakers that the county is better able to handle a biological threat than it was before Sept. 11. For example, fire officials can now test for anthrax, avoiding the past practice of having to send samples to a federal laboratory in Atlanta, he said.

Several council members echoed Kim’s hope that a military conflict will be avoided.

“I think everyone wants peace” Hilo councilman Aaron Chung said.
### APPENDIX C

#### THEME TABULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Turn #</th>
<th>Disaster Impacts</th>
<th>Ethos</th>
<th>Congeniality</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Disaster Preparedness</th>
<th>War</th>
<th>Hope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Disaster</td>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Ethos</td>
<td>Congeniality</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn #</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congeniality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Turn #</td>
<td>Disaster Impacts</td>
<td>Ethos</td>
<td>Congeniality</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Disaster Preparedness</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146-150</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaker A: Male/Committee Chair Chung  
Speaker B: Female/Council Member Leithead-Todd  
Speaker C: Male/County Mayor Kim  
Speaker D: Male/Committee Member Safarik  
Speaker E: Male/Police Chief Mahuna  
Speaker F: Male/Committee Member Holschuh  
Speaker G: Male/Committee Member Jacobson  
Speaker H: M/Committee Member Elarionoff  
Speaker I: Female/County Research and Development Director Testa  
Speaker J: Male/Deputy Fire Chief Wery  
Speaker K: Male/County Civil Defense Director Davis  
Speaker L: Male/Unidentified member from the public audience  
Speaker M: Male/member from the public audience McMett  
Speaker N: Female/member from the public audience Falina  
Speaker O: Male/member from the public audience Smith  
Speaker P: Female/member from the public audience Paula
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