ABSTRACT

Based on a review of all organizational communication research published in 33 professional journals between 1966 and 1978, this essay describes the current status of the investigation of organizational communication. The first part of the essay is organized around Elwood Murray's model of a discipline and employs the typologies suggested by G. Goldhaber in 1974 and F. Kast and J. Rosenzweig in 1970. It examines (1) the internal/external, formal/informal, verbal/nonverbal, dyad/small group/public, and network domains of organizational communication research; and (2) the organizational units that have been studied, which include goals, structure, technology, psycho-social systems, and management. This first section concludes with the observation that organizational communication research is a maturing area of study that has not yet satisfied the criteria for calling it a discipline. The second half of the essay reviews salient features of the classical study of speech communication—including domain, theory, research methods, application, and ethics—and notes that the emerging discipline of organizational communication has much to gain by employing these features of the classical model. (KL)
For The
Primacy of
Speech Communication in
Organizational Communication

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Philip Salem

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Philip Salem
(Ph.D., University of Denver, 1974)
Assistant Professor
Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666

Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association in convention at
INTRODUCTION

Humans organizing for their mutual benefit is as least as old as the first hunting parties. Planning for combat or for simple survival in the wilderness requires some minimum systematic analysis of how organizing is accomplished. The investigation of organizing behavior predates history.

The human communication system may be the identifier of the species. The codified systematic analysis of speech is at least as old as Greek civilization. The investigation of communicating behavior is not a new endeavor.

The investigation of organizational communication is, however, a comparatively new phenomena. Although the organizational researcher often must account for communication behavior and although the communications researcher must often attend to organizational and organizing phenomena, it is only in recent times the the hybrid, organizational communication has become the principle focus of some investigation. The ways in which some speech scholars have approached this investigation were presented at a recent post-doctoral program in San Marcos, Texas.

The purposes of this essay are as follows: 1) to describe the current status of the investigation of organizational communication and 2) to argue that that investigation has much to gain from the classical speech model of human communication.

A REVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

The SCA/SWTSU Conference and Post Doctoral Program was organized around the proposition that organizational communication is a discipline. A discipline is a unified body of knowledge possessing a specified domain, a theoretical foundation, various methods of research, a system of application and a method of criticism or evaluation (Murray, 1972). The notion of discipline has recently been used to orient students to group communication (Goldberg and Larson, 1975). The notion of discipline enables one to raise questions, to define the problem, to orient to the task.
Employing the notion of discipline enables one to direct the reflective process at answering five specific questions: 1) What is the domain of organizational communication; 2) What theories are central to this body of knowledge; 3) What research methods are employed; 4) How can knowledge, gained by research, be applied; 5) What criteria can be used to evaluate research and application. To orient myself to this conference I conducted a survey of literature published in professional journals over the previous ten years (1966-75). That review has been updated; the current review surveyed materials from 1966 through 1978.

With the help of Gail Hudson, a graduate research assistant, I checked every issue of the following journals:

1) All the speech journals listed in the Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1974.
2) Human Communication Research
3) Journal of Applied Communications Research
4) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology
5) American Journal of Sociology
6) American Sociological Review
7) Behavioral Science
8) Human Relations
9) Journal of Applied Behavioral Science
10) Journal of Applied Psychology
11) Journal of Conflict Resolution
12) Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
13) Journal of General Psychology
14) Journal of Personality
15) Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
16) Journal of Psychology
17) Journal of Social Psychology
18) Psychological Review
19) Science
20) Sociology Quarterly
21) Journal of Management
22) Academy of Management Journal

Additionally, we "spot checked" the following journals to discover only exceptions to conclusions based on the more thorough review:

1) Journal of Industrial Psychology
2) Personnel Psychology
3) Administrative Management
4) Administrative Science Quarterly
5) Advanced Management Journal
6) Harvard Business Review
7) Human Organization
8) International Management
What do you study when you study organizational communication? Domain refers to the phenomena under investigation. Domain should not be confused with theory. A theory is a set of relational statements (Dubin, 1969; Dance and Larson, 1976); what the statements relate indicates the domain. For example, to state that the clarity of internal communication is related to organizational complexity implies a domain consisting of the following: Communication clarity, internal communication, and organizational complexity.

The Oral Software Message Paradigm of Goldhaber (1974) suggests that the domain of communication consists of the following: formal and informal networks, internal and external message flows; verbal and nonverbal messages; task, maintenance, and human message purposes; dyadic, small group, and public communication contexts. In cataloging the subject matter currently being taught in organizational communication classes, Downs and Larimer (1974) suggest further additions to this list of units in the domain. No list can be exhaustive, but the combination of lists provides a perspective for viewing research. A particular journal article was assumed to be about organizational communication if one of the units under investigation could be judged as part of this combined list or if one of the units under investigation was simply called "communication."

Kast and Rosenzweig (1970) list five attributes of an organization: goals, technology, structure, psychosocial system, and management. These attributes are defined in such a way that nearly all of organizational research may be classified as falling within the definitional boundaries of one of these attributes. For the purposes of this review, a study was judged to be
an organizational study if one or more of the units investigated could fall into the Kast and Rosenzweig scheme or if one or more of the units under investigation was simply called "organizational."

Communication Units

**Internal/External.** Internal communication involves only members within an organization; external communication involves at least one communicator who is not a member of the organization.

Research about external communication is scarce. Brown (1969) dealt with an organization's capacity to store and distribute information from a dynamic environment. Drabek (1969) explored an organization's capacity to act on environmental data presented under stress. Pruden (1969) studied the effect of a type of cognitive dissonance on sales personnel. Wren (1967) presented some problems involved in interorganizational coordination. These studies represent a focus on the links between an organization and the environment, the public, and other organizations.

The remaining research cited in the communication units section may be considered as studies of internal communication.

**Formal/Informal.** An organization may be considered as a contrived system of roles (Katz and Kahn, 1966). When an individual communicates as part of an organizational role, the communication is considered to be formal. Any other communication is considered to be informal.

There is little research concerning informal communication. Roebuck and Spray (1967) attempted to describe cocktail lounge communication. Dee (1968) concluded that a significant portion of an active union member's communication is informal. Recently, Beaver and Jandt (1973) studied the effects of a rumor, and Rudolph (1973) measured the effectiveness of the "grapevine".

Some studies describe a shift from one type of communication to another.

The choice of one channel over the other has been related to technological
change (Champion, 1967), to status difference (Graves, 1972) and to performance ratings (Jain, 1973).

The research noted in the internal/external section is research about formal communication. The remaining research cited in the communication units section may be considered studies of formal communication.

Verbal/Nonverbal. Verbal communication is languagelike, e.g. memos, conversations, speeches, etc. (Goldhaber, 1974). Nonverbal communication is nonlinguistic and generally refers to such behaviors as touching, voice inflection, kinesics, proxemics, etc.

Cummings, Pittzuber and Arendt (1974) and Goldste (1972) noted the influence of space in group decision making. Willeges, Johnston, and Briggs (1966) compared the effectiveness of vocal communication in the organization have appeared recently in the journals.

Some research focuses on communication style, a combination of verbal and nonverbal communication. Some styles are information seeking or information giving (Wage, 1972), authoritarian, persuasive or participative (Tursjarajen and Deep, 1970), or powerful or powerless (Kipnis and Cosentino, 1969). There are project manager styles (Germill and Tharhain, 1974) and bargaining styles (Mckersie, 1965).

The principle difficulty with communication style is that it is often measured as a perceived style. Gentry and Kenny (1965) indicate that there are critical factors which affect style perception.

Unless specifically noted, the studies cited in the communication units section are studies employing verbal communication.

Dyad/Small Group/Public. One person communicating to just one other person is called dyadic communication. A small group is a number of persons who communicate with one another, often, over a span of time, and who are few enough so that each person is able to communicate with all others face-to-face
(Homans, 1950); most small group research deals with 3 to 15 member groups.

Public communication occurs when one person communicates to many.

Some studies relate the frequency of dyadic communication to organizational norms (Dewhirst, 1971). However, the majority of dyadic research is directed at the superior-subordinate relationship; important factors in superior-subordinate communication are the use of threats (Kay, 1965), influence (Turajjarajen and Deep, 1970), job satisfaction (Burke and Wilcox, 1969), the superior's credibility (Falcione, 1974a), and the subordinate's satisfaction with the supervisor (Falcione, 1975b).

The majority of recent organizational communication research is devoted to the small group. Research about the decision making process is common, e.g. Delbecq, 1967; Holloman and Rendrick, 1972; Van de Van and Delbecq, 1974; and leadership, especially Fiedler's contingency approach, is another popular area of investigation (Hill, 1969). The tendency of groups to shift toward a risky consensus is studied (Cecil, Cummings, and Chertkoff, 1973). The list is endless.

When one person speaks to many persons, the result is public communication. There are few recent studies of public communication. Haakenson (1965) examined public speaker training and will be more closely examined in the section on application.

Network. Network refers to the pathway of communication (Goldhaber, 1974): When supervisors direct messages toward subordinates, the network is downward. When subordinates direct messages toward supervisors, the network is upward. If members of equal status direct messages toward each other, the network is horizontal. The notion of network is a uniquely organizational distinction, and as an area of research, this context is second in popularity only to small groups. Downward and upward networks occur least frequently (Hickesburg, 1968). The efficiency of any one network is dependent on the nature of the message content and the quality of the method of message transmission (Melcher, 1967).
The amount and nature of network blocks is associated with the extent of organizational control (Julians, 1966). Organizational structure is associated with the use of particular networks (1969). Multidirectional networks affect the extent of organizational consensus (Zaeglin, 1972). Environmentally initiated stress affects network effectiveness (Drabek, 1969). Trust also affects network over another and the effectiveness of networks, in general, has been a significant area of investigation.

Davis (1968) concluded that routine information was lost in the downward network. The clarity of upward communication is associated with trust (Roberts and O'Reilly, 1974), the span of control (Brewer, 1971), an employee's sense of insecurity (Athanassides, 1973), and the employee's perception of autonomy (Athanassides, 1974). Furthermore, the availability of upward networks is associated with worker satisfaction (Harriman, 1974). It appears that studies which attempt to measure networks in general are losing popularity to more in-depth investigations of particular networks (Roberts and O'Reilly, 1978; Goldhaber, Yates, Porter and Lesniak, 1978).

Etc.
Structure. The established pattern of relationships among organizational components is the organizational structure (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970). The case and adequacy of communication may vary as a function of the structure's formality (Aiken and Hage, 1968; Hall and Johnson, 1967), complexity (Hall and Johnson, 1967; Hage, Aiken, and Marrett, 1971; Goodman, 1970) and of the structure's extent of centralization (Jones, 1969; Brewer, 1971). Although there are few studies whose focus is structure, structure is implied in the notion of network.

Technology. Technology refers to knowledge or the employment of knowledge to perform certain tasks (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970). The principle concern of researchers of technology is efficiency. Since most studies of communication network studies may be seen as technology research.

Cook (1968) related communication to increased sales, but research which relates communication to a particular technology is uncommon.

Psycho-Social System. Studies of the individual in social relationships are psycho-social research (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970). The psycho-social system includes such things as status, roles, worker satisfaction, conflict, etc. The psycho-social system is one of the most popular areas of investigation.

Communication has been associated with organizational climate (Hall, 1974; Maber and Piersol, 1970), status (Champion, 1972; Groves, 1972), conflict reduction (Blake, 1965), worker satisfaction (Burke and Wilcox, 1969), person perception (Golembiewski and Blumberg, 1968), attitudes of managers toward each other (Ivancevich, 1974) and employee attitudes toward the organization (Hand, Richard and Slocum, 1973). These are some of the more representative units, but a list of psycho-social units investigated would be endless.

Management. The principle concern of management is decision-making (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970; Katz and Kahn, 1966). Communication research has generally focused on two areas: 1) methods of decision-making and 2) leader-
ship. Delbecq (1967) is typical of the first concern; leadership studies are so common and so complex that consulting a more comprehensive review such as Stodgill (1974) or Fiedler and Chemers (1974) is recommended. Most small group communication studies may be regarded as decision-making studies. Management and the psycho-social system are the most popular areas of research.

THEORY

A theory is a set of relational statements (Dubin, 1969). A theory is identifiable because a particular unit of domain is common to all the relational statements in the set.

Theories may emerge deductively. A researcher may employ a variety of previously built theories to create a new one. The new theory usually emerges about the interface of the old one (see Hopper, 1976). A rigorous strategy directed at creating testable hypotheses may then be employed (Dubin, 1969).

Theories may also emerge inductively. The interface of a variety of proven experimental hypotheses may suggest a proposition which explains all of the hypotheses. The interface of propositions suggests laws of interaction, and a set of such laws is a theory.

The explanation of a theory is normally reserved for presentation in a book, not in a journal article. How, then, can one evaluate theories by surveying articles which only present experimental hypotheses or empirical propositions? The notion of the efficiency of a law of interaction suggests a criteria for evaluating the nature of theory from the testable hypotheses.

Theories seek to explain a domain and to predict what will occur within that domain. Well developed theories contain both explanatory power and predictive precision. Theories developed deductively often begin with powerful explanations and only imply prediction; it is left to the researcher to state precise experimental hypotheses. Theories developed inductively often begin
with explicit predictions and imply the explanations; the researcher must
develop the generalizable explanations. The two notions of power (explanation)
and precision (prediction) are complimentary since, generally, the most powerful
theories generate the most precise hypotheses and since the most precise
hypotheses lead to the most powerful explanations. A theoretical law, a pro-
position or an experimental hypothesis is said to be more or less efficient
(Dubin, 1969) to the extent that it is more or less powerful and precise.

The least efficient relational statements only assert that the values of
two units are associated in some way, e.g., attitude change is related to speaker
credibility. Such statements only assert that the presence or absence of one
unit is associated with the presence or absence of the other.

A relational statement may explain or predict the way in which a specific
change in the values of one set of theoretical units affects a specific change(s)
in the values of other theoretical units, e.g., an increase in an organization's
effectiveness at resolving conflict increases worker satisfaction. Such relation-
al statements are said to have directional efficiency.

The third level of efficiency is covariation. Relational statements at
this level of efficiency predict and explain the interaction of units across a
range of changes. The example, in the last paragraph, of a theoretical statement
which had directional efficiency only postulated the relationship resulting from
an increase in the value of one of its units; it did not explain the relationship
of worker satisfaction to a decrease in the effectiveness of resolving conflict,
the effect of an increase or a decrease of worker satisfaction on the effective-
ness to resolve conflict, the effect that particular kinds of organizations or
organizational environments might have on both worker satisfaction and the
effectiveness to resolve conflict, etc. Statements postulating covariance are
usually difficult to decipher and are most often explained by employing a graph
or diagram.
The highest level of efficiency is rate of change; theoretical statements at this level specify, at the very least, a ratio between the amount of change in the values of one set of units and the amount of change covariant in the values of another set of units. Often rate of change is represented by some mathematical formula or formulas.

Presence-absence is the lowest level of efficiency; and rate of change is the highest level of efficiency. The experienced researcher may recognize the movement to increasing efficiency as a movement from simple two-factor experimental designs to multiple factor designs, from simple statistical analyses, such as a t-test, to the more complicated statistical analyses, such as multiple regression, or simply as a movement from categorical to continuous variables.

The notion of efficiency is useful because an explanation of behavioral research implies, at least, the efficiency of a theoretical proposition. The more efficient a theoretical proposition, the more theoretical units and/or the more changes in values of theoretical units are related. The level of efficiency is also related to the accuracy in one's predictions about the values of units.

Most organizational communication research is at a low level of efficiency, i.e., presence-absence or directional. Falcione (1974a) factor analyzed the source credibility of supervisors; this type of analysis is due more to the sophistication of theories of credibility rather than to the sophistication of a theory of organizational communication. There is a trend toward multiple factor ex post facto and post hoc analysis; this indicates a trend toward higher levels of efficiency.

Roberts, O'Reilly, Bretton and Porter (1974) did attempt a theoretical integration. They concluded the following: 1) there are multiple approaches to communication; 2) there are multiple approaches to organizations; 3) the critical theoretical task is one of matching the various approaches to organizations to the appropriate communication perspective. These researchers then
suggested a particular integration of these multiple approaches.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

This section reviews behavioral methods. Critical and historical methods are reviewed in the criticism and evaluation section.

The most popular method of research is the field study. A quick review of comprehensive surveys of the literature (Carter, 1972; Greenbaum and Falcione, 1975) will confirm this assessment. Goldhaber (1974) devotes two of twelve chapters to an explanation of field studies.

Simons (1966) listed some of the more common problems with field studies. Aside from the lack of control in a field study, a principle problem with typical field studies is their reliance on a variety of questionnaires as indicators of the unit being investigated. Indeed, questionnaires are the principle measuring device in all of organizational behavioral research (Price, 1969). Greenbaum (1974) suggested the communications audit as an alternative method.

Fiedler's contingency model has been the focus of the most criticism of a particular research method (Mitchell et al., 1970).

A real problem in analyzing behavioral methods is the seeming unwillingness of researchers to share their methods (see Thompson and Vroom, 1967).

Ackoff and Emery (1972) assert that the key to organizational research is in the refinement of laboratory simulations.

**APPLICATION**

Organizational communication research and theory has had two principle areas of application: 1) application to education and 2) application to the organization. There have been two methods of organizational application: 1) short-term practical (training sessions, sensitivity groups, etc.) and 2) long-term analytical (extensive consultation with an organization to areas of change).
Downs and Larimer (1974) and Knapp (1969) describe the current status of educational application.

There are many reports of the effect of short-term practical organizational application. There are some training programs directed at improving public speaking ability (Haskenson, 1965) or language use (Mollen, 1969). Most training programs employ sensitivity sessions to improve interpersonal relations (Beckhard, 1966; Blake, 1965; Davis, 1967; Golembiewski and Blumberg, 1968; Golembiewski and Blumberg, 1969; Golembiewski et al, 1971; Hand and Slocum, 1970; Hand, Richards, and Slocum, 1973; Hillebrandt and Stinson, 1971). This reliance on sensitivity sessions continues in spite of reports which suggest that such training can be harmful (Paul and Porte, 1967) and that such training is really not valued by management (Kearney and Morten, 1974).

There are very few reports of the results of long-term analytical consultation.

CRITICISM AND EVALUATION

Critical research and the development of critical standards have long been a major part of the speech communication tradition (Goldberg and Larson, 1975). Criticism may take the form of an explicit statement of criteria and direct evaluation (Steel, 1971). More often, however, critical standards emerge from an analysis or purposeful review of literature, e.g. this paper, or from descriptive surveys (Knapp and McCrosky, 1968).

Management spends half a billion dollars, annually, communicating to its employees (Fisher, 1965). In some large industries, seventy-five percent of the work assignments are communicated orally (Brenner and Sigbrand, 1973). When is organizational communication good? What are the critical standards? Few articles deal with these important questions.
CONCLUSIONS

Organizational communication is currently the study of verbal communication within an organization. Research is directed at explaining the small group and communication networks. Communication units are often related to the psycho-social and management systems of an organization and to the efficiency of an organization's technology.

Current research tests theoretical propositions possessing a low level of efficiency. It may be concluded, therefore, that most current research operates from a theoretical base which lacks power or precision. The situation is improving, however.

Although some laboratory research does occur, current behavioral studies of organizational communication are field studies. The principle difficulty in field work appears to be a heavy reliance on the questionnaire as an indicator of theoretical units. Alternative methods of measurement have been suggested.

The principle application of organizational research involves human relations training in the organization. Although many studies verify the usefulness of such programs, the training is not always useful or desirable.

Few scholars approach the area from a critical or evaluative perspective. The importance of communication to the organization suggests the need for creating critical standards.

Organizational Communication is currently an exciting and maturing area of study. The growth of this area in the last decade suggests that it is approaching a state that will soon satisfy Dr. Murray's criteria for a discipline. The potential of the area is only limited by the researcher's ability to ask questions or, in the final analysis, by the researcher's curiosity.
THE ADVANTAGES OF THE CLASSICAL MODEL

Organizational communication is an emergent discipline. This portion of the essay will suggest much can be gained by incorporating aspects of the classical model of speech communication. Again using Murray's distinctions, I will present salient aspects of this classical model and suggest the advantages to be gained from incorporation.

Public communication, public speaking, was the initial domain of speech communication scholarship. Theories were developed with an eye toward practical principles; more energy was spent on the logical development of principles rather than on the systematic collection of data. Dialectical and historical research methods were the norm. Application was straightforward and aimed at "the good man speaking well." It is perhaps, only because that a new synthesis must begin as an antithesis (Hegel) of that new philosophy must start as anti-philosophy (Ortega y Gasset) that so many negative things have been written or said about this fine tradition.

DOMAIN

Although there are many aspects of the classical domain, two are most important for this essay: a) the assumption of intent and b) the importance of the message. In the classical model the speaker was thought to be purposeful, to have a goal(s) and to actively pursue that goal. The most obvious solution to a poor speech was to change the speech. After all, the clients of the classical scholars were not speeches wanting to know how to find the best speakers.

For organizational communication a sensitivity to intent means that the scholar begins with an analysis of those items or artifacts of the organization which are produced by the humans themselves. The scholar begins by a consideration of the proactive environment and not the reactive one (Weick). An analysis of organizational constraints without attention to the desired values of desired
traits is as useless as an audience analysis conducted without knowing the speech topic or the intent of the speaker.

Contemporary speech communication educators evidence this sensitivity to the "intentional domain" in instruction directed at improving group decision making and at improving argumentation and debate. In these activities "intentional domain" becomes a problem orientation. Research in both activities is directed at solving a problem or answering a question. The boundary of the research is fairly discrete; the student discards data not related to the defined and limited problem. The problem is defined, in one way or the other, as an unsatisfactory attempt at a goal.

The advantage of this type of boundary specification is that research is purposeful, as purposeful as the roots of the domain. Rules for including/excluding elements from the domain are easily created and usable. What is germane is what helps answer the question, helps accomplish the goal.

One intentional variable is the message, the speech. Creating a boundary around messages has the advantage of behavioral identifiability. The boundary is more definite.

In trying to identify the domain of organizational communication, I employed Goldhaber's Paradigm. This model presents traits of messages, i.e. messages are easy to use because they relate to observable phenomena. The speech act, the message, in all its various guises, is an identifiable attribute of communication.

There is no comparable unit for "organization". What necessary and identifiable behavior must be present for organization? What is the behavioral indicator of management? The review of domain from Goldhaber's categories was easier than from Kast and Rosenzweig's.

Organizational communication should, therefore, constitute its domain by selecting message elements relative to a goal. Additional units should be included based only on the units ability to solve the problem or answer the
Research question. By adopting such an approach, a discipline gains a more identifiable and usefully limited domain.

**THEORY**

Classical rhetoric is rooted in philosophy. The earliest principles were couched in logic and presented in dialectical fire. Because the rigor was spent in the deductive process, classical rhetoric produced powerful but imprecise hypotheses.

Adopting a formal posture to theory building would allow for an integration of empirically verifiable hypotheses. Current research suffers from a lack of theory, a lack of formal theory development.

The magnitude of the advantages of a deductively based formal approach to theory building may be demonstrated by citing a most obvious deficiency in contemporary thinking. There is no generally agreed upon typology of organizations; the lack of such a classification makes it impossible to generalize results. Current hypotheses lack any power; power is the principle advantage of formalism.

Theory building in organizational communication currently operates on a hypothetical-inductive level. What is suggested here is that more attention should be paid to the deductive approach. Theoretical power is the payoff.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

The classical model is known for historical and critical approaches to knowledge. The relationship between historical and critical is very much the relationship between descriptive and experimental behavioral research. The desired attributes of historical and descriptive research is fidelity and accuracy; relationships between variables are, at best, "suggested" when concluding the research. Relationships are "proven" when compared to an established rhetorical criteria or when tested in the laboratory.
Organizational communication research has been primarily descriptive. One might excuse the lack of experimental research by rightly citing the difficulty in obtaining an adequate sample size of organizations, the ethics of manipulating variables in on-going firms, or the problems encountered in modeling organizational behavior in the laboratory. A most often used compromise is comparative research.

It would be nice if I could point to all the experimental or critical research in speech communication. I cannot. For sometime now, our journals have presented some very sophisticated research in the purification of concepts, constructs, and instruments. When such purification results in testable models, new ground is broken. More often, old relationships are constituted in alternate terminology. Quo vadis?

Experimental and critical research is limited by the ability of a discipline to generate theory. Without the theory, the hypothesis can better be seen as an "I wonder what would happen if..." speculation. Such speculation would be limited if we all spent more of our time reviewing theoretical research before reviewing the empirical research. The suggestion here is to do more theory based hypothesis testing and less speculating and describing.

The principle advantage of this suggestion is an economic one. The test of an hypothesis is also the test of a description. If an hypothesis fails it may be because of many reasons, but the success of an hypothesis not only lends credence to the relationship but also supports the description that is the basis for the hypothesis.

An often expressed rationale to avoiding experimentation is that the researcher needs more descriptive data before making the hypothesis. What contemporary and classical approaches to speech communication can offer the organizational communication investigator is not only data, but a body of theory from which to generate hypotheses.
The observation is that special attention to speech communication theory will yield more experimental research in organizational communication. The advantage is that more research questions can be tested more economically.

Application

The classical speech scholar conducted research with an eye toward pedagogical application. The speech teacher could turn to the student and say, "If you talk this way, this will be the likely result." Because the speech communication discipline is centered around the message and its circumstances, the application of research has been straightforward and behaviorally compelling.

Other disciplines interested in organizational communication do not contain such straightforward applications. If the recommendation is to change organizational social norms, how is this to be accomplished; if the recommendation is to motivate alternate sets of needs, what behaviors will accomplish this.

In nearly every case, at the point of applying theory and research to solving human problems, other disciplines invariably use words like "interaction," "act," "meeting," "relationship," etc. to mean speaking, a behavior other disciplines have not analyzed well.

The advantage of incorporating the classical model's approach to application is a simple one: applications are specific and measurable (also more marketable).

Ethics

Speech communication has many systems of ethics; organizational communication has none. The emergent discipline relies only on a utilitarian measure of excellence.

Organizational literature survived the encroachment of ethics. Kast and Rosenzweig (1970) tried to distinguish Theory X from Theory Y by suggesting that each theory was tied to a more fundamental concept of man. In the end, however, managers do not choose a managerial style because of compliance to their
heartfelt feelings about humanity; a style is judged as more or less useful, profitable. Worker satisfaction ala the Human Relations School was never an end in itself, but only a means to increase production.

Kast and Rosenzweig suggested that an organization, as it reaches its maximum potential, incorporates social and political concerns into its goal structure. I see little evidence of this happening. In an age which is marked by shortages of resources and a real demand for innovation and restraint, we have Henry Ford tell a Meet the Press audience that he has no doubt that automotive safety equipment would not have been installed by U.S. companies, if the government had not forced them to. We read that American companies need a monetary incentive to develop alternate sources of energy for American; until the number of consumers decreases, the demand decreases, no financial risk will be taken.

I am not suggesting altruism as an alternative to sound business. I am recommending that the speech communication scholar interested in investigating organizational communication not discard such concepts as free speech, fairness, and tolerance when enjoined in that investigation. One should not discard such concepts because they are ethically right.

CONCLUSION

This essay has described organizational communication as an emergent discipline. Currently, the domain is incomplete, formal theory development is absent; research is too often descriptive, application is limited, and ethics is relatively non-existent. These states are common to embryonic areas of study and scholarly endeavor.

I have suggested that the classical model of speech communication has much to offer organizational communication. The classical model contains a more clearly defined domain, it is steeped in a tradition of formalism, (until recently)
it offers a history of critical research and theory testing, it is centered in specific and compelling applications and it possesses systems of ethics. These classical traits are part of the well known traditions of the discipline.

Although others may argue for the primacy of speech because of theoretical and humanistic necessity, this essay is meant to suggest that scholars not abandon or devalue the classical speech discipline when engaging in a relatively new area of research because of the comparative advantages of retaining the attributes of the tradition. Retention of these attributes will assist in the development of the newer discipline, organizational communication.
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