Rhetoric as Praxis in Leading and Organizing

a Public Administration: A Journey

in Democratic Governance

Tracey J. Bennett

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Public Administration and Policy

Charles T. Goodsell, Chair

Karen M. Hult

Orion F. White, Jr.

Lawrence F. Keller

Larry D. Terry

February 27, 1998

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Rhetoric, Leading, Organizing, Democratic Governance

Rhetoric as Praxis in Leading and Organizing

a Public Administration: A Journey

in Democratic Governance

Tracey J. Bennett

(ABSTRACT)

Currently, rhetoric is considered a negative term. This dissertation uses rhetoric as a normative term serving simultaneously as both the central story line and storyteller. Rhetoric is both the object of study and the lens through which to study. A field study was conducted with the Roanoke County administration. The rhetorical patterns of administrative leaders were observed and documented in their day-to-day activities.

Rhetoric is the conceptual glue both highlighting and pulling together different layers of understanding. At the level of theory development and application, this includes building conceptual linkages between leading and organizing. In practice, public administrators know that leading and organizing occur as an integrated whole. Methodologically, a new technique to study the rhetoric of leading and organizing is introduced within the Roanoke County field study. At a normative level, the linkages discovered in the rhetorical discourse of leading and organizing reveal a greater understanding of democratic governance. The field study provides insights into leading and organizing that are also constitutive of a normative position regarding democratic governance.

DEDICATION

To Bev and Beni:

Your lifelong love and care have enabled me to make this possible.

I love you both.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PREFACE

It was very early in the morning. We were about to have a breakfast meeting with the local delegation to the state legislature. I was the vice chair of the County Mental Health Board. Most of the Board members and elected officials were present, and there was an air of excitement. We were in the midst of gathering support to request our County Commissioners to place a mental health levy on the ballot for a vote by county citizens. As a Board, we were passionately committed toward seeking additional local revenue in order to provide more quality services for those citizens experiencing mental illness in our community. The need was so vast and our resources so limited. Thus far, we had been very successful at winning support from local leaders for our effort. We were "on a roll"-- experiencing political efficacy for the very first time.

It was a charming, peaceful setting for the breakfast meeting. We had found accommodations outside of our office space because the rooms at the office were too small for large meetings. We leased space as needed in an old, turn-of-the-century renovated mansion near the downtown area. Only a small handful of our staff were present including our Executive Director who would be making our presentation to the local delegation. It was imperative that we win their support in our levy effort as they could help us plead our case to the County Commissioners.

We had only hired our Executive Director a couple of years ago and even though he worked for us, we were all devoted to him. He was a psychologist who had invested his entire career of over 35 years to public service in the state mental health system. He was wise, caring, had unquestioned expertise in his field, and had a wonderful sense of humor-- all qualities endearing him to everyone who knew him.

The Chair of the Board opened the breakfast meeting with a warm welcome and then introduced our Executive Director to make the presentation to the delegation.   He began the presentation. As was his custom, he was wearing blue jeans, tennis shoes, and casual shirt. The Executive Director had always dressed in this manner throughout his career because, as he would explain it, he always wanted to be accessible to clients. He wanted to be

1

unassuming so they would always feel comfortable approaching him. As far as we were concerned, this characteristic only added to his charm. Additionally, many members of the local delegation already knew the Executive Director from previous encounters. They were accustomed to his informal language and attire. Once again, he was making his presentation using informal language. He called upon the usual statistics and studies to make the necessary important points to the delegation. He was very passionate in making our case and occasionally would swear when he wanted to emphasize a particularly important and/or emotional issue.

As Board members, we were all accustomed to our Executive Director's demeanor. However, about one quarter of the way through the presentation, I began to look around the room at the faces of the members of the local delegation. Many of them appeared uncomfortable, even agitated as he continued the presentation. I was horrified! I immediately thought that perhaps something was wrong with the food, and they were feeling sick. Instantly, I knew that the food was all right because our Board members appeared fine, and no one was running out of the room. What was wrong? I made eye contact with our Chair, and he looked away. We were clearly in trouble. Our Executive Director completed his presentation. It was agonizing as it seemed like an endless amount of time had passed, and members of the delegation were so agitated by the end of the presentation that they were even fidgeting in their seats.

The Executive Director then opened the floor for questions and the nightmare began. Our State Representatives and Senators attacked him with angry, provocative questions. Board members were in a state of disbelief---how could this be happening to us? His responses to their questions only made matters worse; therefore, we jumped into the fray to not only rescue our Director, but also to salvage our attempt at winning them over to our levy effort. The breakfast meeting finally came to an end and the local delegation had departed. Somehow, we had managed to smooth things over with them at least to a status of civility. We knew we had a lot of work ahead of us with our local delegation.

SYMBOLIC THOUGHT AND ACTION

This is an account of an actual event that occurred in the late 1980's. We held a debriefing after members of the delegation left the building as was our custom following important meetings. We wanted to determine what had happened, and more importantly, what went so wrong. Although we handled the situation with grace and humor, we (Board members and the Executive Director) determined the obvious: the Executive Director's presentation was not persuasive for the local delegation. But why? Our administrative leader had marshaled all of his organizational forces and professional acumen to persuade the local delegation to support us and help us with our cause; unfortunately, he had accomplished the opposite effect.

We collectively determined at the time that it was our Executive Director's "approach" to the presentation that was the problem. These were elected officials, and he had offended them. In the future, he would have to wear a suit and address local leaders in our community formally (no swearing), and respectfully. We all agreed that we would learn from this experience and move forward to plead our case again.

The encounter above is illustrative of the essence of this dissertation. Essentially, rhetoric is constitutive of, and provides a lens into, leading and organizing in public agencies. Further, insights into the conceptual linkages between leading and organizing fosters a different understanding of democratic governance. Democratic governance is conceptually richer than the common notion of the public administrator self-consciously adhering to explicitly-stated and constitutionally-grounded reified lists of democratic values.

Studying language differs from rhetoric like dessert differs from a hot fudge sundae. Rhetoric is a specialized form of language and is most often defined as the art of persuasion. Rhetoric is "the use of symbols to influence thought and action." What we say and how we say it is our reality in day-to-day activities. "Rhetoric, however, persuades not simply through the deliberate, strategic choices that rhetors make as they create symbols to accomplish goals. It also persuades by creating our reality and generating our knowledge about the world" (Foss, 1989, p.4).

CHAPTER ONE

INTERCALATION

INTRODUCTION: THE JOURNEY TO THE LAND OF OZ

The term *intercalation* is used as the chapter title for teleological purposes. The common synonym for this term is "introduction." At one level, this chapter introduces the dissertation to the reader. Simultaneously at another level, intercalation has a more unfamiliar but unique definition: it explains the character and nature of rhetoric in our administrative "lived experience" as it unfolds in the chapters to follow. Rhetoric is being "inserted between or among the existing elements or layers" (Webster's, 1994, p.609) of leading, organizing, and democratic governance in order to provide a richer understanding of public service.

The rhetorical turn is a lens or perspective through which we may look at the world. Like the Land of Oz, the rhetorical lens can be both a magical and mystical expedition, and thus, may also be allegorical. The rhetorical lens is replete with secrets and symbolism. The journey on the multi-symbolic yellow brick road is complex, but most importantly, the characters and the road they take are central to the story line; in fact, the yellow brick road and the characters who travel on it and interact around it constitute the story line. The individuals in the Wizard of Oz (1939) depend on each other for support, as the yellow brick road consists of many curves and detours with subsequent subplots.

In the story of the Wizard of Oz, we find many of the elements of the dissertation-- namely, rhetoric, leading, organizing, and governance. The names of the cast of characters may read like a children's fairy tale but, like Lewis Carrol's Alice in Wonderland, there is an abundance of symbolic interpretations beneath the surface. Although they are not public servants per se, each character must organize, lead, and govern. Governing in this story means "to exert a determining or guiding influence in or over" (Webster's, 1994, p.504). Glinda, the Good Witch of the North, governs by offering hope and encouraging those she leads to believe in themselves. The Wicked Witch of the West governs through fear, intimidation, and force. The Wizard governs through illusion, and manipulates the perceptions of those he leads, his true capabilities often lacking substance. Dorothy and her

4

friends organize and lead themselves, governing through cooperation and collaboration toward a common mission--to see the Wizard. Rhetoric is the key ingredient in their stories.

In the dissertation, a field study was conducted with the Roanoke County administration. The rhetoric of administrative leaders was observed and documented in their day-to-day activities. In this sense, rhetoric is the object of study--the story line of the dissertation. The rhetoric of the study participants communicates leading, organizing, and democratic governance. Like Dorothy and her friends, study participants demonstrated will and determination, intelligence, heart, and courage in their rhetoric and their actions.

Like the characters on the yellow brick road, rhetoric serves simultaneously as <u>both the central story line and storyteller</u>. Rhetoric is the storyteller because it not only serves as the basis for the methodological approach to the field study, but also illuminates the epistemological and ontological stance for the dissertation. The storyteller for the <u>Wizard of Oz</u> consists of the rhetoric of the actors in the movie, the ten screenplay writers, and the original author of the book, L. Frank Baum (Harmetz, 1989). The administrative leaders in the field study and the researcher are the storytellers of the dissertation through a rhetorical lens. Rhetoric, as both the object of study and the lens through which to study, embodies the intercalary story line and storyteller in this dissertation. Once more, it is "between or among the existing elements or layers" throughout.

Ambiguity is a feature of the rhetorical complexion of reality. Reality is understood intersubjectively, through discourse among people. Therefore, in a fundamental sense, administrative rhetoric can be understood as the "advocacy of realities" (Brummett, 1976, p.31). Persuasiveness is a mutual endeavor among public administrators because it is dialectic-- intersubjectively produced and reproduced in day-to-day organizational life. The field study reveals the recurrence of rhetorical patterns among study participants as understood by the researcher. The emergent rhetorical patterns are our "way of knowing" in order to sharpen our understanding of the connectivity of leading, organizing, and democratic governance.

Rhetoric is the conceptual glue or intercalation, both highlighting and pulling together

different levels of understanding in the Land of Oz. Rhetoric serves a similar purpose in the dissertation, layering different levels of understanding. In the journey to see the Wizard, and in writing the dissertation, there are multiple layers to explore and reveal. At the level of theory development and application, this includes building conceptual linkages between leading and organizing. Methodologically, a new technique to study the rhetoric of leading and organizing is introduced within the county administration. At a normative level, the linkages discovered in the rhetorical discourse of leading and organizing are joined toward a greater understanding of democratic governance. Subsequent to her long-anticipated meeting with the actual Wizard, which is also allegorical to the multiple purposes of the dissertation, Dorothy arrives back home to Kansas at the end of the story. Her journey had purposiveness as an unintentional consequence--a deeper appreciation of the richness of her life. The same came be said of the purposiveness of the dissertation. The rhetorical lens brings practical and theoretical richness to the field of public administration.

SECTION ONE: "WE'RE OFF TO SEE THE WIZARD", BUT WHY?

As mentioned, there are multiple purposes and layers of the dissertation. The dissertation will develop cohesive conceptual linkages between leading and organizing in public agencies at the level of theory development. Leadership studies and organizational studies are vast areas of consideration in both theory and practice; however, conceptual linkages between the two are conspicuously deficient. As a result, organizational life cannot be adequately understood. As practitioners, leading and organizing is an integrated experience. Intuitively, public administrators know that leading and organizing do not occur simultaneously in an isolated fashion as reflected in leadership and organization theory; instead, in practice, they occur as an integrated whole. The lack of integration among leadership studies and organization studies forms an important gap in the academic literature in the field of public administration. The goal for this layer is to begin to build conceptual linkages between the two theoretical realms of leadership and organization.

At the applied level, the development of conceptual linkages between leading and organizing raises awareness of the rhetorical lens for practitioners. The relationship between

what we say and how we say it affects everything in our public organizations. The study performs a consciousness-raising function for field study participants in the Roanoke County administration. The goal for this layer will be for study participants to achieve a better understanding of the constitutive dimension of their own rhetoric as well as the rhetoric of others in leading and organizing their administration, and consequently perhaps, of democratic governance in general.

An additional layer of the dissertation introduces a new methodological technique to the field of public administration. Rhetorical criticism is borrowed from communication studies and applied to the research for this dissertation. Rhetorical criticism takes a rhetorical artifact, such as a speech, a film, or a painting, and examines and evaluates it to understand the "rhetorical processes" (Foss, 1989, p.5). One particular theory of rhetorical criticism-- rhetorical genre--was developed by Karolyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson (1978). In this study, rhetorical genre is used to ascertain the rhetorical patterns of study participants. In turn, these patterns lead to the development of conceptual linkages between leading and organizing. According to Campbell (personal correspondence, April 5, 1995), a study of rhetorical genre has not occurred in a setting where day-to-day rhetorical activity is examined within an organization.

The field study provides insights into leading and organizing that are also constitutive of a normative position regarding democratic governance, and thus an additional layer. The public administration literature is replete with a panoply of rhetorical discourse concerning the relationship between bureaucracy (including leadership) and democratic values. As a goal, the field study inductively "brings to life" the interconnectedness of the following vast areas of study: rhetoric, leading, organizing, and democratic governance. All of these require, for normative content, an element of purposiveness.

Webster's (1994, p.949) lists two definitions of purposiveness. "Being purposeful with clear intentions" is the most commonly understood definition. "Serving or effecting a useful function though not as a result of planning or design" is an additional definition, thus providing a different nuance to the term. As an unintentional byproduct, this dissertation

serves a useful function by intertwining the rhetorical lens within the study of public organizations. Exploring the potential influence of administrative rhetoric can establish important theoretical and practical insights in the field. The next section reveals the journey for the remaining chapters, beginning with a more in-depth examination of rhetoric.

SECTION TWO: THE JOURNEY IN THE LAND OF OZ

<u>Rhetoric</u>

The study of rhetoric dates back to the fifth century B.C. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle all studied rhetoric during their lives. Aristotle was the first to study rhetoric systematically and to write about it. During the Middle Ages rhetoric was used in the form of preaching, education, and letter writing. In the Renaissance, rhetoric took a back seat to logic and was viewed merely as an issue of style. The linkage between classical rhetorical theory and modern rhetorical theory was made by Francis Bacon. Modern rhetorical theory is often called the epistemological school and is characterized by relating classical notions of judicial rhetoric toward the understanding of human nature. Bacon, Descartes, Hume, and Locke, among others, are considered important contributors to the modern rhetorical period (Foss, Foss, & Trapp, 1985; Golden, Berquist, & Coleman, 1992).

The contemporary period of rhetoric roughly begins with the twentieth century. Four key themes summarize the contemporary period; "rhetoric as meaning, rhetoric as value, rhetoric as motive, and rhetoric as a way of knowing" (Golden, Berquist, & Coleman, 1992, pp.338-339). All of these themes within the contemporary period are relevant as the dissertation unfolds. Rhetoric as meaning and value become evident in the field study findings. As we discover shortly, rhetoric as motive, and as a way of knowing ground the dissertation both ontologically and epistemologically. Due to the complexity of these four themes, defining rhetoric poses problems. As would be expected, scholars either define rhetoric very broadly, or very specifically. For example, some equate the term rhetoric with all human communication. Today, rhetoric is commonly used as a derisive term referring to flowery speech without action: "empty words with no substance" (Foss, Foss, & Trapp, 1991, p.1). Rhetoric is misunderstood because it is thought to be exclusively negative.

8

Rhetoric is normative for the purposes of this dissertation because rhetoric consists of speech acts that people use everyday. Rhetoric has two specific meanings in the dissertation; it is both the substance of symbolic human action, as well as a perspective that focuses on the process of symbolism. Again, rhetoric is both the story line and storyteller.

One particular theory of rhetoric mentioned earlier, rhetorical genre, is a form of rhetorical criticism within communication studies and is applied to the field study herein. Rhetorical criticism probes and evaluates the content of rhetorical acts in order to discern the rhetorical process (Foss, 1989). The recurrence of similar forms establishes a genre. It is a group of acts unified by a constellation of forms that recur in each of its members. There are three elements of genre: 1) substantive and stylistic strategies, 2) situational requirements, and 3) an organizing principle or internal dynamic (Campbell & Jamieson, 1978).

Field study strategies involve examining the situation, content, and style of rhetoric used by leaders and others in the Roanoke County administration. Situational requirements of exigence, audience, and constraints place demands on the rhetor. Exigence is defined as the urgency of the situation being examined in the study. The audience must be constrained in decision and action in the organizational setting. The constraints influence the rhetor and can be brought to bear upon the audience (Bitzer, 1968). The organizing principle or internal dynamic of rhetorical genre in public organizations is identified as rhetoric as praxis. Rhetoric advocates a reality of intersubjective meanings that contain orientations toward action. Rhetoric as praxis is a key element in developing linkages between leading and organizing. For example, in conducting the field study I considered the following: do the day-to-day actions of staff reflect the rhetoric of their leaders? Or, conversely, does the rhetoric of staff reflect the actions of their leaders? More fundamentally, are the rhetoric and actions of staff consistent with the rhetoric and actions of their leaders? Furthermore, are researcher observations consistent with revealed communication in staff and leader interviews?

As an internal dynamic for the field study, rhetoric as praxis infers assumptions about the social world. Ontologically, "rhetoric is a mode of altering reality, not by the direct application of energy to objects, but by the creation of discourse which changes reality

9

through the mediation of thought and action" (Bitzer, 1968, pp.3-4). Rhetoric is persuasive because the audience is engaged at the level of thought and action, and often becomes a change agent. Epistemologically, rhetorical discourse refers to social knowledge. "Social knowledge comprises conceptions of symbolic relationships among problems, persons, interests, and actions" (Farrell, 1976, p.4).

Rhetoric as praxis is an integration of knowing and doing within the context of organizational life. Zhao (1991, p.261) suggests that "knowing is an activity which aims to reflect, discover, and understand reality; doing, on the other hand, is an activity which aims to affect, change, and create reality."

The boundaries between thought, action, and reality are indiscernable as evidenced in The Wizard of Oz. Similarly, persuasion and persuasiveness pose elusive boundary problems. Along with rhetoric, persuasion has been studied for thousands of years. Persuasion is a process; and in public organizations, persuasion is often an institutionalized process, continuously experienced, produced, and reproduced by organizational members. Woodward & Denton (1992, p.20) define persuasion as "the process of preparing and delivering verbal and nonverbal messages to autonomous individuals in order to alter or strengthen their attitudes, beliefs, or behaviors." The problem with grasping the notion of persuasion occurs prior to, and subsequent to, the persuasive act. Specific questions surface such as the following: Is persuasion always the result of a conscious intentional speech act? How do we know if someone has been persuasive?

Ultimately, persuasiveness is frequently a circular process. Encounters are dialectical, and are intersubjectively produced and reproduced among organizational members; thus, they are often institutionalized within the organization. In the field study, it is impossible to assign a unidirectional causal link between the rhetorical genres of leaders and encounter participants, or any persuasiveness that may ensue. Persuasiveness is a mutual endeavor. According to Campbell and Jamieson (1986, p.295), "genres are jointly constructed by rhetors and audiences." Likewise, persuasion is jointly constructed and experienced by public administrators.

10

<u>The Discontinuity Among Rhetoric, Leading, Organizing, and Democratic Governance</u>

Looking ahead, Chapter Two reviews the literature and provides a deliberate survey of four major areas. Initially, the elements of rhetorical genre are explored in more depth as Campbell and Jamieson envision it. Additionally, critiques of rhetorical genre are reviewed as well as other treatments of rhetorical genre, in order to provide a balanced perspective of the theory. Secondly, the literature review focuses on theorists who incorporate the rhetorical lens in organization theory and leadership theory. Thirdly, the literature review explores the general lack of integration between organization theory and leadership theory by highlighting the few theorists who attempt to establish interrelationships. Finally, a review of the democratic governance literature takes place with a particular emphasis on the emergent themes in the relationship between leadership and public bureaucracies, and democratic values. A more in-depth discussion summarizing the gap in the literature follows, which represents a crucial landmark in the journey.

Discussions of democratic governance have been a hallmark in the public administration literature. Many scholars argue that bureaucracy and leadership are antithetical to democratic governance in our society (see in particular Iannello, 1992; Gawthrop, 1997). Many of these dichotomous arguments have repeated themselves throughout the history of public administration, with some scholars offering prescriptions that temper the constricting, negative effects of leadership and bureaucracy in order to preserve the values of democratic governance. Others have suggested that there are adequate checks and balances built into our system of governance to dampen the excesses of either leadership and bureaucracy or democratic values. Important scholars have identified key values such as accountability, responsiveness, equity, efficiency, effectiveness, and the public good which are often grounded in the founding period of the country, specifically in the Constitution. Through this line of thinking, public administrators incorporate democratic values in carrying out the policy mandates of the people, chosen through their elected representatives. Democratic values are absolutely critical to public administration and continued deliberation must occur.

However, in order for public servants to authentically enact democratic values as they

lead and organize, other, more important foundational issues emerge for careful examination. Townley (1995) raises the concept of self-knowledge as self-formation. "Self-knowing is the process of giving meaning to the relations between oneself and the context in which one is evolving. Self-formation is based on acting. It emphasizes the inclusive relation between knowing and acting" (p.284). White carries the concept of self-knowledge as self-formation further by suggesting that in public administration, action is collective, requiring us to "contact our fellow human beings" in authentic human relationships (1994, p.17; McSwite, 1996). The concept of self-knowledge as self-formation joined with authentic human relationships creates a sensitivity that is both "self-regarding and other-regarding" (Tomm, 1992, p.103). Clearly, most of the leadership and organization theory literature is devoid of these concepts beyond a cosmetic level. More importantly, self-knowledge as self-formation and the concept of authentic human relationships not only do not appear in the literature to connect leading to organizing, but also do not connect these concepts to democratic governance in public administration. Wamsley (1996, p.369) offers a normative position that most closely approximates the linkage between leading, organizing, and democratic governance:

> *Governing, in other words, may be the ability of political elites to create circumstances that evoke the kinds of relations among citizens that allow us to maintain a collective coherence, establish our identities individually and collectively, and generally foster conditions that ultimately permit us to discover ourselves and the meaning of our lives. Good governance by this definition is about evocation of human potential more than steering a course. Good governance should also enable us to occasionally transcend, renew, or recreate ourselves individually and collectively in ways that maintain democracy while fostering human development and fulfillment.*

In the Land of Oz, Dorothy and her traveling companions understood and appreciated the foundational issue of self-knowledge as self-formation, and the bearing that concept had to authentic human relationships during their journey. Disconnected from all of the discussions in the subsection above is the constitutive nature of rhetoric and the lens it provides in joining

12

administrative leadership, organization, and democratic governance.

The Map of the Remaining Journey

Chapter Three discusses the research design. As interpretive work, the research includes the voices and perspectives of those being studied in the Roanoke County administration. The research design includes observing and interpreting the day-to-day rhetoric of study participants. The field study includes formal interviews with six administrative leaders, "shadowing" and observing these leaders, interviewing and observing staff, examining relevant documents, and reporting the findings to the participants involved in the study. Analytical tools were developed to maximize the rich texture of the data collected during the field study and are included in Appendix B.

Chapter Four reports the findings from the field study. Both observation data and interview data are analyzed to reveal rhetorical patterns discovered in the Roanoke County administration. To reiterate, these rhetorical patterns are "between and among the existing elements or layers" of organizational life in Roanoke County and serve as "connectors" between the concepts of leading, organizing, and democratic governance.

Finally, Chapter Five integrates the connections developed in the previous chapter. Conclusions are drawn concerning rhetoric, leading, organizing, and democratic governance. Field study findings were presented to the study participants in order to share our learning experiences. The post-study procedures and findings are reported in order to explore the applied level of understanding, which is one of the significant layers of the dissertation. The dissertation concludes with a heuristic discussion of the implications for further study.

CHAPTER TWO

RETROSPECTION

INTRODUCTION TO THE SETTING: REVIEWING THE LANDSCAPE OF OZ

During their multi-faceted journey, Dorothy and her friends eventually became acquainted with the singular people, fantastic settings, and bizarre creatures of Oz. In the course of their travels, the main characters of the story processed an enormous amount of information related to their setting and the landscape around them, which included the Poppy Field and the Emerald City. Similarly, the academic literature is the setting for the dissertation because it provides the backdrop that illuminates the landscape ahead. Equally stimulating were the people and creatures they met--the Munchkins of Munchkinland, the Talking Apple Trees, and the grotesque Winged Monkeys (Harmetz, 1989). Reviewing the literature is retrospective because it is a deliberate survey of the past literature in order to understand the present journey. In particular, the discontinuity in the literature among rhetoric, leading, organizing, and democratic governance is elaborated.

As mentioned previously in Chapter One, four major areas are surveyed below in the academic literature. The elements of rhetorical genre are examined in more depth including critiques of rhetorical genre as well as other treatments. The literature review then focuses on scholars who incorporate the rhetorical lens in organization theory and leadership theory. The third section contemplates the level of integration between organization theory and leadership theory by profiling several theorists who attempt to establish interrelationships. Finally, a review of the democratic governance literature takes place with a particular emphasis on the emergent themes in the relationship between leadership and public bureaucracies, and democratic values. Concluding remarks summarize both the contributions of, and gaps in, the literature, as well as the potential role of rhetoric in bridging those gaps.

SECTION ONE: RHETORICAL GENRE

Various aspects of rhetorical genre are examined beginning with a more in-depth understanding of rhetorical genre as Campbell and Jamieson created it. Additionally, a general overview of generic criticism takes place in order to understand the communication studies'

context in which rhetorical genre was authored. Rhetorical genre has been criticized by several scholars and is summarized in order to provide a balanced perspective. Finally, other treatments of rhetorical genre are reviewed as well as related issues. For example, several scholars explore the public aspects of genre, while others examine the action component of rhetorical genre.

Campbell and Jamieson (1978) believe that similarities in form, present in all discourse, constitute a genre. These forms or elements are strategies, substantive and stylistic, in response to situational demands. In other words, a genre is the recurrence of similar forms that are "groups of discourses which share substantive, stylistic, and situational characteristics" (p.20). If isolated, these forms may be visible in other discourses. However, speech acts in a genre recur together in a constellation. Within a constellation, visible forms are brought together by an internal dynamic. In essence, "a genre is given its character by a fusion of forms not by its individual elements" (p. 21). As the constellation metaphors suggests, individual variations occur but "are influenced by each other and by external elements; consequently they move together and remain in a similar relation to each other despite their varying positions over time" (p. 25).

Rhetorical genre is more then a mere classification system. The internal dynamic within a genre draws together the relationships among the elements. The constellation is a unique system within a genre that implies options within boundaries. The "rules" in a genre "are not rigid prescriptions, but parameters within which effective symbolic action occurs" (Campbell & Jamieson, 1986, p.296). These parameters structure and create meaning in a given social reality and reveal the "beliefs, attitudes, and values" inherent in that reality (Foss, 1989, p.112).

Jamieson (1973) maintains that people participating within a particular genre respond to their perceptions of both their audience and the situational demands. Situational requirements may alter or even transform a particular genre, but previous traditions within that genre are often present as well. Genres are not static but tend to evolve over time, sometimes leading to entirely new genres. "Establishment and maintenance of definable

institutional forms of rhetoric serve to define the institution itself" (p.165). Institutional identity and continuity are preserved as those who represent the institution standardize the rhetorical forms within the genre. Audiences in relationship with the institution and its speakers perpetuate the genre through their ongoing expectations over time. The generic forms become a frame of reference for both the institutional members and their audiences.

The situational requirements of rhetorical genre are essential. The situation is so crucial to rhetorical activity that it forms its very foundation. Lloyd Bitzer (1968, p.5) characterizes the importance of the situation as follows:

> Let us regard rhetorical situation as a natural context of persons, events, objects, relations, and an exigence which strongly invites utterance; this invited utterance participates naturally in the situation, is in many instances necessary to the completion of situational activity, and by means of its participation with situation obtains its meaning and its rhetorical character.

In essence, rhetoric is only significant in its situational context. As mentioned earlier, there are three elements of a rhetorical situation: the "exigence" or the urgency of the situation, "the audience to be constrained in decision and action or those persons capable of being influenced, and the constraints which influence the rhetor and can be brought to bear upon the audience" such as values, attitudes, and customs (Bitzer, 1968, p.6,8). As a final point, Bitzer indicates that rhetorical situations usually "mature or decay or mature and persist". For example, there are various rhetorical stages of a political campaign that eventually decay and are no longer necessary. Another example are the inaugural speeches of Presidents as a recurring situation throughout the history of our country that has established a genre of its own. Rhetorical genre is theoretically rich in its own right, leading scholars to apply the theory to rhetorical practice.

The most common application is a method known as rhetorical criticism. Generic criticism is a type of rhetorical criticism. Generic criticism analyzes rhetoric over time across recurring situations in order to understand similarities and patterns. These patterns may then be grouped or categorized into a classification. The elements or features of the genre are not

only enacted by the rhetor(s), but are also interdependent as features (Foss, 1989). Campbell and Jamieson (1986) explain that generic criticism always emerges from analyzing rhetorical practice. They emphasize that: "inevitably, the critic argues that the patterns of or the rules inherent in a rhetorical act or body of rhetorical action reflect and account for that act or body of action as fully as possible" (p. 294). Through the identification of the internal dynamic as the umbrella element joining the substantive, stylistic, and situational requirements, the critic is able to highlight the significance of the patterns that recur over time (Campbell & Jamieson, 1978). Chapter Three will provide a more in-depth understanding of generic criticism as it is applied to the field study of the Roanoke County administration.

There are various critics of the concept of rhetorical genre. Bormann (1978) believes that some generic criticism attempts to mimic the laws and generalizations of the natural sciences, wanting to make claims of predictability and control. He does not believe that this is necessarily an appropriate approach to the human condition. Bormann justifies his position by comparing generic criticism to the study of history. For instance, does the genre (or history) exist only in the mind of the critic, in the discourse itself, or in the audience? Bormann does believe that generic criticism can provide important structural insights and lead to greater understanding. Campbell and Jamieson make no claim that their approach leads to predictability or control. The critic uncovers and/or describes the rhetorical processes taking place. Thus, rhetorical criticism is in the eye of the beholder, underscoring the human condition.

Thomas Conley (1979) is an outspoken critic of rhetorical genre. He believes that rhetorical genre limits, reduces, and distorts because of its use of classification. Conley's (1986, p.59) main point "is that it decontextualizes as it classifies, deflecting attention away from the particular actuality of work over to the class or category of which it is said to be a member." Conley substantiates his argument by comparing the weaknesses of rhetorical genre to the weaknesses of Carl Linnaeus' artificial system of classification in biology, which predated the phylogenetic system by about 200 years. Like Linnaeus' system, which placed dissimilar, unrelated plants in common groups, Conley contends that rhetorical genre is often

inaccurate or misleading, overemphasizing the classification system rather than focusing upon the actual rhetoric. Rhetorical criticism is not intended to be an objective or factual in nature. It is necessarily subjective, and more to the point, intersubjective in nature.

Harrell and Linkugel (1978) believe that generic criticism is too loosely defined for continued development. They believe that the organizing principle or internal dynamic identified by Campbell and Jamieson is the central feature of rhetorical genre. However, Harrell and Linkugel do not view the internal dynamic as resulting from a dynamic relationship between the situation and the substantive and stylistic strategies. Rather, they believe that the internal dynamic is a mode of thinking yielding principles of classification unrelated to situation. A "root term" within the internal dynamic, "represents an idea [and] serves a canopy-like function" (p.264). They suggest four root terms are derived from the internal dynamic: 1) "de facto classification is a common-sense perception, 2) structural classification uses characteristic patterns of language, 3) motivational classification is the motive state of the rhetor, and 4) archetypal classification is based upon persuasive images deeply imbedded in the audience's psyche" (p.264).

In addition to the root terms of organizing principles, Harrell and Linkugel (p.266) envision two types of "systematic schema" in classifying rhetorical genres. "Immanent classification" is "direct, face-value observation" relying on "common-sense perception" (p.266). "Transcendent classification" relies on "normative participation analytically derived from observation" (p.266). The four root terms of organizing principles outlined above are placed on a continuum by Harrell and Linkugel between the "Immanence" and "Transcendence" classification schema.

Harrell and Linkugel offer a a more deliberate definition and approach to generic criticism than orginally presented by Campbell and Jamieson. Like Harrell and Linkugel, the internal dynamic is a central feature of this dissertation. However, they believe that the internal dynamic is unrelated to the situation, and substantive and stylistic strategies. The internal dynamic revealed in the field study herein only becomes apparent as a result of the dynamics that take place between the situation, and the substantive and stylistic strategies.

18

Additional study would need to take place to determine if the internal dynamic present in the Roanoke County field study transcends in relevance for other public administrations.

Hart (1990) develops new, interesting insights into rhetorical genre. Rhetorical genres serve important functions. Genres are "preservative" as they both conserve and extend social patterns (p.190). Rhetorical genres also suggest "possibilities" by providing rhetors with a multitude of established genres from which to borrow and use in a given situation (p.191). Genres also "facilitate listening" as recurring rhetorical patterns create expectations in audiences (p.192). Hart (pp.192-193) concludes that there are many reasons to use generic criticism: "generic study exposes cultural tastes, generic study explains rhetorical power, generic study indexes social change, generic study reveals psychological style, generic study uncovers latent trends, and generic study provides evaluative standards." Hart speaks to the institutionalization of rhetorical patterns that occurs in the dissertation field study. As we shall see, these rhetorical patterns are continuously produced and reproduced in Roanoke County.

"The public" is a useful dimension of rhetorical genre worthy of exploration for the purposes of this dissertation. "Public proceedings" are considered a distinct rhetorical genre by Halloran (1978, p.119). The public is the audience and its members make themselves accessible to the public proceeding. The proceeding not only addresses the business at hand, but also has a direct influence on its audience. This distinguishes a public proceeding from a private proceeding. Halloran contends that there are two important aspects of public proceedings that form a tension. Community issues are deliberated using "procedures rooted in tradition and law," and the identity of the community is celebrated in "a ritual of communion" (p.124).

Bitzer (1978) believes that the public is an interdependent community of people who share certain values, interests, and institutions. Public representatives share their public knowledge and act through rhetorical discourse and are authorized by the public to do so. Competent public representation means that representatives are informed about what the public knows. Incorporating John Dewey's conception of the public, Bitzer concludes that

"the great task of rhetorical theory and criticism, then, is to uncover and make available the public knowledge needed in our time and to give body and voice to the universal public" (p.92).

Both Halloran and Bitzer provide interesting insights into the notion of "publicness" that enrich the context of the field study. However, the concept of "publicness" is not a specific focus of the dissertation. Their insights offer considerations regarding democratic governance by distinguishing public from private proceedings. These considerations highlight the normative dimension of the dissertation.

McGee and Martin (1983) disagree with Bitzer's notions of public and public knowledge and the role of discourse. They believe that conceptions of the public are rooted in ideology rather than philosophy, as Bitzer purports. They further suggest that the public is best understood in terms of "power and will," and not in "reason and knowledge" (p.48). Political praxis is the pervue of an intellectual elite linked with notions that "the people" use a historically-based ideology rather than a theory linking rhetoric with society. McGee and Martin view this as the perpetuation of "romantic rationalism"(p.65). They believe that experts in the public sector are merely people expressing an opinion in a persuasive manner, and that the role of rhetorical analysis ought to explore the limits of expert opinion. Unfortunately, McGee and Martin reduce administrative rhetoric to devious manipulation by public servants. The stance taken in the dissertation is a broader and more expansive notion of rhetorical processes.

Carolyn Miller (1984) provides insights into the action dimension, yet another noteworthy component in a discussion of rhetorical genre. Miller supports Campbell and Jamieson's conception of genre and elaborates it further by stating that "a rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centered not on the substance or the form of discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish" (p.151). Miller touches on the very heart of the internal dynamic revealed in the field study--rhetoric as praxis. She believes that the "recurrent situation" within a genre "represents typified rhetorical action" (p.151). Because a genre is action-based, Miller contends that meaning is derived from the situation and its social context.

Miller (1984, p.157) elaborates:

> It is through the process of typification that we create recurrence, analogies,
> similarities. What recurs is not a material situation (a real, objective, factual event)
> but our construal of a type. The typified situation, including typifications of
> participants, underlies typification in rhetoric. Successful communication would
> require that the participants share common types; this is possible insofar as types
> are socially created.

Thus far a survey of rhetorical genre has occurred by exploring both Campbell and Jamieson's vision of rhetorical genre and generic criticism, as well as other scholars' varying perspectives and critiques of it. The next section examines the organization theory and leadership theory literature for instances in which scholars use a rhetorical lens in articulating their theories. To conclude this section, it is essential to point out that classical rhetorical theory was found to be a necessary ingredient in the field of public administration for both practice and education by Green and Zinke (1993). They assert the position that a "basic understanding of rhetoric and its application reveals some distinctive, legitimating aspects of the profession in practice and theory. It enables one to apprehend important differences among types of knowledge, decision making, and responsibility…" (p.317). They conclude that practitioners and educators alike neglect the rhetorical aspects of public administration.

SECTION TWO: THE RHETORICAL LENS IN ORGANIZATION THEORY
AND LEADERSHIP THEORY

<u>Organizing</u>

The concept of organization is defined in endless ways; however, from the perspective of this dissertation, organization is defined as objectified, habituated collective action (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Organization is a convenience born from a human state of mind. Human beings intersubjectively create organization and perpetuate it. The term *organizing* is frequently used in the dissertation because it is a verb denoting collective action. Organizing is created, understood, and practiced rhetorically by people. Although some organization theorists mention language in their theories, very few specifically recognize rhetoric. Others,

such as Karl Weick, explore rhetorically-related topics such as argumentation, expectation, commitment, and manipulation.

In his recent hallmark book Sensemaking in Organizations (1995), Weick explores the depths of sensemaking in organizational life. He suggests that organizational members have "belief-driven processes" (p.133). These sensemaking processes include "arguing" (p.135) and "expecting" (p.145). Weick suggests that controversy is commonplace in organizational sensemaking. In fact, arguing is one of the "vehicles" for sensemaking (p.137). Expectations on the other hand usually have a stronger hold than arguments. "Events that conform to the expectancy and confirm it make sense. Cues that do not fit stand out. Explanations constructed to explain these discrepancies are what the situation means" (p.148).

Weick also elaborates on "action-driven processes" (p.155). Beliefs and actions are deeply interrelated to each other. Action processes include "commitment" and "manipulation" according to Weick (p.156). Commitment involves explanation and deliberation as sensemaking about a singular event. Manipulation focuses on change involving multiple events. Weick associates commitment with "cunning" and manipulation with "boldness" (p.156). Both begin with action in which beliefs are altered in the sensemaking process.

The remaining articles summarized below can be found in the relatively new journal Organization that was introduced in 1994. Two sets of organization theory scholars use a rhetorical lens to focus on specific areas of the literature. Alfred Kieser (1997) examines management "fashions," specifically, design fashions such as restructuring. He maintains that authors, publishers, consultants, and business school professors all contribute to the rise and distribution of various design fashions in management. The most successful design fashions, sold in the management best sellers of the popular literature, uses a particular rhetoric, effectively spreading its message far and wide in business circles.

Fineman and Gabriel (1994) examine the rhetoric of organizational behavior textbooks. Traditional organization behavior texts give the reader an image of an ordered and predictable world in organizational life. The authors contend that there is a paradigmatic gap between traditional texts and new ways of thinking about organizational life. They found that

traditional texts have titles that are bland with most pages not having any uninterrupted text (e.g. graphs, bullet points, matrices, etc.), and use three categories of content: definitions, case studies, and lists. Alternative texts are more informal and conversational, containing unique, unpredictable elements. Authors of the alternative texts assume that the reader is already experienced in organizational life while authors of traditional texts simply offer readers advice from experts. Fineman and Gabriel analyzed the rhetorical patterns of both traditional and alternative texts in order to highlight their perception of the paradigmatic gap.

A rhetorical analysis is conducted by Peter Hamilton (1997) on the subject of management and union negotiations over local wages. He uses the ancient writings of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian as his rhetorical framework. There are five canons of rhetoric emanating from the classical period: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Hamilton finds that two of the canons, invention and style, are prevalent during the collective bargaining negotiations for wages. Invention is the "proofs and the means of persuasion" while style is the deployment of expressive "word schemes" (p.235). Hamilton concludes that rhetorical analysis is useful because rhetoric is "anti-foundational" as it "highlights uncertainty and indeterminancy" (p.249). Aristotle's classical rhetorical framework uses rational appeals, normative appeals, and emotional appeals.

While all of the above scholars provide absorbing insights for the organization theory literature using a rhetorical lens, none offer a compelling integration of rhetoric and organization theory. Rhetoric is a "newcomer" to the organization theory literature while the leadership theory literature contains many more instances of the rhetorical lens that will be explored below.

Leading

Consistent with organizing, *leading*, "like other social phenomena, is socially constructed through interaction, emerging as a result of the constructions and actions of both leaders and led" (Smircich & Morgan, 1982, p.258). Several themes are apparent in reviewing the leadership literature that uses a rhetorical lens. The most highly developed theme within the literature is presidential rhetoric. In their studies of the U.S. presidency,

both Tulis (1987) and Hart (1987) emphasize the relationship between leadership and rhetoric. Roderick Hart (p.46), for example, provide a valuable insight into presidential leadership:

> The primary convention established seems to be this: a given act of speaking may not constitute an act of leading, but no act of leading can be accomplished without an act of speaking…It is to say that rhetoric may now be the primary means of *performing the act* of presidential leadership.

Windt (1986, p.104), a communication scholar, identifies categories of the presidential rhetoric literature: "criticism of single speeches, criticism of rhetorical movements, developments of genres of presidential speeches, and miscellaneous articles" on related topics. After defining this specific arena of study, Windt concludes with suggestions for furthering the research agenda of presidential rhetoric. Other scholars, such as Carl Friedrich (1961) and Shamir, Arthur, and House (1994), study the importance of rhetoric for charismatic leaders in general, not limited to presidents alone.

Public administration scholars have also made important contributions to the leadership theory literature using a rhetorical lens. Specifically, Doig and Hargrove (1987) and Norma Riccucci (1995) focus on exemplary administrative leaders in the field. The primary theme of Doig and Hargrove's edited work is that public leaders are "entrepreneurs" (p.xi). The biographies are divided into two leadership strategies, those that use rhetoric and symbols, and those that use coalition-building skills. Five administrative leaders are considered rhetorical leaders by Doig and Hargrove. A great deal of attention is devoted to myths and symbols created by these administrative leaders. However, little is said about their rhetoric other than acknowledgment that rhetoric is used by the leaders. One of the editors of the book, Erwin Hargrove, authors the first biography of a rhetorical leader, David Lilienthal of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Ironically, he concludes the Lilienthal biography with the following statement concerning the weaknesses of a rhetorical administrative leader: "The weakness is a danger of confusing rhetoric and myths with reality" (p.58)

Norma Riccucci also features exemplary public administrators and introduces them as "execucrats" (1995, p.xi). The primary focus of her work is the "effectiveness" of

administrative leaders. Although Riccucci does not mention rhetoric specifically, she does find that related factors are critical to the success of exemplary leaders. For example, she believes that effective management and leadership include the capacity to communicate well, the mastery of political insight, adaptation to situational factors, interpersonal skills, strategic prowess, as well as personal attributes. Riccucci found all of these factors among the successful execucrats that she profiles. Interestingly, many of these common factors require speech acts, and arguably, would require impressive rhetorical skill.

Two scholars provide insightful overviews of the leadership theory literature. Louis Pondy (1978, p.87) suggests that leadership is a type of "social influence" and that conceptions of leadership are too closely related in the literature. He proposes more variety and creativity for leadership theories. Specifically, Pondy contends that the language of leaders has been neglected in the study of leadership. Drawing on Wittgenstein's notion of "language games," Pondy exhorts his readers to examine not only the meaning of individual words, but also the function of words in general in studying leadership. He concludes by pointing out the significance of leadership as a language game:

> First, it suggests that we begin to think of leadership, like language, as a collection of games with *some* similarities, but no single characteristic common to all of them. Second, it begins to map out the philosophical underpinnings of the role of language and meaning in leadership and behavior. (Pondy, 1978, p.97)

Lee Thayer (1988), a communication studies scholar, also reviews the leadership literature. He begins by pointing out that communication scholars have devoted little attention to leadership and, likewise, leadership scholars have devoted little attention to communication. Thayer (p.238) contends that we should <u>not</u> assume that "the characteristics of a leadership situation are separable from that situation, *nor* that the characteristics of leaders and followers are separable from those persons in that place and at that time." Fundamentally, he believes that any social experience is about people and those elements that make them human such as their feelings, attitudes, hopes, fears, etc. It is the relationships "between and among" people that are most important (p.238). Leadership and followership

are social and as such are "things of the mind" that "must necessarily be created and maintained in communication" (pp.256-257). Thayer believes that leadership is "social poiesis: of social governance and/or redirection" (p.259). Central to any understanding of leadership is "alternity" or "to alter others' customary ways of recreating the world, to enable them to make of the world something other than it seems to be" (p.259). For Thayer, leadership is concerned with social governance and creating meaning.

In summary, this section has explored the various means the rhetorical lens has been used by scholars in both the organization theory literature and the leadership theory literature. Fascinating perspectives have been revealed and insights developed by these writers concerning the potential for the rhetorical lens in both areas of study. Little, if any scholarship has fully engaged the enormous potential that the rhetorical lens could bring to leadership and organization theory. The next section explores several scholars who have attempted to integrate leadership theory and organization theory in their work. These scholars built the roadbed that forms the very foundation of the prodigious yellow brick road ahead.

SECTION THREE: THE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
ORGANIZATION THEORY AND LEADERSHIP THEORY

The scholars which follow are not necessarily readily identified for their contribution toward integrating organization theory and leadership theory. They are distinguished in their own right and in their own fields. Mary Parker Follett and Chester Barnard were primarily recognized in business administration, Philip Selznick in sociology, and Hult and Walcott in political science. All have contributed significantly to public administration. These scholars most closely represent the interrelationship between leading and organizing, and all embed their work within some facet of democratic governance.

Mary Parker Follett

Although Follett is most often recognized for her contributions to business administration and public administration, her work addressed many issues of the social experience of her time including neighborhood organizations, social work, psychology, pragmatism, nursing, and the League of Nations. Many of Follett's conceptions of

26

organization and leadership overlap and are woven together with common themes. Follett articulates her theory of organization in the context of the industrial organization but believes her theory applies beyond business to all organizations.

For Follett (Fox & Urwick, 1973), organizing is the coordination of experience toward a common purpose. Brian Fry (1989, p.110) describes Follett's notion of coordination: "coordination is the reciprocal relating of all factors in the situation and results in the integrative unity of the organization." The "law of the situation" is crucial to Follett's thinking about organizing. "It means being sensitive to the interweaving reciprocal responses and evolving changes that constitute the situation" (Fox & Urwick, 1973, p.xxvi). In Follett's very last lecture, she summarized the basic tenets of organization (Fox & Urwick, p.xxvii):

1. Co-ordination as the reciprocal relating of all the factors in a situation.
2. Co-ordination by direct contact of the responsible people concerned.
3. Co-ordination in the early stages.
4. Co-ordination as a continuing process.

Follett's theory of leadership is quite extensive in her writings. The idea of followership is considered to be a recent addition to the leadership theory literature. Follett was writing about leadership/followership relations at the turn of this century. Follett (Fox & Urwick, pp.212-213) summarizes her position best:

[W]e now think of the leader as also being influenced by his group. [T]his reciprocal relation [is] the main characteristic of leadership. I think it is one of the best examples of what I have elsewhere called circular response. The currents go both ways. The channels should be kept open for this continuous flow to go on all the time. That is, we should think not only of what the leader does to the group, but also of what the group does to the leader.

For Follett, the challenge of leadership is relating and organizing experience within the organization. An effective leader uses "power-with" to animate and foster cooperation and collaboration toward a well-understood common purpose. "Power-with [is] a jointly developed power, a co-active, not a coercive power" (Fox & Urwick, p.72). Purpose is not

27

determined by the leader alone. It evolves and emerges as a process of sharing experiences within the organization. "Whoever connects me with the hidden springs of all life, whoever increases the sense of life in me, he is my leader" (Fox & Urwick, p.259).

Follett very deliberately connects her principles of leadership with her principles of organization. Four terms summarize this connection: "evoking, interacting, integrating, and emerging" (Fox & Urwick, p.232). In evoking, it is the leader's duty to elicit and maximize the full potential of each individual working with that leader. She views the role of the leader as an educator. For interacting and integrating, Follett focuses on the importance of human relationships in building unity for a common purpose. The role of the leader is to integrate the experiences of organizational members toward group cohesiveness and common purpose. Emerging is ongoing change always evolving and creating new values, where "one situation [is] melting into another" (Fox & Urwick, p.233). The leader understands this evolution and masters the creative moment within the process of ongoing change. For Follett, leading and organizing is all about energy: releasing it, organizing it and moving it toward greater purposes.

Many of Follett's beliefs about leading and organizing transcend to her views concerning democratic governance. Full participation is required of the citizenry as neighborhood organizations should be the basis for the federal structure. She contended that government should be close to the people and local with community as its fundamental premise toward unity. According to Follett (1965), a successful democracy entails the highest degree of individual responsibility to citizens and the "opportunity they are given to exercise that responsibility" (p.342). Follett clearly held a very positive and optimistic view of leading, organizing, and democratic governance.

Chester I. Barnard

Chester Barnard spent almost forty years working for the AT&T (Bell) system and eventually became president of New Jersey Bell in 1928. Toward the end of his career as a practitioner he wrote his most famous book, The Functions of the Executive (1968). Less widely known are a collection of his papers and lectures published in a book entitled

Organization and Management which was published in 1949, well after the first printing of The Functions of the Executive in 1938. Here Barnard is able to be reflective in Organization and Management about his past career as an executive and his previous writings.

Barnard (1968, p.72) defines an organization as "a system of consciously coordinated personal activities or forces" and attempts to integrate the individual within his concept of organization. In Organization and Management Barnard presents an outline of his theory of formal organization that he used in writing The Functions of the Executive. The structural components of his organization theory include "The Individual, The Cooperative System, The Formal Organization, The Complex Formal Organization, and the Informal Organization" (1949, p.132). The dynamic components of his theory include "Free Will, Cooperation, Communication, Authority, The Decisive Process, Dynamic Equilibrium, and Responsibility" (1949, p.133). Incentives or inducements play a key role in Barnard's (1968) conception of a cooperative organizational system that includes persuasion as one of its elements.

Barnard (1968, p.217) outlines the functions of the executive: "to provide the system of communication, to promote the securing of essential efforts (this hinges on cooperative relationships), and to formulate and define purpose." Leadership is more than cognitive or situational for Barnard. It involves qualities such as "feeling, judgment, sense, proportion, balance, and appropriateness" (1968, p.235). In terms of the whole system, the leader will only attain the purposes of the organization through "effectiveness and the efficiency of action" (1968, p.236). Barnard devotes an entire chapter to the responsibility of a leader. A leader must have a personal moral code for himself and create and inculcate an organizational moral code throughout the organization (Fry, 1989).

Perhaps one of Barnard's most insightful reflections concerns the interrelationship between leading and organizing (1949, p.111), no doubt a result of his forty-year career with the Bell system:

> When I began the preparation of a series of Lowell Institute Lectures on the functions of executives, it was my intention merely to give an orderly description of what executives do and how they work. I soon found, however, that I could do this

only in terms relating to the structure and dynamic characteristics of organizations.

Barnard was a great advocate of democratic institutions and government. However, he was extremely concerned about the excesses of government and "its blind worship of hopes and ideals" (1949, p.25). Survival of a democratic organization involves external relationships and internal efficiency according to Barnard. He believed that there are four major problems or tensions in democratic governance: "(1) the opposition between partial consent and complete conformance, (2) the discrepancy between abstract decision and concrete action, (3) time-lags, and (4) political conflict" (1949, p.31). Barnard contended that the ultimate role of a leader in democratic organizations is to solve these problems. Leaders are crucial to the survival of a democratic system. "But in democracies a veritable aristocracy of leadership is required" (Barnard, 1949, p.50).

Philip Selznick

Philip Selznick (1992, p.114) defines formal organization as "the structural expression of rational action." It is a system that has needs and mechanisms for survival. Organizational needs include attention to threats from the environment, stable "lines of authority and communication," stable "informal relations within the organization," consistent policy and decision-making, and a coherent vision and mission. As institutions, organizations contain an action system and a formal system that are in tension with each other which can cause irrational problems within. "Organizations become institutions as they are *infused with value*" (1957, p.40). Selznick's exposition concerning informal patterns was a very important insight in organizational analysis. The informal patterns become institutionalized structural deviations and "arise spontaneously, based on personal relationships, and are usually directed to the control of some specific situation" (1992, p.116) Selznick also believed that social structures involved in social action use adaptive mechanisms to cope with change in a cooperative system either from within the organization or from its environment. Co-optation, another major contribution by Selznick, is one example of an adaptive mechanism. Co-optation is an expression of social power from the community as "an adaptive response of a cooperative system to a stable need, generating transformations which reflect constraints enforced by the

recalcitrant tools of action" (p.122). As a result, there is not only a change by the leadership, but also for the entire organization in order to maintain its stability or survival.

According to Selznick, an institutional leader "*is primarily an expert in the promotion and protection of values*" (1957, p.28). He distinguishes between an institutional leader and an "interpersonal leader" (p.27). The interpersonal leader "is more concerned with persons than with policies" (p.27). As an organization becomes "infused with value" it is institutionalized. "As this occurs, *organization management* becomes *institutional leadership*" (1957, p.138) According to Selznick (1957, pp.62-63) an institutional leader must enact "1) *the definition of institutional mission and role*, 2) *the institutional embodiment of purpose*, 3) *the defense of institutional integrity*, and 4) *the ordering of internal conflict*" while attending to the power relationships inherent in their implementation.

Like Barnard, Selznick views the interrelationship between leading and organizing by understanding large-scale organizations in order to define institutional leadership. A lack of leadership for an organization means a lack of character for that organization, although the organization may still function. Organization character consists of a "historical product, an integrated product, [and] is functional, and is dynamic" (pp.38-39). A leader reconciles the internal system of an organization with its environment by attending to the adaptive mechanisms that leads to changes in the organization's character.

Selznick is devoted in part to public organizations as institutions. A responsible leader must have "self-knowledge" in terms of their own strengths and weaknesses as well as those of the instititution. Institutional leadership is "a self-summoning process, yielding the will to know and the will to act in accordance with the requirements of institutional survival and fulfillment" (1957, p.143). In 1992, Selznick authored The Moral Commonwealth: Social Theory and the Promise of Community, where he outlines in great detail the familiar dichotomous arguments concerning bureaucracy and leadership vs. democratic governance. He acknowledges the positive and negative dimensions of bureaucracy. The positive dimensions include "fidelity to assigned responsibilities, accountability, consultation, and the mitigation of arbitrariness" (1992, p.280). For Selznick (1992, pp.290-291), governance

inherently involves institutional morality and community:

> …to govern is to accept responsibility for *the whole life* of the
> institution…Governance takes account of all the interests that affect the viability,
> competence, and moral character of an enterprise…A vital aspect of governance is
> that it *has the care* of a community or quasi-community…In government,…leaders (or
> systems) have a basic commitment to the participants *as persons* and to groups as
> vehicles of legitimate interests.

Karen M. Hult and Charles Walcott

Hult and Walcott (1990) take a different stance from the previous scholars. They
ground their work in democratic governance by outlining the politics, structures, and design
possibilities involved in governing organizations. Collective action is always political as it
intersects with decision making, forming structures and patterns along the way. In the
process, Hult and Walcott discuss both leading and organizing as their framework unfolds for
public organizations.

Hult and Walcott view public organizations as political systems, or polities, that "have
to do with making choices, allocating benefits and burdens, generating commitment and
legitimacy, and coping with conflict, complexity, and uncertainty" (p.5). Their book is
concerned with "organization policy" that carefully provides guidance for the design of
organizations (p.5). They contend that an appropriate organizational design will help enable a
public organization to follow its mission relatively unfettered toward achieving positive
outcomes. Although Hult and Walcott would not characterize their framework as
organization theory per se, they provide us with an insightful "atlas" for organizational policy.

Specifically, Hult and Walcott develop a "governance model" resulting in "governance
structures" that outline "decision making routines"; and "governance networks" that link these
structures "within and across organizations" (pp. 9; 11). They identify seven ideal type
governance structures that are "types of *structure*, not kinds of organization" (p.41). Hult and
Walcott (p.36) view structures more broadly than merely as means of control:

> *Governance structures* emerge as people in organizations strive to develop patterned

ways in which to discover and articulate goals, select among means, cope with

uncertainty and controversy generated both within and outside of the organization,

and foster legitimacy and commitment inside and outside of the organization.

Governance networks provide linkages between governance structures among all relevant

stakeholders. They outline the means of linkage in seven types of governance networks.

Hult and Walcott view the relationship between leading and organizing differently than

the previous scholars who contended that leadership could only be understood by examining

organizations. Hult and Walcott believe that leadership is an effect, or is defined in part by a

particular governance structure. The definitions of leadership below are tied to their seven

governance structures:

1) Hierarchical: occupancy of superordinate position

2) Adjudicative: ability to shape arguments, marshal evidence, persuade judge,

establish burden of proof

3) Adversarial: ability to probe for weaknesses in arguments, find points of agreement

4) Collegial-Competitive: ability to guide discussion, bargaining

5) Collegial-Consensual: skill at discovering and promoting consensus

6) Collegial-Mediative: ability to mobilize parties to seek areas of shared interest and

consider settlements

7) Market: initial design of "market" (pp.79-80)

The common component of many of their definitions of leadership listed above is language,

specifically rhetoric. All require persuasive speech acts for their implementation.

Hult and Walcott address democratic governance in general through their

organizational model as a political system. In particular, they emphasize "process values" in

decision making: "…we routinely admit that goals (or "the public interest") are diffuse and

usually negotiable. This situation places a premium on the processes by which goals are

established, challenged, and reestablished" (p.62). They focus on four process values:

"bureaucratic rationality, accountability, representativeness, and legitimacy" (p.63). Hult and

Walcott also caution their readers not to focus on process values to the exclusion of

substantive values in decision making such as equity, personal liberty, equality, etc.

In concluding this section, it is important to note that the scholars who were reviewed are only representative of attempts to integrate organization theory and leadership theory. A comprehensive account of all scholars attempting to do so would not only be untenable, but also unnecessary. All of the scholars reviewed in this section contribute valuable concepts and/or dimensions for the remaining journey in this dissertation. Missing from most portrayals of leading and organizing is the conceptual glue to bind them together as an integrated whole as it is experienced in practice. The next section examines democratic governance, in particular, the relationship between leadership and public bureaucracies, and democratic values.

SECTION FOUR: DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

The relationship between bureaucracy and democracy is extremely complex and difficult to summarize or even characterize. As Dwight Waldo (1981) points out, merely defining the two terms is difficult. He believes that democracy is imbued with certain values to enact, specifically, "liberty and equality" (p.86). Bureaucracy usually has two meanings according to Waldo, "popular-pejorative and descriptive-analytical" (p.86). The intersection of bureaucracy and democracy in the scholarly literature is usually either antagonistic or complementary. Waldo insightfully points out that many values claimed today as a result of the historical development of public administration are "non-democratic values", such as "national security, personal safety, productivity, [and] efficiency" (p.91). He also points out that these non-democratic values are no less important.

An exploration of the dichotomous debate in the relationship between democracy and bureaucracy, to include leadership, is foundational to the field of public administration. Due to its foundational nature, it is impossible to include the vast number of eminent scholars that have participated in this debate. In order to capture the flavor of the debate concerning the relationship between democracy and bureaucracy, the subsection to follow will profile the Goodsell/Hummel debate concerning public bureaucracy with augmentation from selected scholars on both sides. Democracry and democratic values are inherent in their debate.

Subsequent to this foundational debate, an additional dimension will be given careful examination: self-knowledge as self-formation, and the concept of authentic human relationships. Moreover, this dimension does not appear in the literature as a connection to leading and organizing; in addition, there is no connection of leading and organizing to democratic governance in public administration.

Goodsell/Hummel Debate

The now famous debate between Charles T. Goodsell and Ralph P. Hummel is embodied in their respective books, The Case for Bureaucracy (1994) and The Bureaucratic Experience (1994), both with multiple editions. Within both of their arguments, Goodsell and Hummel discuss democratic values or principles at great length. Essentially, both arguments resonate with their readers, and ought to be considered as a range of possibilities for bureaucracy and public servants at a descriptive level as well as at a normative level.

Hummel (1988; 1994) believes that the focus of his attention is on public servants. He explores "how government can be so designed as to provide a job environment in which employees can get work done, while at the same time being accountable to the citizenry at large" (1988, p.24). There is a distinction drawn between bureaucracy as an organizational form and bureaucratic life, a byproduct of this organizational form. Hummel contends that critics of bureaucracy as an organizational form are "pro-public servant exactly because we are anti-bureaucratic" (1988, pp.24-25). He suggests that alternative organizational forms enable public servants to accomplish their work more effectively.

According to Hummel (1994, p.4), the bureaucratic experience differs from societal experience in five distinct ways. "Socially," a bureaucrat engages people as "cases" in their daily routine. "Culturally", a bureaucrat generally does not care and seeks "control and efficiency" as a mainstay. "Psychologically", a bureaucratic is not a person but is a "new personality type, headless and soulless" in demeanor. "Linguistically/cognitively", a bureaucrat does not communicate in the same manner as other people; instead, a bureaucrat communicates like a "computer", neutrally providing information. "Politically", bureaucracies do not provide service and are not truly "accountable to society and ruled by politics and

government" because bureaucracies "are control institutions increasingly ruling society, politics, and government."

Hummel (1988; 1994) contends that critiques of the bureaucratic form of organizing are essential in order to adopt new and improved organizational forms. Hummel (1988, p.28) searches for answers to the following questions:

[H]ow can we organize to allow people to do what they know best--get work done-- and still have them be accountable to the folks who make the laws and to the citizenry at large? In short how can organizing for control and mobilizing for work be balanced?

Countering Hummel's argument and search for answers to the questions stated above, Goodsell (1988, p.24) claims that Hummel's attack is on "the pathologies of bureaucracy, not bureaucracy as a whole." "Institutions of public administration" do not inevitably lead to pathologies nor does bureaucracy as an organizational form (1994, p.5). Goodsell argues that pathology does occur, but is an exception in public agencies. Furthermore, he insists that there is clear and convincing evidence of "the very substantial merit and record of achievement and democratic responsibility associated with American public administration" (1994, p.xii).

Goodsell contends that empirically, "bureaucracy is reported as *very often* providing the services sought and expected. *Most of the time* it lives up to acceptable standards of efficiency, courtesy, and fairness" (1994, p.166). Historically to date, many attempts have been made to "fix" or "control" bureaucracy, often portrayed as a monster. Goodsell outlines the various movements using "'re'-words" such as "reorganization, reform, restrict, reduce, rebuilding", and most recently, "reinventing government" (1994, pp.170-177). However, despite all of these movements, he notes that "the essential characteristics of the Weberian model…remain in place" (1988, p.24).

Goodsell (1994, p.23), along with his colleagues in Refounding Public Administration (1990):

[A]rgue that active and forceful administrative agencies are legitimate institutions in accord with the spirit of the American Constitution; embodiments of agreed-upon

36

public purposes, engaged in seeking their fulfillment; and forces in the polity acting in behalf of collective values associated with the public interest.

Correlates to the Goodsell/Hummel debate abound in the academic literature. Some scholars are critical of certain aspects of the traditional bureaucratic form of organization. Kathleen Iannello (1992), for example, advocates alternative means of organizing other than hierarchy. She defines hierarchy "as a vertical and horizontal system of domination with varying degrees of centralized communication. Within this system of domination, privilege and authority are determined by scalar position with the organization, not by the person holding the position" (p.17). In exploring more egalitarian forms of organizing, Iannello differentiates between leadership and domination. She contends that all organizations must address the issue of leadership, whereas not all organizations must inculcate a system of domination.

In Kathy Ferguson's The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy (1984, p.6), she views bureaucracy as both "a structure and a process." In order to maintain itself, bureaucracy continuously addresses a specific process: "its modes of domination must be reproduced and the opposition it generates must be located and suppressed" (pp.6-7). Ferguson challenges the entire field of public administration as "a 'case study' in bureaucratic discourse" (p.61). Although her review of the field is curiously devoted in large measure to personnel administration, she does point out, as does Perrow (1986), the lack of discourse about power in the academic literature, and the struggle over power within public bureaucracies.

Ferguson states her position regarding public administration very clearly: "The literature of public administration is theoretically impoverished, politically dangerous, and, all too frequently, morally bankrupt" (p.80). She believes that the discourse of administration threatens political theory in three ways:

> It is hostile to speculative thinking, to rumination on the perennial questions of human life. Such thinking raises questions that are not answerable by appeals to technique, perhaps not answerable at all, but are the epistemological and ontological foundation upon which instrumental knowledge rests.

…Second, administrative discourse is hostile to the rigorous self-scrutiny that

underlies the task of political philosophy. . . .Ruthless self-examination, the

ability and willingness to scrutinize and judge ourselves in our own concrete

lives, requires a commitment to *self-knowledge* [italics added] that is simply not

possible in bureaucratic language.

…Third, bureaucratic discourse rebuffs the project of social criticism and political

change. (p.82)

Louis Gawthrop (1997, p.205) makes a compelling argument in the Waldo

Symposium in a recent issue of Public Administration Review that "one inevitable

consequence of the fusion of democracy and bureaucracy is the manifestation of hypocrisy."

He explains this hypocrisy by using the metaphor of train tracks; with democracy and

bureaucracy running on parallel tracks "leaving from different stations and heading for

different destinations" (p.205). Further, he suggests that as democracy and bureaucracy run

on parallel tracks, they intersect at times, leading to "a hell of a train wreck" (p.205). A

successful public servant plays a role or acts out this hypocrisy. Public service is a fiction or a

simulation because the tenets of management are contrary to those of democratic values.

Gawthrop recalls the words of Dwight Waldo to buttress his argument: "Why would an

instrument [bureaucracy] designed to be impersonal and calculating be expected to be

effective in delivering sympathy and compassion (in Gawthrop, 1997, p.205)?

Other scholars, from the country's founders to Paul Appleby, and more recently Larry

Terry and Brian Cook, hold a more favorable view of the relationship between bureaucracy

and democracy. Appleby (1965) believed that political processes drive collaborative

administrative action in a democracy. Public administration

is public leadership of public affairs directly responsible for executive action. In a

democracy, it has to do with such leadership and executive action in terms that respect

and contribute to the dignity, the worth, and the potentialities of the citizen. (pp.336-

337)

The administrative process is concerned with action within the scheme of the entire

governance process. Democratic administration is the embodiment of values such as responsibility, responsiveness, and representativeness. According to Appleby, hierarchy is the "structure and instrument of responsibility" (p.340).

As individuals, public administrators must have "character" and "motivation" (p.341). Appleby lists twelve key attributes of a good administrator. This list includes responsibility, an action-orientation, listening skills, and interpersonal skills. Additionally, a good administrator strives toward effectiveness, possesses self-confidence, uses teamwork, and always works toward improvement, particularly with regard to performance.

Larry Terry (1995) examines institutional leadership in public bureaucracies. He suggests that administrative leaders are "conservators because they are entrusted with the responsibility of preserving the integrity of public bureaucracies and, in turn, the values and traditions of the American constitutional regime" (p.xx). Terry contends that as administrative conservators, leaders must conserve the mission, values, and support for public bureaucracies. Furthermore, administrative leadership is often ignored by "scholarly attempts to reconcile bureaucracy with democracy" (p.11).

Terry outlines a legitimate role for bureaucracies in our democracy. Most importantly, bureaucracy not only has an appropriate role in governance, but is also instilled with a responsibility "to sustain and preserve constitutional principles" (p.21). Therefore, administrative leaders conserve public institutions by adhering to "constitutional processes, values, and beliefs" (p.24). For Terry, administrative conservators are statesmen "guided by a moral commitment to preserve the constitutional balance of power in support of individual rights" (p.183).

In Bureaucracy and Self-Government (1996), Brian Cook traces the historical development of American politics, examines the features of a good society, and analyzes public administration's position in our constitutional system in order to claim that the bureaucracy in America is involved in building relationships with and between citizens and "in shaping public purposes" (p.xv). Cook believes that public administration, as manifest in bureaucracy, can be conceived as not only instrumental, but also as constitutive of both our

politics and political system.

Like Terry, Cook suggests that bureaucracies conserve basic values. "Second, public administration as a whole gives concrete, institutional embodiment to values critical to defining and sustaining the regime" (p.20). Public bureaucracies also influence citizens by shaping public purposes. Finally, Cook advances the notion that public administration combines both instrumental and constitutive features in our political system. ". . .[P]ublic administration as a whole is the active institutional expression of *responsible discretion* in the public sphere, a quality that is itself grounded in practical reason" (p.154).

All of the scholars reviewed thus far, as well as many others, contribute powerful arguments concerning the relationship between bureaucracy, leadership, and democracy in our system of governance. Although human beings shape and are shaped by others, the individual does matter, especially in relationship with others. The notion of individual development in relationship with others that follows can potentially make a significant contribution to the discussion regarding the relationship between bureaucracy, leadership, and democracy.

Self-Knowledge as Self-Formation and Authentic Human Relationships

A conception of self is "permeable, that is both self-determined and socially constructed" (Tomm, 1992, p.102). Self-knowing includes desiring both separation and connection to others as well as both knowing and acting. According to Tomm (p.102), " ways of knowing oneself are inseparable from ways of knowing others and being known by them." Self-knowing is a "transformative process of becoming connected to one's own agency and that of others" (p.102). Tomm (p.107) focuses on a feminist ethic that is particularly relevant to public administrators in general:

> Development of self into person is a process of emergence according to patterns of
> interconnectedness. As self-consciousness (i.e., reflection about one's experience)
> develops, one interacts with the conditions of one's context according to one's
> way of experiencing oneself. Self-knowing is the process of giving meaning
> to the relations between oneself and the context in which one is evolving.

Tomm contends that knowing oneself and knowing another means caring for the other. "We

40

are motivated to act according to the ways in which we experience interconnectedness, or lack of it.

…[E]merging patterns of interconnectedness, fullness of being would consist in experiencing the highest degree of interrelatedness" (p.108).

Rita Manning (1992) points out that caring is a required ingredient in human relationships. Caring, like human relationships is reciprocal. Manning suggests that caring means actively caring, or caring for, as well as allowing oneself to be cared for. Obviously, people's ability and desire to care varies a great deal. This variety carries forth in human relationships as well. Manning believes that "in creating and maintaining [a] nexus of care, [one] would be developing bonds and responsibilities of care" (p.52).

As Wood (1994) points out, caring for others is not a high priority or importance in our culture compared to "self-interest and individual achievement" (p.116). Her argument is that because caring is devalued, it is relegated to those with subordinate status, namely women. For the purposes of this dissertation, I would extend Wood's argument to include public administrators and public service in general. For this reason, public administrators are devalued because, as a whole, they care; and caring is devalued by our society. Furthermore, she contends that language is "constitutive of social life" (p.123). Discourse shapes, produces, reproduces, and reinforces the social order. Wood (p.130) concludes that "discourse, then, becomes pivotal in any efforts we might undertake to alter the ways in which caring for others is defined, assigned, and valued in our culture."

According to Barbara Townley (1995, p.275), self-formation "sees the self as formed through active engagement with others and the world." Self-formation is a concept of self that is centered as opposed to being self-centered. Within self-formation,

the self is not an immutable given, identity is rather like a subject in process constituted by discourses and practices, [and] the self is a relational concept--objects (things, events, people) define the subject and vice versa. In self-formation there is no inner self to be reified because the focus is on experiences and "allows for learning from everyday experiences. …It is the practice of reflexivity and the development of a

41

first-person standpoint. (Townley, 1995, pp.283-284)

The construct of self-in-relation suggests a "dynamic of mutual interactional growth within relationship" (Surrey, 1991, p.60). Surrey contends that relationship is the process by which individual development occurs. She adds that authenticity is required in relationships. Surrey (p.61) defines relationship as "an experience of emotional and cognitive *intersubjectivity*: the ongoing, intrinsic inner awareness and responsiveness to the continuous existence of the other or others and the expectation of mutuality in this regard." Mutuality is essential in understanding authentic relationship.

In order better to understand self-knowledge as self-formation in authentic human relationships in regard to leading, organizing, and democratic governance in public administration, Donald Schon (1983, p.ix) offers an analysis of "reflection-in-action." His purpose is to access practitioners in practice. He believes that there is a confidence crisis in the professions because professional knowledge does not comport with professional practice. Practitioners "tend to focus on the mismatch of traditional patterns of practice and knowledge to features of the practice situation--complexity, uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflict…." (p.18). Practical knowledge that incorporates intuitive processes has traditionally been debased because it is unable to be integrated within the dominant paradigm in public administration, the realm of technical rationality. Schon found that practitioners had difficulty articulating or describing intuitive, practical knowledge-in-action.

He likens "reflecting-in-action" to good jazz musicians (pp.55):

Listening to one another and to themselves, they feel where the music is going and adjust their play accordingly…As the musicians feel the direction of the music that is developing out of their interwoven contributions, they make new sense of it and adjust their performance to the new sense they have made.

Reflection allows the practitioner to critique tacit understandings and patterns of knowledge-in-action "while in the midst of it [practice]" (pp.61-62). In the context of this dissertation, I would argue that reflective action is located in rhetorical processes described earlier, in part, as rhetoric as praxis.

We conclude by mentioning a book chapter written by Robert Zinke in 1992 entitled "American Constitutionalism in the Interconnected World: Administrative Responsibilities in a Rhetorical Republic" (p.145). He argues that the American Constitution is rhetorical. "In the American rhetorical republic, the constitutional role of public administration rests with the facilitation of free, open dialogue and debate about the political norms and values that should guide public life" (p.146). Practical discourse establishes political "agreement", "action", "evaluation", and "judgement" (p.151). The Constitution serves as the institutional framework and context for contemporary discourse and action. Zinke (p.154) points out that the rhetorical Constitution is its "openness that resonates with the contemporary rediscovery of dialogue and communication. The Constitution is relevant by virtue of its potential to bring people together in a way that facilitates shared and interconnected relationships…

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This section sampled the relationship between bureaucracy and democracy, and it appears to be disjointed among public administration scholars. Similarly, this chapter elaborated upon the discontinuity and gaps in the literature among rhetoric, leading, organizing, and democratic governance. Dorothy and her traveling companions were also in wonderment as they surveyed their setting and its diverse inhabitants. They began to not only understand themselves and each other in their journey, but also their surrounding landscape and characters. Like the characters in Oz, the retrospective survey of the academic literature provided a backdrop that only initiated an understanding of the journey to follow in the dissertation.

Substantial themes have emerged that warrant review. Rhetoric is only a recent development in the organization theory literature. Most theorists do not engage the concept of rhetoric at the level of day-to-day organizational life. Weick, on the other hand, points out the importance of arguing in organizational sensemaking. Some leadership theorists such as Tulis, Hart, and Windt focus on the rhetoric of presidential leadership, while others such as Friedrich, Shamir, Arthur, and House emphasize the rhetoric of charismatic leaders in general. Public administration scholars such as Riccucci, and Doig and Hargrove detail exemplary

administrative leaders in biographical form with special attention given to the communication skills of each of the leaders. Both Pondy and Thayer explore the leadership literature as a whole, pointing to the lack of scholarship on the language of leaders, as well as the human relationships inherent in leadership and followership.

The work of other scholars were outlined that explore the interrelationship between organization theory and leadership theory. Follett, Barnard, Selznick, and Hult and Walcott all conclude that leading and organizing are inextricably linked--one cannot be described, discussed, or practiced without the other. As Harrell and Linkugel pointed out earlier, the internal dynamic is the central feature of rhetorical genre. Additionally, Miller suggests that a genre is action-based. *For the purposes of this dissertation, rhetoric as praxis is the internal dynamic bridging the gap between leading and organizing that is enacted through specific, identifiable rhetorical genres. Rhetoric as praxis is not only revealed within the field study, but is also the theoretical centerpiece of the dissertation.*

Rhetoric as praxis also connects the organizational level of understanding to the individual level of understanding. Schon's (1983) "reflection-in-action" is the self-conscious reflexivity required for an individual to understand and act upon their connection and interconnection to others. Authentic relationships are born from an individual awareness that is both "self-regarding and other-regarding" (Tomm, 1992). Both Manning (1992) and Surrey (1991) highlight the notion of mutuality and reciprocity in authentic, caring relationships. In sum, Schon, Manning, Surrey, and Tomm are capturing the essence of self-knowledge as self-formation in authentic human relationships. Rhetoric as praxis is the means by which these concepts (self-knowledge as self-formation in authentic human relationships) are enacted through specific patterns of rhetorical genres of leading and organizing.

Contextually, democratic governance is a process inculcated with democratic values and principles. Goodsell, Terry, Appleby, and Cook highlight democratic principles and values in action for public institutions. The presence of rhetoric as praxis in a public agency reveals the potential for the concepts and patterns outlined above. A lack of rhetoric as praxis as an internal dynamic may lead to a lack of attention to caring and authentic human

relationships in a public agency. This could lead to the patterns of domination and control discussed by Iannello and Ferguson, as well as Hummel's notion of the "headless, soulless" bureaucrat. Looking ahead, we will explore rhetoric as praxis in the Roanoke County administration and determine the rhetorical genres that presented themselves during the field study for further analysis.

CHAPTER THREE

FORMULATION

INTRODUCTION: AN INDUCTIVE UNDERSTANDING OF THE LAND OF OZ

While Dorothy and her traveling companions surveyed the setting and landscape of Oz, they were simultaneously experiencing it. Experiencing the variety of people and places in Oz enabled them to understand their predicament. Inductively, through their experiences, Dorothy and her friends collaborated in formulating a plan to meet their collective needs. Similarly, this chapter is titled *formulation* because it describes the research for this dissertation, whose design outlines an inductive process. As interpretive work, the research includes the voices and perspectives of those being studied in the Roanoke County administration, as well as the voice of the researcher.

As was the case in The Wizard of Oz, the field study was just one experience, and as such, can only be generalizable at the level of theory development. The section to follow examines the methodological perspective employed in the research. Succeeding this foundational discussion is a description of the methods of data collection used throughout the field study. Next, the format developed for analyzing the data is delineated. Finally, some of the problems encountered in the research process are mentioned that may be useful for further development of employing rhetoric as a methodological approach.

As suggested by University policy, application was made to the Human Subjects Committee for the field study conducted in the Roanoke County administration. The application requested exemption from the review process because none of the data collected during the field study to be used in the dissertation was of a sensitive or confidential nature. The protocol for the study and the informed consent form signed by study participants is contained in Appendix A. The request for exemption was approved by the Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

SECTION ONE: METHODOLOGY

A combination of two methodological perspectives is utilized in the research for this dissertation: rhetorical criticism and grounded theory. As previously mentioned, the field

study is interpretive work. Qualitative interpretation seeks explanation that leads to understanding, not prediction or control. The field study is ethnographic, inductive, and idiographic. Knowledge is acquired gradually through engagement by the researcher through participant observation of a single case administration (Lindlof, 1995).

Ethnography within the field of communication studies "considers discourse as pivotal to the study of social life" (Lindlof, 1995, p.46). Its roots are set down in the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein. Speech acts involve language games in which meanings "emerge only when we know the social rules that govern its usage" (p.46). Individual words may have different meanings and generally, words may also have different functions (Pondy, 1978).

In discussing "interpretive social science," Silverman suggests that qualitative research is "preferred . . .to describe and illuminate the meaningful social world as prescribed by the interpretivist paradigm" (1993, p.21). The interpretivist paradigm:

> emphasizes that the social world is no more than the subjective construction of individual human beings, who, through the development and use of common language and the interactions of everyday life, may create and sustain a social world of intersubjectively shared meaning. The social world is thus of an essentially intangible nature and is in a continuous process of reaffirmation and change. (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p.260)

Rhetorical criticism as a methodological perspective "is the investigation and evaluation of rhetorical acts and artifacts for the purpose of understanding rhetorical processes" (Foss, 1989, p.5). This field study specifically focuses on the rhetorical act because the rhetor carries out the act before the intended audience. Generic criticism analyzes rhetoric over time and in different situations in order to understand similarities and patterns that may be grouped or categorized into classifications.

There are three forms of generic criticism. The first form is generic description that is used inductively by exploring rhetorical acts and then generalizing about specific features in order to identify the genre. This is considered theory building rather than traditional rhetorical criticism, and is the form used in this dissertation's field study. Foss (1989, p.114)

summarizes:

> generic description involves four steps: (1) observation of similarities in rhetorical responses to particular situations; (2) collection of rhetorical [acts] occurring in similar situations; (3) analysis of the rhetorical [acts] to discover if they share characteristics; and (4) formulation of the organizing principle of the genre.

The second form is generic participation that is used deductively by starting with a general type of rhetoric and moving toward analyzing specific speech acts. A speech act is compared to the genre in order to determine whether it is a part of that genre. Foss (p.117) outlines a three-step process for generic participation:

> (1) description of the perceived situational requirements, substantive and stylistic strategies, and organizing principle of a genre; (2) description of the situational requirements, substantive and stylistic strategies, and organizing principle of a rhetorical artifact; and (3) comparison of the characteristics of the rhetorical artifact with those of the genre to discover if the artifact belongs in that genre.

Suggestions can then be made by the researcher to collaborate or modify the rhetorical genre based on the findings.

The third form is generic application and is also deductive, applying a generic model to specific rhetorical artifacts for assessment. Foss (p.118) outlines the generic application process:

> (1) description of the perceived situational requirements, substantive and stylistic strategies, and organizing principle of a genre; (2) identification of the perceived situational requirements, substantive and stylistic strategies, and organizing principle of the rhetorical artifact representative of that genre; (3) comparison of the characteristics of the rhetorical artifact with those of the genre; and (4) evaluation of the rhetorical artifact according to its success in fulfilling the required characteristics of the genre.

Generic description is used in the field study because of its inductive nature. The

researcher had no preconceived framework about either the types of rhetoric, or even the very existence of genres in leading and organizing in the Roanoke County administration. Speculation, combined with the researcher's own background as a practitioner, stimulated the generic description that ensued in the field study.

Grounded theory as a methodological perspective is based on systematic data collection and analysis. The conceptual linkages between leading and organizing not only emerge from the data, but were conceived in relationship to the data during the actual field study. Grounded theory was developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Like rhetorical criticism, grounded theory is concerned both with patterns and processes (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). Strauss and Corbin (p.278) point out that grounded "theory consists of *plausible* relationships proposed among *concepts* and *sets of concepts*."

As stated earlier, the field study of the Roanoke County administration combines the methodological perspectives of rhetorical criticism and grounded theory. Specifically, generic description is employed in the field study accompanied by a grounded theory approach. Grounded theory scholars prescribe specific analytic techniques such as open coding, axial coding, selective coding, and a conditional matrix. These specific techniques were not used per se in the field study for this dissertation. Instead, the general precepts of grounded theory described above were used as a guideline in designing the research project. Strauss and Corbin (1994, p.273) explain that "grounded theory is a general methodology for developing theory that is grounded in data systematically gathered and analyzed. Theory evolves during actual research, and it does this through continuous interplay between analysis and data collection."

Both generic description and grounded theory were applied to the Roanoke County field study. Generic description was heavily relied upon for data collection techniques. Careful observation of situational requirements, substantive and stylistic strategies, and an organizing principle took place from the rhetoric of study participants. Throughout the data collection phase, the grounded theory approach to emergent, systematic data collection and analysis was used. The emphasis in grounded theory is on the relationship between the data

49

and conceptual development during the data collection process. Upon completion of the field study, further analysis of the data engaged both generic description and grounded theory once again. Patterns and processes emerge from observations of the rhetoric used by study participants in the Roanoke County administration.

<div align="center">SECTION TWO: DATA COLLECTION</div>

Roanoke County, founded in 1838, is located in southwest Virginia in a valley of the Roanoke River. The Roanoke Valley was originally explored by Scotch-Irish, German, and English settlers in the 1740's. Until the latter half of the 20th century, Roanoke County was a rural, farming community. Today, the population of Roanoke County is approximately 83,000, and is primarily suburban, surrounding the City of Roanoke like a donut. The population of the City of Roanoke is approximately 100,000. In 1989, Roanoke County was named an All-American City.

Roanoke County is chartered under the requirements of the Commonwealth of Virginia and operates under what is known as Dillon's rule; this means it operates only under rules explicitly granted by the Virginia constitution. There are five members of the Board of Supervisors elected for four-year staggered terms by magisterial districts consisting of Vinton, Cave Springs, Catawba, Hollins, and Windsor Hills. There are approximately 714 employees within conventional county administrative departments. In addition, Roanoke County has its own school system and public library system. The County Administrator serves at the pleasure of the Board of Supervisors. During the field study, the County Administrator employed two Assistant County Administrators.

The field study consisted of two methods of data collection, researcher observations and both formal and informal interviews. Six leaders were chosen for study using a "purposeful sampling" technique that was designed to select "information-rich cases" (Patton, 1990, p.169). "Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research" (p.169). A "theory-based sample" is employed "on the basis of their potential manifestation or representation of important theoretical constructs" (p.177).

Leading is one focus of the dissertation study, hence the top three leaders of the Roanoke County administration were chosen as study participants: the County Administrator, the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services, and the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services. The County Administrator and two Assistant County Administrators serve as troubleshooters/coaches for departments assigned to them within the Roanoke County administration. The researcher, in consultation with the three top administrators, selected three departments for intensive study, one from each assignment. Organizing is an additional focus of study; therefore, three department heads were chosen to represent departments of different sizes serving different roles and functions, in order to attain a cross-section of departmental purposes and stakeholders involved from the community. The departmental leaders chosen were from Human Resources, Parks & Recreation, and Procurement Services. The leaders of these particular departments have served for varying amounts of time and are from different backgrounds. Each of the six study participants are white, with one female. The participants range in age from the 30's to the 60's.

Each leader, on a voluntary basis, was shadowed for 3-5 days based on the leader's schedule and own convenience. The shadowing experience began with a formal, structured, open-ended interview. The interview questions were as follows:

1) How long have you been with the County?

2) Always in your current position?

3) Previous work history?

4) Educational background?

5) What is the mission of the County (and your department)?

6) What is your vision for the County (and your department)?

7) What is your organizing philosophy?

8) What is your leadership philosophy?

9) What is your philosophy, if any, about the language you use as a leader?

10) How does this philosophy about leadership language relate to the actions you take on a day-to-day basis?

51

11) Any other comments you want to make?

The first four questions were intended to put the leader at ease, and for the researcher to get acquainted with each of the leaders. Responses to the first four questions are not used in the dissertation and responses to the remaining seven questions are used anonymously in reporting the field study findings.

The researcher followed each leader all day, making observational notes of the rhetoric used by each study participant. Specifically, this included the substantive and stylistic strategies, and situational requirements of each rhetorical encounter of the leader. On a regular basis each day, field notes were made to record features of each encounter as fully as possible. The accumulated field notes formed a field journal for each leader studied.

Informal, unstructured interviews took place with staff members of all of the leaders, particularly with the three departmental leaders, as well as with the leaders themselves. Questions for the informal interviews were not predetermined or written down. The researcher obtained permission from the departmental leaders prior to meeting with their staffs. Participation by staff was voluntary and occurred at their convenience. There were a total of 23 individual informal interviews during the field study. The purpose of the informal interviews was to understand the interviewees' specific job responsibilities and to ascertain their perspectives on the mission and values of their departments, as well as the county administration in general.

SECTION THREE: DATA ANALYSIS

The study concentrates on a number of encounters by all six leaders with various individuals and publics. There were a total of 73 of these encounters. In Appendix B documentation is found on these encounters, numbered #1 through #73. The encounters involved both county staff as well as individuals from outside the county administration. However, the majority of encounters involved Roanoke County employees at all levels. Outside encounters generally involved public administrators from other jurisdictions and agencies or administrators from private firms and nonprofit agencies.

An encounter was any engagement the leader had with other people face-to-face.

Each encounter was a discrete event documented by the researcher. For each face-to-face encounter for each of the six leaders, the researcher made note of the situational requirements, substantive and stylistic strategies, and the organizing principle or internal dynamic taking place in the rhetoric being used by all of the encounter participants. Often, encounters were spontaneous, as with a staff member walking into the leader's office unannounced. For example, in Encounter #7 a student intern spontaneously walked into the County Administrator's office for a ten minute meeting. The student intern was to make a presentation to the Board of Supervisors at its public meeting that afternoon. The intern was nervous and was seeking reassurance from the County Administrator. The County Administrator spoke calmly to the student intern. They carefully reviewed the student's presentation in detail to ensure that the student had thoroughly prepared for the public meeting (for more detail on this encounter see Appendix B).

Other encounters consisted of meetings planned in advance. Usually the leader knew the meeting agenda and meeting participants ahead of time. For example, during Encounter #24 the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services conducted the regularly scheduled staff meeting because the County Administrator was on vacation at the time. The Assistant County Administrator summarized and explained each agenda item for the Board of Supervisors meeting to take place the next day. The department heads listened attentively but offered little input until one department head made a complaint about the disrepair of the building where his department was located. The department head was extremely loud and angry, as he detailed the problems with his building. The Assistant County Administrator ignored the outburst from the department head and continued the meeting, reviewing the entire agenda. There was little interaction with staff for the remainder of the meeting. Occasionally, some staff spoke in soft voices to each other, but never disrupted the meeting.

The data analysis began by reviewing 158 pages of observational notes documenting 73 encounters among all six leaders participating in the field study. Journal notes were consulted as well. No telephone conversations or any one-on-one conversations with the researcher were included in the data review process. Written documents were occasionally

consulted to gain insight into specific issues. Once all of the observational data was brought together, careful examination took place. This examination disclosed specific types of rhetoric emerging from the data.

Patterns of rhetoric were found to recur over time and place throughout the field study. These were categorized as substantive and stylistic strategies reappearing over similar situational settings for both leaders and encounter respondents. For example, in situations when encounter participants disagreed with leaders or became emotional regarding a specific issue, they were regarded as using Controversy Rhetoric. When leaders were in situations where they were teaching and/or learning from encounter participants, Didactic Rhetoric was considered as being employed. In situations when encounter participants were seeking close rapport with a leader, Relationship Rhetoric was discerned. Over and over again, these and other distinct types of rhetoric had been recorded in the observational notes of the leaders' encounters. The types of rhetoric were not only repeated by one particular leader or encounter participant, but were also occurring across all the leaders and encounter participants. On the basis of these rhetorical patterns, seven categories or types of rhetoric emerged from observations of all six leaders:

      1) Autocratic Rhetoric

      2) Outcome Rhetoric

      3) Didactic Rhetoric

      4) Reactive Rhetoric

      5) Caring Rhetoric

      6) Method Rhetoric

      7) Team Rhetoric

Eight categories or types of rhetoric unfolded repeatedly from observing encounter participants while shadowing the six leaders:

      1) Anticipatory Rhetoric

      2) Affirmatory Rhetoric

      3) Diplomatic Rhetoric

4) Technical/Task Rhetoric

5) Monitoring Rhetoric

6) Sensemaking Rhetoric

7) Controversy Rhetoric

8) Relationship Rhetoric

A matrix (Table 3.1 below) was constructed with two distinct axes representing the types of rhetoric forming patterns throughout the documented encounters:

TABLE 3.1

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

The horizontal axis, entitled "Leader Isolated Individually," focuses specifically on the rhetoric of the leader under study. This axis consists of seven unique types of leader rhetoric. This researcher observed recurring similarities in the rhetorical acts of all six leaders during their encounters. The seven types of leader rhetoric on the horizontal axis are shared characteristics among all six leaders in their day-to-day speech acts. A description of each cell on the horizontal axis follows.

Autocratic Rhetoric was based on authoritative commands by each leader. The situational requirements elicited a direct command by the leader. The leader generally did not expect comment or further negotiation in this type of situation. For example, in Encounter #3, the County Administrator gave the county's Budget Manager direct instructions to create a statistical chart for the upcoming Board of Supervisor's meeting. The instructions given by the County Administrator were very detailed and specific, and the Budget Manager responded by merely repeating in greater detail the directions he had just been given by the County Administrator. The County Administrator used what is called *autocratic rhetoric* to issue his directive regarding the creation of a statistical chart for the Board meeting. The Budget Director responded by restating in greater detail the directive he had just been given by the County Administrator. *Autocratic rhetoric* was usually very forcefully delivered by the leader.

Outcome Rhetoric by leaders was based on what needed to be done. For example, during Encounter #20 the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services met with the Director of Social Services. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss an employee grievance. After a discussion of miscellaneous issues, the Assistant County Administrator inquired about the status of her employee's grievance. *Outcome rhetoric* was used by the Assistant County Administrator because finding out about the status of the employee grievance was the purpose of their meeting, and therefore, the work that needed to be done. Outcome Rhetoric either focused on the specific task at-hand during an encounter, or it focused on discussing work that needed to be done in the near future, often as a result of the encounter. In another example, Encounter #22, the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was called into the County Administrator's office to report on the status of

the ceremony to install the county's new Fire Chief. After briefing the County Administrator on the work that had already been done in planning the ceremony, he explained additional plans underway for the ceremony, using *outcome rhetoric*. Outcome rhetoric always focused on the desired results by the leader.

Didactic Rhetoric was based on what leaders and respondents taught each other during an encounter, as mentioned above. For example, in a meeting with his Assistant Director during Encounter #47, the Director of Human Resources inquired about a human resources conference the Assistant Director had attended out of town. The Director's stylistic strategy was to approach his questions to the Assistant Director in a teaching/learning manner. He genuinely wanted to learn and to provide feedback on the substance of the conference which the Assistant Director had attended. *Didactic rhetoric* usually involved the leader teaching and/or learning.

What is called Reactive Rhetoric was based on leaders' spontaneous response to others during an encounter. For instance, during Encounter #62 the Director of Parks & Recreation had received a complaint over the phone from a youth league president concerning a number of issues. The Director discussed the complaint with his Youth Services Director, and acquired additional information about league rules. Using *reactive rhetoric*, the Director wondered about the status of this complaint beyond what had been explicitly stated by the youth league president. *Reactive rhetoric* was situational for the leader, responding with urgency to the matter at hand.

Caring Rhetoric was based on a concerned, supportive, family-like climate created by a leader's speech during an encounter. For example, during Encounter #26, the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services met with the Director of General Services. The Assistant County Administrator initiated the meeting with *caring rhetoric*. In a friendly manner, the Assistant County Administrator began the meeting by asking the Director of General Services about his weekend, and about his various hobbies outside of work. When a leader used *caring rhetoric* in a genuine manner, respondents were put at ease and generally experienced a bond with that leader that transcended that particular encounter moment. The

leader and respondent had a history together to call upon in their minds.

Method Rhetoric was based on leader expertise. For instance, In Encounter #4 the County Administrator met with the Director of the Utility Department concerning an easement adjacent to Hanging Rock Golf Course. The County Administrator wanted to know about the installation of water lines in that easement area and the possible effect elsewhere in the water system. Demonstrating a surprising amount of expertise about water lines and the system, the County Administrator used *method rhetoric* to ask the Director of Utilities multiple technical questions about the project. The County Administrator was interested in the status of the project because he had been asked about this situation by concerned citizens. *Method rhetoric* repeatedly demonstrated the specialized knowledge of a leader regarding a specific technical topic.

Team Rhetoric was based on leaders' initiation of collaborative dialogue among all encounter participants. For example, the Director of Procurement Services encountered two staff members in the office hallway during Encounter #64. The Director initiated a collaborative dialogue about several outstanding issues with the department by using *team rhetoric*. The lines of authority were momentarily set aside as all three individuals rallied together to discuss the issues. *Team rhetoric* was often called upon by leaders in complex problem-solving situations when attempting to generate multiple options for purposeful action.

The vertical axis focuses on the "Response of Others" during each encounter. Eight types of rhetoric form these categories. As with the horizontal axis, recurring similarities were observed among encounter participants responding to a particular type of leader rhetoric. The eight types of rhetoric among encounter respondents arose from shared characteristics over time and situations that repeated themselves to form distinct categories.

A category termed Anticipatory Rhetoric included speech acts that involved a discussion of strategy, planning, goals, and vision by encounter respondents. For example, during Encounter #13 the County Administrator met with a staff member of the Economic Development Department. The second half of their meeting was used to discuss various

issues. The County Administrator exchanged ideas and strategies about these various issues
and the Economic Development staff person responded to each issue using *anticipatory
rhetoric* to strategize and plan for each of the issues. *Anticipatory rhetoric* always focused on
the future.

Affirmatory Rhetoric by encounter respondents reinforced the values, beliefs, and
mission of the administration. For instance, the morning after each Board of Supervisors
meeting, a debriefing meeting took place with all relevant parties. The meetings were
conducted by the County Administrator. The County Administrator, in Encounter #25, had
asked the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services to report on the status of
plans underway to develop a regional firing range for local police departments. The Assistant
County Administrator made recommendations to the County Administrator concerning
strategies for addressing the firing range issue. The County Administrator responded using
affirmatory rhetoric to express support for the Assistant County Administrator. *Affirmatory
rhetoric* consistently supported the "bigger picture" involving the entire county.

Diplomatic Rhetoric was employed in speech to outside constituencies, inside actors,
across organizational borders, and was often political in context. For example, the Director of
Human Resources attended a monthly meeting of the Roanoke Chapter of the Society for
Human Resource Management in Encounter #39. As Chapter President, the Director of
Human Resources facilitated the monthly business portion of the meeting as well as a panel
presentation about the Family and Medical Leave Act. All attendees of the meeting responded
to their President and panel members respectfully, using *diplomatic rhetoric*. *Diplomatic
rhetoric* always required sensitivity by encounter participants toward all the people who may
be related to the situation being discussed during an encounter.

Technical/Task Rhetoric consisted of speech that involved technology and day-to-day
duties of respondents. For example, *technical/task rhetoric* was used by the Director of Parks
& Recreation during Encounter #61. Due to the absence of his Assistant Director of
Recreation, the Director convened the regular staff meeting of the Recreation staff. After the
meeting was underway, the Director requested status reports from specific staff members.

59

Each responded with a detailed report of the duties that they had performed regarding specific issues under discussion. *Technical/task rhetoric* used by encounter participants was very detailed and technique-oriented.

Monitoring Rhetoric evaluated performance and articulated continuous improvement. For example, during Encounter #31 the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services went to meet with the Assistant Director of Procurement Services. After exchanging general information about departmental activities, the Assistant County Administrator asked the Assistant Director how things were going with respect to his department's new computer system. The Assistant Director responded in great detail about the positive progress realized using the new computer system, and outlined some of the remaining challenges in their adjustment process with the new system, using *monitoring rhetoric*. *Monitoring rhetoric* used by encounter participants generally displayed a tendency to demonstrate that they "were on top of things" and always looking for new ways to improve their performance.

Sensemaking Rhetoric involved issue definition and reality construction by encounter participants. For instance, during Encounter #69, the Director of Procurement Services met with one of her staff members. The Director asked what the staff person needed and the staff member responded with *sensemaking rhetoric* by asking the Director for clarification about a meeting they had both attended concerning the computer network for the County School system. Extensive detail was exchanged about the meeting in order for the staff member to make sense out of what had occurred. *Sensemaking rhetoric* was frequently enlisted by encounter participants when they were experiencing confusion or ambiguity about a particular issue.

Controversy Rhetoric, discussed above, was often emotional speech related to a general sense of uncertainty or strife within an encounter. For example, the Director of Parks & Recreation had received a phone call during Encounter #52 from the county's public relations staff person regarding a seemingly provocative billboard on Route 419. The billboard was advertising an upcoming recreational event sponsored by their department. The Director reported on the phone call he had just received when he asked his Assistant Director

of Recreation to meet with him. The Assistant Director described the billboard in great detail to the Director. As she described the billboard to the Director using *controversy rhetoric*, the Assistant Director immediately understood the potential for citizen complaints. This potential for contention from citizens led them both to go look at the billboard themselves. After looking at the billboard, they concluded that the billboard was not in poor taste. *Controversy rhetoric* generally flared up from encounter participants over disagreements with leaders concerning a specific issue.

Relationship Rhetoric usually focused on encounter participants' approach in responding to particular leaders. Most study participants valued the usefulness of the Myers-Briggs test results in working with their colleagues. Myers-Briggs is a psychologically-based test of the human personality based on a framework of typologies. The test is called the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI provides "insights into the role of personality in influencing human behavior" (Myers & Myers, 1993, p.xiii). County staff and leaders reported that they frequently used the test results as a tool in responding to leaders in what they felt was the most appropriate fashion. Their interest in the MBTI demonstrated a concern for effectively relating with other people. For example, during Encounter #18 the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services met with the Director of one of the county's public transportation providers. The Assistant County Administrator began the meeting with informal, friendly conversation. The Director responded in- kind using *relationship rhetoric*, with a friendly approach to the Assistant County Administrator. *Relationship rhetoric* was most useful for encounter participants in setting a comfortable atmosphere and tone with a particular leader.

Following the construction of the two axes of the matrix, each encounter was examined on an individual basis. For each of the 73 encounters, observations on four dimensions are described in detail in the encounter documentation(Appendix B). Each encounter is numbered at the top of the page, accompanied by the title of the leader. The matrix precedes the encounter's descriptive text with the table number matching the encounter number of the text that follows. That is, "1" indicates the first to occur, "2" the second, and

so on.

"Context" is the first dimension, providing the fullest descriptive detail. This dimension explains any relevant background and situational information concerning the specific encounter. Identification of encounter participants, the location of the encounter, the date, and the duration of the encounter are identified in the "Context" dimension section. Additionally, the key rhetorical exchanges are depicted for each encounter, based on the judgment and interpretation of the researcher. The key rhetorical exchanges are those determined by the researcher as the most important in characterizing the encounter. The rhetorical exchanges are noted and italicized using the types of rhetoric that emerged for the construction of the matrix which is explained above in Table 3.1.

The second descriptive dimension documented for each encounter is the "Intention" of the leader for each specific encounter. The "Intention" dimension was intended to document preconceived ideas that a particular leader had about a specific encounter prior to the actual encounter. In writing this dimension it became clear that identifying intention was at best difficult. Prior to each encounter, the researcher was unable to question each leader consistently regarding the nature of intentions. One obvious reason for this situation was that many of the encounters were spontaneous. The other reason was that each leader differed tremendously regarding whether or not they consciously considered their intention prior to each planned encounter. Therefore, the "Intention" dimension is often the researcher's own retrospective, reasoned conjecture.

The third documented dimension is the "Aftermath" of each encounter. The purpose of this dimension is to track specific issues engaged by the County during the field study. This dimension enables the researcher to follow the actions taken by County leaders and staff. Additionally, this dimension enables a focus on policy issues in the analysis if so desired, either for the dissertation itself or for future study.

The fourth dimension documented for each encounter is "Normative Concerns" of the specific leader under study. It became very apparent to the researcher from the outset of the field study that democratic values and principles were quite conspicuous within the day-to-day

activities of the Roanoke County administration. Rarely were these democratic values/principles, such as accountability, equity, and responsiveness, ever explicitly expressed by study participants. Instead, these democratic values/principles were enacted in every encounter, and are documented in italics by the researcher.

Finally, the rhetorical exchanges documented in the "Context" section were plotted on the previously described matrix in the sequence in which they took place during the actual encounter. Following the "Normative Concerns" section of each encounter the sequence of rhetorical exchanges is listed in italics under the heading of "Type of Rhetoric Sequence." This section records the generic shifts in the conversation within each encounter in order to track the sequence of these generic shifts. The rhetorical exchanges described earlier in the "Context" section are listed in the sequence in which they occurred during the encounter, and as they are plotted on the matrix.

Additional analysis of the 73 encounters took place with constant attention devoted to subsequent patterns emerging from the data (See Appendix C). Specifically, interesting frequencies and modes became apparent during closer inspection of the matrices and are detailed in the next chapter. Frequencies and modal points of rhetorical category were studied for the six leaders. Then, frequencies and modal points were examined by rank, comparing and contrasting the top three administrators with the three department heads. Finally, frequencies and modal points were assessed by the various stages that occurred within each encounter. Three distinct stages emerge within each encounter: encounter initiations, mid-encounters, and encounter closures. Further review and analysis of the formal and informal interviews served to both augment and accentuate the overall analyses of the field study data. Distinct rhetorical genres are revealed within the Roanoke County administration through paired categories of recurrence to be spelled out in the following chapter arising from the field data analysis briefly outlined above.

SECTION FOUR: THE PROBLEMS AND PROMISE OF THE RHETORICAL

METHODOLOGICAL EXPERIENCE

The methodological perspective used for the field study in this dissertation is not without its problems. The data collected by the researcher are bounded by the experience an individual researcher brings to the interpretation of the rhetorical activities that took place during the field study. Another researcher could apply the identical data collection techniques and interpret the rhetorical acts taking place differently.

Yet these limitations also offer the promise of the rhetorical methodological perspective. This writer contends that all research is both limited by and enlivened by everything the individual researcher brings to a particular research project. The rhetorical approach to research illuminates the primary activity of public administrators--speech acts. The rhetorical genres that emerge in the type of study conducted in this dissertation are didactic in nature and are self-informative as well as informative to others. More importantly, they raise consciousness in a reflexive manner for all involved in leading and organizing a public administration.

Like the main characters in The Wizard of Oz, the researcher surveyed the setting and landscape of the Roanoke County administration by simultaneously experiencing the variety of people and circumstances for two and a half months. This formulation as a research design enabled the researcher to interpret the collective experiences of study participants through their rhetorical patterns and processes. Dorothy and her friends always listened carefully throughout their journey on the yellow brick road.

CHAPTER FOUR

REVELATIONS

INTRODUCTION: THE SIGHTS AND SOUNDS OF OZ

If Dorothy and her traveling companions could have told their own story about their journey on the yellow brick road, they would reveal the complexity of their experience. Their description would yield an understanding that would betray any sense of time. Their insights would be retrospective, prospective, and simultaneous to their many encounters along the road. As if listening to the voices of the characters in the Wizard of Oz, this researcher reveals the multifarious description of the field study experience.

The first section of this chapter reports the aggregate findings of the most frequent types of rhetoric spoken by study participants using data collected in field observations. This includes findings by rank of rhetor, as well as the three stages within the encounters mentioned previously. Researcher observations reveal consistent patterns of rhetoric that emerge to form rhetorical genres. The second section unveils the democratic values and principles implicitly enacted by study participants, using both observation and interview data. Insights into the context of democratic governance within public organizations provide a unique, normative dimension to public service. The last section uses formal and informal interview data, as well as the findings from the previous two sections, to reaffirm the rhetorical patterns and processes experienced in the Roanoke County administration. The rhetorical genres which are organized by an internal dynamic of rhetoric as praxis point to an image of *relational interplay* between leading, organizing, and democratic governance.

SECTION ONE: AGGREGATE FINDINGS

The description of 73 encounters of the six administrative leaders and their encounter participants in the Roanoke County administration yielded 187 matrix points or events where each axis--i.e. leader on the horizontal axis and respondents on the vertical axis--displays a speech act, resulting in a combined observation noted in the appropriate cell of intersection between the two. Thus a matrix point is a rhetorical exchange within an encounter. The type of rhetoric used by both the individual leader as well as the rhetoric used in response to the

leader are represented as a matrix point in each of the summary tables (See Appendix C).

Findings are reported in two types of formats: axis aggregates and rhetorical exchanges. First, each column is totaled at the bottom and each row is totaled at the right end of the row following the equal sign. These axis aggregates are examined for central tendency. The mode, or most frequent type of rhetoric, is in bold for each axis and represents the general tendency for each axis. Second, the numbers within the cells of the table represent the frequencies of each matrix point for specific rhetorical exchanges among leaders and encounter participants. These matrix point numbers report the interplay within genres that took place between the two axis. Of particular importance here are the high incidence cells.

In the analysis, I noted two types of numeric tendency: the modal axis aggregate for both leaders and respondents and the high frequency matrix points within the cells, which reveal the interrelationships between leaders and encounter participants. The most frequent intersection of the axes, which I term a matrix point, forms the rhetorical genres of the encounter.

The modes of the axis aggregates were important to measure and consider. It became evident that the frequency of use of particular types of rhetoric were not evenly distributed, but centered on one or two types of rhetoric along each axis throughout the analysis. For example, in the first table represented, all leaders (Table 4.1), the modal leader rhetoric was Outcome and the modal respondent rhetoric Technical/Task. In the analysis to follow, we will focus on the top two most prominent modal points of the axis aggregates. The axis aggregates figure throughout the analysis and are most relevant in the analyses of the formal and informal interviews in Section Three.

The matrix points representing rhetorical exchanges between the two axes also contained frequencies that were most interesting to track and examine. There are six tables that we explore in the analysis to follow. Five out of six of these tables (83%) have at least one matrix point frequency that stands out significantly from the other cells of rhetorical exchanges. For example, in the all leader table (Table 4.1) two cell frequencies stand out above the rest of the cells, 11 for Outcome-Technical/Task and 19 for Caring-

66

Relationship. This is the table that we will consider first in the analyses to follow.

It is important to keep in mind that axis aggregates merely count the number of instances a particular type of rhetoric was used during the 73 encounters, while the 187 matrix points count the number of instances of rhetorical interplay within the encounters between leaders and encounter participants. These matrix points formed pairs (or genres) of rhetorical exchanges.

All Leaders

First, we analyze the results of all the leaders over 73 encounters. We will examine the most prominent modal points of the axis aggregates, as well as the most frequent matrix points within the cells of the table representing rhetorical exchanges within the encounters. Examples of encounters are provided to illustrate the most frequent types of rhetoric found for both types of numeric tendency.

For the "Leader Isolated Individually" axis aggregate in (See Table 4.1), the modal point is 43, *outcome rhetoric* as noted above. This means that *outcome rhetoric* was collectively the most frequently used type of rhetoric by the six leaders through all 73 encounters. As discussed in the previous chapter, *outcome rhetoric* is based on what needs to be done. In other words, the leaders used *outcome rhetoric* in day-to-day speech acts to convey a message that sets the task/goal agenda for encounter participants. For the "Response of Others" axis aggregate, the modal point is 38, *technical/task rhetoric*. *Technical/task rhetoric* indicates that encounter participants collectively and consistently talk about their day-to-day duties and the various technologies employed in carrying out their job responsibilities. The fact these two rhetorics are conceptually linked to each other is in itself important, as is noted below.

Two examples illuminate these two types of rhetoric. In Encounter #22 the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services addressed the concerns of the County Administrator about the ceremony to install the new Fire Chief. The Assistant County Administrator explained additional plans being made for the ceremony using *outcome rhetoric* because he knew what still needed to be accomplished for the ceremony. In Encounter #46,

the Director of Human Resources asked each staff member to report on their activities. Each staff member in turn responded to his request using *technical/task rhetoric*, and reported on their activities which related to their day-to-day duties.

Looking at both of these axes standing alone, it seems appropriate that, in the aggregate, public administrators would be concerned with both identifying what needs to be accomplished, and explaining how to get it accomplished as it is reflected in their daily speech activity. As Follett, Barnard, Selznick, and Hult and Walcott recognize, leading and organizing go hand-in-hand. Rhetorical patterns point to rhetoric as praxis as the operative internal dynamic, bridging the gap between what tasks need to be done and the best method to get the tasks done. There is a constant interplay between leading and organizing reflected in their day-to-day rhetoric.

Further examination of frequently used types of rhetoric reveals the second most frequent type of rhetoric on the "Leader Isolated Individually" axis aggregate as *caring rhetoric*, with a mode of 34. Leaders using *caring rhetoric* reveal speech acts which convey a concerned and supportive family-like climate to their encounter participants. It is interesting to note that contrary to the stereotype of bureaucratic leaders, the least frequent type of rhetoric used by Roanoke County leaders is *autocratic rhetoric*. On the "Response of Others" axis aggregate, the second most frequent type of rhetoric used is *diplomatic rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric*, both with modal points of 30.

For example, the County Administrator initiated a regular staff meeting by joking around with the new Fire Chief in Encounter #5. The County Administrator wanted to make the new Fire Chief feel welcome and an integral part of the management team; *caring rhetoric* was used to set the tone with him. In Encounter #33, several managers held a planning meeting about a major reengineering project for the county. The hiring of consultants was being discussed, and one department head was resistant to the entire reengineering project. One particular consultant was discussed and the resistant department head continued to object. Other meeting participants suggested that each of them explore other possible consultants for the project. All meeting participants agreed to look into other consultants

except for the one dissenting manager. *Diplomatic rhetoric* was employed in order to be sensitive to the resistant department head. This approach allowed him the opportunity to continue to participate in future planning for the project. Rather than being diplomatic, meeting participants could have been confrontational with the resistant manager which would have caused increased levels of tension as the project progressed.

Overall, this finding indicates that all participants were very attentive to others during encounters. Their sensitivity was to both other encounter participants as well as to those affected by a particular topic before them. Their rhetoric demonstrates a self-consciousness and reflexivity about their connection and interconnection to others in their context (Schon, 1983). Field study participants demonstrated what Schon (p.ix) referred to as "reflection-in-action." Additionally, they relied on their authentic relationships with their co-workers to create a sensitivity that was both "self-regarding and other-regarding" (Tomm, 1992, p.103).

In the dialectical interplay amongst leaders and encounter participants, there are two matrix points in the cells of Table 4.1 that stand out as the most frequent type of rhetorical exchange. As pointed out above, a matrix point is contained within a cell of the table and represents actual rhetorical exchanges between leaders and participants within the encounters. These rhetorical exchanges are among the most crucial findings in the field study because they reflect spontaneous interaction among the field study participants that exemplifies the primary rhetorical genres and the internal dynamic of rhetoric as praxis. The essence of day-to-day rhetorical practice in the Roanoke County administration is revealed in these matrix points of rhetorical exchanges.

First to consider is the most frequent matrix point at 19: *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric*. While the individual leader is conveying a concerned, supportive family-like climate, encounter participants are responding by being attentive to the manner in which they approach individuals in a relationship. The second most frequent matrix point is *outcome rhetoric* and *technical/task rhetoric*, with a frequency of 11. As the individual leader is concerned about what needs to be done, encounter participants are responding with rhetoric about their day-to-day duties and the technology necessary to get the job done.

69

Two encounters highlight these two most frequent rhetorical exchanges. In Encounter #70, the Director of Procurement Services met with the County's Budget Manager concerning the purchase of County vehicles. After they "took care of business," the Director of Procurement Services initiated an informal discussion regarding how the Budget Manager was spending his vacation time using *caring rhetoric*. The Budget Manager responded in-kind by smiling and openly explaining his vacation plans using *relationship rhetoric*. In Encounter #68, the Director of Procurement Services met with the Associate Director of Instructional Technology for the Roanoke County School System regarding their new computer network. The Director asked how she could be helpful to the school system with the new network using *outcome rhetoric*. The Associate Director from the school system responded with a description of all the work she had done in preparation for the network using *technical/task rhetoric*.

Overall, these findings indicate that both leaders and their encounter participants are concerned with an important aspect of leading and organizing. Both are concerned with what needs to be done and how best to achieve the desired outcome as manifested in the frequency of the matrix point *outcome rhetoric* and *technical/task rhetoric* in their rhetorical exchanges. As Weick pointed out earlier, all encounter participants have expectations about the meaning of given situations and rhetorically demonstrate their commitment to act in order to accomplish agreed- upon task-goals. This bond in acting toward a common purpose was also previously identified by Follett, Barnard, Selznick, and Hult and Walcott.

Encounter participants are concerned about another important aspect of leading and organizing— working with people. They are cognizant of the sensitivity required in working with other human beings. This is revealed by the prevalence of *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric* matrix point. The rhetoric of encounter participants demonstrates Manning's and Surrey's notion of mutuality and reciprocity in authentic, caring human relationships within the Roanoke County administration. Caring is a significant component of their organizational life.

TABLE 4.1. TYPE OF RHETORIC

ALL SIX LEADERS ENCOUNTERS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	2	4	1	1	1	1	2	=12
Affirmatory Rhetoric		3	1	2	2		5	=13
Diplomatic Rhetoric	6	5	2	6	3	4	4	=30
Technical/Task Rhetoric	3	11	5	5	4	5	5	=**38**
Monitoring Rhetoric	1	2	3	2	2	6	1	=17
Sensemaking Rhetoric	2	9	6	4		3	4	=28
Controversy Rhetoric	1	5	3	3	3	3	1	=19
Relationship Rhetoric		4	2	3	19		2	=30
	15	**43**	23	26	34	22	24 **187**	

Total Encounters=73 (1.1-1.73)

Total Matrix Points=187

Horizontal Mode=43

Vertical Mode=38

[NOTE: The row sums are in the Team Rhetoric column with equal signs]

71

Examining the rank of the individual leaders in the field study produced notable results. The top three administrators grouped together (See Table 4.2) in comparison with the three department directors grouped together (See Table 4.3) yield both similarities and differences in the types of rhetoric observed in their encounters. The top three administrators grouped together are the County Administrator, the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services, and the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services. The three department directors grouped together are the Director of Human Resources, the Director of Parks & Recreation, and the Director of Procurement Services.

On the "Leader Isolated Individually" axis aggregate, the modal point for the top three administrators is 26, *outcome rhetoric*. Like the aggregate findings above, *outcome rhetoric* is the most frequently used type of rhetoric for the top administrators as a group. On the "Response of Others" axis aggregate for the top three administrators, *technical/task rhetoric* is the modal point at 22, also reflecting the above aggregate findings.

Additional examination of the top three administrators' encounters features the second most frequent type of rhetoric on the "Leader Isolated Individually" axis aggregate: *reactive rhetoric*. *Reactive rhetoric* is based on spontaneous responding to others. The top three administrators differ from the earlier findings of the second most frequent type of rhetoric on the axis aggregate for all six leaders (where *Caring rhetoric* was the second most frequently used type of rhetoric). For example, in Encounter #8, the County Administrator was attending the Board of Supervisors meeting and a sensitive issue involving a citizen came before the Board for discussion. A staff member attempted to address the issue with little success. The County Administrator used *reactive rhetoric* to intervene to not only assist his staff member, but also to move the issue along.

On the "Response of Others" axis aggregate for the top three administrators, *diplomatic rhetoric* is the second most frequent type of rhetoric at modal point 20. This reflects the same result as the second most frequently used type of rhetoric by all leaders in their axis aggregate. Only one matrix point for the top three administrators stands out as the

most frequent type of rhetorical exchange during their encounters with others. This most frequent matrix point at 10 is *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric*. This finding is also identical to the findings for all leaders examined in Table 4.1.

For the three department directors, the modal points on the "Leader Isolated Individually" axis aggregate are *outcome rhetoric* and *caring rhetoric*, both at 17. In the findings for all leaders, *outcome rhetoric* is the modal point and *caring rhetoric* is the second most frequent type of rhetoric. The second most frequently used types of rhetoric for the three department directors in the axis aggregate are both *method rhetoric* and *team rhetoric* at modal point 11. *Method rhetoric* is rhetoric based upon expertise, and *team rhetoric* is based on what everyone involved in an encounter says as a collective.

For example, the Director of Parks & Recreation attended a regular staff meeting of the Department of Recreation during Encounter #57. The meeting was being conducted by the Director of Recreation. After the Director of Parks & Recreation reported on his preparations for a work session he was to conduct that evening with the Board of Supervisors, the Director of Recreation continued their staff meeting with various routine issues using *team rhetoric*. Immediately following the Recreation Department staff meeting, the Director of Parks & Recreation met with one of his staff during Encounter #58. The Director asked his staff member to show him the slides that had been prepared for his work session with the Board of Supervisors that evening. The Director asked the staff member to change some of the slides using *method rhetoric*, demonstrating his own expertise with slide presentations.

On the "Response of Others" axis aggregate for the three department directors, *technical/task rhetoric* at 16 is the modal point, once again reflecting the findings for all leaders. The second most frequent types of rhetoric used are both *relationship rhetoric* and *sensemaking rhetoric* at modal point 15. Like all six leaders and the top three administrators findings, one matrix point stands out as the most frequent rhetorical exchange for the three department heads: *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric* at matrix point 9.

Overall, there were more similarities than differences between the two groups of

leaders. Upon examination of the "Leader Isolated Individually" axis aggregate, it is apparent that the type of rhetoric used by the top three administrators varied only one time from the findings of the three department heads. The top three administrators differed when examining the second most frequently used type of rhetoric. The top three administrators used *reactive rhetoric* as the second most frequent type of rhetoric, while the three department directors used both *team rhetoric* and *method rhetoric*. This indicates that the top leaders are often required to be more spontaneous because they tend to address a larger array of both people and issues. The department directors, as lower ranking leaders, must act on decisions made by the top leaders. In doing so, the department directors must rally staff both in spirit and practice, empowering staff to exercise their expertise.

On the "Response of Others" axis aggregate, the top three administrators are completely consistent with the findings of all the leaders. The modal types of rhetoric for the top three administrators are *technical/task rhetoric* and *diplomatic rhetoric* at 22 and 20 respectively. However, the three department directors differ from both all leaders and the top three administrators in the second most frequently used type of rhetoric. Encounter participants respond to the top three administrators and to all the leaders with *technical/task rhetoric* and *diplomatic rhetoric* in that order. Encounter participants respond to the three department directors primarily with *technical/task rhetoric*, but the second most frequently used types of rhetoric by encounter participants, *sensemaking rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric*, both at modal point15, indicates that lower ranking staff are engaged in two unique speech acts. In using *sensemaking rhetoric*, encounter participants attempt to clarify and understand the rhetoric of department directors. The use of *relationship rhetoric* suggests that encounter participants are also concerned with, and attentive to, their approach to department directors, as well as others involved in an encounter.

TABLE 4.2. TYPE OF RHETORIC

TOP THREE ADMINISTRATORS: FREQUENCIES AND MODE

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1	4	1	1		1	2 =10
Affirmatory Rhetoric		2	1	1	1		3 =8
Diplomatic Rhetoric	6	4	1	4	3	1	1 =20
Technical/Task Rhetoric	2	6	4	4	1	3	2 =**22**
Monitoring Rhetoric	1	2	2	2	1	2	=10
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	4	2	2		1	3 =13
Controversy Rhetoric	1	2	2	2	1	3	1 =12
Relationship Rhetoric		2		2	10		1 =15
	12	**26**	13	18	17	11	13 **110**

Total Encounters= (1.1-1.38)

Total Matrix Points=110

Horizontal Mode=26

Vertical Mode=22

TABLE 4.3. TYPE OF RHETORIC

THREE DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1				1		=2
Affirmatory Rhetoric		1		1	1		2 =5
Diplomatic Rhetoric		1	1	2		3	3 =10
Technical/Task Rhetoric	1	5	1	1	3	2	3 =**16**
Monitoring Rhetoric			1		1	4	1 =7
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	5	4	2		2	1 =15
Controversy Rhetoric		3	1	1	2		=7
Relationship Rhetoric		2	2	1	9		1 =15
	3	**17**	10	8	**17**	11	11 **77**

Total Encounters= (1.39-1.73)

Total Matrix Points=77

Horizontal Mode=17

Vertical Mode=16

Another important set of findings are contained in the various stages within the 73 encounters experienced by the leaders and their encounter participants. Three distinct stages emerged during an encounter: encounter initiations, mid-encounters, and encounter closures. Each stage contains unique rhetorical patterns reflecting some of the rhetorical genres revealed previously.

Encounter initiations for the 73 encounters reveal intriguing insights about study participants (See Table 4.4). Encounter initiations consist of opening exchanges among participants. On the "Leader Isolated Individually" axis, *caring rhetoric* is the modal point at 19. This indicates that all six leaders open their encounters in a warm, friendly manner. On the "Response of Others" axis aggregate, the encounter participant modal point is *technical/task rhetoric* at 26. Encounter participants open their encounters with leaders using speech acts regarding their day-to-day duties.

The matrix point that stands out above all others in the initial rhetorical exchanges between leaders and encounter participants is *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric* at 12. Overall, this demonstrates that both leaders and encounter participants are initially concerned either about each other or relevant others when their encounters commence. For example, Encounter #16 opened with the County Administrator asking the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services about various personnel issues pertaining to a few of their department heads. The County Administrator was very sensitive about the issues and used *caring rhetoric* to demonstrate his genuine concern. The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services responded in-kind using *relationship rhetoric* to discuss the personnel issues raised by the County Administrator.

Mid-encounters represent matrix points occurring between the opening and closing rhetorical exchanges within encounters. There are 55 mid-encounters representing the "sum and substance" of each encounter. Of the 73 total encounters, only 55 have at least three matrix points indicating a "middle" of a particular encounter (See Table 4.5). For encounters with only one or two matrix points, they are already represented as opening and

closing matrix points, and are accounted for and discussed in encounter initiations in Table 4.4 and encounter closures in Table 4.6. On the "Leader Isolated Individually" axis aggregate, 14 is the modal point with *outcome rhetoric* the most frequent type of leader rhetoric. Leaders are very concerned about what needs to be accomplished as this is their focus during the critical mass of many encounters. The "Response of Others" axis aggregate during mid-encounters reveals two modal points at 10, *diplomatic rhetoric* and *sensemaking rhetoric*. Encounter participants employ speech acts centered around sensitivity toward the people involved in their discussions, including the leader. Also, encounter participants struggle to define the issues involved and the complexities of constructing their reality about those issues.

In examining midpoint rhetorical exchanges between leaders and encounter participants, no particular exchange stands out above the others for mid-encounters. The lack of a prevalent rhetorical exchange is particularly interesting because it demonstrates that everyone involved in an encounter "pitches in" in a variety of ways to address the issue(s) before them, depending on the circumstances. For example, in Encounter #69 the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services attended a meeting with three representatives from BFI, a private trash collection firm. The County Administrator conducted the meeting. BFI had been putting pressure on both Roanoke County and the City of Roanoke to privatize their collection of trash. During the meeting, the County Administrator used *outcome rhetoric* to suggest that he was willing to compare notes with BFI as quality customer service was his primary interest. The County Administrator continued to challenge the BFI representatives' substantive data, and the BFI encounter participants responded using *diplomatic rhetoric* to suggest to the County Administrator that privatization was a win/win proposition. The BFI representatives tried to make a political appeal to the County Administrator in this particular situation.

There are 73 encounter closures similar to the encounter initiations (See Table 4.6,). Encounter closures are concluding exchanges among participants. On the "Leader Isolated Individually" axis aggregate, the modal point is *reactive rhetoric* at 14. As encounters come to a close, the energy levels of the leaders wane because the bulk of their "business" has

78

already been accomplished. Therefore, the leaders are spontaneously responding to relatively minor issues or details that encounter participants are raising as the encounters end. On the "Response of Others" axis aggregate, *diplomatic rhetoric* is the modal point at 18. Encounter participants want to convey their concerns about relevant stakeholders, including their leaders, and the political context of any border crossings that may ensue.

One matrix point of rhetorical exchange between leaders and encounter participants stands out as the most frequent type of rhetoric used during encounter closures. The most frequent matrix point at 8 is *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric*. As with the encounter initiations, this demonstrates that both leaders and encounter participants are very concerned about each other and relevant others as they bring closure to their encounters. This is evident as Encounter #45 comes to a close. The Director of Human Resources met with the Director of Real Estate Assessment about a personnel problem occurring in the Real Estate Assessment office. After the Director of Real Estate Assessment detailed his personnel problem, the Director of Human Resources was friendly and supportive using *caring rhetoric*. The Director of Real Estate Assessment became more relaxed and outlined his plan for addressing the personnel problem in his office using *relationship rhetoric*.

The aggregate findings delineated in this section underscore the rhetorical patterns revealed in the Roanoke County Administration. Although many rhetorical genres exist in the rhetorical exchanges detailed above, two pairs are the most prevalent: *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric,* as well as *outcome rhetoric* and *technical/task rhetoric*. These two rhetorical genres recur throughout the field study findings. These genres serve as touchstones for leading and organizing in the Roanoke County administration and form the basis for further revelations to follow. The findings from the axis aggregates become important once again when we examine the formal and informal interviews in Section Three.

TABLE 4.4. TYPE OF RHETORIC

ALL SIX LEADERS ENCOUNTER INITIATIONS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1	2					1 =4
Affirmatory Rhetoric		1					2 =3
Diplomatic Rhetoric				1	1	1	=3
Technical/Task Rhetoric	4	6	5	3	2	3	3 =**26**
Monitoring Rhetoric	1		1		2	4	=8
Sensemaking Rhetoric		5				1	1 =7
Controversy Rhetoric		2	3		2	1	=8
Relationship Rhetoric		1			12		1 =14
	6	17	9	4	**19**	10	8 **73**

Total Matrix Points=73

Horizontal Mode=19

Vertical Mode=26

TABLE 4.5. TYPE OF RHETORIC

ALL SIX LEADERS MID-ENCOUNTERS*:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1	1	1	1		1	1	=6
Affirmatory Rhetoric		2	1				2	=5
Diplomatic Rhetoric	3	1	1		2	2	1	=**10**
Technical/Task Rhetoric		3		1	1	2	2	=9
Monitoring Rhetoric		1	1	1		1		=4
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	3	1	3		1	1	=**10**
Controversy Rhetoric		2		2	1	2	1	=8
Relationship Rhetoric		1		1	1			=3
	5	**14**	5	9	5	9	8	**55**

*For at least three matrix points per encounter

Total Matrix Points=55

Horizontal Mode=14

Vertical Mode=10

TABLE 4.6. TYPE OF RHETORIC

ALL SIX LEADERS ENCOUNTER CLOSURES:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1	1			1		1	=4
Affirmatory Rhetoric				2	2		2	=6
Diplomatic Rhetoric	3	4	1	5	1	1	3	=**18**
Technical/Task Rhetoric	3	2	1	2	1			=9
Monitoring Rhetoric		1	1	1		1	1	=5
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	1	5	1		2	2	=12
Controversy Rhetoric	1	1		1				=3
Relationship Rhetoric		3	2	2	8		1	=16
	9	13	10	**14**	13	4	10	**73**

Total Matrix Points=73

Horizontal Mode=14

Vertical Mode=18

SECTION TWO: DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE AS CONTEXT

The 73 encounters, the interviews, and journal observations implicitly reveal a normative dimension in the Roanoke County administration. Public organizations necessarily operate within a "process" context (see Hult & Walcott, 1990, pp.62-70). "Process" for public agencies means governance using democratic principles and values historically grounded in the United States Constitution (see Rohr, 1989). As previously discussed in Chapter Two, the exact content and nature of these democratic principles and values are contestable, as argument continues today on this very point. However, a recurrent pattern of democratic principles and values revealed themselves within the Roanoke County administration.

Both leaders and encounter participants rhetorically demonstrate a normative concern for specific democratic principles and values. These normative concerns are documented in each of the 73 encounters within a separate subsection (See Appendix B) and constitute an important aspect of the uniqueness of public agencies and public service. A discussion of the most visible democratic principles and values recurring rhetorically throughout the field study follows.

Accountability for study participants in the Roanoke County administration means openly providing information and expertise to leaders within the chain of command, to the Board of Supervisors, to citizens, and to any relevant stakeholders. Accountability also involves a responsibility to follow through with agreed-upon tasks and goals. As Hummel (1988, p.28) points out, accountability involves a balance between "control and mobilizing for work". Feminist scholars such as Iannello (1992) and Ferguson (1984) point out that systematic control and domination occur in public bureaucracies in the name of accountability.

For example, during Encounter #1 the County Administrator met with the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services to determine the status of a regional firing range for local police departments. The rhetorical exchanges were clearly tied to accountability as they used *autocratic rhetoric* and *monitoring rhetoric*, as well as *outcome rhetoric* and *sensemaking rhetoric* during their specific discussion of the regional firing range.

The County Administrator was tracking this issue and wanted to work with the Assistant County Administrator to ensure a successful outcome.

Equity for study participants suggests a sense of fundamental fairness in working with all people. Administrative leaders in Roanoke County hold a high expectation for their co-workers and staff members to uphold this democratic value. As Goodsell (1994) points out, public administrators usually meet standards of fairness. Hummel's account of the "headless, soulless" bureaucrat neutrally providing information and Waldo's reference to bureaucracy as impersonal are often mistaken for attempts by bureaucrats to treat people fairly, without bias.

Encounter #20 illustrates this point. The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services met with the Director of Social Services to discuss a grievance filed by one of her employees. The Assistant County Administrator listened to the Director of Human Services explain the entire situation regarding her employee. The Assistant County Administrator then explained all of the steps involved with the county's grievance procedure. The Assistant County Administrator enacted his concern for equity in dealing with both the Director of Social Services and her employee who had filed a grievance. He wanted to be fair by listening to the Director of Social Services tell her side of the story pertaining to this employee grievance.

Representativeness for field study participants most often meant inclusiveness. This involves access to problems and issues at any given time. In the Roanoke County administration relevant stakeholders are always anticipated and included in meetings. Stakeholders may include other Roanoke County staff, members of the Board of Supervisors, public administrators from other jurisdictions, and citizens from the community. Appleby (1965) understood public administration's obligation to respect citizens and their potential contribution toward "collaborative administrative action" in the political process. Cook (1996) suggests that "shaping public purposes" includes building relationships with and between citizens.

This is exemplified in Encounter #38 by the Director of Human Resources during a regular staff meeting. The County Administrator asked the Director of Human Resources to

report on the Employee Advisory Committee (E.A.C.). The E.A.C. had lost credibility with employees, and the Director of Human Resources wanted to recreate a role for the E.A.C. After seeking input from department heads, the County Administrator made it clear that he wanted a democratic process for the E.A.C. The County Administrator and management were concerned about representativeness in reestablishing a new role for the E.A.C.

Responsiveness is important to the study participants. Anyone and everyone is usually acknowledged and addressed in a timely and professional manner by Roanoke County public administrators. Appleby believed that democratic administration is the embodiment of values such as responsibility, among others. He suggested that a good administrator must have an action-orientation, and possess good listening skills, as well as good interpersonal skills. All of these attributes are directly related to responsiveness.

Encounter #63 is a good example of responsiveness in action. The Director of Parks & Recreation encountered his Assistant Director of Parks in the office hallway. The Director had received a complaint from a citizen about a leaking roof at one of their park facilities. The Director of Parks & Recreation asked the Assistant Director of Parks for a status report about the leaking roof. The Director of Parks & Recreation was primarily concerned with being responsive to the citizen's complaint by inquiring into the status of the situation.

Administrative discretion is a principle that is more complex than those discussed previously. Study participants constantly struggle with the quantity and quality of their discretion at any given moment. Most often Roanoke County public administrators exercise good judgment regarding the extent and the limits of their administrative discretion. Study participants frequently engage in lengthy discussion and inevitable sensemaking activity in order to understand each situation they encounter and to understand their particular role. As Cook (1996, p.154) points out, public administration is both instrumental and constitutive. Administrative discretion is the "institutional expression" by public administrators of "practical reason."

During Encounter #65, administrative discretion is illustrated by the Director of Procurement Services. The Director met with a captain from the police department about a

proposed radio system to be shared by the City of Roanoke and Roanoke County. The captain reported on a rumor he had heard that the city wanted to acquire its own system. The Director of Procurement Services responded by using good judgment and suggesting that they set up a meeting with the project consultant prior to the next joint meeting between the city and the county. The Director used administrative discretion to react appropriately to the rumor reported by the police captain. They would be able to address the rumor with the consultant and plan accordingly.

Efficiency and *effectiveness* are frequently debated simultaneously as to whether or not they even qualify as democratic principles or values. For Roanoke County study participants, efficiency and effectiveness are high priorities. They want to do the best possible job with the best possible result. Efficiency and effectiveness fall into the category of "non-democratic values" which was addressed by Dwight Waldo (1981) and resulted from the historical development of public administration as a field. Waldo also suggested that these non-democratic values were equally important to the more traditional values discussed above.

For example, in Encounter #27 the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services and the County Administrator met with three representatives from BFI, a private trash collection firm. BFI wanted the city and the county to privatize their trash collection services and was applying pressure on both local governments in the media. The BFI representatives made their sales pitch with statistical data to the County Administrator and Assistant County Administrator. The primary response by the County Administrator was centered around efficiency and effectiveness. He challenged the BFI representatives to prove to him that BFI could be more efficient and effective than the county. The quality of service for county citizens was also an important factor to consider.

All of the above most visible democratic principles and values were collectively enacted and recorded in field study encounters, interviews, and observations. Although not an exhaustive account of the democratic principles and values, they were the most noticeable patterns in forming the context and foundation for action in the Roanoke County administration. Rarely were these principles and values explicitly discussed by study

86

participants. Rather, they formed an additional layer of understanding, constitutive of the process of democratic governance throughout the field study. Democratic governance embodied in the values and principles examined above form the "collective coherence" (Wamsley, 1996) in leading and organizing public institutions.

<div align="center">SECTION THREE: REAFFIRMATION</div>

The focus of this section is on the formal and informal interviews with the leaders and many of their employees which are also supported by observational accounts. Comparison is made between the rhetoric of study participants and the actions of participants in day-to-day organizational life. As outlined earlier in Chapter One, the following questions are considered in reporting interview results: do the day-to-day actions of staff reflect the rhetoric of their leaders? Or, conversely, does the rhetoric of staff reflect the actions of their leaders? More fundamentally, are the rhetoric and actions of staff consistent with the rhetoric and actions of their leaders? Furthermore, are researcher observations consistent with revealed communication in staff and leader interviews? The aggregate axis findings are a useful tool in determining the consistency of word and deed among leaders and encounter participants/employees. The internal dynamic of rhetoric as praxis is reaffirmed as we explore interview responses in conjunction with the rhetorical genres previously identified in Section One of this Chapter.

Formal Interviews

An open-ended interview was conducted with each of the six leaders at the outset of the shadowing experience. On average, the interviews were completed in approximately 45 minutes. The first four questions were routine questions about their length of tenure with the county, length of tenure in their current position, previous work history, and educational background. The purpose of these questions was to put the leader at ease, and for the researcher to get acquainted with each of the leaders. The responses to the remaining seven questions are the focus of the following discussion (See interview questions).

In responding to the question concerning the mission of the County (and department while interviewing department heads), the leaders are relatively consistent. All six leaders

explicitly discuss the County's mission as maintaining and improving the quality of life for Roanoke County citizens. Each leader emphasizes the importance of cost-effective, high quality services for County residents. Most of the leaders describe the County's mission as fostering a rich climate for families raising children. They also focus on the importance of maintaining the high quality of the County's school system, as well as protecting the natural beauty of the region. Several leaders mention the necessity for local governments to participate in regional approaches to service delivery. All of the department directors discuss efficient and effective service delivery by their respective departments. Additionally, the directors convey that innovation is a key for each of their departments.

Each leader has a clear vision for the County (and department while interviewing department heads). Most of the leaders want to remain current in the latest technological advances. They also stress "customer service" as essential, both currently and for the future of the County. Each of the leaders describe department specific issues for their futures.

Common themes emerge from the leaders in conveying their organizing philosophies. All of the administrators point to the importance of flexibility, flat organizations, and change. Many mention staff empowerment and teamwork as essential ingredients. Additionally, most impart the key values within the County administrative staff such as pride, enthusiasm, responsibility, and accountability.

The leadership philosophies of these six public administrators also provide common themes. All six speak at great length about the people they work with every day. They believe in their employees and in building professional, authentic relationships with each person. All of the leaders support teamwork, empowerment, development, and an open, non-threatening environment for their employees. Several of the leaders emphasize their inclination for decisions to be made at the lowest level at which the decision issue occurs.

Their philosophy concerning leadership language varies among the six leaders. One of the leaders believes that a leader must know the audience and modify behavior in different situations. Another leader thinks about the language they use after the fact, and analyzes it afterward. One administrator describes their language as "direct, hard-headed, passionate,

and emotional" because the job for this leader is "more than a career". Another leader asserts having a plan prior to every meeting, as well as treating other people the way they would want to be treated. Two of the leaders discuss their sensitivity to language and that language conveys culture and meaning. Both express the desire to create a culture of honesty, security, respect, integrity, and openness within the County.

The administrators' responses to the question regarding the relationship between leadership language and day-to-day actions contains three themes. Some of the leaders think about the connection consciously and intentionally prior to, and during their encounters. Others report that they are not organized about this relationship, and are sometimes haphazard, eventually becoming organized as an encounter unfolds. Similarly, other leaders mention that sometimes they are thinking about their language consciously and intentionally prior to, and during encounters, and yet at other times, they are not consciously or intentionally thinking about their encounter language.

Only one leader expresses additional comments at the close of their interview. This leader communicates his or her approach to working relationships. This administrator tries to maintain every person's sense of worth, and treat everyone equitably. Additionally, this leader believes that this sense of respect holds the organization together. Finally, this leader suggests that the focus of day-to-day work should be on issues, and not focused on the particular people involved.

The responses to the formal interviews with the six leaders are consistent with the aggregate findings reported in Section One above. In the aggregate, and by rank, leaders use speech acts to convey attention to, and concern for results, using *outcome rhetoric*. In the formal interviews, the six administrators articulate concern about the quality of life, as well as cost-effective and high quality services for Roanoke County citizens. Additionally, leaders want to remain technologically current, and emphasize "customer service" in their interview responses. The use of *outcome rhetoric* by the six leaders during mid-encounters demonstrates internal consistency. The leaders are able to state the importance of specific results for their County, and act on these statements through the rhetoric of their day-to-day

encounters. This reveals rhetoric as praxis taking place. A "results" orientation forms a recurring pattern enacted as part of this rhetorical genre of administrative leaders in the Roanoke County administration.

A second pattern within the administrative leaders' rhetoric is their concern for people and key values. The interview responses demonstrate an interest in flexible organizations, with empowerment, development, non-threatening work environment, and teamwork being essential ingredients. All of the leaders relay their belief in their employees and wish to build authentic relationships with each person. They also express key values for everyone working for the County. These values include pride, responsibility, accountability, honesty, security, respect, and integrity. In the aggregate findings, once again, rhetoric as praxis is evident as the internal dynamic within the Roanoke County administration. *Caring rhetoric* is present not only in the aggregate findings, but also in the findings by rank. *Caring rhetoric* dominates both encounter initiations, and encounter closures. During informal interviews and conversations with these six leaders, they frequently express interest and/or concern for individual personnel issues, problems, or personal crises being experienced by County employees. A significant amount of time is spent by the leaders discussing personnel-related issues with each other, or with other staff members. As part of a distinct rhetorical genre, caring is a highly visible aspect of daily life for these Roanoke County administrative leaders.

Informal Interviews

Informal interviews were conducted with 23 County employees and documented in the researcher's field journal. Since "everyone has a boss", the six leaders are included in the total. Using the informal interviews and the aggregate findings of the "Response of Others" axis, patterns emerge to form an encounter participant rhetorical genre. In the aggregate, by rank, and during encounter initiations, encounter participants (the majority were County employees) overwhelmingly use *technical/task rhetoric* in responding to leaders. In the informal interviews, encounter participants primarily discuss their day-to-day duties and "what has to be done", with a strong emphasis on the technology they use to perform their jobs. Many encounter participants express their concern for quality of life, "customer service", and

90

efficient and effective services for County citizens. The consistent recurrence of *technical/task rhetoric* during their statements in the informal interviews reveals rhetoric as praxis taking place. There is a "task/duty" orientation forming a pattern for this rhetorical genre of encounter participants.

Furthermore, the rhetorical exchange matrix point of *outcome rhetoric* and *technical/task rhetoric* in many of the aggregate findings as well as the formal and informal interviews demonstrates a mutuality of purpose. Encounter participants focus on getting their work done ("task/duty" orientation), while leaders focus on achieving certain outcomes ("results" orientation). Encounter participants echo the identical concerns as the leaders for County residents. Also, encounter participants orient their speech acts every day toward addressing and servicing those concerns. This is an important finding because it demonstrates rhetorical consistency between leaders and those they lead, both in word and in deed.

The second pattern of the rhetorical genre of encounter participants is their concern for people and key values. The informal interviews with the 23 employees/encounter participants reveal an interest in teamwork, flexibility, professionalism, and maintaining rapport, as well as good relationships. Many of the encounter participants acknowledge the political climate in which they work. They express feeling comfortable, needed, and trusted by their leaders. They believe that fellow employees are friendly, enjoy light joking and laughing, and are generally caring people. The vast majority of employees in the informal interviews mention their Meyers-Briggs score as well as the scores of their superiors. Once again, there is strong rhetorical consistency among County employees and their leaders.

In the aggregate findings, by rank, and by stage, rhetoric as praxis is evident because *relationship rhetoric*, *diplomatic rhetoric*, and *sensemaking rhetoric* are used most frequently by encounter participants. This sensitivity toward other people is clearly articulated in the informal interviews conducted with encounter participants. The rhetorical exchange matrix point of *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric* in many of the aggregate findings, as well as the formal and informal interviews once again illustrate consistency. Encounter participants focus on the various dimensions of monitoring and tending relationships, while leaders focus

91

on creating a supportive, family-like climate. This is evident as both leaders and encounter participants enact the same concern for people and key values in their rhetorical genre. This is another important finding in determining the consistency of rhetoric as praxis in the daily rhetorical activity within the Roanoke County administration.

Ultimately, rhetorical patterns are enacted in a circular process within the County administration. Encounters are dialectic while interview responses and journal observations are subjective in nature. It is impossible to assign a unidirectional causal link between the rhetorical genres of leaders and encounter participants as these rhetorical patterns are mutually enacted on a day-to-day basis. This mutuality is the essence of rhetoric as ontology. According to Campbell and Jamieson (1986, p.295), "genres are jointly constructed by rhetors and audiences." It is important to add that in this field study, the researcher also plays a role in constructing these genres.

The rhetorical exchanges of a "results" orientation by administrative leaders and a "task/duty" orientation by encounter participants, as well as the mutual concern for people, relationships, and key values join together to build the bridge between leading and organizing in the Roanoke County administration. In addition, all interview responses communicate a context of democratic governance infused with values and principles enacted on a daily basis within the administration. Both the formal and informal interviews reaffirm the earlier findings reported from the observation data. Rhetoric as praxis is the internal dynamic that builds the bridge between leading, organizing, and democratic governance in the Roanoke County administration.

CONCLUSION

The two primary rhetorical genres revealed in the first section, *outcome rhetoric* and *technical/task rhetoric*, as well as *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric* are organized by an internal dyanamic of rhetoric as praxis. The democratic values and principles revealed in the second section outlines a "process" context, unique to public administration because of its normative dimension. There is a bond and commitment to act toward agreed-upon task-goals. Additionally, there is a sensitivity among study participants about working with other people.

This is characterized by a sense of mutuality and reciprocity in developing and maintaining authentic human relationships.

Rhetoric as praxis is reaffirmed in the third section as rhetorical consistency is found between the words and deeds of both leaders and encounter participants/employees. Schon's notion of reflexivity and "reflection-in-action" are the key components of rhetoric as praxis as the internal dynamic rhetorically enacted throughout the field study. Most importantly, the findings evidence the presence of *relational interplay* between leading, organizing, and democratic governance. The rhetorical patterns demonstrate *interplay* among leading, organizing, and democratic governance because they encompass interactive speech acts involving collective action. It is *relational* because the rhetorical patterns of people are intersubjectively constructed, are dynamic, and are circular in practice. Field study participants institutionalize these rhetorical patterns and practices as they are produced and reproduced on a continuous basis within the Roanoke County administration.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINALE

INTRODUCTION: "THERE'S NO PLACE LIKE HOME"

As Dorothy is about to travel back to her home in Kansas, she reflects on what she has learned during her journey through the Land of Oz. She must have thought about all of the challenges she faced along the way. Rhetoric, leading, organizing, and governance were intregal components of her trip. Governance took place because each of the characters in the story exerted influence over their own destinies and each contributed to leading and organizing along the way. Like Dorothy, we will reflect on the lessons learned in the dissertation. In the first section, the linkages and connections developed among rhetoric, leading, organizing, and democratic governance are drawn together toward a more integrated understanding of these phenomena in organizational life. The second section reports post-study findings. Field study findings were presented to the study participants in order to share our learning experiences. Finally, the dissertation concludes with a heuristic discussion of the broader implications for further study.

SECTION ONE: TOWARD INTEGRATION

Summary

The Good Witch told Dorothy that she had always had the power to get back to Kansas but did not believe it. Before Dorothy tapped the heels of her ruby slippers three times and said "there's no place like home", she told the Good Witch what she had learned: "If I ever go looking for my heart's desire again, I won't look any further than my own back yard because if it isn't there, then I never really lost it to begin with." The Good Witch pointed out to Dorothy that she had to find this out for herself during her journey.

This is a valuable lesson for public administrators as well. Public administration in many respects is within ourselves. Field study results point to rhetoric as praxis connecting the individual level of understanding to the organizational level of understanding. "Reflection-in-action" is the self-conscious reflexivity required for an individual to understand and act upon their connection and interconnection to others. Authentic relationships are born from an

individual awareness that is both "self-regarding and other-regarding". This leads to mutuality and reciprocity in authentic, caring relationships. Rhetoric as praxis was the means by which these concepts were enacted through specific patterns of rhetorical genres of leading and organizing in the Roanoke County administration. The lesson learned by Dorothy, and from the field study is that public administration involves growing and developing as individuals over time and through experience. The journey in democratic governance begins with ourselves, continues on with ourselves, and ends with ourselves. Self-knowledge as self-formation includes the development of intellect, heart, and courage. Dorothy, the Scarecrow, the Tin Woodman, and the Cowardly Lion matured during their travels and realized an appreciation for what was already within themselves all along. Eventually their consciousness was raised, and the level of their self-awareness was heightened as they faced the challenges of their journey on the yellow brick road.

The uniqueness of public administration was revealed in the democratic values and principles observed during the field study. They formed the "process" context of the normative dimension of public administration. The two pairs of dominant rhetorical genres, *outcome rhetoric* and *technical/task rhetoric*, as well as *caring rhetoric* and *relationship rhetoric,* were organized by the internal dynamic of rhetoric as praxis. If rhetoric as praxis was the means by which leading, organizing, and democratic governance were enacted, then *relational interplay* was the dynamic phenomenon that occurred among these complex constructs. Individuals and their relationships with others intersubjectively produced and reproduced these interactive speech acts to institutionalize the rhetorical patterns and practices observed in the field study.

Multiple Layers Revisited

The multiple layers of understanding contained within the dissertation were outlined in Chapter One and warrant reconsideration. The goal in the first layer of understanding was to begin to build conceptual linkages between the two theoretical realms of leadership and organization. As summarized above, rhetoric as praxis has served that purpose by connecting the individual level of understanding to the organizational level of understanding. Rhetorical

patterns were observed in the field study leading to specific rhetorical genres. Specific rhetorical genres may differ from public agency to public agency, but rhetoric as praxis, as an internal dynamic, is a significant theoretical development.

Rhetoric as praxis is theoretically significant because it not only bridges the gap between leading and organizing, but also serves as a connection to the unique context of democratic governance. Rhetorical patterns not only point out similarities, but also point to those similarities that are "rhetorically absorbing and consequential" (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990, p.8). Because public administration involves individual and collective action, what we say and how we say it is inextricably linked to our actions on a day-to-day basis. Rhetorical patterns, produced and reproduced, institutionalize daily life in public organizations. As human beings, public administrators are capable of thoughtful, reflexive, and deeply caring relationships with, and on behalf of, other people. At another extreme, public administrators are also capable of being "headless, soulless" bureaucrats. It is quite possible that study participants could have been demonstrating this negative behavior when not being observed by the researcher. Public administrators also have a specific job to perform. Rhetoric as praxis is the conceptual "link between function and form" (p.8) that connects leading and organizing in the context of democratic governance. The "process" context of the normative dimension of public administration highlighted the democratic values and principles observed in the field study. Rhetoric as praxis illuminated the *relational interplay* as a dynamic interconnecting leading, organizing, and democratic governance.

Another layer of understanding to reexamine was the introduction of a new methodological technique to the field of public administration. Rhetorical criticism was borrowed from communication studies and applied to the field study. Rhetorical genre, a specific type of rhetorical criticism, was selected to ascertain the rhetorical patterns of study participants. An original research design was created to observe leading, organizing, and democratic governance in a public administration. Along with interview data, analysis inductively led to rhetorical patterns forming many rhetorical genres. Two pairs of genres, the most prevalent, proved to be the most "rhetorically absorbing and consequential" in the

Roanoke County administration.

Methodologically, the researcher provided an additional rhetorical lens to the field study. In attempting to communicate rhetoric as the central story line of the dissertation, the rhetoric of the researcher as storyteller is relevant to any interpretive work. Rhetoric is the intercalary story line and storyteller in this dissertation. Consequently, the dissertation as a whole is rhetorical in nature because it ultimately makes an argument about leading, organizing, and democratic governance in the field of public administration.

Finally, the third layer of understanding was at the applied level. The goal for this layer was for study participants to achieve a better understanding of the constitutive dimension of their own rhetoric, as well as the rhetoric of others. Field study findings were presented to field study participants. The next section reports on the presentation to field study participants and the post-study findings.

SECTION TWO: POST-STUDY FINDINGS

Approximately eight months after the completion of the field study and analyses, the researcher convened a meeting with the six administrative leaders who were shadowed during the field study. Two leaders were unable to attend due to illness. The meeting with the four study participants was ninety minutes in duration. As leaders arrived they appeared very relaxed, making me feel very welcome. I began the meeting by refreshing their memories about the topic of my dissertation. Each of the six administrative leaders had been supplied with copies of the dissertation prospectus immediately prior to my shadowing them. I proceeded to explain the actual research design, to present the findings, and to distribute a handout outlining the findings.

I explained the requirements for the Human Subjects Committee, distributed the Informed Consent Forms (see Appendix A), and passed around a copy of Appendix B and Appendix C. They were told that after the dissertation was approved by my committee it would be placed on the World Wide Web. I asked them to read the Informed Consent Form carefully before signing it. Meeting participants became somewhat uneasy at the prospect of the appendices being available on the World Wide Web. I reassured them by asking them to

read their portions of Appendix B, and suggesting that I did not believe they would find any of the material objectionable. They took a great deal of time reading their individual portions of Appendix B, and eventually became light-hearted concerning its availability on the Web. They also read the portions on behalf of the administrative leaders who were unable to attend this meeting. One of the meeting participants objected to one item written in one of the encounters in Appendix B because it had become a sensitive issue subsequent to the completion of the field study. I agreed to alter a few sentences to accommodate his concern, and assured him that the following week I would send a revised copy of the encounter.

A discussion followed regarding their reactions to the findings I had presented to them earlier. The County Administrator wanted to know if I found any major problems during the field study, and what recommendations I had for them. I reassured him that I had not discovered any major problems with their administration, and added that they had the usual complement of minor problems. I also reminded them that I had not conducted the study with the purpose of seeking out problems with their administration. I suggested to them that they share the many positive aspects of the research findings with their staff. Additionally, I encouraged them to continue to support and nurture their collective concern for people and key values. I used mutual respect as an example of one of the key values I observed throughout the field study.

Finally, I facilitated discussion that would address the applied level of understanding for the practice-oriented layer of the dissertation. I asked meeting participants if my field study findings could be useful for them in any way. They did not respond. I suggested, for example, that perhaps rhetoric could be used as a training tool for administrators and staff. They believed that more work would be needed to craft the findings into a training and development tool but felt that it definitely had potential in that direction. Notably, one meeting participant suggested that it would be interesting to conduct the same field study with other local governments and to compare results. Other administrative leaders concurred with this suggestion.

The meeting concluded informally with thanks being exchanged. The County

Administrator specifically thanked me for my input during our shadowing experience together. He had found my suggestions helpful. I thanked all of them and told them that my findings were "good news" for the Roanoke County administration because they presented themselves as a desirable and progressive employer, in addition to working hard for their citizens.

The post study findings yielded two very important points. First, at the applied level of understanding, the findings have tremendous potential for training and development activities. Second, from a research standpoint, the research design and implementation appeared to be worthy of further studies of a similar nature. The potential for comparative studies of local governments was of interest to Roanoke County study participants. Both of these important points lead us to a heuristic discussion of the broader implications of the research for further study.

<div align="center">SECTION THREE: BROADER IMPLICATIONS</div>

Green, Keller, and Wamsley (1993) raise enlightening issues in their article entitled "Reconstituting a Profession for American Public Administration" that provide promise for the findings in this dissertation. Their article discusses the traditional reliance on instrumental rationality in public administration embodied in the technicism of the field. They propose that the profession be based on a political model rather than that of science. "The profession's political foundations consist of normative and constitutive dimensions that help define distinctive roles, competencies, and structures" (p.519).

The normative dimension includes democratic principles and values previously discussed as well as the "common good" and "agency" (p.519). The state, along with values and principles such as the common good and agency, form the constitutive dimension of the field. Like Brian Cook, they believe that public administration "*should serve as a constitutional agent*" (p.519). Also, public administrators play an active role in this constitutive dimension because the process inherently involves public argument. In referring to the field they say that "*we constitute ourselves rhetorically*" (p.519). Similar to Zinke's discussion earlier, they explain:

The Constitution, of course, forms a great centerpiece in public argument (Rohr,

1986). It was founded in argument, and its structure and values encourage continued

public debate through independent institutions exercising varying competencies and

powers. Public administration shares the obligation to encourage and participate in

this debate, and to develop its competencies and powers accordingly. *This means that*

it should shape its practices through rhetoric. [italics added] (p.520)

This approach to the profession of public administration joined with the revelations from this

dissertation portends enormous implications for the field, particularly for public administration

theory, practice, and education.

Theory

The political model outlined above by Green, Keller, and Wamsley comports with

further development of rhetoric as praxis as a theoretical expression in the field of public

administration. The *relational interplay* interconnecting leading, organizing, and democratic

governance is derived from the social and political essence of public administration. Public

administration is intersubjective, active, and rhetorical, and operates in a "process" context of

mutuality. Harmon and Meyer (1986, pp.307-308) elaborate:

Action expresses our active nature and thus should be prized for its own sake, but it

also expresses our social nature as well. Through social action, the quality of relations

with others profoundly affects the projects and possibilities that we might discover and

toward which we direct our energies. Although others may constrain our action, they

also make it possible in the first place, by bounding and providing nurture for it.

This framework contains enormous theoretical potential for additional avenues of

exploration in the field of public administration. For instance, rhetoric as praxis opens an

interesting window into ethics. The rhetorical lens into ethical considerations within the field

poses interesting challenges. In particular, how does a dynamic such as *relational interplay*

figure into means/ends calculations in public administration; and rhetorically speaking, where

does action fit into the ethics picture? From a rhetorical standpoint, can means, ends, and

action ever be distinctly separate; and if so, what type of rhetorical genres would come into

play?

100

Another avenue for consideration of the rhetorical lens in public administration is public policy. Theoretical work is already underway in this regard. Liggett (1990, p.86), for example, proposes a model of policy analysis that looks "at policy within the context of contemporary language theory [that] privileges context and highlights the political consequences of participating in the negotiation of meaning." The constitutive aspect of rhetoric as praxis in Liggett's model suggests that meaning and politics are multi-vocal, and are both generated and located "at a number of different sites" (p.86).

Throgmorton (1991) proposes that "policy analysis is inherently rhetorical, that it cannot be fully understood apart from the audiences to which it is directed and the styles in which it is communicated" (p.153). Policy analysts are in a rhetorical situation between three competing audiences: scientists, politicians, and lay advocates. He suggests that in order for policy analysts to be successful, they must persuade all three audiences and "actively mediate the policy discourse between scientists, politicians, and advocates" (p.153). Throgmorton presents the policy situation of Love Canal, New York that illuminates the *relational interplay* of rhetoric as praxis.

The rhetorical lens opens endless possibilities for further theoretical development in the field of public administration. Other areas not mentioned above such as budgeting, management processes, as well as additional work in organizing and leading, are ripe for rhetorical consideration. Human resource management is another area in the field that will be explored next as it may be applied to practice.

Practice

Rhetoric as praxis and the rhetorical genres it engenders may be re-crafted into a training and development tool for practitioners in public agencies. In particular, human resource managers or organizational development consultants could integrate self-conscious reflection of administrative rhetoric into training and development activities for their agencies. For example, this would be useful as part of a strategic planning process in order to heighten awareness concerning the importance of what public administrators say and how they say it. The rhetorical genres present in an agency are infused with meaning and values that may not

be fully understood by organizational members. This is particularly important when undertaking a major organizational change process such as strategic planning.

Additionally, the rhetorical lens could be used in orientation programs, sensitivity training exercises, or interpersonal relations programs as examples. Public administrators would be asked to complete various types of exercises both individually, as well as in group work activity. This would provide public servants, at all levels of their organizations, an opportunity for self-conscious reflection regarding the importance of their rhetoric and those of others in the interconnected world in which they work every day. Their relationships with everyone they touch during their day-to-day activities is crucial to their public service, and rhetorical competence is an essential ingredient.

As a precaution, both trainers and consultants must be made aware of the potential the rhetorical lens contains for misuse. Administrative rhetoric is normative, and not a device for disingenuous manipulation of others. Self-knowledge as self-formation for individuals in public service is a growth process. This process involves human emotion that should not be viewed lightly or instrumentally. Hearts should not be managed, but nurtured and given time and space to grow on their own (Hochschild, 1983).

Education

The rhetorical lens provides lessons for public administration education. Rhetorical competence is essential for practice and should be considered in educational curricula. At the MPA level, rhetorical competency skills should be developed throughout all the courses, not unlike the training and development discussed above. Additional emphasis should be placed on interpersonal skills development as key to practice. At the Ph.D. level, the same should occur in their practice-oriented course work. Theoretically, Ph.D. students should be exposed to language and rhetoric as an important paradigmatic lens in the field. Both teaching and scholarly writing are inherently rhetorical. We are always implicitly projecting a point of view or explicitly arguing a particular stance in teaching, writing, and in our organizations within academic life. We do a great disservice to ourselves, our colleagues, our communities, and our students if we choose not to openly acknowledge the normative dimensions of specific

102

rhetoric as well as the rhetorical lens in general.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Public administrators are often portrayed as being battered and bruised in their thankless jobs. In comparison, Dorothy and her companions could have succumbed to their own negative self-concepts as well as to the daunting challenges they faced along the yellow brick road. The work in this dissertation provides an initial framework for a new window into our field. As Dorothy remarked when her house landed in Oz, "I have a feeling we're not in Kansas anymore. We must be over the rainbow." Public administrators, like Dorothy and her friends, must not succumb to negative self-images and negative portrayals of the field by others. Democratic governance provides a distinct context in which leading and organizing takes place. The rhetorical lens presented in this dissertation provides an opportunity for public administration to take itself "over the rainbow" at both the individual and collective levels. Individual development and collective action through authentic, caring relationships are the promise for public administrators. Rhetoric as praxis, as both the means and the dynamic, is the theoretical cornerstone for further development of this promise for our field.

References

Appleby, P.H. (1965). Public administration and democracy. In R.C. Martin (Ed.), <u>Public administration and democracy: Essays in honor of Paul H. Appleby</u> (pp.333-347). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Barnard, C.I. (1938; 1968).<u>The functions of the executive</u>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barnard, C.I. (1949). <u>Organization and management: Selected papers</u>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Berger, P.L. & Luckmann, T. (1966). <u>The social construction of reality: A treatise in the</u>, L.F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. <u>Philosophy and Rhetoric</u>, 1, 1-14.<u> sociology of knowledge</u>. NY: Doubleday.

Bitzer, L.F. (1978). Rhetoric and public knowledge. In D.M. Burks (Ed.), <u>Rhetoric, philosophy, and literature: An exploration</u> (pp.67-93). West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Bitzer, L.F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. <u>Philosophy and Rhetoric</u>, 1, 1-14.

Bormann, E. (1978). Rhetorical criticism and significant form: A humanistic approach.   In K.K. Campbell & K.H. Jamieson (Eds.), <u>Form and genre: Shaping rhetorical action</u> (pp.165-187). Falls Church, VA: The Speech Communication Association.

Brummett, B. (1976). Some implications of 'process' or 'intersubjectivity': Postmodern rhetoric. <u>Philosophy and Rhetoric</u>, 9, 1, 21-51.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979). <u>Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis: Elements of the sociology of corporate life</u>. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Campbell, K.K., & Jamieson, K.H. (1990). <u>Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance</u>. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, K.K., & Jamieson, K.H. (Eds.). (1978). <u>Form and genre: Shaping rhetorical action</u>. Falls Church, VA: The Speech Communication Association.

Campbell, K.K., & Jamieson, K.H. (Eds.). (1986). Introduction. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 51, 293-299.

Conley, T.M. (1979). Ancient rhetoric and modern genre criticism. Communication Quarterly, 27, 47-53.

Conley, T.M. (1986). The Linnaean blues: Thoughts on the genre approach. In H.W. Simons & A.A. Aghazarian (Eds.), Form, genre, and the study of political discourse (pp.59-78). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Cook, B.J. (1996). Bureaucracy and self-government: Reconsidering the role of public administration in American politics. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Doig, J.W. & Hargrove, E.C. (Eds.). (1987). Leadership and innovation: A biographical perspective on entrepreneurs in government. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Farrell, T.B. (1976). Knowledge, consensus, and rhetorical theory. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62, 1, 1-14.

Ferguson, K.E. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Fineman, S. & Gabriel, Y. (1994). Paradigms of organizations: An exploration in textbook rhetorics. Organization, 1, 2, 375-399.

Follett, M.P. (1918, 1965). The new state: Group organization the solution of popular government. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith.

Foss, S.K. (1989). Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice. Prospect Hts., IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Foss, S.K., Foss, K.A., & Trapp, R. (1985). Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric. Prospect Hts., IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Fox, E.M. & Urwick, L. (1973). Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett (2nd ed.). London, England: Pitman Publishing.

Friedrich, C.J. (1961). Political leadership and the problem of the charismatic power. The Journal of Politics, 23, 3-24.

Fry, B.R. (1989). Mastering public administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers, Inc.

Gawthrop, L.C. (1997). Democracy, bureaucracy, and hypocrisy redux: A search for sympathy and compassion. Public Administration Review, 57, 3, 205-210.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Golden, J.L., Berquist, G.F., & Coleman, W.E. (1992). The rhetoric of western thought (5th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Goodsell, C.T. (1994). The case for bureaucracy: A public administration polemic (3rd ed.). Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers, Inc.

Green, R.T., Keller, L.F., & Wamsley, G.L. (1993). Reconstituting a profession for American public administration. Public Administration Review, 53, 6, 516-524.

Green, R.T. & Zinke, R.C. (1993). The rhetorical way of knowing and public administration. Administration & Society, 25, 3, 317-334.

Halloran, M. (1978). Doing public business in public. In K.K. Campbell & K.H. Jamieson (Eds.), Form and genre: Shaping rhetorical action (pp.118-138). Falls Church, VA: The Speech Communication Association.

Hamilton, P.M. (1997). Rhetorical discourse of local pay. Organization, 4, 2, 229-254.

Harmetz, A. (1989). The making of the Wizard of Oz. NY: Delta.

Harmon, M.M. & Mayer, R.T. (1986). Organization theory for public administration. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Harrell, J. & Linkugel, W.A. (1978). On rhetorical genre: An organizing perspective. Philosophy and Rhetoric, 11, 4, 262-281.

Hart, R.P. (1990). Modern rhetorical criticism. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Hart, R.P. (1987). The sound of leadership: Presidential communication in the modern age. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Hochschild, A.R. (1983). <u>The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling</u>. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hult, K.M. & Walcott, C. (1990). <u>Governing public organizations: Politics, structures, and institutional design</u>. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Hummel, R.P. (1994). <u>The bureaucratic experience: A critique of life in the modern organization</u> ([4th] ed.). NY: St. Martin's Press.

Hummel, R.P. & Goodsell, C.T. (1988). Point......counterpoint. <u>The Bureaucrat</u>, 17, 2, 24-28.

Iannello, K.P. (1992). <u>Decisions without hierarchy: Feminist interventions in organization theory and practice</u>. NY: Routledge.

Jamieson, K.H. (1973). Generic constraints and the rhetorical situation. <u>Philosophy and Rhetoric</u>, 6, 3, 162-170.

Kieser, A. (1997). Rhetoric and myth in management fashion. <u>Organization</u>, 4, 1, 49-74.

LeRoy, M. (Producer), & Fleming, V. (Director). (1939). <u>The Wizard of Oz</u> [Film]. Culver City, CA: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Liggett, H. (1990). The verbal usury model: A post-structuralist approach to policy analysis. <u>Research in Social Policy</u>, 2, 69-90.

Lindlof, T.R. (1995).<u>Qualitative communication research methods</u>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Manning, R. (1992). Just caring. In E.B. Cole & S. Coultrap-McQuin (Eds.), <u>Explorations in feminist ethics: Theory and practice</u> (pp.45-54). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

McGee, M.C. & M.A. Martin (1983). Public knowledge and ideological argumentation. <u>Communication Monographs</u>, 50, 47-65.

McSwite, O.C. (1996). Postmodernism, public administration, and the public interest. In G.L. Wamsley & J.F. Wolf (Eds.), <u>Refounding democratic public administration: Modern paradoxes, postmodern challenges</u> (pp.198-224). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary (1994) (10th ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam-
Webster.

Miller, C.R. (1984). Genre as social action. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70, 151-167.

Myers, I.B. & Myers, P.B. (1993). Gifts differing: Understanding personality type. Palo Alto,
CA: CPP Books.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park,
CA: Sage Publications.

Perrow, C. (1986). Complex organizations: A critical essay (3rd ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill.

Pondy, L.R. (1978). Leadership is a language game. In M.W. McCall, Jr. & M.M. Lombardo
(Eds.), Leadership: Where else can we go? (pp.87-99). Durham, NC: Duke University
Press.

Riccucci, N.M. (1995). Unsung heroes: Federal execucrats making a difference. Washington,
D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Rohr, J.A. (1989). Ethics for bureaucrats: An essay on law and values (2nd ed.). NY: Marcel
Dekker, Inc.

Schon, D.A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. NY: Basic
Books, Inc., Publishers.

Selznick, P. (1948, 1992). Foundations of the theory of organization. In J.M. Shafritz & J.S.
Ott, Classics of organization theory (3rd ed.) (pp.114-123). Pacific Grove, CA:
Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation. Berkeley, CA:
University of California Press.

Selznick, P. (1992). The moral commonwealth: Social theory and the promise of community.
Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Shamir, B., Arthur, M.B., & House, R.J. (1994). The rhetoric of charismatic leadership: A
theoretical extension, a case study, and implications for research. Leadership
Quarterly, 5, 1, 25-42.

Silverman, D. (1993). <u>Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction</u>. London, England: Sage Publications.

Smircich, L. & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. <u>The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science</u>, 18, 3, 257-273.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). <u>Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques</u>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), <u>Handbook of qualitative research</u> (pp.273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Surrey, J.L. (1991). The self-in-relation: A theory of women's development. In J.V. Jordon, A.G. Kaplan, J.B. Miller, I.P. Stiver, & J.L. Surrey, <u>Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center</u> (pp.51-66). NY: Guilford Press.

Terry, L.D. (1995). <u>Leadership of public bureaucracies: The administrator as conservator</u>. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Thayer, L. (1988). Leadership/communications: A critical review and a modest proposal. In G.M. Goldhaber & G.A. Barnett (Eds.), <u>Handbook of organizational communication</u> (pp.231-263). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Throgmorton, J.A. (1991). The rhetorics of policy analysis. <u>Policy Sciences</u>, 24, 153-179.

Tomm, W. (1992). Ethics and self-knowing: The satisfaction of desire. In E.B. Cole & S. Coultrap-McQuin (Eds.), <u>Explorations in feminist ethics: Theory and Practice</u> (pp.101-110). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Townley, B. (1995). 'Know thyself': Self-Awareness, self-formation and managing. <u>Organization</u>, 2, 2, 271-289.

Tulis, J.K. (1987). <u>The rhetorical presidency</u>. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Waldo, D. (1981). <u>The enterprise of public administration: A summary view</u>. Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp Publishers, Inc.

Wamsley, G.L. (1996). A public philosophy and ontological disclosure as the basis for normatively grounded theorizing in public administration. In G.L. Wamsley & J.F. Wolf (Eds.), Refounding democratic public administration: Modern paradoxes, postmodern challenges (pp.351-401). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Weick, K.E. (1995). Sensemaking in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

White, O., Jr. (1994, Spring). A second letter from Praque: Existential crisis on Ostrouni street. Unpublished open letter to the Center for Public Administration and Policy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.

Windt, T.O., Jr. (1986). Presidential rhetoric: Definition of a field of study. Presidential Studies Quarterly, 16, 1, 102-116.

Wood, J.T. (1994). Who cares? Women, care, and culture Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Woodward, G.C., & Denton, Jr., R.E. (1992). Persuasion and influence in American life (2nd ed.). Prospect Hts., IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Zhao, S. (1991). Rhetoric as praxis: An alternative to the epistemic approach. Philosophy and Rhetoric, 24, 3, 255-266.

Zinke, R.C. (1992). American constitutionalism in the interconnected world: Administrative responsibilities in a rhetorical republic. In M.T. Bailey & R.T. Mayer (Eds.), Public management in an interconnected world: Essays in the Minnowbrook tradition (pp.145-157). NY: Greenwood Press.

APPENDIX A

PROTOCOL

Justification of Project

The purpose of this dissertation project research is to develop cohesive conceptual linkages between leading and organizing characteristics using rhetoric as the unifying theme. Traditionally, rhetoric is a negative term. This dissertation research will use rhetoric as a neutral concept. The research will involve examining the relationship between leading and organizing characteristics of the Roanoke County administration by observing and interpreting the day-to-day rhetoric of study participants. The substance, style, and situational aspects of the administrative rhetoric used is the focus of the study. The field study will include interviews with six leaders, "shadowing" and observing these leaders, informally interviewing and observing 15-20 staff, and reporting the findings to the participants involved in the study. For organizational members, what is said and how it is said has tremendous impact on both leading and organizing.

Procedures

The subject pool will consist of six administrative leaders in the Roanoke County administration. The County Administrator and two Assistant County Administrators serve as troubleshooters/coaches for departments assigned to them within the Roanoke County administration. The researcher, in consultation with the three top administrators, will select three departments for intensive study, one from each assignment. Departments of different sizes serving different roles and functions are selected in order to attain a cross-section of department purposes and stakeholders involved from the community. The departments chosen are Human Resources, Parks & Recreation, and Procurement Services. The leaders of these particular departments have served for varying amounts of time and come from different backgrounds. Of the six leaders chosen, one leader is female, and ages vary a great deal (30's-60's).

Each leader, on a voluntary basis, is shadowed for 3-5 days based on the leader's schedule and the specific leader's own convenience. The shadowing experience begins with

an in-depth, open-ended interview (see attached Open-Ended Interview Questions). The first four questions are intended to put the leader at ease, and for the researcher to get acquainted with each of the leaders. Responses to the first four questions are not used in the dissertation. The responses to the remaining seven questions are used anonymously within the dissertation. The field study focuses upon the rhetorical genre of each leader. Careful observational notes are taken by the researcher in the field. The accumulated field notes form a field journal for each leader being studied in order to organize all of the collected data.

The schedule with each leader is determined several days in advance at the convenience of the leader. When meeting with other people, the leader is asked to introduce the researcher and explain what the researcher is doing openly and honestly. All six leaders agree with this procedure.

Informal, unstructured interviews will take place with staff members of each of the leaders. Questions for the informal interviews are not predetermined or written down. The researcher will get permission from the leader prior to talking with staff. Participation by staff is voluntary and will occur at their convenience. The purpose of informal interviews with staff is to understand their job responsibilities and their perspectives on the mission and values of their departments and the county administration in general. In preliminary discussions with the six leaders, all encouraged the researcher to meet and talk with their staff. The researcher will informally interview 15-20 staff members.

Risks and Benefits

The field study subjects are participating voluntarily. Each has the right to refuse to answer questions posed by the researcher formally or informally and may request that sensitive information not be written down or used by the researcher in the dissertation. In fact, the researcher has assured the study participants that no sensitive information (personnel issues) will be used in the dissertation. The researcher also encouraged study participants to excuse the researcher at any time, for any reason they would deem necessary from any encounter during the shadowing experience.

Upon completion of the data analysis, and after the emergent conceptual linkages are

identified, the researcher will meet with the six leaders studied in the Roanoke County administration. The research results will be reported to the participants and a focused discussion will occur. This discussion will center on what was learned by everyone involved, including the researcher, about the entire research process and the results. The major discussion points and feedback from participants will be included in the dissertation.

Confidentiality/Anonymity

Each participant is informed that no sensitive information (personnel issues) will be written down or used in the dissertation. Neither confidentiality or anonymity is promised to the six leaders. All six study participants are referred to by their titles rather than their specific names in the dissertation. Responses to the formal interviews are anonymous as they are reported as an aggregate group in the dissertation. For the informal interviews with staff, anonymity is preserved as their responses are presented in the dissertation as an aggregate group.

Informed Consent

The researcher will not be reviewing any files or records during the field study that are not public documents already. Informed consent from each of the six leaders is attached to this application. As the 15-20 informal interviews are to acquaint the researcher with administrative roles, systems, culture, and functions within the county, informed consent will not be obtained. This type of information is available to any member of the "public".

Biographical Sketch

1. Primary Investigator: Tracey J. Bennett, doctoral candidate, Center for Public Administration and Policy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

I completed my B.A. in Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University in 1989. In 1993 I completed my M.P.A. (Master of Public Administration) at Cleveland State University. Prior to completing my degrees I worked for seven years in two different research libraries at Kent State University Library, and Case Western Reserve University Library. From 1992-1993 I was the Quality Assurance Coordinator at Mental Health Rehabilitation and Research Inc., a community mental health agency in Cleveland, Ohio. From 1989-1992 I was an Associate

Ombudsman and Interim Director at the Citizens of Cuyahoga County Ombudsman Office mediating individual complaints by county citizens about county government and related services. These complaints often involved very sensitive information and at times involved great risk to our clients.

I was a member of the Cuyahoga County Community Mental Health Board from 1986-1991. It is a governmental Board with a $30 million budget responsibility to plan, allocate, monitor, and evaluate the community mental health service system. I served as a Board member for five years, one year as chair, and two years as vice-chair. For several years I was a member of the Ohio Legal Rights Service Protection and Advocacy Advisory Council in Columbus, Ohio, serving as chair for two years. I was a presenter for the Ohio Department of Mental Health at a training seminar on their new medication policy for state psychiatric hospitals. I was also a panel member for the Ohio Department of Mental Health's regional conference entitled: "The Road to Informed Consent" that took place in Cleveland, Ohio. Additionally, I was a presenter at numerous workshops in the mental health field.

Upon entering the Ph.D. program at Virginia Tech's Center for Public Administration and Policy in August, 1993, I was a graduate assistant during my studies. In my second and third years I served as a teaching assistant within the Center. By the end of my third year I taught a Ph.D. level course due to illness of a faculty member and co-taught an additional Ph.D. level course with another faculty member. During the Fall 1996 semester I taught a required MPA course for the Center. In the Spring of 1997, I was asked to provide administrative support services to the Center to include writing the annual newsletter, helping to develop a Service Learning course for the Center, and other support services as needed throughout the semester. I am currently working full time on my dissertation.

2. Faculty Advisor/Chair of Dissertation Committee: Dr. Charles T. Goodsell, Professor, Center for Public Administration and Policy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Professor Goodsell served as Director of the Center, 1986-1991. He was a Visiting Professor at the College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University, 1991-1992. He was

also a Visiting Professor at Carleton University in 1986, and the Department of Government at the University of Texas at Austin in 1978. Dr. Goodsell was a Professor in the Department of Political Science at Southern Illinois University, 1972-1978 where he served as Director of the Masters of Public Affairs Program, 1974-1977. He was Associate Professor in the Department of Government at Southern Illinois University, 1966-1972. Dr. Goodsell was a Research Associate at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, 1964-1966. He was an Assistant Professor in the School of Public Administration at the University of Puerto Rico, 1961-1964. Professor Goodsell received his education at Kalamazoo College and Harvard University. Major publications include numerous journal articles and:

<blockquote>

Public Administration Illuminated and Inspired by the Arts (co-ed. With Nancy Murray)

Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1995.

The Social Meaning of Civic Space: Studying Political Authority Through Architecture.

Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1988.

The Case for Bureaucracy: A Public Administration Polemic

Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1983; 2nd ed.1985; 3rd ed. 1994.

The Public Encounter: Where State and Citizen Meet (ed.)

Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981.

</blockquote>

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent for Participants

of Investigative Projects

Title of Project: Dissertation Working Title: <u>Rhetoric as Praxis in Leading and Organizing a</u> <u>Public Agency</u>

Investigator: Tracey J. Bennett, doctoral candidate

I. The Purpose of this Research/Project

The purpose of this dissertation project research is to develop cohesive conceptual linkages between leading and organizing characteristics using rhetoric as the unifying theme. Traditionally, rhetoric is a negative term. This dissertation research will use rhetoric as a neutral concept. The research will involve examining the relationship between leading and organizing characteristics of the Roanoke County administration by observing and interpreting the day-to-day rhetoric of study participants. The substance, style, and situational aspects of the administrative rhetoric used is the focus of the study. The field study will include interviews with six leaders, "shadowing" and observing these leaders, informally interviewing and observing 15-20 staff, and reporting the findings to the participants involved in the study. For organizational members, what is said and how it is said has tremendous impact on both leading and organizing.

II. Procedures

The subject pool will consist of six administrative leaders in the Roanoke County administration. The County Administrator and two Assistant County Administrators serve as troubleshooters/coaches for departments assigned to them within the Roanoke County administration. The researcher, in consultation with the three top administrators, will select three departments for intensive study, one from each assignment. Departments of different sizes serving different roles and functions are selected in order to attain a cross-section of department purposes and stakeholders involved from the community. The departments chosen are Human Resources, Parks & Recreation, and Procurement Services.   The leaders of these particular departments have served for varying amounts of time and come from

different backgrounds. Of the six leaders chosen, one leader is female, and their ages vary.

Each leader, on a voluntary basis, is shadowed for 3-5 days based on the leader's schedule and the specific leader's own convenience. The shadowing experience begins with an in-depth, open-ended interview. The first four questions are intended to put the leader at ease, and for the researcher to get acquainted with each of the leaders. Responses to the first four questions are not used in the dissertation. The responses to the remaining seven questions are used anonymously within the dissertation. The field study focuses upon the rhetorical genre of each leader. Careful observational notes are taken by the researcher in the field. The accumulated field notes form a field journal for each leader being studied in order to organize all of the collected data.

The schedule with each leader is determined several days in advance at the convenience of the leader. When meeting with other people, the leader is asked to introduce the researcher and explain what the researcher is doing openly and honestly.

Informal, unstructured interviews take place with staff members of each of the leaders. Questions for the informal interviews are not predetermined or written down. The researcher will get permission from the leader prior to talking with staff. Participation by staff is voluntary and will occur at their convenience. The purpose of informal interviews with staff is to understand their job responsibilities and their perspectives on the mission and values of their departments and the county administration in general. In preliminary discussions with the six leaders, all encouraged the researcher to meet and talk with their staff. The researcher will informally interview 15-20 staff members.

III. Risks

As field study subjects, you are participating voluntarily and at no risk. Each of you has the right to refuse to answer questions posed by the researcher formally or informally and may request that sensitive information not be written down or used by the researcher in the dissertation. In fact, the researcher has assured you that no sensitive information (personnel issues) will be used in the dissertation. The researcher also encouraged you to excuse the researcher at any time for any reason you would deem necessary from any encounter during

the shadowing experience.

IV. Benefits

Upon completion of the data analysis, and after the emergent conceptual linkages are identified, the researcher will meet with the six leaders studied in the Roanoke County administration. The research results will be reported to you and a focused discussion will occur. This discussion will center on what was learned by everyone involved, including the researcher, about the entire research process and the results. The major discussion points and feedback from all participants will be included in the dissertation.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality

Each of you have been informed that no sensitive information (personnel issues) will be written down or used in the dissertation. Neither confidentiality or anonymity is promised to the six leaders. All six leaders are referred to by their titles rather than their specific names in the dissertation. Responses to the formal interviews with the six leaders are anonymous as they are reported as an aggregate group in the dissertation. For the informal interviews with staff, anonymity is preserved as their responses are presented in the dissertation as an aggregate group.

VI. Compensation

No monetary compensation is associated with your participation in this study.

VII. Freedom to Withdraw

You are free to withdraw from participation in this study at any time without penalty. You are free to not respond to any question, formal or informal during this study.

VIII. Approval of Research

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and by the Center for Public Administration and Policy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

IX. Subject's Responsibilities

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I have the following responsibilities:

1. To be available to be interviewed and shadowed for 3-5 working days to be scheduled at my convenience.

X. Subject's Permission

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for participation in this project.

If I participate, I may withdraw at any time without penalty. I agree to abide by the rules of this project.

_____

<div align="center">Signature   Date</div>

<div align="center">Should I have any questions about this research or its conduct, I may contact:</div>

Tracey J. Bennett   H.T. Hurd

Doctoral Candidate/Investigator   Chair, Institutional Review

1705 Boxwood Drive   Board for Research Involving

Blacksburg, VA 24060   Human Subjects (IRB)

(540) 951-7251   Research Division

                                                               Virginia Polytechnic Institute

Dr. Charles Goodsell   and State University

Professor/Dissertation Chairman   301 Burruss Hall

Center for Public Administration and Policy   (540) 231-5281

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

The Thomas-Conner House

104 Draper Road

Blacksburg, VA 24061

(540) 231-7034

Table 1.1 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric	**3**						
Monitoring Rhetoric	**1**						
Sensemaking Rhetoric		**2**					
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #1

Context This meeting, with the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services, was called spontaneously by the County Administrator on August 12, 1996. The meeting was conducted informally in the County Administrator's office, and was already underway when the researcher arrived to observe. The entire observation time for this encounter was five minutes. The pace of the encounter was very rapid. Isolated individually, the County Administrator was initially using *autocratic rhetoric* as he inquired about the status of the Cardinal Academy as a possible regional firing range. The County Administrator went on to ask several questions of the Assistant County Administrator, using *monitoring rhetoric* in his interaction. After the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services responded with information, the County Administrator began to ask questions and brainstorm other options for locating the regional firing range, using *outcome rhetoric*. As the County Administrator interacted with the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services, they were using *sensemaking rhetoric* to flush out the goals of a regional firing range as well as their options for a location.

The County Administrator then changed the topic of the meeting and discussed the transportation arrangements for their meeting an hour later at Roanoke City Hall. Isolated individually, the County Administrator used *autocratic rhetoric* to instruct the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services that all three of us would ride together in the County Administrator's car to the meeting at City Hall. The Assistant County Administrator was compliant as they worked out the details using *technical/task rhetoric*.

Intention The County Administrator's intention appeared to be two-fold. One, was to gather information about the status of the regional firing range. The other was to try to move the issue forward by letting the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services know that this particular issue was important and worthy of his attention.

Aftermath The regional firing range issue continued to be discussed periodically throughout the duration of the field study and remained an open issue at the conclusion of the field study. The Chief of police was also heavily involved with the firing range issue. The County

Administrator, the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services, and this researcher went to Roanoke City Hall together in the County Administrator's car for the next meeting.

Normative Concerns The primary normative concern in this encounter was *accountability*. The County Administrator was tracking this issue and had clear expectations that the regional firing range issue was to continue to move forward.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) *a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric*

       2) *a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric*

       3) *a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric*

Table 1.2 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric		**1**					
Affirmatory Rhetoric			**2**				
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric				**3**			

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #2

Context This meeting took place on August 12, 1996 at Roanoke City Hall with eleven people including relevant department heads from Roanoke city and county, as well as the city of Salem, and a representative from the Roanoke Valley Chamber of Commerce. The meeting took place in a conference room for 140 minutes, with the agenda centered around the regionalization of trash collection in the Roanoke Valley. Planning and analysis had been taking place for quite some time regarding this issue. However, more recently, BFI, a private trash hauler, had been putting a great deal of pressure on the city and county to privatize trash collection. BFI's tactic was to appeal to the citizenry through the media that privatizing trash collection would save the city and the county a great deal of money and be both more efficient and effective for both governments. BFI had been focusing their pressure specifically on members of Roanoke City Council, members of Roanoke County's Board of Supervisors, and the Chamber of Commerce. BFI's tactics forced an urgency to the trash collection issue and for this particular meeting.

For the first 55 minutes of the meeting, staff members from both the city and the county briefed meeting participants about current costs of trash collection for the city and the county. This was particularly important because the city and county were in different situations in their trash collection systems. A regional agency, the Virginia Resource Authority (VRA) had been created several years prior to manage a regional land fill as well as the trash transfer station for trash disposal. Trash is loaded onto a Norfolk and Southern train for transport to the land fill. This system avoids a steady stream of garbage trucks running through residential areas to unload into the land fill. As the briefing took place, several participants interrupted with questions and points of clarification about the statistics being presented at the meeting.

At the conclusion of the briefing, the Roanoke City Manager described the politics of the situation between BFI and the City Council. The County Administrator used *outcome rhetoric* in cautioning meeting participants that this issue is going to become very rough and described the politics of the situation between BFI and the County Board of Supervisors. The

County Administrator began interacting with the City Manager and other participants using *anticipatory rhetoric* as they both strategized how both city and county elected officials would react to various trash collection options that could be made available. Both the City Manager and County Administrator discussed the different roles of business and government using *didactic rhetoric* and responding to each other using *affirmatory rhetoric*. Emphasis was placed, with pride, on the higher quality of service that is provided by government. The meeting concluded with the County Administrator making jokes and kidding around using *reactive rhetoric* as there was a great deal of tension in the room. Other meeting participants reacted with more jokes as *relationship rhetoric* eased the tension and cemented the bond that these public administrators forged in facing an outside antagonistic force in BFI.

Intention The County Administrator's intention was to gather information on the statistics and to understand both the administrative and political spheres of the trash collection issue for both the city and the county. Also, the County Administrator wanted to flush out options and strategies to deal with the issue.

Aftermath The trash collection issue continued throughout the field study. Additional encounters document the aftermath of this particular meeting.

Normative Concerns *Efficiency* and *effectiveness* were the two normative concerns in this encounter. The County Administrator wanted to make sure the costs were reflected accurately and that high quality service was preserved in any option that they would take in the trash collection issue.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) *a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric*

       2) *a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric*

       3) *a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric*

Table 1.3 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric	**1**						
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #3

Context The County Administrator had a five minute meeting with the Budget Manager on August 12, 1996. The meeting took place in the County Administrator's office and was convened spontaneously by the County Administrator. Using *autocratic rhetoric*, the County Administrator instructed the Budget Manager to create a chart for the upcoming Board of Supervisors meeting regarding statistics about trash collection in the county. The County Administrator was very detailed in his directions to the Budget Manager. The Budget Manager responded by restating, in great detail, the directions he had just received from the County Administrator. Their exchange was very precise using *technical/task rhetoric*.

Intention The County Administrator's intentions were very deliberate. He knew exactly what he wanted from the Budget Manager and directed him to carry out his wishes for the chart for the Board of Supervisor's meeting.

Aftermath Unknown to the researcher if the chart was ever created by the Budget Manager. However, at the Board of Supervisor's meeting the next evening, a chart was never displayed when the discussion occurred regarding the trash collection issue. The County Administrator was on the phone the entire afternoon discussing the trash collection issue with each member of the Board of Supervisors.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator was primarily concerned with using his *administrative discretion* to brief each of the Supervisors about the impending controversy surrounding the trash collection issue. By doing so, the County Administrator was holding himself *accountable* to the Board of Supervisors.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

        1) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

Table 1.4 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric						**2**	
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric		**1**					
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric	**3**						
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #4

Context On August 12, 1996 the County Administrator held a ten minute meeting in his office with the Director of the Utility Department. The topic was the Roanoke College/Salem easement adjacent to Hanging Rock Golf Course. The County Administrator used *outcome rhetoric* to ask questions about how the water lines would be installed and the effect elsewhere in the water system. As information was exchanged between the Director of the Utility Department and the County Administrator, *technical/task rhetoric* was being used to explain the situation. The County Administrator had been asked elsewhere about this situation and kept firing questions at the Director of the Utility Department using *method rhetoric*. The Director of the Utility Department interacted with the County Administrator using *anticipatory rhetoric* as he listed all the possible options to install the water lines. The Director of the Utility Department began asking the County Administrator questions about the situation using *controversy rhetoric*, wanting to understand the reason for the concern by the County Administrator. The County Administrator concluded the meeting using *autocratic rhetoric* by directing the Director of the Utility Department to get this project done quickly and to not lose momentum on it.

Intention The County Administrator was responding to outside pressure about the water line project and was trying to protect the Director of the Utility Department from this pressure. The County Administrator kept the dialogue at a technical level with his focus on the outcome.

Aftermath The aftermath is unknown to the researcher. The issue did not present itself again during the field study.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator was being *responsive* to outside concerns while holding his department head *accountable* for the implementation of the water line project.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

       2) a. Method Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

       3) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

Table 1.5 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							**4**
Diplomatic Rhetoric	**2**				**3**		
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric	**5**		**7**				
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric				**6**	**1**		

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #5

Context This encounter was a regular staff meeting held twice a month in preparation for the Board of Supervisors meeting the following day. The staff meeting was held in the fourth floor conference room on August 12, 1996 for 65 minutes. The County Administrator conducted the meeting with twenty department heads by reviewing the Board of Supervisors public meeting agenda. This agenda is developed twice a month by the County Administrator and the Chair of the Board of Supervisors in consultation with relevant parties such as department heads and other Supervisors. The County Administrator began the meeting by joking around and using *caring rhetoric* to ask the new Fire Chief a question about whether his fire trucks would be able to cross a particular one-lane bridge in the county. The Fire Chief smiled and responded seriously as the two were using *relationship rhetoric* to develop a bond with each other.

In 1992, the county administration devised a team structure for the staff to work on various operational issues in the county. It was initially very successful but had become rather benign over time. The County Administrator had asked one of the teams, the Internal Support and Operations Team (ISOP) to present a status report at this particular staff meeting in an effort to rejuvenate the team concept once again. The County Administrator used *autocratic rhetoric* in conducting the meeting agenda and asked for a report from the ISOP team. The Budget Manager presented the ISOP team report. This agenda item lasted for over 30 minutes. The Budget Manager used *diplomatic rhetoric* to report on the ISOP team discussion that focused on the team concept in general for the county. There was a great deal of anxiety in the room as various staff eyes darted around the room at each other, as well as continually "checking" the reaction of the County Administrator. The County Administrator primarily listened to the report and ensuing discussion, and occasionally asked clarifying questions using *caring rhetoric.* The Director of Human Resources reported on the second meeting of the ISOP team using *diplomatic rhetoric* to describe the various personnel issues that had been discussed during their second ISOP meeting. More discussion took place within the staff meeting about the personnel issues.

132

The County Administrator asserted control over the staff meeting once again to facilitate general discussion about the team concept using *team rhetoric*. The County Administrator supports the team approach as an important value for the county administration. Staff was very responsive to the County Administrator, although nervous, in their use of *affirmatory rhetoric* to the idea of rejuvenating the team approach. The County Administrator proceeded using *autocratic rhetoric* to state that he wants regular reports from all the teams beginning in 30 days. The County Administrator continued by listing exactly what he wanted done on several other internal issues. Although there was very little response to these issues from staff, *sensemaking rhetoric* was used to clarify the assignments by the County Administrator.

The County Administrator used *reactive rhetoric* to complement the new fire chief as the meeting had become tense. The Fire Chief acknowledged the County Administrator and smiled using *relationship rhetoric*. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to discussion of the Board of Supervisors meeting agenda items with the County Administrator using *didactic rhetoric* to explain and teach the staff about each agenda item before them. Staff would respond with *sensemaking rhetoric* to either explain a specific agenda item in their area of expertise or to ask clarifying questions to understand agenda items that were not in their area of expertise.

Intention The County Administrator wanted to emphasize the importance of the team approach in his administration. At the same time, the County Administrator wanted to assert his control and leadership with staff by challenging them to deal with the important issues at hand. The County Administrator also wanted his staff to know that he cares about them individually and collectively by listening to their concerns and using humor and support within the context of the staff meeting.

Aftermath The aftermath of the ISOP issues and team approach is documented in subsequent meetings. The Board of Supervisors meeting preparation was thorough as the staff was prepared the next day for the public meeting.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator was concerned about holding his staff *accountable* for the immediate work at hand. Additionally, he was concerned with being *responsive* to his staff members.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

    1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

    2) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

    3) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

    4) a. Team Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

    5) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

    6) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

    7) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.6 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric		**1**					
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric				**2**			
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #6

Context This meeting took place in a conference room on August 13, 1996 with the County Administrator and representatives of the Industrial Development Authority (IDA) and other county staff. There were a total of ten participants in the meeting. The researcher arrived thirty minutes late to the meeting that lasted 60 minutes. The IDA is an independent agency charged with assisting the business community and in doing so, work with various local governments. The meeting was formally conducted by a member of the IDA. A variety of issues were discussed at the meeting regarding the activities of the IDA. The County Administrator questioned a member of the IDA about a particular issue using *outcome rhetoric* as he wanted to be able to explain all of the contingencies for this specific issue to the Board of Supervisors. The response and further discussion outlined all the possible contingencies for the County Administrator using *anticipatory rhetoric*.

There was a discussion of expanding programs to rehabilitate abandoned industrial sites. The County Administrator expressed concern about neighborhood sites as well, using *reactive rhetoric*. The discussion then centered upon abandoned industrial sites located within or adjacent to neighborhoods in the county using *diplomatic rhetoric* to advocate the importance of cleaning up these type of sites. The IDA concluded the meeting with routine reports about their financial status.

Intention The County Administrator wanted to make sure that the County's interests were being addressed by the IDA.

Aftermath There was no continuation of any specific issues raised during the meeting; however, there was discussion subsequently during the field study regarding the purpose of the IDA in general and concern about accountability of the IDA.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator was concerned about *accountability* for both the IDA and the county in terms of being able to explain possible outcomes of a specific project to the Board of Supervisors. The County Administrator was also concerned about *responsiveness* to county citizens regarding the rehabilitation of industrial sites located in neighborhoods. Abandoned properties are a constant concern for citizens.

<u>Type of Rhetoric Sequence</u>

       1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

       2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.7 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric			**1**				
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #7

Context A spontaneous meeting took place in the County Administrator's office on August 13, 1997 for ten minutes between the County Administrator and a student intern. The student intern was going to be presenting an item at the Board of Supervisors public meeting that afternoon. The County Administrator used *didactic rhetoric* to reassure the nervous student by giving him tips on how to make his presentation. They went over the student's presentation using *technical/task rhetoric* to make sure the student had thoroughly prepared his agenda item.

Intention The County Administrator was acting as a mentor for this student, trying to calm him down and make sure he was properly prepared for the public meeting.

Aftermath The student intern did a good job at the public meeting that afternoon and received numerous complements from the county staff.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator is very *responsive* to students who show an interest in learning about public administration. He is particularly accommodating to students working with the county.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

Table 1.8 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric				**3**			
Sensemaking Rhetoric				**2**			
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**1**		

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #8

<u>**Context**</u> The Board of Supervisors meeting took place on August 13, 1996 in the public hearing room on the first floor of the county administration building. The meeting length was 135 minutes. There were five supervisors, numerous county staff members, a few members of the media, and approximately ten individuals from the public in attendance. The meeting was carried live on cable television for the public. Prior to the meeting, the County Administrator's demeanor changed significantly as he was preparing for a "public performance". The meeting was convened and operated by the Chair of the Board of Supervisors. The County Administrator makes a practice of delegating agenda items to appropriate staff, usually at the department head level. The first order of business was the presentation of awards to visitors from Poland. The County Administrator facilitated the presentation, working with the chair of the Board of Supervisors using *caring rhetoric*. The visitors were appreciative and used *relationship rhetoric* to convey their positive experience while visiting the county. Several agenda items were completed before the County Administrator participated once again in the meeting. There was a sensitive item concerning a contractor losing money in a bidding process because he had filled out some of the required paperwork inaccurately. The contractor was appealing the staff decision to the Board of Supervisors with his attorney present. Questions from the Supervisors and communication problems bottlenecked the issue during the meeting. The County Administrator stepped in to assist his staff member and to move the issue along using *reactive rhetoric*. It was decided that certain staff would meet for a short time with the contractor and his attorney during the public meeting to clear up the confusion and then the issue would be brought back to the Board of Supervisors during this meeting a little later. *Sensemaking rhetoric* was used to facilitate this action.

The trash issue was brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors by a county department head in order to inform them on the current status of the issue. It is important to note that although the County Administrator did not speak publicly at this time about the issue, he had been working diligently behind the scenes to brief the Supervisors and prepare

141

the Chair for a public statement at that particular meeting.

Several additional agenda items were dispatched before the County Administrator participated directly in the meeting again. Toward the end of the meeting, several Supervisors were angry with the County Administrator about the unsightly median strips, freeway interchanges, and some of the county buildings. The Supervisors wanted these areas in the county to have a pleasant appearance (mowing, landscaping, etc.). The County Administrator used *reactive rhetoric* to acknowledge the Supervisors' concerns. He used *monitoring rhetoric* with the Board of Supervisors to state that he would look into this issue with his staff.

Intention The County Administrator's intention during the meeting was to serve the needs of the Board of Supervisors and to be supportive of his staff when necessary.

Aftermath The aftermath of every Board of Supervisors meeting is discussed at a regular meeting convened early the next morning. These regular meetings are known as the "debriefing" meetings.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator has numerous normative concerns during the public meetings. Most of the democratic values can be observed in action at every meeting. These values include *accountability*, *equity*, *representativeness*, *responsiveness*, *administrative discretion* (quantity and quality of), *efficiency*, and *effectiveness*.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

3) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric

Table 1.9 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric	3						
Technical/Task Rhetoric							1
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric			2				
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #9

Context This debriefing meeting took place in the fourth floor conference room for 100 minutes on August 14, 1996. The County Administrator presided over the meeting with nine additional staff in order to review the previous day's Board of Supervisors' public meeting. The County Administrator opened the meeting by asking how the meeting went and what did not go well using *team rhetoric*. There was discussion about the contingency fund which the Supervisor's had voiced concern about during the public meeting. The County Administrator and staff used *technical/task rhetoric* to determine how to deal with the issue.

The County Administrator raised the trash collection issue at the previous day's public meeting using *didactic rhetoric* in explaining to his staff some of the complexities of the issue. A lengthy discussion ensued about the trash collection issue using *sensemaking rhetoric* to gain a collective understanding of the issue. The meeting continued with very brief reviews of many minor issues raised during the public meeting, always accompanied by the action steps needed to be taken to address each of the issues. The debriefing meeting concluded with the County Administrator using rapid-fire *autocratic rhetoric* to define the issues for the next Board meeting and to delegate responsibility to various staff on specific issues. Staff members briefly responded at various moments to the County Administrator with suggestions using *diplomatic rhetoric*.

Intention The County Administrator's intentions were very clear in the debriefing meeting. He wanted everyone to learn from the Board meetings in order improve staff performance including his own.

Aftermath The aftermath of the meeting was an ongoing flurry of activity of agreed upon action steps that needed to be taken as a result of their discussions. These action steps included not only responding to issues raised at the previous day's Board meeting, but also steps necessary to prepare for the next Board meeting.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator and his staff were holding themselves *accountable* to the Board of Supervisors and the citizens of Roanoke County. Additionally, they were also being *responsive* to the needs of the county that were articulated by the Board of Supervisors.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Team Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

       2) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

       3) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.10 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric					**3**		
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric					**1**		
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**2**		

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #10

Context The County Administrator met with the top layer of management of the Fire Department at a fire station on August 14, 1996 for 40 minutes. There were 18 Fire Department participants including the old Chief and the recently installed new Chief. Historically, there had been a great deal of tension between these top managers of the Fire Department and the County Administrator. This tension arose due to management problems at the Fire Department. The County Administrator had to intervene to correct the problems. Top management at the Fire Department resented this intervention and as a consequence, morale had been low among the ranks. There was also ongoing tension between volunteer fire and rescue personnel and paid staff.

The County Administrator began the meeting by offering support to the new Chief and his top managers using *caring rhetoric*. He continued by recalling the extensive selection process for hiring the new Chief. He then described to them how the county was changing and the way the county was doing business was changing as well. The County Administrator pointed to the future of the Fire Department, telling them that they all have to work together to plan for the needs of the Fire Department. He then opened the meeting up for questions. The first question and discussion involved how the volunteers would be held accountable using *monitoring rhetoric*. The next question and discussion addressed the morale problem. The managers expressed concern that if an individual makes a mistake, fire and rescue personnel felt that it was always held against them. Also, they told the County Administrator that they felt unappreciated and mistrusted. The County Administrator used *caring rhetoric* once again by asking them to work with him toward common understandings and asked for their support. The discussion continued with the County Administrator and managers swapping stories about previous incidents over the years. It was a nostalgic discussion interspersed with joking and laughter using *relationship rhetoric*. A significant amount of time was spent at the end of the meeting informally discussing cars and car repairs with the County Administrator using *caring rhetoric* and the managers responding with *affirmatory rhetoric*. They all shared this common interest with each other.

147

Intention The County Administrator's primary intention was to begin to relieve the tension between the Fire Department top managers and himself. In doing so, he wanted to reestablish a good relationship with them and provide support for the new Chief and his initiatives for the Fire Department.

Aftermath The aftermath of this particular meeting was an ongoing dialogue throughout the field study with the new Fire Chief to continue building trust with the Fire Department's top managers and improve the relationships between them and the county administration.

Normative Concerns The primary normative concern for the County Administrator was *responsiveness*. He wanted to make sure that the Fire Department managers' concerns were being heard and acknowledged.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> 1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric
>
> 2) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric
>
> 3) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

Table 1.11 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric			**2**				
Technical/Task Rhetoric		**1**					
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric		**3**					
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #11

Context On August 15, 1996, the County Administrator met the department head and a staffer from the Engineering & Inspection Department in the County Administrator's office for 30 minutes. The topic was the building permit for the 460 east subdivision project. The County Administrator used *outcome rhetoric* to find out about the situation so that he could report on the status at the next board meeting. Engineering & Inspection staff used *technical/task rhetoric* to explain the permit process including the fact that it takes several weeks to complete. The County Administrator used *didactic rhetoric* to explain the background of the project. He instructed his staff that they must be responsive to the citizen involved and yet ensure that the citizen understands that the permit process takes time due to the requirements. Staff used *diplomatic rhetoric* to discuss the issue with the County Administrator as they attempted to understand the nature of the problem in this particular situation.

Engineering and Inspection staff shifted the meeting agenda by discussing other projects using *sensemaking rhetoric*. Staff was trying to determine if they could request additional funds from the Board of Supervisors for these other projects. The County Administrator used *outcome rhetoric* to ask questions to determine what projects need to be done and discussing their options.

Intention The County Administrator wanted a status report on various projects from staff and share any information he had on them.

Aftermath The researcher is not aware of this issue ever resurfacing again after this meeting.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator was primarily concerned with *equity* and *accountability* regarding the various issues discussed in the meeting. He was also concerned that his staff be *responsive* and *efficient* in working with county citizens.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

       2) a. Didactic Rhetoric   b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

       3) a. Outcome Rhetoric   b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.12 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric	**3**			**4**			
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric				**2**			
Relationship Rhetoric					**1**		

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #12

Context The County Administrator met with the Executive Director of the Roanoke Valley
Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber's new staff member coordinating the "Leadership
Roanoke Valley" training program. They met in a conference room across from the County
Administrator's office on August 15, 1996 for one hour. The County Administrator used
caring rhetoric to informally exchange information with the Chamber's new staff person. The
new staff person responded in a friendly manner using *relationship rhetoric* to establish a
bond with the County Administrator and her new supervisor at the Chamber of Commerce.
The County Administrator was very supportive of the training program as many of his
department heads were participating in the leadership training program.

The meeting then took a dramatic turn as the Executive Director of the Chamber of
Commerce changed the subject entirely by raising the "trash issue". The County
Administrator used *reactive rhetoric* to respond to questions posed by the Chamber Director.
The Chamber Director used *controversy rhetoric* to relay rumors he had been hearing about
the issue and the county's position on the issue (See Encounter #2 for the context of the trash
collection issue).

The County Administrator used *autocratic rhetoric* to detail the complexity of the
trash collection issue with the Director of the Chamber of Commerce. The County
Administrator asserted the county's position on the issue as the tension in the room
heightened. He was particularly disturbed that the issue was being played out in the local
media. The County Administrator suddenly changed the subject by suggesting to the
Chamber Director that there was an unfriendly distance between his Board of Supervisors and
the Chamber of Commerce. The Director of the Chamber of Commerce used *diplomatic
rhetoric* to respond, appearing very concerned about the issue just raised by the County
Administrator.

The County Administrator ended the meeting by suggesting that the two of them
discuss this relationship (between the Board and the Chamber) further at another time using
reactive rhetoric as he had another meeting to attend. The Chamber Director responded to

152

the County Administrator agreeing that they should meet using *diplomatic rhetoric*.

Intention The County Administrator initially went into the meeting to form a relationship with the new staff person coordinating the leadership training program. After the agenda suddenly changed, the County Administrator asserted the county's position on the trash issue. At the same time, he was very circumspect about the amount of information he shared about the issue with the Chamber Director.

Aftermath As detailed in previous and subsequent encounters, the trash collection issue remained in the forefront throughout the field study. It should be noted that a representative from the Chamber of Commerce had been involved in some of the regional planning meetings regarding the trash collection issue.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator used *administrative discretion* in responding to the Executive Director of the Chamber of Commerce. Due to the controversial nature of the trash collection issue, the County Administrator had to use a great deal of caution and political savvy in sharing information with the Chamber Director.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

>1) a. Caring Rhetoric   b. Relationship Rhetoric
>
>2) a. Reactive Rhetoric   b. Controversy Rhetoric
>
>3) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric
>
>4) a. Reactive Rhetoric   b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.13 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric		**2**					
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							**1**
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #13

Context The County Administrator held an informal meeting with a staff member of the Economic Development Department in his office on August 15, 1996 for 30 minutes. The staff member stopped in to discuss a dispute between two county citizens that she was trying to resolve using *sensemaking rhetoric*. The County Administrator asked questions about the situation and asked the staff member how she wanted to handle the situation using *team rhetoric*. This was a relatively new staff person that the County Administrator had recruited for the Economic Development Department. The meeting continued with a discussion of additional issues with the County Administrator using *outcome rhetoric* in exchanging ideas and strategies with the staff person who was using *anticipatory rhetoric* to strategize about a number of different issues under discussion.

Intention The County Administrator wanted to empower the new staff person to demonstrate to her that he had confidence in her work.

Aftermath The researcher is not aware of any subsequent discussion of these particular issues.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator wanted the new staff person to understand that he trusted her judgement in using her *administrative discretion* with the various issues they discussed in the meeting.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Team Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric
      2) a. Outcome Rhetoric   b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

Table 1.14 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							**1**
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric				**2**			
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #14

Context The County Administrator met with one city of Roanoke staff person, one staff person from United Way, and one county staff person on August 16, 1996 for 30 minutes about the upcoming United Way campaign. The staffers began the meeting pitching United Way and their agencies using *affirmatory rhetoric* to announce fundraising goals for this campaign. The County Administrator commented on the previous year's campaign using *team rhetoric* to point out that with fewer county employees last year their contributions were higher.

The staffers discussed the overall campaign goals. They also discussed some of the agencies that had caused difficulties using *controversy rhetoric*. These difficult agencies included the National Rifle Association and Planned Parenthood. The County Administrator discussed these controversial agencies by acknowledging the politics of their missions using *reactive rhetoric*.

Intention The intent of the meeting was a routine exchange of information about the upcoming United Way campaign.

Aftermath The United Way campaign took place throughout the county administration.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator wanted to ensure that the county's campaign was *effective* and that county employees were *responsive*.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

1) a. Team Rhetoric   b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

1) a. Reactive Rhetoric   b. Controversy Rhetoric

Table 1.15 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric		**4**		**1**	**2**		
Technical/Task Rhetoric						**3**	
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #15

Context The County Administrator held a speaker phone meeting on August 16, 1996 in the conference room across from his office. The Director of Utilities from the county was in the conference room and the Botetourt County Administrator was on the speaker phone. The meeting took place for 75 minutes concerning the regional sewer upgrade project. There was a problem and a sense of urgency to solve the problem. As the Director of Utilities explained to the County Administrator using *diplomatic rhetoric*, (prior to calling the Botetourt County Administrator), the project involved adding capacity to the regional system.

The Utility Director believed that the terms agreed upon by all participants were not going to be implemented, and the county was going to be short-changed. In order to change the orginally agreed upon specs., all participants had to agree with the changes. The regional participants included Botetourt County, Vinton, Salem, Roanoke City, and Roanoke County. Botetourt County was preparing to go to its own Board of Supervisors with the proposed changes, without consulting with the other regional participants first. The County Administrator listened to his Utility Director and became very concerned and using *reactive rhetoric* believed that they needed to take action right away.

The County Administrator called the Botetourt County Administrator at his office and discovered that he was home ill. He called the Botetourt County Administrator at home. He began the conversation over the speaker phone using *caring rhetoric*. The County Administrator had a good working relationship with him historically and was genuinely concerned about his health even though they laughed and joked about it. The County Administrator then expressed concern that the Botetourt County Administrator was going to his Board about the sewer project without meeting with all the participants first. He asked the Botetourt County Administrator to "help him out" by agreeing to a meeting first with all the regional participants. The Botetourt County Administrator acknowledged the County Administrator's concern using *diplomatic rhetoric*.

The County Administrator began discussing the details of the project and the proposed expansion using *method rhetoric*. The Director of Utilities and the Botetourt County

Administrator joined the discussion with the County Administrator using *technical/task rhetoric*. The County Administrator ended the meeting by offering to set up a meeting with all of the regional participants using *outcome rhetoric*. The Botetourt County Administrator agreed to the meeting and to postpone going to his Board with any changes using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The sense of urgency and tension dissipated as the meeting came to a close with both County Administrators joking and laughing again.

Intention The County Administrator's intent was to solve an urgent problem by preventing a crisis among regional participants in the sewer system.

Aftermath The aftermath of this encounter is unknown to the researcher.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator was concerned about *equity* and *representativeness* by Botetourt County attempting to make changes without consulting all of the regional participants. *Accountability* was also an issue for the County Administrator because he, along with all of the other regional participants, would be obligated to justify these proposed changes to their own Boards and Councils.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

       2) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

       3) a. Method Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

       4) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.16 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric		2					
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					1		

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR: ENCOUNTER #16

Context The County Administrator held an informal 20 minute meeting in his office on August 16, 1996 with the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services. This meeting covered a variety of topics. The County Administrator asked the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services about some personnel issues pertaining to some of their department heads using *caring rhetoric*. The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services engaged in a discussion with the County Administrator about these personnel issues using *relationship rhetoric*.

The County Administrator then asked about the farewell dinner for their Polish visitors and made some suggestions for it using *outcome rhetoric*. The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services responded with *diplomatic rhetoric*, assuring the County Administrator that everything would be taken care of for the farewell dinner. The meeting concluded with a brief review of several other issues.

Intention The County Administrator's intent was to gather information on several issues in order to monitor their progress.

Aftermath The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services followed through on all of the items discussed in their meeting.

Normative Concerns The primary normative concern was that these various issues be handled *effectively* with *accountability* as a secondary concern.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> 1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric
>
> 2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

<p align="center">**Table 1.17** Type of Rhetoric</p>

<p align="center">**LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY**</p>

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric			**1**				
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							**2**
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #17

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services met with the Director of Procurement in his office on August 20, 1996 for 20 minutes concerning the construction project taking place at Glenvar Middle School. It appeared that the construction project would not be completed in time for school to open. Rumors and finger-pointing were swirling around at the Roanoke County School administration and Roanoke County administration about the issue. The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services had been contacted by the County Administrator, a department head within the county, and one of the Supervisors.

The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services met with the Director of Procurement to discuss alleged procurement difficulties that the school was experiencing. He used *didactic rhetoric* to explain the situation to the Director of Procurement for the county. The Director of Procurement used *technical/task rhetoric* to describe events that had taken place to include the rules and laws under which they must operate. A substantial portion of procurement responsibilities had been transferred from the Roanoke County school administration to the county's procurement department by the Board of Supervisors (due to a history of problems). The Board of Supervisors allocate county monies to the Roanoke County School Board. The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services used *team rhetoric* to discuss the next steps that needed to take place. The Director of Procurement was very cooperative, using *sensemaking rhetoric* to assess and understand the situation.

Intention The intent of the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was to smooth things out between all of the parties in order to focus everyone on the goal before them which was to make sure the construction was completed on time.

Aftermath This particular project consumed the entire day for the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services. He was on and off the phone discussing it with various parties including school system administrators. He also made a trip over to the school to see how the construction was progressing. He monitored the issue for over a week until the

164

project was completed.

Normative Concerns The biggest concerns for the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services were *responsiveness* and *accountability*. He had to be responsive to all those that contacted him about project problems and ensure that the project got done on time.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

  1) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

  2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.18 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric			**3**				
Affirmatory Rhetoric				**5**			
Diplomatic Rhetoric		**4**					
Technical/Task Rhetoric						**2**	
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**1**		

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES:
ENCOUNTER #18

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services met with the Director of one of the County's public transportation systems in the Director's office on August 21, 1996 for 45 minutes. The county has a contract with this transportation company. The Assistant County Administrator began the meeting with friendly informal conversation using *caring rhetoric*. The Director responded in kind using *relationship rhetoric*. The Assistant County Administrator began asking technical questions of the Director using *method rhetoric* and the Director responded in great detail with statistical information using *technical/task rhetoric*.

The Assistant County Administrator shifted the dialogue to more strategic issues using *didactic rhetoric*. The Director reacted to the strategizing by using *anticipatory rhetoric*. The Assistant County Administrator became more specific in his proposal to the Director using *outcome rhetoric* to detail possible implementation of his proposal. The Director used *diplomatic rhetoric* to reveal some information he had concerning other funding sources. The Assistant County Administrator used *reactive rhetoric* in support of the Director's ideas and suggested that he may take this new proposal to the Board of Supervisors for approval. The Director was very pleased and proudly stated that this proposed service change was already being implemented by his company in another county. The Director announced that this other county was very pleased with their service using *affirmatory rhetoric* and that the public was giving it rave reviews.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services went into this meeting knowing that some changes needed to be made with this contracted service. He often reacted to the direction taken by the Director of the company but was able to work his way through the meeting to accomplish his goals for change.

Aftermath The researcher was unaware of the aftermath of this particular meeting.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was primarily concerned with issues of *accountability* as the county's public transportation services required some changes. He wanted to ensure *efficiency and effectiveness* for county residents.

<u>Type of Rhetoric Sequence</u>

  1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

  2) a. Method Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

  3) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

  4) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

  5) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

Table 1.19 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric		**1**					
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #19

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services met spontaneously with the Assistant Director of Finance in the Finance Department on August 22, 1996 for 10 minutes. This meeting was in preparation for the CPMT meeting to be held in a couple of hours. CPMT is a review board of diverse children services providers that meets regularly to review specific cases involving troubled youth. The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was asking the Assistant Director of Finance various questions about costs to the county associated with various services provided to children through the CPMT panel. He used *outcome rhetoric* to determine the remaining budget for these services and services that still had to be paid for by the county. The Assistant Director of Finance exchanged information with the Assistant County Administrator using *technical/task rhetoric*.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services intent was to exchange information about the budget for CPMT services.

Aftermath The aftermath of this budget discussion was unknown to the researcher.

Normative Concerns The only normative concern for the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was *accountability* for the county in funding these children services.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

Table 1.20 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric				4			
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric			5				
Sensemaking Rhetoric		2					
Controversy Rhetoric						3	
Relationship Rhetoric							1

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #20

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services met with the Director of Social Services on August 22, 1996 for 35 minutes to discuss a specific employee grievance. The meeting took place in the Assistant County Administrator's office. The Assistant County Administrator began the meeting with a discussion of miscellaneous issues with the Director of Social Services using *team rhetoric*. The Director of Social Services engaged the discussion of these various issues with *relationship rhetoric*.

The Assistant County Administrator then inquired about her employee grievance using *outcome rhetoric*. The Director of Social Services explains the entire situation with this employee including the employee's specific grievance. The Director made her case using *sensemaking rhetoric*. The Assistant County Administrator explained the grievance procedure in general to the Director using *method rhetoric*. The Director of Social Services became angry and restated her position about this particular employee using *controversy rhetoric*. The Assistant County Administrator asked the Director additional questions about the grievance using *reactive rhetoric*. The Director responded as they began to brainstorm about the possible outcomes of this employee grievance using *anticipatory rhetoric*.

The meeting concluded with the Assistant County Administrator describing other instances of employee grievances and their outcomes using *didactic rhetoric*. The Director of Social Services responded by describing in detail the paper trail pertaining to this specific employee using *monitoring rhetoric*. Additionally, the Director mentioned that this grievance had produced a positive effect in her office. The meeting ended with a friendly tone.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was doing his job in following the steps of the grievance procedure by meeting with the Director of Social Services to hear her side of the employee grievance. His intention, although not explicit, was to be supportive of the Director of Social Services as this employee's situation was very clear to everyone involved in the case.

Aftermath The aftermath of this employee grievance was unknown to the researcher.

Normative Concerns One of the normative concerns for the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was *equity*. He wanted to be fair by listening to the Director of Social Services tell her side of the story pertaining to this employee grievance. The Assistant County Administrator also wanted to be *responsive* to county employees, both line staff and management.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

    1) a. Teams Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

    2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

    3) a. Method Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

    4) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

    5) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric

Table 1.21 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric				**1**			
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #21

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services attended the CPMT meeting in the conference room in his building on August 22, 1996 for two hours. Ten other professionals were in attendance including representatives from the county school system, state department of juvenile justice, county police department, health department., county social services, county finance department, etc. The meeting was called to order by the Chair and followed a prescribed agenda. The Chair initially conducted a business meeting, covering a variety of topics including training opportunities and a financial report.

The meeting went into executive session to discuss two specific children and to determine their service needs. Due to the confidential nature of these discussions, they are not reported here. The researcher signed a confidentiality statement at the outset of the entire meeting. The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services spoke twice during the two hour meeting using *reactive rhetoric* to respond to procedural questions. Further discussion of each of his responses clarified the procedural issues using *technical/task rhetoric*.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services intention was to represent the county administration in this regularly scheduled meeting.

Aftermath The aftermath of this particular meeting was unknown to the researcher.

Normative Concerns   The primary concern of the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was *representativeness*. He was there to represent the interests of the county's children and the county administration.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> 1) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

175

Table 1.22 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric		2					
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric						1	
Relationship Rhetoric					3		

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #22

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was called into the County Administrator's office spontaneously on August 22, 1996 for a 15 minute meeting to discuss the ceremony to install the new Fire Chief. The County Administrator's secretary was present during the meeting. The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services explained the ceremony in great detail using *methods rhetoric* in response to aggressive questioning by the County Administrator using *controversy rhetoric*. The County Administrator was concerned about the politics of the situation surrounding the ceremony. The Assistant County Administrator explained additional plans underway for the ceremony using *outcome rhetoric* as he responded to the County Administrator's instructions concerning the tasks that still needed to be completed using *monitoring rhetoric*. The meeting ended with the County Administrator complementing the Assistant County Administrator using *relationship rhetoric*. The Assistant County Administrator was pleased and proud and acknowledged the complement using *caring rhetoric*.

Intention The intent of the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was to explain the plans for the new Fire Chief's ceremony and to appease the aggressiveness of the County Administrator.

Aftermath The ceremony installing the new Fire Chief was very successful by all accounts.

Normative Concerns   The Assistant County Administrator was strictly concerned with *responding* to the County Administrator's questions and concerns.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> 1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric
>
> 2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b .Monitoring Rhetoric
>
> 3) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.23 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric		**4**					
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric	**5**						
Technical/Task Rhetoric		**3**		**1**			
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							**2**
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES:
ENCOUNTER #23

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services attended a two hour meeting about Youth Haven II on August 26, 1996 in the third floor conference room of the county administration building. Youth Haven II is a residential treatment program for teenagers operated by the county. There were four other people in attendance including two representatives from the state Department of Juvenile Justice, the county's Assistant Director of Finance, and the county's Director of Youth Haven II. The purpose of the meeting was to strategize about the future of Youth Haven II and the funding sources for youth services in general.

The meeting began with an exchange regarding ideas for the future of Youth Haven II with everyone in attendance participating. The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services questioned several of the ideas being discussed using *reactive rhetoric*. His questions were responded to in terms of program substance using *technical/task rhetoric*. The Assistant County Administrator then focused his questions around their funding source, which is the state, using *team rhetoric*. A flurry of discussion ensued about the purpose of state funds, with everyone consulting documentation from the state. There is an understanding that the state funds are for juvenile justice programs and related services. There is a great deal of frustration in the room as participants tried to determine, using *sensemaking rhetoric*, how the state funds could be used in a manner that would address the needs of Roanoke County youth.

The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services took control of the meeting and began to assert a focus onto the discussion using *outcome rhetoric*. He calculated costs for various options that had been discussed during the meeting (using a calculator). Meeting participants responded to the Assistant County Administrator's request for concrete cost figures using *technical/task rhetoric*. Additional brainstorming took place about the specified options and their costs. The Assistant County Administrator once again focused the discussion on funding options for a particular program that seemed viable among meeting

participants using *outcome rhetoric*. One of the state participants began to joke about potential problems with the program using *anticipatory rhetoric*.

The Assistant County Administrator summarized the costs once again for all of the program options that were discussed during the meeting and then strongly stated, using *autocratic rhetoric*, that Youth Haven II as they have known it no longer exists. He concluded the meeting by suggesting that they meet again next week. The only response from meeting participants was acknowledgment that they should meet next week, using *diplomatic rhetoric*.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator wanted a definitive plan for Youth Haven II going into this meeting but was clearly frustrated in that attempt.

Aftermath Ongoing discussion about the future of the Youth Haven II program took place during the field study.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services was primarily concerned about *responsiveness* in terms of the service needs for Roanoke County youth. He was also struggling with the amount of *administrative discretion* they had in fashioning a necessary, viable program for the county.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

    1) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

    2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

    3) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

    4) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

    5) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.24 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric			1				
Relationship Rhetoric		2					

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #24

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services conducted the regular staff meeting on August 26, 1996 for 30 minutes. The County Administrator was on vacation. Approximately 17 department heads were in attendance at the meeting. The Assistant County Administrator reviewed the agenda for the Board of Supervisors meeting to take place the next day using *didactic rhetoric* to summarize and explain each agenda item. The department heads listened, with little input until one department head made a complaint about the disrepair of his building where his department was located. The department head was extremely loud and angry, using *controversy rhetoric* to detail the problems with his building.

The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services ignored the outburst from the department head and continued the meeting using *outcome rhetoric* to review the agenda items. There was little interaction with department heads for the remainder of the staff meeting. Occasionally, some department heads spoke in soft voices to each other, using *relationship rhetoric*, but never disrupted the meeting.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services intent was to conduct the regular staff meeting in a routine manner.

Aftermath The department heads were grateful to the Assistant County Administrator for keeping the meeting moving along at a rapid pace.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator was primarily concerned with *accountability* in making sure the meeting was conducted thoroughly and that department heads were sufficiently prepared for the next day's board meeting.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

      2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.25 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric		**2**					
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric						**1**	
Sensemaking Rhetoric						**3**	
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:
ENCOUNTER #25

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services attended the regular debriefing meeting conducted by the County Administrator the morning after the Board of Supervisors meeting, along with six other department heads. The debriefing took place on September 11, 1996 in one of the fourth floor conference rooms for 110 minutes. The County Administrator reviewed the events of the Board meeting for the first 40 minutes. The County Administrator asked the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services for an update on the firing range issue. The Assistant County Administrator reported on the current status of the issue using *method rhetoric.* The County Administrator responded periodically with some questions using *monitoring rhetoric* to clarify certain points. The Assistant County Administrator then made recommendations to the County Administrator concerning strategies that should be used to address the firing range issue using *outcome rhetoric*. The County Administrator expressed support to the Assistant County Administrator using *affirmatory rhetoric*.

The meeting continued, with occasional questions and comments by the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services. The meeting concluded with a report from the Assistant County Administrator on the status of the trash collection issue, using *method rhetoric*. In order to understand the issue further, there were a few questions in response to his report, using *sensemaking rhetoric*.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services intent was to attend the meeting and provide input as requested. This was a routine meeting.

Aftermath The aftermath of the meeting was continued follow-up on many of the issues and concerns raised during the Board of Supervisors meeting. The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was heavily involved from the beginning in the trash collection issue as the General Services Department (location of county trash collection services) fell under his coordination.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services used his *administrative discretion* to report or ask questions about various issues.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

        1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric

        2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

        3) a. Method Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.26 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							**2**
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric				**3**			
Monitoring Rhetoric		**4**					
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**1**		

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #26

Context The Assistant County Administrator met with the Director of General Services for two hours on September 16, 1996 at the General Services Building on Kessler Road in the Director's office. The Assistant County Administrator meets periodically with department heads under his area of coordination. The meeting was generally informal and began with friendly small-talk initiated by the Assistant County Administrator, using *caring rhetoric*. The Director of General Services responded accordingly using *relationship rhetoric*. The majority of the meeting was conducted for the benefit of the researcher. The Assistant County Administrator, using *team rhetoric*, asked the Director to explain what goes on in the General Services Department, what the department was like when he began as Director, the Director's approach to management, and the Director's future direction for the department. The Director of General Services spoke at great length, using *affirmatory rhetoric*, to address each of the above issues.

The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services interrupted to ask for an update on the trash collection issue, using *reactive rhetoric*, as the Director had been explaining their solid waste collection system. The Director responded by referencing an article in that day's newspaper, using *technical/task rhetoric* to casually report the substance of the article. The meeting resumed as it had before the interruption. Toward the end of the meeting there was a lengthy discussion of personnel within the General Services Department. The Assistant County Administrator, using *outcome rhetoric*, asked many questions and was concerned about some personnel problems. The Director of General Services responded to all of the questions and concerns of the Assistant County Administrator using *monitoring rhetoric* to assure him that he was on top of all of these personnel issues.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services wanted a general report on the General Services Department's internal operations.

Aftermath The researcher is not aware of any particular consequences to this meeting.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services wanted to hold the Director of General Services *accountable* for his department by asking him to explain its operation to this researcher. He also wanted to ensure that the Director was always working on *efficiency* and *effectiveness* in his department.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

       2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

       3) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

       4) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric

Table 1.27 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric	6						
Affirmatory Rhetoric		2					
Diplomatic Rhetoric	3					7	
Technical/Task Rhetoric				1			
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric		4			5		
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #27

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services attended a meeting conducted by the County Administrator with three representatives from BFI in a fourth floor conference room on September 16, 1996 for 55 minutes. BFI is a private trash collection firm that had been initiating the pressure on Roanoke City and Roanoke County to privatize trash collection. BFI had been particularly aggressive in making their case in the local media.

A BFI representative began the meeting with a sales pitch about the services they could offer the county. His pitch included statistical information about cost per home for their services using *technical/task rhetoric.* The County Administrator responded to the representatives from BFI challenging them with the idea that he did not know how they could beat the county's costs for trash collection using *reactive rhetoric*. Two representatives responded to the County Administrator with an additional sales pitch. The County Administrator suggested that he was willing to compare notes with them using *outcome rhetoric* as quality customer service was his primary interest.   One of the representatives explained their customer service system in Charlottesville using *affirmatory rhetoric*.

The County Administrator challenged the BFI representatives once again using *autocratic rhetoric*. They responded by suggesting that it would be a win/win situation using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The meeting continued for some time with all participants exchanging information and statistical data. The County Administrator then expressed concern about several issues using *outcome rhetoric.* These concerns included ownership of the waste, payment of debt service, the transfer station, and the Resource Authority. The BFI representatives addressed each concern using *controversy rhetoric*. They responded to the waste ownership issue by explaining that they were not in charge of that decision at their management level. Further, they expressed concern about the tipping fees being too high and that the Resource Authority needed to lower their tipping fees.

The County Administrator explained the current landfill situation using *caring rhetoric*. He detailed to them how the participating local governments decided to use the

"big- heart way" to build the landfill and use the train and transfer station to move the trash so that residents near the landfill would not be disturbed by trash trucks. The BFI representatives did not respond directly to the County Administrator's story about the landfill and instead changed the subject. They used *controversy rhetoric* to begin a discussion about their belief that the City of Roanoke was using the County as a stumbling block for privatizing trash collection services.

They continued by reporting that the City was going to submit a RFP and that the City was saying that the County did not want to privatize. They then asked if this was true. The County Administrator told the representatives that they want to go regional using *autocratic rhetoric*. He stated that local government takes as much pride in delivering services as they do in the private sector. He somewhat angrily explained that the Board of Supervisors were feeling "jerked around" and that they should be careful about" messing with mountain folk". The County Administrator than told them that his Assistant County Administrator for Management Services would compare notes with them. One of the BFI representatives arrogantly stated that the private sector is much more efficient using *anticipatory rhetoric*. He added that BFI could beat the County. There was an angry exchange of statements between the County Administrator and the BFI representatives.

A BFI representative stated that collection and disposal were separate issues using *diplomatic rhetoric*. Another representative added that they would do whatever they could to move the community. Further, they want a RFP from the County. The County Administrator closed the meeting expressing a desire to work with BFI behind the scenes using *method rhetoric*.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services expected the County Administrator to run the meeting. The Assistant County Administrator played a vary passive role in the meeting with the BFI representatives. He said very little during the meeting and was present to offer support to the County Administrator if support had been necessary.

Aftermath The trash collection issue with BFI continued throughout the duration of the field study. It remained a vary contentious issue throughout the study.

191

Normative Concerns The County Administrator was primarily concerned with the *efficiency* and *effectiveness* of trash collection services for Roanoke County. This included the quality of services for county citizens.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

      2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

      3) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

      4) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

      5) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

      6) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

      7) a. Method Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.28 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric			**1**				
Sensemaking Rhetoric				**2**			
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:
ENCOUNTER #28

<u>**Context**</u> The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services held an informal meeting with the Director of Human Resources in the Assistant County Administrator's office for 55 minutes on September 16, 1996. The two main topics of the meeting were the history of the structure of the organization and a proposal to initiate a reengineering project within the County. The Assistant County Administrator began the meeting with a description of the history of the county's use of the team concept using *didactic rhetoric*. The Director of Human Resources had just recently been hired by the County and was still learning about the county administration. The Assistant County Administrator explained the process that led to the use of teams. Both Assistant County Administrators had visited other counties in Virginia to observe and understand their administrative structures. When they returned they reported on the site visits and formed a committee to make recommendations for structural changes within Roanoke County.

In 1991 the County Administrator made recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the changes were approved and implemented at that time. The changes were patterned after Hampton. The Assistant County Administrators were removed as a formal administrative layer and became coordinators. Six teams were formed as well as the "gang of 40" which was to serve as a strategic management team composed primarily of department heads. Formerly the department heads had been very competitive but since the change have worked much better together. Initially, there was a great deal of mistrust and general pain attached to all of the changes. However, over time there has been a great deal of personal growth for county employees and for department heads. There were six teams initially, and now there are three teams and are currently moving to ad hoc teams. Overall, there is a team mentality throughout the county and employees want more involvement. Generally, the county has avoided getting trapped in trends and slogans such as TQM or reinvention. Elements of the changes have held together well and have been beneficial.

The Director of Human Resources responded by pointing out that this organization

was consistent with teams, empowerment, and participative management values. He also observed that there was an open employee culture with a buy-in to the team concept. However, he also observed, using *monitoring rhetoric,* that there had been a loss of infrastructure to support the team concept and this had resulted in a lack of communication. He continued by observing that the sole focus of the administration was on serving the Board, but there was no parallel focus within the departments.

The Assistant County Administrator agreed with the Director of Human Resources using *reactive rhetoric*. The Director of Human Resources, using *sensemaking rhetoric*, felt that there was a lack of faith in the team model because it had dissipated over time so that the culture had changed. He proposed that they needed to grow the infrastructure again. At the October 15th meeting he wanted to explore with staff how to move the team model to the next level and wanted to use teams to rebuild the model. He stated that he believed that management processes are important performance measurements. The remaining portion of the meeting involved brainstorming about reengineering with the participation of the researcher.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services used this meeting to educate both the Director of Human Resources and the researcher about the structural changes that had taken place within the county administration over the previous five years.

Aftermath The key outcome of this entire meeting was ongoing planning for a reengineering project within the county administration. This unfolded in several subsequent meetings.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator was concerned about *representativeness* for county employees and department heads. He was also concerned about *administrative discretion* in terms of organizing and managing to county administration.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric

      2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.29 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric	2						
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					1		

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #29

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services attended the regular staff meeting to review the agenda for the Board of Supervisors meeting to be held the next day. There were nine other participants attending the meeting that lasted 90 minutes in the fourth floor conference room on September 16, 1996. The County Administrator conducted the meeting and began by reporting on a problem that had occurred in one of the county neighborhoods. The County Administrator smiled as he briefly described the problem using *caring rhetoric*. The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services returned the smile as he used *relationship rhetoric* to respond to the County Administrator. There was a brief exchange of joking and laughter as this was a difficult situation.

The County Administrator continued the meeting using *autocratic rhetoric* to review the meeting agenda by asking questions of his staff and delegating assignments to them. The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services said very little during the meeting as it was fairly routine in nature. The County Administrator requested information about the church issue and the Planning Commission. Construction involving I-81 appeared to be impacting a church within the county and the Planning Commission had become involved due to a zoning problem. The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services responded to the County Administrator using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The meeting concluded routinely with a review of the remaining agenda items.

Intention The intent of the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was to participate in the staff meeting as needed.

Aftermath The aftermath of the meeting was reported by the researcher the next day at the public Board of Supervisors meeting.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was primarily concerned with being *accountable* and *responsive* to the County Administrator.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

        1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

        2) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.30 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric					**1**		
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #30

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services held an informal meeting with the Director of Real Estate Assessment in the Assistant County Administrator's office on September 17, 1996 for 30 minutes. The Assistant County Administrator had called the meeting to find out what was going on with a minor controversial issue concerning a well-lot using *caring rhetoric*. The Director of Real Estate Assessment responded by informing the Assistant County Administrator about the issue using *diplomatic rhetoric*. They exchanged information regarding the issue using humor to create a friendly climate.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services wanted to ascertain the status of this particular issue and provide support to the department head involved with the situation.

Aftermath The well-lot issue surfaced again at a subsequent staff meeting documented by the researcher.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was concerned about *accountability* regarding this controversial issue and ensuring that the county was staying on top of the situation. He was also concerned about *responsiveness* to county citizens as citizens were bringing the problem to the attention of the county.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.31 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric			1				
Monitoring Rhetoric						2	
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #31

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services went to Procurement Services to meet with the Assistant Director of Procurement Services in his office. The meeting took place on September 17, 1996 for 75 minutes and was somewhat informal. The Assistant County Administrator asked the Assistant Director to report on current activities taking place within the department using *didactic rhetoric*. The Assistant Director of Procurement Services began a lengthy explanation the functions and statutes governing procurement as well as current activities within the department including the installation of a new computer system, using *technical/task rhetoric*.

The Assistant County Administrator asked the Assistant Director of Procurement Services how the new computer system was going using *methods rhetoric*. The Assistant Director explained in great detail the status of the new computer system using *monitoring rhetoric*. The meeting concluded with additional discussion of the department and its role and function within the county.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services wanted an update on the status of departmental activities. He also used the meeting as an opportunity for the researcher to become informed about the procurement activities of the county.

Aftermath Nothing occurred as a result of this meeting.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was primarily interested in *accountability* in monitoring the activities of Procurement Services.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

       2) a. Method Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric

Table 1.32 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							**1**
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #32

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services met with the County Attorney in the County Attorney's office on September 17, 1996 for 45 minutes in an informal meeting. The Assistant County Administrator updated the County Attorney concerning the trash collection issue using *team rhetoric*. The County Attorney strategized with the Assistant County Administrator using *anticipatory rhetoric* to determine the best approach for dealing with the issue at the next Board meeting.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services wanted to get some of the legal aspects of the trash collection issue cleared up with the County Attorney.

Aftermath The Assistant County Administrator used some of the strategies discussed with the County Attorney to make recommendations to the County Administrator in preparing for the trash collection issue at the next Board meeting.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was primarily concerned with the type of *administrative discretion* to be used to address the trash collection issue.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Team Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

Table 1.33 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric		**3**					
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric		**1**					
Controversy Rhetoric						**2**	
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #33

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services met with three department heads in the second floor conference room on September 18, 1996 for two hours to discuss the reengineering project for the county. Department heads present were the Director of Human Resources, the Director of Engineering and Inspections, and the Director of Planning & Zoning. The Assistant County Administrator reminded them, using *outcome rhetoric*, that they had been charged by the County Administrator to reengineer the permit process. Meeting participants responded with many questions regarding the purpose and clarity of their charge using *sensemaking rhetoric*.

One of the meeting participants raised the issue of bringing in a consultant for this project using *method rhetoric*. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the need for a consultant with one department head explaining at length what a particular consultant that he knew about could offer the project. One department head argued against a consultant using *controversy rhetoric*. Although the department head continued to resist the idea of a consultant, other participants suggested that they look into other possible consultants using *outcome rhetoric*. All meeting participants, except one, agreed to look into other consultants using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The meeting concluded with this consensus.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services wanted to move the reengineering project along at this meeting.

Aftermath The result of this meeting was that participants were to report back at the next meeting regarding information about other consultants.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was primarily concerned with being *accountable* to the County Administrator in moving the reengineering project along.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

2) a. Method Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

3) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.34 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric			1		3		
Monitoring Rhetoric				2			
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:
ENCOUNTER #34

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services met with the Director of Utilities which is located in another county building. The meeting took place on September 23, 1996 for 55 minutes. Initially, the meeting occurred in the Director of Utilities' office, with the Assistant County Administrator asking the Director to explain what his department does using *didactic rhetoric*. The Director of Utilities responded with a lengthy description of his department including many of the major projects underway using *technical/task rhetoric*.

The Assistant County Administrator asked about how a particular sewer project was going using *reactive rhetoric*. The Director explained the current status of the project using *monitoring rhetoric*. The meeting concluded with a car ride to the water treatment plant with the Assistant County Administrator asking the Director to give us a tour using *caring rhetoric*. Once again, the Director methodically described the water treatment plant, using *technical/task rhetoric*, as we walked around the plant.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was primarily interested in the researcher learning about the Utility Department. However, he was also monitoring the progress of various projects within the Department.

Aftermath There were no ongoing issues that the researcher was aware of as a result of this meeting.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was holding the Director of Utilities *accountable* for the various projects being implemented by the Department.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> 1) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric
>
> 2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric
>
> 3) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

Table 1.35 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							**2**
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric			**1**				
Relationship Rhetoric					**3**		

210

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #35

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services met with the Director and Assistant Director of the Finance Department, and the Director of General Services in the Director of General Services' office on September 23, 1996 for 70 minutes. The topic was one of two garages that is operated by the County School System. The Assistant County Administrator began the meeting by giving the participants background information about this garage using *didactic rhetoric*. The Director of General Services responds with additional information and statistical data using *controversy rhetoric*.

There is a lengthy exchange along meeting participants about the data and the bottom line indicating that the County is losing money with this particular garage. The Assistant County Administrator challenges the staff to suggest possible solutions using *team rhetoric*. The staff responds with brainstorming about the problem using *anticipatory rhetoric*. Additional strategizing took place for quite some time with the outline of a plan worked out among meeting participants. The meeting concluded with an informal discussion between the Assistant County Administrator, using *caring rhetoric,* and the Director of General Services, using *relationship rhetoric*, about computers being used in cars now. They were joking around and telling stories about it, at meeting's end.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services clearly intended to solve the problem with this garage as it was a difficult issue due to the politics of the situation.

Aftermath There was ongoing informal discussion about this issue during the length of the field study.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was primarily concerned with *accountability* as this garage was wasting taxpayers money. He also had to be concerned with *administrative discretion*, as this was a highly political issue as well.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

      2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

      3) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.36 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric		**1**					

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:
ENCOUNTER #36

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services met with the County Administrator in the County Administrator's office on September 23, 1996 for ten minutes. The County administrator wanted to rehearse and strategize about the trash collection issue to be presented to the Board of Supervisors at their public meeting the next day. The County Administrator reviewed his presentation of the trash collection issue using *outcome rhetoric*. The climate was very tense. The Assistant County Administrator was very supportive using *relationship rhetoric*.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services wanted to be cooperative and understanding.

Aftermath The Assistant County Administrator worked on drafting notes for the County Administrator's presentation to the Board on the trash collection issue.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator was using his *administrative discretion* in offering to help the County Administrator. He was also being *responsive* to the County Administrator's needs.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.37 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							**2**
Technical/Task Rhetoric		**1**					
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:
ENCOUNTER #37

Context The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services met in the second floor conference room with the Director of Human Resources, the Director of Planning & Zoning, and the Director of Engineering and Inspections to discuss reengineering. The meeting took place on September 23, 1996 for 65 minutes. The meeting began with the Assistant County Administrator asking for an update on the consultants using *outcome rhetoric*. There was a report from the Director of Human Resources about a specific consultant using *technical/task rhetoric*. He made a persuasive case for choosing this particular consultant.

There was an exchange of information regarding necessary preparations to bring in this consultant. The Assistant County Administrator listened as meeting participants built a consensus that the County Administrator should be involved with the consultant from the beginning. The Assistant County Administrator agreed using *team rhetoric*. Meeting participants suggested that the County Administrator be brought up to speed about the consultant using *diplomatic rhetoric*.

Intention The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was ensuring that the reengineering project was moving forward.

Aftermath Contact was made with the County Administrator concerning the consultant or the reengineering project.

Normative Concerns The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was primarily concerned with *accountability* in making sure the reengineering project was continuing forward as mandated by the County Administrator.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence
>   *1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric*
>   *2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric*

Table 1.38 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric				6			
Technical/Task Rhetoric		2				1	3
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric		4					5
Relationship Rhetoric							

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES:

ENCOUNTER #38

<u>Context</u> The regular staff meeting was convened by the Assistant County Administrator for Human Services as the County Administrator was tied up in another meeting. The meeting took place in the fourth floor conference room on September 23, 1996 for 85 minutes with 20 in attendance. The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services began the meeting by reviewing the agenda for the Board of Supervisors meeting using *method rhetoric*. Various department heads responded to agenda items relevant to their areas using *technical/task rhetoric*.

The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services referred to the trash collection agenda item and asked the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services to report on that item using *outcome rhetoric*. As the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services was giving staff background on this difficult issue, the County Administrator came into the meeting. The Assistant County Administrator continued his presentation of the issue by explaining what the key issues were concerning trash collection using *technical/task rhetoric*. These key issues included flow control, debt retirement, tipping fees, convenience to citizens, and to remind and inform the public about their trash collection services. He methodically listed the order in which the staff would present the county's case before the Board of Supervisors.

The County Administrator stood up to passionately present the "bigger picture" regarding trash collection services for the County. Using *team rhetoric*, he stated "we are the best in the Valley". He went on to explain the role that BFI was playing in applying pressure to both the City and County to privatize through intense media scrutiny. He then made some jokes to relieve the tension in the room. The Assistant County Administrator for Human Services continued the staff meeting with additional agenda items using *technical/task rhetoric*.

The County Administrator took over the meeting and asked the Director of Human Resources to report on the Employee Advisory Committee (E. A. C.) using *outcome rhetoric*.

The Director of Human Resources presented information on the E. A. C. using *controversy rhetoric*. He explained that employees had become disenfranchised with the Committee and Human Resources wanted to create a new, more constructive role for the E. A. C. The Director of Human Resources asked department heads if they had questions using *team rhetoric*. Various department heads voiced various concerns about the committee based on its history using *controversy rhetoric*. The Committee had been organized to deal with employee concerns within the County. It had become a regular forum for griping, rather than a constructive effort to solve employee issues.

The County Administrator suggested that the Director of Human Resources work on the E. A. C. further and complemented him as well. He made it clear that he wanted a democratic process and did not want to stifle input using *reactive rhetoric*. The Director of Human Resources asked for further input using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The staff meeting concluded with the suggestion that the new role for the E. A. C. be promoted first before elections were held for new employee representatives.

Intention The intent of the regular staff meeting was to prepare for the public Board meeting the next day. Upper management wanted to be sure that there department heads were fully aware of the two most controversial issues-- trash collection and the E. A. C.

Aftermath Both the trash collection issue and the E. A. C. continued as important issues throughout the field study and are documented in further encounters.

Normative Concerns Regarding the trash collection issue, upper management wanted to ensure both *efficiency* and *effectiveness* in communicating to the Board of Supervisors. For the new role of the E. A. C., management was concerned about both *representativeness* and *equity*.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

      2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

      3) a. Team Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

      4) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

      5) a. Team Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

      6) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.39 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric		**2**					
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**1**		

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #39

Context The Director of Human Resources went to the monthly luncheon meeting of the Roanoke Chapter of the Society for Human Resource Management on September 24, 1996 for 90 minutes at the local Holiday Inn. Approximately 60 people were in attendance, primarily human resource managers from the private sector. The Director of Human Resources was serving as president of this professional association. The luncheon began informally, with the president meeting and greeting members using *caring rhetoric*. Members responded accordingly, using *relationship rhetoric*.

The president facilitated the regular meeting including presentation of a panel of speakers and the business portion of the meeting using *outcome rhetoric*. The panel presentation pertained to the Family and Medical Leave Act (F. M. L. A.). For both the panel presentation and the business meeting, members responded to the president using *diplomatic rhetoric*.

Intention The intent of the Director of Human Resources was simply to conduct the regular meeting of the local chapter.

Aftermath The researcher was not aware of any issues that carried forward from this meeting.

Normative Concerns The Director of Human Resources was concerned about the *efficiency* and *effectiveness* of the meeting. He was also concerned about being *responsive* to Chapter members.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

   1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric
   2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.40 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric		**1**					
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							**2**
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #40

Context The Director of Human Resources, and two of his staff met with the new Fire Chief on September 24, 1996 in the Human Resources conference room for one hour. Human Resources Staff presented the Fire Chief with a draft recommendation for posting the position of Assistant Fire Chief using *outcome rhetoric*. The Fire Chief responded with some questions and suggestions of his own for the posting using *affirmatory rhetoric*. The meeting continued with the Fire Chief and with the Director of Human Resources. The Director of Human Resources discussed several major personnel issues with the Fire Chief using *team rhetoric*. The meeting ended with the Fire Chief providing input on these issues and exchanging ideas with the Director of Human Resources using *monitoring rhetoric*.

Intention Human Resources staff wanted to clear up several lingering personnel issues with the Fire Chief.

Aftermath Several of these major personnel issues within the Fire Department were carried on throughout the field study with Human Resources staff as the new Fire Chief tried to implement major changes within the Fire Department, both in the culture and the structure.

Normative Concerns Human Resources staff was concerned about being *responsive* to the needs of the new Fire Chief.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

       2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric

Table 1.41 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric						1	
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric			2				
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #41

Context The Director of Human Resources met with his Assistant Director in their conference room on September 24, 1996 for 75 minutes. The Board of Supervisors had asked that they implement an employee suggestion/recognition system for the County. The County Administrator was to propose recommendations from the Director of Human Resources. The Director of Human Resources discussed a draft memo concerning recommendations for the system using *method rhetoric*. The Assistant Director responded with various suggestions for the memo using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The Director of Human Resources was somewhat unclear as to precisely what the Board wanted using *didactic rhetoric* to explain the state of the art in employee suggestion/recognition programs. The rest of the meeting was spent exchanging ideas with the Assistant Director of Human Resources using *sensemaking rhetoric*.

Intention The intent of the meeting was to attempt to clarify the Board of Supervisors request.

Aftermath There were ongoing discussions of the system after this particular meeting.

Normative Concerns Human Resources staff was primarily concerned with being *responsive* to the request of the County Administrator and the Board of Supervisors. However, they were also concerned about the type of *administrative discretion* that they had concerning recommendations for a system.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> *1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric*
> *2) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric*

Table 1.42 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric			**2**				
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**1**		

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #42

Context New employee orientation took place with six new employees on September 25, 1996 in the fourth floor conference room all day. Two Human Resources staff members conducted the orientation with the Director of Human Resources beginning the morning session. He began the session welcoming the new employees using *caring rhetoric*. He explained to them that customer service was a vital component of the county's mission. He outlined the availability of the Human Resources Department to serve them as customers. The Director of Human Resources continued with a brief description of the diverse County departments and explained that the team approach was important within the County. Although the new employees did not speak, their body language was relaxed and comfortable implying a type of *relationship rhetoric*.

The Director of Human Resources left the orientation session; subsequently, his staff took over with the trainer conducting customer service exercises using *didactic rhetoric*. These exercises continued interactively for quite some time, with the new employees responding using *sensemaking rhetoric*. The researcher left the orientation session during these exercises 70 minutes after the beginning of the morning session.

Intention The intent of the Human Resources staff was to acquaint new employees with the culture of the county administration.

Aftermath The only ongoing issues resulting from orientation was discussion of how to possibly restructure and improve the orientation process.

Normative Concerns The Human Resources staff was primarily concerned with *effectiveness* in terms of conveying the important values of the County to new employees.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

      2) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.43 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric						1	
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					2		

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #43

Context The Director of Human Resources met with the Assistant Director of Parks in the Director of Human Resources' office on September 25, 1996 for 20 minutes. The Director of Human Resources asked the Assistant Director of Parks how he could be helpful using *method rhetoric*. The Assistant Director of Parks responded by explaining a personnel problem that he had in his department using *monitoring rhetoric*. The Director of Human Resources was supportive, friendly, and helpful to the Assistant Director of Parks using *caring rhetoric*. The Assistant Director of Parks was relieved and relaxed in coming to an understanding of and closure to the problem. He then closed the meeting by explaining to the Director of Human Resources his management philosophy using *relationship rhetoric*.

Intention The Director of Human Resources wanted to be supportive to the Assistant Director of Parks by empowering the Assistant Director to form his own solution to the personnel problem.

Aftermath As far as the researcher is aware, the Assistant Director of Parks resolved his personnel problem.

Normative Concerns The Director of Human Resources was primarily concerned with being *responsive* to the Assistant Director of Parks.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> *1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric*
>
> *2) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric*

Table 1.44 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							**2**
Technical/Task Rhetoric		**1**					
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #44

Context The Director of Human Resources met with the County Ombudsman in the Ombudsman's office on September 25, 1996 for 30 minutes. The Director of Human Resources asked the Ombudsman to describe the daily operation of the permit process using *outcome rhetoric*. The Ombudsman responded by explaining their daily operations using *technical/task rhetoric*. The Director of Human Resources pointed out the ongoing personnel problem within his unit using *team rhetoric*. The Ombudsman understood the perception that there was a personnel problem, but made a persuasive case that it was due to structural and organizational problems within the Department which impacted his unit using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The meeting concluded with an understanding that the Human Resources Department would provide some regular training to the Ombudsman's unit. The permit unit is located within the Engineering and Inspections Department. The permit process is the subject of the County's reengineering project.

Intention The Director of Human Resources wanted to resolve the personnel problem within the permit unit. This would be a short-term solution only.

Aftermath The permit process was the first unit to be worked on in the reengineering project for the County. There was an awareness that the problems within the unit were more extensive and complex than just a personnel problem.

Normative Concerns The Director of Human Resources was very concerned about the *responsiveness* of the Human Resources Department to the personnel problem within the permit unit.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> *1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric*
> *2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric*

Table 1.45 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric						**1**	
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**2**		

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #45

Context The Director of Human Resources met with the Director of Real Estate Assessment in the Director of Human Resources's office on September 25, 1996 for 45 minutes. The Director of Human Resources asked how he could be helpful using *method rhetoric*. The Director of Real Estate Assessment responded by explaining a personnel problem that he had in his department using *monitoring rhetoric*. The Director of Human resources was supportive, friendly, and helpful to the Director of Real Estate Assessment using *caring rhetoric*. The Director of Real Estate Assessment became more relaxed and outlined in great detail his plan for dealing with this personnel problem using *relationship rhetoric*.

Intention The Director of Human Resources wanted to be supportive of the Director of Real Estate Assessment.

Aftermath The researcher was unaware of this issue after the conclusion of this particular meeting.

Normative Concerns The Director of Human Resources was primarily concerned with being *responsive* to the Director of Real Estate Assessment.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> *1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric*
> *2) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric*

Table 1.46 Type of Rhetoric

Table 1.46 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric	**1**						
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #46

Context The Director of Human Resources conducted a staff meeting with four of his employees in the second floor conference room on September 30, 1996 for 35 minutes. The Director asked each staff member to report on their activities using *autocratic rhetoric*. He commented periodically on particular issues and occasionally delegated responsibility. For the remainder of the meeting, each staff member gave their report using *technical/task rhetoric*.

Intention This was a regularly scheduled routine staff meeting for information exchange.

Aftermath There was a great deal of activity after this meeting as it involved the day-to-day work of the entire staff.

Normative Concerns The primary concern of the Director of Human Resources was the *accountability* of his staff.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

Table 1.47 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							**2**
Controversy Rhetoric			**1**				
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #47

Context After the staff meeting, the Director of Human Resources met with the Assistant Director of Human Resources in the second floor conference room on September 30, 1996 for 25 minutes. The Director of Human Resources wanted to know about the human resources conference that the Assistant Director had attended the previous week using *didactic rhetoric*. The Assistant Director responded with a description of a particular software package she had been impressed with and also commented that the private sector human resource managers were well advanced of public sector human resource managers using *controversy rhetoric*.

The Director asked the Assistant Director about her recollection of the particular personnel issue within the Fire Department using *team rhetoric*. The Assistant Director responded as best she could about the chain of events using *sensemaking rhetoric*. The Director then updated the Assistant Director on what had occurred while she had been away at the conference.

Intention The Director of Human Resources genuinely wanted to know how the conference was that the Assistant Director had attended the previous week. He also wanted to recall the events concerning the personnel issue within the Fire Department.

Aftermath The Director and Assistant Director of Human Resources continued there meeting later that day.

Normative Concerns The Director of Human Resources was being both *responsive* and holding his Assistant Director *accountable* for the human resources conference and for information about an internal personnel issue.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence
> 1) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric
> 2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.48 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric			2				
Sensemaking Rhetoric						3	
Controversy Rhetoric					1		
Relationship Rhetoric		4	5				

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #48

Context The Director of Human Resources met with his Assistant Director in the Director's office on September 30, 1996 for 90 minutes. The purpose of the meeting was for the Director to update the Assistant Director on issues and events that had taken place while the Assistant Director had been away at a conference. The Assistant Director expressed concern about the personnel issue within the Fire Department using *controversy rhetoric*. The Director explained what had occurred concerning this issue while she was away and assured her that everything was going fine now using *caring rhetoric*.

The Director explained the issues pertaining to the reengineering project including the personnel aspects within the permit unit using *didactic rhetoric*. The Assistant Director responded with concern about the personnel aspects once the reengineering project is completed using *monitoring rhetoric*. The Director then described the personnel problem within the Parks and Recreation Department as he currently understood it using *method rhetoric*. The Assistant Director recalled the history of this particular personnel problem using *sensemaking rhetoric*.

The Director brought up the E. A. C. issue, expressing concern about its progress using *outcome rhetoric*. The Assistant Director made some suggestions concerning the E. A. C. and was very supportive of the Director trying to clear up expectations for the Committee, using *relationship rhetoric*. The Director reintroduced the reengineering project and updated the Assistant Director on who had been suggested for coordinating the actual process using *didactic rhetoric*. The Assistant Director was supportive of the decision using *relationship rhetoric*. The meeting concluded with and exchange of information regarding several minor issues.

Intention The Director of Human Resources wanted to update his Assistant Director on current issues and events within the County.

Aftermath All of the major issues raised in this meeting were ongoing topics throughout the researcher's field study.

Normative Concerns The Director of Human Resources was primarily concerned with

accountability in ensuring that the Assistant Director of Human Resources was fully aware of all current issues and events concerning personnel within the County.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

      2) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric

      3) a. Method Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

      4) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

      5) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.49 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric						**2**	
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric		**1**	**3**				
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #49

Context The Director of Human Resources met with the Police Chief in the Director's office on October 1, 1996 for one hour with another police officer and with the Assistant Director of Human Resources. The Director asked the Police Chief how they could be helpful using *outcome rhetoric*. The Police Chief explained how he would like to see a particular employee reclassified within his department using *sensemaking rhetoric* as this specific employee is performing beyond her current classification. They exchanged comments about the situation and agreed to look into it further.

The Police Chief then discussed another classification problem within his department using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The Director asked several questions concerning the situation and presented the Police Chief with several alternates using *method rhetoric*. The Police Chief concluded the meeting by inquiring about creating a pool of part time staff for a particular position within the department, using *sensemaking rhetoric*. The Director of Human Resources exchanged information about this proposal with the Police Chief using *didactic rhetoric*. The meeting ended with the Director and Police Chief laughing and joking about an informal issue.

Intention The Director of Human Resources wanted to address the issues and concerns of the Police Chief.

Aftermath All of the Police Chief's questions and concerns were addressed by the Human Resources Department over time.

Normative Concerns The Director of Human Resources was primarily concerned with being *responsive* to the Police Chief.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> 1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric
>
> 2) a. Method Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric
>
> 3) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.50 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**1**		

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #50

Context The Director of Human Resources met with the Assistant Director of Human Resources in the second floor conference room on October 1, 1996 for 45 minutes. They wanted to review two videotapes related to reengineering. The Director began the informal session by joking around and laughing using *caring rhetoric*. The Assistant Director responded in kind using *relationship rhetoric*. The videotapes were shown and they decided that one of them was worthy to use for training purposes.

Intention The Director wanted to review the videotapes to determine it they would be useful to show to staff for training purposes.

Aftermath One of the videotapes was shown at a reengineering meeting.

Normative Concerns The Director and Assistant Director of Human Resources used *administrative discretion* in making the decision about the usefulness of the two videotapes.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.51 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric	**1**						
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES: ENCOUNTER #51

Context The Director of Human Resources attended the reengineering meeting on October 2, 1996 in the second floor conference room. In attendance were the Ombudsman, Director of Planning & Zoning, the Assistant County Administrator for Management Services, and the Director of Engineering & Inspections. The meeting began with the Assistant County Administrator announcing that the Director of Engineering & Inspections would be leading the reengineering initiative using *autocratic rhetoric*. The Director of Human Resources then began to facilitate the meeting agenda using *anticipatory rhetoric* to explain how much time would be involved with this project for participants. The researcher had to leave the meeting after one hour but left with participants brainstorming and planning for the project.

Intention The Director of Human Resources and the Assistant County Administrator wanted to establish the new leadership for the reengineering project and get planning for it underway.

Aftermath The reengineering project continued throughout the duration of the field study.

Normative Concerns The Director of Human Resources and the Assistant County Administrator were primarily concerned with the *effectiveness* of the reengineering project.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric

Table 1.52 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric				2			
Controversy Rhetoric					1		
Relationship Rhetoric							3

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #52

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation received a phone call from the County's public relations staff person and also met with the Assistant Director of Recreation on October 7, 1996 for 45 minutes. The Director received a phone call from the public relations staff person for the County concerning a provocative billboard on Route 419. The billboard was advertising an upcoming recreation event for the weekend celebrating American Indians. Ceremonial Indian dancing was included in the event, and the billboard was portraying one of the dancers in a loin-cloth that revealed his upper thigh in a potentially provocative pose. The Director took the call from the County public relations person telling him about the billboard and the potential problem it may cause in upsetting County citizens.

The Director initially took the call very seriously and discussed it thoroughly with the public relations staffer but then began to joke and laugh about it, using *caring rhetoric*, after he had determined that no complaints had been made thus far. After the phone call, he became somewhat concerned about the billboard and asked his Assistant Director of Recreation to come into his office to discuss it. The Assistant Director of Recreation explained the exact portrayal of the Indian dancing on the billboard and all of the background information regarding the advertisement using *controversy rhetoric*. The Director conveyed the telephone conversation he had with the County public relations person and then began to joke around about it again, but suggested that they go take a look at the billboard themselves, using *reactive rhetoric*. The Director drove us to the billboard in the County car. The Assistant Director suggested possible responses to any complaints that citizens may make using *sensemaking rhetoric*.

On the way to the billboard, the Assistant Director of Recreation discussed some other recreation issues with the Director. After arriving at the billboard and inspecting it, the Director did not see how anyone could be offended by the authentic nature of the portrayal. In the car, he called the public relations staffer to convey his opinion, and began laughing and joking again using *team rhetoric*. The Assistant Director joined in and responded in kind using *relationship rhetoric*.

Intention The Director wanted to carefully respond to a potential controversy by addressing the concern immediately.

Aftermath The billboard issue never arose again after this encounter.

Normative Concerns The Director was primarily concerned with being *responsive* to the potential controversy and to the public relations staff person. He also used his *administrative discretion* in making the judgment that the billboard should not be a problem for people.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

     1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

     2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

     3) a. Team Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.53 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric						**1**	
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric		**2**					
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #53

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation met with his Assistant Director of Parks in the Director's office on October 7, 1996 for 30 minutes. The Director was preparing for a work session with the Board of Supervisors the following evening. The Director reviewed the statistics he had with the Assistant Director of Parks using *method rhetoric*. The Assistant Director checked the statistics and made suggestions on which statistics should be included and those that should not be included in the Director's presentation, using *technical/task rhetoric*. The Assistant Director and the Director exchanged information about the statistics and reviewed the overheads the Director planned to use for the presentation. The Director requested specific statistics from the Assistant Director using *outcome rhetoric*. The Assistant Director responded with frustration, using *controversy rhetoric*, to explain that the statistics kept in previous years before his arrival were very unreliable to use for such an important presentation. The meeting concluded with both of them agreeing about the unreliability of the historical data.

Intention The Director and Assistant Director wanted the presentation to the Board of Supervisors to go well and wanted reliable statistics.

Aftermath The Director had several more meetings in preparation for the Board work session. The work session went extremely well for the Director of Parks & Recreation.

Normative Concerns The Director was very concerned about being held *accountable* by the Board for the performance of his department. He was also attentive to the *effectiveness* of his upcoming presentation to the Board.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

       2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

Table 1.54 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric					**4**		
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric					**3**		
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric		**1**					
Controversy Rhetoric				**2**			
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #54

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation met with the County Administrator in the County Administrator's office on October 7, 1996 for 45 minutes. The County Administrator wanted to know how the Director was going to make his presentation at the Board of Supervisors work session, using *outcome rhetoric*. The Director responded by outlining his presentation using *sensemaking rhetoric*. The County Administrator asked the Director what his vision was for the department using *reactive rhetoric*. The Director asked the County Administrator how to approach that issue. Should he give the Board his vision or let the Board tell him what the vision should be using *controversy rhetoric*.

The County Administrator made some suggestions to the Director about the presentation and then began to informally joke around with the Director for almost ten minutes using *caring rhetoric*. The Director explained that he would also be using overheads and slides for his presentation using *technical/task rhetoric*. The County Administrator suggested that the Director focus on the department's strengths and take the initiative to show them where we ought to go. Additionally, the County Administrator cautioned the Director to solicit feedback from the Board. He reminded the Director about his background and expertise and provided the Director support in articulating the future direction of the department, using *caring rhetoric*. For the remaining portion of the meeting, the Director detailed all of the initiatives he saw for the future using *anticipatory rhetoric*.

Intention The intent of the Director was to gain approval from the County Administrator for his presentation to the Board. The County Administrator wanted to be supportive and empower the Director to articulate his vision for Parks & Recreation.

Aftermath The Director's presentation at the Board work session went very well and the County Administrator was very pleased with the Director's performance.

Normative Concerns Both the Director and County Administrator were concerned about the *effectiveness* of the Director's presentation at the Board work session.

<u>Type of Rhetoric Sequence</u>

>   *1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric*

>   *2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric*

>   *3) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric*

>   *4) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Anticipatory Rhetoric*

Table 1.55 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric					**3**		
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric			**1**				**2**
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #55

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation attended the "gang of 40" meeting in the fourth floor conference room on October 7, 1996 for two hours. The "gang of 40" began during the implementation of the team concept in the County and served as the major input and strategy group for the County. It consisted of all department heads in the County. For this particular meeting, the Director of Human Resources convened the meeting by welcoming everyone and announcing that the focus of the meeting was on communication, using *didactic rhetoric*. He also told them that the Director of Engineering & Inspections would be updating everyone on the reengineering project.

The Director of Human Resources asked each department head to take a few minutes to inform everyone about their current departmental activities. Each department head proceeded to brief everyone else about their department, using *technical/task rhetoric*. This portion of the meeting lasted 90 minutes. The Director of Human Resources then asked the Director of Engineering & Inspections to brief them on the reengineering project using *team rhetoric*. The Director of Engineering & Inspections gave a brief presentation on the reengineering project using *technical/task rhetoric*.

The County Administrator spoke to conclude the meeting by praising his department heads and encouraging them to do more using *caring rhetoric*. He also acknowledged the reengineering project for the permit process as just the beginning for the County. The Director of Human Resources responded to the County Administrator by expressing his disappointment in the low attendance at this meeting using *affirmatory rhetoric*.

Intention The Director of Human Resources sincerely wanted to begin to address the communication problem within the County. He also wanted to disseminate current information about the reengineering project to alleviate employee fears and concerns.

Aftermath The "gang of 40" transitioned into the regular staff meeting and the climate was very positive and upbeat.

Normative Concerns The Director of Human Resources was primarily concerned about the level of *responsiveness* among department heads within the County. He was also ensuring that information was disseminated about the reengineering project to address employee fears and concerns.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

      1) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

      2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

      3) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

Table 1.56 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**1**		

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #56

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation stayed for the regular staff meeting in the same room on October 7, 1996. The meeting only lasted for five minutes. The County Administrator convened the staff meeting by announcing that there would be five Board work sessions tomorrow. He reflected on the previous "gang of 40" meeting by smiling and expressing how well it went and also hoped that tomorrow's needs would go well, using *caring rhetoric*. The staff present at the meeting smiled and echoed the County Administrator's statements, using *relationship rhetoric*.

Intention The County Administrator wanted to preserve the positive climate created as a result of the "gang of 40" meeting.

Aftermath The meeting participants left for the day with a very upbeat outlook.

Normative Concerns The County Administrator wanted to be *responsive* to the positive climate present at the meeting. He used his *administrative discretion* to not hold a regular staff meeting at that time.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

        1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.57 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							**2**
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric		**1**					
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #57

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation attended a regular staff meeting of his Department of Recreation in the Director of Recreation's office on October 8, 1996 for 65 minutes. The Director of Parks & Recreation told the staff about his preparations for the Board work session that evening and also reviewed the County Administrator's reaction to his preparations, using *outcome rhetoric*. The Recreation staff responded with an exchange of ideas using *sensemaking rhetoric*. The Director of Recreation continued the meeting with various routine issues using *team rhetoric*. Again, Recreation staff responded with suggestions concerning the issues raised using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The meeting concluded with the Director of Parks & Recreation interjecting humor into the meeting on an informal basis.

Intention The Director of Parks & Recreation wanted his staff to be informed about the Board work session.

Aftermath Some of the Recreation staff decided to attend the Board work session due to their heightened awareness.

Normative Concerns The Director of Parks & Recreation used his *administrative discretion* to inform his Recreation staff about Board-related issues in order to raise their awareness beyond their day-to-day activities.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> 1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric
> 2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.58 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric						1	
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #58

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation met with a staff member in the conference room on October 8, 1996 for 30 minutes. The Director asked the staffer to show the slides for the Board work session. He asked the staff member to change some of the slides using *method rhetoric*. The staff member discussed the changes with the Director using *sensemaking rhetoric*. They concluded the meeting with a consensus on the slides to use for his presentation.

Intention The Director wanted to make sure his slides were in order for his presentation to the Board.

Aftermath The slide presentation went well at the Board work session that evening.

Normative Concerns The Director of Parks & Recreation wanted to ensure that there were *equitable* and *representative* slides of the parks and recreation programs throughout the county system.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.59 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							**1**
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #59

Context The Director worked on refining his presentation for the Board work session in his office on October 8, 1996 for one hour. He called in a steady stream of staff members to clarify and secure his strategy and data, using *team rhetoric*. Staff responded quickly to the Director's requests using *affirmatory rhetoric*. The Director concluded the hour feeling comfortable with his material.

Intention The Director wanted to make sure his material was ready for his presentation that evening to the Board.

Aftermath The Director had a successful work session with the Board that evening.

Normative Concerns The Director was primarily concerned with the *effectiveness* of his presentation to the Board. In order to the comfortable, he checked his strategy and material with his staff.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Team Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

Table 1.60 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric			**2**				
Controversy Rhetoric		**1**					
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #60

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation attended a meeting in the Utility Director's office with the Director of Planning & Zoning and a staff member from Planning & Zoning on October 9, 1996 for one hour. The Planning & Zoning staff member introduced the topic of the meeting, using *controversy rhetoric*. Two citizens had contacted the County Administrator about possibly incorporating land near the reservoir into a forest trust. The County Administrator contacted Planning & Zoning to check into the situation. The Director of Utilities pointed out that the County Administrator had also requested a master plan for that area, using *outcome rhetoric*. He suggested that both the citizen request and the master plan could be developed together.

Meeting participants exchanged information and suggestions about this situation. The Director of Parks & Recreation suggested that Planning & Zoning seek clarification from the County Administrator about his thoughts on the matter. Further, he advised Planning & Zoning to seek out more information about the situation, using *didactic rhetoric*. All of the meeting participants concurred with the Director of Parks & Recreation using *sensemaking rhetoric*. The last thirty minutes of the meeting were spent discussing miscellaneous issues.

Intention The Director of Parks & Recreation attended the meeting for informational purposes.

Aftermath The researcher is unaware of what occurred with the issue after this particular meeting.

Normative Concerns The Director of Parks & Recreation used his *administrative discretion* during this meeting to provide constructive input.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

       2) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.61 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							**2**
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric					**1**		
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #61

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation convened the regular Recreation staff meeting due to the absence of the Assistant Director of Recreation on October 15, 1996 for 40 minutes. The Director informally asked various staff members about miscellaneous issues prior to the beginning of the meeting. The Director began the meeting with a joke, using *caring rhetoric*. He continued the meeting with a series of announcements about various issues. He also asked about the outcome of various recent events. The Director then requested reports from various staff members. Staff members responded to his requests using *technical/task rhetoric*.

The Director continued with additional announcements and requests for information. The Director then asked the Assistant Director of Parks to present information about United Way using *team rhetoric*. He exited the meeting at that time, exhorting staff to keep up the good work. Although staff did not respond verbally, many of them smiled proudly as the Director left the room, implying *affirmatory rhetoric*.

Intention The Director of Parks & Recreation intended to facilitate the regular staff meeting of the Recreation unit.

Aftermath The precise aftermath of this meeting is unknown to the researcher. However, many issues and directions were planned during the meeting and were subsequently implemented by staff actions.

Normative Concerns The Director of Parks & Recreation was concerned about staff *accountability* as well as his own *responsiveness* to their work and their needs.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

  1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

  2) a. Team Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

Table 1.62 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric				**2**			
Technical/Task Rhetoric							**1**
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #62

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation received of phone call from a league president complaining about various issues on October 15, 1996. The Director went to the office of his Director of Youth Services to look into the complaints for 25 minutes. He asked his Youth Services Director about the situation and explained the phone call he had just received, using *team rhetoric*. The Director of Youth Services responded with an explanation of the situation with a focus on league rules, using *technical/task rhetoric*. The Director of Parks & Recreation wondered what was going on with this complaint beyond what had been stated explicitly, using *reactive rhetoric*. The Youth Services Director concurred with the Director of Parks & Recreation, using *diplomatic rhetoric*.

Intention The Director of Parks & Recreation wanted to find out what was really going on with this league president's complaints.

Aftermath The Director of Parks & Recreation was going to check into this situation further.

Normative Concerns The Director of Parks & Recreation was primarily concerned with being *responsive* to this citizen's complaints.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Team Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

       2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.63 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1					
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric		2					

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: ENCOUNTER #63

Context The Director of Parks & Recreation encountered the Assistant Director of Parks in the hallway on October 15, 1996 for seven minutes. The Director followed up on a citizen complaint that one of their buildings had a leak in the roof, using *outcome rhetoric*. The Assistant Director responded with a report on the situation using *technical/task rhetoric*. They exchanged more information about the building. The Director stated that he would have to find the money to replace the roof using *outcome rhetoric*. The Assistant Director closed the encounter in the hallway by informally making a joke using *relationship rhetoric*.

Intention The Director was following-up on a citizen complaint about one of their buildings.

Aftermath The researcher is unaware of the aftermath of this particular encounter.

Normative Concerns The Director of Parks & Recreation was primarily concerned with being *responsive* to this citizen complaint.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> 1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric
>
> 2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.64 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							**1**
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric			**2**				

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #64

Context The Director of Procurement Services encountered two staff members in the hallway on October 21, 1996 for five minutes. The Director inquired about several outstanding issues within the department using *team rhetoric*. The staff members responded to the Director using *technical/task rhetoric*. The Director briefed her staff members about the trash collection issue using *didactic rhetoric*. She then initiated informal discussion about personal matters with one staff person. The staff person responded warmly using *relationship rhetoric*. The hallway encounter concluded with an additional exchange of work related information.

Intention The Director of Procurement Services spontaneously initiated an exchange with her staff to find out the status of several departmental issues.

Aftermath Staff members followed up on all of the issues discussed during the hallway encounter.

Normative Concerns The Director of Procurement Services was interested in holding her staff *accountable* for their work while also being *responsive* to their needs and there input.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence
>   1) a. Team Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric
>   2) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.65 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric				**2**			
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric		**1**					
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #65

Context The Director of Procurement Services met with a captain from the County police department in the Director's office on October 21, 1996 for 15 minutes. The Director began the meeting by discussing the report about the proposed radio system to be shared between the city of Roanoke and Roanoke County using *outcome rhetoric*. The captain responded that he had heard a rumor that the city wanted to acquire its own system, using *controversy rhetoric*. The Director suggested that they set up a meeting with the consultant for the project before the next joint meeting using *reactive rhetoric*. The captain concurred, using *affirmatory rhetoric*, and they concluded the meeting by exchanging additional information about equipment.

Intention The Director wanted to strategize with the captain about the proposed radio system.

Aftermath The researcher was unaware of the aftermath of this particular encounter.

Normative Concerns The Director of Procurement Services used *administrative discretion* to address the rumor and plan for the next step in the process.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

  1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Controversy Rhetoric

  2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Affirmatory Rhetoric

Table 1.66 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric		**1**					
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #66

Context The Director of Procurement Services attended the regularly scheduled staff meeting with 20 other administrators on October 21, 1996 in the fourth floor conference room for 50 minutes. The Assistant County Administrator for Management Services started the meeting until the County Administrator arrived late, using *outcome rhetoric*. It was a very routine meeting and staff responded as needed using *technical/task rhetoric*. The Director of Procurement Services did not offer any input to the staff meeting.

Intention The Director routinely attends the regular staff meetings.

Aftermath There were no issues raised at the staff meeting that had an impact on Procurement Services.

Normative Concerns The Director of Procurement Services is *accountable* for attending and being informed about the staff meetings.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

Table 1.67 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric					**1**		
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					**2**		

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #67

Context The Director and Assistant Director of Procurement Services attended a meeting in the conference room with a staff person from the county's MIS department on October 22, 1996 for 15 minutes. The Director greeted the MIS staffer in a friendly, warm manner using *caring rhetoric*. Prior to being appointed Director of Procurement Services, the Director had worked in MIS and was acquainted with most of the staff. The MIS staff person reported to the Director on the progress of the new computer system being developed for Procurement Services, using *monitoring rhetoric*. They exchanged additional technical information about the new system.

The Director asked the MIS staff person if she was going to attend an upcoming conference in Florida, using *caring rhetoric*. The MIS staff person responded informally, using *relationship rhetoric*. The remaining moments of the meeting were used to exchange friendly, informal conversation about their own lives.

Intention The Director of Procurement Services wanted to be updated about the department's new computer system and to see an old colleague.

Aftermath The new computer system was discussed informally throughout the time spent by the researcher in Procurement Services.

Normative Concerns The Director of Procurement Services was primarily concerned with the *efficiency* and *effectiveness* of their new computer system, as well as holding the MIS department *accountable* for meeting the department's needs.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence
>   1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric
>   2) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.68 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric			**3**				
Technical/Task Rhetoric		**1**					
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric				**2**			
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #68

Context The Director of Procurement Services met with the Associate Director of Instructional Technology for the Roanoke County Schools in the Director's office on October 28, 1996 for 30 minutes. The Director asked how she could be helpful to the Associate Director using *outcome rhetoric*. The Associate Director responded by reporting that she had done her homework on the proposed computer network for the schools, using *technical/task rhetoric*. Both the Director and Associate Director exchanged information about the computer network.

The Director of Procurement Services wanted to know what personnel at the school system would be involved with the new computer network, using *reactive rhetoric*. The Associate Director explained the personnel involved using *sensemaking rhetoric*. The Director then offered suggestions about strategies for implementation of the new computer network using *didactic rhetoric*. The Associate Director agreed with her suggestions and closed the meeting with a discussion of the politics of the situation using *diplomatic rhetoric*.

Intention The Director wanted to acquire information from the Associate Director about the computer network planning at the school system as well as the politics of the situation.

Aftermath The researcher was not present when the computer network issue continued within the Procurement Services Department.

Normative Concerns The Director of Procurement Services was clearly concerned about the *efficiency* and *effectiveness* of the proposed implementation of the new computer network for the County School System. The Director used *administrative discretion* in gaining information about the situation at the County School System.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

>   1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric
>   2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric
>   3) a. Didactic Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 1.69 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							3
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric	4	2					
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					1		

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #69

Context The Director held a meeting in her office with one of her staff members on October 28, 1996 for 55 minutes. The Director greeted the staff member in a very friendly manner using *caring rhetoric*. The staff member responded accordingly and informally discussed a movie she had seen using *relationship rhetoric*. The Director asked the staff member what she needed using *outcome rhetoric*. The staff member needed clarification related to a meeting she had attended concerning the computer network for the County schools using *sensemaking rhetoric*. They exchanged extensive detail about the meeting.

The Director asked for input from the staff member about a particular departmental issue using *team rhetoric*. The staff member provided her input on the issue using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The Director listed items that must be included in the R. F. P., directing the staff member on what steps needed to be taken, using *autocratic rhetoric*. The staff person asked a question of clarification using *sensemaking rhetoric*.

Intention The Director wanted to ensure clear communication with her staff person regarding the computer network system for the County schools.

Aftermath The researcher was not present to observe the aftermath of this particular meeting.

Normative Concerns The Director was concerned about the *accountability* of the computer network issue. She was also being *responsive* to her staff member's needs.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

       2) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

       3) a. Team Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

       4) a. Autocratic Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

Table 1.70 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric						1	
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					2		

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #70

Context The Director met with the Budget Manager for the County in her office on October 28, 1996 for five minutes. The Budget Manager presented the Director with a document regarding the purchase of County vehicles, and wanted to set up a meeting to discuss her comments, using *monitoring rhetoric*. The Director asked several questions regarding the issue, using *method rhetoric*. The Director initiated an informal discussion with the Budget Manager about how he was spending his time off from work, using *caring rhetoric*. The Budget Manager ended the meeting by responding in a friendly manner, using *relationship rhetoric*.

Intention The Director and Budget Manager planned to follow up on the vehicle purchasing issue.

Aftermath A meeting date and time was established as a result of this particular meeting.

Normative Concerns Both the Director of Procurement Services and the Budget Manager wanted to ensure *accountability* concerning the process involved in purchasing County vehicles.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence
>   1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric
>   2) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

<p align="center">**Table 1.71** Type of Rhetoric</p>

<p align="center">**LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY**</p>

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric						**1**	
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric				**2**			

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #71

Context The Director met with a staff person from M. I. S. spontaneously in her office on October 28, 1996 for 15 minutes. The M. I. S. staff person asked the Director about software programs within Procurement Services regarding the year 2000 issue for all the County Computers, using *technical/task rhetoric*. The Director responded with information about her department's computers using *method rhetoric*. The Director asked the M. I. S. staff person about database management issues using *reactive rhetoric*. The M. I. S. staff person answered the question as she was laughing using *relationship rhetoric*. The meeting concluded with a mutual exchange of miscellaneous information.

Intention Both meeting participants wanted to clarify information about computer issues within the Procurement Department.

Aftermath The researcher was unaware of the aftermath of this particular meeting.

Normative Concerns Both meeting participants were concerned about the *efficiency* and *effectiveness* of the computer equipment in the upcoming millennium change.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

       1) a. Method Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric
       2) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Relationship Rhetoric

Table 1.72 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric		3		4			
Monitoring Rhetoric						2	
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1					
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #72

Context The Director of Procurement Services met with a student from Virginia Tech in her office on October 29, 1996 for 15 minutes. The student was there to explore a possible volunteer opportunity in Procurement Services in order to fulfill a course requirement. The Director asked the student if she was interested in volunteering using *outcome rhetoric*. The student responded using *sensemaking rhetoric*, to explain that she was taking a business ethics course and wanted to volunteer in order to write a paper for the course. The Director explained the kinds of tasks that she needed done within the Department using *method rhetoric*, and suggested that the student may want to talk to the head of the M.I.S. Department. The student asked what other projects the Director may have using *monitoring rhetoric*.

The Director quickly suggested that Procurement Services needs a home page using *outcome rhetoric*. The student responded immediately that she could do that using *technical/task rhetoric*. The Director asked the student how many hours and how many weeks could she volunteer and when she could start, using *reactive rhetoric*. The student told the Director that she could start immediately and could work six hours; furthermore, her paper was due the first week in December, using *technical/task rhetoric*. The meeting concluded with the Director calling in a staff member to work with the student. She ended the encounter informally by being warm, friendly, and making jokes.

Intention The Director wanted to meet the student to determine if their mutual needs could be met.

Aftermath The student began her volunteer role within the Procurement Department.

Normative Concerns The Director was primarily concerned with being *responsive* to the needs of the student as well as her department.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

1) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Sensemaking Rhetoric

2) a. Method Rhetoric b. Monitoring Rhetoric

3) a. Outcome Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

4) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric

Table 1.73 Type of Rhetoric

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric				3		2	
Technical/Task Rhetoric					1		
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: ENCOUNTER #73

Context The Director of Procurement Services met with two procurement representatives from a private sector firm in her office on October 29, 1996 for 105 minutes. The two businessmen wanted to get acquainted with the Director and ultimately become a County vendor. The Director welcomed them using *caring rhetoric*. The businessmen began describing their own operation using *technical/task rhetoric*. The Director also described the operations of her Procurement Department using *method rhetoric*. The businessmen began asking questions about the Department using *diplomatic rhetoric*.

The Director responded to their questions and asked them questions as well, using *reactive rhetoric*. The businessmen responded by boasting about the private sector and their firm using *diplomatic rhetoric*. The entire meeting continued in this manner with the businessmen frequently using war metaphors to describe their work. The meeting concluded with a polite, friendly exchange between the Director and the businessmen.

Intention The Director wanted to exchange information about the latest procurement techniques with the two businessmen.

Aftermath The researcher concluded the field study after this particular encounter so the aftermath is unknown.

Normative Concerns The Director of Procurement Services was concerned about being *responsive* to the local business community.

Type of Rhetoric Sequence

> 1) a. Caring Rhetoric b. Technical/Task Rhetoric
>
> 2) a. Method Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric
>
> 3) a. Reactive Rhetoric b. Diplomatic Rhetoric

Table 2.1 Type of Rhetoric

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR ENCOUNTERS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric		3				1	=4
Affirmatory Rhetoric			1		1		2 =4
Diplomatic Rhetoric	3	2	1	3	2		=**11**
Technical/Task Rhetoric	2	2	1			1	1 =7
Monitoring Rhetoric	1			1	1		=3
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	2	2	1			1 =7
Controversy Rhetoric	1			2			=3
Relationship Rhetoric				2	5		=7
	8	**9**	5	**9**	**9**	2	4 **46**

Total Encounters=16 (1.1-1.16)

Total Matrix Points=46

Horizontal Mode=9

Vertical Mode=11

Table 2.2 Type of Rhetoric

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES ENCOUNTERS:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric		1	1	1			=3
Affirmatory Rhetoric				1			=1
Diplomatic Rhetoric	1	1					=2
Technical/Task Rhetoric		2	1	2		1	=**6**
Monitoring Rhetoric		1	1				=2
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1					2 =3
Controversy Rhetoric			1			2	=3
Relationship Rhetoric		1			2		1 =4
	1	**7**	4	4	2	3	3 **24**

Total Encounters=8 (1.17-1.24)

Total Matrix Points=24

Horizontal Mode=7

Vertical Mode=6

Table 2.3 Type of Rhetoric

**ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES
ENCOUNTERS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1						2	=3
Affirmatory Rhetoric		2					1	=3
Diplomatic Rhetoric	2	1		1	1	1	1	=7
Technical/Task Rhetoric		2	2	2	1	1	1	=**9**
Monitoring Rhetoric		1	1	1		2		=5
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1		1		1		=3
Controversy Rhetoric		2	1		1	1	1	=6
Relationship Rhetoric		1			3			=4
	3	**10**	4	5	6	6	6	**40**

Total Encounters=14 (1.25-1.38)

Total Matrix Points=40

Horizontal Mode=10

Vertical Mode=9

298

Table 2.4 Type of Rhetoric

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES ENCOUNTERS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1						=1
Affirmatory Rhetoric		1					=1
Diplomatic Rhetoric		1				2	1 =4
Technical/Task Rhetoric	1	1					=2
Monitoring Rhetoric			1			2	1 =4
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1	3			1	1 =6
Controversy Rhetoric			1		1		=2
Relationship Rhetoric		1	1		5		=**7**
	2	5	**6**		**6**	5	3 **27**

Total Encounters=13 (1.39-1.51)

Total Matrix Points=27

Horizontal Mode=6

Vertical Mode=7

Table 2.5 Type of Rhetoric

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric					1		=1
Affirmatory Rhetoric					1		2 =3
Diplomatic Rhetoric				1			1 =2
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1	1		2	1	2 =**7**
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric		2	1	1		1	=5
Controversy Rhetoric		2		1	1		=4
Relationship Rhetoric		1			1		1 =3
		6	2	3	**6**	2	**6 25**

Total Encounters=12 (1.52-1.63)

Total Matrix Points=25

Horizontal Mode=6

Vertical Mode=7

Table 2.6 Type of Rhetoric

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric				1			=1
Diplomatic Rhetoric			1	1		1	1 =4
Technical/Task Rhetoric		3		1	1	1	1 =**7**
Monitoring Rhetoric					1	2	=3
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	2		1			=4
Controversy Rhetoric		1					=1
Relationship Rhetoric			1	1	3		=5
	1	**6**	2	5	5	4	2 **25**

Total Encounters=10 (1.64-1.73)

Total Matrix Points=25

Horizontal Mode=6

Vertical Mode=7

Table 2.7 Type of Rhetoric

ALL SIX LEADERS ENCOUNTERS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	2	4	1	1	1	1	2	=12
Affirmatory Rhetoric		3	1	2	2		5	=13
Diplomatic Rhetoric	6	5	2	6	3	4	4	=30
Technical/Task Rhetoric	3	11	5	5	4	5	5	=**38**
Monitoring Rhetoric	1	2	3	2	2	6	1	=17
Sensemaking Rhetoric	2	9	6	4		3	4	=28
Controversy Rhetoric	1	5	3	3	3	3	1	=19
Relationship Rhetoric		4	2	3	19		2	=30
	15	**43**	23	26	34	22	24	**187**

Total Encounters=73 (1.1-1.73)

Total Matrix Points=187

Horizontal Mode=43

Vertical Mode=38

Table 3.1 Type of Rhetoric

TOP THREE ADMINISTRATORS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1	4	1	1		1	2	=10
Affirmatory Rhetoric		2	1	1	1		3	=8
Diplomatic Rhetoric	6	4	1	4	3	1	1	=20
Technical/Task Rhetoric	2	6	4	4	1	3	2	=**22**
Monitoring Rhetoric	1	2	2	2	1	2		=10
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	4	2	2		1	3	=13
Controversy Rhetoric	1	2	2	2	1	3	1	=12
Relationship Rhetoric		2		2	10		1	=15
	12	**26**	13	18	17	11	13	**110**

Total Encounters= (1.1-1.38)

Total Matrix Points=110

Horizontal Mode=26

Vertical Mode=22

303

Table 3.2 Type of Rhetoric

THREE DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1				1			=2
Affirmatory Rhetoric		1		1	1		2	=5
Diplomatic Rhetoric		1	1	2		3	3	=10
Technical/Task Rhetoric	1	5	1	1	3	2	3	=**16**
Monitoring Rhetoric			1		1	4	1	=7
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	5	4	2		2	1	=15
Controversy Rhetoric		3	1	1	2			=7
Relationship Rhetoric		2	2	1	9		1	=15
	3	**17**	10	8	**17**	11	11	**77**

Total Encounters=(1.39-1.73)

Total Matrix Points=77

Horizontal Mode=17

Vertical Mode=16

304

Table 4.1 Type of Rhetoric

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR ENCOUNTER INITIATIONS:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric		2					=2
Affirmatory Rhetoric							1 =1
Diplomatic Rhetoric				1			=1
Technical/Task Rhetoric	1	2	1				1 =**5**
Monitoring Rhetoric	1				1		=2
Sensemaking Rhetoric							1 =1
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric					4		=4
	2	4	1	1	**5**		3 **16**

Total Matrix Points=16

Horizontal Mode=5

Vertical Mode=5

Table 4.2 Type of Rhetoric

**ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES
ENCOUNTER INITIATIONS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1	1	2			=**4**
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric							
Controversy Rhetoric			1			1	=2
Relationship Rhetoric					1		1 =2
	1	**2**	**2**	1	1	1 **8**

Total Matrix Points=8

Horizontal Mode=2

Vertical Mode=4

Table 4.3 Type of Rhetoric

**ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES
ENCOUNTER INITIATIONS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							1 =1
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric					1		=1
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1	2	1		1	=**5**
Monitoring Rhetoric			1			1	=2
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1					=1
Controversy Rhetoric			1				=1
Relationship Rhetoric		1			2		=3
	3	**4**	1	3	2	1 **14**

Total Matrix Points=14

Horizontal Mode=4

Vertical Mode=5

Table 4.4 Type of Rhetoric

**DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES ENCOUNTER INITIATIONS:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1						=1
Affirmatory Rhetoric		1					=1
Diplomatic Rhetoric						1	=1
Technical/Task Rhetoric	1	1					=2
Monitoring Rhetoric						2	=2
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1					=1
Controversy Rhetoric			1		1		=2
Relationship Rhetoric					3		=**3**
	2	3	1		**4**	3	**13**

Total Matrix Points=13

Horizontal Mode=4

Vertical Mode=3

Table 4.5 Type of Rhetoric

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION ENCOUNTER INITIATIONS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							1 =1
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1	1		1	1	1 =**5**
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric		2				1	=3
Controversy Rhetoric		1			1		=2
Relationship Rhetoric					1		=1
		4	1		3	2	2 **12**

Total Matrix Points=12

Horizontal Mode=4

Vertical Mode=5

Table 4.6 Type of Rhetoric

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES ENCOUNTER INITIATIONS: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric								
Affirmatory Rhetoric								
Diplomatic Rhetoric								
Technical/Task Rhetoric		2			1	1	1	=**5**
Monitoring Rhetoric					1	1		=2
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1						=1
Controversy Rhetoric		1						=1
Relationship Rhetoric					1			=1
		4			3	2	1	**10**

Total Matrix Points=10

Horizontal Mode=4

Vertical Mode=5

Table 4.7 Type of Rhetoric

**ALL SIX LEADERS ENCOUNTER INITIATIONS:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1	2					1	=4
Affirmatory Rhetoric		1					2	=3
Diplomatic Rhetoric				1	1	1		=3
Technical/Task Rhetoric	4	6	5	3	2	3	3	=**26**
Monitoring Rhetoric	1		1		2	4		=8
Sensemaking Rhetoric		5				1	1	=7
Controversy Rhetoric		2	3		2	1		=8
Relationship Rhetoric		1			12		1	=14
	6	17	9	4	**19**	10	8	**73**

Total Matrix Points=73

Horizontal Mode=19

Vertical Mode=26

311

Table 5.1 Type of Rhetoric

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR MID-ENCOUNTERS*:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric						1	=1
Affirmatory Rhetoric			1				1 =2
Diplomatic Rhetoric	2		1		2		=**5**
Technical/Task Rhetoric						1	=1
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	1	1	1			=4
Controversy Rhetoric				1			=1
Relationship Rhetoric				1	1		=2
	3	1	**3**	**3**	**3**	2	1 **16**

*For at least three matrix points per encounter

Total Matrix Points=16

Horizontal Mode=3

Vertical Mode=5

<div align="center">

Table 5.2 Type of Rhetoric

**ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES
MID-ENCOUNTERS*: FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

</div>

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric		1	1	1			=**3**
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric		1					=1
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1				1	=2
Monitoring Rhetoric		1					=1
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1					1 =2
Controversy Rhetoric						1	=1
Relationship Rhetoric							
		5	1	1		2	1 **10**

For at least three matrix points per encounter

Total Matrix Points=10

Horizontal Mode=5

Vertical Mode=3

Table 5.3 Type of Rhetoric

**ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES
MID-ENCOUNTERS*: FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1						1	=2
Affirmatory Rhetoric		2					1	=3
Diplomatic Rhetoric	1							=1
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1		1			1	=3
Monitoring Rhetoric				1				=1
Sensemaking Rhetoric								
Controversy Rhetoric		2			1	1	1	=**5**
Relationship Rhetoric								
	2	**5**		2	1	1	4	**15**

*For at least three matrix points per encounter

Total Matrix Points=15

Horizontal Mode=5

Vertical Mode=5

Table 5.4 Type of Rhetoric

DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES MID-ENCOUNTERS*:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric						1	=**1**
Technical/Task Rhetoric							
Monitoring Rhetoric			1				=**1**
Sensemaking Rhetoric						1	=**1**
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric		1					=**1**
		1	1			**2**	**4**

For at least three matrix points per encounter

Total Matrix Points=4

Horizontal Mode=2

Vertical Mode=1

Table 5.5 Type of Rhetoric

DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION MID-ENCOUNTERS*:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric							
Technical/Task Rhetoric					1		1 =**2**
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric				1			=1
Controversy Rhetoric				1			=1
Relationship Rhetoric							
				2	1		1 **4**

For at least three matrix points per encounter

Total Matrix Points=4

Horizontal Mode=2

Vertical Mode=2

Table 5.6 Type of Rhetoric

DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES MID-ENCOUNTERS*:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric						1	1 =**2**
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1					=1
Monitoring Rhetoric						1	=1
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1		1			=**2**
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric							
		2		1		**2**	1 **6**

*For at least three matrix points per encounter

Total Matrix Points=6

Horizontal Mode=2

Vertical Mode=2

Table 5.7 Type of Rhetoric

ALL SIX LEADERS MID-ENCOUNTERS*:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1	1	1	1		1	1	=6
Affirmatory Rhetoric		2	1				2	=5
Diplomatic Rhetoric	3	1	1		2	2	1	=**10**
Technical/Task Rhetoric		3		1	1	2	2	=9
Monitoring Rhetoric		1	1	1		1		=4
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	3	1	3		1	1	=**10**
Controversy Rhetoric		2		2	1	2	1	=8
Relationship Rhetoric		1		1	1			=3
	5	**14**	5	9	5	9	8	**55**

For at least three matrix points per encounter

Total Matrix Points=55

Horizontal Mode=14

Vertical Mode=10

Table 6.1 Type of Rhetoric

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR ENCOUNTER CLOSURES:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric		1					=1
Affirmatory Rhetoric					1		=1
Diplomatic Rhetoric	1	2		2			=**5**
Technical/Task Rhetoric	2		1				=3
Monitoring Rhetoric				1			=1
Sensemaking Rhetoric		1	1				=2
Controversy Rhetoric	1			1			=2
Relationship Rhetoric				1			=1
	4	4	2	**5**	1		**16**

Total Matrix Points=16

Horizontal Mode=5

Vertical Mode=5

Table 6.2 Type of Rhetoric

ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR HUMAN SERVICES ENCOUNTER CLOSURES: FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric				1			=1
Diplomatic Rhetoric	1						=1
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1		1			=**2**
Monitoring Rhetoric			1				=1
Sensemaking Rhetoric							1 =1
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric		1			1		=**2**
	1	**2**	1	**2**	1		1 **8**

Total Matrix Points=8

Horizontal Mode=2

Vertical Mode=2

Table 6.3 Type of Rhetoric

**ASSISTANT COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES
ENCOUNTER CLOSURES: FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							1 =1
Affirmatory Rhetoric							
Diplomatic Rhetoric	1	1		1	1	1	1 =**6**
Technical/Task Rhetoric					1		=1
Monitoring Rhetoric		1				1	=2
Sensemaking Rhetoric				1		1	=2
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric		1			1		=2
	1	**3**		2	**3**	**3**	2 **14**

Total Matrix Points=14

Horizontal Mode=3

Vertical Mode=6

Table 6.4 Type of Rhetoric

**DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES ENCOUNTER CLOSURES:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1							=1
Affirmatory Rhetoric								
Diplomatic Rhetoric		1					1	=2
Technical/Task Rhetoric	1							=1
Monitoring Rhetoric							1	=1
Sensemaking Rhetoric			3				1	=**4**
Controversy Rhetoric								
Relationship Rhetoric			1		3			=**4**
	2	1	**4**		3		3	**14**

Total Matrix Points=13

Horizontal Mode=4

Vertical Mode=4

Table 6.5 Type of Rhetoric

**DIRECTOR OF PARKS & RECREATION ENCOUNTER CLOSURES:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric					1			=1
Affirmatory Rhetoric					1		2	=**3**
Diplomatic Rhetoric				1			1	=2
Technical/Task Rhetoric								
Monitoring Rhetoric								
Sensemaking Rhetoric			1			1		=2
Controversy Rhetoric		1						=1
Relationship Rhetoric		1			1		1	=**3**
		2	1	1	3	1	**4**	**12**

Total Matrix Points=12

Horizontal Mode=4

Vertical Mode=3

Table 6.6 Type of Rhetoric

**DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES ENCOUNTER CLOSURES:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES**

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric
Anticipatory Rhetoric							
Affirmatory Rhetoric				1			=1
Diplomatic Rhetoric			1	1			=2
Technical/Task Rhetoric		1		1			=2
Monitoring Rhetoric							
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1						=1
Controversy Rhetoric							
Relationship Rhetoric			1	1	2		=**4**
	1	1	2	**4**	2		**10**

Total Matrix Points=10

Horizontal Mode=4

Vertical Mode=4

Table 6.7 Type of Rhetoric

ALL SIX LEADERS ENCOUNTER CLOSURES:
FREQUENCIES AND MODES

LEADER ISOLATED INDIVIDUALLY

RESPONSE OF OTHERS	Autocratic Rhetoric	Outcome Rhetoric	Didactic Rhetoric	Reactive Rhetoric	Caring Rhetoric	Method Rhetoric	Team Rhetoric	
Anticipatory Rhetoric	1	1			1		1	=4
Affirmatory Rhetoric				2	2		2	=6
Diplomatic Rhetoric	3	4	1	5	1	1	3	=**18**
Technical/Task Rhetoric	3	2	1	2	1			=9
Monitoring Rhetoric		1	1	1		1	1	=5
Sensemaking Rhetoric	1	1	5	1		2	2	=12
Controversy Rhetoric	1	1		1				=3
Relationship Rhetoric		3	2	2	8		1	=16
	9	13	10	**14**	13	4	10	**73**

Total Matrix Points=73

Horizontal Mode=14

Vertical Mode=18

TRACEY J. BENNETT

1705 Boxwood Drive   (Home) 540-951-7251
Blacksburg, VA 24060   (E-Mail) trbennet@vt.edu

<u>EDUCATION</u>

     Ph.D: Virginia Polytechnic Institute
               and State University
               Center for Public Administration and Policy
               Conferred May 1998

     M.P.A.:   Cleveland State University
               Master of Public Administration
               Conferred June 1993

     B.A.:   Cleveland State University
               Conferred August 1989

               Major field: Urban Studies
               Minor field: Interpersonal Communication

<u>HONORS AND AWARDS</u>

     1991: Award for Contribution of Leadership and five years of service to the
         Cuyahoga County Community Mental Health Board

     1989: Golden Key National Honor Society invited member

     1988: Alumnae Award for a Junior Woman, Cleveland State
         University Alumni Association

     1986-1989: Dean's List, Cleveland State University

     1985: Award for Superior Achievement and Excellence in Service
         to Ohio's Mental Health System

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

1997-1998
Instructor
Department of Political Science
Radford University
Radford, Virginia

  Fall Semester: Wrote dissertation full-time. Co-presented and co-authored with Dr. Larry Keller at the ASPA RegionVI Annual Conference, October 2-4, 1997 in Akron, Ohio. Title of presentation and manuscript was "Leadership: The Administrative State and the Modern Condition".
  Spring Semester: Taught required American Government course. This was an introductory level course for undergraduate students.

1996-1997
Instructor
Center for Public Administration and Policy
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

  Fall Semester: Taught required MPA course on Governmental Administration I. The course explored managerial roles and competencies necessary for the public manager to lead, to supervise, to organize, and to communicate in public settings. Spring Semester: Provided administrative support by writing annual newsletter, assisted with the development of a Service Learning course for the Center, and other support services as needed throughout the semester.

1995-1996
Graduate Assistant
Center for Public Administration and Policy
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

  Fall Semester: Assisted with teaching duties and responsibilities for MPA course on Governmental Administration I.
  Spring Semester: Taught Ph.D. level course on Reinvention due to illness of faculty member. This was a specialized advanced topics course that explored deregulation and devolution in the public service. Additionally, co-taught Ph.D. level course on Complex Public Organizations. This was a foundation course that examined the principal conceptual and theoretical bases for understanding the structure and environment of complex public organizations.

WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING

1994-1995
Graduate Assistant
Center for Public Administration and Policy
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

      Assisted with master's level courses on Governmental Administration I and
      Public Personnel. Provided support services for local American Society for
      Public Administration chapter. Assisted with instructional and support services
      for two additional master's level courses at the Center: Concepts and Approaches
      in Public Administration and Governmental Administration II.

1993-1994
Graduate Assistant
Center for Public Administration and Policy
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

      Organized the Center's library with a complete listing of holdings. Conducted
      other clerical duties as assigned.

1992-1993
Quality Assurance Coordinator
Mental Health Rehabilitation and Research Inc. (Hill House)
Cleveland, Ohio

      Responsible for all aspects of quality assurance implementation, documentation,
      administration, and coordination. Ensured integration of quality assurance
      activities with program evaluation activities. Also served as the agency's client
      rights and grievance officer.

1989-1992
Associate Ombudsman and Interim Director
Citizens of Cuyahoga County Ombudsman Office
Cleveland, Ohio

      Served as Interim Director while continuing duties as Associate Ombudsman for
      nine months. Mediated individual complaints about county government and
      related services. Documented and provided systemic feedback to relevant
      administrators. Conducted an agency investigation with final report including

recommendations for improvement of internal operations and service delivery.

1989
Undergraduate Internship
The George Gund Foundation
Cleveland, Ohio

Summer Quarter: Conducted study on alcohol and drug abuse services for the Gund Foundation and Cleveland Foundation. Reviewed specific programming nation-wide as well as community task force models.

Winter Quarter: Conducted special project on homelessness. Included national research review and local inventory of services. Made recommendations for local collaborative funding and service delivery efforts. Assigned human service proposal for review through entire staff process.

1987-1989
Full-time undergraduate student
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio

1985-1987
Senior Library Assistant
Serials Department, Technical Services
Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio

Duties included operating the Periodicals Office in Freiberger Library. Responsible for receipt, claiming, invoice verification, and maintenance of the periodicals collections of Freiberger Library. Trained and supervised staff assigned to the Periodicals Office. Provided information from periodicals records as needed by Freiberger Library public service staff.

1985
Library Assistant
Acquisitions Department and Serials Department
Technical Services
Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio

Duties were to coordinate the routines related to ordering, receiving, and payment of University Press approval plan publications. Gathered information and provided statistics on other types of approval plans. Participated in Serials

Unit functions, particularly those that required a high level of bibliographic or financial understanding.

1984-1985
Library Assistant
Technical Services
Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio

Assigned responsibilities as departmental assistant in Technical Services in support of various functions and special projects.

1982-1984
Secretary
Technical Services
Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio

Assigned responsibility for the operation and organization of the office of the Head of Technical Services and as division secretary.

1982
CETA Clerical Training
Cleveland, Ohio

Twelve week refresher course that consisted of typing, filing, business math, ten-key calculator and telephone receptionist duties.

1981
Private First Class
United States Army
Fort Dix, New Jersey

Completed four weeks of basic training until honorable discharge.

1980-1981
Library Assistant
Serial Record Unit, Technical Services
Kent State University Library
Kent, Ohio

Operated mainframe computer system for serial check-in and problem solving.

Maintained periodical newspaper printout for the library.

<u>1979-1980</u>
Library Aide
Cataloging Department, Technical Services
Kent State University Library
Kent, Ohio

Reclassified books from the Dewey Decimal system to the Library of Congress system.

<u>1976-1979</u>
Part-time and Full-time undergraduate student
Cleveland State University and Kent State University

<u>OTHER EXPERIENCE</u>

Continuing Education on behalf of employers:

PC's as a Management Tool
Cleveland State University

Conflict Management
Cleveland State University

Effective Communication: Team Building
University of Michigan

Planning Skills:

Planning Committee, Cuyahoga County Community
Mental Health Board, 1986-1991:

-chair, county civil commitment plan

-chair, subcommittee on county special projects, reviewed proposals
 for innovative services for two years

-member, Board's strategic planning committee

-member, Board's county-wide housing plan

Communication Skills:

      Presenter at numerous workshops in the mental health field

      Member of Race Relations Forum as Associate Ombudsman

      Member of JOBS Advisory Committee, Department of Human
      Services as Associate Ombudsman

Computer Skills:

      Knowledge and use of mainframe, mini-system, and personal computers.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Member:
      Hill House Board of Trustees

Presenter:
      Ohio Department of Mental Health training seminar, new medication
      policy for state psychiatric hospitals, Orient, Ohio

Panel Member:
      Regional Conference, "The Road to Informed Consent", Ohio Department
      of Mental Health, Cleveland, Ohio

Chair:
      Ohio Legal Rights Service Protection and Advocacy Advisory Council,
      Columbus, Ohio

Member:
      Study Committee on Mental Health Services for the state of Ohio,
      Columbus, Ohio

Chair:
      Cuyahoga County Community Mental Health Board. Governmental Board
      with $30 million budget responsibility to plan, allocate, monitor, and
      evaluate community mental health service system. Served as Board
      member for five years, one year as chair and two years as vice-chair.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Society for Public Administration

American Political Science Association

Public Administration Theory Network