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ABSTRACT
ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION AND CONCERTIVE CONTROL

by Matthew Charles Ramsey

August 2007

Organizational identification and concertive control are two key areas of interest to organizational communication scholars. This dissertation reviewed relevant research on both concepts and addressed the problem of previous research not establishing an empirically sound relationship between the two constructs. To examine their relationship and the effects of salience on both concepts, two hypotheses were proposed. $H1$: When individuals’ organizations are made more salient, individuals will identify more strongly with their organizations than when their organizations are not made more salient. $H2$: A positive and statistically significant relationship exists between individuals’ perceptions of organizational identification and concertive control. Hypothesis 1 was not supported indicating that category salience does not affect reported levels of organizational identification. Hypothesis 2 was supported in an initial study and upon replication, signifying that a statistically significant relationship exists between organizational identification and concertive control. The findings indicated that simple category recognition does not affect perceived levels of organizational identification. A more substantial identification-eliciting device, other than salience, must be used to enhance perceived levels of organizational identification. Organizational identification and concertive control were found to be in a reciprocal relationship feeding and intensifying each other. Organizational identification was found to be a requirement for a functioning concertively controlled system.
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CHAPTER I
ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION AND CONCERTIVE CONTROL

Introduction

Eisenberg and Goodall (2004) argued that organizational communication is a balance of creativity and constraint. Much like Wenberg & Wilmot (1973), they held that organizational interaction is a transaction and “a moment-to-moment working out of the tension between individual creativity and organizational constraint” (Eisenberg & Goodall, 2004, p. 30). For example, if an individual works for a company such as Hallmark, he or she may be required to be creative, yet the pressure of deadlines for product productions can constrain the creativity of the employees. Eisenberg and Goodall recognized this key communication issue for organizations needing to balance creativity and constraint, and based upon their view of organizational communication it is evident that communication within organizations can be challenging and unique to study. Krone (2005) asserted that organizational communication is a rich and complex enough concept to be studied in a variety of ways by scholars, as the complexities of organizational interaction can be understood by quantitative, qualitative, and rhetorical approaches.

Organizational communication is a rich area of study because the process takes place on several levels: organizational, group, and individual. Organizations are composed of groups of individuals who identify, maintain, and are part of the organization. To adequately address organizational communication issues, scholars must speak to interpersonal concerns involving conflict, identification, and various other issues that arise within an organization. For example, in the face of conflict, some scholars, such as Jabs (2005) and Robertson (2005), recommend acquiring interpersonal skills and
establishing quality relational rules within an organization. Although the skills approach may defuse conflict and strengthen relational bonds among employees within organizations, it fails to address the deeper theoretical constructs upon which organizational communication rests. Other scholars have wrangled with theoretical questions affecting organizational communication. How organization members can cope with differences and “get on the same page” through communication has been a major concern. For example, Papa and Pood (1988) examined coorientational accuracy and conflict. Coorientational accuracy, or how closely one estimates another’s orientation to a concept, was found to affect conflict resolution and employee satisfaction within conversations. Papa and Pood found that people in high-coorientation settings were more satisfied with organizational discussions and were more likely to employ friendly means to address conflict. Conversely, the individuals in low-coorientational settings typically used assertiveness more frequently to resolve conflict, and were not as satisfied with discussions as those in high-coorientational settings. Other scholars of organizational communication have thoroughly researched detailed theoretical problems such as organizational identification (Cheney, 1982; 1983a; 1983b; Tompkins & Cheney, 1983; Meyer, 1996; 1997), job satisfaction (Van Dick et al., 2004a), and organizational and concertive control (Barker, 1993; 1998; Tompkins & Cheney, 1985).

A key concept for organizational communication is identification, or one’s feelings of being a part of an organization. Since, as noted, organizational communication is a balance between creativity and constraint (Eisenberg & Goodall, 2004), the balance between freedom and control is an indistinct area that challenges scholars’ understanding. Creativity allows individuals to create and communicate in a liberated sense, and control
or constraint provides restrictions and boundaries so that organizational communication is
unifying and effective. Amidst the enormity of the research possibilities in the area
organizational communication, three concepts were selected for investigation based upon
how they relate to an individual becoming a part of and balancing communication within
an organization. The selected concepts are: organizational identification, concertive
control, and category salience. First the dissertation addresses organizational
identification.

Organizational identification as an organizational communication concept can be
traced back to early group categorization psychology as well as mythic identification
research (Becker & Carper, 1956; Burke, 1937; 1973; 1989; Carper & Becker; 1957;
Tolman, 1941). However, the majority of scholarly work pertaining to organizational
identification establishes a conceptual link to Tajfel’s (1981) social identity theory and
Kenneth Burke’s (1937; 1973; 1989) study of consubstantiality and identification. Rooted
in Tajfel and Burke’s works, scholars such as Ashforth and Mael (1989), Cheney (1982;
1983a; 1983b), and Tompkins and Cheney (1983; 1985) extended the ideas of social
identity theory and consubstantiality into an organizational setting. Ashforth and Mael
contended that organizational identification is merely a type of social identification, and
is part of one’s self-concept. Cheney and Tompkins and Cheney’s writings adopted
heavily from Burke, acknowledging the issues of social identification and the concepts of
“congregation” and “segregation.” Since the 1980s, organizational identification has
emerged as a concept sparking a rich research area. Scholars have linked organizational
identification to organizational decision making, employee turnover intentions, on-the-
job performance, employee motivation, and group cohesiveness with in an organization.
Considering such research, scholars developed a strong body of findings on organizational identification along with potential applications in a corporate setting.

Much like organizational identification, concertive control is a growing area of organizational communication research. Concertive control emerged from management studies focusing on organizational control. Some early researchers were concerned with administrative and psychological perspectives of control (Baumler, 1971; Smith & Ari, 1964; Tannenbaum, 1956). Tompkins and Cheney (1985) developed an understanding of what they considered to be a new type of organizational control, concertive control. A concertively controlled system, according to Tompkins and Cheney, can thwart and remove a hierarchical type of control in favor of self-management teams where individual work groups develop norms and rules by which they control the work process. Peters and Waterman (1982) explained organizations as exhibiting loose and tight properties. Peters and Waterman’s assertions are the case with a concertively controlled system. A concertively controlled organization should exhibit a loose or liberated environment with no hierarchical control, but at the same time display tight qualities of control based upon the norms and rational rules the concertively controlled self-management teams develop (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985). Since concertive control’s conception, scholars have continued to examine the concept and how it works. Some have found that concertive control does not necessarily avoid the pitfalls of traditional bureaucratic systems (Barker, 1993; 1998; 1999). Concertively controlled systems tend to challenge the identities of
managers, but at the same time are considered useful tools to establish rational rules and accepted behavior within organizations (Barker, 1999; Larson & Tompkins, 2005).

Lastly, category salience, the process of making active social categories that are part of one’s identity in various social contexts, is an organizational communication concept closely tied to organizational identification and concertive control (Barker, 1993; 1998; Blanz, 1999; Brewer & Miller, 1984; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Validize, 1998; Gonzalez & Brown, 2003; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Lalonde & Silverman, 1994; Tajfel, 1981; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Van Dick, Stellmacher, and Christ (2005) found category salience and organizational identification to be interrelated concepts. They concluded that when one’s organization is made more salient, one is more likely to identify strongly with the salient organization. Thus, making an organization a more salient category can affect perceptions of employees and work-related behaviors.

Organizational identification, concertive control, and category salience are not only the concerns of scholars, but are also leading issues for organization members. Many companies, such as Coors Brewing, Xerox, and General Motors, have adopted self-management teams with flattened hierarchies, which are ideally controlled concertively as opposed to a bureaucratically (Barker, 1993). Both organizational identification and concertive control offer hope to industries desiring to avoid past problematic methods of organizational control (Barker, 1993; 1998; Tompkins and Cheney, 1985). Yet, research has not adequately addressed the relationship existing between organizational identification and concertive control. Many scholars have suggested an implied relationship between the two concepts, but empirical validation has eluded the current
body of organizational communication research (Barker & Tompkins, 1994; Larson & Tompkins, 2005; Papa, Auwal, & Singhal, 1997). The failure to empirically verify a relationship between the two constructs is a weakness and problem with the current research on organizational identification and concertive control that led to this dissertation. This dissertation contributed to research in organizational communication by quantitatively examining the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control by verifying empirically a relationship between the two concepts. Also, this research addressed the effects salience has upon organizational identification and concertive control.

First, Chapter 2 reviews relevant literature and establishes the historical development of organizational identification, concertive control, and category salience. Following that, hypotheses are presented that set up the quantitative analysis of the potential relationships of the three concepts. Then Chapter 3 details the quantitative methods employed by explaining how each concept in this study is measured via statistical scales. The third chapter also explains the research design employed as well as a rationale for the participants selected for this study. Chapter 4 provides a detailed report of the statistical findings and indicates whether or not the research hypotheses were supported. Lastly, Chapter 5 interprets the results of the dissertation, generalizes the findings to organizational settings, proposes a model for understanding the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control, and offers future research ideas.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational identification, concertive control, and category salience are the major concerns of this dissertation. Each concept is rooted in the individual and eventually affects the group or organization system. The individual is considered the starting point of communication experiences. Intrapersonal communication, or communication within one’s self, can be considered the creation of a communication experience. Intrapersonal communications are merely “internal messages” (Weaver II, 1996, p.17). From the initial and internal communication, individuals can decide to make their messages external, thus from the person messages emerge. Such individually originating communication experiences are the basis for the discipline of communication’s founding interaction models. For instance, the Shannon and Weaver model (1949) is founded on the idea of a sender/receiver model of communication. The model is not founded on group communication, but rather the individual as a starting point. Gergen (1994) argued that the needs and desires of a person are the center-piece of social reality in Western culture. He claimed that “individual minds have served as the critical locus of explanation, not only in psychology, but in many sectors of philosophy, economics, sociology, anthropology, history, literary study, and communication” (p. 3).

Based upon this foundation for the discipline of communication, clarifying a person’s perceived value of communication concepts such as organizational identification, concertive control, and category salience seems uncomplicated. Organizational identification places the identification responsibilities squarely on the individual, yet the identification supersedes
the individual as it is based upon communication at the group and organizational levels. Nevertheless, organizational identification is an individual's communication concern within an organization. The same can be said for concertive control. Although group norms and rational rules emerge from group interaction, the effects of these interactions are studied, valued, and responded to on an individual level (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985). Lastly, category salience also emerges from an individualistic perspective. Category salience can be explained through Tajfel's (1981) social identity theory. The core concern of Tajfel's theory is the individual. Tajfel's explained that group categorization and one's social identity is part of an individual's self-concept.

All three concepts, organizational identification, concertive control, and category salience, are rooted in the idea of the individual being the primary unit of concern. With the value of the individual being fundamental to Western society, and group or organizational interaction the focus of most scholarly publications within the discipline of communication, the desire to test connections that unite individuals into organizations comes naturally. Research on these concepts will benefit the discipline of communication by furthering understanding of how individuals make sense of communication and become a part of organizations and society as a whole. The first topic to be reviewed is organizational identification.

Organizational Identification

In the field of communication, and even within organizational communication more specifically, organizational identification is viewed as a relatively new area of study. Most modern works in organizational identification reference Cheney (1983a; 1983b), Tompkins and Cheney (1983), and Ashforth and Mael (1989) as starting points
for the majority of scholarly research pertaining to the way in which people identify with work and organizations. However, Redding (1985) asserted that the roots of organizational identification date back to industrial psychology shortly after World War I. During this time, management theories were implemented and developed in an attempt to bring to fruition a greater understanding of organizational structure. Tolman’s (1941) article, “Psychology Man,” was one of the first works to directly address identification in relation to groups. Tolman contended that:

He who identifies with a group not only tends to develop a strong superego in the sense of being ready to sacrifice many of his id wants and his primary ego wants for the welfare of that group, but also acquires an enlarged ego. This enlarged ego he equates with the group. (pp. 207-208)

This excerpt explains one’s rationale and need for identifying with a group. According to Tolman, group identification plays a vital role in one’s psychological existence. Tolman contended that each individual contains an inherent need to identify with humanity. “The superego satisfaction of sacrifice will be provided for both the masses and the elite by all sorts of vocational groups and place-groups in which the individual can immerse himself and relative to which he will be willing to give up some of his primary ego demands” (p. 215). Tolman’s specific reference to vocational groups, as identifiable groups, is a key assertion that established a basis for organizational identification some 30 years before the term was established in the lexicon of social scientists. Though organizational identification was not mentioned by name, this work made clear the human desire for group identification and interaction in multiple settings.
Becker and Carper (1956) produced one of the first works that dealt with occupational identification. They examined how graduate students within various disciplines identified with their discipline. Also, Becker and Carper analyzed the mechanisms they believed influenced or altered identification. Some of the mechanisms listed were pride in skills, internal motivations, sponsorship, and ideologies. They found these factors to be influential in how one identifies with an occupation. For example, if one has pride in skills, one would be considered a person that identifies in the area of "task commitment" (p. 297). If one has pride in one's work, then such a person will more likely complete a given task within the discipline.

Carper and Becker (1957) examined conflicting expectations within occupational identification. Through interviewing philosophy, physiology, and engineering doctoral students, their goal was to study the expectations that are involved with occupational identification. They found that engineering students had few problems identifying with their career. They contended that engineering is often a career choice that is adopted from an early age and supported by family and friends. However, the physiology doctoral students explained in their interviews conflicted feelings of failures and successes. Carper and Becker contended that the majority of the physiology doctoral students had a harder time identifying with their occupation because they were students that previously desired to pursue medical degrees. However, they were either not accepted into medical school or could not withstand the rigorous pace of the medical degree. Those students explained that they felt as if they had to explain or reconcile their career choice with the expectations of family, leading to anxiety and identification problems with their chosen career. The last group of doctoral students, the philosophers, did not adhere to the
traditional standards of success. According to Carper and Becker, they were not concerned with expectations of society as much as they were with intellectual enlightenment, thus they did not experience the dissonant identification issues of the physiology students.

Carper and Becker (1957) argued that the incompatibilities between family and career expectations are the ultimate determinants for identification adjustments occurring in individuals’ careers. By 1970, the term *occupational identification* was dropped or no longer used in the social scientific community to explain identification with one’s work. The new term, organizational identification, emerged as the new catch phrase in this line of research.

Hall, Schneider, and Nygren (1970) offered one of the first social scientific studies to use the term *organizational identification*. Hall et al.’s (1970) work examined personal factors that influenced organizational identification within the U.S. Forest Service. Based on past identification research, Hall et al. contended that organizational identification occurs when "the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent" (pp. 176-177). Hall et al. desired to know if organizational identification increases over one’s career, and in what ways it manifests. Also, Hall et al. studied the amount of need satisfaction the foresters experienced in their work and if the need satisfaction was related to organizational identification. Their research indicated that organizational identification positively correlates with the time in one’s organization. In other words, the longer one is with a specific organization, the more likely one is to identify with that organization; thus time was the key variable associated with identification, and not rewards or promotions in one’s career.
Over time, organizational identification has grown into a broad concept spanning multiple disciplines, rooted in social-psychology as well as communication. Generally, two approaches to understanding the development of organizational identification are cited in academic research. One is the social psychological approach embraced by industrial psychology and communication experts alike, and the second is a Burkean rationale usually only referenced in communication publications. First, this work will examine the social psychology approach to organizational identification, followed by the Burkean approach.

**Social-Psychological Approach.** The social-psychological approach to organizational identification is based in social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981). The concepts that compose social identity theory were adopted from a long history of research conducted in the area of social categorization, intergroup behavior, and identification (Billig & Tajfel, 1973; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Tajfel et al. (1971) conducted a seminal study considered a building block to social identity theory and furthered scholars’ understanding of the effects social categorization has on intergroup behavior. First, they found that people typically favor their own group over others to distribute rewards and penalties. Second, if people are given rewards independently of their group interaction the rewards do not affect how rewards are distributed in their group. Third, reaching the maximum benefit for one’s group affects how an individual’s group rewards are distributed. Lastly, the clearest effects on the distribution of rewards are when people attempt to distinguish differences between their ingroup and the opposing outgroup. Billig and Tajfel (1973) built upon Tajfel et al. (1971) by establishing that merely mentioning social categorization led to discriminatory
behavior despite the participants in their study recognizing that the groups to which they were assigned were arbitrary. The participants still used intergroup classifications in their decisions, thus supporting that even minimal social categorization leads to intergroup biases. From this research, Tajfel (1981) extended the idea of social categorization into examining how it affects one’s identity.

Tajfel (1981) contended that the basis for understanding one’s social identity is rooted in Leon Festinger’s (1954) theory of social comparison processes. Festinger found that individuals strive for a minimum of a satisfactory self-concept. Tajfel (1981) adopted this belief as a basis of social identity theory, arguing that one’s social identity is an element of self-concept that “derives from his or her knowledge of his or her membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 255). Kippenberg (2000) asserted that Tajfel’s conceptualization of social identity is merely that groups provide oneness or a feeling of belonging to an individual. Tajfel explained that social identity can be constructed by multiple groups, and that some groups are more salient to an individual than others. For example, one may be a member of a family unit, church, baseball team, and university. However, he or she may value the membership in the family unit over the other groups.

Another aspect of one’s social identity, according to Tajfel (1981), is how one’s group compares to other groups. During social comparisons is when most groups feel as if they have achieved success. For instance, if a group is known for its wealth, it can be compared to lesser groups that do not have the financial means of the wealthy group. Thus, the group gains confidence or a feeling of success when compared to outgroups with fewer resources. Based upon Tajfel’s (1981) social identity theory, Ashforth and
Mael (1989) claimed that organizational identification is merely a category of social identification. "The individual's organization may provide one answer to the question, who am I? Hence, we argue that organizational identification is a specific form of social identification" (p. 22).

Ashforth and Mael (1989) explained that organizational identification, a type of social identification, is vital to the social well being of an individual. Much like with social groups such as a family, one can acquire meaning and empowerment through organizations. For example, one may value his or her work for an organization, thus gaining a sense of pride from the organizational interaction. Ashforth and Mael proposed three issues that researchers should consider. First, much like group socialization, "organizational socialization can be understood in part as an attempt to symbolically manage the newcomer's desire for an identity by defining the organization or subunit in terms of distinctive and enduring characteristics" (p. 35).

Second, Ashforth and Mael (1989) explained that one can have multiple identities within an organization, and the identities can be conflicting in nature. However, conflicting identities one may adopt within an organization are usually not resolved by combining the identities. For example, one may develop an identity within an organization as a well-liked manager, yet at the same time be perceived as personal friends with many of his or her subordinates. This person could also be a coworker with the other managers. Thus, this one individual has multiple roles as a manager, coworker, and friend to subordinates. The roles adopted by this hypothetical individual are likely conflicting in some way. Yet, Ashforth and Mael argued that these roles should not be integrated; in contrast, they should be separated. "Individuals have multiple loosely
coupled identities, and inherent conflicts between their demands are typically not resolved by cognitively integrating the identities, but by ordering, separating, or buffering them” (p. 35).

Lastly, Ashforth and Mael (1989) argued that an organization that develops teams or subunits that are compared to each other pre-disposes the organization to intergroup conflict. This is most noticeable in the areas where the groups are mutually compared. For example, a company may develop two quality control teams that do similar jobs in which they are evaluated similarly. This could lead to intergroup competition within an organization. The teams could be in competition for rewards, promotions, or status with their superior. Also, outgroup or intergroup labeling could occur. One team may out perform the other team on specific tasks. This could lead to the lower-performing team to be labeled as poor performers or not as competent on the job.

*Burkean Views of Identification.* Burke (1989) considered identification a rhetorical function. He introduced his view of consubstantiality as simply being a human connection developed through shared experiences or values: “A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B. Or he may identify himself with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so” (p. 180). Burke not only addressed identification and consubstantiality, but he also examined what he titled “the identifying nature of property” (p. 183). He argued that in a metaphysical sense all things are named by their properties. Thus, he contended that people tend to seek out opposites, and that often the lines between identification and division can be blurred to the extent that the line from where one begins to where one ends is not tangible. For example, Burke argued, how can one
truly *identify* how the world came about, or who is in ownership of the world? The identification argument is not resolvable, so it is merely a rhetorical problem that will never be solved.

If you would praise God, and in terms that happen also to sanction one system of material property rather than another, you have forced rhetorical considerations upon us. If you would praise science, however exaltedly, when that same science is at the service of imperialist military expansion, here again you bring things within the orbit of rhetoric. For just as God has been identified with a certain worldly structure of ownership, so science may be identified with the interests of certain groups or classes quite unscientific in their purposes. Hence, however “pure” one’s motives may be actually, the impurities of identification lurking about the edges of such situations introduce a typical rhetorical wrangle of the sort that can never be settled once and for all, but belongs in the field of moral controversy where men properly seek to “prove opposites.” (p. 185)

The last argument Burke made about identification addressed the role of identification and things that are autonomous. He contended that despite autonomous activities appearing free of identification, they are not; he stated, “they are not extrinsic to the field of moral action as such, considered from the standpoint of human activity in general” (p. 186).

In sum, Burke’s (1937; 1989) views on identification made the argument that humans seek consubstantiality for the sake of identification with one another to overcome mystery. Meyer (1996) contended that often mystery and ambiguity are states that individuals attempt to reduce through communication. However, Meyer argued that
mystery can be beneficial to individuals and organizations by using it to enhance communication at work. He argued for two major implications involving mystery in organizations: (1) Mystery should be sought after, rather than reduced. It enables individuals to complete tasks and helps develop some group identity, ultimately fostering unification through the development of common values. (2) Organizations always transcend their formal or structured properties. Groups and networks tend to form and appear irrational, yet they provide richness and go beyond the typical hierarchical structure. Burke reduced his thoughts about identification to the simple argument that all things are identified or are identifiable by their parts, even when the ownership or composition of something is debatable. Lastly, Burke asserted that the autonomous is not free from identification. The autonomous is merely identifiable like all other things. In other words, nothing escapes identification.

Burke’s notion that nothing escapes identification begs the question, why study such a broad concept within an organizational setting? If everything is identified with and the scope of identification is limitless, why bother attempting to understand identification in such a confined setting as an organization? So, if identification involves “everything,” why study so broad a concept in organizations? Why is it important (especially from a rhetorical perspective)? The first three questions, “why study such a broad concept within an organizational setting,” and “If everything is identified with and the scope of identification is limitless, why bother attempting to understand identification in such a confined setting as an organization,” “So, if identification involves everything, why study so broad a concept in organizations,” can be explained through understanding the goals of scientific methodology. By observing units of humanity, such as organizations,
generalizable knowledge about a greater population can be discovered. For example, in the medical field, the information gathered while studying a small group of terminal cancer patients, can help medical doctors understand the treatment needs of other cancer patients. Such is the case with studying identification in an organizational setting. The information learned about identification within an organizational, can provide insight into the human identification process. Second, “why is this important”? Understanding identification in an organizational setting can be a great asset to academicians attempting to understand human communication, more specifically identification. If one were to assume that the concept of identification is too broad to study on a micro-level, such as in an organization, the individual would be doing a great injustice to academia. If Burke (1937; 1989) was correct in his assumption that identification permeates all of human existence, it is important that identification be deconstructed within various social contexts. Understanding how human identification functions in varying contextual situations such as: families, groups of friends, religious groups, and organizations, will be essential to understanding how the mechanism of identification interlaces humanity.

Organizational Identification Studies. As discussed earlier, the roots of organizational identification pre-date the supposed evolution of organizational identification from the social psychological and Burkean perspectives (Becker & Carper, 1956; Burke, 1937; Burke, 1989; Carper and Becker, 1957; Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970; Tolman, 1941). Nevertheless, the majority of organizational identification research is conceptualized based on the two aforementioned perspectives.

Cheney’s (1983b) work was one of the first organizational identification articles published using a Burkean rationale for organizational identification. Cheney contended
that identification is “the symbolic process underlying basic tendencies in social
relations” (p. 143). Cheney noted that identification from a social relations perspective is
what Burke (1973) considered congregation by segregation. In sum, identification allows
one to differentiate or associate with an organization. In other words, Cheney asserted
that it places a we or they outlook on how one views a group. “Our corporate identities
are vital because they grant us personal meaning” (p. 145). Based upon the works of
Burke (1937; 1973; 1989), Cheney proposed three types of organizational strategies that
he claimed emerged from his research. His proposed strategies allow one to better
understand communicative action within an organization. The three strategies are: “the
common ground technique, identification through antithesis, and the assumed or
transcendent ‘we’” (p. 148).

The first strategy, the common ground technique, is observable when an
individual links him or herself to an organization in some overt way such as common
goals, economic security, or identity fulfillment (Cheney, 1983b). Identification through
antithesis occurs when one unites with an organization against a common enemy. An
observable corporate example may be local organizations being strongly united against
corporate giants such as Wal-mart. Lastly, Cheney proposed the strategy of the assumed
or transcendent we; this strategy is employed when members of a group feel as if they
can speak for, or represent, the other members without truly understanding the other
members’ views on issues. In simpler terms, it is when one takes for granted his or her
identification with a given organization. Cheney’s (1983b) work provided a strong
foundation for future Burkean organizational identification publications.
Cheney’s (1983a) other early Burkean-based study, published in the same year, examined how identification and decision making are related in an organizational setting. This work extended the research on organizational identification by examining the decision making processes involved in organizational settings. Simon (1976, p. 205), as cited in Cheney, offered a strong operational definition for identification. He contended: “A person identifies with a group when, in making a decision, he evaluates the several alternatives of choice in terms of the consequences for the specified group.” Recognizing the choices and alternatives, Cheney found that the participants in the study based their decisions upon the interest of their direct division of employment. Also, many of the participants’ decisions were directly related to the interests of their place of employment. One third of the participants contended that they were concerned with the success of the company and pursued the goals of the organization. Cheney stated, “interviews revealed that they (participants) hold their own decision premises and receive premises from organizational sources. Most of the employees interviewed saw organizational interests as relevant to on-the-job decisions” (p. 361).

Tompkins and Cheney (1983) extended this study and amended Cheney’s (1983a) findings. They stated, “a person identifies with a unit when, in making a decision, the person in one or more of his/ her organizational roles perceives that unit’s values or interests as relevant in evaluating the alternatives of choice” (p. 144). Tompkins and Cheney accounted for individual perceptions in this conceptualization. Thus, the authors broadened Cheney’s previous research that limited or did not fully account for the perceptive abilities of individuals within an organization.
Tompkins and Cheney (1985) offered a summation of organizational identification. They contended that “organizational identification guides the individual member in supplying premises for participation in the organization” (p. 194). This argument presented the idea of organizational identification in the form of enthymemes. An organization supplies premises, but the individual that desires to identify with an organization is required to adopt the argument and complete the syllogism. Tompkins and Cheney noted that identification is in the perception of individuals. For instance, an individual may identify with a major premise of an organization before gaining entry into the organization. An example of this is an individual agreeing with the mission statement of an institution before being hired or becoming a part of that institution. Many children identified with Nike company’s “Just do it,” slogan from the ‘80s and ‘90s. However, they were not members of the organization. Tompkins and Cheney argued that an enthymeme is both an adoption to and from the audience. Yet, in each individual case the member of the organization arrives at conclusions, “drawn from organizationally preferred premises” (p. 195).

As the study of organizational communication and identification became increasingly popular with social scientists, so did accounting for theoretical problems or gaps within this area of study. Bullis and Wackernagel-Bach (1989) argued that the gaps in theory and research failed to explain an individual’s role within an organization. They contended that the developing body of research in organizational identification typically examined identification from the organization’s perspective. More specifically, Bullis and Wackernagel-Bach contended that turning points of an individual within an organization should be scrutinized. Baxter and Bullis (1986) contended that turning
points are, "any event or occurrence that is associated with change in a relationship" (p. 470). Bullis and Wackernagel-Bach found that newcomers within an organization experience numerous turning points. However, the various types of turning points in one’s initial experience with an organization did not affect his or her immediate identification with the organization. Nevertheless, over time individuals that reported positive social turning points had strong identification levels with their organization, and those that experienced disappointment as a turning point reported lowered levels of identification. Being aware of variables that influence identification is essential within an organization, especially one that demands extreme actions of its members.

Mael and Alderks (1993) examined organizational identification in relation to military performance during combat. They found that organizational identification, cohesion, and task motivation were all related to combat performance. Mael and Alderks cautioned that the results of their study may not be generalized in contexts outside of military situations; nevertheless, support for the assumption that identification affects performance was found in their study. Though the findings lacked generalizability, this work advanced scholarly understanding of the importance of organizational identification as a possible performance-enhancing tool in an organization.

Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) expanded the research on organizational identification by looking at how organizational images relate to organizational identification. They contended that organizational identification is strengthened through images of the organization. Also, Dutton et al. contended that images serve as cognitive reference points of the identification, as they found that images cause a cognitive link or
disconnect between the individual and the organization, establishing that the images of an organization shape how the members define themselves.

Much like organizational images, another unique way that scholars have furthered the understanding of organizational identification is through biodata; Mael and Ashforth (1995) argued that biodata and one's social identity work hand in hand. They contended, "The social identity theory on biodata thus indicates that, similar to previous accomplishments and acquired skills, every experience that conceivably categorizes a person has the potential to shape the person" (p. 311). The authors contended that biodata such as gender, place of birth, and parents all play a role in this process. Mael and Ashforth’s study was conducted on new Army recruits. The findings supported a relationship between biodata, organizational identification, and attrition of new military recruits. The biodata orientations examined in the study were: rugged/outdoors orientations, team sports/group orientations, intellectual/achievement orientations, and the solid citizen orientation. Each biodata orientation contained a description and correlated with organizational identification and attrition in a unique way. Mael and Ashforth contended that their study supports the use of biodata and its worth in possibly predicting behavioral antecedents. Again, organizational identification was negatively related to attrition and negative organizational behavior.

With the technological advancements of the 1990s, many workplaces began to distinguish themselves from traditional places of work, resulting in new and interesting ways to research organizational identification. In the late 1990s, recruitment within high technology workplaces became a salient issue for identification researchers to address. Vaughn (1997) collected data from eight organizations to examine identification
strategies used in high technology organizations, and contended that high technology organizations are inherently different from other organizations due to the fast pace of the industry, ever-changing environment, and radical innovations. Vaughan’s analysis of the data collected from the eight organizations led to the emergence of strategies or value sets with which the high technology organizations desire their employees identify.

Innovativeness was the first value that emerged. Vaughan argued that this is seen as a creative, inventive, and aggressive value that the organizations want their employees to conform to. Second was quality, associated with the success of the products and environment of an organization. The third value that Vaughan contended high technology organizations desire their employees identify with was equity, as in fairness. Vaughan contended that organizations use equity as a recruit tool via retirement plans, large salaries, and profit sharing. Fourth was the value of individualism, and organizations use individualism to attract independent thinkers. Fifth and finally was teamwork, a concept supporting the notions of shared responsibility and unity according to Vaughan.

Ultimately, Vaughan’s work exposed high technology corporate value-sets that were used as strategies to bring about a socialized identification with employees. Continuing with the high technology theme, one aspect of organizational identification that is a growing concern to scholars is organizational identification within the virtual world (Wiesenfeld, Raghuram, & Garud, 1999).

Wiesenfeld, Raghuram, and Garud (1999) contended that one of the major concerns of employers and human resources is the lack of organizational identification due to the new freedoms of working online for organizations. According to Wiesenfeld et al., online or virtual work appears to reduce the shared communicative experiences that
take place in one’s work environment. Sproull and Kiesler (1991) and Fulk and Boyd (1991) cited in Wiesenfeld et al. argued that communication is important because of the social cues and social presence that emerges from interaction. Huff, Sproull, and Kiesler (1989) in Wiesenfeld et al. argued that the public act of participating leads to stronger organizational identification and commitment. Wiesenfeld et al.’s findings suggest that communicative interaction fosters organizational identification. However, electronic communication was not found to be a predictor of organizational identification across levels of virtual status. Nonetheless, Wiesenfeld et al.’s work does support the idea that “electronic messages were critical predictors of organizational identification among virtual employees” (p. 785). As organizational identification has become a growing concern to scholars in various contexts such as the virtual community, the boundaries composing an organization continue to change.

Cheney and Christensen (2001) argued that organizational communication should be viewed internally and externally, as it should not merely be gauged as an internal issue with the organization, but also as a phenomenon that affects outsiders as well. Cheney and Christensen contended that both internal and external communication can affect identity:

While the problem of identity is not the only concern of large organizations and often not an explicitly stated objective, we observe the surprising extent to which the question of what the organization “is” or “stands for” or “wants to be” cuts across and unifies many different goals and concerns. In the corporate world of today, identity-related concerns have, in other words, become organizational
preoccupations, even when organizations are ostensibly talking about other matters. (p. 232)

Cheney and Christensen explained that the preoccupation with an organizational identity has blurred the lines between the organization and the outside world. For example, a blurred identification is observable in our society. Wal-mart, a major national corporation, has constantly dispersed messages such as, “everyday low prices,” “always save,” and “we are rolling back prices.” With such slogans and mission statements establishing public identification, where does the organization end and the external audience begin? Cheney and Christensen argued that

to conceive of internal and external communication as interrelated dimensions of organizational sensemaking means to move our focus beyond the container metaphor to embrace communication activities traditionally relegated to academics and professionals in communication functions such as advertising, marketing, and public relations.” (p. 235)

With the boundaries of the traditional organization blurred, one thing that is certain within organizations is change.

Organizational identification can provide valuable insight into the dynamics of organizational change and thus organizational identification should be examined both at the organizational level and the individual level (Chreim, 2002). Chreim declared that organizations frequently want employees to dis-identify with past attributes during organizational change and re-identify with the organization through the new attributes. Chreim introduced the concept of organizational confluence, conceived through communication, that acts as an anchor to a past organizational existence. Chreim also
claimed that confluence is necessary for self-consistency, and is useful for individuals and an organization during organizational change by making the transitions more acceptable. Yet, with uncomfortable changes within one’s organization, leaving an organization is often a consideration for members. Thus, understanding the relationship between organizational identification and job satisfaction is of great interest to scholars. Examining such a relationship could lead to corporate success and the possibility of lowered turn-over rates.

Van Dick et al. (2004a) examined the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational identification, and turnover intentions within organizations. They found that organizational identification is closely related to turnover intentions within organizations, as a result of “a strong influence of identification on job satisfaction” (p. 357). They argued that if one wants to avoid a high turnover rate in an organization, one should create an environment conducive to organizational identification. They proposed that one can do many things to help increase identification: “stressing the organization’s identity, by highlighting the common goals, mission and unique culture of the organization” (p. 357). Van Dick et al. collected four different data sets from four different occupational groups, thus their study can be generalized to various occupational settings and organizations. Powerful generalizability is the strength of their work and findings. Although the importance of organizational identification continued to be established throughout various social scientific publications, many scholars turned their attention to understanding or reconceptualizing organizational identification. With organizational identification growing as an area of study, and many scholars building upon previous research from specific disciplines without knowledge of similar defining
research in a related discipline, the concept of organizational identification became imprecise.

Vague conceptual lines have divided organizational identification and organizational commitment (Gautam, Van Dick, & Wagner, 2004). For years, the actual differences between the two concepts have been unclear. Gautam et al.'s findings based on Cheney's (1982) Organizational Identification Questionnaire indicated that organizational identification and organizational commitment are related, yet empirically distinct. According to Gautam et al., organizational identification is seen as the merging of an individual with an organization, and organizational commitment is viewed as an attitude held by an individual about an organization. “The empirical distinctiveness refers to the fact that organizational identification is a merger of personal-self with organizational-self whereas commitment is more an attitude that ties employees to their organization” (Gautam et al., 2004, pp. 310-311).

Much like Gautam et al. (2004), Van Dick et al. (2004b) investigated the boundaries of and reconceptualized organizational identification. Van Dick et al. (2004b) scrutinized the way organizational identification has been studied and proposed what they argued were different foci of identification. For example, a university professor may herself as a member of the university. However, she may identify with other organizations by way of multiple memberships. Van Dick et al. found individuals do discriminate between different foci of identification. For example, he or she may select to identify more strongly with one organization than another. Their findings established that organizational identification can be viewed as a multidimensional concept with different foci. Also, Van Dick et al. (2004b) reaffirmed Gautam et al.'s (2004) view that
organizational identification and organizational commitment are related, yet empirically distinct ideas.

Harris and Cameron (2005) continued to examine the multi-dimensional perspective of organizational identification, organizational commitment, and turnover like their predecessors (Gautam et al., 2004; Mael & Ashforth, 1995; Van Dick et al. 2004b; Vaughan, 1997). Harris and Cameron found once more that organizational identification and commitment are related yet distinct concepts, establishing support for Gautam et al. (2004) and Van Dick et al. (2004b) in their research. They argued that committed employees tend to be employees who exhibit high levels of organizational identification. Their findings showed the levels of both organizational identification and commitment allow one to adequately predict turnover intentions. Both organizational commitment and identification overall were found to be negatively related to turnover intentions. However, the cognitive centrality of the measured organization did not help predict turnover intentions. Also, the continuance dimension of commitment was found to be negatively associated with self-esteem and self-efficacy. Thus, Harris and Cameron contended that future research should be conducted on the social identity theory perspective of organizational identification to clarify the odd results from their findings. As mentioned earlier, the social identity theory perspective of organizational identification is one of the primary means of understanding organizational behavior: organizational identification (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Recently, the scholarly examination of organizational identification has continued to build upon the social identity theory approach. Van Dick et al. (2005) examined the categorical social identity theory perspective of organizational identification, finding that
salience plays an important role in organizational identification. For example, if one identifies with an organization, then his level of identification may be altered when the organization becomes salient; Van Dick et al. found that teachers identified more strongly with their schools when their school-type was made salient. Also, the teachers identified more strongly with their school when they were compared to other schools. Thus, the teachers conformed to the group categorization notions introduced by social identity theory (Tajfel et al., 1971; Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The social identity theory perspective of organizational identification has been supported by an established influence of salience on levels of group identification (Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2005).

This essay has reviewed seminal works and recent publications in the area of organizational identification as a popular area of research among organizational communication, psychology, and management scholars. Another area of interest to organizational communication scholars is concertive control (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985). Both concepts are inherently related. For an organization to function and be identified with, elements of control must be present (Barker & Tompkins, 1994; Larson & Tompkins, 2005). Concertive control, the new type of control based upon Edwards' (1981) work, relies upon emerging group norms, values, and rational rules established by employees who identify with their organizations (Barker, 1993; 1998; Tompkins & Cheney, 1985). Thus, concertive control depends upon organizational identification and organizational identification may be strengthened by concertive control (Larson & Tompkins, 2005). Next follows a chronological review of literature pertaining to concertive control.
Concertive Control

Concertive control as a concept developed from Edwards' (1981) work through studies by Tompkins and Cheney (1985). Deeply rooted in the study of organizational control, it was considered a new form of it. Tannenbaum (1956) redefined the way that organizational control was viewed at the time, contending that "the importance of the control function stems from both its universality and its many implications for the way in which organizations behave" (p. 50). Tannenbaum's goal was to provide a strong organizational and administrative view of organizational control. He found that "the early studies (of organizational control) were largely an attempt to apply psychological conceptions to an organizational setting" (p. 52). Tannenbaum viewed this approach as problematic. In his study he presented what he argued is a "more adequate conceptualization of organizational control" (p. 58). He proposed five dimensions of organizational control: (1) the distribution of control, (2) the total amount of control, (3) discrepancies between active and passive control, (4) orientation span of control, and (5) the sources span of control.

The first dimension, the distribution of control, is merely concerned with how control and power are distributed throughout an organization's hierarchy. The second dimension, the total amount of control, pertains to how much control an organization has with its employees. The third dimension, the discrepancies between active and passive control, is concerned with "the extent to which the various hierarchical levels exercise control as compared to the extent to which they are subject to control within the organization" (Tannenbaum, 1956, p. 59). The fourth dimension outlined by Tannenbaum, the orientation span of control, examines whether or not a hierarchical
group exercises a wide or narrow range of control over other hierarchical groups. Lastly, Tannenbaum’s fifth category, the source’s span of control, addresses whether a hierarchical group is controlled by a narrow or wide array of hierarchical groups.

Building upon Tannenbaum’s (1956) work, Smith and Ari (1964) argued that control “refers to any process by which a person (a group, or organization of persons) determines or intentionally affects what another person (or group, or organization) will do” (p. 624). Smith and Ari found that a high-control environment within all echelons within an organization tends to be conducive for consensus among colleagues and in-between rank and file. The high-control environment was found to promote consensus decisions. Also, they established that regularity, orderliness, and predictability are all essential to a highly effective organization and the proper functioning of control. In sum, Smith and Ari’s work hinted at a relationship between effectiveness and control.

Seven years later, Baumler (1971) examined the relationship between effectiveness and organizational control. Baumler conducted a laboratory-based study designed to measure organizational control, finding that a defined-criteria approach to organizational control is strongly related to effectiveness, especially in situations with minimal interdependence. In other words, having stringent criteria requirements typically leads to effectiveness especially when a worker’s required criteria is not dependent upon the tasks of others. A few years after Baumler’s study, McMahon and Perritt (1973) found a direct relationship between organizational effectiveness and the amount of control and influence exerted within a system. The more control that was employed on the managerial level of an organization, the more favorable the communication reports and productivity. However, this study was strictly based on a participative-type management style that,
according to Likert, (1961) is one that is heavily involved within the organization, is open
to input from employees and rewards the positive actions of workers. McMahon and
Perritt argued that interaction from a participative manager accounts for an increase in
control. Lastly, McMahon and Perritt contended that “organizational effectiveness will be
enhanced to the extent that there is a high amount of control exerted within the
management system, and that this control is distributed in a power equalized fashion and
that there is agreement among managerial echelons as to the amount of distribution
control within the system” (p. 634). Thus, the successful use of organizational control
brings increased effectiveness within an organization.

As organizational control continued to be explored and scrutinized by scholars, they
sectionalized control into two modes, behavioral and output (Ouchi & Maguire, 1975).
Ouchi and Maguire contended that the two modes of organizational control are often seen
as the same, but they argued that according to their research they are distinct. They
asserted that output control occurs in response to a manager’s need to offer a legitimate
substantiation of performance. On the other hand, behavioral control occurs when,
“means-ends relations are known and thus appropriate instruction possible” (p. 559).
Based upon the two modes of organizational control, Ouchi and Maguire found the
greater the manager’s knowledge of his or her employee’s tasks, the greater the
manager’s emphasis on behavioral control. They found that output control is generally
used when a manager feels the need to defend his or her position. They argued that output
measures control tends to benefit the entire organization more than behavioral control.
The benefit from output measures is due to the requirement of quantifiable data that
supports performance. For example, if accusations are proposed against a manager
regarding his or her performance, the manager may go to great lengths to support his or her case with output data positively backing his or her performance, and bringing to fruition a greater understanding of organizational output and performance.

Many of the scholarly publications regarding organizational control focus on the greater organizations or specific roles within a given company. However, Posner and Butterfield (1979) examined personal correlates of organizational control, viewing the concept differently from their predecessors. They examined how individuals are affected by control, and focused less on the organization as a unit. They contended that “control is a highly complex dynamic phenomenon that involves factors with both personality and structural variables” (p. 300) and that “an individual’s perception of organizational control has important implications for organizational effectiveness” (p. 299). Posner and Butterfield presented a model taking into account six variables that affect an individual’s perception of control: (1) level of organizational hierarchy, (2) feelings about work environment, (3) feelings about supervisor’s competence, (4) belief in personal control, (5) feelings about access to a decision-making network, and (6) clarity of role requirements. This study makes clear the plight of an individual within an organization, and possible problems with the traditional approaches to organizational control. Edwards (1981) brought a new perspective to the study of organizational control.

Edwards (1981) contended that organizational control must contain three components: (1) the direction of work tasks, (2) the evaluation of completed work, and (3) the rewarding and disciplining of subordinate workers. Within the three components he proposed three types of control.
The first is what I call “simple control”; capitalists exercise power openly, arbitrarily, and personally (or through hired bosses who act in much the same way). Simple control formed the organizational basis of 19th century firms and continues today in the small enterprises of the more competitive industries. The second is “technical control”: the control mechanism embedded in the physical technology workplace. The third is “bureaucratic control”: control becomes embedded in the social organization of the enterprise, in the contrived social relations of production at the point of production. (Edwards, 1981, p. 161)

Simple control “was the rule in the 19th century businesses” (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985, p. 182). This method of control can be found in small businesses today, but not as often in larger corporations. Edwards (1981) contended the second type, technical control, was more impersonal and expected than simple control.

Technical control only emerges when the entire production process of the plant, or large segments of the plant, are based on a technology which paces and directs the labor process. In this case, the pacing and direction of work transcend the particular workplaces and are thus beyond the power of even the immediate boss. (Edwards, 1981, p. 166)

Bureaucratic control, finally, employs rewards for loyalty to an organization. “The positive incentives, relief from capricious supervision, the right to appeal grievances and bid for jobs, the additional job security from seniority-- all these made the day-to-day work life of Polaroid’s workers more pleasant” (Edwards, 1981, p. 178). Though the bureaucratic method appears to be a more favorable method of control for employees,
Edwards contended that this third type of control may result in workers becoming bored, frustrated, and unhappy with stagnation throughout their work.

Extending Edwards' (1981) work, Tompkins and Cheney (1985) proposed a new category of control: concertive control. This system thwarts and rejects traditional rules and systems for a new type of work environment. "In the concertive organization, the explicit written rules and regulations are largely replaced by the common understanding of values, objectives, and means of achievement, along with a deep appreciation for the organization's mission. This we call-- to modify a phrase in current use-- the soul of the new organization" (Tompkins and Cheney, 1985, p. 184). This type of control, according to Peters and Waterman (1982) displays loose and tight properties concurrently. For example, it may present workers with the freedom without the restraints of a hierarchy, yet group norms emerge making the environment a tight system.

Though Tompkins and Cheney (1985) contended that this system is the "soul of the new organization," they acknowledged that all of their ideas were not completely original (p. 184). "Of course, organization of this type is not entirely new; research and development labs have consistently displayed the characteristics mentioned above, thus coming into conflict with the bureaucratic organization of which many are part" (p. 184). Parker (1992) contended that the bureaucratic systems of control were giving way to post-modern systems such as concertive control.

Concertive Control Studies

Barker (1993; 1998) conducted an ethnographic study that examined how control changed within managerial changes from a hierarchical, to a bureaucratic, and then to a concertive control system. Weber (1978), in reference to hierarchical and bureaucratic
systems of control, contended an individual, "cannot squirm out of the apparatus to which he has been harnessed" (pp. 987-988). Barker argued that Tompkins and Cheney's (1985) concertive control system is supposed to be liberated from such restraints, since, according to Barker (1993; 1998), "this form represents a key shift in the locus of control from management to the workers themselves" (p. 411). To see if this idea was true Barker studied ISE, a small manufacturing company that switched from a hierarchical system to a flattened organization with self-management teams that Barker contended believed to be concertively controlled. Over the course of four years Barker (1993; 1998) watched as the organization experienced a turbulent beginning due to attempts at establishing new norms and rules. At the end of the four year period Barker (1993; 1998) contended, "The rules became rationalized and codified and served as a strong controlling force of the team actions" (p. 419). Barker's findings suggested that concertive control partially transcends the rules and problems of a bureaucratic system of control. The self-management teams established the norms and rules themselves. Barker (1998) declared; however, that the concertively controlled system may not escape all of the pitfalls of the other systems.

Concertive control creates a communal value system that eventually controls their (workers) actions through rational rules. More importantly, however, my analysis suggests that concertive control does not free workers from Weber's iron cage of rational rules, as the culturalist and practitioner-oriented writers on contemporary organizations often argue. Instead an ironic paradox occurs: the iron cage becomes stronger. The power combination of peer pressure and rational rules within the
concertive system creates a new iron cage whose bars are almost invisible to the workers it incarcerates. (p. 435)

Thus, concertive control may be more controlling than other systems. However, the control is not visible and structured. Rather, it is intangible and created through group interaction and identification.

Concertive control is not only valuable in an organizational setting. Concertive control can be viewed in the broader context of society as a generative discipline (Barker, 1999); a concertive system is a powerful tool for controlling and establishing accepted behavior due to *discursive formations*. Barker claimed that discursive formations are rooted in shared values that are enforced via peer pressure. All the same, a concertive system can be viewed in the broader context of society or in the confines of an organization.

To summarize briefly, discursive formations are sets of power relationships, knowledge about those relationships, and rules for the right way of behaving in terms of power and knowledge. Discursive formations are sets of possibilities that we use to create a workable shared meaning in the organization. Disciplines present us with specific arrangements of these possible meanings, a behavioral template that instructs us how to act, regularly and recurrently, in ways functional for the organization. (Barker, 1999, p. 46)

Concertive control as a concept is relatively new to the discipline of communication. Despite 21 years passing since Tompkins and Cheney coined the term *concertive control*, very few publications have addressed the issue of measuring the concept. Until Wright and Barker’s (2000) study, concertive control had primarily been measured or observed
qualitatively. However, Wright and Barker changed how concertive control was studied by developing a scale to quantitatively measure team-based concertive control.

The quantitative scale was developed from a thorough literature review in which Wright and Barker established four dynamics of concertive control: (1) shared values, (2) normative expectations, (3) rule formalization, and (4) peer relationships. Their scale was composed of nine questions that measure concertive control on the team level; however, merely measuring concertive control on a team-level is also a limitation to this scale as it does not measure concertive control in different contexts, being limited to a team-based setting. Yet, for measuring team-based concertive control this scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .87. The majority of the scholarship on concertive control deals specifically with teams in a concertively-controlled setting; new research is emerging, however, on how managers deal with concertive control.

Holding to the managerial theme, Larson and Tompkins (2005) found that concertively controlled systems tend to challenge the identities of managers. Larson and Tompkins established that managers may mildly support employee resistance to concertively controlled systems via ambivalent comments. Also, they argued, much like Barker (1993; 1998), that concertive control may not escape the iron cage of rules and restrictions that employees and management hoped to flee (Weber, 1978). One other key finding was the link drawn between identity and concertive control. Larson and Tompkins argued that managers and employees must negotiate their identity roles when adopting a concertively controlled system; such negotiations are due to concertively controlled systems primarily having flattened hierarchies. Thus, the role of management is altered, and considerably limited from the traditional hierarchal structures.
Category Salience

Now that organizational identification and concertive control have been reviewed, this work will address the role of category salience in relation to both concepts. Tajfel (1981) argued that category salience or group salience is merely a shift in behaviors and impressions from an interpersonal level to a group level. Hogg and Terry (2000) claimed that category salience is the process of making active social categories that are part of one’s identity in various social contexts. “The cognitive system, governed by uncertainty reduction and self-enhancement motives, matches social categories to properties of the social context and brings into active use (i.e., makes salient) that category rendering the social context and one’s place within it subjectively most meaningful” (p. 125). Wellen, Hogg, and Terry (1998) asserted that group norms can make salient group identification. They contended that Tajfel’s (1981) social identity theory and Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, and Wetherell’s (1987) and Hogg and Abrams’ (1988) self-categorization theory both claim an individual’s group membership is a part of his or her self-concept. In other words, when one identifies him or herself as a part of a group, he or she has psychologically accepted membership. Thus, the enforcement, recognition, and participation in group norms make salient group membership to the individual. In sum, salience is a key component to a social identity theory perspective of organizational identification because it requires individuals to acknowledge their membership in a given organization(s). Group-membership-acknowledgement leads to the question: how do individuals behave based upon organizational memberships?

Lalonde and Silverman (1994) examined salience and how it affects behavioral strategies. They found when an individual’s status was made salient; the individual was
more likely to attribute his or her salient status as a major influencing factor of group decisions. However, an individual status was not a predominant influencing factor for the group where the participants’ status was not made salient. Lalonde and Silverman found salience, in regards to category or group permeability, to be a major factor in behavioral strategy selection. For example, they contended when group boundaries were not an issue, in an open intergroup setting, individuals were more likely to employ individual behavioral strategies. However, when group boundaries were salient, or closed, the members opted for collective or group behavioral strategies. Thus, being salient or cognizant of group boundaries and group norms influenced individual adaptations of behavioral strategies. Similar to behavioral strategies, Wellen, Hogg, and Terry (1998) found that high-salience individuals, or individuals who are aware of group membership, were more likely to be affected by group norms than individuals experiencing low-salience. In sum, Wellen et al.’s work found that people’s social identity is embedded in a salient category membership, and when individuals are exposed to group norms they tend to systematically process information. Another component to understanding category salience and group norms is leadership.

Hogg, Hains, and Mason (1998) conducted two studies addressing category salience, identification, and leadership. Their first study found support for the notion that group leaders should not only possess stereotypical attributes of a leader, but they should also be seen as holding prototypical characteristics of the group. In other words, they should represent key issues of the group or make salient the group’s voice. In doing so, they are more likely to be identified with as a leader. The second study yielded several key findings. First, individuals in the high-salience category identified more with a group
than the low-salient individuals. Second, the study confirmed that individuals do want leaders who do hold stereotypical qualities. Nevertheless, when individuals identified with a salient in-group they desired a leader with prototypical characteristics over one with nonprototypical characteristics. Category or group salience was the key factor influencing identification and desired leadership traits.

A few years after Hogg, Haines, and Mason (1998), Hogg and Terry (2000) outlined the theoretical developments of self-categorization theory and the effects of salience on issues of identity within groups and organizations. They argued that through recent research that social categories lead to prototype-based depersonalization, in other words, the merging of one’s identity with a group to develop a new social identity. Hogg and Terry contended when an individual’s category or group is made salient, prototypical/collective behaviors are expected from the individual. Prototypical/collective behaviors are not uncommon on the organizational level. Hogg and Terry contended that prototypical behaviors are a plausible explanation for groupthink and actions based upon groupthink. Within groups, groupthink continues to be a major problem, but between groups, intergroup conflict continues to plague societies, and scholars are still attempting to understand intergroup contact and conflict.

Gonzalez and Brown (2003) reexamined multiple intergroup contact theories based upon social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981) and the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954). They attempted to examine each perspective to see which theoretical approach was the most practical for explaining intergroup interaction and empirically establish the most relevant theoretical approach. The first perspective examined by Gonzalez and Brown was Brewer and Miller’s (1984) de-categorized contact model. The authors of this model
contend that merely placing people into differing categories is enough to lead to intergroup bias. The proposed resolution to this problem is to de-categorize the groups to make the differences and categories non-salient.

The second model addressed by Gonzalez and Brown was Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, and Dovidio’s (1989) common ingroup identity model. This approach seeks to re-categorize in and out groups into differently defined groups that are more inclusive. The blurred or more inclusive boundaries supposedly remove the salient and rigid boundaries that feed intergroup bias.

The third approach addressed by Gonzalez and Brown was the mutual intergroup differentiation model. This model was developed by Hewstone and Brown (1986). They contended that if the groups are considered equal in status and are not threatened with contact, then intergroup bias is reduced.

The last approach Gonzalez and Brown addressed was the dual identity hypothesis. Dovidio, Gaertner and Validize (1998) and others popularized this approach. Gonzalez and Brown argued that the dual identity hypothesis is a valuable approach that argues that individuals should simultaneously maintain both in and out-group distinctions and a superordinate identity. Gonzalez and Brown required their participants to undertake intergroup tasks in four possible category salience settings: subgroup, superordinate, subgroup and superordinate, and no category salience. They found the dual identity hypothesis approach to be the best of their reviewed approaches as it was the only approach where intergroup bias did not reoccur during the intergroup tasks.

Since organizational identification is merely one part of peoples’s social identity, according to Ashforth and Mael (1989), many conclusions can be drawn about the
relationship between category salience and organizational identification. Hogg, Hains, and Mason (1998) found support for the notion that salience increases identification. Such an increase in identification can also lead to intergroup biases, group awareness, prototypical leadership, and groupthink (Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Wellen, Hogg, & Terry, 1998). With this empirical relationship established throughout prior research the link between identification and salience appeared obvious, but scholars did not empirical link between organizational identification and salience until 2005. Van Dick, Stellmacher, and Christ (2005), as discussed earlier, found that when school teachers’ organizations were made salient the teachers tended to identify with their organizational more strongly than those teachers whose organizations were not made salient. This research supports the idea that organizational identification is merely part of one’s social identity.

A final concern with the category salience research is idea of chronic salience vs. situational salience. Salience in general refers to the cognitive accessibility of our roles and belongingness to various groups (Oakes, 1987; Obst & White, 2005). Palomares (2004) argued that certain categories may act as schemas that chronically affect behavior throughout other group memberships. For example, gender socialization may affect language usage. For instance, a woman who is a medical doctor may use language that is stereotypical of her gender without thinking about being a woman. When she is called upon for her medical expertise, however, she may use a direct language style that is not stereotypically used by women outside of the medical profession. Yet, immediately after addressing medical issues, she may revert back to a gender stereotypical speaking style. In sum, gender is an easy-to-access schema or category that could be constantly salient,
and thwarted only when necessary categories supersede the schema. Obst and White (2005) viewed a category such as gender as *chronic* salience accessibility or “the ease with which a category can be cognitively activated across all sorts of social situations” (p. 129).

In contrast to the schema view of *chronic* salience, the *situational* perspective of category salience is when certain categories are accessible in social contexts and can be primed or readied (Devine, 1989; Obst & White, 2005). For example, one’s identity within a company may be primed when he or she interacts in a workplace environment. Conversely, the identity could be primed during a religious service if a fellow co-worker attends the same religious group and asks about a situation at work. The two types of category salience, *chronic* and *situational*, as defined in the above research, are critical in understanding organizational identification and concertive control. Although gender, race, and ethnicity are more than likely *chronically* salient categories, organizational affiliation is more than likely a *situational*. Thus, the research for this dissertation is primarily concerned with the *situational* type of category salience.

The relationship between organizational identification and category salience is clear, but the relationship between concertive control and salience is unclear. To this date, academic studies addressing concertive control and salience are nearly nonexistent. Unfortunately, speculation about the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control may provide insight into the role of salience in a concertively controlled system. Papa, Auwal, and Singhal (1997) contended, “Organizational identification is a central component to concertive control systems” (p. 245). Papa et al. also explained that a positive relationship exists between empowerment and
organizational identification within concertively controlled systems. However, this relationship was not fully explained in their work. Larson and Tompkins (2005) hinted at a relationship existing between organizational identification and concertive control, yet failed to explore the relationship and its attributes. Barker and Tompkins (1994) found that team-members tend to identify more strongly among themselves, as opposed to the organization as a whole. Nevertheless, the nature of the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control continues to elude the scholarship of organizational identification and concertive control. Thus, the relatedness of organizational identification, concertive control, and category salience has not been empirically established.

Literature on organizational identification, concertive control, and salience has been reviewed. However, little research has been conducted examining the relationship between organizational identification, concertive control, and salience. First, salience has been shown to affect organizational identification. (Van Dick, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2005). As previously discussed, Van Dick et al. found category salience to be an influencing factor of organizational identification. However, Van Dick et al.'s study is new, controversial, and without replication or similar findings by other scholars. Van Dick et al. explained that as one’s workplace category is made salient organizational identification increases. To create a salient atmosphere Van Dick et al. used both visual and verbal (written) modes of communication to influence salience. Critics of this study have argued that providing verbal leading likely influenced the respondents to perform as the researcher desires by hinting at the organizational importance throughout the
measure. To avoid this possible flaw, the present study was limited to a written text to convey salience. Based upon the above research the following hypothesis was proposed:

H1: When individuals’ organizations are made more salient, individuals will identify more strongly with their organizations than when their organizations are not made more salient.

Secondly, Papa, Auwal, and Singhal (1997) and Larson and Tompkins (2005) qualitatively claimed that organizational identification and concertive control are interrelated concepts; however, this supposed relationship has never been quantifiably verified. Based upon the above research assumptions the following hypothesis was suggested:

H2: A positive and statistically significant relationship exists between individuals’ perceptions of organizational identification and concertive control.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Study 1

Participants. The first study of this dissertation was devised to assess the reliability of the scales used in this study. The first set of research participants, \( N = 150 \), were undergraduate students at a mid-sized Southern U. S. university. The data were collected in basic oral communication and introductory biology courses. The basic oral communication and introductory biology courses provided a quality cross-section of participants from multiple majors, backgrounds, and genders. Contrary to graduate and upper-level undergraduate courses, where the students meet distinct criteria to be a major, introductory courses such as basic oral communication and introductory biology are general education course requirements required for all students who plan on completing a degree at the university where the reliability of the scales was assessed. Having such a diverse group of participants allowed for variation in beliefs and attitudes. The participants’ ages ranged from the traditional freshman age of 18 to nontraditional students in their 40s and 50s. Also, the large number of participants acquired from the university, as opposed to a smaller company or organization, allowed for reliability assessments of the tools used in this study. DeVellis (2003) argued that 3 to 5 participants are needed per scale item to adequately access the reliability of a scale. The university student sample acquired an adequate number of participants for relevant statistical testing.
Measures. Three measures were used to make up the research packets for the first study. The first measure in the packet was a reconceptualized version of Ramsey’s (2005) generalized organizational identification scale, developed to access organizational identification in various contexts; however, the scale was trimmed down from 24 items to 11 items to meet needs of this study. To avoid disclosing information that could make one’s organization salient and hinder the methodology of the study, two new scaling constructs involving potential identification—family and religion—were added for each organizational identification item. Consequently, the new identification scale was composed of 33 items, randomly ordered. Participants rated each item on the newly constructed scale via a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree (Appendix A).

The second scale used in this study was Shamir and Kark’s (2004) visual identification scale. Their scale originally presented participants with seven rectangles containing two spheres. The two spheres contained in the rectangles were in various stages of overlap, from no overlap to complete overlap. The two spheres presented in each rectangle represented (1) the individual and (2) the organization, team, or group. Participants were asked to circle the rectangle that contains the type of spherical overlap they perceive with their organization. Shamir and Kark’s scale was reduced to five rating options instead of seven to maintain consistency and uniformity throughout the measures used in this study. Shamir and Kark’s scale was useful for assessing organizational identification by moving beyond word identification and into a visual modality. The reconceptualized Shamir and Kark scale produced one-item interval level data as opposed
to multiple item data of the other scales. Rather, the visual identification scale rating options present visual categories of identification participants can select (Appendix B).

Lastly, the final measure used in this study was Wright and Barker’s (2000) eight-item concertive control measure. Wright and Barker developed this measure to access concertive control on the team level within an organization, to allow management to assess concertively controlled teams. Based upon Wright and Barker’s reliability assessment, their scale yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .87. Despite the satisfactory reliability rating, this concertive control scale had to be adjusted semantically. The original scale was conceptualized in Australian English. The language usage referring to workplace wages, time off, and scheduling was different from the terms used in the United States. For example, scale item number three on the measure stated, “Does your team have its own system of determining when people can roster days off”? This would most likely be confusing for most U.S. participants because the term “roster days” is misleading. Linguistic adjustments were made on the recommendation of James Barker, one of the co-creators of the scale (2006, personal communication). Other adjustments were made to the scale for purposes of clarity and ease for the respondents. The concertive control scale, like the other two scales, was a five-option measure. Like the identification measure, this concertive control rating option ranged from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree (Appendix C).

Procedure. After receiving Institutional Review Board approval for research with human participants, a number of professors and instructors at a mid-sized Southern university were asked if their introductory classes in oral communication and biology could participate in a study of communication. Data were collected sporadically
throughout a six week period. Data collection only occurred when the participating professors had class time available for student participation. Usually, the students were approached in groups of 20. The participants, $N = 150$, were read an informed consent statement, and made aware of their rights as participants. Following the informed consent notification, the participants were given a packet containing the three measures: an identification scale, a visual identification scale, and a concertive control scale. Once the packets were handed out, the participants were asked to think of their most recent job in which they are either currently or recently employed. They were asked to rate their responses for each measure according to the most recent or current job they mentally selected. They were reminded a second time to follow this process, and if they perceived the directions as unclear, the participants were allowed to ask questions or request that the directions be repeated. Once the participants completed the measures in the packets, the primary researcher or an assistant collected the packets. The completed measures were stored in a secure area until they were prepared for data analysis. The data were analyzed in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was generated for each scale.

**Study 2**

*Participants.* To test both hypotheses, data were collected from a mid-sized Southern mental counseling services center. The participants, $N = 41$, were participating professional and paraprofessional employees of the counseling services center. The respondents were typically middle-aged and approximately 50% male and 50% female. The paraprofessional case managers possessed bachelor’s degrees, and the professional therapists had a minimum of a master’s degree and were licensed as counselors. The
response rate for the organization was high. Out of a possible 47 participants, $N = 41$ participated resulting in an 87% response rate.

The organization was known for having self-managing teams that are responsible for the establishment and enforcement of rational rules and group norms within their organizations, which are considered attributes of concertively controlled systems (Barker, 1993; 1998; 1999; Barker & Tompkins, 1994; Parker, 1992; Seibold & Shea, 2001; Tompkins & Cheney, 1985). The self management teams within this organization were composed of mental health therapists and case managers. Both the therapists and case managers independently charged an hourly rate for their services. However, neither the therapists nor the case managers were strictly managed; they had a great amount of freedom and creativity in their work. The only major constraint facing both the therapists and case managers was filing their financial paperwork. For example, the therapist must ensure that the case managers turned in their billing notes and information, and that both the therapists’ and case managers’ notes were comparable regarding the treatment of their clients. If not, they could lose pay.

Tools. The three measures previously assessed for reliability (the identification measure, visual identification scale, and the concertive control scale) were all employed as packets much like the previous study. However, three different versions of the packets were developed to elicit three different levels of organizational salience, and an informed consent letter was attached to each packet. The first version, or the low salience packet, contained the normal unaltered scales used in the reliability assessment study. The second packet, the dummy salience category, contained a visual logo (the city logo) that everyone in the organization could identify with. The logo was printed at the top of each
page on each measure. The third and final packet, the high organizational salience category, contained the organization’s official logo at the top of each page on every scale. The visual recognition of the organization’s logo was thought to increase identification and salience (Dandridge, 1983; Morgan, Frost, & Pondy, 1983; Timm & DeTienne, 1995; Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2005; Wilkins, 1983).

Procedure. Upon receiving Institutional Review Board approval for human participants in research, and receiving a willingness to participate letter from the mid-sized Southern mental counseling services center, the center was approved for study. Upon agreement with the Center Coordinator, the packets were randomized and placed in the employee mailboxes. The randomized set of packets included thirteen low salience packets, thirteen dummy salience packets, and fourteen high salience packets. Thus, the participants were divided into three groups, two control groups and one experimental group. Two weeks after the initial drop off, the data were collected; however, the response rate was extremely low, 10% of the organization population. To remedy this issue, the Center Coordinator agreed to allow an informative research lecture and participation recruitment at one of the company staff meetings. With nearly the entire paraprofessional and professional population of the counseling center in attendance, each attendee was asked for his or her participation. A new set of randomized packets, with the previously completed packets deducted from the possible packet options, were passed out to the participants. However, people who had previously participated in the study were asked to not fill out another packet. The participants were made aware of their rights orally, and they each received an informed consent form with their packet. Upon the participants’ completion of the packets, they were thanked for their participation, and the
packets were collected. Post-staff meeting, the response rate rose to 87%, \((N = 41)\). The low salience category had \(n = 15\) respondents, the dummy/low salience category had \(n = 10\) participant responses, and the high salience category had \(n = 16\) participants. An ANOVA was conducted to test for statistically different mean scores among the three salience groups, and multiple Pearson's Product-Moment correlations were conducted to assess the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control as well as the relationship between the visual and written identification scales used in the study.

**Study 3**

To bring strength to the findings of study 2, the study was replicated in a second organization meeting the requirements for a concertively controlled organization. The second organization examined in the study was The College of Education at a mid-sized Southern university.

**Participants.** To retest the proposed hypotheses, data were collected from participants \((N = 29)\) employed in The College of Education. The participants were tenured or tenure-tracked faculty members of multiple departments including physical education, psychology, leadership education, teacher education, and curriculum education. The participants represented diverse backgrounds, ethnicities, genders, and ages. The academic liberties enjoyed by tenured and tenure-tracked faculty members are indicative of concertively controlled organizations. This is evidenced by a substantial level of job security and creative freedom inherent within their job. The College of Education employed 60 tenured or tenure-tracked faculty members within multiple departments. The participant response rate for this study was slightly greater than 48%.
Tools. Just like study 2, three different versions of the packets containing the reliability assessed scales were used to elicit different levels of organizational salience. Each packet contained an informed consent letter attached to the measures. The first of three versions, or the low salience packet, contained the unaltered scales used in the reliability assessment study. The second packet, the dummy salience category, contained a visual logo (the city logo) that everyone in the organization could identify with. The logo was printed at the top of each page on each measure. The third and final packet, the high organizational salience category, contained the organization’s official logo at the top of each page on every scale.

Procedure. Upon receiving Institutional Review Board approval for human participants in research, and receiving a willingness to participate letter from the Dean of The College of Education, the study could formally start. After the Dean of The College of Education drafted an approval letter, he sent out an email to the full-time faculty members within The College of Education soliciting their participation. The randomized packets containing the measures were distributed to the various departments within The College of Education. The packets were placed in the mailboxes of the faculty members. When possible, faculty members were reminded with face-to-face visits from the researcher about the study. Also, email reminders were sent to the faculty members. The randomized set of packets included twenty low salience packets, twenty dummy salience packets, and twenty high salience packets. Thus, the participants were divided into three groups, two control groups and one experimental group, like the previous study. At the end of a two week period, the packets were collected, and the various departments were thanked for their time and participation. The participant response rate for this study was
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over 48%, \(N = 29\). The salience groups reported the following number of participants: low salience \(n = 10\), dummy/low salience \(n = 10\), and high salience \(n = 9\). To test the first hypothesis an ANOVA was conducted to assess the mean scores among the three salience groups for statistical differences. Lastly multiple Pearson’s Product-Moment correlations were conducted to examine the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control and the visual and written identification scales used in the study.

*Combined Data Examination.* The data from the two hypotheses-testing studies were combined resulting in \(N = 70\) participants. An ANOVA was conducted to examine the differences among the mean scores of the three salience groups. To determine the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control, the relationship between the visual and written identification scales, and to test for a spurious correlation among various identification-types (family, religious group, and organizational), a series of Pearson’s Product-Moment correlations were computed.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Study 1

The purpose of the first study of this dissertation was to assess the reliability of the measurement tools used to test the research hypotheses. Out of the 153 undergraduate students sampled for the reliability assessment, $N = 150$ students' survey packets were deemed usable; $n = 3$ participants' packets were determined to be unusable because of incomplete or undeterminable responses. Each student packet contained an identification scale, a visual identification measure, and a concertive control scale. For reliability analysis, the identification scale was divided into three distinct eleven item identification scales: religious group identification, family identification, and organizational identification.

The religious group identification scale yielded a strong inter-item correlation producing a Cronbach's alpha of ($\alpha = .95, M = 3.61$). Much like the religious group identification scale, the family identification scale was also internally consistent, ($\alpha = .89, M = 4.46$). Lastly, and most important to this dissertation, was the reliability of the organizational identification scale. Like the other two scales, the analysis of the eleven-item organizational identification scale indicated a strong inter-item correlation, ($\alpha = .86, M = 3.72$).

Unlike the identification scale, the visual identification scale is a single-item interval-level data scale. The visual organizational identification scale was used to bring visual support to the written identification scale by allowing the individual participants to select a visual category that best represents their feelings of identification ($M = 3.17$).
However, since the scale is limited to a one item response, an alpha coefficient could not be computed. (see Appendix B).

Finally, the concertive control scale was analyzed for reliability. Originally, this scale was used to assess concertive control in Australia; consequently, the linguistic differences between Australian English and United States English posed a problem. On the recommendations of Barker (2006, personal communication), one of the original authors of the scale, and the dissertation committee, the wording of the items was altered. This alteration seemed to affect the original alpha rating found by Wright and Barker’s (2000) reliability assessment of their scale (α = .87). The current assessment found that two items were producing low inter-item correlations (r < .09). After further scrutiny of the measure, the two low correlating items were dropped, resulting in a six-item concertive control scale. The analysis of the new six item scale yielded a respectable Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, (α = .74, M = 3.64).

In sum, upon the revision and reliability assessment of the scales used in this study, analysis of the data indicated a respectable to good alpha coefficient for each scale, according to the DeVellis’ (2003) scale development guidelines. With the different measures producing adequate reliability coefficients, the hypotheses of the study were ready to be investigated.

Study 2

Study 2 examined a mid-sized Southern mental counseling services center to test the research hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 predicted that as individuals’ organizations are made more salient, individuals identify more strongly with their organizations than when their organizations are not made more salient. In other words, as salience increases
identification should increase as well. To test this hypothesis, mean levels of organizational identification were compared across groups representing three categories of salience: low salience (no logo), dummy/low salience (an identifiable logo not related to the organization), and high salience (the organizational logo). The results of an ANOVA failed to support this prediction \( F(2, 38) = 6.79, p = .522, \eta^2 = .033 \). Thus, hypothesis 1 was not supported, and did not reaffirm Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ’s (2005) study that indicated that category salience has a direct effect on organizational identification. The mean scores of the groups representing the three levels salience were not only statistically similar, but scores did not exhibit a statistical tendency towards the proposed research hypothesis: low salience, \( (M = 4.21, SD = .48) \); dummy/low salience, \( (M = 4.17, SD = .40) \); high salience, \( (M = 4.05, SD = .36) \).

Hypothesis 2 proposed that a direct and statistically significant relationship exists between individuals’ perceptions of organizational identification and concertive control. This hypothesis was based upon the qualitative data and observations of previous researchers (Larson & Tompkins, 2005; Papa, Auwal, Singhal, 1997). As described in the method section, the organization sampled exhibited characteristics of a concertively controlled organization, essential to the validity of the study. To test the second hypothesis, a Pearson’s Product-Moment correlation was conducted to examine the relationship existing between the two constructs. The results of the Pearson Product-Moment correlation supported the hypothesis (\( r = .33, p = .038 \)). The organizational identification scores yielded a mean of \( (M = 4.14, SD = .41) \), and the concertive control scores produced a mean of 3.5 (\( SD = .55 \)), (Figure 4.1).
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Participant scores on the visual organizational identification scale provided support for the existence of an association between the written and visual organizational identification scales. The results of a two-tailed Pearson Product Moment correlation indicated that a significant relationship existed between the participants' scores on the two scales ($r = .321, p < .05, M = 2.95, SD = .95$). Overall, the analysis of the data confirmed previous qualitative research assumptions and observations. Nevertheless, the visual organizational identification scores failed to be significantly correlated with concertive control scores. The analysis of a Pearson Product Moment correlation
indicated that no significant relationship existed between the two scales ($r = .068, p = .673, M = 2.95, SD = .95$). Despite the limitations to the visual identification scale, which does not fully represent organizational identification via its one item, the findings of this study contributed to the body of organizational communication research by quantifying a relationship that had been only been investigated qualitatively. To reaffirm the reliability of the findings of the first study, a replication study was conducted with another organization that indicated a strong reliance on concertive control.

**Study 3**

To test the research hypotheses study 3 was administered at The College of Education at a mid-sized Southern university. The College of Education at the university also, like the previous study, exhibited the characteristics of a concertively controlled system. The faculty was divided into teams, departments, and committees. However, each faculty member was allowed academic freedom and creative control of his or her classroom. The first research hypothesis proposed that as individuals’ organizations are made more salient, individuals will identify more strongly with their organizations than when their organizations are not made more salient. In other words, as individuals experience high salience, they should also report experiencing high levels of organizational identification. Thus, differing levels of salience should evoke differing levels of reported identification. For example, a highly-salient environment should lead to reported high identification levels with key aspects of that environment. Like in the previous study, to test this hypothesis, mean levels of organizational identification were compared across groups representing three categories of salience: low salience (no logo), dummy/low salience (an identifiable logo not related to the organization), and high
salience (the organizational logo). The results of an ANOVA failed to support the hypothesis, \( F(2, 28) = 6.22, p = .783. \eta^2 = .014 \). Similar to study 2 of this dissertation, the findings failed to reject the null hypothesis, thus not supporting Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ’s (2005) findings, and confirming the results of study 2. Once again, the analysis of mean scores of the three groups indicated that there was not a statistical tendency in the direction of the research hypothesis: low salience \((M = 4.52, SD = .46)\), dummy/low salience \((M = 4.59, SD = .51)\), and high salience \((M = 4.43, SD = .48)\).

The second research hypothesis proposed that a direct statistical relationship exists between individuals’ perceptions of organizational identification and concertive control. The results of a Pearson Product-Moment correlation indicated that this hypothesis was supported within The College of Education sample \((r = .519, p < .01)\). Analysis of The College of Education data revealed the following descriptive statistics: organizational identification \((M = 4.20, SD = .44)\), concertive control \((M = 3.45, SD = .63)\), (Figure 4.2).
The visual identification scale failed to statistically be related to the written identification scale ($r = .213, p = .267, M = 3.21, SD = .77$), thus questioning the usefulness of the visual identification scale in this replication study. Also, the analysis of a two-tailed Pearson Product Moment correlation found no statistically significant relationship between the visual organizational identification scale and concertive control ($r = .094, p = .297, M = 3.21, SD = .77$). Nevertheless, the overall findings indicated that a direct relationship between organizational identification and concertive control exists.
Since the significant relationship was observed within two different organizations, the findings are not likely due to uniqueness of a specific organization, but rather this phenomenon is expected to be observed in most concertively controlled systems.

_Inter-organizational Results._ The data from both organizations were combined to examine if an inter-organizational merger would alter the findings of the previous studies; $N = 70$ participant responses were used for the merged analysis. Hypothesis 1 was not supported. The ANOVA did not yield significant findings $[F(2, 38) = 12.48, p = .49, \eta^2 = .021]$. The combined outcome was similar to the earlier studies, and there were no statistical differences among the mean scores of the three salience categories. The combination of the two organizations’ data indicated that the dummy/low salience category had the highest mean score ($M = 4.22, SD = .42$). Second was the low salience category ($M = 4.19, SD = .44$), and the lowest mean score was high salience category ($M = 4.1, SD = .43$). Once again, the statistical tendency was not in the direction of the proposed hypothesis.

The second research hypothesis was supported. The results of a Pearson’s Product-Moment correlation indicated that a significant relationship exists between organizational identification and concertive control, $r = .414, p < .01$. This relationship was confirmed in all three studies. Organizational identification ($M = 4.17, SD = .42$) and concertive control ($M = 3.46, SD = .58$) are quantitatively related constructs within the two organizational studies, (Figure 4.3).
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Next, the visual organizational identification scale used was evaluated compared alongside the written organizational identification scale. The results of a two-tailed Pearson Product Moment correlation indicated that the overall participant responses of the two scales were in a direct statistical relationship ($r = .283, p = .018$). The written identification scale descriptive statistics across the two organizations ($M = 4.17, SD = .42$), indicated similarities to the visual organizational identification scale ($M = 3.1, SD = .89$). Although each scale provided a different approach to measuring organizational identification, both scales appeared to be statistically similar. However, a relationship
was not observed between the visual organizational identification scale and concertive control ($r = .077, p = .528, M = .305, SD = .88$). While the visual organizational identification scale may be a quick and simple measure of organizational identification, it fails to truly assess the full content organizational identification. A one-item visual scale is likely too simple of a tool to adequately measure the range of the construct. Nevertheless, such a simple and quick visual measurement instrument could be beneficial for businesses looking to acquire a rough identification assessment tool for their organizations.

Lastly, an inter-organizational comparison was conducted on the religious, family, and organizational identification scale scores in relationship to the reported concertive control scale scores. This comparison was computed to check for a spurious correlation among all three identification and concertive control scales. The results of a two-tailed Pearson Product Moment correlation indicated that the inter-organizational participant concertive control scores were only in a direct relationship with the participant organizational ($r = .414, p = .001, M = 45.82, SD = 4.68$) and family ($r = .443, p = .001, M = 49.71, SD = 4.31$) identification scores. The religious identification and concertive control scores failed to be statistically related, which helped to rule out the spurious correlation explanation for the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control.

The family identification connection to concertive control can be explained a number of ways. Firstly, this connection could be a mere coincidence, which is not likely the case since the participants’ religious identification responses did not statistically correlate with their concertive control scores. Another possible explanation is the nature
of a concertively controlled system. As previously discussed in this dissertation, concertively controlled systems are usually liberated from the traditional trappings of bureaucratic organizations. In other words, employees have freedom and are responsible for establishing the governing rules and norms. Such a system seems to be more family-aware and concerned with the desires of employees. Based upon the attributes of a concertively controlled system, one can plausibly assume that individuals may have more time to participate in family activities. At a minimum, the relationship between concertive control and family identification can be explained by the norms and deep appreciation team-members have for each other, which likely extend beyond work-place concerns and are notable in the personal lives of the team-members.

To summarize the findings,

**H1:** When individuals' organizations are made more salient, individuals will identify more strongly with their organizations than when their organizations are not made more salient.

Hypothesis 1 was neither supported by two separate studies, nor by the combined data analysis. Possible explanations for this failure to reject the null hypothesis will be explored in the next chapter. Second:

**H2:** A positive and statistically significant relationship exists between individuals' perceptions of organizational identification and concertive control.

Hypothesis 2 was supported in both studies as well as the merged data analysis. The support of the second hypothesis clearly signifies that a positive relationship exists between organizational identification and concertive control within concertively
controlled organizations. Implications of the clear relationship between these two concepts are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Roughly twenty-five years have passed since Cheney (1982; 1983a, 1983b) brought organizational identification into the lexicon of communication studies. Since that time, countless scholarly publications have outlined the boundaries and theoretical reality of this construct. The years of research investigating organizational identification led to many important findings, as outlined in the literature review. However, the past twenty-five years have failed to bring a clear understanding of organizational identification in relation to category salience and concertive control. Few studies exist that have examined the relationship among these three constructs. Although Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ (2005) examined the effects of category salience upon school teachers’ reported levels of organizational identification, little to no quantitative research existed on the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control.

Organizational Identification and Category Salience

First, the current study attempted to confirm Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ’s (2005) research pertaining to organizational identification and category salience. The current study examined category salience between two different types of organizations. Although Van Dick et al. conducted their study on grade school teachers, the current research sought to support their findings in broader organizational settings. The research hypothesis predicted that their findings would be supported, and that salience would directly affect individuals’ reported levels of organizational identification. However, this was not the case according to the analyzed data. Van Dick et al.’s findings
were not successfully supported in either of two different organizational studies. Beyond not finding statistical support for Van Dick et al.’s findings, the mean levels of the different groups, as reported in the results section, did not yield a statistical tendency towards the proposed research hypothesis. The findings indicated that the organizational logos implemented to increase organizational salience had no effects on the participants’ responses, and that all three salience groups (low, moderate, and high) rated the research surveys similarly. No evidence from the two organizational studies indicated that category salience affected reported levels of organizational identification.

The findings related to the first hypothesis can be explained in multiple ways. The following are possibilities: (1) category salience may not affect organizational identification; (2) Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ’s (2005) research may have been methodologically flawed; resulting in type I error; (3) the instrumentation differences between Van Dick et al.’s study and the current studies could be responsible for the differing results; and (4) the methodology of the current studies may have resulted in type II error.

This dissertation’s findings failed to reject the null-hypothesis, indicating that category salience levels do not affect reported organizational identification levels. Despite Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ’s (2005) findings, it is probable that category salience has no effect on organizational identification. For example, does making salient a category truly cause individuals’ identification levels to increase? Not according to the results of this dissertation. Are awareness and identification directly related? From the findings here, the answer is no. To affect perceived levels of organizational identification a more substantial identification-eliciting device, other than
salience, is likely needed. Thus, altering organizational identification levels is unlikely when relying upon the mere recognition of belonging to a category or organization.

Tompkins and Cheney (1983) contended, “a person identifies with a unit when, in making a decision, the person in one or more of his/her organizational roles perceives that unit’s values or interests as relevant in evaluating the alternatives of choice” (p. 144). Tompkins and Cheney recognized that decisions can be based upon salient identification. In other words, making a decision that is perceived in the interest or values of the organization is affected by salience; however, this does not support the notion of increased identification. Although increased identification is a possibility, as evidenced by Van Dick et al., the idea of increased identification by way of salience failed to be supported here. Perhaps salience can influence an individual’s decision-making process, as Tompkins and Cheney argued. However, their argument was not reflected in the findings here indicating that salience merely results in either increased organizational awareness or the salience-enhancing logos were an ignored distraction. Nevertheless, no increase in organizational identification was observed.

The second possibility for why the current research did not support Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ’s (2005) research is methodological flaws. Van Dick et al. used strong verbal descriptions for their research’s high salience occupational group. The statements used for the headings on their research surveys compared the individuals assigned to the high salience treatment to relevant outgroups (teachers to other teachers). However, this was problematic because the participants were aware that they were being compared to other groups, and that their performance as teachers was being compared to other groups of (outgroup) teachers. Consequently, the participants were prompted to
respond to the research surveys in a competitive manner. This likely placed Van Dick et al.'s participants in a forced dichotomy. The participants could either perform in a weak or strong mode. Performing in a weak mode would result in not identifying strongly with their organization. As a result, the participants would run the risk of appearing inadequate in the competition, and performing in the way the researchers did not desire. Or, the participants could provide high identification responses, and assert their dominance in the competition. This would result in the researchers finding a statistical difference among the different salience level groups. However, salience was not likely the influential factor. This competitive phenomenon could easily explain Van Dick et al.'s results, the teachers' desire to perform well, and the higher identification responses. Gilner and Morgan (2000) asserted that “participants who know they are being investigated may change or act differently” (p. 19). This is considered the Hawthorne effect, a common problem with research methodology. The strong verbal descriptions used by Van Dick et al. possibly led to their significant findings. If so, their findings were a result of type I error, finding significance when none truly exists.

Another possible explanation for the differing results is instrumentation. Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ (2005) used their own tools for measuring organizational identification and creating varying categories of salience. The same is true for this dissertation, as an original organizational identification scale was employed and organizational and city logos were used to create categories of salience. The different measures may have resulted in the conflicting finding with Van Dick et al.'s results. As discussed earlier, Van Dick et al.'s approach to creating different levels of category salience, especially their high salience category, was drastically different from the
method employed in this study. Van Dick et al. used relevant outgroup competition and comparisons with occupational representation. The approach used here simply employed representative logos, both visual and verbal, to create an increase in salience. For example, in this study’s high salience category, the participants were presented with their company’s logo. The logo acted as a visual representation making more salient the participants’ organization as they filled out the research surveys. Although this approach appeared more methodologically sound than Van Dick et al.’s verbal leadings and competition, the results were drastically different. The findings indicated that the different salience categories did not elicit significantly different responses from the participants, where Van Dick et al.’s work did find significant differences.

Beyond the salience manipulation differences, the organizational identification scales in the two works were completely unique. In theory, Van Dick et al. and this study’s organizational identification scales measured the same concept; however, the two scales had distinctive approaches. The scale used here focused on a social identity theory approach to measuring organizational identification (Tajfel, 1981). Also, the scale strictly measured organizational identification as a workplace concept. The rationale for this focus was to simplify findings, and directly address the participants’ self-reported feelings of identification within their workplace. Van Dick et al. took a similar social identity theory and self-categorization approach, but divided organizational identification into three foci: career, occupational, and school identification (Hogg and Terry, 2000). Thus, they measured organizational identification in a different manner than this study. Ultimately, the unique differences in measurement tools may have contributed to the different findings.
A final reason for failing to reject the null-hypothesis for hypothesis 1 is methodological problems. One of greatest issues of concern for the methodology of each of this project's studies was the manipulation of salience categories. Fearing the possibility of leading the participants down the slippery slopes of the Hawthorne and Pygmalion effects via strong verbal suggestions, the salience categories were created through the presence, or the lack thereof, of logos. Salience, as explained in the literature review, can be viewed as chronic or situational (Devine, 1989; Obst & White, 2005). Situational salience occurs when certain categories are primed in a variety of social settings, thus situational salience was attempted to be manipulated in this study. The rationale of salience categories was to prime the situational salience of the three groups in different ways. To illustrate, no logo was used for the low salience category, a dummy logo was used to control for participants who were responding based upon the prestige of logos, and the participants' organizational logo was used to prime organizational identification. Despite what was considered a well-executed attempt at creating different salience categories, the logos may have failed to elicit varying levels of salience. The organizational salience category may have been too chronic. This could have occurred due to the study being carried out within the place of employment for the participants; thus the logos may have had little to no impact.

Another issue of concern was the five-point Likert-type scale used to assess organizational identification. A seven-point scale would have provided the respondents more options, possibly resulting in a stronger separation of means scores. In spite of the potential for a greater statistical separation among the groups' mean scores, a seven-point Likert-type scale would not have resolved the statistical dilemma of the high
salience category producing the lowest mean organizational identification score of the three salience groups. Statistically similar mean scores occurred in both organizations studied. Even though the means did not statistically differ, this tendency was the opposite of what was hypothesized.

Organizational Identification and Category Salience

Barring the possible methodological problems, the findings suggested that the organizational logos, as high salience primers, did not lead to higher levels or greater responses of organizational identification. The analysis of the data also specified that salience does not increase organizational identification. As previously discussed, salience may result in a heightened concern or awareness of an organization. Salience may also be a factor in organizational decision making, as previous research suggested (Tompkins and Cheney, 1983). Based upon the results of this project, however, category salience is not a factor that increases or strengthens organizational identification.

Organizational identification, a construct that is part of one’s self-concept, likely requires interaction and stronger experiences beyond mere salience to alter individuals’ perceived levels (Asforth & Mael, 1989; Tajfel, 1981). As the results here indicated, category salience was not powerful enough to create stronger perceptions of organizational identification within the participants. However, the findings here do not rule out the value of organizational recognition or salience as tools in organizational promotion and understanding organizational behavior. Nevertheless, salience, the process of making active group memberships or categories, did not affect the participants’ reported levels of organizational identification, thus the present research failed to confirm earlier findings (Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2005). However, the current
research did not reject the notion that identification and salience are related constructs, as proposed earlier (Hogg & Terry, 1998; 2000).

Managers, public relations specialists, and individuals of decision-making power within organizations can gain some insight into organizational life through these results. The findings speak little in favor of the effectiveness of logos on organizational identification. Although logos have clearly indicated salience, organizational recognition, brand familiarity, and symbols of belongingness (Dandridge, 1983; Morgan, Frost, & Pondy, 1983; Timm & DeTienne, 1995; Wilkins, 1983), the results here suggested that logos do not increase levels of perceived organizational identification. Thus, organizational decision-makers should not expect their logos to increase employee identification, but should expect employees to base their identification on more substantive events beyond a simple category recognition. However, the findings do not suggest that organizational logos fail to enhance organizational awareness. Earlier research validated the importance of logos in relationship to concepts similar to organizational identification. For example, organizational commitment, an individual’s attitude towards an organization, has been shown to be affected by the presence of organizational logos (Gautam, Van Dick, & Wagner, 2004). In sum, organizational leaders should not rely on logos or emblems to create stronger levels of organizational identification. Logos should be viewed as organizational tools that solely make an organization’s presence salient and present to employees and the society the organization serves.

*Organizational Identification and Concertive Control*
This project also examined the possible relationship between organizational identification and concertive control. Two studies were conducted in two organizations that met the criteria for concertively controlled systems. In other words, the studies were conducted on organizations where “the explicit written rules and regulations are largely replaced by the common understanding of values, objectives, and means of achievement, along with a deep appreciation for the organization’s mission” (Tompkins and Cheney, 1985, p. 184). Both studies yielded results indicating that a statistically significant relationship exists between organizational identification and concertive control, thus quantitatively confirming a relationship that had only been speculated about or qualitatively indicated in previous research (Barker & Tompkins, 1994; Larson & Tompkins, 2005; Papa, Auwal, & Singhal, 1997).

Finding a positive relationship between organizational identification and concertive control acknowledges concertive control as a tool for enhancing organizational identification, and organizational identification as a tool for enhancing concertive control within organizations. The direct relationship between the two constructs allows one to speculate about how the concepts interact. Within the two concertively controlled systems sampled, the positive relationship indicated that as perceived levels of concertive control and organizational identification increased, so did perceived levels of the other related variable. Confirming this relationship establishes a new area within organizational communication to be investigated.

Within the first organization studied, the Southern mental health counseling services center, this statistical relationship was observed based upon the responses of mental health case managers and therapists. They relied upon each other to report for
billing purposes. If the case managers or therapists did not turn in their billing statements within a set timeframe, not only would the late parties lose pay, but their tardiness would result in a loss of pay for other therapists or case managers who shared common clients with the tardy individuals. Neither the case managers nor the therapists were bureaucratically controlled. Thus, the case managers and therapists did not have to submit to the authority of a hierarchical system. Rather, they were required to establish group norms and rules to guide their behavior pertaining to client billing and their work schedules. In sum, they submitted to concertive control as opposed to bureaucratic control.

The results of this study indicated that the perceived levels of concertive control, observed team norms and rational rules, were directly correlated to the case managers’ and therapists’ reported levels of organizational identification. Thus, the stronger the team norms and observed rules became, the more likely the case managers and therapists were to strongly identify with their organization. Barker (1993; 1998) contended that the rules within a concertively controlled system become “rationalized and codified and serve as a strong controlling force of the team actions” (p. 419).

Much like the Southern mental health counseling services center, the College of Education Faculty at a mid-sized Southern University experienced a similar phenomenon. The findings indicated that the faculty’s scores suggested a positive relationship between perceived levels of organizational identification and concertive control. The faculty members within The College of Education were liberated from typical bureaucratic control based upon their tenure and academic freedom. They were considered equals among their colleagues, and functioned within their departments as teams within the
College of Education. Much like the case manager and therapist teams of the counseling services center, the professors relied upon each other to carry out duties and maintain academic principles in compliance with their departmental obligations to the college. Akin to the counseling services center, the group norms and rules of the College of Education were found to be related to enhancing organizational identification. From the observed relationship, one can infer that acceptance and participation in the concertively controlled teams resulted in a similar acceptance of and identification with the greater organization. As Barker (1998) suggested, concertive control operates on the team level. The teams tested in these studies, case managers and therapists as well as faculty in academic departments within the College of Education, all reported team-based concertive control scores and organizational identification scores that were statistically related.

The relationship between organizational identification and concertive control is a reciprocal association. Tompkins and Cheney (1985) contended that concertively controlled systems require “a deep appreciation for the organization’s mission” (p. 184). Thus, for the creation of group norms, and for rational and informal rules to function as devices of control within organizations, some level of organizational identification must be established. Conversely, for organizational identification, “the symbolic process underlying basic tendencies in social relations,” to strengthen within a concertively controlled organization one may assume that the norms and rational rules that guide behavior and originate categorical identity are intact (Cheney, 1983b, p. 143). Thus, the support found for hypothesis 2 led to a proposed model showing the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control (Figure 5.1). The model visually
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indicates how the concepts are engaged. For example, organizational identification is required for concertive control to function and intensify within an organization. However, concertive control is not a requirement for organizational identification, since organizational identification can certainly occur outside of a concertively controlled system (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Mael & Ashforth, 1995). Nevertheless, concertive control’s norms and rules do intensify and enhance organizational identification levels.

Figure 5.1: A model describing the relationships between organizational identification and concertive control. Concertive control requires organizational identification for existence and intensification. Organizational identification may be enhanced by the development of the norms and rules of concertive control, but does not require a connection to concertive control to exist.
Beyond understanding the relationship existing between the two constructs, the implications of their relationship for organizational leaders are notable. Statistically verifying the relationship clarified the influence of concertively controlled systems on organizational identification. Concertive control, according to Tompkins and Cheney (1985), empowers employees and creates a liberated work environment. However, the liberated environment is not free from control and organizational restraints. Concertive control can result in industry leaders and organizational-decision makers reaping benefits from developing concertive controlled teams within their organizations. Concertive control, at times, has been observed as being a stronger form of control than bureaucratic systems (Barker, 1993; 1998). While supposedly providing autonomy to workers, group and self-imposed rules can become stricter than those of other systems of control (Barker, 1993; 1998). Outside of the potential for strict control, concertive control, as confirmed here, is a tool that enhances organizational identification. As previously discussed, increasing organizational identification has been linked to more organization-enhancing decision making, reduced employee turnover intentions, improved on-the-job performance, increased employee motivation, and more group cohesiveness within an organization (Kippenburg, 2000; Tompkins & Cheney, 1983; 1985; Van Dick et al., 2004a; Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, & Christ, 2005; Wiesenfeld, Raghuram, & Garud, 1999). With all of the strong practical links to organizational identification, a concertively controlled system might thwart the recent trend toward workers being viewed as independent businesses merely outsourcing their abilities for pay. Tompkins and Cheney (1985) argued that concertive control is the soul of new organizations.
Concertive control has many benefits and drawbacks. The benefits include team-based camaraderie. With camaraderie established in a concertively controlled system, a greater sense of organizational identification should be present, strengthening an organization. Also, the workers in a concertively controlled system are liberated from bureaucratic control. In other words, they are allowed to form their own group norms and rational rules by which they are governed. Being able to establish their own norms and rules will likely give the workers a sense of autonomy, resulting in a more satisfying work environment. Barker (1993; 1998) indicated that once a concertively controlled system in place has made it through the organizational adjustments, production benefits from the workers can be observed. Despite the benefits of concertively controlled systems, they are not flawless; they are not free from ingroup arguments, groupthink, and many of the other problems that occur in small groups and teams.

Throughout history, small groups and organizations have become so sensitized to ingroup identification that the levels of identification have become harmful. Such is the case with cults like the Branch Davidians that had many members willing to die for their organization. Also, gangs appeal to individuals with strong identification tactics, resulting in gang members committing violent acts for the group. For example, a "sense of identity is understood to connect different experiences and reduce fragmentations in feelings and thinking" (Alvesson & Willmot, 2002, p. 625). With this connection and de-fragmentation of identity, the lure of group identification can be strong enough to discount the rules of a greater society and participate in criminal activity. Along with such extreme cases other limitations to concertive control exist. For instance, the use of group norms for the only method of control can be detrimental to an organization when
the quick hierarchical decisions made by an individual boss are sacrificed for the collective group decisions that may cost a company time and money to make.

Although concertive control offers the benefits previously discussed, it falls short on the promises of a completely liberated work environment. Arguably, it can produce a stronger controlled work environment (Barker, 1993; 1998). The stronger features of concertive control can lead to the greater oppression of workers in two differing ways. (1) Workers, in an attempt to blend in with the norms and the rules of a concertively controlled team, often fall into what Alvesson and Willmott (2002) called a good corporate citizen or an individual who simply attempts to fit in an organization and merely get by. Jackall (1988) referred to this phenomenon as an individual being a role player. He contended that a role player “plays his part without complaint. He does not threaten the others by appearing brilliant, or with his personality, his ability, or his personal values” (p. 56). This type of behavior can result in a stagnated work environment where production is minimal and new ideas and thoughts are oppressed by team norms. For example, team members may not consider an individual member’s ideas as valuable, not because his or her ideas lack quality, but because the majority of the team does not want to create more group work. (2) Secondly, the group norms and rational rules of a concertively controlled system can be stronger and more oppressive in regards to production than a bureaucratically controlled system. Barker argued that peer-pressure and group norms within concertively controlled systems often intensify to the extent that workers become incarcerated by the system and feel performance pressure beyond the iron cage of traditional control systems (Barker, 1993; 1998; Weber, 1978). However, in concertive control the incarcerating control is not visible like in hierarchical systems;
thus in some respects concertive control may be a more intense form of oppression than that of previous systems. Nevertheless, concertive control does allow work-teams more creativity and perceived freedom. This perceived freedom and autonomy may explain the powerful relationship to organization identification. In opposition to the perceived freedom, concertive control is not a system that is beyond being exploited by organizational leaders.

In sum, the current research indicates that concertive control and organizational identification are related concepts that can be beneficial for organizations and employees. Employees within a concertively controlled system can experience benefits such as a bureaucratically liberated work environment, group camaraderie, and a sense of belonging. Yet, concertively controlled systems also pose risks of stricter control, mindless actions stemming from groupthink, lazy team norms or more intense peer pressure, and a system that can still be exploited by management. Organizational leaders who are concerned for the well-being of an organization can expect to see concertively controlled employees identify more with the organization, and likely continue to perform well in the organization because of the strict control features set up through group norms and rules. However, organizational leaders should be cognizant of the previously discussed problems that can occur within a concertively controlled system. Business leaders and employees should be clear on the fact that organizational identification and concertive control are reciprocal concepts. Organizational identification feeds off the group norms and rational rules of concertive control; and concertive control is strengthened through the lure of social group identification, belonging, and the desire to fulfill the organization’s mission.
Limitations and Future Research

Although this dissertation stayed theoretically consistent with works reviewed in the literature review, the first hypothesis failed to support Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ’s (2005) research findings. The possible reasons for this inconsistency were examined earlier in the discussion section. Regarding the first hypothesis, failure to reject the null-hypothesis could be directly related to the sample-size acquired for this study. Despite carrying out two different studies on distinct organizations, the likelihood of finding statistical significance was small due to the small sample sizes. However, the reported mean levels did not indicate that an increased sample size would have resulted in mean statistical differences in the proposed direction of the first hypothesis. Other variables that may have aided the failure to reject the null hypothesis were the organizational types sampled. As opposed to Van Dick et al.’s research population, the populations used for this study were participants working in concertively controlled systems, where performance is driven by group norms and not the fear of bureaucratic or authoritarian punishment. Thus, category salience and organizational identification may interact differently depending on the specific organization sampled.

Another factor hindering the investigation of the first hypothesis were the logo representations creating varying levels of salience. A natural level of salience was present without logo representation. Merely asking the participants to fill out the scales regarding their organizations, families, and religious groups resulted in making the categories salient. Thus, the surveys with no logos on them were considered low salience surveys. However, it is impossible to understand how salient the organization was to the
individual as they were filling out the logo-free surveys. Possibly some respondents were
as sensitized to their organizations as the high salience group respondents. If this
occurred, it could explain why a statistical difference was not found among the mean
scores of the different salience groups. Using a salience measure after the surveys were
completed was an option for remedying this problem; but doing so seemed to pose more
methodological setbacks than solutions. For example, if a salience measure was given to
participants after completing the other measures, and the participants were asked how
salient their organization was while they were filling out the surveys, the participant may
become sensitized to purpose of the study. Also, the participants’ salience levels are
peaked by answering questions regarding their organization and salience. In short, the
accuracy of post-survey salience measures is instantly compromised upon completion.
Thus, truly understanding the perceived differences among the salience categories was
problematic. However, this approach seemed to be more methodologically sound than
using leading verbal descriptions as employed by Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and
Christ (2005).

Testing the second hypothesis posed fewer methodological problems. A statistically
significant relationship was observed in both studies. This relationship may be seen with
greater strength in a larger sampling population. The small sample-size was one of the
methodological weaknesses of the two studies. With the difficulties of acquiring
institutional review board approval for human subject research on multiple organizations,
acquiring large populations of participants is time consuming and challenging. Also,
growing skepticism among companies that are willing to participate in research is a
hindering factor. Many organizations are not willing to allow their employees to
participate due to time constraints and fears of legal problems related to outside research. All of the above factors hindered growth of this dissertation's participant population sample. However, the sampling population did not result in type II error for the second hypothesis.

The measures used in this dissertation's studies were another issue of concern. The written identification measures met the research assumptions without incident. Each written identification scale adequately measured the full content of social-identity-theory-based identification, and yielded good to excellent inter-item reliability alpha coefficients, in accordance with DeVellis' (2003) test measurement guidelines. In contrast to the written identification scales, Wright and Barker's (2000) measure of concertive control was initially problematic. Two of the eight items failed to properly correlate with other scale items. Upon a detailed review, the items were dropped because of ambiguous language. Despite the two items being dropped, the content validity of the scale remained strong. The other six items adequately covered the content of the two dropped items. Upon the removal of the poorly correlating items, Wright and Barker's concertive control scale produced a satisfactory reliability rating.

The last scale used in the studies was a one-item visual organizational identification scale developed by Shamir and Kark (2004). Shamir and Kark's scale did correlate with the written organizational identification scale; however, the one item visual scale failed to correlate with concertive control. The failure to significantly correlate with concertive control can be attributed to the shallow content validity of the visual identification scale. By only having a one item, the visual scale cannot measure the full content of social-identity-theory-based organizational identification. Although the visual scale does
measure attributes of organizational identification, other identification measures should be employed to strengthen the depth of findings. Nevertheless, the potential for the visual organizational identification scale as a surface and quick identification measure tool should not be overlooked.

The major limitation regarding the research support for the second hypothesis is interpreting the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control. Although a positive statistically significant relationship was found in both studies, determining the nature of the interplay between the constructs is delicate. For example, organizational identification exists in various types of organizations, many not being concertively controlled. One can conclude that organizational identification is merely related to concertive control, and is not dependent upon a concertively controlled system. Thus, organizational identification can exist without concertive control. Nevertheless, a concertively controlled system cannot exist without at least moderate levels of perceived organizational identification. By definition, a concertively controlled system must have employees who exhibit "a deep appreciation of the organization's mission" (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985, p.184). By employees showing an appreciation for or a level of identification with a given organization, concertive control then becomes a possibility for that organization. However, this study did not examine finer details of how concertive control interacts with similar constructs to organizational identification. Future research should examine concertive control and similar constructs to organizational identification such as organizational loyalty, commitment, worker trust, and participative or group decision-making. Nonetheless, each of these concepts will likely benefit from qualitative and quantitative investigations. While constructs such as organizational loyalty and
commitment have previously been investigated quantitatively by Van Dick et al. (2004a), other organizational concepts such as worker trust and group decision-making may benefit from qualitative means of investigation, especially since worker trust and group decision-making are concepts deeply rooted in the changing norms as concertively controlled systems are developed. As observed by Baker (1993), members of a concertive controlled system develop group rules in phases, and as a new rule phase is entered into, the past phase's rules are replaced. Thus, quantitatively measuring changing rules and norms to understand a developing worker trust and group decision-making process could prove problematic, and would likely be best understood through a qualitative methodological approach.

A final limitation of this dissertation is the generalizability of the findings. Although the information is theoretically sound and provides valuable content regarding organizational communication, the findings of this dissertation were not meant for generalizing beyond the organizational setting; more specifically concertively-controlled organizations. In other words, the findings have no value to the general public beyond the organizational settings. The presence of this limitation should not be interpreted as a weakness of the research, but rather a guideline for interpreting the results.

Future researchers could examine how concertive control and organizational identification interact with organizational commitment and workplace loyalty. Another important continuation of this study and Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher, and Christ's (2005) work would be a thorough study of effects of category salience on organizational identification. Future researchers should attempt to answer the question: can salience truly influence worker attachment or identification with a specific organization? In
addition, such a study would benefit from being conducted across multiple organizations and occupations. A well-thought-out salience measure check could be beneficial if employed without hindering the methodology. The effects of category salience on organizational decision making would also serve as an intriguing area for future scholarly activity. More particularly, how does category salience affect organizational decisions on such topics as employee termination, hiring, and job promotions?

Conclusion

As organizational communication continues to grow as a sub-discipline of communication studies, more interest will be generated about understanding organizational issues through research. Scholars in a wide variety of disciplines such as business, marketing, management studies, psychology, and communication have added to relevant knowledge pertaining to organizational life. This dissertation examined three key concepts in organizational communication: organizational identification, concertive control, and category salience. The findings of this dissertation indicated that category salience may not influence organizational identification. Rather, category salience may simply influence organizational behavior. For example, a person who belongs to an organization and is made aware of his or her relationship with the organization may base a decision upon the salient organization. However, this dissertation’s findings indicated that category salience did not affect the participants’ perceived levels of organizational identification. Altering levels of organizational identification likely requires organizational interaction, and perceived levels should not be expected to change based upon the recognition of the organization.
Most importantly, this dissertation examined the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control. The findings specified that a positive statistical relationship exists between the two concepts. By definition, concertive control requires a moderate level of organizational identification to exist, and thus organizational identification functions as a type of control within an organization. For example, if a team of workers do not at least moderately identify with an organization, then why would they care to work and establish group norms for productive labor? They would not; thus organizational identification is one proverbial fuel that runs a concertively controlled system.

Understanding these findings can be beneficial to organizations as well as individuals interacting with organizations. The individual is valued as the starting point of communication within Western society (Gergen, 1994). As Burke (1937; 1989) argued, identification permeates every aspect of human existence, thus being cognizant of how organizational identification functions in relation to concertive control will allow an individual to function more fluidly within an organization. As a result, the individual will likely be a more productive worker and asset to an organization. Also, organization leaders and decision makers can use this research to understand how flattened hierarchical systems, such as concertive control, can enhance employee identification and satisfaction within their organization.

Lastly, the ultimate goal of this work was to provide a greater understanding of organizational communication in relation to category salience, organizational identification, and concertive control, thus understanding a few aspects of human communication in a new way, resulting in the empowerment of the individual and
ultimately society, as “whatever solutions are offered for the initial variants on the problem of meaning, they must finally be able to render an account of meaning with others” (Gergen, 1994, p. 254).
APPENDIX A

Indicate the degree to which the statements below apply to you using the following possibilities: (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) neutral; (4) agree; (5) strongly agree.

1. I want to be viewed as a part of the team at my place of work.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. I want to be associated with my family.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. The company I work for is important in my life.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. My family is an important part of my life.
   1 2 3 4 5

5. I am concerned with how I am perceived at my place of work.
   1 2 3 4 5

6. Acceptance by my family is important to me.
   1 2 3 4 5

7. I feel like part of my identity as an individual is strengthened through involvement with my work.
   1 2 3 4 5

8. I am concerned with how my family views me.
   1 2 3 4 5

9. Acceptance by my religious organization is important to me.
   1 2 3 4 5

10. I am happy with my place of employment.
    1 2 3 4 5

11. It is important to me that people who are outside of my religious group know I am part of my religious group.
    1 2 3 4 5

12. I feel like part of my identity as an individual is strengthened through involvement with a religious group.
    1 2 3 4 5

13. I am concerned with the possibility of my religious group failing.
    1 2 3 4 5
(14. I feel like part of my identity as an individual is strengthened through involvement with my family.  
1 2 3 4 5

(15. I am happy with my family.  
1 2 3 4 5

(16. My religious group is an important part of my life.  
1 2 3 4 5

(17. I want to be viewed as a part of my family.  
1 2 3 4 5

(18. It is important to me that people who are outside of my place of employment know I am part of my work.  
1 2 3 4 5

(19. It is important to me that people who are outside of my family know I am part of my family.  
1 2 3 4 5

(20. I am concerned with the success of my religious group.  
1 2 3 4 5

(21. My place of work is vital to my sense of belonging.  
1 2 3 4 5

(22. I am concerned with the possibility of my workplace failing.  
1 2 3 4 5

(23. My religious group is vital to my sense of belonging.  
1 2 3 4 5

(24. I am concerned with how my religious group views me.  
1 2 3 4 5

(25. I want to be associated with my religious group.  
1 2 3 4 5

(26. I am concerned with the success of my place of work.  
1 2 3 4 5

(27. Acceptance by my co-workers is important to me.  
1 2 3 4 5

(28. I am concerned with the success of my family.  
1 2 3 4 5

(29. I want to be viewed as a part of my religious group.  
1 2 3 4 5
(30. I want to be associated with my place of work.
     1  2  3  4  5

(31. My family is vital to my sense of belonging.
     1  2  3  4  5

(32. I am concerned with the possibility of my family failing.
     1  2  3  4  5

(33. I am happy with my religious group.
     1  2  3  4  5
Instructions: Each rectangle contains two circles. The clear circle represents you, and the shaded circle represents the organization you are involved in. Rate how you perceive yourself in relation to your organization by circling one of the rectangles.

1.  

2.  

3.  

4.  

5.
Directions: Indicate the degree to which the statements below apply to you using the following possibilities: (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) neutral; (4) agree; (5) strongly agree.

(1) You and your coworkers set standards of performance.  
1  2  3  4  5

(2) You and your coworkers have your own rules and policies.  
1  2  3  4  5

(3) You and your coworkers have your own system of determining when people can take leave.  
1  2  3  4  5

(4) You and your coworkers have your own way of doing things.  
1  2  3  4  5

(5) You and your coworkers make sure that everyone pulls their own weight.  
1  2  3  4  5

(6) You and your coworkers need everyone's agreement to change the way you do your job.  
1  2  3  4  5

(7) You and your coworkers usually check with other coworkers before doing something that might affect them.  
1  2  3  4  5

(8) Your coworkers usually check with you before doing something that might affect you.  
1  2  3  4  5
TO: Matthew Ramsey  
4308 Keller's Chapel Road  
Jonesboro, AR 72404

FROM: Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.  
HSPRC Chair

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 27010404  
PROJECT TITLE: Organizational Identification and Concertive Control

Enclosed is The University of Southern Mississippi Human Subjects Protection Review Committee Notice of Committee Action taken on the above referenced project proposal. If I can be of further assistance, contact me at (601) 266-4279, FAX at (601) 266-4275, or you can e-mail me at Lawrence.Hosman@usm.edu. Good luck with your research.
HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTECTION REVIEW COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Human Subjects Protection Review Committee in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.
  Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 27010404
PROJECT TITLE: Organizational Identification and Concertive Control
PROPOSED PROJECT DATES: 01/09/07 to 01/09/08
PROJECT TYPE: Dissertation or Thesis
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS: Matthew C. Ramsey
COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Arts & Letters
DEPARTMENT: Speech Communication
FUNDING AGENCY: N/A
HSPRC COMMITTEE ACTION: Expedited Review Approval
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 02/27/07 to 02/26/08

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
HSPRC Chair

2-28-07
Date
# APPENDIX D

**HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW FORM**

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI**

(SUBMIT THIS FORM IN DUPLICATE)

Name: Matthew C. Ramsey

Phone: 601-466-8272

E-Mail Address: speechramsey@yahoo.com

Mailing Address: 4308 Keller's Chapel Road, Jonesboro, AR 72404

(address to receive information regarding this application)

College/Division: College of Arts and Letters

Dept: Speech Communication

Department Box #: 513

Phone: 601-266-4271

Proposed Project Dates: From 1-9-2007 To 1-9-2008

(specific month, day and year of the beginning and ending dates of full project, not just data collection)

Title: Organizational Identification and Concertive Control

Funding Agencies or Research Sponsors: __________________________

Grant Number (when applicable): __________________________

X New Project

X Dissertation or Thesis

Renewal or Continuation: Protocol # __________________________

Change in Previously Approved Project: Protocol # __________________________

Principal Investigator: Matthew C. Ramsey

Date: 11-30-2006

Advisor: John C. Meyer

Date: 12-7-2006

Department Chair: Charles H. Long

Date: 12/7/06

---

**RECOMMENDATION OF HSPRC MEMBER**

Category I, Exempt under Subpart A, Section 46.101 ( ) ( ), 45CFR46.

Category II, Expedited Review, Subpart A, Section 46.110 and Subparagraph ( ).

Category III, Full Committee Review.

HSPRC College/Division Member: __________________________

Date: 2-14-07

HSPRC Chair: __________________________

Date: 2-25-07

---

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX E

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
ADVERSE EFFECT REPORT

This form should be used to report single adverse effects. Incident reports (i.e., reports of problems involving the conduct of the study or patient participation, including problems with the recruitment and/or consent processes and any deviations from the approved protocol) should be described in a letter. Return this form to the IRB Coordinator, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive # 5147, Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39406-0001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator:</th>
<th>Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB Approval #:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse Effect (3-4 words):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of adverse effect:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional details/description of effect and treatment, if any. (A detailed report may be attached.)

Adverse effect appears to be (check one):
- Directly related to the research
- Indirectly related to the research
- Unrelated to the research

Research involved the use of a:
- Was use of procedure intended to directly benefit subject? Yes | No
- Was subject enrolled at a USM site? Yes | No
- Has this type of adverse effect been reported before? Yes | No
- Is this type of effect likely to occur again? Yes | No
- Is the effect adequately described in the protocol and consent form? Yes | No

* If not, are changes needed in the protocol and/or consent form? Yes** | No

** If so, a modification application should accompany this report.

What other agencies (e.g., sponsors) have been notified of this adverse effect?

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date
APPENDIX F

1. STATEMENT OF PROJECT GOALS

The specific purpose of this project is twofold. The first goal is to assess the reliability and validity of questionnaires measuring organizational identification and concertive control. The second goal of this study is to quantitatively examine the relationship among organizational identification, category salience, and concertive control. The broader goals include advancing social scientific research via studying human communication in general and in organizational settings specifically.

2. PROTOCOL

*Questionnaire Assessment.* Participants for this project will be approximately 170 students, 18 or older, enrolled at a midsized Southern University. The participants will be recruited in two ways. Some will be approached individually and asked to participate. Others will be part of intact classes.

The investigator or an assistant will explain the general purpose of the study, describe the nature and length of the questionnaires to be completed (see attached questionnaires), and ask for volunteers. The questionnaires will be given to the students who agree to participate. In the classroom setting, all students may be given the questionnaires, but anyone who does not want to participate can simply hand back the blank form. Filling out the forms should take the participants no longer than 20 minutes to complete.

*Assessment of organizational identification, category salience, and concertive control.* Participants for the second part of this study will come from organizational groups from two distinct organizations who appear to meet the specifications of a team-based or concertively controlled organization (see the attached letters of permission). Concertively controlled teams within an organization are teams who are not subject to typical bureaucratic and hierarchical control, but are allowed freedom and the ability to develop distinct group norms and rational rules within their organizations. Some participants within this study will be approached individually, and others will be approached as groups. The participants will be asked to participate in the study. The total number of participants recruited from both organizations may total 200.

The investigator or an assistant will explain the general purpose of the study, describe the nature and length of the questionnaires to be completed (see attached questionnaires), and ask for volunteers. While questionnaire responses regarding religious group and family identification will be solicited, the data are not of interest to the goals of the study. The questions pertaining to religious group and family identification are merely diversionary questions employed to reduce the perceived salience of the participants’ organizations. While the data will not be used to test the hypotheses of the study, they serve an important scientific diversionary function to the methodology. The written identification scale containing questions regarding organizational, family, and religious group
identification is an original scale. The concertive control and visual identification scales are reworked measures that were previously published. The concertive control scale was developed by Wright and Barker (2000) and the visual identification scale was developed by Shamir and Kark (2004). The questionnaires will be given to the workers who agree to participate. Filling out the forms should take the participants no longer than 20 minutes to complete. No demographic data will be collected; only data pertaining to methodology, as previously explained, will be solicited from the participants.

The questionnaires will be collected by the researcher, and the anonymous scores will be entered into statistical analyzing software. The researcher will be the only person in contact with the completed questionnaires. The questionnaires will be locked and stored securely in a filing cabinet in the home of the researcher until the completion of the study. Upon the completion of the research and analysis, the questionnaires will be destroyed.

3. BENEFITS

People participating in the experiment may become more aware of key issues of identification and control in organizations. The study will advance understanding of organizational communication and general human interaction. It will clarify the relationship between organizational identification and concertive control.

4. RISKS

There are no realistic physical or psychological threats to participants. No identifying information will be solicited from participants. Anonymity is of the utmost importance, and is essential to this project.

5. INFORMED CONSENT

A written consent form will be used for all the data collection (see attached). Only people over 18 years of age will be allowed to volunteer.
The University of Southern Mississippi
(Written form)
Authorization to Participate in Research Project

Participant's name

Today you are being asked to participate in study of communication. Each of you will be asked questions that involve your attitudes, beliefs, and experiences about communication on questionnaires. The questionnaires should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete.

Please do not put your name or any identifying information on your questionnaires. All of the information you provide in this study will remain anonymous. You will not be identified by name as a participant in this project. There are no likely physical or psychological risks or discomforts from participation in the study. The data will be handled only by the researcher, and it will be kept in a secured location. Also, no identifying information will be solicited. Anonymity is of the utmost importance, and is essential to this project. A potential benefit to participating in this study is acquiring a greater awareness of how survey research is conducted in the discipline of communication studies.

Consent is hereby given to participate in the research project entitled “Quantitatively Understanding the Relationship between Organizational Identification and Concertive Control.” All procedures and investigations to be followed and their purpose, including all experimental procedures were explained by Matthew Ramsey. Information was given about the benefits, risks, inconveniences, and discomforts that might be expected.

The opportunity to ask questions about the research and procedures was given—when the researcher handed out the questionnaires. Participation in the project is completely voluntary, and subjects may withdraw at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. Any new information that develops during the project will be provided if that information may affect the willingness to continue participation in the project.

Questions regarding the research during or after the project should be directed to Matthew Ramsey at (601) 466-8272. This project and consent form have been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee who ensure that research projects involving human participants follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS, 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

Signature of the participant
Date

Signature of the person explaining the study
Date
October 23, 2008

Dr. Betty Ann Morgan
Administrator
Institutional Review Board
Human Subjects Protection Review Committee
118 College Drive #5147
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001

Dr. Morgan:

Matthew Ramsey has my permission to conduct questionnaire/survey research pertaining to organizational identification, concertive control, and category salience on willing participants who are faculty members in Arkansas State University's College of Education. I have notified the department chairs in the college that Mr. Ramsey has my permission and that faculty may take part in this study if they wish. We are happy to assist Mr. Ramsey in his doctoral work.

Sincerely,

John A. Beineke
Dean
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November 17, 2006

Dr. Betty Ann Morgan
Administrator
Institutional Review Board
Human Subjects Protection Review Committee
118 College Drive #5147
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001

Dr. Morgan:

Matthew Ramsey has my permission to conduct questionnaire/survey research pertaining to organizational identification, concertive control, and category salience on willing participants who are therapists and case managers at Families Incorporated in Jonesboro, AR.

Sincerely,

Mark Thurman
Chief Operating Officer of Families, Inc
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