Participatory Pressuring and Strategic Self-Silencing Theory:

Warning! There can be Health and Organizational Risks

By

Ellen Rudderham-Gaudet

A Dissertation Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Business Administration

April 30, 2013, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Approved:	Dr. Albert J. Mills	Supervisor
Approved:	Dr. Cathy Driscoll	Reader
Approved:	Dr. Linda Christiansen-Ruffman	Reader
Approved:	Dr. Monica Diochon	Examiner
Date:	April 30, 2013	

Abstract

Participatory Pressuring and Strategic Self-Silencing Theory:
Warning! There can be Health and Organizational Risks

By Ellen Rudderham-Gaudet
April 30, 2013

Initial gendered studies on the male dominated organization of Rotary International (Rotary) were catalytic to the decision to do more research on both female and male membership experiences. Previous theoretical knowledge was initially put aside to develop substantive theory about a membership problem and how it was resolved. Theory emerged and was developed using a classical grounded theory approach (Glaser, 1998) to analyze data collected using participant observation.

Participatory pressuring (PP) was identified as a central problem for participants. PP tactics were used to engage members to think or engage in certain ways. In the short term, PP tactics often worked, but members often felt uncomfortable with their use and subsequently resorted to strategic self-silencing (SSS) behaviors in resistance and avoidance to protect relationships and/or the organization.

A developing conceptual framework of PP and SSS was compared to related scholarship. With data from the literature indicating a causal link between self-silencing and anxiety and depression for women, the research was redirected to comparatively include gendered data. Based on 'all the data' from incidents and the literature, the semi-fictional story of Violet emerged. Violet's story was created to reflect the gendered implications of PP and SSS theory and the sensitive nature of data collected. Violet's story highlighted the importance of how PP and SSS behaviors can impact women compared to men and offered insight into why women may be opting out of opportunities to participate more in organizational contexts.

In the silence of Rotary, leaders are not getting invaluable feedback to address membership retention and recruitment challenges. PP-SSS theory provides both descriptive and explanatory conceptualizations about what is going on in Rotary and the impact these behaviors have at both individual and organizational levels. This research contributes to knowledge about practices used to engage members and to the growing body of knowledge about organizational silence.

Descriptive details with conceptual and critical insights on how the research process was conducted contribute to the evolving interpretations of grounded theory methodology.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated first and foremost to my husband, Charles, whom I share a partnership in life and whose love and support were critical to my doing this research, for as long as it took. Through thick and thin, I thank you and love you, especially for all you have done to help me cross this finish line. MERCI! XOXOXO

I also dedicate this endeavour to my parents, Betty and Bob Rudderham and in memory of my parents' in-law, Nelson and Bernadette Gaudet. My parents' influences and support were essential in helping me manage life challenges and complete this PhD. In particular, I thank you, Mom, for always encouraging and challenging me to do my best, especially when faced with life's curve balls. My Mother is one very smart lady and a wonderful nurturer who gave so much, not just to her family, but to a community of friends and family. Mom and Dad, I love you and thank you for teaching me so much about life, love, laughter and learning.

I also dedicate this thesis to Olney MacDonald, Duke and Anna Gallant, Locker and Jean Laughlin and my beautiful Aunties; Mary, Cynthia and Phyllis, Sally, Anna, and Dawn. I much appreciated the influence of family and special family friends from whom I learned so much and who inspired me as great role models to do all I can do.

To Matthieu, Marc, André, Joseph, Stéphane and Samuel, I also dedicate this academic work to you. I hope your Father and I have done well to reflect the importance, intrinsic value and joy of lifelong learning without compromising our role and commitment to you as parents.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to Rotary International and the many Rotarians who cared and shared Rotary with me. Special thanks to Rotarians Dick Hodgson, John Williamson and Dorothy Britten who introduced me to Rotary and helped facilitate the research process.

Dr. Albert Mills, thanks for your patience, guidance and ongoing considerations for the duration of this journey. Dr. Linda Ruffman, Dr. Cathy Driscoll, and Dr. David Wicks, thanks for your help, support and academic wisdom to complete the thesis. Dr. Monica Diochon, thanks also to you for agreeing to be the external examiner.

To Peggy, Amy, Jim, Margaret, Jean, Bally, and Sandra, thanks for all your help and encouragement. I can't imagine having done this without sharing it with you all! You were the best academic pals with whom a gal like me could do a PhD!

Through the years, I have shared (and burdened) the study load with friends with whom I kept mentally and physically fit 'playing' soccer, hockey and music. I have much appreciated the support and inspiration from the Mother Puckers and Storm teams and from our band, The Mother Pluckers. I am most thankful for the encouragement and help I had from Debbie MacDonald-Gray, Corrine Boudreau, Nancy (Mac)Lean, Jill Urich, Leigh Huestis, Wanda White, Eliza Manual, and Rose Carter. THANK YOU!

They say it takes a community to raise a child. Well, it was a community of friends and family who helped me and my family complete this academic challenge. I feel very grateful and privileged to have had this chance to learn. Many thanks to Saint Mary's University and the Sobey School of Business for the opportunity and years of support to complete my PhD (and MBA).   My plan now is to continue to learn and to give back, God willing; "Today I'm going to try to change the world".

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction and Background to Thesis Research

Preface

Personal Reflections

Research is an inherent part of life; how we live, love and learn.
Every day we make reflections, connections and contributions;
Some have meaning more significant than others.
Contributions can happen in so many different ways.
It all counts; it is all data, good or bad.
How we make sense of it can make all the difference in the world.

"Today I'm going to try and Change the World"

(Song Written by Johnny Reid, Singer & Composer)

Introduction

This thesis and the overall research experience represent a prolonged engagement and adventurous academic endeavor into learning about life, in particular, about organizational life. It also represents a sincere and dedicated attempt to 'give back' in more ways than one in appreciation for the privilege I have had to do this research as a member of Rotary International (RI). This research experience also represents an arduous academic development and challenge to understand and execute "Classical Glaserian Grounded Theory" (GT), the chosen methodological approach for the study.

In this research, I studied lived experiences of members of Rotary International (Rotarians), including those of my own. I engaged in examining many organizational incidents in pursuit of making a contribution to academia by discovering and developing theory about a main problem for participants. This introductory chapter provides a background as to why this study was conducted and introduces the reader to the research context of Rotary International. Summaries of several research projects that were

conducted on the organization prior to this one are also provided. These initial projects and their supporting academic literature were catalytic to the decision to conduct further study on membership experiences of Rotarians (members of RI).

The literature references cited in initial chapters are somewhat dated. This accounts for my pre-exposure to theory dating back to when I first began research on Rotary International, before embarking on this thesis research. The theoretical knowledge and empirical data from the smaller research projects on RI were at first noted as possible data for future comparisons, but initially put aside as I began the research for the thesis. This data, however, became relevant to conceptual developments in the latter stages of the research. It was 'all data' that was analyzed when it became relevant during the research process using constant comparative analyses.

Throughout the research process, learning as I was doing it, I conceptualized and theorized as much about the methodology as I did about the data from the research context to develop theory. I thought it was important to recount the experience and related discoveries from engaging in GT. The nature of the approach and my experience with it weighed heavily on my decision of how I would present this thesis. Consequently, I provide insights and highlights about the various stages and processes of GT throughout the entire thesis. This may be, in itself, an important contribution to the academic arena of the methodology. "Classical GT" (Glaser, 2002) continues to evolve and my writing intimately about the experience may help others to better understand the approach. Others may think twice about following the methodology for a dissertation after reading

this thesis. Conversely, it may be a helpful model for someone with conceptualizing abilities and some GT experience deciding to conduct a major study using Glaser's GT.

To follow in the next section, I provide a chronological background to the initial choices to do this study. Deciding to write this entire thesis in a chronological way was an important decision that may frustrate some readers at first who expect to have the research problem and study goals clearly defined in the first chapter followed by and an extensive literature review. Further explanation for the organization of this thesis is provided in chapters to follow to give some clarity to the not so typical and linear way that this thesis was written and how the research unfolded and GT emerged (eventually).

Background to the Research Project: A Chronological Account

In the beginning, when I was so very fortunate to be admitted into the PhD program at Saint Mary's University, I listened attentively to any advice that was offered. In particular, I was advised to choose research topics for course assignments that interested me most and that could be related to my eventual thesis research. During my first year in the PhD program, my professor (who later became my thesis supervisor) offered a variety of research topics as a course project.   One of the suggested assignments was to do research on the impact of women in Rotary International.

Rotary International (RI, Rotary)

I was immediately attracted to the assignment because it was related to research about women. However, I did not know anything about Rotary International (RI), nor did I know anyone who was a member of the organization. So, before deciding my course assignment, I quickly did some cursory research and learned from RI's main website that:

3

Rotary is an organization of business and professional leaders united worldwide who provide humanitarian service, encourage high ethical standards in all vocations, and help build goodwill and peace in the world. In 166 countries worldwide, approximately 1.2 million Rotarians belong to more than 31,000 Rotary clubs.

In nearly 100 years, Rotary has grown from a small club of four members to a worldwide network of men and women who share a common vision for a better world. The world's first service organization, Rotary has a long history of helping those in need and uniting people of different cultures and beliefs (About Rotary, 2003).

Rotary seemed like an interesting enough organization to study, but what sparked my interest most was what I found on a different website link, referred to as *Rotary's Global History Project* that included a particular segment about *Women in Rotary* (Rotary History, 2003). From there I learned that for most of its history, Rotary was restricted to male membership. As early as 1912, one club had considered allowing women to join, but it was not until 1986 that the Rotary Club of Duarte, California, decided to allow women to officially become members of its club. RI, however, responded by revoking the club's charter. In 1987 after a legal battle, the courts mandated that Rotary clubs in the United States could no longer refuse women from joining. Subsequently, the Duarte club had its charter reinstated. In 1988, Canada followed by also making it against the law to exclude women from Rotary clubs. Then in 1989, Council on Legislation, Rotary International's parliament, voted to eliminate the male-only provision, opening up membership to qualified women across the world (Rotary History, 2003).

With this brief glimpse into Rotary and the history of women in the organization, I excitedly confirmed the topic choice for my first research paper in the PhD program. Thus, it all began with that first assignment where I was to examine the role and impact of

women in an organization that for many years had only male members. I was most

intrigued to understand more about the behavioral dynamics of women entering into such

a traditional bastion of male leaders. The topic fit well with my ongoing interest in 'glass

ceiling' research, the encompassing concept about what gets in the way of women trying

to climb to the top of organizational ladders to the positions of power and authority

(Morrison, White and Van Velsor, 1987). The topic also related to research I completed

for a Master in Business Administration. In that study, I identified the challenges

entrepreneurial women faced starting up and expanding their businesses in the Sultanate

of Oman in the Middle East – where the roles of men and women in traditional life and in

business have pronounced boundaries and cultural dimensions according to one's sex.

Stepping Stones and Building Blocks to Thesis Research

In the summer of 2003, I enthusiastically embarked upon my first research paper

of the PhD program. I quickly became immersed in researching Rotary International.   I

know how inexperienced I was in doing that initial research. Nonetheless, it signified a

starting point in engaging in a series of research projects and a long term research study

on an organization and its members. It also represented a time when I became exposed to

particular areas of gendered research, qualitative research and grounded theory.

During my second year of the PhD program, I became intrigued by what I learned

from the *Discovery of Grounded Theory* by Glaser and Strauss (1967).   I found that the

constant comparative methodology made such good sense to me as a way to

systematically and rigorously do a qualitative study. Ever since that initial reading, I have

used the analytical process often in the way that I think, analyze, conceptualize and solve

problems. Before reading "Discovery of Grounded Theory", I tended to gravitate towards

quantitative research with my more scientific background. The comparative process,

however, seemed the way to systematically analyze qualitative data to find significant

difference and relevance in social research. I could envision comparing qualitative data

in a similar way to how significant difference was determined with quantitative data. I

became convinced that GT was the analytical approach needed to dig deeper into the

female experience in Rotary.   However, while I was still following PhD program

requirements, I needed to choose methodological approaches prescribed by course

content. In the next sections of this chapter, I first provide an overview of literature

reviewed and then a summary of each of the three research projects that I conducted

before officially embarking on the thesis research.

Initial Research Projects on Rotary International

The impetus for doing all three initial studies was supported with literature

reviews as I set out to meet the goals of each study. The common problem focus and

theoretical threads tying the projects together were related to my research interest in the

lack of participation and advancement of women in organizations. In their book, first

published in 1987, Morrison, White and Van Velsor presented the results of a ground-

breaking three-year study of female executives. This research brought the "glass ceiling"

concept to national attention to explain how women in organizations were held back by

invisible barriers. Ongoing research provided many metaphoric derivatives of the

concept, each related to various forms and levels of barriers confronting women (Still,

1997). Research also put forward the metaphor that glass ceilings were broken or

cracked, with women making advancements into managerial and leading positions

(Laturnus, 2001; Lyness and Thompson, 1997). As women continued to become a force in comparable numbers to men in the general workforce, research began to focus more on the upper echelons of power and authority where the presence of women was still relatively low (Brooks, Jarman and Blackburn, 2003; Catalyst-Knowledge, 2004; Cooper Jackson, 2001; Lyness and Thompson, 1997; Morris 2001).

The resolve to glass ceiling circumstances was referred to as "glacial at best" by the President of Catalyst[1], Dr. Susan Black, during the Administrative Science Association of Canada Conference in 2005. Women were slowly making some progress, but there was ample evidence that the glass ceiling was still well intact (Armitstead, 2004; Beeby, 2004; Church, 2004; Gamba 2001; Hughes, 2002; Lipscombe, 2004). More research was needed to assess the complexity of the ongoing problem. There was also increased interest in this area with research indicating companies with more women in leadership positions were financially outperforming those who had fewer or no women at the top (Catalyst Knowledge, 2004). Affirmation action, equity programs, and flexible human resource initiatives helped women make inroads, but mysterious stumbling blocks remained and the solution was unclear.

> It took a revolution to get women where they are in business today. But now to push hard-won gains wider and deeper, a different approach is necessary. Not a revolution. Not this time. In 1962, 1977, and even 1985, the women's movement used radical rhetoric and legal action to drive out overt discrimination, but most of the barriers that persist today are insidious, a revolution couldn't find them to blast away. Rather, gender discrimination now is so deeply embedded in organizational life as to be virtually indiscernible. Even the women who feel its impact are hard-pressed to know what hit them (Meyerson and Fletcher, 2000, p. 127).

---

[1] Catalyst is a leading organization on women in the workplace in North America.

To reveal more deeply embedded elements affecting women's organizational participation, researchers shifted focus to also examine the gendered nature of organizational cultures. Studies in this area revealed how the gendered cultures limited networking, role models, and mentor opportunities for women differently as compared with men (Tharenou, 2001; catalystwoman.org, 2004). Although limited access to networking was often cited in the research as a notable problem for women's advancement (catalystwomen.org, 2004; Cooper Jackson, 2001; Kanter, 1977; Korac-Kakabadse and Kouzmin, 1997; Mills, 2002; Rutherford, 2001; Wilson, 1998), there were gaps in empirical research on the network medium itself (Linehan, 2001):

> One of the most serious critiques of current research is that, despite consistent findings of gender differences, "no comprehensive perspective on networks and women's careers has been offered" (Ibarra and Smith-Lovin, 1997, p. 359). We believe this theoretical problem ties directly to the need for additional complexity in research exploring how and why relationships matter (Gersick, Bartunek, and Dutton, 2000, p.1027).

Rotary International, as a network of (relationships) professional and business leaders with glass ceiling circumstances seemed like a viable medium to study female experiences and a gendered context. To follow, I provide a brief summary for each of the three studies I conducted before the thesis research:

1. *Assessing the Implication of a Gendered Organizational Culture on the Glass Ceiling Phenomenon: A Study on Rotary International (2003)*

In this study, I examined selected aspects of Rotary International's organizational culture (Pettigrew, 1983; Schein, 1991). The approach was exploratory and empirical in nature. Secondary data were reviewed and two long interviews (McCracken, 1988) with a male and female Rotarian were conducted to get a sense of the changes in Rotary since

women were permitted to become members. Following similar research done by Benschop and Meihuizen (2002), I also analyzed "cultural products" of Rotary, such as communication documents, databases and websites to explore how representations and implications of gender impacted women and the organizational culture of Rotary. A comprehensive content analysis of components of RI's magazine, the *Rotarian*, was also done to identify changing female participation and role depiction from 1985-2003. A number of variables were sampled and analyzed to provide a measured assessment of the impact women had since their entry into the organization.

"Body counting" (Alvesson and Billing, 2002) alone indicated that a glass ceiling existed for women. Data analysis supported the notion that Rotary had not changed much with increasing numbers of women joining Rotary over the years. Results supported the implication that the glass ceiling phenomenon was rooted in less obvious practices and circumstances of a gendered organizational culture. Findings supported the theory that enduring masculine cultures inhibit change and impede a greater participatory role from women in the organization (Gherardi, 1995; Ibarra and Smith-Lovin; Kanter, 1977, 1987; Maddock, 1999; Mills, 2002; Wicks and Bradshaw, 2002).

2. *Participation and Advancement of "Exceptional" Women Where Their Numbers Are Low: A Case Study of Rotary International (2004)*

Eleven long interviews (McCracken, 1988) with nine women and two men were conducted in this study. I also engaged in ethnographic activities (Schwartzman, 1993) by observing Rotary meetings and reviewing RI manuals, reports and websites. This research revealed types of behaviors, attitudes and practices affecting participation and advancement of women in Rotary. I followed the grounded theory approach of Strauss

and Corbin (1998) to identify concepts and major categorical themes. Emerging from the data was that the networking experience for women in Rotary reflected the "old boy's network" (Rogers, 1988) experience of a male dominated hierarchy. 'Inner circles' of clubs were a formidable center of power and biased political maneuverings originating from a dominating masculine framework of shared histories and thinking. This circumstance had a negative impact on female members and thus, female members were often frustrated with their membership. They hesitated to invite other females to join Rotary, assuming other women would not tolerate the male domination like they could.

Findings in this study added to theories about the barriers women face, helping to explain why the glass may be 'hardening' in some domains. In this study, the committed female Rotarians interviewed seemed rather 'exceptional' types who were able to endure the male dominating culture. They experienced the same in their own work places and managed to "*handle the boys*" (participant quote). These exceptional women perceived that they were able to fit in and get along better with their male counterparts than most of their female friends and colleagues could. This helped to shed light on why numbers of women in Rotary remained low. Also, from the data, it was learned that women hesitated to consider advancing in Rotary because the workload could be quite heavy. The cost and time to do Rotary were barriers for women to consider taking on greater leadership roles. Also, in RI there were leadership advancement polices that effectively resulted in women having less opportunity to take on leadership positions.

3. *Examining gendered perspectives in a male dominated network: A glass ceiling study on network members of Rotary International (2004)*

In this study, I developed and administered a survey to triangulate and build on exploratory, secondary and qualitative research to examine gendered aspects of Rotary International's organizational culture. The survey also included two open-ended questions. 255 surveys were completed by participant members from different Rotary clubs from District 7820 of Rotary International. Most participants were from the Atlantic Provinces, Canada. There were 192 male and 59 female respondents; four surveys did not indicate sex.

Survey results provided empirical evidence that supported theory that prevailing masculine cultures tended to be enduring through homo-social reproduction (Burton, 1991, as cited in Korac-Kakabadse and Kouzmin, 1997) or what is explained by the similarity attraction theory (Byrne, 1971, as cited in Elvira and Cohen, 2001). In contrast, results refuted research purporting it was work-family conflict keeping women from networking (doing Rotary) more so than men (Cooper Jackson, 2001). The research supported the notion that the women in Rotary were 'exceptional' and that it is hard to find more women like them to join Rotary.

Literature Reviewing the Big Picture with a GT lens

In describing the three smaller research projects, I have provided further insights into the organization of Rotary International and its membership. I have also made transparent the theory that I was exposed to before embarking upon the major research for this thesis. I needed to acknowledge this prior theory exposure so that I could in turn put it aside to conduct classical Glaserian GT research – for which it is advised that no formal

literature review is to be done until the latter stages of the research (Glaser, 1998). I

needed to begin the thesis research open minded to what was to be discovered in the data

and mindful not to allow past experience and knowledge, any preconceived notions, to

bias the process.   In the next chapter, I provide a more detailed explanation of the

importance of putting aside prior experience and knowledge and the relevance to

theoretical sensitivity in deciding to do more research on Rotary using Glaser's GT.

The importance of the three research projects I had already done and the literature

I had previously reviewed was a reference point to, in turn, zoom out from focusing with

the glass ceiling and gendered culture theoretical lenses to take a different approach. The

lack of clarity and resolve from extant research and the findings from those three initial

studies were catalytic in re-directing the research towards **'unearthing' what was really**

going on.   I was beginning to understand that the glass ceiling problem was more

complex than the matter of identifying barriers for women and implementing practices to

remove them. I sensed the need to step back and take a fresher look at what was going on

in terms of membership for both men and women in Rotary. With such an approach I

thought that I might be better able to uncover some of the mystery surrounding the slow

progress of women in organizations dominated by men.

I was beginning to sense that the glass ceiling metaphor was distracting

researchers from gaining a deeper understanding of what was really going on in the

interactions and relationships of women and men in organizations. The glass ceiling

metaphor, even with its many derivatives, had not provided all the answers.   This quote

reflected well the mysterious circumstance and daunting challenge for future research:

"…it's not the ceiling that's holding women back, it's the whole structure of the organizations in which we work: the foundation, the beams, the walls, the very air. The barriers to advancement are not just above women, they are all around them" (Meyerson and Fletcher, 2000, p. 136).

Importance of Research for Rotary International

In deciding what to do for my thesis research, I hoped further study of Rotary might solve a theoretical mystery or two. At a minimum, I knew researching membership experiences, including my own, was likely to render invaluable insights into the common struggle for volunteer organizations like Rotary to retain and recruit new members. Interest in volunteering and joining philanthropic causes has actually grown in recent years; however, what is commonly happening is that people enlist but their volunteering experience is often short lived (Volunteer Growth in North America, 2006). In my years of involvement with Rotary, I have observed this happening. Within a year or two, and sometimes even within months, a newly joined member's attendance is noted as declining and then a short time later, you hear that the member has resigned. Membership recruitment, development and retention are priorities for Rotary International (RI). RI has made this widely known within the organization and more publically with national and international advertising campaigns to increase membership.

When I first became involved with Rotary (2003), membership numbers were only a budding concern for Rotary leaders who were slowly becoming aware of the outlook of an aging and declining membership. During my first research encounter with Rotary, I was welcomed to do research and was asked by Rotary leaders to provide

insights into the membership challenges faced by clubs. In the last couple of years of my Rotary experience, membership retention and growth has become a number one priority and requiring full attention.

A major goal for most RI clubs concerning membership continues to be that they would like to have younger men and women in greater numbers to join and stay with Rotary and advance to leadership positions in the organization.   Female membership in Rotary has grown over the years but is still relatively low, especially in some clubs where their numbers can be just a few or none at all.   Compared to other volunteer organizations, Rotary International did relatively well in the face of the general downturn in volunteerism when women were finally permitted to join the organization in 1987 (Rotary History, 2003).

In concerning who becomes a Rotary member, clubs select and invite members to join from all vocations, with the intention of having not more than a 10% representation from any particular profession or business. RI's primary mission is humanitarian in nature. See Appendix A for further insight into Rotary and its philanthropic work.   The foundational component of Rotary's success in doing the 'good' work is that a Rotary member is typically a leader and power holder from an industry sector and is well connected to those of other sector divisions. Those connections and access to resources are key to meeting Rotary goals. In turn, there are membership benefits, including the opportunity to network with powerful leaders and develop mentor and role model relationships.   Whereas RI's membership and organizational context reflects, in various ways, the glass-ceiling context in leading positions and boardrooms of most

organizations, the theoretical developments from this study might also provide insights for comparable corporate settings. At a minimum, this research on Rotary would likely result in generating meaningful theory about membership development and retention for volunteer organizations, particularly those that have similar traditional, hierarchical structures with a significant male membership.

Evolving Methodological '*ground*work' for the Thesis

Collectively, the initial studies conducted on Rotary International and its members yielded some interesting research findings, but for the most part I found that I was just uncovering, validating and slightly adding to what I learned from supporting academic literature.   I felt there was much more to discover in Rotary with its interesting history and membership dynamics. I was compelled to continue researching this context.

As I learned about ethnography (Schwartzman, 1993), case study research (Yin, 1989) and participant observation (Dewalt and Dewalt, 2002; Jorgenson, 1989) in the qualitative methods course of the PhD program, I excitedly considered these different research paths as ways to further understand membership challenges in RI. However, course requirements did not allow for such in-depth, time consuming commitments. Like so much research that goes on, I was resigned to follow a 'quicker fix' design. I chose then to do long interviews in the second research project on women in Rotary. These interviews were eye opening and, retrospectively, foundational towards this thesis.

I gained experience in generating theory from data following Strauss and Corbin (1998) in that second research project. In taking this approach and doing interviews I gained a better understanding of the context, experience and particular challenges faced

by female Rotarians. Even while I engaged in the research, however, I sensed that I was just getting at the surface and that interviewees were often giving me "party lines" (Strauss and Corbin, 1998), especially when I was recording interviews. Glaser calls this "properline data", which participants think is proper to tell the researcher (Glaser, 1998). In any case, there were plenty of indicators in the interviews that were taunting me to get past the veneer to uncover data about what was really going on. The data was suggesting that more theoretical (purposeful) sampling and different sources and methods to collect and analyze data were needed.

Although I had used different methodological strategies in the initial three projects, I had nonetheless, constantly compared, conceptualized and written memos. Course requirements and time restrictions influenced the research designs for the first three smaller projects, but for the all-encompassing, culminating thesis project, it was the data and theoretical developments that would influence the research path. It was difficult, however, to determine initial steps. I considered different paths and consulted various literature sources on methodology to examine pros and cons for different research designs (Creswell, 2003; Dyer and Wilkins, 1991; Eisenhardt, 1989; Hammersley, 1992; Hall, 1999; Merriam, 2002; Popay, 1998; Silverman, 2000; Travers, 2001).

Participant Observation: Next Research Step, A Giant's One

I was often told by both male and female Rotarians, "You really need to be a member to understand what goes on." While doing the initial studies, there were times I was mistaken for a Rotarian and I got a taste of how the data collected from such a vantage point might be different. Logistically, the research that I had already done was

16

illuminating a path to collect more data by becoming a member and participating and

researching from inside the organization (Dewalt and Dewalt, 2002). As a member, I

could take a good look around and become involved like any Rotarian to get a deeper

understanding of the organization and the experiences of both female and male members.

Rather than relying on secondary data, second hand perceptions or impressions (as per

alternative research strategies), I could experience for myself what it is like to be a

member. As an insider, I could theoretically sample and compare data collected from a

variety of sources (see chapter 3, pp. 61-64 for methods and sources of data).

Engaging in participant observation would mean taking a path less traveled. It is

not surprising that this type of research is not often chosen; the time commitment and cost

are major deterrents. However, I considered also how research often highlights the need

for more in-depth and longitudinal studies and greater complexity in research. Although

still relatively new to academia, my impressions have been that there is an overabundance

of cross-sectional studies, just small slices of the research pie. Many research studies

seem to be too focused and narrow, more superficial than meaningful. The following

quote reflects the need for more meaningful efforts, in this case, with ethnographic

studies:

> In brief, critiques of contemporary ethnographic studies seem to maintain that
> genuine cultural immersion is singularly lacking in many studies. In part, the
> sheer proximity of local cultures is to blame for this deficiency. Anthropologists
> in the classical ethnographic tradition were forced to travel to distant and
> unfamiliar lands where they remained for months (and even years), becoming
> acculturated in the society. Today, a few fleeting visits are held to be sufficient to
> qualify a study as ethnographic. Bate (1997) strongly deplores this turn from
> "thick description" to "quick description" resulting in far shallower cultural
> accounts. As he stringently comments, these days, "prolonged contact with the
> field" means a series of flying visits rather than a long-term stay (jet plane
> ethnography) (Prasad, 2005, p. 85).

By choosing to do participant observation over an extended period, I would have the option to engage in a full complement of ethnographic methods to discover what might be difficult to uncover otherwise. I would take my time and not just do some fleeting visits and interviews. I determinedly considered that by doing participant observation I could make a meaningful 'ground breaking' contribution. Initially, I assumed the contribution would be gendered in nature, but little did I know at the time where the 'grounded' process would take me. It seemed that the path of my thesis work was clearly before me. I could use my previous studies, triangulate further with additional sources of data through participant observation and present a comprehensive thesis package.

It seemed like a clear direction at the time; however, retrospectively, I did not have a clear vision or understanding of how I would begin the research or how I would analyze data collected during participant observation using GT. Admittedly, when I first began this thesis, the waters were muddied by not knowing classical GT methodology, as well as I do now. I was also confused somewhat by having first used Strauss and Corbin's (1998) version of GT. I did have a sense of the methods that I could use to collect more data, but, looking back, I was unclear about what I would do with all the data from the multiple research projects and from participant observation. I also think that I became even more confused by the many different ways that studies define and use grounded theory. In any case, after a fair amount of wavering, I somewhat blindly took the plunge and decided to TRUST the process, as Glaser (1998) strongly purports you can do – when I still did not have a clear understanding of Glaser's way. However, as I discovered, one really does not begin to understand the process until you are well into

doing it; that is the learning curve for doing grounded theory, in the classical Glaserian style (1978, 1992, 1993, 1995, 1998, 2003). There were plenty of curves experienced.

Chapters to Follow: Thesis Layout

Given the nature of GT and its application, so intimately involved with all the stages of the research – "because grounded theory research uses iteration and sets no discrete boundary between data collection and analysis" (Suddaby, 2006, p. 639), the GT research path (design) is as much a product of this research, as is the theory that emerges from it. Consequently, the typical order and content of chapters and finding data analysis and methodological insights throughout this document are different than what is found in most theses. Also, at first it may seem like the writing and content is at times disjointed. The methodological and theoretical pieces do fall into place as the write-up unfolds, in the way GT emerges and comes together, eventually.

Following this introductory chapter, the next two provide an overview of the Glaserian approach to grounded theory, which includes further explanation for the cursory literature reviewed in this first chapter and what I needed to do with this pre-exposure to extant theory. Chapter 2 describes the methodology more generally and why I chose Glaser's GT. Chapter 3 provides a more in-depth synopsis on the iterative data collection and comparative analysis components of GT. I provide illustrations of how I engaged in classical GT in both chapters 2 and 3, but the reader will have a better sense of how I conducted GT when I present the fruit of my GT labor in remaining chapters.

Chapters 4-6 represent much of the data collected and analyzed over the years of participant research activity that involved extensive comparing and sorting through

hundreds of concepts and memos. The contents of these chapters contain almost purely the chronological emergence and conceptual development of theory before any comparisons were done with data from extant research. Unlike other theses, you will not find extant theory woven into the theoretical developments up to this point. Because putting aside prior theory knowledge and not contaminating the emergence process until the theory was well developed were critically important, I decided it was likewise important to present this part of the research in a way that reflected this. Also to note, in writing these chapters I retained some of the casual memo writing style used in the research process. In doing this, the reader is exposed first hand to the 'ground' level personal experience and importance of GT memoing for this research.

In Chapter 7, I provide an overview and some comparative analysis of research literature that I chose as connected to the conceptual framework as presented in the preceding three chapters. I explain how and why I chose to review certain literature and not others. Technically, I use chapters 7 and 8 as a comparative backgrounder to highlight relevant extant literature and data comparisons to further develop theory. I dedicate a section of chapter 8 to "Violet" and her gendered side of the story. As it turns out, gendered implications found in the research data analysis compared with data from extant literature represented a 're-sounding' theme, which resulted in comparing anew gendered data that I had initially put aside. The semi-fictitious persona of Violet and her story was created based on empirical data from many true stories and incidents involving Rotary members. The emergence of Violet's story responded to the need to concisely and creatively represent the conceptual analysis of gendered data and its relevance to the

developed theory. Violet was also created to protect identities of a minority of 'exceptional' women in Rotary and to tactfully handle sensitive data.

In Chapter 9, I provide an integrative theoretical summary relating the conceptual discoveries to one another. I go through the process of 'weaving' in the theoretical threads grounded in the data from both the research data and scholarship to present a concise, abstracted theory that includes gendered implications. I discuss the importance of this substantive theory in terms of Rotary and also more generally and suggest avenues for future research. In the final chapter 10, I end the thesis by providing highlights and a critical review of the methodological experience. I examine some outstanding questions arising from the research. I also revisit the GT literature to comparatively critique the use of GT in general and specific versions thereof after having completed this major research work using Glaser's Classical Grounded Theory.

Chapter 2: Discovering Grounded Theory Research Goals

Introduction

In this chapter, I provide further background on how the decision for the methodological approach continued to evolve and how I resolved my integral role as the researcher. Also, I discuss in more detail the appropriateness and fit to use Glaser's GT, and in so doing, I begin to provide a more in-depth synopsis on the GT processes I followed. I also offer comparative insights of why I did not choose other approaches.

Discovering Grounded Theory, Naturally and Serendipitously

During my PhD coursework, I was exposed to different quantitative and qualitative approaches and methods for doing academic research. I was exposed to the philosophical assumptions and debates about reality, truth, knowledge and values behind research design choices in doing organizational research. Before starting the PhD program, I had a stronger background in natural sciences and scientific method and my thinking was well aligned and somewhat fixed in terms of seeing the world objectively and quantitatively. After becoming immersed in organizational and management research, I have less interest in hypothesis testing and researching a narrow slice of the reality pie. I now have more of an interest in social research. It took me some time to understand how this research was different and to grasp the implications of the multidisciplinary nature of management research.

I crossed over into the world of social research to face the "paradigm wars" and what it all meant (Kuhn, 1970; Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Denzin and Lincoln 2003). As I slowly sorted it out, my world view changed to wanting to do research to gain in-

depth understanding and meaning about organizational life and management as a way to solve problems and prevent them. I learned that the choice of methodology and methods depended on the kind of research question or problem to be studied and underlying assumptions about studying realities and contributing to knowledge. The types of questions or problems I was increasingly interested in, I realized, were better suited for qualitative research. However, there were many types of qualitative approaches to choose from for a major research project. I considered doing a linguistic study (Johnston, 2000). I also weighed in on whether a mixed methods course of action would be suitable; after all, for those first three studies I used both quantitative and qualitative methods. I spent time assessing and re-assessing what I wanted to accomplish with my thesis research and the pros and cons of using mixed methods (Creswell, 2003; Morse, 2003; Shah, 2006; Teddlie, C. and Tashakorri, 2003).

At one point, I considered participatory action research (Wadsworth, 1998) as the way to go, but as I learned more about the method, I realized it was not appropriate for a few reasons I considered. Foremost, although I was understanding more about Rotary and its members, I had not yet been able to map out the theory that would be the basis of a sound and responsive change program. Action research did not fit with the direction of the research, with what the data was indicating (from the three initial studies). I needed to *excavate* and *unearth* that which I sensed was to be found buried deep in the *grounded* data of the organizational context. Increasingly, I sensed that I needed to start anew from scratch and get away from theoretical frames that would direct me in a particular direction like action research would.

23

In a rather coincidental and beneficial way, I had the opportunity to attend a "Grounded Theory Troubleshooting Seminar" in Halifax, Nova Scotia in August of 2007 (I attended a second one in 2009). The seminar was organized through experts of Barney Glaser's work; Glaser, himself, participated via teleconferencing. In preparing as a troubleshootee for this intensive workshop, I read a great deal on the Glaserian, classical approach. With the preparatory work and the intensive workshop, I gained a better understanding of how Glaser's GT was different to other qualitative data analysis approaches. Somewhat mind bending at the time, I learned that Glaser's approach was neither a qualitative nor quantitative approach; it was considered a general methodology. The enlightenment that came from this workshop amounted to a major leap from my previous thinking and use of GT. For the most part, though, I believe the difference was that I was beginning to understand it much better and was recognizing it as an appropriate path to follow for more Rotary research. The workshop did much to build my confidence to proceed with GT.

In doing classical GT, I was often unsure where the data were leading me. I know now that this was the natural progression of learning the process and engaging in the iterative and revolving pattern of analysis. Glaser warns of this challenge; "The grounded theory researcher must feel comfortable with uncertainty, ambiguity and confusion that comes initially and during various stages of grounded theory for brief periods. He must trust that uncertainty, ambiguity and confusion are a useful path to being open to emergence" (Glaser, 1998, p. 44). The revolving nature and uncertainty of doing GT can make you quite dizzy, until conceptualizing and making connections lead you to major categories. I persevered through times of ambiguity to eventually sorting both the

24

conceptual data and me out! My GT experiences in this regard are further described in later chapters of this thesis with the presentation of concepts and theory that emerged.

GT Indicates the Research Questions (And My Role)

As the clouds of ambiguity dissipated, and as I advanced in using GT, it became clearer to me what this thesis research would look like. Clarity in this regard had a lot to do with letting go of an original idea that I would be doing a focused gender study about the experiences of women in the organization. I daringly re-set out on this research mission by putting aside any pre-conceived ideas about what challenges women might be facing there and the gendered culture of Rotary; I started anew to simply discover a main problem for members. In fact, soon after I officially became a member of RI, a "Rotarian", I remained unsure in what direction the research would take me.

Once into membership, I found myself examining data about how the organization and its members were struggling with change and so, at one point, I thought this academic endeavor would contribute to the field of change management. I changed my mind about what I would study a few times during the initial stage of this research. I re-started this thesis project keeping an open mind to discovering whatever might be a main problem for participants, for both male and female members of Rotary. With classical GT you do not start with a problem, you discover one. How and where I collected data for this thesis research was re-directed to asking the basic classical GT questions;

- What is going on?

- What is a main problem for the research participants / members?

- How do participants resolve this main problem? (Glaser, 1998).

In following a classical GT approach, I needed to put aside my former knowledge and interpretations from the academic literature and my previous gendered research on Rotary. I let go of 'pet' theories (Glaser, 1998) about glass ceiling and gendered culture frames of references. I remained open to having the data determine the nature of this thesis research and collected data according to the basic GT questions as stated above. I allowed the GT process to illuminate a central problem facing members in Rotary. In following and using the prescribed, necessary elements of GT, I was theoretically sensitive to comparing new data, ongoing conceptualizations and emerging theory. Following the revolving, iterative process and fundamental tenant of GT that "all is data" (Glaser, 1998, p. 8) meant that as it was relevant to what I was finding in the new data, findings from the initial studies and their informing literatures could be brought into the comparative process of generating concepts and developing theory – but, only if relevant. As much as I understood this from the beginning, starting anew and putting aside the gendered lens allowed me to discover what was really going on.

In using GT and collecting data by engaging in participant observation, I, the person participating and executing the research, played a critical role. I impacted both the research and the researched. No matter whether the research is quantitative, qualitative, or theoretical in nature, the researcher plays a role and thus it is important to reveal the personal context and author's frame of references to the research topic (Alvesson, 2002). No research can be without bias (Cohen, 1994; Alvesson and Deetz, 2002); however, with some understanding of the personal and professional background, the academic audience can better comprehend and assess the ideas or findings that are advanced. In qualitative research there is extra pressure on offering a comprehensive disclosure:

It should not be a mystery, then, exactly how the data were collected, by whom, and under what circumstances; how the analysis was carried out (if only just 'by looking repeatedly for patterns'); how the researcher decided on the research site and what his or her background was there; and what his or her previous relationship to participants was (Johnston, 2000, p.67).

Given the nature of grounded research and the intimate role of doing participant observation, I recognized the significant role I would play in this research. Glaser describes the importance of the researcher's role in this way:

Also included at each state of generating theory is reliance on the social psychology of the analyst; that is his skill, fatigue, maturity, cycling of motivation, life cycle interest, insights into and ideations from the data. Generating theory is done by a human being who is at times intimately involved with and other times quite distant from the data – and who is surely plagued by other conditions in his life. The analyst operationalizes the operationalizing methodology called grounded theory. Within the analyst, as the research continues, is a long term biographical and conceptual build up that makes him[2] quite "wise" about the data – how to detail its main problems and processes and how to interpret and explain them theoretically (Glaser, 1978, p. 2).

Given my age, reluctantly, I have reflected on my long term biographical and conceptual build-up that might make me wiser about the data. I have also recognized how humanly flawed I am and that biases could get in the way of my doing GT well. I consciously attempted to be wise about my biases for this research. However, whatever prior theory exposure, experience, bent, or bias that could have come into play, were addressed through the constant comparative GT process.

With GT, a biased dimension is treated like any other data sample. It becomes comparable and can become a relevant variable. Any bias variable must earn its relevance through the constant comparison process. A bias correction will be made

---

[2] Glaser footnotes here to indicate, "His means his or her (or all people) throughout this book. This convenience of style does not imply that only men are sociological analysts, which is trite and obvious to all but a few readers".

through the process, cancelling out researcher impact or interpretation— if not relevant to emerging theory (Glaser, 2002). This reduces the need and concern for a reflexive personal assessment. However, attention is still needed to consider and to compare personal bias, knowledge and experience as data. After all, there is a fine line between doing the pure, classical, Glaserian GT approach versus doing "Constructivist" GT (Glaser, 2002). Glaser, himself, acknowledges this. That thin line was evident in the epistemological and ontological foundations of Glaser and Strauss' original work and discovery of GT. They struggled with that line more personally in their working relationship (Glaser, 2002). In this regard, readers will wonder about the impact my personal background and academic bents had on this research. So then, to follow in the next section, I provide a personal account and insight into my 'bents' because I did play such an integral role.

Where did 'I' fit into the Research? : The Personal Account

I approached this research reflecting on how my educational background and life experiences might play a role in conceptualizing and developing theory. Throughout the process, including the write up of this thesis, I kept a reflective account of past experience and knowledge to compare with data incidents when relevant. I was also cognizant of some of the personal reasons that seeded my interest in studying Rotary International. For instance, as a female brought up in a family of one sister and five brothers and who now has a husband, three sons and three stepsons, I have always been interested and sensitive to how other women function in circumstances outnumbered by males and subjected to their different (authoritative) ways.

When I was younger, I had not thought a lot about how I was dominated by males in the sense that they had governed or controlled me in my home-life or professional opportunities. I did not recognize barriers in my way, at least not any that I could not overcome in whatever I wanted to do. For example, I was one of the first girls to join an all boys' Little League Baseball team. With my first attempt to try out for the team, I was sent home, but the second time around I would not go home. Once the coach realized I could play just as well, I made the team. Even though I had better skills than most of the young men on the team, once I did reach the young adult stage of my baseball career, I abandoned playing with the guys, because of them. I felt increasingly uncomfortable with the boys as I was often subjected to their sexist jokes. More and more I was simply not enjoying the camaraderie of playing with them and at times felt that they did not like me playing among them, although this was never directly communicated to me.

Although science and engineering was the initial direction I took on the academic track, I soon considered career alternatives that would better suit having a family. Having found that teaching and learning fit well with a determined goal of maintaining a healthy work-family balance, I pursued public teaching and for a time (in retrospect) enjoyed working in this organizational medium less dominated by men. Interestingly enough, during my time as a public school teacher, there were concerns about the lack of male role models as teachers. It was duly noted, in contrast, that there remained to be a strong presence of male leadership in this organizational medium. I have noted and reflected upon the gender dynamics of this context, compared to others.

While taking a break from teaching to do stay at home mothering, I completed a Master in Business Administration and then leaped into the academic arena to pursue the PhD in Management. During these experiences, I have felt like I was back into that familiar male dominated context. It has been challenging. I too have considered "opting-out" (Mainiero and Sullivan, 2006) after coming so far, but have not really fully understood why. It was purported that there is an existing glass ceiling in academia itself, an international phenomenon in fact (Todd & Bird, 2000), with disconcerting views about compliance and resistance to the problem (Bradshaw and Wicks, 1997). I am interested in understanding more in this regard and contributing in some way to help both men and women participate in better ways in the different types of organizational contexts we find ourselves. It is important to me to help fill or identify gaps in the organizational and management literatures where there has been a lack of female perspectives. I am interested in helping to fill 'holes in the grounding', in particular, for those who struggle with the nurturing role, whose voices have been weaker in academia.

There is a whole range of feminist theories and frameworks that address women's causes and need for change, which also suggest a variety of ways change can be made. Theories about male dominance in social arrangements, in particular, highlight a necessity to change patterns of domination (Calàs and Smircich, 1996; 2006). I am in some ways a feminist, but I have labeled myself a 'Motherist', based on my developing theory of Motherism and 'Motheristic Management'. These are theoretical concepts that emerged through constantly comparing data from life and management experiences, scholarship, and my ongoing research on Rotary International and other gendered mediums. This developing theory has underlying feminist motives that drive for more

respectful consideration and fair representation of women and the need for change – but, not necessarily, in the way that feminists focus primarily on the plight of women. Motherism seeks to identify better ways for all concerned, especially for our children, the organizational members of the future.

Addressing Biases, Credibility and Ethics Concerns

I brought to this research project my biases and assumptions, but I have used a methodology that involves its own tradition and inherent assumptions and a comparative analysis process that addresses biases. I realized in doing this research that I was, in fact, a human instrument for data gathering and analyzing (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). I began this study reflexively, conscious of the ways in which research is carried out and understanding how the interpretive process of doing research can influence outcomes (Clegg and Hardy, 1996; Hardy, 2001; Holland, 1999). Understanding this, I proceeded to do systematic research using the classical GT approach and have incorporated my experiences and knowledge as data to be compared and conceptualized, but only when relevant to the data and developing theory.

I consider my gendered experiences and personal philosophy as a sort of analytical gestalt (Strauss and Corbin, 1998), or as Glaser calls it, a "bent" (Glaser, 1998, p.119) that helped me more readily recognize discriminating patterns of organizational life. In this research case, my analytical gestalt or bent enhanced my theoretical sensitivity in analyzing data from incidents and experiences of members and also of my own as a Rotarian. The importance of theoretical sensitivity was evident in how it was the 'driver' of this research and the resulting theoretical discoveries. I proceeded with

this research to 'drive' conscientiously and reflectively to what could influence the research path (consciously and subconsciously).

I proceeded with this research respecting my own personal values about honesty and ethics, including my beliefs as a Christian. As an academic researcher, I am attentive to the importance of ethical researching and the impact the activity can have on me and others (Grafanaki, 1996; Knapik, 2002). As a Rotarian, I adopted the famous "Four Way Test" of Rotary (Forward, 2003), the golden rules of how *we* conduct ourselves in an ethical and fair way as Rotarians, in everything 'we' do. I made a conscious, honest, and skillful effort in putting preconceived notions aside as I began the participant observation component of this research to collect and analyze data according to the systemic, comparative process of Glaserian GT.

For the most part, fellow Rotarians knew I was doing research on Rotary, in general, and on membership more specifically. Some knew that I had a previous interest in the role of women in Rotary; I believe this was often assumed considering my sex and that I was often one of a few females present during Rotary activities. For the most part, I was upfront about my dual role as a member and researcher. After over seven years of participating as a Rotarian, however, I know that there were those who had forgotten or dismissed the relevance of my researcher role, even though I frequently gave reminders about my continued research.

As my years of membership increased, and members got to know me and I participated more as one of them, I increasingly experienced and observed more data incidents that were, comparatively, gendered in nature. I recognize that, with little doubt,

the emergence of much of the gendered data had a lot to do with the fact that it was me, a female researcher who was collecting, experiencing, analyzing and theorizing with the data. I am certain if a male researcher proceeded to engage in a similar study as I did, the research outcome may have been different.

As I advanced this thesis research and began comparing the developing theory with extant literature, I turned back to make comparisons with data from the initial three gendered studies I did with Rotary. Likewise, some of the literature reviewed from those studies also became relevant for theoretical sampling and understanding my own experiences as a female member in a male dominated Rotary club. There will be those who will question whether the data lead me or I forced the data. Some may suggest that I selectively chose data, influenced by my theoretical bent from past research or because of my personal sensitivity to gender. I understand this critique and address further such questioning of the quality and value of my research efforts in sections to follow.

Valuating Grounded Theory Research

As Glaser suggests, there really is no point in entering into the rhetorical wrestling match on the value of this type of research and its epistemological and ontological assumptions (Glaser, 1998, p. 35). Such a debate can weigh heavily on a researcher. Ultimately, what really matters in the end is the outcome of the research, the theory that emerges. Glaser suggests that the developed theory should be judged, not by questioning the open mindedness, assumptions or the rigor of the research and the researcher, but by asking the following questions;

- Does the theory <u>work</u> to explain relevant behaviour in the substantive area of research?

- Does it have <u>relevance</u> to the people in the substantive field?

- Does the theory <u>fit</u> the substantive area? Is it readily <u>modifiable</u> as new data emerge"? (Glaser, 1998, p. 17).

Glaser adamantly purports that dealing with reservations about the process is a waste of time; the product and the quality of the research and emerging theory will speak for itself (Glaser, 1998). It has been a prolonged engagement; this should help in terms of research credibility.   Developed theory was generated from a lot of data gathered in different ways and from different sources that was constantly compared. I actively participated in a membership role as a Rotarian, but remained conscientious and overt about my research role. I was part of the reality I studied, but remained attentive to collecting relevant data and conceptualizing to develop sound theory.

I was particularly sensitive to wanting to put forward meaningful research. It took time. During the research process, I re-read Glasers' key books on GT and continued to review articles from other sources on different versions of GT.   I was mindful of the criticisms and recommendations about doing GT and presenting it. I was attentive to avoiding the pitfalls of engaging in "What Grounded Theory Is Not" and the common misconceptions about doing a grounded theory study (Suddaby, 2006). I followed the systematic analytical process and believe that I made appropriate theoretical choices to generate theory that is affirming to the value and integrity of the <u>classical </u>GT process.

Having survived GT's uncertainty, I became more confident in the process and its importance as a meaningful research methodology, as Glaser states:

Grounded theory's academic roots are from the traditionally known highest quality sociological schools of thought, theory and methods. These roots, along with the amazing product of grounded theory, legitimate its use as one among the many other methods of research (Glaser, 1998, p. 3).

I also remained mindful in this research endeavor to how grounded theory is not perfect and that there would be times when I might need adjust my GT approach.

It was founded as a practical approach to help researchers understand complex social processes. It was also designed as method that might occupy a pragmatic middle ground between some slippery epistemological boundaries. Because of this genealogy, grounded theory techniques are inherently "messy" (Parke, 1993) and require researchers to develop a tacit knowledge of or feel for when purist admonitions may not be appropriate to their research and may be ignored (Suddaby, 2006, p. 638).

It was meaningful to me to have done this research using a "pragmatic middle ground" approach, considering the blurring epistemological lines.

Grass Rooting with GT

In *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (1967), Glaser and Strauss showed how a rigorous, systematic comparative analysis of data could transform gut feelings into reliable substantive theory and defensible knowledge claims. It was a ground breaking contribution that challenged the hegemony of theory-testing methodologies and mindsets of the time. It was catalytic to advancing qualitative methodology and establishing the tensions of how it could be used to discover objective versus subjective reality.

In the original text and publications that followed by both authors, terms used in the descriptions of the GT process seemed to imply objectivism. In contrast, descriptions of the conceptualization process reflected more an interpretative, subjective reality, which relates to GT's roots with the interactionist school of Chicago researchers (Glaser, 1998, p. 31). Judith Holton (2007) recounted how different scholars have positioned grounded

theory as positivist, constructivist, interpretivist, realist and neo-empiricist and declared that "grounded theory methodology, in the classic sense, does not fit within established research paradigms…rather as a general methodology, classic grounded theory transcends the specific boundaries of established paradigms to accommodate any type of data sourced and expressed through any epistemological lens" (p.268).

Karen Locke (2001) declared that it was hard to situate grounded theory within the competing paradigms. She reported on research reflecting the usage of the GT approach adhering to both positivist and interpretive paradigmatic stances. Through this research experience of GT, I proceeded to collect and analyze data as though I was observing, assessing, comparing and thus identifying the reality that existed, out there. However, at the same time, I could not avoid taking into consideration my own presence and participation in the research and the interpretive thought process I engaged when conceptualizing about that reality, subjectively. My experience and the impact I had as a researcher and a member participant were part of the data I compared.

Since my initial reading of Glaser and Strauss (1967), I discovered and re-discovered grounded theory more intimately as I did it, in a grounded theory way. My understanding of GT emerged while doing it and reading a variety of literatures that explained how to do it.   I depended primarily on Glaser's books: *Doing Grounded Theory* (1998) and *Theoretical Sensitivity* (1978). I also consulted related GT websites (groundedtheory.com and groundedtheoryonline.com). In my opinion, many of Glaser's books are not an easy read, but these two books and the websites were promoted as providing the best direction in doing Glaser's GT in the workshops I attended. I have

come to theorize about how there is no quick way to understand and engage in the power of GT; it takes time and lots of experiencing.

Although I followed the Glaserian version of GT, I consulted other grounded theorists' interpretations like that of Charmaz (2006), Locke (2001) and Strauss and Corbin (1998). I also reviewed research that examined and deciphered differences between GT interpretations (Bryant, 2007; Heath and Crowley, 2004; Holton, 2007; Suddaby, 2006). Comparing this data on GT proved most useful to understand Glaser's approach and to convince me that Glaser's way was the better one to follow, at least in this research case. Glaser's GT was the way I could draw upon the initial studies to help generate theory, if the data from those studies became relevant for whatever problem I might discover in the data and decide to study. In particular, in using GT, I was able to compare data from even the quantitative study.

The Stronger Case for Using Glaser's GT

Fundamental to grounded theory is that "All is Data…this perspective makes doing grounded theory especially fun and powerful, as the researcher does not need to buy into any particular data as sanctified, objective or valid. A researcher need only see what incidents come his way as more "data" to constantly compare, to generate concepts and induce the patterns involved" (Glaser, 1998, p. 8). GT facilitates a path to integrate data from multiple research projects no matter the type of data or how it was collected. Qualitative data incidents are what is used most often with GT, but "through conceptualization, GT is a general method that cuts across research methods (experiment,

survey, content analysis and all qualitative methods) and uses all data resulting there from" (Glaser, 2002, p. 3).

Although participant observation seemed to be the next logical and theoretical step to take, I had second thoughts about using it as the methodology. I decided to proceed with Glaser's GT and to use participant observation as a method to collect data. There were a couple of reasons supporting this decision. First and foremost, I did not want to do a descriptive study and collect a lot of contextual data as typically done in participant observation studies. Providing a lot of descriptive detail about Rotary and its members would not be meaningful towards the kind of theoretical discovery about behavior desired. My understanding of Strauss and Corbin's GT (1998) is that their recommended way to do GT involves gathering large amounts of contextual data and this was not needed. I was interested in illuminating a problem about membership experiences that was difficult to discern. I increasingly believed there was new theory to be discovered by studying what was really going on for members. I was not interested, nor would it be needed to write a lot about Rotary International. As the medium for discovery, I needed only to understand contextual circumstances to help conceptualize about members' behavioral interactions. I was interested in theorizing about social behaviors, incidents and relationships in an explanatory way, not in a descriptive way.

I enjoy writing as a way to think, analyze, discover and report to contribute to knowledge. As Glaser suggests, "The researcher should always (at least try) to choose the method best for him and for the problem at hand" (Glaser, 1998, p. 11). I believe that I have an inherent ability and spirit to generate ideas. In reflecting more on what method

might be best for me (and therefore also for the research initiative) and considering my busy, unpredictable life pattern, I also liked what Glaser had to say about GT and balancing life activities and research:

> Built into the method is the ability to put it down at will and pick it up later with virtually no need to backtrack or unduly review where the researcher was before the break in pace. The study is always ready to go forward on the current, next step. Thus there is no need to sacrifice the requirements of and need of family, friends, and recreations for the research. The research in progress is always there waiting to move forward when the researcher can return to it (Glaser, 1998, p. 15).

Having experienced GT, while managing and balancing the research path with heavy work-family-life commitments, I can say that the process worked well this way. Often, I was required to suspend research activities for periods of time to contend with family matters. At first, I was uncomfortable with this and worried that this might have a negative impact on the research. However, when I returned to the research, I discovered the break from the research was helpful, as if it was a necessary part of the process.

I found the time away from the research was a necessary time to reflect and gain a fresh perspective to recognize what was relevant to compare. It also allowed for some time and space to think about my role as a researcher and to get some distancing. As Glaser also prescribes, I maintained the ongoing practice of reading about unrelated research and theory. The downtime and diverse reading helped me, I believe, develop my theoretical sensitivity to better generate concepts and theory from the data. Furthermore, whereas the methodology was all about focusing in on a main problem and the generation of theory abstract of time, people and place, there was likely to be very little change in the behavioral dynamics with the problem over time. This was certainly what I observed over the years of my studying the same problem.

Conceptualization to higher levels of abstraction

In considering the important role that I would have in the research, Glaser's GT was personally appealing to me, but I had more than just me to consider. I gave much consideration to study participants and the intimate role I would have with them as a participant-observer. Perhaps the most critical factor that tipped the scales in the decision on methodology was related to the conceptualization process of GT and what it meant to me in relation to research participants. In this regard, the following resonated greatly; "The most important property of conceptualization for GT is that it is abstract of time, place and people" (Glaser, 2002, p.2). Having decided to become a member of Rotary International meant that I would be intimately involved with clubs and their members. In this research mode, my preference was to retain as much anonymity about club members and their personal experiences as possible – keeping to the requirements of doing meaningful, but ethical research that gave due consideration for the participants and ME. GT fit well with this goal, certainly in comparison to using other qualitative data methodologies that suggested having rich contextual descriptions and lots of examples of the 'voice' of participants to enhance credibility.

Although members of RI welcomed my combined research and membership role, I felt more at ease knowing that the level of abstraction required for developing grounded theory meant that I did not need to present a lot of specifics on personal behavior or descriptive details about incidents, even though identities would be concealed. Given my intimate role as a member of a clubs, I often reminded participants about this and I sensed that it made them feel more at ease in sharing their experiences and to more readily accept me into their organization as one of them.

I have made more references to time and place and participants in this write-up than I originally planned, as this was a necessary requirement to advance the dissertation. If I had the time and given more latitude, I would have attempted to remove more identity references, even the name of the organization studied. Context means a lot, but I would also argue that context is not everything, at least not for the purpose of this research. Theory need not be so contextually based to be meaningful and make a difference. In any case, I have compromised to achieve a balance to 'show and tell'. I have abstracted conceptually to higher levels, but have strived to provide sufficient descriptive details in a way to also minimize the possible risk of revealing identities and events.

No Recording Devices or Analysis Software Required

Conceptualizing to higher levels was an element that was appealing in my concern to protect identities. Glaser's advice to solo researchers for GT research: "DO NOT TAPE INTERVIEWS" (Glaser, 1998, p. 107) was also helpful in this regard for many of the reasons discussed in the previous section. Participants shared more freely and generously in the absence of a recording device. Likewise, I did not take detailed field notes while I engaged in membership which allowed participants to engage uninhibited by someone studying them. When I followed Strauss and Corbin's GT approach and used a tape recorder in one of the initial research projects on RI, I found that interviewees talked a lot more after the tape recorder was turned off. Once the recorder was turned off, more revealing and relevant data were collected. I experienced a considerable difference in conversations and interviewing without recording them and am personally convinced it is much better not to do so for certain forms of research. Glaser explains why recording interviews is not required with GT:

> The confusion is between the traditional use of the interview as complete evidence for substantiating or verifying a finding compared to grounded theory's use of interviews for conceptualization for generation of concepts and hypotheses. When doing grounded theory there is no need for complete recording of the interview as one would want in descriptive completeness. Theoretical completeness only requires those notes written down after an interview to be later used for constant comparisons. The researcher can trust this approach (Glaser, 1998, p. 107).

Similarly, Glaser purports that there is no need for using computer software and if the methodology is used with qualitative data the process has to be technology free (Glaser, 2003, pp. 17-44). Glaser is not alone for advising against or cautioning on how software may be used for doing GT:

> Qualitative software programs can be useful in organizing and coding data, but they are no substitute for the interpretation of the data. The researcher must make key decisions about which categories to focus on, where to collect the next iteration of data and, perhaps most importantly, the meaning to be ascribed to units of data (Suddaby, 2006, p. 638).

I did not use qualitative analysis software. I was surprised by how well it worked for me to physically sort memos and concepts using pieces of paper spread out on my office floor. I did some sorting electronically. I used major concepts as search terms and then when it came to writing-up, I efficiently cut and pasted memos into the body of the thesis.

Developing theory abstract of time, place and people without the use of recording devices afforded other important benefits that I considered in my decision to use GT rather than other qualitative designs. Glaser explains:

> Conceptualization solves and resolves many QDA (Qualitative Data Analysis) difficulties, which are not abstract of time and place. QDA focuses on description of time, place and people, so is confronted with the problem of accuracy, context, interpretation, construction and so forth in trying to produce what "is". GT generates conceptual hypotheses that get applied to any relevant time, place, and people with emergent fit and then is modified by constant comparison with new data as it explains behavior in a substantive area (Glaser, 2002, p. 6).

Conceptualization is the point of grounded theory methodology (GTM), not describing or proving reality; it is less about showing and more about informing on what theory emerges from the data**.**

> GTM is a well-developed set of procedures or analytic techniques designed with a particular end in view: creating a formal, substantive theory that explains a particular sort of social phenomena. GTM is based on the tenets of field research, where investigators "seek to move beyond particular meanings to identify general patterns and regularities in social life" (Charmaz, 1983, p. 93). Generating theory, then, requires that we take what we learn from observations and interactions with participants and indicate what these data tell us about the group upon which they are based, and about the social life of similar groups (Dillon, 2012).

Sometimes it seems that Glaser positions his GT as the better approach to discover substantive theory, but Glaser adamantly advances that GT is just one way, not the only way. He articulates well the value of different approaches, but makes the strong point of why descriptive detail is not needed for the purpose of using GT:

> Others may feel, even know in their hearts, that data could be handled more profitably other ways, whether theoretically or empirically. Verificational studies abound which alter theories. There is a whole school of thought – ethnomethodology – that affirms that the "immaculate description" is the best way to render research data. Still others go for empirical generalizations – broad scope empirical patterns. *Our perspective is but a piece of a myriad of action in Sociology, not the only right action* (Glaser, 1978, p. 3).

From what was learned from the literature and from findings of the initial research studies on Rotary membership and compared to what I was learning about Glaser's GT, grounded in all this data was an emerging case for choosing Glaser's GT. It seemed like the right path to profitably handle all the data considering the in-depth understanding about illusive behavior that was sought and the intimacy of social relations to be studied.

The Generalizing Trade-off is not so bad with GT

Unquestionably, there can be value in any chosen approach; the trade-offs are to be considered when choosing one over another. An important goal of experimental science and hypothesis testing research is to discover or verify laws and universal truths that may be generalized and applied to a broader population. Contrastingly, the goals of social research are different, where the aim often involves wanting to describe or explain human behavior. In doing such research, the specifics of the social research context have importance and so findings tend not to be so generalizable. Social contexts change and a rapidly changing world means that qualitative research insights can be temporary, but valuable none the less.

It was my understanding that choosing the classical GTM offered an alternative, a sort of reasonable compromise of extremes, considering the trade-offs of doing either qualitative (of the descriptive type) or quantitative research. Doing GT would result in substantive theory more readily modifiable for generalizing to related substantive fields. Furthermore, substantive theories generated through GT could in turn be constantly compared with other contextual substantive theories towards the goal of generating formal theory (Glaser, 2007). In deciding to follow GTM according to Glaser, I was well aware of the risks and trade-offs in deciding not to record thick descriptions and participant voices. I do not have hard proof, recordings or videos of the many incidents and experiences from this research. However, in lieu of this kind of evidence, I was able to be exposed to data about what was really going on in a more in-depth way to gain insight and explanation on complex social interactions of members. As previously

advanced in chapter 1, greater complexity in research and new theory were needed to

gain more understanding about the challenges women (and men) faced in organizations.

GT is viewed as an approach well-suited for capturing the complexity of

organizational situations and processes. It is considered an appropriate methodology to

investigate new areas of research, but can also be used to garner a new perspective on

established research areas (Locke, 2001). GT is a way of doing research that goes

beyond providing accurate description of the context or giving voice to the research

participant. After all, "participants usually just give impressionary concepts based on one

incident or even a groundless idea…they may have many concepts that do not fit or

work" (Glaser, 2002, p.5).

There is a demand for research to go beyond superficial impressions and to

examine member's experiences to unveil challenges they may really face. For this

research, GT was a way to get past the 'upper crust' and unearth membership challenges

that they themselves might not consciously pay much attention to. "GT uncovers many

patterns the participant does not understand or is not aware of, especially the social

fictions that may be involved" (Glaser, 2002, p. 5).

Glaser's GT and Participant Observation: A Powerful Partnership

Combining GT with participant observation was a logical and powerful next step

to understanding what was really going on with members of Rotary amidst the possible

multiple fictions and realities. The following quote reflects well why:

> Multiple social realities can exist around a phenomenon because those involved
> interpret the phenomenon differently. This results in different people reaching
> different conclusions about the causality of the phenomenon, the implications of
> the phenomenon, and the relationships other phenomena have with the focal

phenomenon. It is the researcher's responsibility to rigorously gather and understand these disparate interpretations and, in a systematic way and informed manner, develop his / her own interpretations of the phenomenon that make sense to the informants who experienced it first hand, are plausible in uninformed others, and can be expressed in relation to current theory. By placing oneself in the context where the phenomenon is occurring and developing interpretations of the phenomenon based on personal experiences, as well as the experiences of those living it, a researcher develops insights not possible through other methods of analysis (Shah and Corley, 2006, p. 1823).

By placing myself into the context to identify and analyze a main problem using GT made all the difference in my gaining insights and generating substantive theory that I do not believe could have happened otherwise. As previously indicated, I did not engage in participant observation in a methodological way, but I did use it as a method to collect data. I learned about doing participant observation (Dewalt and Dewalt, 2002; Jorgenson, 1989) and was consciously aware of the different ways I could proceed to collect data this way, but I engaged in the iterative, multiple processes of GT to analyze all the data.

<center>**Chapter 3: Digging Deeper into Glaser's Grounded Theory**</center>

Review and Preview

Chapter 1 provided a background to the research and highlighted the importance for continuing to study membership experiences in Rotary. An overview of how I became better 'grounded' to use Glaser's GT and why it was a better methodological path to follow was provided in Chapter 2. In summary, I engaged in this research and chose GT to develop conceptual insights and generate theory in a way that I increasingly believed could not be done through other methods. I engaged in participant observation over a length of time and in a context that, to my knowledge, was not done before. The GT methodology allowed me to constantly compare disparate strands of research and different types of data from previous studies with new data collected via a variety of data collection methods. GT was a better fit for me, personally. GT allowed me to discover what was really going on and to protect the identity of participants as much as possible. I was encouraged by Glaser. "Just do it. Let's do it. Do it because it is meant to be. Do it because it is there to be done. Do it because it WORKS" (Glaser, 1998, p.1). This chapter provides more detail about how GT works and how I engaged in the iterative processes. An outline of data sources and collection methods used during this research concludes the chapter.

The Nature of GT: How it Works

In presenting the stronger case for choosing Glaser's GT in the last chapter, I have already presented much about the nature of the GT process. I continue in this section and subsections to follow to present more on my understanding, interpretation and adoption of GT by discussing the main elements of the GT and how they worked for me. Now that I

<center>47</center>

am a more experienced grounded theorist, I understand how Glaser's GT can work, but I also advise that Glaserian grounded theory is not easy to learn, as was openly shared among troubleshootees of Glaser's GT workshops. Understanding the process came slowly for me; the interpretive process of coding and constant comparing was challenging. "Many grounded theory researchers describe this interpretation as occurring subconsciously, as a result of constant "immersion" in the data—an event that some describe as akin to "drowning" (Suddaby, 2006). I felt consumed at times and struggled to stay 'afloat' in all the data and constant comparative analysis.   The process was unpredictable and revolving. I sometimes felt like I was on a merry-go-round!

The Unpredictable, Iterative Process

Fundamental to the way in which GT works is the iterative nature of the process. From the start and throughout the research process, the iterative handling of data did seem like a juggling act with cycling patterns of comparative analysis. Through the multivariate research process, the confusion dissipated as theoretical emergence took place.   Glaser describes the experience of doing GT:

> The more general way to describe going through the Grounded Theory package is by the five S's. Doing grounded theory is subsequent, sequential, simultaneous, serendipitous and scheduled and not in this or any other predetermined order. Sequential is what must be done next. Subsequent is what is to be done later as a part of current activity. Simultaneous is doing many things at once, as collecting, coding, analyzing, memoing, sorting and writing – keeping in mind that the relative emphasis keeps changing while proceeding toward the finished product. Serendipitous is being constantly open to new emergents in and from the data and analysis which come as surprise realizations. Lastly, schedule means, of course, the project should have an overall rough schedule with periods set out for collecting data, analyzing it, sorting memos and writing the product. By rough I mean that it is subject to adjustment continuously as the research and researcher's life proceeds (Glaser, 1998, p. 15).

The iterative and non-linear process of having so many research activities happening all at once makes GT challenging to understand and to execute. After I got accustomed to the complexity of the process, I faced the subsequent challenge of sorting it out and writing it up. Where did I begin? In this regard, I struggled with deciding how the writing of this research would be organized. It became quite evident from the beginning of the process that the first chapter would be very difficult to complete until all other chapters were written. Conceptualization and theorizing were ongoing and the research path unfolded as the processes indicated the way. In getting further into the write-up of this research, as I forged ahead to get it done, I continued to go back and forth and in circles on the organization and content as theoretical developments continued. I understand better now this fundamental aspect of doing GT and realized that this cyclical pattern was an integral part of how it works! Constantly comparing really means it is done constantly, from the beginning right up until the end.

> In pure form, grounded theory research would be presented as a jumble of literature consultation, data collection, and analysis conducted in ongoing iterations that produce many relatively fuzzy categories that, over time, reduce to fewer, clear conceptual structures. Theory would be presented last (Suddaby, 2006, p. 637).

The quote above reflects how the task of presenting GT research (no matter the particular type) is not an easy one. I hope that I have done it sufficiently well enough that the reader obtains an adequate understanding of how I operationalized the various GT processes. Towards a goal of wanting to write a coherent thesis and to be parsimonious, included in my description of the critical elements of GT that follows, I highlight some of the surrounding critical debates of the grounded theory approach.

In dealing with the unpredictable GT path, this does not mean there is any lack of rigor going into the process. Paradoxically, the Glaserian approach is advanced as a methodology that grants a researcher liberty to adapt and adopt procedures and creatively engage in the research, but one must keep to the systematic process. The rigor of the GT process and analytical techniques is assured by respecting a number of critical elements. To follow I present how I interpreted the critical elements and engaged in the processes.

Critical Elements of Grounded Theory

1. No Literature Review – Remaining Open to Discovery

In the more common hypothesis testing studies, one begins the research with a theory, preconceived notions and research objectives that are situated and supported in a formal review of the literature and related to an identified problem before the research begins. Then, data is collected and analyzed to test the theory. Contrastingly, in proceeding with a grounded theory approach, a researcher does not do a formal literature review, so as to remain open to what is to be discovered in the data.

A researcher begins a GT study untainted by preconceptions or influencing theoretical lenses, but instead allows the identification of a participant problem to emerge as the research unfolds. Glaser advises, "Grounded theory's very strong dicta are a) **do not do a literature review in the substantive area and related areas where the research is to be done, and** b) when the grounded theory is nearly completed during sorting and writing up, then the literature search in the substantive area can be accomplished and woven into the theory as more data for constant comparison" (Glaser, 1998, p. 67).

As previously discussed in both chapters 1 and 2, I had exposure to the literature and to 'pet' theories related to glass ceiling and gendered organizational culture research. As prescribed, and as best as humanly possible, I consciously put aside this theoretical knowledge as data to be compared with if, and only if, it became relevant during the research processes. To ward off theoretical influences unfounded in the data and to remain open to the data, I also avoided prematurely discussing theory developments with others, even my supervisor and committee members. I also stopped myself on various occasions from "incident tripping" as Glaser calls it (1998, p. 75), when you can excitedly recount events that were particularly meaningful with concept discoveries. There were occasions I could not help myself and I did some research storytelling. From those experiences, I learned why it should not be done. Speaking too soon about discoveries can derail and side track conceptual progress. Glaser (1998) warns that incident tripping puts energy out there, draining it from the reservoir needed to continue and finish the research and write-up. There were times when my energy reached lower levels.

2. Theoretical Sensitivity

It can seem somewhat contradictory at first – Glaser's strong dicta to put aside prior theoretical and personal knowledge and biases, but then insists, "The researcher should also be sufficiently theoretically sensitive– by training – so he has the tools within him to self-consciously formulate a theory as it emerges from the data" (Glaser, 1978). As soon as one begins to do GT, previous knowledge and understanding of related research (and not so related research) can play a role in one's sensitivity and ability to recognize the relevance and importance of patterns of behavior and to conceptualize and theorize about it.

As I have learned and adopted grounded theory, I have come to realize that

Glaser's recommendations are not contradictory. Glaser offers direction on the

complementary conditions for analyzing in a way so as to avoid interpreting data to fit

with logically deducted hypotheses known prior to doing the research. While avoiding

the GT contamination plight, the researcher, however, still needs to be theoretically

sensitive to the data as it is collected in order to code, conceptualize and give meaningful

insight and explanation about a main problem. The researcher needs to be "wise about

the data– how to detail its main problems and the processes and how to interpret and

explain them theoretically" (Glaser, 1978, p. 2).

The role of a grounded theory researcher is critical to the quality of theory that

will be generated. Through the systematic process of GT, concepts, categories, and

substantive theory are generated and derived from the data, but, fair enough, "data don't

generate theory – only researchers do that" (Mintzberg, 1979, p. 584).   In doing GT, I

had the liberty to generate theory in a creative way. This is what I considered a fun part

of doing GT, a theoretical imagination gets stimulated. This creative flare of doing GT is,

however, sobered with a resounding reminder to adhere to the systematic process and as

Glaser puts it; "that your imagination doesn't get carried away …from the data".

> Successful grounded theory research has a clear creative component. Glaser and
> Strauss were aware of the tension it would create with those who find comfort in
> trusting an algorithm to produce results. Glaser(1978) used the term **"**theoreticial
> sensitivity" to describe the essential tension between the mechanical application
> of technique and the importance of interpretive insight (Suddaby, 2006).

Apparently, the blurred boundary line of this tension between open and creative analyzing

to following a more prescriptive process was a dividing line between Strauss and Glaser

(Locke, 2001; Suddaby, 2006).

One can easily conclude that there are thin lines among the parameters of putting aside predetermined ideas and biases, being truly open and yet theoretically sensitive and creative at the same time to the data – while keeping to the mechanical application of the method. It is no surprise then when critics and researchers alike wrestle with questions and suspicions of whether data have been well interpreted and conceptualized in a rigorous and sensitive way or misinterpreted in a biased way.

Personally, I resolved a bit of the **"**rhetorical wrestle**",** as Glaser describes this challenge faced by GT researchers (1998, p. 35), by considering that I began this thesis research with a general area of interest and questions about the experiences of women in Rotary International. Evidently, the impetus to do any research is for some good reason. This is why I included in Chapter 1 some of the literature I reviewed early on with those initial studies on Rotary – to make transparent my exposure to the literature and provide some account to my theoretical sensitivity before embarking on the thesis research. I also provided a personal and academic background to transparently account for life experiences and a multidisciplinary background that were part of the analytic gestalt to develop theory.

As previously indicated I felt unsatisfied with what I learned from extant literature and what I discovered in my own initial research projects. I wanted to take a fresher, but more in-depth look at membership experiences. I prepared to put aside, for that matter, the assumption that female Rotarians were facing any particular challenges. It was in fact liberating and somewhat daring for me to put it all aside as I began the research anew, open to the data leading me to a main concern for Rotary members, male or female.

In terms of theoretical sensitivity, I self reflected on how as a female researcher I may have influenced behaviors of others, both male and female in the club. I adjusted my approach at times in sensing how participants reacted to me because of my researcher role and because of my sex. I recorded data in this regard. I also made a conscientious effort to remain open to how women and men of Rotary might be facing different types of challenges and resolving them differently and compared this data to my own experiences. By reading a lot about this aspect of GT and the debates and concerns that surround this part of the story, I believe that I became sufficiently attentive to self-monitoring and constantly comparing the data. I selectively collected, compared and conceptualized data and did not draw upon personal experience, prior knowledge or pre-conceived notions unless prompted by what was discovered in the data and analytical process. Constantly comparing lots of data ensured relevancy to what was really going on.

3. Coding, Conceptualizing, Category Creation, Constant Comparison

Pardon the alliteration (not just here); it does seem to happen often with GT and with me too. I did not put the elements above together here just because they all began with the letter 'C'. They appear here together because they collectively represent the analytical processes that happened as I first confronted the data, and continued to do in no particular order, throughout the GT analytical process. I engaged in each of these critical elements of the process while collecting and reviewing data for the purpose of developing theory. "The researcher within the first days in the field already begins to generate codes, to emerge hypotheses and to integrate them. Thus much of his complex analysis is done while collecting data, not only after the data is finally collected" (Glaser, 1978, p. 36). After doing it and reading extensively about how to do it, gradually I got into a routine

pattern for analyzing the data. In the next few paragraphs, I describe in more detail how I engaged in the processes.

Following the basics, I began this dissertation research with writing field notes, at first about my experiences in becoming a member. Subsequently, during the first few months as a member, I mostly just observed Rotary activities and noted first impressions. When I began to participate more actively as a member, I wrote field notes about these initial experiences / incidents (the unit of study). From the very first field notes written, I identified codes. I conceptually labeled what I thought a group of words or notes represented. I asked the question, "what does this represent" when reading my notes or memos, to help me conceive a code from lines of notes or from a group of codes.

I also generated codes, in the moment, while observing and participating in incidents. The first chance I would get, I would write down a short note or just a code to later recall and often write a memo about the codes I identified. In Appendix B, I provide a listing of codes / concepts I identified. As I conceptually named patterns of behaviors in the incidents, from there I started to identify concepts as categorical, which in turn, other concepts could fit into. Through this comparative coding processing, I compared incident to incident and then compared codes to incidents and so forth. I engaged in the GT techniques iteratively and as categorical concepts emerged, I repeated these processes to saturate categories by collecting more data, and in so doing also identified subcategories. By identifying connections between and among related categories resulted in the emergence of overarching categories and theoretical memos (Glaser 1998; Holton

2007). In Appendices C and D, I show how I sorted out concepts and memos according to the two main overarching categories of this study.

There were instances, in which I thought I had identified a main category, but then with more data coding and comparing concepts, a main category became a subcategory and then I re-sorted concepts under a more abstracted concept label. For each technique and level of conceptualizing, I identified and also creatively envisioned links between and among concepts. I collected more data (theoretically sampled) in respect to the developing theory. Newly collected data either fit into categories or helped to create new ones. I reached higher levels of abstraction with increased use of theoretical codes (more abstract concepts) and memos.   In this section to follow, I provide specific examples of how I engaged in the multiple, concurrent processes of GT.

4. Theoretical Memoing, Sorting and Writing

Memoing

Collectively, Appendices B, C and D reflect the results of comparative analysis and sorting that took place in the initial stages of this research to develop a theoretical framework. Further along in the research, as I started to get a better feel for the GT process, I did much of the conceptualizing / coding in terms of and contained within theoretical memos. I did not write detailed field notes, but rather incidents and supporting data were often conceptualized and recorded in short memos of a few lines.   As previously mentioned, often, I quickly wrote down a key word (concept) to be later more comprehensively written with multiple conceptual (coded) elements in a longer memo. These longer memos in turn were used, as I approached writing-up, in the sorting and

integration stage. Memos were cut and pasted into the dissertation, edited as required (as

a result of more data comparisons), as the pieces of the theoretical puzzle came together.

There were many membership incidents – encounters, exchanges and interactions over

the years for which I wrote memos. Once the main problem category was identified,

memos were written to represent the theoretical links between and among categories as

they related to the main problem and how respondents responded to this challenge.

Here are a few examples of field notes I wrote early on in the research. Just below

the memo paragraph, in square brackets, I indicate the concept labels I derived from this

data through the coding process:

> *I was proposed this week to become a member – any new member needs to be first approved by the Board and then my name is circulated among members and if nobody objects, I will be inducted – can take a couple of weeks or more depending on when the Board meets. Traditionally, Rotary was picky about who became a member and still there are those who ask more questions than others...*
>
> *My proposer reported back to me that my name was approved – there was just some slight hesitance to my becoming a member. No it was not because I was going to be doing research, but there were concerns that I was not joining for Rotary – just for Rotary. Meaning... whether I was really into it-- to do the humanitarian work or was I JUST joining to get my research done.*
>
> *[Selective Membership Process, Bureaucratic, Elitist, Dedication Seeking]*
>
> *Really beginning to feel pressure to join Rotary, sooner rather than later. Rotarian Frank (pseudonym) has helped me, I am feeling guilty that I have not already joined – need to return kindness. They are asking Frank why I haven't joined yet – he had told them it would be by the end of the month and it was now two months later.*
>
> *I've been so busy and hesitate to join right now especially during their big fundraising event – I don't have the time. They want me to fix my induction date so I can get started. I am asked quite pointedly – am I going to join or not? I agreed to the date proposed for the induction.*
>
> *[Indebtedness, Creditability Maintenance; Feeling Pressured]*

Here are a few examples of field notes /memos mid-way in the research:

The mood was tense at the assembly meeting. I could not figure out what was behind the unfriendly exchange, but I sensed it had something to do with those funds having been given without the formal decision made by the Board / club members. But, why were they not just saying so? They seem to be arguing over this subject but not wanting to say too much about it. Maybe not everyone knows what happened?

[Interpersonal Conflict; Avoidance; Unclear Decision Making; Unclear Communicating]

They frown upon members passing around their business cards – but Rotary is a networking organization – this is confusing.

[Norms vs Org.goals?, Competing Agendas?]

Jane was so irritated by Frank; she said she had never been spoken to that way before…in all the years she worked as a bank manager. He just told her what to do! "He didn't bother to ask me – he skipped that polite part."

[Frustration; Employer vs Employee, Voluntold]

Another Rotarian has resigned…they said it was because of work pressure, but heard that something was said to him at dinner last week about how nice it was to see him again – it was apparently a sarcastic remark, but not everyone laughed.

He did not bring up the real reason he was upset about the decision…why not? Gosh, he was really upset and had lots to say about what a wrong step it was but when matter was discussed more openly, he just nodded his head with approval when asked if there were any more questions or concerns. ??

Questions go unanswered about why letters were not sent out to advise that membership could be terminated.

[Undercommunicating, withholding, silencing]

I often wrote what I called "Memory Memos", a memo written when I recalled

data from the past (an incident or some other relevant data) which was not relevant at the

time, but then gained comparative relevance with some new data / comparative incident.

The temporal pieces of data fit together and conceptually added to the developing theory.

An example:

> *The discussion at Board meeting today: a new member proposed – new members needed! But concerns were raised that they were not sure the person was "joining for Rotary, just for Rotary" – they said that they think that this new one is joining just to do networking…and don't need another one like that…need to find more like minded members to do the humanitarian work – that's what Rotary is really all about.*

> Upon experiencing and writing the above, I recalled data collected in an exploratory interview during that first Rotary research project I did.

> *Rotarian told me how there were several new members that had joined in the last year. But, only one was still a member.   The other two, who were females, did not last long. I questioned why they had left… The club was very welcoming to them, glad to have women joining. He believed they did not last because they probably thought they could do a lot of networking and it didn't work out for them in this way. You join Rotary to serve others not to do business.*

> As a result of comparing data from a number of different incidents, I wrote in the following "Theoretical Memo" as I was proceeding to put the comparative pieces of the conceptual puzzle together.

> *They are so focused on Service Above Self that they off put potential members or new ones who barely get their feet in the door to prove themselves as hardworking humanitarians.*

Sorting

As part of the process, I laid out concepts, categories and memos on the floor to

sort out and begin to put the theory puzzle(s) together. Admittedly, when I first heard

about doing this at the GT seminar, I rolled my eyes and thought it would not be

something I would be doing. However, when I decided to try it out, it turned out to be a

worthwhile exercise that helped me identify categories and connections among them.   I

also did a lot of mind mapping to sort through concepts and memos, especially in the

early morning just before I awoke. I "lucid dream" (Van Eeden, 1913) frequently, so I

kept a note pad nearby my bed. During the course of this research, I often became aware

of mental comparisons during lucid dreaming times. I wrote memos in this regard and

much to my surprise (as it may be to others) my comparative lucid dreaming played a

meaningful role in conceptualizing and theory development.

I do not remember if I have always experienced lucid dreaming or whether it is

something that I became more aware of since I began doing this intensive, long term

research. In becoming more aware of it, I have learned how to make it happen more

often.   In this regard, especially once I identified a main category, I would deliberately

read through the list of concepts, categories and memos before going to sleep. Sure

enough, the next morning I would have made some connections among this data and

would jot down a memo in the notebook on my bedside table to review later in the day.

Writing

Lucid dreaming was a passive and relaxing way I advanced with this research

endeavor. Writing up, on the other hand, was so much more challenging than I ever

imagined. It was (and continued to be through revisions) a learning experience in itself.

GT is so not linear and very different to write up compared to the standard theory testing

research. It is not so much about the writing itself, but rather it is the challenge of how to

recount an iterative, revolving process into a linear, flowing presentation. Throughout this

final write-up, I share insights into the struggle and choices I made to write this thesis– it

was a mind bending laborious part of the research process.

5. Theoretical Sampling

Theoretical Sampling is the process of data collection for generating theory
    whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes his data and decides what

data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges" (Glaser and Strauss, 1969, p.45).

This definition describes concisely what is meant by this important element of grounded theory. In this research case, theoretical sampling evolved and revolved, and resulted in my having engaged in a relatively complex research design, in retrospect. The path to discovering theory by doing participant observation was not preplanned. The research path was continuously determined in a theoretically sensitive way. Lucid dreaming helped me with the deductive decision making for sampling. The paths chosen were not linear and there was not just one path, there were many. I literally and figuratively researched all over the 'place', even geographically, as far as Chicago for the 100th Rotary International Convention – involving participants from all over the world.

> Theoretical sampling is not simply a single line, unidirectional method of moving from less to more directed observation and from specific data to conceptual rendition. It also requires that the analyst engage in many other operations while accomplishing the latter along multiple lines and directions, and while going back and forth between data and concept as one generates theory (Glaser, 1978, p. 36).

In the quote above, Glaser talks about "going back and forth", failing to mention how it gets you going around in circles too! With the multiple processes happening all at the same time, the process can make your head spin. However, it can save you time once you do focus in on a central problem and core category. Once I identified and decided upon studying a particular problem, I then became more selective about when and what data I collected, narrowing, in theory, my research path. I then even ignored (as best I could) unrelated data just because it was there, although there were many research nuggets that distracted me along the way. Theoretical sampling saves time by delimiting

the process once data collection repeatedly reveals nothing that modifies the theory any

further, when theoretical saturation is met (Glaser 1998; Holton, 2007; Suddaby, 2006).

Throughout the remaining chapters, I indicate many of the theoretical sampling

choices I made at various points in the process. I have continued to be involved with the

research context. Ongoing exposure to the research context and with more data before

me, I have come across data that resulted in my modifying the theory accordingly.

However, I have stopped theoretically sampling, at least for now. The data-process

indicated the direction on when, where and how to collect more data, lots of it.

Data Collection Methods and Sources

The major analytical techniques of GT, as previously discussed, can take place,

more or less, concurrently and iteratively. As inductive conceptualization takes place,

deductive analysis of where and what data to collect next can happen at the same time.

Glaser gives little direction on the methods to be used to collect the data, because it does

not really matter. "All is data", whatever the source, whether interview, observations,

documents and in whatever combination of comparison, it does not matter. What does

matter is the relevance of the data for conceptualization.

> Data is discovered for conceptualization to be what it is—theory. The data is
> what it is and the researcher collects, codes and analyzes exactly what he has
> whether baseline data, 'properline' data or objective data or misinterpreted data.
> It is what the researcher is receiving, as a pattern, and as a human being (which is
> inescapable). It just depends on the research. … Abstraction frees the researcher
> from data worry and data doubts, and puts the focus on concepts that fit and are
> relevant (Glaser, 2002, p. 1).

So, in fact, I did not worry about or keep track of details about how much, where and

when, what and how I collected data. Although feeling comfortable in not writing more

in this regard, I provide some information in this section to report on the range of data collection activities that took place.

Effectively, I began collecting and comparing data in the summer of 2003 and continued to collect and compare data for this thesis until the final draft was completed (2013). The data I chose to collect came mostly from observing and participating in membership incidents / experiences. As data was collected, analysis was done and subsequently, theoretical sampling directed my research path for collecting more data. Efforts for data collecting were focused on the GTM approach for constant comparing and conceptualization as previously described. Deciding to become a member of Rotary to collect data meant that I became a participant observer, but for the most part, just in name only. In terms of methodology and method, I followed the GT way. For most of this research, the GT way meant that data was collected through observations, casual conversations and interviewing with open ended questioning and passive listening and analyzing the data as it was collected.

Once the research became more theoretically focused (which took years) then I asked more direct questions and interviewed in different ways, at certain times and places. I engaged in the research in both a strategic and theoretically sensitively way. I also deliberately engaged in particular behaviors and activities, role playing and experimenting to understand better incidents and membership experiences. With a focus on main categories, I continued to identify more patterns of behavior that related to the main problem or how it was resolved. To follow on the next page, I provide a summary listing of methods used for collecting data for this research. I also indicate many of the

data locations, activities and events from where I came across data or selectively sampled during this thesis research.

Data Collection Methods Employed:

- Informal interviewing with passive listening (conversations).
- Writing field notes; memoing
- Observation, Observation Participation, Participant Observation
- Website / Document Analysis (Operation Manuals, Membership Recruitment and Orientation Materials, Historical Accounts).
- Secondary Data Research (including from Rotary's own research on membership)
- Experimentation and Role Playing

Data Sources
Attended and Participated in:

- Rotary Club Meetings Before Becoming a Member
- Meetings with and about a Club that was losing members (this club folded)
- Membership in two different Clubs
- Meetings to Start a New Rotary Club
- Weekly Rotary Meetings (of several different Clubs as a 'visiting Rotarian').
- Presidents' Council Meetings (Joint Rotary Club Meetings).
- District and International Conferences (incl. 100th Anniversary Int. Conference).
- Rotary Training Conferences (Rotary Leadership Institute and President and Secretary Training)
- Board Member Meetings – as Secretary and Director of Membership
- Committee Meetings – Administrative, Membership, Fundraising
- Rotary International Website and Rotary Club Websites
- RI Head Office, Chicago (including Archives)
- RI and Rotary Club Literature and Publicity
- Conversations with past Rotarians and others who had the opportunity to join Rotary but did not.

64

- Conversations with Family members of Rotarians and past Rotarians
- Conversations, in passing, with the general population to gather outside impressions about Rotary and Rotarians

I did a lot of comparisons of data from many different sources during a prolonged period of engagement. I have asked myself whether I did more than I needed to do to complete this thesis. It took time to decide what research path to follow and then it took more time to get better at doing the conceptualizing. It took me a while to figure out what research problem I would study. The data along the way kept taunting me, but also confusing me. There were clues in the data suggesting that I needed to dig deeper. Grounded in the data, I continued to excavate in the darker, quiet corners of organizational activity to find elusive data; it took time.

It was years before I reached an underlying problem and discerned how participants were resolving the challenge. In retrospect, I think that my research was driven by what I had learned while doing a Master in Business Administration. When facing a business problem, I was taught to not be misled by superficial symptoms of a problem, but to investigate further to identify the underlying (real) problem. Following Glaser's GT, I determinedly researched to discover what was really going on and to identify an underlying problem; one that was relevant to the participants.

Chapter 4: The Problem of Participatory Pressuring

Methodological Bridge

As I constantly compared data from incidents and Rotarian experiences (including my own), gradually my understanding about the methodology improved, by doing it. I collected, coded and engaged in plenty of conceptualizing and theorizing, which I recorded and stored in the memo bank. In this chapter and the next two, I present the conceptualizations and theoretical insights that were generated, for the most part, from data analyzed <u>before</u> I compared emerging conceptualizations and theory with a comparative review of the literature. The organized content of chapters 4-6 involved piecing together memos that were written and added to with additional data and further comparisons and theoretical abstracting. It all derives from the research data and all is data towards further theory development that I report on in chapters 8 and 9.

In this chapter, I describe how the main problem emerged. I present many of the foundational concepts and memos, which constitute the product of my sorting out and identifying a main problem categorization, sub-categories and respective properties and dimensions (concepts that describe categories). For some of the more important concepts contained within recorded memos, I present them in *italics* to draw attention to their significance. These were key ones that helped me make sense of other concepts and memos. My use of direct quotations marks (") on any of these concepts indicate conceptual labels used by participants themselves. This chapter describes how I engaged in the conceptualizing, comparative and theoretical sampling processes, and in turn how the evolving research path resulted in the discovery of a main problem.

Back to a Beginning

Before I even became a member of Rotary, I knew about the growing concerns about membership. I understood that most volunteer organizations like Rotary were struggling with attracting and keeping new members. It was an obvious circumstance that Rotary was also vulnerable with its aging membership profile. Younger members were needed and like many organizations, Rotary wanted to have more diversity reflected in their membership (more women and members with different ethic backgrounds). My research focus would have, no doubt, something to do with membership.

When I was considering which club to join for this thesis research, someone who was familiar with my interest in Rotary directed me to join a club whose numbers had dangerously declined and the club's future was doubtful. I believe they hoped that I could help with efforts to rebuild the club. I did learn more about the club and attended a couple of club events. I sensed that the age of most of the members might have been a deterrent to attracting new members. With only a cursory look into the club, my hunch was that it would not survive and so I chose another to join. Two years later that club did fold. I wondered why and thought it was likely due to having too many older members and not enough younger ones to attract new members. I later learned that the age of members was not the only reason for the club folding; data was collected in this regard and compared with the memos I had taken with my knowledge of this club.

I was invited to join another club. Early impressions of the one I chose to join were that it was a much healthier, larger and vibrant club. It had a long history. There were many recently retired and some older men in the club, but there was also a good mix

of younger men as well. At the time I joined, female membership was at approximately

10%. There were more women in this club than most and for the first time, a female was

President. Members also seemed pleased and welcoming to the idea of having another

female member join. This was my first impression when I was attending several

meetings as a guest, before I was formally invited to join. I was proposed as a new

member and went through a new membership proposal process and orientation.   I

recorded many memos in this regard. Of particular note at the time was that there were

dissenting opinions about my joining the club because I was not joining just for Rotary.

There were concerns that I was only joining Rotary to do research.   Little did I know at

the time, but this was foreshadowing data to the main problem that would be the focus of

my study. It also indicated to me that the level of participation I would need to do would

be perhaps higher than most other joining members to become more accepted as one of

them and to have access to reliable data that reflected what was really going on.

Shortly after joining, I began asking myself the basic GT question, "what is going

on here?" First impressions and conceptualizations were that this was a club well into the

challenge of changing with the times. I learned that its long history and traditional ways

of doing its volunteer work needed more changing to keep the interest and commitment of

members and to attract younger new members. There seemed to be much tension

involving whether certain changes were needed and how they could possibly happen

without upsetting members. There was considerable resistance to change, especially if it

were not directed and supported by Rotary International. The *Wheels of Rotary turn*

slowly with change resistance; I wrote memos in this regard. There was *pushback when*

ideas of change were proposed. So, at first, the data directed my research efforts towards

discovering more about the club's history and cultural traditions and to examine how it needed to change in order to attract new members without losing many of its dedicated long term members. Apparently, changes made prior to my joining resulted in the departure of members who had been with the club for many years. However, there were also recently joining members who also resigned as members of Rotary.

As the honeymoon stage wore off from my status as a new member (relatively short lived), I was solicited to get more involved by joining the club's Board of Directors. Actually, I barely got into the door when I was asked (*persuaded*) to take on the Secretary position for the Club. I thought I was too new to be considered for such an important job, but I also considered this as a chance to quickly learn more about Rotary. Those asking me to take on the responsibility also emphasized how taking on the job would be to my advantage for doing my research and help was promised. I considered how I would be well positioned to collect data on the inner workings of the club and more. In retrospect, I did not realize at the time just how much work the role of Secretary entailed. At first, with the demands of learning the new responsibility and doing it well, I hardly had time to think about the data and to conceptualize.

Once I settled into the job of Secretary, I managed to get back to collecting data and making deposits into the "memo bank". This was the label I gave to where I electronically re-recorded memos that I often wrote on whatever piece of paper was handy. Although I kept a small notebook with me most of the time, there were many times that relevant data was before me when I least expected. As soon as I could, I would make the deposit into the memo bank so as not to forget how I had coded, compared and

conceptualized about particular incidents.   In particular, I started identifying concepts and some categories related to how members were frustrated about how the Club was operating. I also noted how members were labeled according to their involvement and attendance. I gleaned from the data a typology for levels of member participation, adding to data collected from the initial research I did before becoming a member.

Further into my membership experience and research efforts, I started to observe, note, conceptualize and theoretically memo about different patterns of behavior.   As I felt pressure to do more in a variety of ways, I likewise wrote memos about my own feelings in general and in relation to certain repetitive incidents and behavioral patterns that were increasingly bothersome. As I constantly compared, I identified links to other theoretical memos I had recorded. Henceforth, the data began to indicate a different research path from the initial sense of the main problem being about change. Constantly comparing indicated some interesting variables and relations in the data.   It was confusing to discern at first and it took some time before the link among the concepts emerged. As I began to theorize about the connections among the concepts, it triggered more memories, as well, to the data collected in my previous studies on Rotary and prompted me to look back into that data. I began to re-direct my collection and analysis of data towards discovering more about the challenges of being a Rotarian. The 'flood gates were opening' and then an Aha! moment happened.

From the diverse strands and multivariate nature of this research, there was an underlying theme in the data depicted in the experiences of both men and women in Rotary and in my own experience. I was not so conscious of it initially, nor did I really

understand its complexity until I, myself, experienced it; until I really 'felt' it too. Constantly comparing memos from my personal encounters with Rotary with data from the experiences of others, I began discovering the disconcerting pattern of behavior. There was so much pressuring going on to do more Rotary and in certain ways! The pressure, I began to conceptualize, was from a variety of sources, intensity, forms, and combinations, although surprisingly, not so easy to identify. Often, the pressuring behaviors were so very subtle.

The Problem of PARTICIPATORY PRESSURING

After first conceptualizing a number of different possible problems facing Rotarians, I began to identify different types of pressures and pressuring behaviors. I soon realized that there were many incidents and conceptual content pertaining to this topic. I decided to collectively identify what I was repetitively and comparatively finding in the data as a main problem and I named it categorically, "participatory pressuring". In time, as more and more data items and concepts fit into the category, I gradually made better sense of what this problem was and proceeded to define it (a much more difficult challenge than I first thought).

Participatory Pressuring is a type of subtle, sometimes covert tactical behavior (and combinations thereof) that can include both verbal overtures and non-verbal gestures used to persuade another to engage in an organizational activity or to influence ways of thinking. The tactic is leveraged by the recipient's initial choice(s) to engage and a sense of membership and belonging. However, the recipient subsequently feels uncomfortable and pressured to engage or think a certain way, but does not fully understand why.

71

I have rewritten this definition a number of times and each time I wondered if it would be the last time. Each time I have asked myself the question, have I represented and conveyed its meaning well according to the data? I refer to Glaser in this regard:

> In comparing incident to incident and incident to concept while asking the three questions, keep in mind that concept generation is a (theoretical) meaning making activity…. The constant comparing carefully generates the meaning of the category or property. It corrects impression generation of concepts as it validates the fit in naming the category, its relevance and its workability (1998, p. 140).

I did not think about the meaning enough, in retrospect, until I was well into revising this thesis in regards to why I used the word "participatory" to go with the concept of pressuring. I did more comparative thinking about the concepts realizing that the two concepts put together represent a sort of oxymoron, which is a figure of speech that combines contradictory terms. In deciding on using the word participatory it was in reference to the importance of participation in Rotary and how members (each individual) are encouraged to share of their time and skills for humanitarian goals and to have a say on how they are achieved. In this regard, as well, there is a prominent theme that Rotary practices and policies support inclusion and democratic processes in all that it does. "Participatory" has a positive connotation associated to its use, while "pressuring" has a negative, *stressful* denotation (Merriam-Webster.com, 2012). However, they fit well together in this categorical labeling of certain behaviors because in combination, the concept reflects why this type of pressuring is so subtly effective and why its impact is not readily recognized or understood, at least not in the short term.

Recall that Rotary International is an organization of volunteers – where you can *volunteer* to help make humanitarian differences. You join to participate in worthwhile causes; you *join to collaborate*, cooperate and share your time and skills (and other

resources) to make a difference. Rotary is an organization of leaders who volunteer and do not receive payment for their work. There is no pressure to perform, at least not like you might feel if you were receiving a salary. Furthermore, there are club membership dues to be paid yearly, which are relatively expensive in comparison to other volunteer clubs. There are also other associated costs when you engage in Rotary for meals, routine member fundraisers and volunteering costs not covered by the club or Rotary. Membership benefits exist, including networking opportunities, but are much less promoted in light of the much espoused motto of "Service Above Self". You join Rotary to serve; benefits are downplayed.   You may be one of many in a club and in RI, but each member can play a role in working together to make a difference. Participation from all is wanted and the impression is given that the way it all happens is in a participatory way.

What is not so expected as a newer member of Rotary is the pressuring part of participatory pressuring. It can go relatively unnoticed as it is not what most might anticipate in a volunteer organization. Furthermore, it is often subtly applied and experienced, most often, without any conscious thought to it. I did not recognize it at first; it took me a long time to conceptualize participatory pressuring. One is so personally implicated in how it happens and how it can affect you; after all, one volunteers to get involved in the organization for some good reasons.   A commitment was made and it is all for a good cause.   "*You get sucked in and then you are caught. I can't afford to get caught; I don't have the time.*"   This was a response by a former member when asked about rejoining Rotary.

Through the observation, experiencing and conceptualizing of a number of different ways participatory pressuring was engaged in, I gradually identified it as a main category. I then redirected data collection, conceptualizing and constant comparing towards discerning the different ways in which participatory pressuring happened. I became more theoretically sensitive to it and began to more readily recognize the patterns in the data for it. I also became sensitive to and started identifying concepts about the *affects* participatory pressuring had on members and the *effects* it had on the organization.

To follow is a delineation of named sub-categories indicating the different forms of participatory pressuring. With each subcategory, I identify properties and dimensions as were discovered in the data and through the comparative analysis. Depictions into how the behavior is enacted and insights into why members engage in this behavior are revealed in the defining descriptions of each subcategory. Illustrations are used to help in this regard; they are abstracted from and based on actual incidents. Quotes contained within are not necessarily direct quotes, but may be slightly edited to help protect anonymity of the people, place, events and particular incidents studied in this research project. Also, fictitious names are used in all instances.

The conceptual framework that follows was developed over time, a relatively long time considering most research projects. It was modified many times through the constant comparative process with further data analysis and by sometimes collapsing two or more concepts to be parsimonious, making the theory denser. The sub-categories are not in any particular order; however, I do present one after another with data that identifies connections between and among them. They are all related to one another as

forms of participatory pressuring, some having closer conceptual links than others. The pressuring power of these tactics, which is indicated in several examples, is that Rotarians often engaged in these behavioral tactics in combinations of two or more.

Participatory Pressuring by:

1. *Mottovating:* Many organizations have their missions and with them come cultural mottos and related sayings about who they are, what they do and how they do it. Rotary is no different. Perhaps the most espoused motto in Rotary is "Service Above Self". The motto has been around a long time and is proudly promoted, perhaps even more so than ever. It is part of the spirit and encouragement to do humanitarian service– putting others first. It is an honorable benchmark to live up to in Rotary and without doubt it played a role in how Rotary became quite well known as a successful and powerful organization for its humanitarian work and more. There were at one time in Rotary's history waiting lists of invitees anxious to have their chance to become a member. Traditionally, it was quite an honor and privilege to be invited to join Rotary and so it was expected that one would readily serve when asked and be reminded of their duty to do "Service Above Self".

   When you first become a Rotarian, you may have already heard the "Service Above Self" saying, but you do not realize how relevant it is until you learn more about the organization and become more involved with club operations and Rotary projects. Soon enough, it begins to seep in what it means to (many) members. It is about having a commitment and dedication to doing Rotary. It is about contributing and serving the organization in its mission and goals to help others above (before) yourself. It is a driving force, a cultural philosophy, and resulting behavioral norms

direct the attention and focus of its members to a strong personal commitment with Rotary, till death do 'we' part – and even thereafter, you can commit to Rotary and "Service Above Self" via an estate legacy.

In operation, I have observed and served in the ideal of "Service Above Self". It is the desired behavior. Through cultural norms it has been translated into the idea that even passing of business cards is a frowned upon activity—in this network of business owners and professionals. Self-promotion is, generally, not encouraged. You become a Rotarian to do Rotary, not to benefit in a personal way. When my application to become a member was submitted, there were concerns raised about my interest in Rotary. My primary interest of doing research – 'for me', was questioned. Was I just joining to doing my research or was I joining Rotary to serve? Needless to say I felt the pressure even then that I had to prove myself as more than just someone who was becoming a member to take a look around and try it out. After I had been around for a while, I started feeling more pressure like this, although, I was not able, at first, to discern why – until I could put the pieces of the puzzle together.

2. *Recognitioning:* I find this particular pressuring behavior one of the most mind bending ones especially when juxtaposed with 'mottovating' for "Service Above Self". To the extreme that the self is not to benefit, so then, one would feel uncomfortable with being recognized for service work at all levels of the organization, as an individual or as a club. Recognition at any level in Rotary can result in 'bragging rights' and in turn can help promote a cause or an organization. An individual, with his or her respective business or profession, can also benefit,

perhaps less directly, as one does not want to so obviously be personally benefiting; this would appear as self-serving and not as service above self.

Unsurprisingly, lots of recognitioning does go on in Rotary, after all it is a well-known and important element to encouraging and thanking volunteers. More subtly, it also can 'set the bar' in terms of the expectations for membership participation and performance. One of the most promoted recognition structures in Rotary is the yearly "True Rotarian" award, given to a member in each club who has demonstrated the ideals of Rotary. It is an award, but also, practically speaking, another benchmark on how Rotary can (should) be done. It reflects a role model who does so much and more, above self.

Initially, I saw this recognitioning practice in a mostly positive way, motivational and aspiring to one and all. However, as I became more sensitive to why members might be uncomfortable or frustrated about it (and how it was done), I began to code data and theorize about how recognitions make those receiving them feel good and thanked, but they can also make some feel uncomfortable in realizing what little they may have done, comparatively. An added pressure point to this story is the commonly espoused saying: "A TRUE Rotarian never says no". This puts extra pressure on some who aspire to be what it really means to be a Rotarian. The shoes of a "True Rotarian" are tough ones to fill.

Then there are also those who may feel hurt in trying to fill those shoes, as they personally reflect about how much time they have devoted to Rotary, but have not (yet) been recognized. They may even perceive that their contributions were greater than another who received an award. There can be questions about why and how one

person was awarded but not another. Murmurs in this regard suggest an unsettling and perhaps de-motivating side to recognitioning depending on how it is done.

I did not figure all this out until I began writing memos about my own feelings of inadequacy and why I was feeling this way. This, again, triggered memories to what was said in the long interviews that I did before becoming a Rotarian. Members spoke of their passion and even love for Rotary but also of how bad they felt for not being able to do more.

During a Rotary strategy meeting, when I dared to speak up about how we were doing "recognitioning" and how it might be problematic, I was relieved to have support to this notion when an active younger male Rotarian bravely interrupted (as if what I began speaking about sparked simmering thoughts) to share his feelings of inadequacy and frustration. Even though this Rotarian did so much for the club, Frank expressed how bad he felt about his performance and that he was considering resigning from the club because of this. Club leaders were surprised to hear this and they listened attentively. Interestingly enough, and shortly thereafter, Frank was given the prestigious Paul Harris Fellowship Award[3] and with it was praised for having raised the most funds during the last fund raising event.

To have a young male member openly share his concerns, I thought, was an important breakthrough and so then club leadership had a chance to think about why someone like this much respected Rotarian could feel bad about what they have not done, rather than feel good about what he did contribute. It was, for me, a notable incident, adding to the data on the discomfort and pressures Rotarians were feeling. If

_____

[3] The "Paul Harris Fellow" Award is considered by many Rotarians as the highest honor that can be given to a fellow Rotarian. Paul Harris founded Rotary

a Rotarian as active as Frank were feeling this way, one could surmise that this feeling might be pervasive with those who were less active. I pursued researching in this direction to discover more. I did this in casual conversations, sometimes prompting the conversation with introducing the topic of participation levels and asking how members felt about what they had recently done for Rotary.

It is hard to know for sure how the club may have changed as a result of this particular incident. I do not think it had the impact needed. There was not much follow-up discussion on this topic. I believe club leaders considered the matter resolved once the award was given to Frank. Nonetheless, I became increasingly more 'sensitive' to discover more about the impact of recognitioning in this regard. From the data, I got the feeling that after receiving the award, Frank was then under more pressure than ever. By way of his comments, facial expressions and heavy sighs, more than ever, it became increasingly obvious that Frank was feeling more obliged to not let his fellow club members down. They had given him this prestigious award; Frank had to live up to the award and make a better effort to do more. Recognitioning, on its own, may have little negative impact, but when it is added to the flames of more overt pressuring tactics, the pressure builds.

3. *Shame Mongering*: They were told, *"YOU SHOULD FEEL ASHAMED OF YOURSELVES!" for not having sold enough tickets – yet. Never in the history of the Club has it ever lost money on a fundraiser, and we should not let it happen!"* I had not even joined Rotary yet when I was invited to attend a meeting. During this meeting, I witnessed a passionate and dramatic overture to the membership to get

them to step up to the plate and do Rotary! At first, I assumed this was one personality and one approach to getting results. However, after years of membership, I observed how many Rotary leaders use strong messages (sometimes with an added touch of anger), but typically more tactfully and subtly, to rally the troops. One of the more common lines used was "*surely we are not going to allow this fundraiser to fail just because we haven't found the time to get the job done – let's not forget why we joined Rotary*". Reminders about keeping your commitment and not disappointing others worked to stir the troops to action, especially when deadlines were looming.

I observed how this approach did get results, especially immediate ones at hand. However, I also observed and reflected on the long term effects of making members feel bad and pressured as a way to meet Rotary goals. Yes, a successful outcome of those immediate goals happened, but the longer term impact was not so positive in nature. One of the most meaningful findings of this research was that members felt bad more often about what they did not do or give in Rotary, rather than feel good for the volunteer work or donations that they did offer.

4. *Voluntelling*:   This was not one of my conceptual label creations. "Substantive categories are about the actions in the substantive area. They can be "in vivo", which is part of the conceptual talk of the participants in the area" (Glaser, 1998, p. 137). This concept label originates with the participants. Like 'participatory pressuring', there is also a contradiction of terms with this word combination.   It is one thing that a volunteer is <u>asked</u> to volunteer to do something. It is quite a different thing to be "voluntold". My first experience with the concept was through Rotary.   I have since

learned that the term is used in other contexts and it can be found in the "Urban Dictionary" (http://www.urbandictionary.com/).

The messaging was simple, as Rotarian Amanda declared, "If members do not volunteer, then they will be voluntold what to do". It may sound a bit forceful, even though sometimes it was used in this way more as a joke or just another way to garner attention to help needed. However, one can easily imagine how some would then feel the pressure to volunteer before what might be an embarrassing consequence of having to be more directly 'told'. Adding to the pressure to comply was that, often, the voluntelling was done with some prompting for the membership to remember why they joined Rotary – to do "Service Above Self". Again, I theorized about how this tactic worked, but wondered how (volunteer) members really felt about the imposing way it was done. I wondered about long term consequences. It was, I also thought, a fairly forward and effective way of getting volunteers organized. I was not observing any resistance to the approach, at least not at first and I cautioned myself – maybe it was just me feeling uncomfortable about it.

I then compared particular voluntold incidents with more like it and determined it was not a whole lot different from other ways Rotarians were often told or delegated to do things. One common example in the Rotary world is how a member is coaxed into one of the club or district administrative roles. What often happens is that there is not enough time to become fully informed about the job when asked or politely told that it is their turn to do the work. The Board nominated you and you *should* just take on the role. After committing, thereafter one learns (is told) more about the role and

how it should be done. Often enough, it is much more than what was anticipated, but the member says very little, conforming to the standards of "service above self".

5. *Public Pressuring*:   It is one thing to be asked (or be told) to volunteer by someone, it is a much different story to be asked in front of a whole group. Combine it with some other participatory pressuring, well then the PRESSURE is on to give in and agree to 'volunteer'.   To illustrate: When there is a volunteer vacancy, for example, one need only to speak up among the crowd and say, *"Amanda can do that! She is the best person for the job; she has the skill set!"* After all the cheers of support and 'eye pointing', you feel the stress going down your neck; you know you are stuck now. Yes, indeed, you have been put, not just on the spot, but into that great big spot light – that bright, hot beaming light and oh how you feel the pressure; you cannot say no. This is not just your standard social conforming (Jenness, 1932) at work where you are influenced to go along with the rest of a group. In this case, you have been roped in to do more by a pressuring tactic deliberately executed in public – it was only about you. You have missed meetings and were notably absent during the last fundraiser. The consequence involves having to do more than you planned and you feel manipulated. You could have protested at the time, but who dares to make a public scene in Rotary by refusing to serve – above self?

6. *Persuasive Propositioning*: In this tactical case, it is not just about "ingratiating" (Jones, 1964) or "sucking up", as commonly it can be expressed. This is more when some flattery can get you anywhere.   Persuasive Propositioning is, on its own, a

combination of two behavioral tactics that packs quite a punch. It is a powerful technique that can penetrate a suit of armor. With a whole lot of 'sweet talking' (or 'heroizing') and one form or another of leveraging, it can be most effective to persuade another to comply. To illustrate: Upon having been told how well he executed his duties as Chair of the fundraising committee, and just how deserving he was of the True Rotarian Award, Dennis was informed of how there was an unanimous vote of support for him to take over the all important membership portfolio. Dennis, they all declared, was the best person for this job. Furthermore, if Dennis did volunteer to lead up the cause, Amanda said she would relieve him of the tiresome task of tracking and reporting the weekly attendance numbers (serious bargaining chips are offered).

Negotiations like this can make all the difference with someone who you know is likely and even determinedly prepared to say no. Although the respondent feels the pressure of another challenging job to do, there is that bribe of relief from doing a task that they are tired of doing. With all the sweet talking and attractive bribe, Dennis got distracted from his original stance to reduce Rotary commitments, just long enough, to get hooked into taking on another Rotary responsibility that was even more tasking.

7. *Super Soldiering*: "Soldiering" was a term to describe how workers worked together in a consistent way and amount so that they could reduce or keep workload expectations to a reasonable level (Taylor, 1911). It was a tactical way to resist the pressure to do more. What I have observed in Rotary is somewhat the opposite thing happening. The Truest of Rotarians, those most dedicated and who have the time,

role model, soldier together, and raise the performance bar to a super high level.   The pressure is on to meet them even half way! Extreme role modeling is daunting and hard to keep up with. Members can be inspired by this, but also there are those who feel overly pressured to do more. There have also been those who think they just cannot keep up, so they give up and leave Rotary.

Benchmarking and score-carding are also familiar terms in the business world for setting and attaining performance goals. When performance goals are met or exceeded, then members can boast about the success. This can be motivational to the attainment of even higher goal levels.   Promoting successes of the past can likewise be used to apply some pressure onto the 'team' to get them moving in the direction to surpass past accomplishments. Super-Soldiering can translate into competitiveness between club divisions. Noted in this research was how super soldiering behavior also occurred among clubs and how the resulting rivalry translated into less cooperation between and among some clubs.

Some refer to what can go on between clubs as "*healthy competition*", which can sometimes result in improving output and performance. Historically, "*bragging rights*" did egg-on clubs to worker hard to competitively out perform a neighboring club. It might have been all in good fun and motivating to accomplish more humanitarian work; however, with some clubs' memberships declining, it meant more pressure on fewer members to keep up with the competition. There were Rotarians who recognized that with more cooperation and less competition, more successful clubs could help alleviate some of the pressures on those with smaller numbers.

8. *Heroizing*: FRANK SAVED THE DAY! If it had not been for Frank, this project could have failed and instead it was a huge success.   "FRANK!, Please, YOU must help us – could you please head up this project? You are the only one who can do it, just like you did it before!" Once you become a hero or have 'championed' a cause, people expect a lot from you and it is hard to let them down, especially after they have put you way up high on that pedestal.   This participatory pressuring tactic is similar to the process of persuasive propositioning, however, it is different in that in the approach, the focus is more personalized, whereas persuasive proposition can be used on anyone for any reason. Heroizing is the ultimate in perpetuating that there is one and only person (the hero) to champion a cause. The pressure is on, but what often happened was that it was a lonely journey to champion the cause, as the one and only one who carried the bulk of the responsibilities.

9. *Eye Pointing*: Finger pointing is rude and standing over someone is also a noticeably unpopular thing to do, but giving good eye contact is something well known as an effective strategy to successful communication. However, the practice of zooming in on a particular person while making a plea for help that someone should step up to the plate can be almost as good (bad) as pointing a finger. As eyes come upon you, in their intensity, and you have missed a couple of meetings, well then, it does feel like pressure is on you to 'step up to the plate'.   When heroizing takes place in combination with passionate eye pointing, the pressure in on.

   I caught onto this as a notable pressuring tactic, ironically, when others, jokingly, spoke about me and my use of it. As an enthusiastic voice in the cause to advance women's hockey, I passionately spread the word and requests for volunteers to have

the "Mental Pausal Hockey Encounter" take place. After a few years of it, some key volunteers began suggesting that it was time to recruit others. Volunteer fatigue was settling in. They 'jokingly' warned new volunteers to avoid LOOKING INTO ELLEN's EYES. I did not get the 'point' at first. I understand better now how I had unconsciously taken on the skill of 'eye pointing' putting pressure on unsuspecting souls to do more than they might have planned.   If only they had a chance to reflect more, before my passionate eyes made contact with theirs.

Upon recognizing the power of eye pointing, I became more aware of its use in Rotary. I also observed how Rotary members avoided eye contact when a passionate, pressuring plea was in the making for someone to volunteer and 'step up to the plate'.

10. *Bad Mouthing*: This is what I called it. Some may know it better as negative gossiping.   In terms of participatory pressuring, it plays out like this: One may have been around long enough and worked hard enough in Rotary to become part of a core group with trusted ears to hear the talk about how some (really) think about what is really happening (or not happening) in Rotary. Often the talk is about the issue of how little some do in Rotary, while a minority of Rotarians does most of the work. If there were more hands it would make for less work, but the focus of the talk quickly shifts to the problem of Rotarians not participating enough.

Often enough, Rotarians raise concerns about how certain others are not doing their fair share. As an outsider, I heard some about this and then as an insider, I heard more about this, particularly once I had access to 'inner circles' of Rotary activity. In comparing data from my initial studies on Rotary with data from the participant

observation data, it became clear that there was this background tension and bad mouthing about participation levels. This problem is not always quietly spoken about because some Rotarians want to let newer Rotarians or potential Rotarians know how a club does not want to have more *"Knife and Forkers"* (the label given to Rotarians who come to eat and enjoy the social, but don't do much more).   More "*Worker Bees"* (the label given to those who do the 'lions' share of the Rotary work) are needed. The "*cheque writers"* (the label given to those who donate money as their way to contribute to Rotary) make important contributions to the club and are much needed and appreciated. More "*RINOs"* are not wanted. 'Rotarians in name only' are those who are rarely even seen at meeting. In providing this understanding to a newcomer, the expectations are set and the pressure is on to pull their weight and then some – otherwise be at risk to be labeled a *"Knife and Forker"* or worse – *"dead wood"*.   What Rotary wants is to make a difference and it is hard to make a difference with the undesirables, those who rarely come to the meetings and who contribute very little time or resources towards Rotary goals.

    To add to this pressuring done by bad mouthing others, a few long term Rotary members will openly recite their past accomplishments and contributions in the club to newer members so that one and all can take account and reflect on how much more they could do. Then, the not so underlying messages can be uncomfortably received. Some examples of the messaging: *"We need you to do more! Many of us have had perfect attendance records; rarely did we miss a meeting. Where have you been? We haven't seen you for so long!   You are not on a committee yet? Have you forgotten about the commitment you made to Rotary?"* For whatever reason a Rotarian has not

been able to participate more, it may not matter once they have been bad mouthed and labeled about their participation in Rotary.

A tradition in many Clubs is to issue *"fines"* as a way to fundraise, but it can serve other purposes. The practice of issuing a fine to someone is typically meant to be all in fun and can be as simple as fining a Rotarian a dollar (donation) who is five minutes late for the meeting.   It can be all in fun, supposedly, but sometimes the fines seem to be more like *"taking a shot"* at someone or subtly bad mouthing them about how participation expectations have not been met. To illustrate, Frank gets fined $2 dollars because he missed two committee meetings in the last month, a not so subtle nudge for Frank to not to miss the next one.

There can be a fair amount of banter, jokes and sarcastic comments made, again, supposedly, all in fun.   However, often there is that underlying (negative) message of how someone is not meeting expectations and that they '*should*' be doing more. The target of the 'shot' is often not just meant for one and it can sometimes be perceived by someone to be about them, when it was not. They feel pressured nonetheless. Pressure is at an extreme when more serious incidents of bad mouthing occur. For example, rumor had it that a potential returning member would be poisonous to the club. Many were feeling an uncomfortable pressure when this bad mouthing got back to the joining member, when so many others had hoped (begged) for the member to rejoin.   Conflicts and competing agendas seeded some unkind bad mouthing, not so reflective and abiding to the Rotarian Four Way Test. Thankfully, more serious incidents such as these rarely happened; at least this was not often found in the data.

11. **_'Shoulding' on Members_:** I have become, perhaps, overly 'sensitive' to the word 'should'. Now when I hear it, an alarm goes off in my head to alert me to the strong possibility that the communicator is about to impose upon me what they think I should do. Inevitably, I will be getting a good taste of their value system and in no uncertain terms, it will be somewhat of a directive. It can include not only what I should do, but how I should do it as well. It is a commonly used word and practice for some Rotarians who have the authority to let other members know. Those who know Rotary better and have so much Rotary experience and plenty of expertise from their own workplaces too, will let you know what you should do and how. Some will 'should' all over you. You feel the pressuring and only infrequently, you might just get a chance to make a counter claim to the 'truth' claims supporting the thinking behind the SHOULD directives.

Imposing / shoulding upon the volunteer membership resulted in members feeling uncomfortable. In this respect, some Rotarians also felt that their own opinions were not valued. This was well reflected, for example, during an interview I did prior to joining Rotary. The interviewee was a much valued, long-term member who ended her membership after having been told, quite publically during a club meeting, it was now her turn to take on the role of club President. Amanda felt pressured into assuming this important position (recall True Rotarians never say no), but then felt so very bad because she really could not assume the role. Amanda decided, consequently, the best thing for her to do was to resign from Rotary. Her Club assumed she resigned for personal reasons and work pressures at the time. For the most part, Amanda resigned because she did not like how she had been pressured and

simply told that she should become President. Sometime later, Amanda <u>was asked</u> to rejoin and she did. From then on she was more careful about how to *"handle the boys"* if ever they 'should' try to impose upon her again.

12. ***Singling Out, Marginalizing***: You're the ONLY one! Done more privately, this pressuring tactic can have a better effect; in a group someone else may speak up to help out and defend the other who gets put into the spotlight and singled out. It is not the same tactic as heroizing or eye pointing. This tactic is different in how it is done. Often singling out happens when leaders or chairs are trying to get enough worker-bees to fill up committees. The tactic can unfold something like this: "Hey Winston, you are the only one who has not yet signed up for a committee; can I put your name down for Membership?" Approaching one at a time and singling out how someone needs to participate is quite effective.

    Also what can similarly work with more than just one is to promote the majority versus the few (delinquents). For example, tactfully the pressuring unfolds in a statement like this: *"The majority of members have already sold their ten tickets; there are only a <u>few of you</u> who have not met this goal"*.

13. ***Senti-mentaling***: This participatory pressuring tactic works best on those who have been members for a number of years or among members who have close personal ties. Newer members may not have been around long enough to know all that Rotary does or has done, nor have they had the time to develop the friendships or experience the camaraderie of being a Rotarian that comes after years of doing Rotary together.

90

Senti-mentaling happens with members who have shared histories and behave like family. I have observed how it could be used to get these members to volunteer more of their time, even after they have done so much to date, not just in the past. Senti-mentaling is enacted like this: "Brian, could you take the lead on this project, one more time for old times' sake? Brian, it was you who first came up with the idea to do this project 10 years ago and every year it has been successful. Brian, will you lead us one more time? We love doing this project with you – wouldn't be the same without you". The Rotary leader knows how sentimental Brian can be. Even though Brian has already done more than his fair share and has little time to spare, he just cannot say no. For old time's sake and in honor of the shared his-stories, Brian signs up to do more when he planned to say no this time.

14. *Pulling on Heart Strings*: Senti-mentaling is used more often on those members who have been with Rotary a while; but any member, even newer ones, with a 'weak heart' can be deeply affected when their emotional heart strings are tugged. Given the nature of its mission and organizational goals, Rotary members are aware of how their primary purpose in Rotary is to help others. It is assumed this is why you join Rotary. The way in which one can help and how much depends on the individual capacity and desire to help for every Rotarian (it can be a heartfelt consideration). To make use of and access the maximum from each member, Rotary leaders will use many ways to appeal to Rotarians to give and do more. One of many ways this is done is by dramatizing the need, relating and personalizing the need to members. The effort is made to gain members' understanding and empathy, and members with 'softer' hearts

FEEL the (heart) pressure to do more, when they might not really be able. It can be quite an emotional roller coaster ride as a member is giving more of the story about the desperate need. For instance, one is hard pressed not to 'step up to the plate' when you learn that without YOUR HELP, the family will likely lose their home; what if it were your home and your children having to sleep in a homeless shelter?

15. *E-pressuring***:** Today, just about every organization is using electronic media to get their messages through to their target audiences. Rotary still does some physical print ups and mail outs, but is increasingly getting into the game of accessing members through this medium to communicate more directly and more frequently. In the past when members missed meetings, monthly bulletins kept members informed but in their absences the opportunities for their getting more involved with tasks at hand were missed. Phone calls were made but communication lagged. Modern technology has made a difference; emails are used to call in the Rotary troops and E-Clubs are forming in Rotary.   Club websites are common, and in combination with emails are helpful to informing and keeping club projects on the radar for most members. This communication pathway is particularly helpful to provide reminders to Rotarians of the commitment made to Rotary and the humanitarian projects of their club. Then there is that pressure to 'respond'. Sometimes, there is pressure to engage in the conversations, which can be very time consuming.   As many have learned the hard way, there are also dangers and pitfalls to using this convenient medium. Miscommunications are easy enough, and the fall-out can be stressful and 'E-MOTIONAL'.

16. *Classic Silent Treatment***:** I think most have experienced this tactical approach of

coercion, often used in close relationships.   Silencing and distancing are used until

you change your mind and succumb to the pressure of the subtle rejection bestowed

upon you for your non-compliance (four year olds do this really well). Add to this

some guilt mongering and soon enough you come around, at least for the interim. In

Rotary, this tactical behavior begins when you have slipped up and did not participate

in the recent major fundraiser. Something is different. You note that several of your

Rotarian friends do not greet you with that big hello.   There is a circle of Rotarians

chatting away, but the circle does not open for you to join in, like it usually does.

Certain members are behaving in a stand-offish way. Then there is finally something

said that gives you a clue. A comment is made about how they were disappointed that

you were not able to participate and that hopefully you will be able to participate in at

the next event. After that next time when you do participate, well then, you feel the

notable difference of friendly reception and camaraderie as one of the gang.

Feeling the Pressure

You may never have heard of Rotary before, but in reading through the conceptual

framework above and supporting illustrations, you now know a lot more about what goes

on in Rotary. Given the negative connation implicit in the word 'pressuring' and the

many forms of it discussed, one might be wondering why anyone would stay with or join

an organization with so much of this pressuring going on. Do recall and be cognitive to

the nature of this research and that it was to focus in on a main problem, identified in this

case as participatory pressuring. What is REALLY also going on in Rotary is a lot of

great humanitarian work, with men and women giving up a lot of their time (billable

hours, personal time and resources) to make a difference. However, I set out to discover a main problem for participants that would provide explanations to behavioral activity. I observed a lot of pressuring going on and experienced firsthand how the more pressuring that went on the greater impact it had, especially when done in a combination of tactics.

There is so much about Rotary; it is a complex organization with a long history of success and it is struggling with keeping up with the times (as many organizations are). I personally believe it will catch up, adapt and continue to be an organization with an active membership making a difference in the world. Although problematic for the participants, participatory pressuring cannot be all bad; if it were then one would soon hear about dramatic consequences to the organization. Just because it is problematic for the participants does not mean it does not work. Conceptualizations about the impact of the pressuring are presented in the chapters to follow.

In terms of the GT research process, discovering participatory pressuring and the many ways it was engaged upon represented the important research step of answering the GT research question, "What is the main problem?" It took me some time to finally decide what to study for this dissertation.   In the next chapter, I continue to present more on this main problem of participatory pressuring and to discuss some of the conceptual connecting pieces that subsequently helped lead me to study participant behaviors in response to this main problem.

Chapter 5: More on Participatory Pressuring: The Plot Persists

Introduction

      The main category of participatory pressuring and its various forms that emerged from the data were introduced in the last chapter.   In the first part of this chapter, I provide further interpretive insights into the nature, roots, connections and implications of participatory pressuring. For the remainder of the chapter, I then provide a conceptual analysis on how participants responded to the main concern of participatory pressuring. Focusing in on a main concern and examining how participants resolved that main concern provided an account for a lot of the behavioral activity within the organization.

Participatory Pressuring, Prevalent and Pervasive

      As reflected in the various forms of the behaviors, participatory pressuring tactics were generally used to get members engaged in projects and to take on leadership roles. The purpose of clubs is to accomplish humanitarian goals and to function well and grow as a club. Many clubs today are struggling to meet their commitments and do their humanitarian work, which was easier to do in days gone by with more club members who seemed to have more time, resources and power to get things done.   Today, generally speaking, there is also lots of competition for their volunteer time and attention, including within members' more socially responsible workplaces. If a Rotarian is not retired from the workplace, she/he is struggling to keep up.

      Many older Rotarians who are retired and who may have more time to offer than those who have demanding workplaces, participate and contribute greatly to Rotary causes. However, with many of these dedicated Rotarians, there are also a number of

them who are not physically able to participate as much and likewise not able to maintain regular attendance. As a result, there is lots of Rotary work to be done with an increasingly smaller number of Rotarians to do it. The pressure is on fewer to do more, especially when there are not enough new recruits joining up (a familiar tune in most organizations). Evidently, getting new members can provide much relief, but this challenge seems to be a major hurdle. When there are new recruits, much attention is directed towards them.

The Problem for New Members: New Kids on the Block

Getting new members is a challenge compared to years gone by when there were waiting lists for invitees anxiously hoping for an opening. Those who were previously a member or exposed to Rotary are considered good prospective members. However, these potential members often have negative pre-conceptions about Rotary and can be reluctant to join or rejoin. It is commonly expressed by these potential members that they do not have the time to give and that they are afraid of the commitment; they know about the attendance rules and they want to avoid "*getting roped in*". There are those who also retain the notion that Rotary is still too much of a men's club and that it is elitist and so they are not interested.

To address the challenge of preconceived notions about membership, some Rotarians profess how the organization has changed but remain quiet about how it has not changed. I was surprised to hear a Director of membership instruct others that it was best not to be too forthcoming about how much it really costs to be a Rotarian or how much work it involves. It was advised that providing too much info may result in never getting

a potential member to join. This was surprising to hear given the importance of the "Four Way Test" promoting honesty in all that Rotarians do or say.

Often, potential new members have little to no knowledge of Rotary. There is a lot to learn with Rotary and it is time consuming. The pressure is on membership committees to get a potential new member knowledgeable enough about Rotary to want to join. In some clubs, where they still use the traditional application and review process, a potential member can wander off during the bureaucratic phase before the club gets a chance to induct. New members usually join one at a time, which is an intimidating circumstance to enter into older clubs who tend to be a well-established group of friends. If the older club has declining numbers, members are just waiting for some new blood to take up the slack and more.   This is just one of the reasons clubs may have difficulty keeping new members. There is a lot of participatory pressuring that begins to take place not long after someone becomes a new member to get them right away to work.

In collecting data from members who had left Rotary, there was a resounding common theme expressed among many. Their short-lived membership was due in most part because they were not able to keep up with the commitment and workload of Rotary; work-life pressures weighed in heavily, as well. For newer, younger or retired members who left within a year or two, their reasons for leaving were similar, even though you might think that they would be different.   The research revealed to me the reason why, once I myself learned more about Rotary. I discovered that Rotary leaders believe one of the ways to get new Rotarians committed to Rotary more quickly is for those newcomers to become immersed in its operation and humanitarian projects as soon as possible after

joining the club. This may be so; however, how this gets played out does not result, necessarily, in the desired goal. What happens is that the unsuspecting newcomers, without much time to get a grip on what Rotary is all about, are tossed into the ring too quickly and they become overwhelmed. Making matters worse, not only do these new members get quickly weighted down with Rotary workloads, but they also feel pressures to do that work in the way that longer termed, senior members direct them. They get 'should' all over in no time at all. So, practically speaking, a strategy that might help keep new members stay around often fails due to the excessive burdens and pressures put on these new members.

There is another variable that factors into this story. Many of the older Rotarians, and even some younger ones that have been members of Rotary for many years longer, feel that they have already done more than their fair share and are looking to newer members to take over. Senior Rotarians have done their time after-all. There is so much pressure on new members; no wonder many of them leave within just a few years or as a little as a few months. A new member, John, declared things were *happening too quickly* and wondered if things could slow down a bit. He was just barely in the door and just beginning to know Rotary and other members. John expressed, "*We are just dating, what is the rush?*" I recognized the sentiments; John was feeling like Rotary was coming on too strong and too fast, so to speak.

Historical Roots to Today's Pressuring

In the past, as I learned in data collected from long-term Rotarians and as a number of texts on the history of Rotary indicated, Rotarians worked hard and were

dedicated to the causes they encountered and supported. There were workload pressures then too, but Rotary leaders did not need to resort to as much participatory pressuring or at least not in the same way as practiced today. In the past, if a member did not do his fair share and if his attendance record was less than stellar, he could be kicked out of the club; there were many others waiting to join. The threat of removal from the club was participatory pressure enough to keep the troops in line. The traditional role of Sergeant at Arms in Rotary had the important task to track club and committee attendance and participation. If there were members neglecting their duty, then there were corrective actions to take place.   Those on membership waiting lists would gladly fill a vacancy in the club and so the pressuring threat of dismissal prompted members to do their fair share.

In present day Rotary, ironically, even if someone has not participated much and their attendance has been low, much *tolerance and consideration* can be offered. Efforts are made to woo the member to remain a Rotarian if there is a threat that they might resign. Often this is much to the disdain of some members who retain the traditional mindset that the "*knife and forkers*", and the "*deadwood*" should not be allowed to continue their membership as a Rotarian if they are not contributing enough towards Rotary's humanitarian work. You need only hear such talk once and you do not forget it. The talk alone can be pressure enough to keep up with attendance requirements and participatory expectations. Alternatively, you start thinking about an *exit strategy*.

Historically, members were attentive to the call to duty. Business owners gave-up more of their time and executives were given more liberty to contribute, considering the many benefits that could be derived through a Rotary membership. At one time, years

ago, clubs kept track of the economic benefits attained through the networking activities of members in their clubs (Forward, 2003). To be a member of Rotary was an elite opportunity to rub shoulders, gain access and opportunities to other business and professional members; but, in turn there were important membership expectations to live up to. In this past history of organizational prosperity, many of the seeds for steadfast traditional ways were planted deep into the ground. Although some of them may not be so obvious, cultural habits of the organization today can be traced back to the beginning and booming years of membership growth in the history of Rotary International.

An Organization of Leaders

From its early beginnings, Rotary International's membership was about having one 'leader' from each type of corporation, level of government, vocation and profession. Paul Harris, who founded Rotary, wanted to enjoy the companionship of professionals and leaders like him, but wanted to share and learn from others whose work was in different areas of businesses and professions. He was a lonely lawyer, as the story goes, who did not want to spend more of his time with other lawyers (Forward, 2003).

Traditionally, Rotary members were the leaders who could access an extensive network of connections to help do Rotary (and to help one another). No two members of a club could come from the same vocational position. Members had to be known as the leaders in their workplaces, having important decision-making responsibilities. Leaders invited other leaders to join Rotary, and inherent to the Rotarian membership were the commitment and pressures to live up to high expectations to contribute, participate and role model good leadership.

As the saying goes, "too many cooks in the kitchen can spoil the broth". In Rotary, with a membership of leaders, who are the followers? Who are the doers? In the past, the classical, hierarchical structure with a militaristic theme and authoritative stance is what kept the troops in line. The Sergeant of Arms' duty was to keep order and make sure Rotarians were attending and participating as they should. The position still exists and the role still played out in interesting and sometimes, even still, intimidating ways in clubs. At the 100th year Rotary International Convention, I experienced firsthand the important role of Sgt. at Arms. At the opening ceremony of this event, I was trying to find my way when I was abruptly confronted and authoritatively directed by a Sgt. at Arms to return to my seat. He warned me that I could be removed from the building if I did follow his instructions promptly. This directive was in lieu of a hello and a smile that I eventually did get when I that I had been directed to the area by another Sergeant at Arms. Leaders in Rotary take their role seriously, just as they learned their role from the leaders before them. How participatory pressuring is done has changed over the years. From the data, it would seem that it is more subtly and less consciously done, but remains a prominent behavioral component of how Rotary functions.

Today, especially after women won the right to join Rotary (1989), there is more diversity within the ranks of Rotary. The concept of a "leader" has evolved in the way that the number and variety of leading positions of businesses and professions have changed. Rotary reflects well the evolution of leadership – from the more autocratic, top down to softer, "transformational" or "appreciative" forms of it. The "Wheels of Humanity" turn slowly with the leadership hierarchy and bureaucratic processes within clubs and as governed by RI central.

There are some challenging dynamics that exist today in Rotary with different types of leaders. For example, one participant labeled it the "*employer versus employee problem*". Martha explained that there were leaders among them that treated others just like they were their employees. They give the orders and others are expected to follow the directions as if this person were their boss. These bosses were described as the entrepreneurs or the top executive types and were often times the older, male members who had been members for many years. The employees— they are the other Rotarians, often including the few women who are assumed to be lower ranking government employees or banking managers. The way things 'should' be done, when and by whom is decided by the 'employers'; and the 'employees', well, they are expected to fall into their roles as followers should do. They are the ones to be "*voluntold*".

In my own Rotary experience, as a supposed leader among leaders, I did at times find myself feeling beneath some and expected to follow their lead. I did feel the pressure many times to follow even when the one *taking the lead* did not hold a particular (hierarchical) leadership position within the club. Among some women, the feelings were shared and the ideas emerged: *Many of the men were used to having 'women under them' and so, without much thought, they turn to us female Rotarians – they turn to their 'girls' and politely express the directives.* One female Rotarian declared she had resigned from Rotary because she could no longer stand to be referred to as a "*girl*". Another left because she could no longer tolerate being delegated tasks by a committee chair. *Leadership is not always done well in this organization of leaders, I concluded.*

Interestingly enough, one thing I learned about what it might mean to be a good leader, particularly considering the leadership membership context of Rotary, is that a good leader is one who is prepared and able to follow. I also have come to conclude that the 'leadership' concept is problematic at best and I think it is time to identify and promote a new label to depict how better to get everyone on the same page (collaboratively), moving in the same direction. As reflected in Rotary, there are traditional and enduring mindsets about leadership, which in turn make it challenging for newer, younger female members to take on more collaboratively leading roles. Also, evidently from the research data, this dissertation highlights concerns about how participatory pressuring is used as a way to lead.

With my own experiencing of leadership, I found myself wondering at times about who was really leading at the wheel of the Rotary ship? I also wondered from where all the participatory pressuring was originating? Subsequently, I recalled the notion of the "*inner circle*" as labeled by a participant in an interview I conducted before I became a Rotarian. Theoretically, I needed to collect data from this vantage point to understand more about participatory pressuring and its impact.

Power, Politics and Pressuring of the Inner Circle(s)

Operationally, Rotary clubs are typically steered by members of the Board, presided over by the President. Yearly, board members are proposed and voted in to set goals, draw up a budget and to keep the club informed. Directors of the Board chair committees for various operational functions. Along with the President, the Board helps

keep communications flowing. They help provide the necessary information to identify goals and guide their implementation.

Having served on a Rotary Board, I was able to experience firsthand its importance for club decision making and communications. The President and Secretary also have important roles in their connection to the mother ship, the administrative and chartering body of RI for all clubs. As much as clubs can operate independently, RI central has a powerful, political influence on decisions made at the club level – much like a franchise form of business.   There is pressuring to participate and conform to the mandate of Rotary internationally; pressuring begins at the 'top' and flows down hill to clubs. Knowledge and understanding of the inner workings at the international and district levels of Rotary can translate into a powerful leveraging base for any agenda.

"*Oh the POLITICS*!" declared Martha. "*The competing agendas make your head spin*". Within a Club, and with district and international implications and influence, club decision making by leaders, in an organization of leaders, is rather interesting to say the least. Although organizational hierarchy is in place for the President and members of the Board to provide leadership and guide the decision making process, certain members, whether on the Board or not, seem to have a certain say and power to influence the Board or the general membership one way or another.

I served on a Rotary board for several years before I began to see or understand what Martha was talking about when she spoke of the "inner circle(s)". The concept was latent in the back of my mind until I experienced firsthand how some decisions came through the Board, but these decisions were already well promulgated by others. In some

104

cases, Board approval was more of a formality; the change was already in effect. Then

there were also some decisions made by the Board, but then were altered or even

overturned or somehow forgotten about because they were not embraced by the

membership (or sometimes just by a few). Sometimes the membership simply were not

informed about a change, so the anticipated impact of the Board decision did not

materialize, leaving some confused and left wondering why.

I was certainly confused at times. I continued to collect more data to discover

what was really going on in this regard. Who, when, and why, I wondered, were making

some of these counter Board decisions and applying pressure to the Board and

membership to follow their lead? Like other Board members, I began to feel that the

Board was, in many ways, the workhorse to do all the administrative, back- breaking

chores of the club, while from the 'backroom', bathroom, barroom or golf course, others

were deciding what the Board / club should do.   I therefore proceeded to identify inner

circles and to be a part of one to understand their operation and impact.

Getting connected to an inner circle gave me the background understanding to

better discern what happened in the foreground of club meetings in relation to "*hidden

agendas*". I was then able to identify more with the political tensions of competing

agendas during assembly meetings, when counter thinking and feelings came face to face

for a deciding vote from the membership at large. One may think it is then that it might

become obvious who is a part of the inner circle, but no, that is not what happens. For the

most part, the issues, debate and motions were brought forward through the democratic

process of the club. Although there could be some strong points made to swing some

votes, the results of the vote often did not reflect what happened in the discussions prior to the vote. For some of the sensitive motions brought forward, it seemed that members had already decided on how they would vote, no matter the discussions or Board's reporting that took place. I directed my research to understand why this was happening.

Researching further into inner circle functioning, I discovered that some of the political pressuring to sway membership thinking had already taken place before the assembly meetings. I observed how it was done somewhat covertly by members of an inner circle to avoid catching the attention of those who might provide some counter 'truth' claims to the debate.   In any case, the Board was often too busy doing its work to pick up on all that was happening.   Furthermore, many Rotarians just enjoyed the camaraderie and opportunity to serve and really did not want to get involved with the politics; they did not have the time. They did not pay much attention to it all and when present to make a vote, they tended to offer a supporting vote to whoever had approached them about it. Often times, it was a long-term Rotary member who they might have golfed with just days before the assembly meeting. The voting member recalled how important voting a particular way mattered to their fellow Rotarian, and without much thought offered a supporting vote for their friend's proposition to the club.

That is politics. With a combination of participatory pressuring tactics, the vote is in and the majority rules. The majority rule is problematic to say the least in many clubs where the membership is still dominated by older, male Rotarians who have been club members, friends and business associates for many years. Newer members are usually in the minority and those not yet members, of course, also have no say. Unsurprisingly,

agendas reflecting change from new members are often voted down by the majority of

members who tend to share the same thinking about how Rotary should work. Majority

rule often means that the traditional mindsets and ways of doing Rotary are safeguarded.

Consequently, newer members have little power or voice to advance changes that would

allow Rotary to become more welcoming and accommodating to them or their potential

invitees.   New members therefore hesitate to invite business associates and begin to have

second thoughts about continuing with their own membership.

Within Rotary you have many STRONG leaders with loud and deep (masculine)

voices who have been Rotarians for a long time (this kind of voice of Rotary tends to be

the favored one). These members know so much and have lots of Rotary experience.

These Rotary 'authorities' are heard by the majority; they manage to get lots of speaking

time. They need not hold a leadership position or even seek the support of the Board to

have the power to cause a change or prevent one. After all that is said and done,

sometimes to the surprise of a minority, questions or concerns that may arise because of

disconcerting ways that decisions have been made are downplayed and soon forgotten.

What happens with volunteers who have little time to spare, they have even less time to

evaluate or question how the work gets done. Besides, *it is all good"* and many

members are just content to know that they are part of a membership willing to give of

their time to make things happen, no matter how.

Changing Human Nature of Volunteerism and Business

I have volunteered at various times for different causes and in different contexts,

but comparatively, my experience as a Rotarian has been like no other.   There is much

more about Rotary than volunteering. I have likewise done some comparative research

on organizations like Rotary (e.g., Lions Club, Kiwanis, Richelieu) and I have come to

conclude that Rotary, in the way it does its humanitarian 'business', operates more like a

for-profit enterprise than like other non-profit volunteer organizations. Today,

differences between for profit and non-profit organizations are becoming increasingly

difficult to discern. The not-for-profit sector, for example, is adopting policies and

practices from for-profit industries and corporations striving for competitive advantages

are adopting and adapting strategies that traditionally were found more often in non-profit

organizations. Furthermore, philanthropic activities and causes are increasingly

becoming big business. This got me thinking about how and to what degree participatory

pressuring might be happening in other volunteer contexts and for-profit companies.

To engage an employee to work towards organizational goals, leaders have

become more attentive to the notion that financial compensation is not the only way to

motivate and manage employees. More commonly known today is that there are higher

level intrinsic rewards that leaders use to motivate others to accomplish organizational

goals. Much research has been done to identify effective strategies to motivate a

workforce of any kind. The notion of "volunteering" is typically known as how people

will act and do for others without transactional rewards. They are self-motivated and

engaged by their own free will. Rumor has it and it is purported in research that doing

'good' by performing humanitarian acts to help others has the inherent benefit to the

volunteer of 'feeling good' and there can also be both mental and physical health benefits

(Grimm, Spring, and Dietz, 2007). For some people and in some scenarios, the good

feelings might make the difference to sustain volunteer efforts. However, it may not be

enough to maintain a self-motivating momentum to continue volunteering towards

organizational goals year after year.   There are other circumstances, benefits and ways that can encourage employees or members of an organization to engage and perform at higher levels.

In comparing the self-motivated notion of volunteering and how motivation can be used to engage members in organizational activities, the participatory pressuring tactics, as found in this research, contrastingly seem to relate to the traditional balancing act of how much 'carrot or stick' ought to be used to get people to do what you want them to do. Both are manipulative ways to motivate; the latter involves applying some pressure to get people to do something. When the workforce receives a salary for their efforts, participatory pressuring might supplement monetary benefits, but usage of heavy handed pressuring tactics on volunteers may be doing more damage than good.

To highlight the relevance of how manipulative strategies, either done motivationally (in a positive way) or in terms of participatory pressuring (resulting in discomfort), can be as much a part of volunteerism as they may be with for-profit organizations, I shall recount a particular incident.   I recall, so very well, a casual conversation among a select few Rotarians outside of the usual context of the club domain. In this situation, I decided to go along for a ride to a pub, not something I normally do as a Rotarian. I do not like to socialize this way as I am married and such social encounters tend to be with mostly male Rotarians. However, I was interested in connecting more to an inner circle and this was one way I thought it could happen. Sure enough, the casual conversation at the pub was quite different from the typical club conversations.

One of the conversations began with someone voicing concerns about having enough volunteers to accomplish a particular task. Thomas, an older senior executive, successful business owner and respected consultant in management, spoke about the frustrating circumstance with volunteers. In his field of expertise there were so many ways to get paid employees to do what was required from them. However, with volunteers, Thomas was finding it challenging to figure out what to do to get members doing what the club needed them to do. Very quickly, Walter, with more years of experience and expertise in the field of volunteerism, responded and enthusiastically informed Thomas about how there were, indeed, many ways to get volunteers to do what you want them to do! Walter also explained that it was not a whole lot different from the business world, and it was a whole lot cheaper too. "Volunteers don't cost as much!" Volunteers need not be paid, but there can be, nonetheless, costs associated with getting them to participate more. This conversation continued and became a lively exchange and brainstorming session about the many ways to motivate and manage volunteers. I was able to hear about and collect more data on some of the participatory pressuring tactics that I had started to identify.

I started to think about how much of anyone's Rotary experience was about personally wanting to volunteer (by free will) to serve others or how much of it was spurred on in a manipulative and controlling way. I thought about it in relation to myself, but brushed off the notion because I thought of myself as an independent thinker, someone who could easily identify and resist manipulation. I can play along and resist when needed. I also have no problem with motivational strategies to cheer on and promote team spirit to getting a job done; besides, it is all for a good cause, right? It was

110

not until I began to FEEL it in a different way and in more intense ways that I began to resent and dislike the participatory pressuring tactics. I also began to have a greater understanding of their impact and personally felt more of the side-effects. Moreover, I started to make better sense of what others had told me in interviews before I became a member.

As a volunteer Rotarian, doing what I supposedly wanted to do, self-motivated and self-directed, I began to realize that I was doing more and more of what I was manipulated and pushed into doing rather than experiencing what I really wanted to do as a volunteer. As much as I had come to appreciate all that was good about Rotary and all the good that was done through RI, I was starting to feel worn down and frustrated as a Rotarian. Again, I remembered and compared research notes (data) about my experiences to those who shared theirs in interviews before I became a Rotarian. I too will now say, as one interviewee said to me, you really cannot know or understand what it is like to be a Rotarian until becoming one and FEELING it.

Feeling it and Responding to Participatory Pressuring (PP)

"Feeling it" helped me identify the main problem of participatory pressuring and to identify various subcategories and their properties. I soon became convinced that PP was a main problem as so much of the data I collected, coded, compared and memoed about could be conceptually connected to this main concern for participants. It would not surprise me if many or even most participants of this research may never have conceptually thought of the problem in this way. I would likewise not be surprised if some Rotarians (and others) may not perceive participant pressuring as so problematic,

111

but instead see it as an understandable and practical way to do Rotary. It is a way that has worked and in many ways continues to work.

There are TRUE, devoted Rotarians who may feel offended and defensive by any negative portrayal of Rotary. I do not want to offend any Rotarian or risk hurting the reputation of Rotary in any way, but rather quite the opposite. I care about Rotary and I have a deep respect for fellow Rotarians. I have felt the pride of being part of an incredible organization that has done and continues to do great work. However, I also became a Rotarian to do research. In choosing to do grounded theory, I chose to go looking for a problem and to study how participants resolved that problem. By doing this, I was able to generate theory about what was happening substantively and to provide explanatory insights into membership behavior.

I felt some *"pushback"* in previewing a bit of my research to some Rotarians. I adjusted such experimental testing at times; as Glaser (1998) suggests, one should try to avoid any possible negative consequences that this research could inevitably cause. As more Rotarians learn about this research, many will make their own interpretive insights. I hope they will do it understanding that I, like them, also care about Rotary and its humanitarian cause, and that I have proceeded with this research and write-up believing that the theoretical knowledge resulting from this research will not only be of important benefit to Rotary, but also to other organizational contexts.

The decision to delimit this research to studying the problem of participatory pressuring in turn led to theoretical sampling of data for how participants reacted to participatory pressuring. Data analysis became focused on answering the question, as

112

Glaser states; "What is the basic social psychological process or social structural process that processes the problem to make life viable in the action scene?" (Glaser, 1978, p. 57). The "scene" effectively, but not necessarily deliberately, was Rotary leadership and others 'PPing' all over their membership and, in turn, some members were getting 'P'd off'; pardon the puns. They *"feel it"*, and Rotarians do not like how it feels. "*Uncomfortable*, *bothersome*, *unhappy*, *stressed, p'd off and frustrated"* are but a few of the expressions Rotarians used to describe how they felt about the pressuring.

Some members were not as consciously aware of it, while some were less bothered by it than others. There are those who used the tactics and there are those who were more likely targets for more pressuring than others. For some members, it was a routine practice to get the membership engaged and participating more, one way or another, especially when goals were to be met and timelines were looming. There were *"wonderful, gratifying feelings*" resulting from the good work that got done and it often helped to compensate for the resulting negative effects from the pressuring. For some, in the aftermath of what was a difficult project, they were ready to *"go to battle"* again. They were prepared to rise to the call of duty for the next humanitarian project. However, for others, they felt tired and wounded, not fully recovered from the pressuring they experienced and were hesitant and evasive to partake in the next Rotary challenge.

To decipher this main problem of participatory pressuring was challenging enough, but researching for how members felt and dealt with the pressuring was even more problematic. Initially, emerging from the data, I identified some general ways members responded to participatory pressuring with:

1. **Stepping Up to the Plate:** This is perhaps one of the more common ways members respond to pressuring (and a commonly used phrase to encourage participation). After all, this is simply following through on why a member joins Rotary (and is often reminded about). When they are asked, members respond to the call of duty without further ado. It is difficult not to respond when a public show of hands is requested and almost all or at least most hands are raised. Some might be confused in how they were suddenly summoned to the cause, not recalling even how the club got involved with a particular project. However, this can be the routine. Decisions have been made and now the work needs to get done; all hands on deck. All Rotarians *"should"* do their part and many Rotarians stoically step up to the plate to get on with it. There is no further thought or word and they dutifully engage to do "Service Above Self".

2. **Excusing One-self:** Sometimes members are unable to engage in a Rotary activity or responsibility, either at all or in part. Despite pressure to participate, a Rotarian asks to be excused from the commitment. The Rotarian apologizes for this, often citing work or family conflicts as reasons for not being able to participate. A promise to participate next time may be given. There is pressure to make an offering to compensate for the shortcoming this time around. A monetary donation might also be offered to help excuse oneself and to avoid any further pressure.

3. **Paying Lip Service:** In response to an obvious need or special request, there are members who speak up quite enthusiastically about what could be done and how they will help to meet the developing tasks. Their name goes down onto the volunteer list.

Some members are full of ideas and will do some of the 'heads-on' work, but when it comes to do the 'hands-on' work, they are less interested in engaging. This then can result in just a few (less) hands doing heavy work. I observed this happening often. I also heard, consequently, a bit of the bad mouthing that goes along with this, "*he or she's all talk no action"; "they talk a good story about helping but then just sit back".* "*We need all hands on deck". "We need all club members to commit to the project".*

4. **Avoiding:** When you really do not want to do something, and especially if you want to get out of the line of fire from pressure to comply, avoidance behavior is one way to keep from getting caught. "*If you can't handle the heat, you get out of the kitchen*". Evidently, identifying an elusive behavior as 'avoiding' is not an obvious observation to come by. After receiving advice on how to get better at the behavior, I began to put the pieces of the puzzle together and talk openly with others about how they avoided getting talked into doing more and more. "*You want to be careful about saying 'yes'. Before you know, you get caught with too much on your plate". "There is always more work than you thought you had committed to".* By avoiding the asks, you can avoid the uncomfortable situation of disappointing and letting the person asking down; you avoid the pressuring.

It can be as simple as avoiding eye contact or avoiding a meeting altogether when you anticipate high pressured sales will occur to get members to commit to a club task. You can avoid for a while; however, soon enough, you will be found and it is so hard to say no. "*True Rotarians never say no".* I was told about an escape route when you really need to get away from it all; you can ask for a leave of absence. It is less known about and practiced today, but a Rotarian need only request a leave and a

115

specified period of time for it. It is pretty much a formality these days, but in the past, if you did not have a valid reason the leave might not be granted. After all, in days gone by there were others waiting for a chance to become an 'active' member.

5. **Resigning as a Member:** Before the pressure-cooker blows, some members resign from their Club. The pressure cooker is filled with competing pressures that come from their workplace, home front and call to duty of Rotary. "*Work pressures*" is often times the reason given when a Rotarian leaves the Club. It seems to be a standard reason and I suspect more times than not it is not the actual underlining reason, likely a 'party-line' – as was discovered when further prompting revealed other reasons why some Rotarians left Rotary.

   Giving a party-line reason does not raise questions or concerns and left behind members respond in an understanding way, for the most part. There can be some lingering bad mouthing about how the dearly departed "*did not give that good ole college effort*"; "they *jumped ship*"; "*because Tony didn't get his way, he took the highway*".   I have heard it said on a number of occasions that it was likely the resigning Rotarian had joined Rotary for potential networking benefits and once they realized it was all about "Service above Self", they decided to move on to those business networks that only do networking. *"He only joined for the networking; not a big loss; he wasn't here for Rotary"*.

6. **Speaking Up, but not saying much:** There are those who have raised their concerns for how Rotary is done, hesitantly and cautiously in a quieter and sometimes tired voice. After being a member for a while, I was perplexed as to why so little was said

116

among members about why membership was declining. I also wondered why the problem of *"work pressure"* was not discussed more. I reflected on how interviewees from initial research projects spoke about these challenges they faced as Rotarians (especially after the tape recorder was turned off). In contrast, barely a word was mentioned about membership concerns at club meetings. Likewise, on the survey I administered prior to joining Rotary, members from many different clubs were asked to identify if there was anything that they disliked about Rotary. The most common and prevalent response was that they did not like having to sell tickets; however, very little did I ever hear about this dislike for ticket sales in clubs or district meetings.

There have been times during my membership when fundraising ideas have been proposed that involved selling tickets. On a couple of occasions I informed and warned about how Rotarians do not like to sell tickets and that it is one reason why some have left Rotary. This message fell mostly on deaf ears; but, in one case it initiated a back and forth email debate with a fellow Rotarian who quite adamantly purported how and why selling tickets was a necessary part of Rotary work and a duty for Rotarians to fulfill. If a Rotarian did not want to sell tickets, he argued, perhaps they did not deserve to be a member of Rotary. With such a passionate stand on this Rotary exercise, needless to say, I had little else to say.

There were those who were good at selling tickets and their exemplary efforts were broadly announced for all to hear. I observed those who sheepishly bowed their heads. There were a few times when members dared to speak up to provide their reasons why they could not sell any more tickets. Incidentally, I recall how Winston, a fundraising chair, appealed to his club to *SELL MORE*! Winston believed that the

problem was apathy and pleaded for members to wake up to help the club meet fundraising goals. Several months later, Winston left the club.   Little was openly said about his departure, but it was fairly well known it was not from "*work pressures*".

Pressure Cooking in Silence

 After identifying general ways that members resolved participatory pressuring, I was left with a lingering sense that I was still missing a part of the story. How members responded to the pressuring amounted to not much more than how any organizational member acts when dissatisfied or uncomfortable with their organizational experience. There was another dimension to this story that I just could not figure out, at least not at first.   With more comparative analysis and mulling it over in my mind like a crime detective, I began to recognize an underlying theme to the pattern of behaviors discussed above. I was slow to put the pieces of the puzzle together, when, in retrospect, there were so many data indicators of it.   It was not something so readily observable, because what was really going on was what was not going on; so little was being said about so much. Once again, I did not get a full sense of it until again I, myself, engaged in the behavior. Finally, the light went on; I had that AHA! moment. I discovered that the way in which participants were primarily resolving or responding to the participatory pressuring was, as I labeled it, by "Strategic Self-Silencing" in various ways and degrees.

Chapter 6:   The Emergence of Strategic Self-Silencing (SSS)

Methodological Implications

> Grounded theory produces a core category that continually resolves a main
> concern and through sorting the core category organizes the integration of the
> theory.   …Grounded theory is a package. It is a revolving-step method that starts
> the researcher from being a "know nothing" to becoming an expert who will later
> become a theorist with a publication and with a theory that accounts for most of
> the action in a substantive area (Glaser, 1998, p. 13).

In the last two chapters, a conceptual analysis was provided about the main

concern of participatory pressuring. Some general ways participants responded to this

problem were identified.   I gradually began to conceptualize how responses to

participatory pressuring were conceptually linked and how they were fitting into an

overarching core category, which I labeled "strategic self-silencing" (SSS). In respect to

the above quote, sorting out this core category and its conceptual links to participatory

pressuring represented the revolving next step to developing a theory package to account

for substantial behavioral action (and inaction) of participants**.** A description of the

progressive steps in conceptualizing and constantly comparing to more fully develop the

theory continues in this and remaining chapters.

Discovering SSS

Over the years as I experienced first-hand the organizational context of Rotary, I

have seen, read and heard a lot, but continued to suspect that I was not hearing or seeing it

all. In the PhD program, I learned that it is just as important to be sensitive to what is not

seen or said as you are observant to what is.   I believe that by using the combined power

of grounded theory with participant observation over a prolonged period, I was able to

decipher clues (by constantly comparing) to unearth the less than obvious core category

of strategic self-silencing. This research path represented a significant commitment of time, effort and financial cost; it was a long haul. However, what emerged from the data I do not believe would have happened any other way. Time and patience were necessary commodities for discovery.

Exposure to different theories during the PhD program played a role in providing another term of reference that led me to discovering the SSS core category. So much of the feminist theory reviewed in course study highlighted the need to have greater 'voice' from those barely heard from within organizations.   As students, we were encouraged to find our own voices and to use them more. Comparatively, I could not understand why Rotarians were not using their voices to speak more openly about what bothered them as Rotarians within their clubs and RI. After all, most men and women of Rotary have the leadership qualities and the skills to use their voices well. The question remained, why were Rotarians not speaking up about how they really felt or thought about their membership? Considering the growing challenges with membership, it certainly seemed that it would be most helpful for clubs and RI to uncover, for example, the true reason why some members ended their membership unexpectedly.

The climatic point of discovering SSS was similar to the experience of discovering participatory pressuring. The 'pieces of the puzzle' fell into place when I began to engage in the behavioral process myself. As part of the research process and as a new member to Rotary, for the first few years of my research I deliberately took on a more conservative and 'quieter' role as a Rotarian. There is a lot to learn about Rotary and the operations of any Rotary club and so, typically, it does take a while to learn and

know Rotary before you feel comfortable enough to raise your voice more prominently in the organization. I had learned more about Rotary than most, prior to becoming a member of a club. Nonetheless, it still took me a while before I understood enough to feel comfortable to say much among those who had been Rotarians for many years. Once I had a better grasp on Rotary and began to feel more at home and part of the 'family', I began to say more and engage in a more active role (and to collect more data and memo). In fact, I began to speak more openly and honestly about my own personal concerns about membership. Gradually, and ever so gently, I also began to share some of the discoveries from the research and attempted to put them to good use for membership development.

From Voicing to Silencing

After several years contributing to Rotary by serving as the Secretary in a club, it was time to make a change and I was likewise seeking alternative paths to selectively collect data related to developing theory. When asked to become Director of Membership, I quickly accepted as I thought this was just the opportunity and context that I might discover more about membership and to be able to try out some of what I learned from the research. I was enthusiastic to take on the role and also thought that I could really help the club to grow membership. I also thought it was a good vantage point to discover data related to PP and SSS.

I think, as a committee, the membership team had a good start. However, I soon became confused and frustrated with my Director of Membership role. A senior male Rotarian on the committee, with more years of experience than me, began to take over the lead as the chair of the 'membership committee'. As Director of Membership, I was

politely advised to be, primarily, the communication liaison between the Membership Committee and the Board. Apparently, this had been how the role of the Director of Membership was conducted in the past.

Having felt like I lost a footing to lead and work as a team player to address membership challenges, I still attempted to express some ideas about doing membership differently. I tried, for example, to implement a couple of new membership activities and strategies, however, these were not embraced. Furthermore, I began to sense some pushback to a couple of my ideas, which were practical applications emerging from the research that might have helped. Although membership was an important RI goal and high on the agenda of our club, several times membership agenda items were put aside while less vital agenda goals advanced by long term members were given priority.

Increasingly, I became frustrated with both my membership in general and what little I seemed to be able to accomplish as the Director of Membership. I also began to feel less comfortable about voicing concerns and advancing ideas to help the situation. Without much thought, I began to speak up less as I became more discouraged. I did not, at first, consciously recognize my own frustrations and mixed feelings until I compared them with those I had heard about from other members. I reviewed comparative data collected in interviews before joining Rotary and I also re-examined vague tidbits of data from members who had recently resigned. From what I was experiencing, coupled with comparisons to previously collected data and memos, I was gaining a much better understanding in what was happening with members and to me. I conceptualized more and more about the suppressed feelings of frustration felt by many Rotarians.

The personal, hands-on experience helped me to understand and to discover more in the research. It facilitated the discovery of the strategic self-silencing core category. Through the participatory role, I gained a deeper understanding about membership and I was able to compare this core category to other categories and identify the links and explanatory power. With this new categorical concept, I integrated more of the incidents, conceptualizations that I had identified and stored in memos, just as I had done for the categorical development of participatory pressuring. Excitedly, I re-set the course for more theoretical sampling to understand the behavioral dynamics involved with the silencing. I was intrigued by this unexpected breakthrough. I continued researching and focusing my efforts on filling categorical gaps. I began thinking more about integrating the theory, while remaining attentive to how more data comparisons, including any negative case incidents, could modify the developing theory.

I also started to add in some comparative data from other organizational contexts and participants. As Glaser (1998) indicates, as you analyze and theorize to higher abstract conceptual levels, you begin to see the core category all around you. One cannot help but begin to constantly compare related data from different contexts. I admit that, at this juncture in the research, I was tempted again to do a bit of incident tripping and talk about the breakthrough of how SSS had emerged and what it meant. I was excited thinking about the implications of PP and SSS in different research contexts. However, rather than share the discovery in any detail with others, I provided, instead, a superficial insight into the theory so as to spark others to incident trip. These casual conversations with people outside of Rotary were often initiated when people asked about my thesis and I responded to them with a twitter version of the discoveries. In response to a brief

introduction to my research, I was responded to with listeners' own stories. Stories

offered this way provided insight as to what I might be missing in Rotary; data collected

in this regard gave some direction for more date collection.

When one begins to compare substantive theory that has been discovered with

data collected outside of the immediate research area, one begins to take a research path

that can develop the substantive theory to the level of formal theory (Glaser, 2007). I

went only a short way down this path realizing it was a formative goal for future research.

I compared the developing theory outside the research context just enough to experiment

with my voice about the conceptual framework; while in contrast, within Rotary from was

increasingly feeling less comfortable to share the developing theoretical knowledge.

I came up with the SSS label quite spontaneously.   Its emergence came upon me

like a 'perfect storm' as multiple strands of research came together. But then, post

discovery, I needed to sort out the fallout data from the storm. I needed to sort all the

memos to more clearly understand developing concepts, their properties and dimensions

and how it all would fit and work into a theoretical package. I found myself writing more

theoretical memos – conceptualizing at more of an abstract level to develop the theory.

To follow in the remainder of this chapter, I share more of the conceptual examinations

concerning the meaning, relevance and specific forms of SSS as generated from the data.

SSS – Its Meaning, Comparatively

What is central to strategic self-silencing, as derived comparatively from the data,

is that participants <u>decided for themselves</u> to be quiet about how they felt or thought, even

when their feelings and thinking were of relevance and foremost on their minds. In

Rotary, participants do not need to keep quiet, in the sense that they are fearful or threatened into keeping silent. Such pressuring to an extreme was not found in the data of this research. Members of Rotary are not hired employees who might be fired from the job for speaking out about the wrong thing. There is plenty of opportunity to speak up in Rotary; you need only ask and you can be heard. As an organization of leaders among leaders, there is little hesitance to speak up if someone wants to do so.

Indicated in the data, there can be some Rotarians who experience pressures above and beyond those found within the Rotary organization. Some members' workplace employment or economic well-being as business owners can have some ties to their Rotary performance depending on the significance of networking connections with RI. This would explain some quiet acceptance, tolerance and withholding of feelings and thoughts about how Rotary is impacting them personally. In spite of this exceptional circumstance for a relatively few, most Rotarians normally feel at ease about speaking up and voicing their opinions and concerns. At least on the surface, RI is an organizational context that gives the impression of being supportive to members having a say.

The concept of SSS is more than just the decision to withhold thoughts and feelings. There is a secondary component to this behavior that involves the process of choosing among alternative strategies to remain quiet about something, and to some degree. The self-silencing behavior is but one part of the story; strategic self-silencing also involves a strategic decision making process to then engage in the behavior of silencing one-self. It is a "basic social process" (BSP) and as Glaser denotes (1978, p. 97), a BSP typically involves at least two components.

I am certain that I have only scratched the surface of the complexity and relevance of this concept in this research project. I believe there is much more to learn about SSS with different research approaches and in different research contexts. Until the completion of this thesis, I continued to collect, compare and theoretically sample more data to discover and theorize about SSS. Future research will no doubt lead to modification of this theory. To follow, I describe what I discovered about SSS in the data of this study.

Strategic Decision Making of Self-Silencing

In the previous Chapter 5, six general behaviors were initially identified as those that participants engage in to resolve the main problem of participatory pressuring. Describing these behaviors illuminated some of the reasons why, how and to what degree participants engaged in SSS. Participants self-silence, for example, to a lesser degree when they cautiously and tactfully speak up against some of the pressuring; but they can also self-silence to a higher degree if they resign from Rotary, but do not share all the reasons why they ended their membership. For Rotarians who stoically respond to the call of duty without obvious second thought, it was necessary to 'dig deep' into discovering whether these participants were simply happily doing their volunteer duty or if they were also engaging in self-silencing.

I discovered that there were some "True Rotarians", for example, who did feel pressured to participate and were hesitant in sharing more openly about how they felt about being pressured. As a result of such findings, I decided to direct the research towards understanding more about how participants were making this strategic choice to

self-silence rather than voicing their concerns. I was also interested in examining the

impact that this silencing behavior was having on the organization; therefore, I

theoretically sampled more for data along these conceptual lines.

To study more about the SSS concept, I first directed my research efforts to

uncover more about the strategic decision-making part of this social process.   I was

interested in identifying rationales behind the choices and the desired outcomes that might

be involved.   I theorized, from the data, that participants compared and anticipated

consequences of speaking up to the consequences of remaining quiet. Participants

weighed the costs versus the benefits among alternative levels of self-silencing. By

examining the data more closely (observing and participating in certain incidents) and

constantly comparing, I learned that more often than not, participants chose to keep quiet

to some degree to meet a strategic goal. I proceeded to research more in this regard and

theoretically sample, code, compare, record memos and theorize with all the data.

To follow is a listing and some discussion of specific patterns of silencing and

associated thinking (rationales) participants engaged in with the decision to self-silence

(to some degree) to meet related goals.

Strategic Self-Silencing by:

1. ***Avoiding Burning Bridges; Relationships more important.*** Preserving a relationship

   seemed to be the most important rationale for engaging in strategic self-silencing.

   Rotary is a networking organization. In the past, networking was an important

   component of why it was such a popular organization to be invited to join. Although

   the promotion of "Service Above Self" may have lessened its importance to some

degree; nonetheless, relationships, relationship building and networking are still fundamental to Rotary's operation and success. The networking connections are also instrumental to fundraising and project work. As members work with one another on Rotary activities, they get to know and trust one another. When networking works well, business, professional and personal relationships blossom and can grow beyond the boundaries of the networking organization.

Friendship and camaraderie of Rotary were foundational to Rotary beginnings and today you have members in clubs that have known one another for years. The strength of these long-term relationships, *"like family",* can have great impact on club dynamics.   As relationships become closer and more meaningful, there can be less attention paid to the organization and more focus placed on a relationship. However, as relationships grow deeper *"in Rotary"*, the club, and RI are also integral relationship elements. Rotarians have a relationship with Rotary. *"I love Rotary."*

When Rotarians speak up, loudly, strongly and passionately about what is best for Rotary (Service Above Self = Rotary Comes First), they do so confidently knowing that their quieter, closest friends and comrades in Rotary support their views. They would not speak up without their closest Rotary friends' support and agreement. Consequently, often nothing or very little is said at times that would go against loyal friendship and networking alignments.

I often observed it happening in this way: a fellow Rotarian would come up with an idea and be quite sure about how it should be advanced for a project. However, if a close Rotary friend responded to the idea in any kind of a dissenting way, it was quickly abandoned. No matter how some others thought it was a great idea, the

Rotarian insisted on forgetting about his idea. He did not want to risk offending or going against his longtime friend and fellow Rotarian. Similarly, even when many knew a project was at risk of failing, no one spoke up to identify what was happening. It would seem that the club would rather the project fail than risk offending a fellow Rotarian.

2. ***Keeping the Peace.*** This reasoning to SSS can be related to the first, but worthy of its own discussion in how deciding to keep quiet is not just about protecting valued relationships. Deciding to be silent in this case is also about valuing peace and harmony in relationships, as well as with the collective. There are those who do not want to upset the 'family', especially if it can have impact on those who might be considering leaving a club or on those who might be considering joining one. In any case, there are those who, in general, value peaceful relations and do not like conflict of any kind (even the 'good' kind). *"Let's avoid conflict at all costs". "I don't want to be part of any confrontation".*

Conflict is inevitable, but nonetheless, there are those who will act as peace keepers and others who will avoid it and *'run for the hills'* if there is any sign of it. After all, many members join Rotary to do good, have fun and get away from the rat race and conflicts of their workplace.   So when the *"shit starts flying"*, there are those who will advocate for peaceful and respectful relations or they will just lay low, quietly waiting until the storm is over. It is less about valuing relationships and more about avoiding uncomfortable, stressful conflict. When there are signs of escalating conflict, there are those who keep avoiding. There are those Rotarians, then, who will

stay away from club meetings for a while and then may decide not to return at all. It is what many value most – peaceful relations and a peaceful setting. If only it could be that easy. Some members just do not want to get involved with any sort of conflict. They are in Rotary to do humanitarian work, not deal with the headaches of differences of opinions and agendas like at their workplace.

3. ***Speechless in Awe.*** Rotary is a large and relatively complex organization. There is much to learn about it. New members can remain speechless for quite some time before understanding Rotary and the club they have joined. Even when asked to join in and share their opinion, a newcomer hesitates. *"Just thinking before I speak." "Keeping quiet until I know more."* One of the problems with this hesitance to speak up and join in is that during this quiet time, there can be missed opportunity for a club to connect with these new members to ensure they will stay around for the long run. New member orientation and education is a much needed step before members meaningfully engage in Rotary and play an active role. If this is not done well, new members can lose interest and may quietly move on to another organization.

   In some instances, I have noted that the situation with newer members is not that they are not ready, but instead, they are overwhelmed and holding out to avoid getting into the fray of more work, especially if there are notable differences of opinions of how that work should be done. There have been times newer members were speechless in awe of incidents that they had not expected in a volunteer organization. Doreen almost ended her membership within the first couple of months. Doreen was taken by surprise when a fellow Rotarian advised her that she was not doing what she

was supposed to do and he suggested he would take over to ensure the project succeeded. Doreen was shocked to be spoken to and treated in such a manner. She almost quit. She persevered out of respect for her close friend who had invited her to Rotary. Doreen became overwhelmed by Rotary at first, but fellow Rotarians helped her hang in there to one day better appreciate Rotary.

Clubs are taking better care to recognize when a new member may be getting sidetracked or slipping through the cracks. In recent years, better efforts are made to encourage a new member to learn more about Rotary and to get more involved sooner. However, sometimes too much effort is made to get members doing more and they become overwhelmed, so much so they quietly retreat from Rotary.

4. ***Avoiding "Tipping Points".***   Related to "avoiding burning bridges" and "keeping the peace", with this strategic thought process the difference is in the conscientious cost-benefit analysis. There can be a significant expenditure of time, effort and heart put into advancing a particular agenda or offering up resistance to one. After a tiring experience or two, if early indications are that there is resistance to your thinking, you may decide, depending on the matter and your personal investment in the story, to just drop the matter altogether.   It may be that "*it is not worth the headache or heartache*" (this time).   Members weigh the odds of how counter arguing might result, and considering the costs and benefits, decide not to pursue their goal. Self-preservation and considerations for healthy relations weigh in more heavily on some more than others because of what they may have on their plate from a variety of sources, not just with their volunteer commitments. Also if experiences involve

conflict that becomes 'heated', there is an increased desire to avoid such energy

sapping circumstances and the potential for the conflict to escalate. There can be

angst about how bad a situation can get when too much is said or how it is said.

We know the stories; society struggles to understand how "tipping points"

(Gladwell, 2000) happen and how to avoid when a dramatic incident is triggered,

which results in detrimental circumstances. Rather instinctually, when a conversation

starts to become heated, many will be making a mental note of when and how they

can exit the situation (wanting to keep the peace and avoid burning bridges). But,

there will also be those thinking that there is a 'battle' that needs to take place.

Silence or silencing may likewise be the trigger to a tipping point.   It is tough to

decide what to do and it is much easier to just say nothing. It is human nature to

follow the path of least resistance rather than addressing serious conflict; however, in

the silence of no resolve, a tipping point can happen. Most fear the worse, like a

resignation from Rotary; alternatively, there can finally be some resolve to an

escalating problem.

Howard became so frustrated with the lack of participation of the most recent

fundraiser that he openly shared his disappointment during the weekly meeting. A

fellow member responded somewhat defensively to the negative feedback and

proceeded to argue that the results of the fundraiser reflected success. Howard had

done more than his fair share. He had worked much harder than planned. He was

disappointed in the performance of some Rotarians; they had not done as much as

Howard expected they would. "Club members should have done more!" was

Howard's somewhat angry response. The fallout from the incident resulted in the low

attendance of one member and the resignation of another. This left some Rotarians

thinking that next time such a tipping point ought to be avoided at all costs. However,

there were a few others who quietly considered that it was not all bad that the tipping

point happened. There was a lot learned from that incident.

5. *Picking the Battle*. This is an extension to the strategic cost-benefit thinking done

when "avoiding the tipping point". For this silencing strategy, a member remains

quiet about an issue or will let go of a particular battle (let others have their way) as a

good tactical approach. The member patiently waits out for the battle that she / he

cares more about and with giving up on one issue, wagers to win the next one. Roger,

for instance, let go of his position on wanting the sponsorship program, anticipating

that in turn, opposing members would then feel obliged to drop their resistance to

changing meeting locations. There are limited time and effort resources; one

strategically manages how and when time and effort will be used to seek particular

goals.

Sometimes Rotarians speak up loud and clearly, making it known about how a

particular issue is important to them and how, potentially, it could even be a 'deal

breaker' if their concerns (or position) are not respected. Some members keep quiet

on a number of related issues, and then, frustration or discomfort levels reach a certain

point and finally they just have to say something. There are those members, as in

most organizations, who can often have lots to say, but when those who typically do

not say much do speak up, others tend to listen more attentively. When they do speak

up and also give fair warning of resignation considerations, and if their position is not

supported, there can be, subsequently, quite a hush come over the club. With membership numbers dangerously low, more often than not, there is accommodation given to ward off a threat of losing (another) member. With further reflection, some members consider how threats of resignation may be a tactic that some use as a 'bargaining chip' to win a well picked battle.

6. ***Undercommunicating.*** There are those in Rotary that just prefer not to say much and live more by just doing. They decide in a more strategic way that the best course of action is to just get on with it and put into action what others may just talk about. They believe what can work well is to just do, and role model what needs to happen. This can work; but, then it can be problematic when those actions take place without care or consideration of what others think or feel.

It can be a deliberate strategy to just act quietly. It is believed to be a waste of time to get input before proceeding with the action plan. It is pre-mediated that if actions do not meet approval with others after the fact, well then it is *"easier to ask for forgiveness than permission". "We'll cross that bridge if we have to"*. After the fact, the fallout can be that fellow Rotarians are frustrated by actions taken without collaboration. The critical feedback after the fact is that what transpired should have been done more transparently. In response to the criticism and requests for accountability, the undercommunicating Rotarians justify their actions with such explanations as *"there was no time to get input; a decision had to be made; we saw no need to involve others; we knew what had to be done"*. I conceptualized in this

regard that some in Rotary were consciously undercommunicating in order to execute their own agendas and to avoid the hassle of dealing with competing agendas.

Sometimes actions taken without due consideration of others resulted in unintended consequences.   In reference to a number of similar incidents, the response to undercommunicating behaviors included uncomfortable silences, which in a couple of instances were unpleasantly broken with disproving confrontation.   There was also the consequence of a dead silence when someone resigned from the club without further mention by members. There were many incidents where undercommunicating and the lack of collaboration resulted in negative consequences.

Giving and receiving feedback are invaluable processes. They are behavioral actions that are important in any organizational setting to know what is happening, to understand how well things are working and to make adjustments if needed. This is commonly known in Rotary, but there can also be too much talk and not enough action – a common complaint by some Rotarians. However, most Rotarians agree that finding the right balance makes the difference, because they have experienced how in silence serious misunderstandings can result when not enough communication has taken place. *"Why wasn't the membership advised beforehand?" "Why wasn't the matter brought before the Board before action was taken?" "There needs to be more communication between the membership and club leadership"*.   In Rotary, these are commonly spoken phrases, but too often after the (f)act.

7. ***Balancing the Good, the Bad and Political Correctness***. For some in Rotary, it is a more technical, rational, business-like decision (sometimes even legal) when

weighing the costs and benefits in deciding what to say and how much on various matters. For others, it can be more about struggling with strongly held values. Backgrounds and cultural experiences can weigh heavily on Rotarians and how they interact. The traditional, historic influences of Rotary play a role in what happens. From the data of this research context, there were prominent religious, military and political undertones for how clubs functioned and how decisions were made. *"Silence is golden". "Let's keep the Peace". "Majority Rules". "Being a good Christian". "Honesty is the best policy"*. The list could go on for so many expressions and *"rules of thumb"'* that Rotarians used as terms of reference to guide them. Many of these expressions and related behaviors resulted in Rotarians saying less about what was foremost on their minds. Members hesitated and often stopped themselves from openly and honestly sharing how they thought or felt, influenced by the challenge of balancing the good, the bad and what could impact Rotary in a negative way.

8. ***Noble Silencing.*** In Rotary, with the high standards of the "Four Way Test", Rotarians are to be truthful and fair with others in all that they do. Most Rotarians, I believe (through experience) do follow this golden rule. Sometimes, however, Rotarians will present a perspective in a way that technically a truth has been told, but in 'reality', part of the story that has been omitted or *slightly revised or distorted. Also, other members in the know are silent to altering the story as presented. This is less about strategically silencing to advance an agenda and more about silencing to prevent a negative outcome or to protect a relationship, the club or Rotary in general.

It is not silencing to avoid burning a bridge but more about thoughtful considerations of how someone or Rotary could be unnecessarily hurt if truthful details of the incident were publically presented.

An example of this was when an older Rotarian had failed to collect funds as she had committed to obtain for a fundraising event.   Fellow Rotarians decided to pool funds to cover for this loss of projected funding. In club reporting, these details were not disclosed and it was simply reported that funds were collected as planned and used to seed the most recent fundraising project. This noble silencing, in this case, seemed to be, indeed, noble. However, what then happened because of the noble silencing, incidents like this could be repeated. What actually had happened was not fully known or addressed to prevent a repeat occurrence.

*** To note: this silencing tactic was added after the comparative review of literature.**

9. ***Silencing in Futility.* "***Tired of trying to be heard*".** It may only be one's own perception that no one is listening. It does not matter. The results are that you feel what you have to say does not matter to others and so you go silent. There is little to no response to what you have said in the past, so why say anything more? This may evolve into an ongoing sentiment that it is a waste of time to speak up. Fatigue and apathy can, quite naturally, contribute to silencing. It is less about making a choice of *"it's not worth the battle"*, and more about a debilitating consequence of believing you will not be listened to and even if you were heard, it would not make any difference. *"No sense making the effort."* Reluctantly and restlessly you remain silent.

In Rotary, part of the silence in futility can be from feeling intimidated and outnumbered. A member somberly realizes that there is little hope their voice will make a difference. A member knows that there are but a few who may feel and think as he/she does. There is no point in advancing what you really think when you are outnumbered and "*majority rules*". New members are in this boat in Rotary. So are others. Bravely, one can dare to be David against Goliath, but there are few who will attempt to fill those shoes. Putting up with some heckling may not be the worst of it. There is also the much needed energy that can easily get burned up, which needs to be saved for the real workplace. Why would anyone in their right mind want to go to battle in such an intimidating circumstance– and you are only a volunteer! Bravely and generously some members make an effort to speak up to make a difference. However, others are too intimidated to say anything at all.

"Might as well just keep my mouth shut." This is how Veronica thought. She had made several attempts to change the way members were inducted into the club. After several attempts to alter a by-law in this regard, she was becoming increasingly frustrated with the resistance to what she thought would improve the process. When a member passionately protested with an angry tone about how the change was not needed, Veronica ceased to persist.

10. ***Deliberately Disconnecting.*** Strategically, one might be decidedly beyond a certain point of no return, but remain with Rotary in body only, for at least awhile. It is part of a silent retreat strategy that will end with a resignation from a club to take place at the right time. It is a work in progress. Choosing a right time is to minimize any

damaging impact to the club or Rotary and not to "burn any bridges". It is best to avoid having questions raised, or any possible conflict about your Rotary membership and commitment can come into play. As a researcher, I observed the pattern that begins as a gradual withdrawal because of discontent. Then a quiet period of time goes by and the news is reported. A member has resigned and the reason offered for their departure is one of the more acceptable, understandable reasons. The 'party-line' reason is given so as not to offend anyone or hurt the club or Rotary in any way. The President reports that Jordan has left our club because he was just *"too busy with family and work"*. There are typically promises to stay in touch, to attend a meeting when they can and hopeful comment made that they will rejoin when life is less busy. However, during the course of this research, I did not observe this happening.

Silencing in Summary

From the above delineation of rationales, behavioral goals and circumstances, one gets a synopsis of the variables contributing to the strategic decision-making component of self-silencing. This explanatory analysis, grounded in the research data, reflected a variety of reasons why members chose to engage in self-silencing. Generally speaking, members decided not to share thoughts and feelings in order to avoid a predicted undesired consequence or in hopes of achieving a desired one. Sometimes the reasons for self-silencing were more personal in nature, like to protect a relationship, or more altruistic to avoid a perceived negative consequence for the club or RI.   Sometimes the silence was quite deliberate to covertly engage, while other times silence was chosen in futility. Having garnered understanding on why participants were self-silencing and because I was not finding much new in the data in this regard, I began to direct data

139

collection efforts towards examining the impact that strategic self-silencing was having on the organization.

Organizational Impact of Strategic Self-Silencing

From the data, it was increasingly evident how members were withholding valuable feedback about their Rotary experience. I recognized the theoretical connections of how these behaviors were resulting in much of the confusion and unrest in resolving challenges with membership. The organization was not and is still not getting a full picture of what is happening with membership. Accordingly, the consequence of this state of affairs is that with all the silencing going on, clubs (RI) have been handicapped in determining ways to improve upon membership. As clubs try to develop strategies to retain long-standing dedicated members or to recruit new ones, the process is compromised when the leadership is not fully informed about how Rotarians feel and think about membership. As found in the data, this is particularly reflected in the continued use of slightly updated and adapted membership strategies that have not been effective enough in improving membership commitment, attracting new members or holding on to some newly joining members.

Over the years, RI had done some of its own research to understand better the challenges facing clubs in terms of retention and growing membership. Likewise, many individual clubs engage in periodic surveys of their members to better understand and improve upon their policies and practices for improving membership experience. Thus, to some degree there has been an avenue to garner how members feel and one would think that such feedback could be the beginning of changes. Unfortunately, this has not

been the experience; this was not found in the data. I wondered why and thus proceeded to collect data to find out.

I did more in this regard than just collect data. I decided to speak up more in my participatory role. Recall that I had discovered 'strategic self-silencing' when I too began engaging in the behavior. I realized that this was not helpful to the organization to withhold invaluable information about my experience. I felt that it was time to more consciously speak up about my own personal experience and to also share, some of the more salient theoretical discoveries from my research. As prescribed by Glaser, I did this cautiously and incrementally (Glaser, 1998, p. 250).

Research wise, a perfect opportunity to speak up presented itself when a special, members only, strategic planning session was scheduled. During this meeting a report was given based on some membership research that RI had conducted. RI has made membership a top priority in recent years and is more than ever focusing research and policy changes towards membership growth in the face of threats of declining numbers. During this important meeting, I was able to add to some related RI findings by speaking up about my own research discoveries, which I thought would give more credibility to the combined research efforts – RI's and mine and that it would be more meaningful to those concerned.

I noted the rolling of eyes reaction from some Rotarians even with RI's own research reporting on negative impressions outsiders have about Rotary and its membership. Some did not like hearing this negative feedback, but the exercise was breaking the ice to having members recognize some of the formidable challenges with

membership. During this particular meeting (and other incidents), I spoke up a bit more to share personal insights and research developments from my research.   Each time I did this, I was responded to with some defensive resistance, and at times, *pushback* from some Rotarians. I did, however, receive some support and encouragement for expressing my own personal feelings. In expressing more generally about participatory pressuring, there were Rotarians who acknowledged how this was a problem and some shared how it impacted them – but this was mostly done in private with me.

As I expressed my concerns and some of the research findings more widely in Rotary, increasingly I encountered resistance and some avoidance.   Once again, but this time more consciously, I decided to self-silence. For many of the reasons delineated in this research, strategically, I decided to speak up less. I did not like the defensive push-back I started to experience, but also, I did not want to jeopardize the research context further. It also became obvious from then on that some leading Rotarians were less interested in my research than they previously had been. I speculated that it likely was, ironically, just more of the strategic self-silencing happening, at least to some degree. It was, evidently, what was happening in the more public contexts of Rotary.

What Goes on Behind Closed Doors

Through this participatory research experience, I was able to have the opportunity to collect data for incidents and behaviors happening quietly 'behind closed doors'. Weekly Rotary meetings can be attended by Rotarians, their guests and guest speakers. Rotary fundraising and humanitarian activities are typically quite public. Committee activities are less public and then there are other Rotarian gatherings and meetings that

are conducted more privately, like Board meetings.   These more private meetings, conversations or email exchanges are often about matters that are kept more confidentially from the general public or even from the club membership-at-large. In terms of this research, such meetings, discussions and decision making about sensitive subject matters is what was categorized as *"what goes on behind closed doors"*.   I have also heard the expression used in other contexts and have used the term myself in reference to what can go on in organizational life – for what can be talked about and decided upon privately, rather than more openly and transparently in the wider organizational context.

Through this research endeavour, I was able to collect data either directly or indirectly about some of what was not openly spoken about in the more public context of Rotary. On a few occasions, I also collected data that I do not think was intended for me to know – through accidental forwarding of emails and other not so accidental ways that information gets around in an organization. I was able to understand more about what I was experiencing more than most newly joining Rotarian members because of the research I had conducted before I actually joined. This precursory research activity was instrumental in my discovering the self-silencing behavior and also giving me insight into the notion and existence of *"inner circles"*.

By virtue of the extended period of this research and becoming increasingly engaged in the membership, I was able to have more access to some of what members wrote about via emails.   Having exposure to inner circles of Rotary meant that I was able to dig deeper into the 'ground' to collect data and unearth what was buried under the

surface because of strategic self-silencing. From this in-depth research experience and data analysis, I have concluded that what may be the most significant effect of the SSS in Rotary is the very existence and level of inner circle activity that goes on not so quietly behind closed doors. I am also left wondering whether, conversely, what goes on behind closed doors (within inner circles) is what also causes or helps maintain levels of SSS and the problematic role of participatory pressuring?

Whatever it be cause or effect, in either case, with comparisons of data I was able to identify more properties for both of the sub-categories of SSS and participatory pressuring behind some closed doors of inner circles. With some relief, because of using Glaser's GT, I was able to generalize and avoid providing confidential and worrisome details about sensitive data in this regard. I discuss more about the discoveries extending from inner circles in the chapters to follow when I present and compare conceptual research data with those from a review of the literature.

Emergence to Divergence

I continued to collect data about participatory pressuring and strategic self-silencing as long as I continued to identify more behavioral sub-categories, dimensions and properties thereof. Once there was no new data adding to the developing theory, this signaled the time to diverge from only collecting data from the research context of Rotary to also compare conceptual discoveries with the scholarly literature. In Chapter 7, I get into the review of related research and report on initial comparative analyses.

Chapter 7: A Comparative Review of the Literature

Resolving and Revolving Methodologically

As adamantly prescribed by Glaser (1978, 1998) once I began this thesis research, I resolved not to contaminate the process by any further review of the literature before or during most of the data collecting and analyzing processes. I strived for remaining open to what was there to be found in the data, which resulted in my going down an unfamiliar research path. As the process unfolded, I was absorbed into the repetitive and revolving process and writing memos about patterns in the data.

Because staying away from extant research was such a critical and meaningful component to this research, I decidedly chose to present the preceding three chapters with an almost exclusive presentation of concepts and theory that emerged from the comparative analyses of data from the research context of Rotary. I presented the reader with the conceptual discoveries from my participatory research efforts. I included a few references to older literature that I was previously exposed to prior to commencing this research, as I recalled it during the data analysis. However, I did not do a formal review of related literature until substantive theory was well before me.

As recommended by Glaser (1998), I read unrelated research to enhance my theoretical sensitivity throughout the entire process. In fact, at times I became distracted by (very) different research problems and thought that I could have written a few theses during this extended course of study. It was easy enough for me to become distracted, but I remained open to discovery while I struggled with comparing data and concepts for which I had very little background knowledge. This was an exciting part of the process;

although, I also worried about how the developing theory would fit into academia. It was daunting that I had discovered, named, and memoed so much about two social processes for which I had very little theoretical background. I knew that the discoveries were meaningful; after all, I was personally immersed in the substantive context.

The only time that I strayed from keeping away from related extant theory was when I prematurely googled "participatory pressuring". However, I did not find anything of consequence pertaining to my so called concept. I was left wondering whether I had chosen a good concept label for this category. This initial 'sneak peak' had no impact other than challenging me to think more about the category name I had chosen. Thereafter, I continued onward with the process, committed to avoiding any temptation to look at related literature until deducing the time was right. As I learned and engaged more in the GT way, I gave my best effort to rigorously follow the constant comparing methodology and letting the data (only) lead the way and not beyond—not until it was the appropriate time for looking around and beyond the boundaries of the research context and the developing theory.

Cautiously, Next Stepping into the Literature Review
The time had come. I had exhausted theoretical sampling paths. Data incidents were increasingly repetitive and not suggesting anything substantially new or different for the categories or their interconnecting relationships. A number of times, I put off getting into the literature when I would discover another PP or SSS behavior. I would then spend more time in focusing research efforts to gain a great understanding of its implication. However, new developments like this were happening less often and the period of time

between such discoveries became increasingly longer. I excitedly, but nervously, decided it was (about) time to seek out what it all possibly meant compared to existing theories.

In terms of Glaser's GT (1998), the review of the literature represents an opportunity in the research process to sample more data that may be relevant to further develop the theory. In terms of theoretical sampling choices, I decided to first focus my next research efforts towards examining more about strategic self-silencing, as this was the core category. From the research and membership experience (from all the data), I sensed that much of what was happening and problematic in Rotary had mostly to do with the silencing going on. It was what kept me wanting to research more to uncover some of the mystery about what was really going on.

Conveniently, the next theoretical sampling tactic was simply to do a google scholar search using the "strategic self-silencing" term to identify any related area of research with which I could begin to compare. Even with advanced literature review searches, I never did find a close referencing (in terms of terminology) to "participatory pressuring", but for "strategic self-silencing" I found closely related research topics. Most interesting of all, my first sampling of the literature was on a body of research in the field of psychology involving the behavior of "Silencing the Self" (Jack, 1991). At first, I felt a sort of disappointment to find out that I was not the first to have studied this closely named derivative of my concept. However, once I became more deeply involved in the literature, I was excited to learn about how this body of research was related to mine. There were interesting theoretical connections, but the research on "Silencing the Self" was very different from my own.

This leading sampling into the research area of "silencing the self" denoted a starting point for a more formal review of the literature. It represented a turning point to examine comparatively how data from the literature might further modify the conceptual discoveries as presented in Chapters 4-6. I decided not to weave comparative references or developments from the extant literature into those chapters, but chose instead to leave the conceptual discoveries as they had emerged from comparative data analyses from primarily the participatory research process. I decided to present any further theory developments in chapters to follow to distinguish between discoveries made before and after doing the review of related literature.

Because remaining open to the data and not pre-maturely contaminating the process with other theories was such an important part of the methodology, it made sense to me to have the thesis organized to reflect this. There was also the 'methodological questioning incident' that also influenced my decision in this regard. In retrospect, I believe this incident represented one of the more important methodological insights to be shared from this research experience. I explain why in the section to follow.

Methodological Questioning Incident

I had never heard of the "Silencing the Self" concept before my discovering it during that initial google scholar search. I declare this again for good reason— because I was *questioned* in this regard by a Glaserian GT academic. It was less a question and more like a suspicious suggestion when I presented my initial theoretical discoveries on PP and SSS and the "silencing the self" connection to the literature. In response to a brief overview of my research, this well-respected expert of Glaser's GT wondered if I had been previously exposed to the silencing literature prior to commencing my research. At

148

first, I was somewhat speechless by the insinuating comment, but then I realized that such a question would understandably arise considering the close thematic link to my research. In retrospect, the questioning incident highlighted for me the sensitivity towards any pre-exposure to theories.

The questioning incident helped me to better appreciate the importance of not indulging into extant literature before or too soon into the process, especially after discovering how connected Jack's research was related to my thesis. This was quite meaningful to me. I really (honestly) did not have any prior knowledge about 'silencing the self' or organizational silence before starting this research. What I discovered was not biased by a pre-exposure to theory in this area. In this regard, I remained confident that even if I were challenged this way by a non-believer, I trusted Glaser's declarations that if I followed his approach, the resulting theory could stand on its own substantively and meaningfully connect and contribute to other academic research (Glaser, 1998). The suspicious questioning incident reinforced my decision to present the conceptual discoveries in Chapters 4-6 as I did. I wanted to clearly distinguish the theory generated from my research efforts (with minor exceptions) in contrast to the comparative impact extant theory had after the fact. The comparative relevance that reviewing the literature had on the developing theory is found in remaining chapters.

In presenting the comparative review, I illuminate how my research relates to and may contribute to different research areas. Through this process, I gained further insights into my own developing theory. The review to follow is not an exhaustive delineation of all possible related research areas. Likewise, I do not provide any in-depth review and

comparatives with any one particular data source in the literature. I reviewed more generally some of the most relevant theory pertaining to the conceptual discoveries of this research. I begin with Jack's work on silencing the self. I followed conceptual leads from Jack's work to different research areas on silence and silencing. From one research source to another, I found conceptual clues (subject content) and did advanced searches to lead me to other areas of research; I followed a sort of snowballing sampling path, constantly comparing data from my research to the literature review data.

More on Self-Silencing: A Silent Killer?

The body of theory relating to "silencing the self", as previously mentioned, is situated in the field of psychology and stems from the pioneering research and initial book written by Dr. Dana Crowley Jack, "Silencing the Self: Women and Depression" (1991) and her development of the Silencing the Self Scale (1991, 1999). Jack's research has focused on learning about mental depression and how the behavior (behavioral trait) of silencing the self plays a role in the symptomatic presentation of the disease. Her research has highlighted the importance of relationships for women, emphasizing that if women are inauthentic in a valued relationship and quiet about their feelings, this puts them at risk for depression. Contrastingly, even though there is research reporting men self-silence more than women, men apparently do not suffer the same unhealthy consequence. Men and women also self-silence for different reasons. There exist interesting gender discrepancies in the epidemiology of depression and in the gendered research of self- silencing (Jack and Ali, 2010; Parker-Pope, 2007; Ussher and Janette Perz, 2010).

The growing body of theory in this research area, its evolution and relevance to my research is represented in the recent publication of "Silencing the Self Across the Cultures: Depression and gender in the social world" edited by Jack and Alisha Ali (2010). The studies and editorial analyses contained in this book reflect pointedly to the role of context in relation to women's emotional distress and how historical and present day social and gender inequalities are part of routine experiences (globally) – which, in turn, are closely connected to the body of research about having voice versus self-silencing. Related psychological theories are juxtaposed with feminist perspectives and the connections and disconnections analyzed among the varying conceptual frames of silence, silencing, silenced, and of course, 'voice'. The research also describes how self-silencing and silencing begin as thoughts and feelings are suppressed to avoid conflict, to protect a relationship (as were found in my research) or to protect one's own security (not found in my research). The silencing can also stem from externalized self-perception when women judge themselves by external standards not their own. Likewise, women also accept a divided self, an outward compliant self, living up to prescribed gender roles and the inner self, who is becoming increasingly angry and tired from holding back her true self (Jack and Dill, 1992).

Although experienced at a personal level, the resulting feelings of loss of self, of being lost, isolated and depressed, the implications and impact are also at the cultural, social level:

> A male-centered world tells women who they are or who they should be, especially in intimate relationships. Self-silencing is prescribed by norms, values, images dictating what women are "supposed' to be like: pleasing, unselfish, loving. ….When followed, these self-silencing relational schemas create a vulnerability to depression by directing women to defer to the needs of others,

censor self-expression, repress anger, inhibit self-directed action and judge the self against a culturally defined "good woman". In tandem with women's wider social equality, such beliefs can keep a woman entrapped in negating situations as she blames herself for the problems she encounters (Jack and Ali, 2010, p. 5).

The above excerpt highlights the fine line between whether one really makes a strategic choice to be silent, as found in my research, or that resulting silence is caused by prescribed behaviors, cultural and structural circumstances imposed on others, especially women. In any case, the correlations between self-silencing and depression found in this scholarship are most concerning, especially for women.

Besides this troublesome connection between silencing and anxiety disorders, there are also research studies that have linked self-silencing to other psychological and physical health risks. In such research, gender differences are 'dearly' noted, as a lot of these research studies examine the close relationship of marriage.   In one study on heart disease involving more than 3500 people, it was found that women who self-silenced during conflict with their spouse [compared with women who did not], had four times the risk of dying. This was not the case with men. Also, to the surprise of study researchers, marriage satisfaction or disagreement levels in the relationship were not linked to heart problems for men or women. From the New York Times article reporting on this:

> The tendency to bottle up feelings during a fight is known as self-silencing. For men, it may simply be a calculated but harmless decision to keep the peace. But when women stay quiet, it takes a surprising physical toll. "When you're suppressing communication and feelings during conflict with your husband, it's doing something very negative to your physiology, and in the long term it will affect your health," said Elaine Eaker, an epidemiologist in Gaithersburg, Md., who was the study's lead author. "This doesn't mean women should start throwing plates at their husbands, but there needs to be a safe environment where both spouses can equally communicate" (Parker-Pope, 2007).

In that close, micro-organizational context of marriage, evidently, women need to openly and safely express their thoughts and feelings; it is not good for their health if they do not. Silence, thus, can be sickening and a possible silent killer.

Learning about self-silencing and its connection to depression was an eye opener for me. Yes, I think it is generally known that it is healthy to express one's feelings and thoughts, honestly and openly and to be one's authentic self. However, I was not aware of the possible health consequences for women if you did not. This learning represented an important turning point in my research. I found myself then thinking anew about and comparing gendered research that I had put aside to do this research. I also started to think more about the data bites I gathered during membership experiences, also sidelined as I focused on developing a theory that, at least at first, had little relevance to gender. This gender twist had me thinking more about possible theoretical implications. In chapter 8, I provide further comparative analyses and a more integrative account that includes this gender implication from silencing-the-self research. To follow, I continue with a comparative review of other related scholarship.

Spiral of Silence Theory and Self-Censorship

After reviewing the health related research on self-silencing, I moved on to sample data on variations of this subject and its relevance in organizations. In starting to piece together strands of related research, I gained a sense of the multi-disciplinary nature of silence and the theory from my own research. Particularly helpful to my sorting out more about silence and organization was to review a number of recent theses to become acquainted with the classical and extant theory that might connect and add to my

research. I was given advice by research experts to seek out thesis research as this is where one can find an extensive literature view that also identifies current research gaps in a particular area. I was excited to find some recent theses about silence and organizations, indicating to me a possible growing interest for research in this area.

In reading the theses of Ryan (2011), I found myself into another unfamiliar research area, that of mass communication. In this research, the author sought to identify different types of sanctions that contribute to people choosing to self-censor their strongly held beliefs, values and opinions. Ryan relied heavily on the foundational research work in public opinion by Noelle-Neumann (1974, 1993) who coined the theoretical term of "spirals of silence". The term is used to describe how varying types of silencing can become increasingly pervasive in an organization. It is a theory about how people are deterred from being open and honest about their opinions in fear of the threat of reprisal or isolation if they express a minority opinion among a majority one. Henceforth, majority opinions thrive while minority opinions, often considered dissenting, become increasingly diminished.

Ryan (2011) mentions some of the different terms that are used in related theoretical frameworks for the varying types and micro-processes of silencing behaviors. For his own work, Ryan used the term "self-censorship" to collectively consider all the different silencing terms that represent the "behavioral choice to refrain from speaking out about an issue or topic that is sensitive or may elicit some negative reaction" (p. 9). Ryan provides an insightful overview of the multidisciplinary connections and disconnects of related theory and definitional challenges in this area:

The subject of self-censorship is primarily researched within the disciplines of mass communication, public opinion (Hayes et al, 2005a) and journalism (Levinson, 2003), but there are threads within the fields of psychology and social psychology such as communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1977) and groupthink (Janis, 1982), philosophy (Foucault, 1975; Loury, 1994), business ethics such as whistle-blowing, business management such as organizational communication, scientific and academic policy, library administration, the arts and entertainment, and so on. Most of these specific research paths rarely if ever intersect or cross-cite and thus often do not even consider the findings of one another (Ryan, p. 10).

This account summarizes what I was discovering in my own cursory review of the literature and why I struggled to determine where to begin and where to stop with this literature review exercise. There were threads of silence / silencing theory to be found in so many fields of study. The above quote also highlights the need for more research on silencing behaviors and how important it is to look at related theory across the disciplines, especially for organization and management purposes.

Ryan (2011) also reported on different forms of sanctions – the negative reactions to speaking-up, and how they influence self-censorship, above and beyond the fear of isolation. Operationally, the connection is made to Noelle-Neuman's (1993) definition of public opinion as a means or mechanism of social control and conformity, but Ryan questions the defining parameters of the concepts involved. In particular, Ryan theoretically challenges the definitional notion of self-censorship, whether it is an act, behavior, choice, decision, state of mind, or about control and whether it considers situational factors—context is everything, some say. After much theoretical deliberation, Ryan decided upon his working definition to be:

> Self-Censorship is the personal choice or the decision to withhold, modify, or misrepresent one's genuine unmitigated opinions, knowledge, preferences, beliefs, values, attitudes, or identity from any audience including an individual, in an actual or potential, anticipated or

unanticipated, communicative setting. This decision may be motivated by perceived danger or threat of sanction to themselves or to others that might result from speaking out. Self-censorship also includes the avoidance of settings or situations where one may be encouraged or pressured to express or reveal one's opinion, belief, attitude, perspective, or identity (p. 13).

Interestingly enough, within this encompassing definition, one can identify some common linkages with strategic self-silencing and also with participatory pressuring. In fact, in reviewing this literature and comparing it to my own developing theory, I theorized that the participatory pressuring going on in Rotary was like sanctioning behavior and self-censorship was similar to the concept of strategic self-silencing.

Comparatively, in my research, I uncovered more strategies / "motivations" to why participants make the decision to keep quiet. Like self-censorship, there was also that important behavioral element of avoidance as a form of self-silencing in my conceptual discovery. The notion of sanctions had me thinking about, particularly, *"pushback"* experienced by Rotarians and that I, myself, experienced. In stark contrast, though, in Rotary there was little to do about fearful or threatening behaviors or consequences as variables influencing decisions to self-silence. In Rotary, the motivating variables to self-silence were more related to thoughtful, strategic considerations about the possible impact on interpersonal relationships and on the organization. Also, self-silencing tactics were engaged to resist and avoid the uncomfortable and stressful pressuring to participate more or to think a certain way. Ryan's study also identified what motivated people to speak up, but this was not found in the data of my research. In Rotary there was just so much silencing going on, but very little recognition of this.

Undiscussables and Organizational Silence

From a different research angle, I proceeded to compare data about which topics organizational members kept silent or were silenced (censored). Down this scholarly path, I began with Klonsky's thesis (2010) to review research related to the term "undiscussables". I learned from Klonsky's literature review that this term originated in research done by Argyris, Putnam and Smith (1985), which was further developed by Ryan and Oestreich (1991). The term is generally used to describe how certain topics of discussion are avoided in the workplace. Subject matter related to management problems, performance, conflict, bad news, personal problems, etc, are not openly discussed. There is hesitance and even fear among employees to speak of such issues openly even with superiors, where help and resolve with sensitive or threatening matters could be sought. There can be 'an elephant in the room' but employees remain silent (Klonsky, 2010).

No matter what the 'elephant in the room' may be, of greater importance seems to be the hesitance and negative feelings against speaking up and the resulting silence. Milliken, Morrison & Hewlin (2003) reported on the concerns employees had for speaking up on certain issues. The top four concerns related to – fears of retaliation and punishment, being viewed negatively, damaging a relationship and feelings of futility (no sense speaking up as it would not make any difference). Comparatively, fears of retaliation and punishment were not found in the data I collected. Also, I did not observe much in terms of members concerned about being viewed negatively. What seemed to matter more with Rotarians was that they did not like to disappoint and they struggled to figure out how to avoid letting others and the organization down. In this regard, predominantly, the decision to self-silence with Rotarians had a lot to do with protecting

157

relationships. It was less about their image or damaging a relationship, and much more about maintaining or growing the relationship. Self-silencing in Rotary also reflected similar beliefs that there was no sense speaking up because there was little hope that voicing what they thought or felt would make a difference.

Other research findings about undiscussables indicate that in silence and fears of speaking up there can be, consequently, a decreasing confidence in leaders, a withdrawal of loyalty and employee turnover (Ryan and Oestreich, 1991). Comparatively, in the silence of Rotary, members were also withdrawing by decreasing their participation levels or worse, resigning from Rotary indefinitely. I also observed how at times current club leaders were blamed for decreasing membership engagement, but this was not openly discussed. Leaders felt the pressure and responsibility to do something about it, but were evidently handicapped to know what to do.

Following this similar vein of research and theory, the concept of "organizational silence" was the label first introduced to describe the widespread practice by organization members not to openly discuss certain matters in organization. Morrison and Milliken's (2000) foundational article described organizational silence as the shared, pervasive perspective by organizational members that speaking up is unwise. It operates in a more systemic way as organizational members keep quiet to avoid perceived negative feedback (sanction, *pushback*). They anticipate that the feedback is not wanted and that it is futile to offer their personal opinions. Through this conceptual lens, the silence is less about why individuals self-silence (as it was found more predominantly in my research) and more about the contextual variables that contribute to and reinforce the silencing.

Organizational silence is not about the collective sum of individuals self-silencing, but rather it pertains to the systemic forces that are at play deterring honest and open communications. When it is widely believed that speaking up is futile and / or dangerous, the organization suffers from a "climate of silence" (Morrison and Milliken, 2000, p. 708). Contributing to this climate of silence, Morrison and Milliken (2000) argue, are managerial assumptions that employees are self-interested and untrustworthy and need to be controlled as subordinates by the managers who know best. It is also assumed by managers that in the peaceful quiet of unity, agreement and consensus, disagreement and conflict are to be avoided. Organizational silence is favored. From the data, peaceful silence does seem to be what is favored in Rotary, but RI leaders do not hold assumptions like managers, as Morrison and Milliken (2000) propose. This was not found in the data. There can be respectful disagreements, but generally, Rotarians avoid serious conflict to protect relationships. Why and how silence happens in Rotary is different, but nonetheless, the level and impact of silence are similarly disconcerting.

How pervasive the silence can be in organizations is reflected in "chilling stories and figures, telling us that the culture of silence is a powerful organizational reality" (De Maria, 2006, p. 224). An interesting example of how pervasive silence can be was reflected in research conducted on the "code of silence" of police (Trautman, 2000, as cited in De Maria, 2006). Of a subsample of 1017 police recruits, 79% acknowledged the existence of a code of silence and 52% were not bothered by its existence. From the subsample of 2698 officers, 46% said they witnessed colleague wrongdoing, but remained silent about it. Considering the research context is where addressing wrongdoing is an institutional mission, it is shocking to know employees kept quiet about

wrongdoings. If there is this much silencing going on in an organization whose mission and employees' duty is to investigate, uncover and pass on the truth, I wondered about just how much employee silencing was happening in other organizations.

Employee Silence

Under the label of "employee silence", research in this area also examines silence in organizations in terms of the absence of voice (Pinder and Harlos, 2001). As it seems with most of the conceptual definitions surrounding studies on silence, definitions on employee silence vary and, evidently, are still developing. Brinsfield (2009) drew attention to the differential construct of employee silence to more clearly define it, to identify its dimensions and to develop measures. Of significance in this work was sorting out what employee silence is and what it is not:

> Employee silence is conceptualized in the extant literature as the intentional withholding of work-related information based on a variety of different underlying motives (Pinder and Halos, 2001; Van Dyne, Ang, and Botero, 2003). It is this intentionality to use silence as a means of fulfilling an underlying motive that differentiates *employee silence* from silence associated with merely an absence of voice. Similarly, silence arising from simply not having anything to say, or the natural pauses embedded in typical verbal discourse do not constitute forms of *employee silence* because they also lack this aspect of motive-driven intentionality (Brinsfield, p. 2).

With this attention on motive-driven intentionality, Brinsfield identified different forms of employee silence (and subsequently measures thereof) with their different underlying motives. Motives to silence and motives to voice are closely connected. Given the strong, graduated connection between voice and silence (Hirschman, 1970), and that they are not considered binary opposites (Neuwirth, Frederick, and Mayo, 2007), Brinsfield grounded his research work on a review of the conceptual connections for both voice and silence in relation to several differentiating parameters, including the motives. The

160

motive-driven intentionality of employees' silence is much like the strong thematic role for Rotarian strategizing when engaging in participatory pressuring and self-silencing.

From Brinsfield's research, one learns that motives for employee silencing and voicing can be conflicting and also exclusively for one or the other. Motives for silencing or voicing can be influenced by different situational variables and by individual characteristics. This research, like others (but, unlike mine), advanced how motives for employee silencing are often related to the threat or fear of isolation or reprisal (as in organizational silence). Brinsfield (2009) proposes (in theory) a diverse range of motives for employees silencing, and there were comparative linkages. However, for the most part, motives were different from the strategic rationales of the volunteer members of RI. The differences between employees' motives for silencing and SSS for volunteers thus likely have much to do with the non-profit versus for profit contexts.

Brinsfield (2009) advanced the need for greater empirical research in this area, which for the most part, has relied on more conceptual work than empirical. Although stressing employee silence as a distinct construct area for study, Brinsfield also made reference to how employee silence can extend into group and team silence and how it can become a factor in a "climate of silence" and "organizational silence". Deliberate withholding of invaluable information is problematic at many levels.

Employee Voice, Culture and Leadership

The need for voicing of information within an organization and for it to flow upward, horizontally and downward is commonly known to make a difference in decision making and meeting goals. Organizational feedback is critical for avoiding serious

161

problems. Considering the traditional hierarchical structures of most organizations, voice, in the direction of upward communication is what most research has focused on in this area (Adelman, 2010). It is likewise what is widely publicized in cases where the lack of upward information flow was considered the cause of things going terribly wrong. If only someone had spoken-up or if only someone had listened to voiced concerns, detrimental consequences may have been avoided in such famous cases as with Enron and the Challenger disaster. It is from these cases that the concept of 'whistle blowing' and subsequent legislation to encourage voicing has evolved (De Maria, 2006). From examinations of such serious cases, it is now more commonly understood how important it is that silences are broken and organizational members speak up in the interest of the organization itself and, in many cases, the public at large.

In contrast to employee silence and yet not necessarily opposite to it, "employee voice" has been defined as the discretionary provision of information intended to improve organizational functioning to someone with the authority to act (Detert and Burris, 2007). In this definition, like that of employee silence, there is that element of employees consciously deciding to speak up or not. Within any type of organization, including less hierarchical or volunteer organizations, employee voice is necessary to pass on invaluable feedback to someone who can make a difference. As with employee silence, employee voice research relates to what motivates employees to speak up more freely or what subject matter they tend to speak up about or not (the 'undiscussables').

I found it particularly interesting to read a recent thesis about employee voice and upward communication involving leadership in health organizations (Adelman, 2010).

162

The research context was in a hospital, where the lack of information flow and mistakes can be a matter of life and death. The thesis highlights the importance of critical upward communication in this field. It is important for both positive and negative feedback to be communicated to leaders to avoid flawed perceptions and interventions in decision making. In Adelman's research (2010) it was found that there was a tendency for an overabundance of positive feedback to be communicated. In contrast, employees were hesitant to pass on what might likely be unwelcomed negative feedback. As can be typical in hierarchical organizations, "ingratiation" (Jones, 1990 as cited in Adelman, 2010) or deliberate communication distortion (Athanassiades, 1973) can be at play where lower ranking organizational members tend to over-agree and support their superiors to instrumentally gain favor, influence, security or advancement with them.

A lack of negative, but relevant information flow then results in leaders thinking that other organizational members generally share and agree with their opinions and actions, when this may not be the case. Leaders, themselves, can be part of the problem in engaging in behaviors that support and perpetuate these scenarios (Tourish and Robson, 2006). What is voiced goes hand in hand with important information left unsaid or communicated with distortion in upward, downward and lateral communication. De Maria (2006) differentiates the use of silence in terms of "legitimate and illegitimate uses of secrecy (and silence)" (p. 220). De Maria's research focused on the illegitimate use of secrecy, which is when secrets are kept to cover up wrong doings. What goes unsaid can result in negative consequences. A necessary element to leaders making informed decisions and preventing the negative consequences is to be in regular supply and receipt of all relevant and valid information, good or bad (Adelman, 2010).

163

Rotary leaders need to find better ways to know what is really going on with their members. RI and individual clubs do yearly surveys, but members are not as forthcoming in giving meaningful feedback as needed. Given that surveys are often done by fellow club members, silencing strategies prevent having more reliable findings. I learned for myself how feedback was different when I helped administer a survey as a Rotarian compared to when I did one as an outsider. Even with independent research that has been done by Rotary, Rotarians seem somewhat indifferent to findings and thus, change has been slow going. I believe part of the problem is that the right questions have not been asked in the right way. However, even if a better approach and survey tool were used, it would seem that most senior members of Rotary (who tend also to be the majority) are reluctant to listen to or give negative feedback because of their dedication and loyalty to the organization.

Responses to Decline and Dissatisfaction

Loyalty plays an important role in Rotary. With years of dedication to "Service Above Self", most long standing members remain quietly loyal to the organization. Although many of these members may not be enjoying their experiences as much, and even though they may not be as actively involved as they were in the past, they routinely renew their membership each year. These Rotarians are sentimentally attached and remain committed to the cause, through the good times and the bad. Many have connections and heartfelt investments into certain areas of Rotary work. They enjoy the fellowship and share "*like family*" sentiments among other members who have been with Rotary for as long as they have. In the survey I conducted before becoming a Rotarian, I was amazed at how many Rotarians declared that they remain members just because they

164

have been members for a long time. Despite indications of dissatisfaction with what happens in Rotary at times, these members will still loyally boast more loudly and more often about all that is good in Rotary.

There have been exceptions. After becoming a member, I learned about how some long-termed, loyal Rotarians had resigned over the years because they were not happy with changes happening in Rotary; there were a number who *exited*, for example, when women started joining and also because of time or location changes to meetings. After becoming a member, I observed how a couple of members threatened to leave Rotary after passionately expressing their dissention on a certain changing policy. However, for the most part, in this research I have found that there were many more of these long termed members who have hung on, while a disconcerting number of newcomers have resigned without saying much. This research uncovered specific reasons why this has been silently happening in Rotary.

Thesis committee members, upon first reading my thesis, alerted me to review Hirschman's (1970) work on exit, voice and loyalty. Perhaps surprisingly to my professors, I did not recall this theory during the 'no literature reviewing' stages of this research. Upon comparing this data, I readily understood the connection. Hirschman's model with the extension of neglect (Rusbult et al, 1988) and patience (Leck and Sunders, 1992) provides theoretical insight into what has been happening (and not happening) in Rotary, especially with long termed loyal members. These members do speak up more than others and may be neglectful to their membership at times (withdrawing, and less active). I have also noted their patience and strong belief that there will be better times in

Rotary, like those bygone glory days when it was an honor and such good fortune to be invited to join Rotary.

> As a rule, then loyalty holds exit at bay and activates voice. It is true that, in the face of discontent with the way things are going in an organization, an individual member can remain loyal without being influential himself, but hardly without the expectation that *someone* will act or something will happen to improve matters. (Hirschman, 1970, p. 78).

Loyalty moderating the decision to voice or to exit explains some behavioral patterns for Rotarians who have been members for a longer time. However, for members who have not been around for long, it would not. Although they begin their membership with enthusiasm, their attendance can drop off and they too can become neglectful to their Rotarian commitments. Too often, Rotarians choose to quietly exit Rotary, having little hope of improving circumstances; Rotary has lost valuable members, both long term ones and newer members.

The tensions between deciding to voice or to exit and the influencing variable of loyalty, as in Hirschman's model, are represented in the membership experience in Rotary. However, it is better to describe what has been happening in Rotary in terms of the differential and consequential ways that participants choose silencing strategies in response to participatory pressuring and resulting declines in membership. Hirschman's EVL model, as a simplified model, does not reflect the complexity in how members respond to organizational challenges in so many behavioral ways. In Rotary, what is not happening is better depicted and explained in terms of silencing rather than with voice. The addition of neglect to the model helps to explain behaviors in Rotary in terms of silencing by avoidance and reduced attendance. Conceptually, neglect refers to passive

behavior and inactivity in response to dissatisfaction. In contrast, what I observed in Rotary was more of a conscious strategic choice to avoid by self-silencing. The SSS behavior was a viable, proactive way to address the prominent use of PP. Unfortunately, too often the behavior eventually translated into exiting the organization, for a variety of possible reasons that went untold.

Coercive Persuasion, Compliance and Reactance

The conceptual portrait of participatory pressuring and strategic self-silencing, as explanatory representations of participant behavior in Rotary, were also compared with other related theoretical framings. Coercive persuasion (Schein, 1961), for instance, connects to participatory pressuring in its milder form through social influencing. However, the aim of coercive persuasion, by definition, is to gain <u>substantial</u> change in behavior and thinking. It has been described as a form of brainwashing and mind-control. In an organization of leaders who practice social influencing to a milder degree, this is not the kind of behavior that would be tolerated for long. The 'Wheels of Humanity' (Rotary) turn slowly as leaders among leaders attempt to find the time and resources to accomplish club goals. They do so by firstly and mostly asking and encouraging Rotarians to engage. The problem lies when Rotary leaders cross a continuum line of using motivational (pleasant) ways to inspire fellow members to, instead, resort to using milder forms of participatory pressuring and various combinations thereof. The result is a discomforting silence. Input and buy-in to determine what road to follow and how to travel down the road to achieve goals does not become apparent in membership silence.

Compliance-gaining (Boster and Stiff, 1984) is another concept that could be considered like participatory pressuring in the kind of results desired. There are interesting conceptual linkages with compliance and its connection to social influence. Compliance is the submissive response to influencing forces of words, actions or someone's presence and body language (Cialdini and Goldstein, 2004). According to this definition then, there is influencing going on to gain compliance in Rotary. The response of some Rotarians could be described as compliance, in that they do submit to influencing tactics and quietly 'step up to the plate' to do what is expected. Once their 'foot is in the door', club leadership resort to using the leveraging tactics of PP to get new members involved as soon as and as much as possible if the workload is pressing.

Participatory pressuring tactics can work in a way similar to the compliance gaining "foot in the door" and "door in the face" psychological techniques (Rodafinos, Vucevic and Sideridis, 2005) used to get customers to comply and buy. Combined and escalating tactics can make the difference to gain compliance or at least some degree of compliance. Conceptually, participatory pressuring depicts better what is going on in Rotary. As previously expressed in the last paragraph, participatory pressuring may result in some compliance, but more importantly and problematically, by definition, PP results in stress and discomfort for the recipient. In action, PP can look and behave like social influencing and compliance gaining, but I would argue PP describes better what is happening in Rotary, especially in also considering the silencing 'affects' of PP.

There is other research that label and describe behaviors similar to PP and social influencing tactics. Based on early work on power tactics (French and Raven, 1959),

Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson (1980) identified six types of influencing strategies; namely, ingratiation (flattery), rationality (good arguments), exchanges (favors for compliance), coalitions (group pressuring), upward appeal (using hierarchical relationship) and sanctions (repeated appeals, and other pressuring tactics). In follow-up research, the label of sanctions was replaced with "assertiveness" (Schriesheim and Hinkin, 1990) to represent a more serious tone of pressuring with demands, threats, and intimidation tactics.

In Yukl and Tracey (1992) the effectiveness of nine different influence tactics (see Appendix E for definitions) were examined. Unsurprising to me, the most effective tactics were rational persuasion, inspirational appeal, and consultation; the least effective were pressure, coalition, and legitimating. Ingratiation and exchange were only effective for superiors to use on their subordinates. Comparatively, these tactics reflect some descriptive content of a number of the participatory pressuring tactics found in my research. As a collective, and by definition, participatory pressuring tactics all involve a consultative element, which is part of the subtle effectiveness it can have. Superficially, the response to participatory pressuring often seemed like compliance, but in the silencing this was not necessarily so. As revealed in data of my research, silencing represented more often strategic resistance than compliance.

The silencing response to participatory pressuring could be described as a form of "reactance" to persuasive pressuring. This is when pressuring is perceived as a sort of threat to freedom (autonomy), resulting in a motivational state to reassert the free

behavior in proportion to the perceived intent to persuade (Brehm 1966; Brehm and

Brehm, 1981). This reaction to pressuring is considered in terms of trait reactance:

> A number of measures of trait reactance have subsequently been established (e.g.,
> Hong 1992; Hong and Faedda, 1996). Measures of trait reactance address the
> extent to which a person tends to be angry or frustrated when their freedom is
> restricted, the extent of their tendency towards non-compliance and the extent of
> their resistance to the influence attempts and advice of others (Pavey and Sparks,
> 2009).

Less positive attitudes and weaker intentions to engage are also part of non-compliance /

reactance behavior (Pavey and Sparks, 2009). This was also reflected in how Rotarians

responded to participatory pressuring, but however angry or frustrated they might have

been, most held it in and remained silent about it. There were only rare occasions that

anger was observed during incidents. From the data, the reaction to PP was to respond

quietly with a strategy to resolve the uncomfortable and stressful circumstances of not

wanting or not being able to do all that one was expected to do as a Rotarian.

Comparative Summary before More Comparing

In considering and comparing many behavioral concepts related to PP and SSS, I

was increasingly understanding definitional differences and how these other conceptual

frameworks did not provide sufficient representation or explanation of what was

happening in Rotary. However, comparable elements of related research were helping me

to sort out all the conceptual pieces; the theoretical puzzle of what was really going on in

Rotary was slowly emerging.

With more comparative processing, I was beginning to see the light at the end of

the academic journey. At times, I thought I was closer to the end of the research road

than I was. Looking back in the rearview mirror was a guiding measure to progress with

theoretical developments and to manage twists and turns and even some backing up on

this journey. In this regard, I had started the literature review with comparing theoretical

data from silencing-the-self research. In that comparative analysis emerged a surprising

gender twist. Then, there was also gendered data to be compared with in the different

areas of literature review. With more comparisons, a more pronounced gendered theme

was emerging, which directed me to compare gendered data that I had initially put aside.

In the next chapter, I continue with more comparative review of relevant literature

towards further understanding and development of the PP-SSS conceptual framework,

which includes the gendered side of the story.

Chapter 8: The Gender Story with More Literature Comparisons

Introduction

After learning about Jack's silencing-of-self theory and its connection to anxiety and depression and what this meant for women in close relationships, from then on study data comparisons were filtered by this sobering theory. I became more sensitized to sampling data in the literature to learn more about the relevance of gender and diversity in the social processing interactions of PP and SSS.

Silencing Work-Family Conflict

There seems to be much discussion about improvements in the balancing act of work-family by organizational members. However, "employee silence" and a "climate of silence" remain important elements of work-family conflict. Organizational members are still relatively silent about the struggle to gain balance with their work-public and family-private lives. Schwartz (1992) reported that both men and women keep quiet about their personal or family commitments for fear that if the workplace knew about their challenges to balance work and family life it might affect their position, status or advancement opportunities in the organization. Schwartz also introduced the concept of the "conspiracy of silence" happening among those who share a collective interest to keep quiet about this sensitive issue.

Based on personal work-study-family experience, including my time in Rotary, many of women (mothers and daughters) quietly speak among ourselves about how we dare not say too much about our nurturing roles within an organization. If we do we can be subjected to traditional attitudes of what we should be doing. I have attempted to

voice such sensitive "undiscussables" in hopes of helping to change mindsets and

structures that may be biased against women in particular, but also for any male or female

affected by work-family conflict. I have been at times surprised by not only the resisting

mindsets traditionally held by men in the workplace, but also those held by career-minded

women (in Rotary). I was increasingly interested in all that was said and left unsaid

about work-family conflict in organizations, leading me to examine theories about

mothering, and conceiving the idea of "Motheristic Management" (Rudderham-Gaudet,

2006). A 'motherist' approach in the workplace would make work-family conflict less of

a personal issue and more of a problem for organizations to address. With a motheristic

management approach, mindsets about traditional roles of men and women in the

workplace (and at home) would be debunked and corporate goals would include more

considerations for work-family-life-learning balance.

Organizations have introduced policies to help address work-family conflict.

Mindsets are changing, however, there also seems to be a perception settling in that

women can be SUPER WOMEN and SUPER MOTHERS and that they can have and DO

IT ALL! Unrealistic life benchmarks are advanced for both women and men to do more

and more and to have it all. Having a healthy, balanced life is a challenge; however, the

struggle with resulting imbalance is much less openly discussed in workplaces. Work-

family conflict and the struggle to have balance continue to be primarily a personal and

private issue, and perceived to be more of a problem for women than men. Literature

reports on how women still do the lion's share of the work on the home-front and how

they have adapted career paths and work scheduling to find work-family balance (Brooks

et al, 2003; Dorrell, 2000; Higgins, Duxbury and Johnson, 2000; Lyness and Judiesch,

2001). It is widely assumed that this debate and resolve lies in having men (fathers) do their fair share on the home-front (Williams, 2010).   Work-family conflict remains to be associated with causing glass ceiling effects (Hoobler, Wayne and Lemmon, 2009). However, assumptions and perceptions in this regard are keeping most discussions on this topic happening privately on the home-front.

Rosemary McGowan's (2003) thesis research examined discourses in the workplace on the work-family issue of eldercare and the silence surrounding this topic, also an undiscussable.   In this research, McGowan highlighted the role of discourse in silencing, and through analysis of elder care discourse discovered and labeled three types of silencing behaviors; absolute, revisionist and selective silencing. "Absolute silencing" is when nothing at all is said about the issue in the workplace; "revisionist silencing" is when organizational members use cover-up stories to hide their eldercare responsibilities and activities. "Selective silencing" happens when certain, less embarrassing aspects of the issue are openly discussed in the workplace, but parts of the story are left untold. McGowan's thesis research provided insight into how processes of voice and silence operate in concerning the avoided topic of elder care. It was interesting to reflect on the conspiracy of silence surrounding the elder care topic and the climate of silence that can exist, even when organizational members, in McGowan's research, were encouraged to openly discuss their eldercare challenges with their superiors.

Interestingly enough, Rotary members are likewise encouraged to speak up about any concerns they may have about membership, but many do not. On the growing concerns about membership and the pressuring that goes on, there exists something close

174

to "absolute silencing". I observed and practiced "selective silencing". Like other Rotarians, I cautiously brought up concerns about pressuring and the heavy Rotary workload. The response to me and other female Rotarians was often a sympathetic acknowledgement of what 'our' problem was – our competing workload on the home-front. This kind of stereotypic thinking resulted in female members avoiding saying too much about their home-life or that of other Rotarians. "Revisioning Silencing" in McGowan's research was used to avoid possible stereotypic attitudes or discriminatory treatment, which appeared to be, somewhat, what was happening in Rotary.

Revisioning / Noble Silencing

Before doing this literature review, I had not observed or considered "revisionist silencing" while collecting data. Because Rotarians follow the Four Way Test, I believe that I was somewhat blinded to finding anything but reliable accounts of data incidents. However, after my exposure to this concept from extant literature, I became more theoretically sensitive to observing such behavior. Subsequently, I identified incidents (data) that did fit with this concept. Thus, as I initially thought, revisionist silencing could be integrated into my theoretical framework. I hesitated, however, to go with the concept because revisionist silencing, according to McGowan's definition and research examples, was just not the same as what was going on in Rotary. In her research revisionist silencing was used to protect personal circumstances, while in Rotary, participants altered their stories to protect others or Rotary. Theoretically then, I decided that data incidents similar to that of revisionist silencing (Rotarians distorting incidents) would be better labeled under the subcategory of "noble silencing".   I got the idea for this label in unrelated research reading on Alzheimer's.   In this field of research, there is

"noble lying", which is done by caregivers of advanced Alzheimer's patients to protect them and others from harm related to the consequences of the disease.

Thus, in comparing conceptual ideas from a couple of sources, I added and modified the noble silencing tactic, describing it as an altruistic silencing behavior to protect others or the organization by omitting or distorting information. I should note that this modification was made after exposure to the literature (see chapter 6, p. 139). This analytical exercise represents how theory can constantly be challenged and modified with additional data comparisons for any type of data; "it is all data" (Glaser, 1998).

McGowan's research (2003) sensitized me to revisionist silencing, which I had not observed until I went looking for it in the data from Rotary. However, with more data comparing, I ultimately conceived noble silencing as a more suitable and meaningful way to reflect the data. I observed noble silencing often as a caring gesture to protect fellow members from personal life struggles becoming more publically known. Many incidents consisted of a sort of covering up for those who did not keep up their Rotary commitments because of life balancing conflicts. McGowan's research further sensitized me to more gender implications in the silence of the undiscussables.

Spirals of Silence in Diversity, Differences and Conflict

On the subject matter of "spirals of silence" for what is "undiscussable", Bowen and Blackmon (2003) extend these theoretical perspectives to examine the effects of diversity on "organizational voice". In their article, these strands of theory are used to explain what can happen when individuals do not fully express aspects of their personal identity within a workgroup. Individuals do not fully share personal information because

they perceive that there is a negative climate against how they are different to the dominate population. Concealing parts of one's identity reduces social exchange and subsequently results in less workplace communication; silence spirals and the 'organizational voice' weakens as the minority one or minority group becomes increasingly isolated and silent among the dominate group. "…Employees will not use voice unless they are likely to have support from their co-workers. If they are not confident of support from their peers, or think that resistance to voice is likely, they will choose silence or dishonest responses" (Bowen and Blackmon, 2003, p. 1394). As a result, an organization suffers as the spirals of silence restrict open and honest discussions that are essential to organizational improvement. This is certainly a disconcerting perspective in light of all the rhetoric on the benefits of having greater diversity within organizations. If differences of diversity are not recognized then there may not be as much engagement in diversity going on in organizations as might be touted.

There are members slowly beginning to join Rotary with diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds. However, there is relatively little corresponding change to how Rotary actually operates (Parsons and Mills, 2012). This was reflected in my very first study on Rotary that examined how little impact women had on the organization since women were given the right to join. Although female members have made a difference in terms of membership numbers and participation levels in meeting humanitarian goals, their minority presence and participation has not resulted in many changes to the prevailing traditional and dominating masculine culture. As many female and even male Rotarians have indicated and discussed over the years about membership, Rotary has had

a hard time getting rid of its reputation for being an 'old boys' club, which continues to attract certain types of men.

In Leslie Perlow's (2003) book, "When You Say Yes But Mean No" (2003), her research illuminates what might be going on in many organizations today regarding how differences and diversity are addressed. Perlow connects the pieces of the conceptual puzzle together by examining what is actually <u>not</u> going on in organization – in the silence and spirals of silence:

> Each act of silencing—whether from silencing on our own or silencing in reaction to something someone else says or does—further makes us all the more likely to silence next time. We get stuck spinning in the "silent spiral", where each act of silencing increases the likelihood we'll silence again next time, and at increasingly high cost for ourselves, for our relationships and for work (Perlow, 2003, p. 9).

Perlow makes reference to "silencing self" and describes it as a conscious or unconscious choice when one identifies that they have a perceived difference with another person and the choice is not to fully express differences. She equates difference with conflict and that silencing is an avoidance of conflict to recognize or resolve differences. Perlow argues that people tend to want to avoid negative conflict, but in so doing lose out and suffer negative consequences by deciding not to engage in positive conflict.

Subsequently, the silences and silencing may be indicative of people and organizations not sharing, engaging in or celebrating their differences as much as the rhetoric of the day might espouse. Organizational members may quietly work and participate alongside one another, but they might not be sharing or taking advantage of their combined creative capacities. Of greater concern is that there could be negative conflict quietly brewing and potential organizational learning and development is

compromised.   The future of the organization can be at risk. This is somewhat representative of what is happening in Rotary with the negative impact of participatory pressuring and strategic self-silencing.

Comparatively, Perlow (2003) also described various forms of silencing, which resembled some of the self-silencing behaviors I have discovered in this thesis research. Perlow had different labels for the behaviors. This is not surprising considering the organization she studied did not involve a workforce of volunteers. Similar to my own research, Perlow named and described the silencing in terms of behavioral processes: "The Subordinate Sits Silently, The Boss Bites His Tongue, Keeping the Peace with Peers, and Suppressing and Glossing when Silenced by Another" (pp. 14-24). Perlow summed up the implications of silence in its various forms and in terms of both the personal and organizational context as follows:

> We live in a culture—especially at work—that prefers harmony over discord, agreement over dissent, speed over deliberation. We often smile and nod to each other even though deep down we could not disagree more.   Whether with colleagues, friends, or family members, the tendency to paper over differences rather than confront them is extremely common. We believe that the best thing to do to preserve our relationships and to ensure that our work gets done as expeditiously as possible is to silence conflict (Perlow, 2003, inside cover).

Thus, in an organizational culture of silence, there may be more covering up and avoiding differences than learning from diversity.   For many years, Rotary had a male membership who had much in common. When recruits were needed, they typically invited others who were like minded and interested in giving back. Today, change is happening and there is more diversity reflected in Rotary membership. However, the Wheels of Humanity turn slowly; Rotary has resisted changing in many ways. Members

have limited time to give for humanitarian work and even less to offer for addressing change and differences. Time enough was given, however, to a strong resistance (and a legal fight) against allowing women to become Rotarians. It took years before many Rotarians became comfortable with having women among them; many Rotarians quietly protested and some less so. Today, there are still some who self-silence about women in Rotary and many more who say comparatively little about the pressuring going on.

Members choose to self-silence rather than address their discomfort with participatory pressuring; they feel the difference but choose to say little about it. Consequently, silencing has become pervasive in Rotary, and in turn, more participatory pressuring is used to gently push Rotarians to participate more. In the short term, there can be higher participating levels, but this also results in more silencing. In the long term, membership involvement decreases and the threat of losing members increase.

Perlow's (2003) research was comparatively insightful in helping me discern the theoretical connections between differences and conflict, and how the concepts were linked to silencing and relationships in my own research. It also highlighted for me the need for research to identify leadership and managerial approaches not just to avoid negative consequences from silencing in organizations, but also to address missed opportunities for organizational growth and development. In the silence (and secrecy), there is so much that goes unsaid about differences and differential treatment that could make all the difference to an organization's growth, or decline.

Silence and Secrecy and Feminist Connections

As I continued to review the literature, I was beginning to see how my thesis research was connected in different ways to what is, obviously, a multivariate and complex phenomenon involving silence at the individual, group and organizational level. Silence is found as problematic in many diverse fields of study. Given the lack of voice in the quiet margins of silence, it was of no surprise to me that I was soon reviewing feminist connections to this subject area. After all, feminist research is about breaking silences and giving women voice in the present and in historical accounts In their volume of related articles on silence, *Secrecy and Silence in the Research Process: Feminist Reflections*, Ryan-Flood and Gill (2010) give theoretical insights into the silencing and secrets that exist in organizations and also in research processes that fall short in their own silence to be revealing about what is really going on, particularly for women. An excellent, overarching summary on silence is given in the forward of their volume:

> Sometimes silence can be a tool of oppression; when you are silenced, whether by explicit force or by persuasion, it is not simply that you do not speak but that you are barred from participation in a conversation which nevertheless involves you. Sometimes silence is a strategic response to oppression; one that allows subjects to persist in their own way; one that acknowledges that, under certain circumstances, speech might not be empowering, let alone sensible. Sometimes you might speak out to announce a disagreement with what is being said, sometimes not, as to speak can mean to agree to participate in a conversation that you don't agree with (Ahmed, 2010, p. xvi).

In one sense, I theorized, participatory pressuring could be considered a form of oppression. Strategic self-silence then arises as a mode of resistance to that oppressive approach. In silence, then, individuals can be withholding information and keeping secrets, but depending on the circumstances it can be an empowering or disempowering action. For the individual or organization, behavioral acts of silence, silencing and

holding secrets can be to an advantage. Silence and secrets within organizations can be strategically helpful and not necessarily detrimental towards individual or organizational goals.

I reflected further on how this related to my Rotary research. Behavioral processes of both participatory pressuring and strategic self-silencing at different times and under different circumstances can have helpful and detrimental implications for participants and the organization. However, overall, in the long term, these two social processes were having a negative impact on Rotary and its members. Newer members in Rotary were the ones most often affected by pressuring and silencing, those who have not had the time or experience to find their voice, to know more or to "*grow the alligator skin to deal with the traditional masculine framework*" in Rotary. The majority of long term (male) Rotarians were well versed in Rotary and various strategies to get the humanitarian work done; while newer younger members, especially female Rotarians, faced particular challenges.

Shpungin, Allen, Loomis and DelloStritto (2012) demonstrate in their research, the connection and value for using feminist methodology to address silencing as a structural issue. In this intervention study, an innovative strategy was used to give voice to silencing experiences. The problem of silencing was pervasive and longstanding. Silencing experiences were identified and then theatrical presentations were created to role play various silencing incidents as a form of intervention. Feedback indicated that the interventions were successful; "anti-silencing tools" worked well to raise awareness and also provided interpretive insights about the way silencing experiences take place.

This intervention process included an opportunity for participants to offer solutions to silencing related problems. One component of the role-playing involved interactive participation from the audience to develop alternative behaviors to encourage voice, and thus avoid silencing outcomes. In particular, this research highlighted the importance and impact of 'group silence' and how disturbing it can be when there is a deafening group silence.   This happens, for example, during incidents of interpersonal insults and sexist and racial prejudice made between or among individuals while a larger group observes, but says nothing in objection to this unkind behavior.   This finding resonated with me in thinking about some unpleasant incidents when I heard something unkind said about a Rotarian or when something unsettling happened between Rotarians in front of the larger membership group. I was surprised, for example, by the deafening silence that followed sexist jokes and insults about how women do things differently. An incident like this would happen and nothing would be said, as though it never happened. In a more private setting with a just a trusting few, there would be some talk of the problem and the change required, but rarely did a discussion like this surface with the larger group.

The innovative research-intervention combination used by Shpungin et al (2012) highlights the potential usefulness of more non-traditional, complex forms of a research-intervention combination. I think this is what is needed for research problems that have feminist undertones – to uncover, analyze and help change subtle behavioral processes that result in silencing.   Also, salient to my own discoveries, this research advanced the point that "although acts of silencing can occur at the individual level, they thrive in an environment in which power, privilege, and historical inequities operate invisibly

183

(without being named, acknowledged, or addressed)" (Shpungin et al, 2012, p. 44). In the silencing social interactions where power, privilege and historical inequities play a role, women, evidently, feel differential affects.

Silencing the Self, Gender Implications and Violet's Story

With an abstracted conceptual framework on the relationship between participatory pressuring and strategic self-silence slowly developing into a theoretical package, I considered at one point that this thesis would have little to say about gender. I held to this notion until I discovered the research on "silencing the self" (Jack, 1991). This research and related feminist literature on voice and silencing prompted me to compare anew gendered data that I had put aside during earlier stages of concept generation. The flood gates holding back data and my previous exposure to gender research came open as I reviewed and compared this data to current research discoveries. I excitedly engaged in speculations about how my research might contribute to glass ceiling research in recalling that:

> …Most of the barriers that persist today are insidious; a revolution couldn't find them to blast away. Rather, gender discrimination now is so deeply embedded in organizational life as to be virtually indiscernible. Even the women who feel its impact are hard-pressed to know what hit them (Meyerson and Fletcher, 2000, p. 127).

This thesis research may very well shed some light on the shadowy shades of silence affecting women's participation in organizational life. In comparing my research with extant literature, I have discovered deeply embedded elements of the "virtually indiscernible" impacting women. Both men and women of Rotary engage in PP and both male and female Rotarians respond to it by strategically self-silencing to various degrees.

However, gendered implications in "silencing the self" and its link to anxiety and depression highlight how and why women might be "hard pressed to know what is hitting them" in particular. There are mental health concerns for women who self-silence in close relationships. Reflecting on the context of this and similar research, this theoretical connection and relevance is accented and concisely described by Carol Gilligan, prefaced in Jack and Ali (2010):

> The stark implication of the self-silencing theory of women's depression is that the self does not go gently into silence. Whatever its biological substrates or sociological precipitants, depression in women is also a sign or a symptom of a woman's resistance to silencing herself. However costly or misguided, it is a resistance to the gender binaries and hierarchies of patriarchy. The etymology of the word "hierarchy," literally meaning a rule of priests, reveals the religious *pater*, a father. The dynamics of depression thus become inseparable from the tensions between democracy and patriarchy, one grounded in equality of voice, the other privileging the voices of fathers (p. x).

Although Rotarians readily engage in participatory and democratic processes for the assignment of leadership roles and policy and decision making, the situation in most clubs is that the male majority dominates these processes. The hegemony of hierarchy of patriarchy remains steadfast in Rotary. The gender implications of this are significant. As I looked back, forward, all around, and back again through the years of data collection and after comparing it all with the literature, the gendered elements were there. Once this gendered path became evident, I realized that much of the participatory pressuring I observed and experienced came from primarily male Rotarians, many of them current or past leaders. The primary users of participatory pressuring were men; however, as a prominent majority this was not surprising. There were some 'exceptional' female Rotarians who were also quite good at soliciting and directing volunteers, although, notably their approach was less forceful and more participatory than pressuring.

185

Recounting More Gendered Data

As I continued to visualize pieces of the conceptual puzzle emerging, I reflected on observations of how men of Rotary turned often to the women folk to do the Rotary 'housekeeping' work (without much thought). Because true Rotarians never say no, especially to kind, older, generous men who have done so much for Rotary, it was thus difficult for any woman (or man) not to oblige. Given that Rotary women typically work outside of the home and also have the lion's share of work to do on the home front, the pressure on a few good women of Rotary was likely higher than their male counterparts. These gendered differences were substantiated in literature findings that highlighted how work-family conflict continues to have a greater impact on women (Lyness and Judiesch, 2001; Lyness and Thompson, 1997; Soonhee, 1998; van Vianen and Fischer, 2002).

The differential impact for men and women is highlighted in the overlap of work-family literature and glass ceiling research. These areas of research report on women having difficulty advancing in the workplace because of inter-role conflict and stereotypical attitudes about traditional women's roles. As well, the research purports that women have difficulty subscribing to the prevailing masculine frameworks (Mills, 2002; Powell and Graves, 2003; Wilson, 1998; van Vianen and Fischer, 2002) and long hour cultures of organizations (Cooper Jackson, 2001 and Rutherford, 2001) while trying to manage the home front. Research has also indicated how career paths for women are encumbered with more gaps in their work history than what men have because women are more often leaving their jobs or taking leaves of absences from the workplace to attend to nurturing roles of a child and / or for elder care (Dorrell, 2000; Hoober, Wayne and Lemmon, 2009; Lyness and Judiesch, 2001; Sicherman 1996; Stroh et al., 1996).

Ultimately, the toll of work-family balancing is the responsibility of the family, but the weight of this burden is primarily imposed on mothers (Runte and Mills, 2004) and daughters of aging parents (McGowan, 2003).

There can be exceptions for some women who may not be impacted in the detrimental way as described above or as I often observed in Rotary. I referred to Rotary women, in general, as "exceptional women" in the second research project that I did before joining Rotary. Noted in this earlier research, most of the women of Rotary either had no children or their family was small and they had focused a significant part of their lives on advancing in their careers. I should also note that there were exceptional men of Rotary affected by participatory pressuring and work-family conflict, who also struggled with demands of parenting. However, as indicated in data from this research, the impact on female Rotarians was more noticeable and openly discussed, at least among female members. If the work-family-life balancing challenge was brought up among both male and female Rotarians, it was usually referenced in a stereotypical way. It was typically assumed, for example, that the reason a female Rotarian was not able to participate or take on a leadership role was because of her family commitments. Challenges to these and similar assumptions, more often than not, were not voiced.

I found it particularly interesting to have observed and engaged in incidents that reflected the traditional, stereotypical thinking that remains prevalent in Rotary. For example, I wrote a memo about a discussion among a group of leading Rotarians, including a few women, who were proposing names of who could be nominated for the position of President Elect of RI for the upcoming year. A name or two was suggested.

A reply to one name was that District Governor 'Mr. X' would not be able to do the job because his wife was still working full-time. His wife would therefore not be able to be by his side to help as typically needed and expected for the year-long intensive work schedule of the RI President. There were no comments made in reply to this argument and then other names were proposed. A not-so-obvious traditional mindset in Rotary has been that the role of the wife is to be man's helper. In this case, for someone to be RI President, their wife would need to be available. In subtle ways, the role of women in Rotary is often promoted to be as the helper, a *"workhorse"*, not the leader or decision maker, even if a female Rotarian is promoted or delegated to take on a leadership role. As I became more involved in Rotary and developed closer relationships with male and female Rotarians, I was able to observe and experience first-hand how traditional attitudes about women and participatory pressuring resulted in making some women feel uncomfortable and unwelcomed.

I became more sensitive to and better able to recognize the signs and sounds of silence and the quiet 'affects' of discomfort from what was sometimes said and done in Rotary. After learning more about the positive correlation of self-silencing to anxiety and depression disorders and the differential importance of relationships for women, I became more attentive to and interested in how both men and women were really thinking and feeling in their silence. In reviewing this literature, I compared it with related data and conceptualizations from research I previously did on Rotary. There were interviews and casual conversations alluding to subject matter that participants were not comfortable speaking more about. I had put aside specific memos in this regard and there were many related ones that I compared anew.

188

As I brought together and compared more data fragments, pieces of the conceptual puzzle fit together to provide a generalized depiction of women's experiences in Rotary. To sort out and present more data in this regard, I decided to create a persona named "Violet". The story of Violet and a recounting of her thoughts and feelings about her Rotary experiences is actually a composite depiction that is grounded in data sourced from many incidents involving women (and men) of Rotary. The portrayal of Violet also includes comparative data insights gathered from outside the walls of Rotary, including from the literature. It was written illustratively, but is based on the comparative analysis of factual data. I have taken the creative liberty that classical GT affords to weave together the gendered theoretical threads of this research into Violet's story.

Creating Violet also served to protect the anonymity of a minority of participants and their close relationships in Rotary and the sensitive nature of some data. As a participant observer for this research, I also developed close relationships as a Rotarian, a researcher and as a friend. If I were to tell individual stories in detail, I believe there would be a greater risk of revealing identities and relationships. After all, many incidents involved a small group. I conducted and presented this research in a thoughtful and responsible way to make sure there would be no harm to participants. Presenting data or study findings using semi-fiction narratives is also supported in the literature (Phillips, 1995; Vickers, 2010; Whiteman and Phillips, 2006; Ybema et al; 2009). I understand the trade-off and arguments against the use of fiction in scientific research. However, in this research case, I determined that using a semi-fiction narrative was the best way for me to 'show and tell' the gendered implications of the developing theory.

Violet's Voice: An 'Exceptional' Sound of Silence

Violet felt honored to be invited to join Rotary. She was one of the first few women to join a local Club. She gave little thought to joining an organization of almost all men, as she had lots of experience with that at her place of work. Members of the club were most welcoming to Violet and some seemed quite content to have another female join, as at that time there were only two other female Rotarians. In no time at all, Violet was also invited to join and participate on several committees. Violet enjoyed volunteer work and she was not afraid to take on any challenge to help make a difference.

Violet grew to love Rotary and established many close relationships with fellow Rotarians. Rotarians had much respect for Violet. She did much humanitarian work and also contributed heavily to the operation of their club. Every year, Violet took on either a Board position or chaired a committee. Her club honored Violet for her work and dedication, recognizing her as a "Paul Harris Fellow" and then as a "True Rotarian". For many years Violet worked hard in Rotary and endured surprisingly well in the male dominated context. Violet declared that she could "*handle the boys*" and any female friend she invited to join, she just warned them, *"As a woman of Rotary, you need to have alligator skin to contend with their masculine frameworks"*. In fact, Violet only invited three women to join Rotary and only one of the three became a member. Violet's female invitee resigned from Rotary two years later, claiming she did not have time for Rotary after returning to full-time paid work.

During many years of dedicated service, Violet continued to enjoy doing Rotary work, but became increasingly tired of how some Rotarians took her for granted.

Sometimes they spoke down to her, like she was their employee. At times she felt uncomfortable with their sexist jokes, but she was able to throw a few good ones back at them; it was all in good fun, most of the time. Gradually this kind of insulting banter began to bother Violet more. Violet hesitated to openly share her changing feelings. She held back from letting fellow Rotarians know how she was becoming unhappy with her experiences. After all, it was "Service Above Self" and how she was feeling was not important compared to the value of serving her club and others. As well, she did not want to upset anyone. Violet was particularly sensitive to not wanting to upset those older gentlemen who had been dedicated, self-sacrificing, generous Rotarians for many years. Many of them also helped her out on occasion. What bugged her, though, was that she could easily enough understand and tolerate the behavior of Rotarians from the *"old boy's club"*, but found it increasingly intolerable how younger male Rotarians behaved when they knew better. *"At least they should know better"*. It was the *"younger boys' club"* behaviors that bugged her more.

Violet was tiring and no longer had the energy to *"bite her tongue"*. She began to voice some of her feelings, but felt unheard. Violet became tired of asking 'them', for instance, to stop referring to her and fellow female Rotarians as "*girls"*, but they just would not take her seriously. It also irritated Violet that there were some women of Rotary who responded by saying how much they liked being called girls as it made them feel younger. It frustrated Violet when fellow women behaved in such ways, making matters worse for career women who thought differently. Violet also felt that some of the younger women with children were making matters worse by advocating for children to be allowed to attend Rotary meetings and functions. Violet felt that this was not helpful

191

to changing stereotypically attitudes that women had too much to do with their nurturing roles to be a Rotary member.

Although annoyed by some of her female Rotarian friends' behaviors and attitudes, Violet would never say much to them. There were so few women in Rotary and they were needed, as they did a lot of the work. However, concerning the many male Rotarians, Violet became increasingly frustrated with the *"back room boys"* and their politics and attempted to speak up more frequently to challenge their ways. Several times she initiated motions to change the focus of club goals, for instance. Frustratingly, too often her motions were voted down by the majority who did not see the need for the change. One particular change that Violet wanted was to have at least a couple of the main fundraising events become more family friendly (to compromise on the traditional, unwritten rule of *"no kids allowed"*). While few members had younger children, there were Rotarians who wanted to involve their grandchildren in Rotary.

There was, however, reluctance and resistance to include children as Rotary was not viewed as a place for them; most yearly routine activities were not child friendly. The traditional notion of a Rotary club being *"like a family"* was really more like a brotherhood that cared about each other's families. Violet was well aware of how many Rotarians preferred to keep their Rotary activities separate from their home-family life. Violet did not have children, but she considered the need for Rotary to become more family friendly at least for some functions. Violet also recognized that becoming more family friendly might remove a barrier to recruiting younger members. In any case,

Violet was becoming increasingly unhappy with the steadfast attitudes and unchanging ways of many Rotarians and of RI in general.

Violet was especially becoming more intolerant of how some Rotarians took charge and directed decision making with little consultation with others. She did not like how; *"They* (the male Rotarians) *make the decisions and we* (women) *get to do all the work"*. It never ceased to amaze her how 'they' speak for and make decisions for others, and it was a monumental mistake when they made a decision for her. This was an unforgettable incident. On this day, Violet became particularly disturbed when 'they' told her (it was announced before the Club) that she was going to be President for the following year. They failed to ask her if she even wanted to become President; they just assumed she would be honored by her appointment. When Violet protested and declined, they (those who had taken charge of filling the slate of vacant officer positions) persisted and declared that it was her time and turn and she should be very happy about this opportunity. They also encouraged her and boasted that she was the best person for the job and that she could do it! Violet became very upset by this as she really did not think she could do the job well enough. Her aging father's health was declining and she needed to spend more time helping him. She would not have the time to devote to doing Rotary leadership well – but she kept most of this to herself.

Violet felt very bad during this particular time in Rotary. She shared, "you know I could have cried, but could you imagine it if I had cried? What would they have thought then?" Rather than share how she truly felt, Violet retreated from Rotary for several weeks. During this time she actually considered quitting. Her closest Rotary friends

coaxed Violet to return and after some down time, she thought things would get better. However, for the next while Violet struggled with trying to regain her passion for Rotary, when she had even less tolerance for how 'they' behaved. She increasingly resented how they knew what was best for her and what she should do. Violet became resigned to the fact that there was no sense trying to have them understand how she felt. She knew that her Rotarian friends really cared for her and that they really appreciated all that she did in their club. They were more than generous with letting her know how valued a member she was and that they did not want to lose her as a member. However, Violet was tired of it all. She was tired of trying to make a difference in Rotary and with them.

Rotarian Violet privately shared with her closest friend about how upset and disturbed she had become as a member of Rotary. She had started seeing a therapist to address her frustrating and heartfelt feelings that were upsetting her increasingly. She also struggled with similar feelings about her workplace of many years, although she was going to retire soon. She became more fed up with the way 'they' (men and some women who behaved like men) behaved and treated others. Although she was a top executive in her field, 'they' consistently treated her like someone beneath them who needed their help. Violet became tired and worn down from it all, both physically and emotionally. She felt disengaged and a sort of sadness set in. Violet left Rotary after many years of dedicated service.

Rotary lost a "True Rotarian". Violet was well respected in Rotary because she had done so much. Many members were disappointed and surprised that she left the organization. Fellow club members were left wondering why, but no one really pursued

the question. Violet did provide some insight in her resignation letter, but once she was gone, there was little more said or asked about it.

Violet really missed Rotary and her close Rotary friends, who were like family in so many ways. However, in time Violet realized that it was the best decision for her to leave and not return again. She recognized that she had done her time, endured enough and gave enough, not just with Rotary, but also with her work.   She no longer had the energy and patience to deal with the politics and sexist mindsets. She was tired of trying to figure out what to do about it. It was time for someone younger with more energy to take her place… someone like me? Violet encouraged me to join and to hang in there because Rotary was a wonderful organization to be involved with. She also believed that I could *"handle the boys"* well too. But she warned about how it could 'affect' someone like me. Violet expressed passionately, *"Ellen, enjoy Rotary, but be careful, because, you know, Ellen, women really FEEL it, we FEEL it; don't we? You know what I mean."*

After years of research, I understood better what Violet and other 'exceptional' women of Rotary were telling me, and what I was observing and experiencing in the data.

Chapter 9: Theoretical Summations, Integration, and Speculations

Methodological Bridge Back to the Future

I have always been interested in gender research and this was why I jumped at the chance to do a study on the impact of women joining Rotary International. I knew that I would be able to learn a lot about what it was like for a female minority to navigate their way in an organization traditionally dominated by men. Besides the significant representation differences of the sexes, Rotary's history, traditional ways, non-profit status and drive to have more women within its organization made RI an attractive research milieu. In studying Rotary, I have had the opportunity to dig deeper into the illusive unrest of why women have not participated or advanced in organizations as might be expected. In deciding to follow Glaser's way of doing GT, I initially put aside the quest to study, specifically, women's experiences. Rather, I chose a research path to discover a problem central to participants, in general. Ironically, although I identified what I initially considered a gender-neutral problem of participatory pressuring, subsequent comparisons of data from the literature and research context led me to do gendered conceptualizations. It also led to the emergence of Violet's story.

It was over a two year period (2003-2005) that I conducted gendered research on Rotary before becoming a member and participant observer. This pre-membership research was an integral component to what I consequently discovered in this overall, comprehensive thesis package. Many conceptualizations would not have emerged if it were not for the research I conducted as an 'outsider'. Subsequently, as a participant observer, I often compared newly collected data to data from the initial studies. Data

observations from those first studies were particularly relevant when, further into the research, I discovered strategic self-silencing.

Retrospectively and Reflectively in Rotary

When I decided to study Rotary using Glaser's GT, I also made that conscientious decision to take account of and put aside theoretical knowledge to start anew in order to discover more about membership. By methodological design, initial research questions were pre-set to identify a main problem for participants and how they resolved it. As a conceptual framework emerged, I theoretically sampled, compared and memoed in a delimiting way to develop theory.

Perhaps to a fault, I committed to doing this research by comparing data and conceptualizing to higher theoretical levels that were abstract of time, place and people. This meant that, at least at first, the sex of Rotary members was not relevant. Although I came across data that was gendered in nature, I either put it aside or conceptualized it to a higher level so that the resulting memo was void of gender. So then, I discovered participatory pressuring as a main problem affecting and practiced by both female and male Rotarians. I proceeded to collect more data related to this behavioral process. I identified the different forms and the ways members of both sexes engaged in pressuring tactics and strategic self-silencing and the impact these behaviors had on members and on the organization.

Prompted by extant research, I theoretically sampled to observe that in the silence and disengagement of members, frustrated Rotary leaders would in turn engage more actively in participatory pressuring tactics. Consequently more silencing resulted.

Effectively, with more pressuring going on in Rotary, the silence was spiraling. The use of participatory pressuring often resulted in the accomplishment of short-term goals, garnering quick fixes, but in the long term, there were negative consequences and affects above and beyond individual members' stress and discomfort. The impact was realized at the organizational level with a general decrease in morale, goals not being met, financial unrest, a leader stepping down, and a disconcerting parallel decline in membership.

The "absolute" forms of silencing (McGowan, 2003) in this research were to the extremes as evidenced by how members just participated as required and said nothing, or how members terminated their membership and who said very little about as why they resigned. There were serious concerns voiced within the club about how newer members resigned in a relatively short time. Even though departing Rotarians often reported that they needed to resign because of work or family pressures, there were those who also left because of the pressuring to do more in Rotary—but they did not openly share this point of view upon departure.

Typically, a person volunteers because they want to; they are self-motivated as the term implies, to step up to the plate by their own free will. Volunteers who are willing to give of their time will tend to make the time. However, as found in the data, members resigned and potential members decided not to join or rejoin to avoid the pressuring to participate more or to engage in ways they did not like. Some of the best prospects for new members were seasoned volunteers who as visitors to Rotary quickly recognized the pressuring tensions and decided not to join. There are other reasons why potential members decided not to join and why members decided to resign, but many of these

reasons Rotary could not do much about, while participatory pressuring and strategic self-silencing could be addressed.

The widespread feelings and concerns of Rotarians about pressures to do more with a smaller volunteer workforce and the subsequent silence surrounding this problem is indicative of the challenges faced today by many Rotary clubs. Slowly but surely, Rotary International has begun to recognize some of the more serious membership issues. In the last few years, RI has started to respond by providing some direction to clubs in a more concerted way. I am not sure, however, that RI has clearly identified the main problem(s) or that the organization is taking the appropriate action to address membership challenges. The organization has been focusing on public relations to attract new members, but has given less attention to club-level membership feedback on the actual functioning of clubs. Most of any increase in membership has come from newly forming clubs, but how they learn to function as a club comes from other clubs. Both the best practices and dysfunctional ways of a club often get replanted in new clubs.

Rotary ought to be asking more questions. What are the "undiscussables"? For too long in the history of Rotary, for example, there was little concern about membership numbers or membership make-up. Succession planning and membership recruitment were not foremost on the minds of Rotary leadership, at least not when there were waiting lists for members to join Rotary. However, the waiting lists became shorter; RI and most clubs have been slow to respond and now there is pressure to catch up, regroup and plan ahead. As membership numbers and leadership succession have become more critical issues, the pervasive use of participatory pressuring to address the challenges of

membership have in turn resulted in some disquieting consequences.   The resulting

silence, apathy and indifference are subjects that have become undiscussable in Rotary.

Although it was an important turning point in Rotary's history when females

started joining, Rotary did not initially pay particular attention to its female membership.

For many years, Rotary did not even keep track of members' sex in its archives. Rotary

does now promote that women are members and that there is diversity in their fold. It

was likewise well-noted when there was finally a female member on the Rotary

Foundation Board. However, for the most part, the role of women in Rotary and the

particular challenges they face participating in Rotary are rarely openly discussed.

One incident, in particular, reflects well how some Rotarians have not (yet)

recognized the 'deep seeded' attitudes, behaviors and cultural mindsets affecting

membership and why and how certain subject matters, like participatory pressuring and

women in Rotary, are undiscussable. Glaser (1998) advises against 'incident tripping' too

soon in the process, but at this latter point in the research, I shall share this 'incident trip'.

This recounting of a personal experience is to provide a concluding depiction of how

many in Rotary think about women in Rotary and why silencing often takes place.

The Incident Trip: Looking Back Through the Rear View Mirror

This incident occurred before I became a member. It was the first time I presented

a paper on my Rotary research at an academic conference in Puerto Rico. The paper

presentation went well with a sizeable audience who were interested and many questions

were asked.   Upon completion of the formal presentation, a professor addressed me and

authoritatively proclaimed, quite proudly, that he was a Rotarian. This gentleman

proceeded then to pointedly provide feedback on my research. 'Mr. Professor' prefaced

his comments by saying quite succinctly that I had missed the point and that I got it all

wrong. He told me that researching the impact of women in Rotary was not meaningful.

He impressed upon me that what Rotary was all about was the humanitarian goals and

ideals of RI. Mr. Professor bluntly stated that whether a Rotarian was male or female had

no relevance. He proceeded to expound further about how the sex of a Rotarian did not

matter; what mattered was what a Rotarian could do or give. His declarations continued

along this line of argument.

Further into the mostly one sided discussion, I did manage to ask the question if

Mr. Professor was aware of any notable differences since women began to join Rotary.

Mr. Professor did then concede that, yes, there were some noted improvements. He stated

that it was great having females in Rotary and in academia as well! Female Rotarians, he

noted, were like the "girls" he was supervising, who were also presenting at the

conference. In his view, the females in Rotary and in academia were like work horses

who contributed more than most of the men. Mr. Professor was very happy about having

more women in Rotary and working with him in academia.

I was somewhat taken aback and intimidated by Mr. Professor's tone and his

apparent in-depth knowledge of Rotary, so I did not offer any rebuttal. I would now, but

might still hesitate to say too much as a fellow Rotarian. I will abstain from too much

incident tripping and resist the temptation to tell more such stories representing how some

members of Rotary think about women in Rotary. Rotarians remain relatively quiet about

this subject matter and express such gendered thoughts and feelings, for the most part,

'behind closed doors' with those whom they have a close, trusting relationship. There are

many Rotarians that are most appreciative, respectful and welcoming to women in

Rotary. However, in subtle ways, traditional mindsets and viewpoints of a mostly male

organization translate into perceptions, expectations and behaviors that 'affect' women in

Rotary in not so understanding or welcoming ways.

More Theoretical Developing in Light of the Literature

The Importance of Relationships

A driving theme in the overall study, and well-reflected in Violet's story, was the

importance of relationships. In this networking organization of Rotary International

many of the silencing strategies were about protecting relationships or leveraging them.

In considering the correlating relationship between participatory pressuring and strategic

self-silencing and the implications of depression, this study revealed how and why

relationship is differentially important to the women of Rotary.

> One of the most serious critiques of current research is that, despite consistent
> findings of gender differences, "no comprehensive perspective on networks and
> women's careers has been offered" (Ibarra and Smith-Lovin, 1997, p. 359). We
> believe this theoretical problem ties directly to the need for additional complexity
> in research exploring how and why relationships matter (Gersick, Bartunek, and
> Dutton, 2000, p.1027).

By engaging in participant observation, I observed first-hand and became involved with

the interpersonal relationships of membership. I was able to collect intimate and sensitive

data as reflected in Violet's story. Her relationship (and that of many) to fellow Rotarians

and to the Rotary organization weighed heavily on her behaviors and in the choices she

made. Relationships mattered in many ways. The importance of networking and

relationship building is widely known to make a significant difference in management

and business.   The historic and present day success of Rotary has been much about

trusted networking relationships that grew to combine resources and skills to accomplish

formidable humanitarian goals (and help their own businesses and professions as well).

Having participated in and observed how the networking unfolded and how close working

relationships developed, I gained first-hand knowledge and experience with the intimate

relational processes that took place with those who shared membership for years.

From the "silencing the self" and related feminist research, close relationships are

integral to self-silencing and the silencing of others. Effectively, participatory pressuring

may be considered a silencing tactic, as it results in silencing. It seems like common

sense to speak up about how one is truly feeling in relationships. However, how people

actually behave in different relationships is often hard to understand. To follow, I offer

some analytical insights into this important element of the research.

The value and quality of relationships are inherently linked to honest and genuine

relations (Jack, 1991). However, some people are not honest in a relationship or they

avoid being honest to protect a relationship. In this research, I found that, in general,

Rotarians did not openly share honest feelings about pressuring; they chose to be silent.

If Rotarians truly valued their relationships, one might think that they would make an

effort to share their honest feelings. From the "silencing the self" research (Jack, 1991)

the theory is that the value of the relationship will be proportional to the level of

authenticity, time and effort, or, <u>conversely</u> to the self-silencing put into the relationship.

From this research, personal goals, hidden agendas, rationales, time and situational

variables (like a climate of silence, patriarchy, and a hierarchal structure) also affected

relationships and the choice to speak up or self-silence.

The gendered implications of data found in this research, especially in terms of

relationship, can be further analyzed with respect to other data found in the literature.

Mainero and Sullivan (2006), for example, examined the differential importance and

impact of relationship for women as compared to men as they analyzed and discussed the

groundbreaking contribution of Carol Gilligan's book, *In a Different Voice,* and Joan

Gallos's analysis of this book.   What is purported in this discussion is that women and

men develop and adjust differently, which can be comparatively analyzed according to

two major themes, attachment and separation. Development for men involves becoming

more autonomous and detaching towards strengthening who they are and what they can

and will do. Women, contrastingly, develop through increasing connections, attachments

and nurturing relations, and sacrificing one's needs for others.

Subsequently, "for women, connecting with and taking care of others is reinforced

by society. For men, separating from others and becoming an individual identity, "one's

own man" who is independent from others is reinforced" (Mainero and Sullivan, 2006, p.

50).   In the later stages of life, development patterns of men and women can change to

men caring more about intimacy and relations, while women gain greater self-identity and

value equal to and in relations to considering others. The differential development

patterns and value for relationships result in conflicting circumstances:

> Because the workplace has been a man's world, the behaviors valued by men—a
> command and control leadership style, attention to hierarchy, quick action and
> response—have dominated and been rewarded. Women—who value connection,

attachment, caregiving, and process—find they are odd ducks in a sea of masculine corporate values (Mainero and Sullivan, 2006, p. 55).

The differences between men and women's behaviors and relationship approaches are also reflected in studies about how they typically differ in management and leadership styles. Women engage more in the transformational style of leading by empowering others, and by supporting inclusiveness and participation. Such management strategies are valued by women more so than is traditionally valued by men. However, gradually, organizational leaders are recognizing the positive outcomes of transformational, more collaborative leadership versus the traditional, masculine, hierarchical command and control style (Mainero and Sullivan, 2006).

Female Rotarians often discussed how they disliked the approach of some leading Rotarians who would 'delegate' (tell) unto others what to do without asking for input. Personally, I found that the best leader in Rotary was one who not only collaboratively engaged members, but who also empowered other members to take over the lead (and then he/she would follow). I was not alone in wanting to more actively participate in Rotary when we had this type of leadership. Contrastingly, I observed how the command and control leadership style, especially with the use of participatory pressuring, was not appreciated. Often, this approach resulted in strained relationships and less communication. Unfortunately, Rotary leaders have not benefited from having this important feedback due, at least in part, to the strategic self-silencing that is occurring. Instead, this lack of feedback is perceived as *"everything is okay"* or *"it's all good"* and that the membership is supportive to what is going on. However, leaders are left wondering why Rotarians are not participating as much or why some decide to resign.

Integration of Theory and Theoretical Hypothesizing

Through discovery and by constantly comparing and conceptualizing, substantive theory emerged from the data that reflected and explained what was going on in Rotary (and possibly reflecting meaningful insight into what is happening in other organizational contexts like Rotary). By conceptualizing, abstract of time and place, and integrating theory concisely, what is going on in Rotary can be described this way:

In close working relationships, participatory pressuring (PP) tactics are used to engage others to think or act in a certain way to meet organizational goals. In the short term PP can work, but resulting discomfort often leads to strategic self-silencing (SSS) behaviors of resistance and avoidance to protect relationships and/or the organization. These behavioral interactions in turn reduce relational exchanges, weaken working relationships and decrease goal attainment. Also, women, in particular, can experience differential affects from PP and SSS if they engage in silencing the self, as they may be at greater risk of experiencing anxiety and depression. Increase use of PP results in more SSS. Subsequently, silencing can spiral into an organizational climate of silence.

Given how women can feel differential 'affects' from self-silencing, this may explain why women do not do participate or advance as expected in certain organizational contexts, especially in ones with a climate of silence. After the struggle to climb up the organization ladder and break through a glass ceiling, in theory then, women may be jumping ship as a result of the silencing consequences stemming from participatory pressuring. They may be exiting because of concerns for their mental health.

Violet's story contained elements of the lived experiences of female members of Rotary from different clubs in Rotary International. Violet's story is case specific to the context of Rotary, but her story reflects challenges women face in organizations in general. This research illuminated why both women and men strategically self-silence and do not express their authentic selves and why organizations are not getting invaluable feedback from organizational members.

This research sheds light on the "opt out revolt" (Mainiero and Sullivan, 2006). This research begs the question, "Are women opting out because of pressuring silencing and concerns about their mental health?" Additional research will help answer this question and will no doubt prove to be invaluable considering how progress for women's advancement in organizations continues to be 'glacial at best'. "Despite high-profile news about gender gaps, equal pay, and women on boards, once again the needle barely budged for women aspiring to top business leadership in corporate America" (Catalyst Census, 2012). Research continues to report that there is less career success for women than for men. Masculinity continues to be favored in organizations and perceptions about work-family conflict still represent a glass ceiling barrier to advancement in organizations, and alternative explanations and more research are required (Hoober, Wayne and Lemmon, 2009; Kirchmeyer, 2006).

This thesis research adds to extant theory about why both male and female members leave (exit) an organization frustrated and fed up. Based on past research and this research, it is likely, then, that they move on in search of better experiences that do not require sacrificing life balance, authenticity, challenge and their health in what they

do in organizational life, especially as a volunteer. To the detriment of the organization, members do not tend to voice their concerns before choosing the exit strategy, leaving those behind wondering why.

Big Picture Relevance of Theory Grounded in the Data

The importance of this research and the need for more studies on self-silencing, silencing and silence going on in organizations has been well noted in the related, supporting literature of this thesis. As previously indicated, there has been relatively little empirical research that has responded to this need. This thesis research makes an academic contribution by providing empirically generated theory, grounded in data from a volunteer, networking organization. Based on recent literature reviews, this research is unique. It appears that empirical research to date has involved the public sector or for-profit corporations. This thesis research expands the academic knowledge of silencing to the volunteer, nonprofit sector and provides comparative insights into the social processes of participatory pressuring and strategic self-silencing to the research area of organizational silence in general. In particular, definitional descriptions of PP and SSS behaviors also add to the literature on similar (but different) behaviors described in diverse areas of research.

The importance of having open communication channels and empowering employees is much espoused in current organization and management programming. However, from research findings, employees report that their organizations do not support the sharing of information as readily as it may be espoused and this is why initiatives to address needed change in this regard are often not successful (Adelman,

208

2010; Brinsfield, 2009; Detert and Burris, 2007; Pinder and Harlos, 2011; Perlow, 2003; Ryan, 2011). The lack of information flow and trust in the feedback process are paramount to the problem as first put in the academic spotlight by Morrison and Milliken (2000) through the theoretical lens of "organizational silence".

Many organizations survive by constantly adapting to maintain a competitive advantage and to continue to engage in meaningful missions that will endure the tests of time and new challenges. In the volunteer sector, organizations must be especially vigilant to change and carefully manage how they keep their members engaged and satisfied. Recruiting new members to their fold and ensuring they stay around for a long while is an ongoing challenge. Members are not paid; there are no profitable gains to be used to motivate and control members or attract new ones. Participatory pressuring is one method to get volunteers to perform towards organizational goals. However, the use of PP can result in silencing consequences that can have detrimental impact on individual member experience and on the overall healthy functioning of the organization.

Rotary International suffers from organizational silence and spirals of silencing; members are holding back on giving their feedback and this is impeding much needed change. From the data of this study, there is a need for more research to identify root causes and ways to break silences that impact negatively on an organization and its members. This research also draws attention to individual health risks for members that may be caused by the existence of subtle organizational practices that result in self-silencing. The empirical research indicating a correlation between self-silencing and anxiety disorders draws attention to how serious a problem this can be, especially for

women. Interestingly enough, recent media are reporting on increasing concerns about mental health in organizations (CTV News.ca, 2011). There may be some important connections with my research that warrant further consideration (and more research).

Learning more about how and why the social processes of PP and SSS are engaged in can allow the informed to be more readily able to recognize the pressuring patterns of behavior and to avoid negative consequences. To understand how the pressuring tactics can be used might be helpful in order to have a volunteer or an employee to participate in an organizational goal. However, the use of such pressuring strategies must be limited and done with caution; they may work in the short run, but can impact in negative ways in the long run, as evidenced in the membership experiences in Rotary. The resulting silencing may not be an indicator of positive support or indifference, but rather a symptom of members disconnecting from their membership and from the organization.

More importantly, having knowledge about the use of the different forms of participatory pressuring can be helpful for a person to better address these tactics, given the possible manipulative and controlling motives behind the pressuring. Preemptively, one can prepare to appropriately respond when in receipt of these pressuring behaviors. After all, responding to participatory pressuring with strategic self-silencing may not be such a healthy choice to make, especially for women in close relationships in organizations. I observed and also tested alternative strategies to SSS to address PP. I found that expressing feelings of discomfort and providing information on how you preferred to be engaged resulted, in some instances, in a less pressuring approach.

Advising with specifics and clarity on capacity and preferences for volunteer work before a project was implemented also helped to ward off pressuring tactics in advance. While completing this thesis, I began to consider the kind of change program that could help Rotary address the negative implications of the pressuring and resulting silencing.

Organizational leaders need to identify strategies to encourage those under their charge to speak up so that feedback is provided in a timely way to ensure that organizational goals are achieved. Better still, a reduction in the use of PP and removing structural barriers of hierarchy may help members of an organization feel more inclined and less intimated to speak up and share important feedback. In turn, there can also be more opportunities for individual and organizational growth.

Without much thought, I have engaged in participatory pressuring. It goes on without much notice. I must emphasize that participants, themselves, may have perceived being pressured to participate (more) when in fact there was no conscious or intentional (manipulative) attempt to pressure. Much of the participatory pressuring that goes on, I believe, goes on innocently, inadvertently and mostly unrecognized. In the participatory ways it happens, the pressuring is subtle (as compared to more pronounced coercive persuasion tactics found in comparative literatures). The importance of this research may simply lie in the fact that it is important that organizational leaders and those that follow their lead are aware of participatory pressuring and the impact it can have and to know when adjustments are needed. Timely adjustments may prevent organizational members from holding back invaluable feedback or getting 'p'd off' from all the 'PPing' going on and then deciding to resign from the organization.

Before members engage in a silencing exit strategy, organizations should become more aware of how to be more encouraging and supportive so that members voice their dissent or discontent, especially to avoid losing the valuable ones. Now it may be that some members who are disconnecting may not be as valuable as others; RI may not be a good fit for some. However, hearing dissenting views is nonetheless important. This gives an organization a chance to address the issues in a timely way to avoid the negativity of discontent becoming pervasive and more damaging. This is an ongoing battle as members come and go. It is a matter, then, of having a good balance between voice and exit as Hirschman (1970) suggests;

> In order to retain their ability to fight deterioration, those organizations that rely primarily on one of the two reaction mechanisms need an occasional injection of the other. Other organizations may have to go through regular cycles in which exit and voice alternate as principal actors. Finally, an awareness of the inborn tendencies toward instability of any optimal mix may be helpful in improving the design of institutions that need both exit and voice to be maintained in good health (Hirschman, 1970, p. 126).

More Speculatively in Rotary

From the previous quote, then, it is inevitable that there will always be changing circumstances and times of instability in Rotary. Comparatively, I have surmised that participatory pressuring is a social process that has evolved and has become more pronounced during recent, rapidly changing times of instability and membership decline. Accentuating the effect, with little doubt, is increasing influences of the corporate world in the non-profit volunteer sector. With the threat of decline, Rotary leaders are referring to their business and professional skills to get more done by a smaller membership. Participatory pressuring techniques are the evolutionary product mixing of softer

212

motivational approaches typically found in the volunteer world mixing with heavy-handed coercive pressuring experienced more often in the for-profit world.

The business minded, profit focused, leaders in Rotary institute their techniques to get the work done the way they know how, especially in a hierarchical organization of authority and power to act. Tactics are tempered to varying degrees with the contextual restraint that volunteer members are not paid and that membership can consist of diverse types of people / workers. A disconnect lies in the circumstance that those who join Rotary come with the assumption that they are joining to volunteer of their free will. Usually, a volunteer expects to choose what they would like to do, not to be told what to do nor subjected to authoritative and manipulative ways. Furthermore, many who join Rotary have accomplished careers and in their ability and desire to give back to society, they are self-motivated and empowered to do so. They have little tolerance to be directed on how they will volunteer. By membership definition, newly joining Rotarians are accustomed to leading, not following. With too many cooks in the kitchen, there is bound to be tension.

The sources of tension and temptation also lie in the networking power of Rotary and its attractive international capacity. Thus, there is compromise and tolerance to embrace all that is good about Rotary. Members, for the most part, decide to put up with the pressuring, and make the adjustment by silencing. Finding new members to adapt to this environment is the challenge. If they stay around long enough, as I did, they then understand the ongoing cognitive and heartfelt dilemma. To stay or not to stay; to put up, shut up or voice dissent in the interest of Rotary. For some, "*It's all good*". With the

213

ongoing threat of declining membership, Rotary must determine how it might need to adapt quickly enough to maintain its powerful networking advantage. It is indeed a puzzling circumstance for Rotary and its members.

Evaluating the Research Results, Comparatively and for Future Research

One of the most important components of this research was to develop new theory that was at least, initially, uninfluenced by previous theoretical knowledge.   I proceeded with this research to discover a participant problem as opposed to doing a study on a preconceived problem. As a result, the behavioral processes of participatory pressuring and strategic self-silencing emerged – a conceptual framework that offered explanation to a lot of behavior going on in Rotary. It was a prolonged engagement with me as a participant observer of many membership incidents. I was often a passive observer to incidents or a good listener as participants recounted their incident experiences.   I also actively engaged in membership. I was both a member and a researcher, balancing the roles to discover all that I could about what was really going on in Rotary.

Inherent in the GT process and further heightened by my doing participant observation, I know well how the theory discovered in this research fits with the data and works to explain behavior going on in the substantive area. I know from first-hand, participatory experience. I have provided examples and explanations to reflect the conceptual link and developments from data to theory. The concepts and theory discovered and reported in this thesis are obviously relevant to me as both a participant and the researcher. In experiencing and sharing my theses work with other Rotarians, I have received confirming feedback on the theory and in some cases obtained more data to

compare and modify the theory. The theory is indeed readily modifiable, as even in the final hours of doing this write-up, I continued to compare data from the research context and the literature, and subsequently, have garnered further insights. The elements of this comparative evaluation reflect the criteria for assessing GT results as Glaser (1998) proposes and as I outlined and discussed in chapter 2, p. 33.

With the comparative review of the literature, I examined research that I determined was most meaningful to the developing theory. I chose to focus the review more on the core category of strategic self-silencing. I also chose to examine more diverse areas of research rather than focus in on a few in order to have a broader understanding, whereas I had found myself into unfamiliar research territory. More comparative literature reviewing, more conceptualizing, revising and modifying the theory could be done. What has not been done yet or what has been missed can be taken up in future research. Glaser emphasizes that one need not apologize for what has been missed, but rather, what really counts is what has been discovered (Glaser, 1998). Future research will no doubt lead to theory modifications and to better comparative understandings of how this research fits into the bigger picture of organizational and management research.

I have little doubt that the social processes of participatory pressuring and strategic self-silencing are pervasive in other organizational contexts, and not just in other volunteer ones. Exploratory sampling in this regard has supported the conjecture. The variables influencing workplace versus volunteering relationships and the resulting impact of silencing will likely be different, but comparatively meaningful to more theory

development.   In comparing diverse situational contexts and possible variables impacting

organizational relationships will, no doubt, raise more questions and highlight paths to

future research for formal theory development.

Certainly for me, future research considerations include wanting to learn more on

how the combined implications of pressuring, silencing and mental health may be

impacting women who have made it to the top of corporate ladders, but then decide to opt

out.   I am also now in a better position to consider action research for a future study.

With the theoretical framework from this thesis research, I am envisioning the kind of

change program that could help Rotary address recruitment and retention challenges

impacted by the social interactions of pressuring and silencing. There is, evidently, more

comparing that can be done with each PP or SSS behavior. For many of these identified

behaviors, each one of them could represent a research question for study. In particular, I

would be interested in understanding more about 'mottovating' activities that can change

from a supporting strategy to engage members, to a silencing and de-motivating

interaction.   In considering the impact of pressuring and silencing and the illusive and

sensitive nature of related subject content, more research is needed, but it is not going to

be easy to do.

Challenges for Future Research

It is of no surprise to me that there has been a lack of ongoing research in this area

since Morrison and Milliken (2000) first noted how silence impacts organizations and

also raised concerns about how this area had not received the attention it deserved. In

Shcojaie, Matin and Barani (2011, p. 1732), a summary of reasons why research in this

area is lacking is provided:

- Silence is viewed as the absence of speech and in the absence of the behavior; it is not particularly obvious and does not attract attention.

- The absence of behavior is more difficult to study than more overt behavior (Dyne, 2003, p. 1363).

- The latent or subjective nature of silence makes it inherently difficult to qualify or quantify without the proper lens to recognize or interpret it.

- The hierarchical constructs of organizational structures and power suggest that employees' silence may occur too far from senior management's detection and therefore may inhibit an awareness of its presence (Slade, 2008, p. 6).

From my own research experience, it was challenging enough to examine the subtle processes of participatory pressuring and then even more difficult to study strategic self-silencing. In considering future research, I must reiterate how **developing close relationships was key to sampling and collecting data.** I cautiously paced myself to become more closely connected to members, and in turn, I discovered an even more complex problem for an organization of people who have grown to mean more to me than just another research context. This intimate relational experience, while maintaining a goal to make a research contribution, was a critical ingredient to the discovery of theory grounded in illusive data of subtle social processes. It was no easy task. I believe that the theory discovered and developed to be meaningful and relevant because I did not waver to the challenge to learn, adapt and adopt the classical, Glaserian approach to discovering grounded theory.

Chapter 10: Critical Rearview Reflections of Classical GT

As previously indicated in the opening chapter, this research endeavour was as much about learning and conceptualizing about GT methodology as it was about discovering and developing theory. I spent considerable time learning about GT in the different stages of this thesis research. While I advanced in the process, I continued to read about GT in general and comparatively to learn how to do it well. I wrote this thesis in a chronological way, thinking that I could do the write-up in a way that it could be helpful, instructional representation for others conducting similar research. I also conceptualized attentively and extensively on how I engaged in GT with the hope that the product of this effort could add to the ever developing and evolving interpretations of the methodology and its core analytical processes. To this end and because GT was all encompassing to the research experience and the theory generated, I conclude this thesis with some comparative highlights and critical reflections about doing Glaser's GT and about GT in general.

I outline the content of this final chapter prompted by questions that emerged with some of the more challenging aspects encountered in using the Classical GT approach. This culminating discussion on GT is supported by a research review of more recent literature on the various debates on how grounded theory research should be conducted —in comparative enlightenment after having completed this major GT study. Insights found in this chapter were also garnered from the comparative processing that happened in preparing for the thesis defense and in receiving more feedback from my thesis committee. As noted previously, but ever so more salient when the last word was typed

for this thesis, the comparative process of GT ends (finally) when one ceases to revise or add anything to the research write-up.   With each stage of the thesis process, including final revisions, the comparative GT process continued, making the experience seem like it was never ending.

Retrospectively, Questions About the (Glaser's) GT Process:

Does it have to be such a lonely process and if so, for how long?

Looking back through a conceptual rear view mirror, I understand why it can be and why it needs to be a lonely research path when one sets out to do a classical GT research project. It is part of the effective (and different) way that Glaserian GT can provide meaningful (and different) discoveries grounded in data. Glaser's GT is just one of many ways to do research, with an accent on proceeding in a way to reduce the risk of having preconceived or ungrounded ideas distort results. It is a way to reduce the chance of forcing data to fit theoretical frameworks and conversely, to allow concepts and theory to emerge from the data. After the experience, I understand better the importance of the differential directives and goals of Glaser's Gt.   Nonetheless, I did encounter and find it daunting to have conflicting committee feedback later in the process. This, I know, is typical. It is also not uncommon for there to be conflicts between grounded theory requirements and institutional requirements, especially given how GT can be used in quite different ways.

The recommended solution to conflict and challenges in doing a Glaserian GT study (as previously mentioned) is to present the research product after or close to its

completion (Luckeroff and Guillemette, 2011). However, built into most PhD programs are a thesis advisor and supervising committee guiding and / or directing the student during each stage of advancement towards the doctorate. So then, it is not surprising that a conflict of interests and process arises when a student chooses to do grounded theory research –a 'do-it-yourself' kind of methodology – especially when supervising academics may not be aware of just how 'do it yourself' GT can be.

As a sort of 'do it yourself' learner and an entrepreneurial, non conforming kind of gal, it is perhaps no coincidence that I discovered and jumped at a chance to do Glaserian research, but then faced some challenging consequences. I did proceed rather independently and as the methodology prescribed, I kept a temporal and spatial distance from the literature and from my thesis committee to avoid any influences that could have been distracting to developing theory FROM THE DATA. In retrospect, however, I think that it might have been better if I had presented a draft outline of the thesis sooner. In this regard, I also now think that the formal write-up could be started as soon as main categories are identified and even if data collection and comparisons are still presenting new concepts. Furthermore, once the write-up is somewhat advanced, as I experienced, it proves to be an invaluable medium of process to sort concepts and conceptualize more. I wonder if I had started writing up sooner whether I would have completed and defended sooner – a comparative review of similar research experiences might help answer such a question and help to clear up some of the more confusing elements of GT.

How to contend with the GT confusion?
The purpose of Jin Tan (2010)'s research paper was to help clear up some of the confusion in doing GT and Tan likewise recommended that future research was needed

to examine researchers' GT experiences to better understand how misconceptions and

arguments about GT continue to confuse inexperienced qualitative researchers. Tan

provides explanation and some important advice for the novice GT researcher, which I

would similarly advance considering some of the confusion I experienced:

> Analysing data and generating an integrated grounded theory are practical
> difficulties for many new GT researchers. They occur because of diverse existing
> versions evolved from Glaser and Strauss' original idea, their later disjunctive
> emphases on coding techniques, some misinterpretations of their ideas, and
> ongoing debates based in different disciplines. The researcher may adopt any of
> the GT versions or combine them. However, they need to explicitly explain how
> they use each version, what coding techniques were employed, and how the ideas
> of categories and relationships emerged, rather than simply call their research a
> GT study without following the criteria of any version on the pretext of
> "flexibility" or "creativity".

I appreciated the flexibility and creativity aspects of Glaser's GT. However, I was

cautious not to take advantage of these liberal dimensions. I readily concur with Tan that

research papers should explicitly explain how GT is conducted to account for the work

done no matter what version is followed. In the future, then, those daring to do a GT

study will also have better guiding research examples. Greater accountability and

integrity for this kind of research will surely follow.

What to do about Literature Reviewing?

Much debate surrounds the function of the formal literature review when

considering different versions of GT research. Likewise some of the misconceptions

about doing GT center around how, how much and when literature reviewing should take

place. Allan (2003) suggested that the notion that fieldwork could start before a literature

review was a misconception of Glaser and Strauss's original work together. Arguments

along these lines continue to be an important dividing line between the Straussian and

Glaserian schools of GT thought.   Glaser, in his more recent publications (1978, 1992, 1998, 2002) provides guidance about when a literature review should be done, although there is some interpretative flexibility in operationalizing Glaser's suggestions. Glaser is quite adamant to avoiding any reviewing until one is well advanced in theory developing, but when one is 'well advanced' is open to interpretation.

"In contrast to the Glaserian notion of the "non-knowing researcher" who allows only the emergent data to shape theorizing, Strauss allows a much more provocative, interventionist, and interrogationist researcher influences over the data" (Jones and Noble, 2007).   Glaser has argued that Strauss and Corbin's version of GT opens the door to temptations of forcing the data to whatever theoretical templates are used in the research other than what is derived from the data (Glaser, 2002).

In practical terms, no matter the path that might be followed, it is important to describe in detail the methodological process followed so that the discoveries can be evaluated comparatively. When and how much the researcher consulted the literature (or academic peers) and to what degree should be clearly indicated in the research reporting. Subsequently, it will be easier to determine if the researcher theorized beyond conceptual developments or was restrained by what is found in the data. I believe that choosing to consult sooner or later or more or less will make a difference to the discovery and development of theory – the resulting difference, either way, can be what is needed or useful towards future research.

With no initial formulated research question based on a literature review, I struggled with not knowing what I was going to study, especially when I was venturing

(conceptualizing) into unfamiliar theoretical territory. In retrospect, I have questioned whether I could have accomplished more if I had become more theoretical sensitive to conceptual developments sooner in the process with at least a cursory literature review. Upon reflecting more critically on the research experience after its completion, I do have some regrets about possible time wasted re-inventing, re-discovering some concepts that had already been examined in the literature. When time is a rare and much valued commodity, no one wants to waste time re-inventing a wheel. The Wheels of Rotary turn slowly enough and researching the context was even a slower process.   I did discover beyond what was found in the literature, but time could have been saved by starting, as most research does, with having reviewed some of the related material. The trade-off of wasting some time re-discovering, I counter argue, can be off-set with identifying and developing new theory not biased by a pre-exposure to theory. As well, it can be considered that time has been well spent gaining a different perspective and digging deeper into problem to gain knowledge, otherwise unattainable without the expenditure of excess time and capacity.

I believe that there is nothing better than discovering a reality for oneself, even if it involves a reality that has already been discovered and well examined. Inevitably, the discovery is in some small way different and adds at least some small dimension to a story. Furthermore, from the vantage point of having discovered a reality on your own, allows one to have a better 'grounding' and to be in a better position to contribute to a perspective, from the 'ground up'.

With a better understanding about the differences in approaches, for future

reference, the choice to follow a Glaserian or Straussian approach, for me, would be a

matter of choice and instinct to which way may result in a more meaningful theory or a

different theoretical perspective. I will make the decision next time with much less

hesitance and concern because, either way, if the research is done rigorously and with

attention to the core GT processes, theory will emerge. Depending on the research

context and ongoing data collection and analysis, I believe that a researcher should

consult the literature or other academics sooner or more according to their expert

intuitions (theoretical sensitivity). Whether it happens from the beginning or in advanced

stages of the research, whatever the researcher decides to do should be openly and

honestly reported.

In terms of reviewing, I think it is an obvious conclusion that a GT study, no

matter the chosen approach, must include a literature review at some point. Yes, surely,

doing a GT study is no excuse to ignore the literature (Suddaby, 2006). Post my

experience and critically questioning my doing the review after the theory was well

developed, I am left also wondering whether I should have done a more exhaustive

review. In retrospect, I think I could have done more reviewing in the area of

volunteerism, for example. I think that if I had started the review sooner, I may have had

more time and space to think about other areas of relevance.

I think that I waited longer than necessary to do the formal literature review. I

kept away from the literature and beginning the write up while I was still adding data

concepts to sub-categories. I interpreted Glaser's directive that you do a literature review

after the theory was well developed meant that I needed to saturate all categories and sub-categories before diving into the review. In hindsight, I think that it would have been appropriate and time saving to dig into the literature and start formal writing earlier in the process when the conceptual framework was first taking shape.   I did not need so many pieces of the puzzle. Enough pieces had emerged to see the outline of the overarching puzzle to seek out what data pieces might also be found in the literature.

I know better now about when to begin the formal literature review and how to be more attentive to considering different areas of research. However, these reflections are in hindsight, well after the moments of time when the data were before me. I may have countered different challenges and different results if I did consult different literatures or if I had consulted my thesis committee sooner in the process. One cannot know for sure what difference one way or another might have to theoretical outcomes when a path gets chosen. With GT, the research path unfolds while conceptualizing and developing theory. You do not know the path you will take until the data and choices are before you. Once you choose a particular direction, you cannot go back.   There is no going back, but there is always more comparative research that can happen to verify or modify the theory. The quality of the GT research effort will make a difference.

Concerns about the integrity of GT research (Jones and Noble, 2007 Suddaby, 2006), I think, will be remedied when there are more published GT articles that represent well the rigor of GT processes. Also a wider, greater understanding of GT research will also make a difference, as there can be diverse depictions of GT. In reviewing 32

empirical GT studies, Jones and Noble (2007) identified several major issues that arise from the creative and flexible nature of GT:

> First, grounded theory can be strictly emergent or can allow any combination of forcing element in the form of pre-conceived phenomena, research questions, sampling techniques, interrogative questions, coding templates, and so on. Second, the grounded theory product can be either conceptual or descriptive. Third, the grounded theory product can be an integrative (core category) theory that pulls together all categories and sub-categories into an overall scheme, or it can be a loosely connected theory embedded in numerous narratives and stories, or it can be no theory at all. Fourth, the grounded theory process can employ either systematic, non-optional procedures, or a flexible mix of procedures from which researchers can pick and choose (Jones and Noble, 2007).

Paramount to the quality of GT is that no matter which interpretation is followed, the research must include the common processes of GT that both Glaserian and Staussian approaches promote as necessary to the rigor of GT methodology. As Jones and Noble (2007) suggest, GT is not about "anything goes" and they also insist that in the future management scholars need to give more defined direction to the use of grounded theory in their research. I like to think that this thesis, and the future articles that will hopefully be published from it, will represent the kind of representation and direction needed to validate the usefulness and integrity of GT research.

Is Glaser's GT suitable for any researcher?

A driving theme that I gleaned from the PhD program of study is that choices about what methodology and methods to use depend upon, most importantly, the nature of the research question and the associated ontological and epistemological assumptions. After learning about Glaser's GT and having such a personal experience in doing this type of research, I now consider that who you are, as a researcher, your personal qualities and aptitudes for the different ways to do research should also be factored into the

226

decision equation of what approach to follow. As an educator, I believe that anyone can learn anything eventually. However, practically speaking, concerning the limited time and resources typically associated with research projects, it only makes sense that we choose methods that suit us to help ensure research results are worthwhile and relevant. In their comparing the Glaserian and Straussian GT approaches, Heath and Cowley (2004) advise new qualitative researchers to choose the approach that accommodates their cognitive style and that will help them develop analytical skills.

Glaser (1992, 1998) advocates strongly about how classical GT is not for everyone. It is not for those who have little tolerance for the uncertainty, confusion and lack of a more structured plan for research.   Given the learning curve, I would suggest to other PhD students to think twice about doing classical GT for dissertation research. Thankfully, I had the good fortune to attend a couple of intensive GT workshops. During workshops, I benefited from warnings given about possible challenges to be faced and how to address them. This helped a lot.   I was given the heads-up. I made a more informed choice before proceeding, unlike others who get into GT and realize it was not a methodology suited for them. I also had the chance to learn about what could happen with dissertation committees and how some could insist upon revisions to suit standards of how most theses are written.   I was prepared and it is in my nature to accept such risks and welcome that challenge, but for someone else, GT may not be a good choice because of this.

Although I would caution someone who is risk averse and has limited time and resources against doing a Classical GT research project, I would also argue that those

who are relatively new to academia could learn a lot and do well with a classical GT study. Someone new to academia or new to a particular research area can be better prepared for such a study in that they would not have the pre-exposure to theoretical frameworks that could bias the process. As well, someone new to qualitative research will learn a lot by starting out with the foundational processes of the grounded theory approach, no matter what version of GT is chosen. The drawback, however, in having little experience or knowledge in a research area is that you would not have the theoretical sensitivity that could be helpful to conceptualize as well as someone who has a background in the study area. So then, as an experienced, knowledgeable researcher or one with little experience or knowledge, either way, what matters is to proceed with an open mind and to use whatever theoretical sensitivities you have appropriately. Any bias in this regard should be eliminated with rigorous, constant comparisons of the data. At minimal, a researcher should be skillful or want to become skillful with the core analytical process of comparing and conceptualizing.

I hope this thesis will serve as a good model for any researcher who decides to follow Glaser's GT or that it could at least help someone choose which GT interpretation to follow. It is difficult to sort through the controversial ways that Glaser's GT differs from other interpretations. Adding to this challenge has been the use of GT terminology in qualitative research that has not followed the rigorous analytic processes fundamental to GT (O'Connor, Netting and Thomas, 2008). In the face of these challenges, I learned a lot and as one of relatively few who has followed Glaser's path (Jones and Noble, 2007), I will have, at least, raised awareness of this form of GT as a viable option and this discussion should help others decide whether Glaser GT is well suited for them or not.

Is there a gendered nature to Glaser's GT?

There can be gendered implications to how GT is engaged in a number of ways. For me, choosing to use GT and the way the process unfolded made a big difference in relation to my life priorities, to my roles as wife, Mother and daughter and in balancing my time. I have no regrets for how long this research took to complete. It was, in part, the nature of the participatory exercise, context, methodology and complexity of the social processes studied. Participant observation was a once or twice a week routine and it took years to know the organization and the people, and to become more accepted as a Rotarian. I have a busy life that played a role in hindering more timely participation to engage and develop relationships; however, GT accommodated my need for lots of flexibility.

Because of its flexible nature, GT can be an attractive choice for women in particular. As more women (and men with work-family conflict) enter academia, Glaser's GT may become a more popular option. A good friend of mine who read this thesis and who gave some feedback noted in her edits that she (a mother of two) would pick GT as well for the same reason; "there is no need to sacrifice the requirements of and need of family, friends, and recreations for the research. The research in progress is always there waiting to move forward when the researcher can return to it" (Glaser, 1998, p.15). The challenge, authenticity, flexibility of doing GT and its power to generate theory about what is really going makes doing Glaser's GT an attractive and sound method choice a woman, in particular. Untimely family interruptions, ironically, were for me an important part of the research process as a time to gain perspective and for sorting out concepts and memos.

229

In contrast to its attractive (gendered) nature for flexibility, Glaser's GT may not be the best choice for some feminist researchers or for studies that seek to answer questions about challenges faced by minority or marginalized groups. Glaser's GT directs the research with pre-set questions to be about a main concern (universal) for participants. It could be argued that if using Glaser's GT for management research, studies will focus more often than not on male perspectives if directed to focus on a central problem (their concerns). Focusing on a 'main problem' will likely lead the sampling path to study what concerns a majority – in most organizations the majority is likely to reflect a male dominance. Also, with the accent on developing theory about social processes abstract of time, place or people, this tenet can also reduce the chance for theoretical developments to be about the differences between people—and so then some people can go unacknowledged.

> Feminist research has a tradition of demanding that the unseen and the unacknowledged be made visible and heard…The very act of treating women's experiences as worthy of academic research was in itself a revolutionary concept in the face of much theory by the 'founding fathers' of social science and generations of empirical work that assumed male perspectives and experiences were universal (Ahmed Ryan-Flood and Gill, 2010, p.1).

Thinking more critically about GT and Glaser's possible sexist voice as a 'founding father' of GT, I should mention how much of his writing of GT is from the male perspective. Glaser makes an effort to footnote that with his writing "his means his or her (or all people) throughout his book" (Glaser, 1978, p. 2). However, this begs the question of whether this is a sufficient effort to address concerns about gender bias in his writing or in the version of the research process he promotes. With some prompting, Glaser (2002b) addressed issues of "Grounded Theory and Gender Relevance" and

reiterated that elements of gender, race, and other "fact sheet data" must earn their way into GT analysis and should not be forced into relevance by research design (Clarke, 2007). There may be a not so obvious bias of gender relevance if the research is about a 'main' concern. In most traditional organizations, main concerns will inevitably be about men's concerns.

As previously indicated, I diligently put aside gendered data, considering such data not to be relevant to what was a gender neutral (at least initially) problem of participatory pressuring. Data comparisons with the literature eventually provided the grounding for explicit gender data involvement in my research. 'Eventually' may not be soon enough and so Glaser's GT, I suggest, may not be the best approach for a research question that requires a focused study on a pre-conceived problem that concerns a particular group of people. GT is generally considered "always already implicitly feminist" by its nature and roots in American symbolic interactionist sociology (Clarke, 2007). However, Glaser's GT focus on a 'main' problem does put a slant on the research design, which could be addressed for a gender and diversity study by adapting Glaser's GT. This could be done by asking, more specifically, what is the main problem for a particular minority (female) group.

The irony in this study was that, although I did divert from focusing on women's experiences in Rotary to discover a main problem for Rotarians in general, further comparative study on the problem lead me back to focus in on the differential experience of women. Comparing gendered data collected from the study site and then from the literature made me more aware of how theoretical lenses (and research designs) can help

illuminate reality, but they can also narrow and bias the vision to discovering. I now

question more about whether some research findings are a result of what the researcher

expected to find rather than what is actually found significant in the data. Much research

has happened through the lens of gendered organizational culture and the glass ceiling

metaphor that has offered insights and some resolve to challenges women face in

organizations, but more research is needed. Classical grounded theory is but one avenue

to generate theory, gendered theory included. With a critical sensitivity, Glaser's GT is a

methodology that I know can be 'trusted'. I now understand better why and how.

Is Glaser's GT a process of trust?

With challenging and helpful feedback from my thesis committee and more

reflecting, I realized that 'trust' was a notable theme of this research worthy of special

consideration. Perhaps more so than other researchers might be, I was a willing

participant to trust the GT process as Glaser strongly advances (1998). I did not fully

understand the methodology when I began it, but I took the chance. Because of my initial

lack of understanding of the processes, I was more cognitive and reflective on the

experience than I have ever been in other research experiences. For those who do not feel

comfortable with uncertainty and need more structure and evidence producing thick

description in a research process, Glaser's GT may not be a good method choice –

especially for thesis research. I took the leap and trusted the process and am satisfied

with the results as they were promised (Glaser, 1998).

Trust was a critical factor to getting results from this research endeavour. Given

that the purpose of doing this GT study was to develop explanatory theory about social

behavior in Rotary, it is not surprising that trust played an important role. Getting to some of the sensitive data found deeply grounded in elusive social processes of the research context was not readily accomplished. I only realized when I was preparing for the thesis defense how hard I had to work to build trusting relationships in Rotary in order to identify the subtle behaviors of participatory pressuring and strategic self-silencing. In order to have greater access to relevant data, which was often also personally sensitive to some, I needed to earn participants' trust.

There was a major turning point to my gaining the trust of fellow Rotarians and to be treated and considered as one of them. As I learned more about Rotary and got to know the organization and Rotarians more personally, I began to have a sense of the history and pride Rotarians have for all that they do. I wrote a song about how the "Wheels of Humanity" make a difference in the world (see Appendix A). I daringly sang this song at an important, formal Rotary dinner function attended by Rotarians from local clubs. It was a special night of celebrating, connecting, and networking. It was a special Charter Night that included the deliverance of Paul Harris Fellow Awards upon the most deserving. District leaders were also present.

You could have heard a pin drop as I sang the Rotary song to an audience of unusually quiet Rotarians. Nervously, I was not quite sure what this meant until I finished the song and to a pleasant surprise, I received a standing ovation. I do not believe such a positive response was about a stellar performance. Rotarians were moved by the words of the song, the passion for Rotary it depicted and my brave effort to so personally share the song I wrote – for Rotary, for them, honoring them. After this

particular incident and by participating in more Rotary activities and fundraisers, I felt

(through experiences) that fellow Rotarians were finally accepting me as one of them.

Thereafter, I found that Rotarians were more forthcoming, open and honest in sharing

more about their own personal experiences, thoughts and feelings about Rotary.

Rotarians increasingly trusted that I cared about Rotary too and that whatever research I

was still doing about them and their organization would be of value and benefit to Rotary.

As also accented in the previous chapter, building meaningful and trusting

relations with Rotarians was instrumental to collecting a lot of the data. It was only really

after the fact, however, that I could really take stock of all I did to develop relationships.

Much of the research unfolded slowly, as I was likewise slow to realize the need that I

needed to actually do more in Rotary to gain trust with fellow Rotarians. I believe the

theory that was developed through this research would not have emerged without making

great efforts and sincere overtures to gain the respect and trust of fellow Rotarians. As

Glaser's GT is all about developing theory about a main 'concern' for participants, in

retrospect, it really is of no surprise how important trust was for this thesis research. I

conclude that no matter the methods used to collect data, gaining participants' trust is

critical to gaining the kind of insightful data that the GT approach can reveal for

developing original and meaningful theory.

From Trusting to Silencing

To those who may not fully trust the theoretical product of this research and how

it all emerged, future research and more comparative analysis will provide the verification

and modification that may be needed. In the confidences, interest and respect of

participants, including myself, I was not all revealing of the data evidence that could have

added to the trustworthiness of this research—for good reasons. In the secrecy and

silence of the research process:

> Sometimes we might stay silent about some of the findings of our research
> because we do not have trust in how those findings might be used by other actors.
> A lack of trust can be reason not to speak: or you can speak about your distrust.
> The point of this 'sometimes' is that we learn that silence and speech have
> different even contradictory effect given their timing, which is a question not
> simply of their time, but also of the place in which we reside at a given moment of
> time…(Ahmed, 2010, p. xvi).

As trusting as I was to take the plunge and to make the commitment to follow Glaser's

GT approach, upon completion of this research, I am surprised by how I became silent at

certain times and about certain data aspects of this research.   With this in-depth research

experience and becoming more knowledgeable about the power and safety in silence from

the literature, I have changed my thinking a few times about the resolve and what all to

reveal about the organizational challenges faced in a culture of silence. I have become

less innocent and more cognizant to the challenging contextual circumstances of deciding

to speak up or not.   I have been a strong advocate for the importance of honesty and

openness in all that we say or do in our relations, especially in the public domains of

organizations. However, until leaders truly appreciate the value and importance of honest

and upfront feedback and that injustices are better addressed, the power and safety in

silence will continue to be a viable choice for an individual and for the competitive

survival of an organization.

    Although my membership and the research in Rotary had its ups and downs,

twists and turns, trusting and distrusting experiences, uncertain and silencing moments, it

was worth it. Having engaged in Glaser's GT, the process afforded time and space to

maintain a degree of life balance. Rather than face brain drain or become fed up and frustrated, I enjoyed the challenge, authenticity and balance in doing this research work (Maineiro and Sullivan, 2006). I hope that the substantive theory generated from this research initiative is meaningful to Rotary International and that it will make a difference to other organizations like Rotary in their efforts to retain and grow their membership. With a better grounding in ways to engage volunteers and to encourage them to speak up, organizations like Rotary can continue to prosper and make their worthwhile differences in the world.

In light of this research, organizational leaders of today need to be attentive to how subtle participatory pressuring behaviors may be impairing the flow of invaluable organizational feedback. They should be asking whether there is a climate of silence and if so, what is the impact and how can it be addressed? Are there health concerns in this regard? Also, leaders will want to consider how diversity, differences, and conflict play a role in silencing so as to take corrective action to avoid missing organizational development opportunities when differences and diversity are not fully embraced.

In silence, much can be missed and can go wrong, especially if not addressed in a timely way and if allowed to spiral out of control.

Final words—of warning:

When all is quiet, believed to be peacefully quiet,

And there is no one challenging or speaking up

Whilst there is an 'elephant in the room' the cost of silence can be great.

The cost, like silence, may not be so readily observable,

Often not before it is too late.

It can be a "Soul Sucking Situation"

(Concept Conceived by Corinne).

In Contrast:

May the Wheels of Humanity Keep on Turning

With Less Participatory Pressuring, More Voice and less Silencing.

References

About Rotary (2003). Rotary International, "About Rotary", Retrieved August 1, 2004 from http://www.rotary.org/aboutrotary/index.html.

Adelman, K. (2010). Employee Voice and Upward Communication: A Phenomenological Collective Case Study of Leadership Behaviors in Performance Excellence Award Winning Health Organizations. UMI Dissertation Publishing (UMI No. 3427805).

Ahmed, S. (2010). Secrets and silence in feminist research. In R. Ryan-Flood and R. Gill (Eds). *Secrecy and Silence in the Research Process: Feminist Reflections* (pp.xvi-xxi). New York: Routledge.

Allan, G. (2003). "A critique of using grounded theory as a research method". *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 2 (1), Retrieved June, 2013 at: www.ejbrm.com/vol2/v2-i1/issue1-art1-allan.pdf .

Alvesson, M. (2002). *Postmodernism and social research*. Phildelphia, Pa.: Open University.

Alvesson, M. and Deetz, S. (2002). *Doing Critical Management Research*. London: Sage.

Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. D. (2002). Beyond body counting: a discussion of the social construction of gender at work. In I. Aaltio and A. J. Mills (Eds.), *Gender, Identity and the Culture of Organizations* (pp. 72-91). London: Routledge.

Armitstead, Louise (2004). Women step up drive to break into boardrooms. *The Chronicle Herald*, Sunday, December 12. The Halifax Herald Limited, Nova Scotia, p. A12.

Athanassiades, J. (1973). The distortion of upward communication in hierarchical organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *16*(2), 207-226.

Bate, P. (1997). Whatever Happened to Organizational Anthropology? A Review of the Field of Organizational Ethnography and Anthropological Studies. *Human Relations*, 50(9), 1147-1171.

Benschop, Y and Meihuizen H.E. (2002). Representations of gender in financial and social annual reports. In I. Aaltio and A.J. Mills (Eds.), *Gender, Identity and the Culture of Organizations* (pp.3-18). London and New York: Routledge.

Beeby, D. (2004, November 29). Harassment of women 'alarming' at DFO, audit says, The Chronicle Herald Limited; Retrieved from December 5, 2004 from: http://www.herald.ns.ca/stories/2004/11/29/fCanada150.raw.html.

Boster, F. J. and Stiff, J. B. (1984). Compliance gaining message selection behavior. *Human Communication Research*, 10, 539-556.

Bowen, F., & Blackmon, K. (2003). Spirals of silence: The dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 1393-1417.

Bradshaw, P. and Wicks, D. (1997). Women in the academy: cycles of resistance and Compliance. In Prasad, P., Mills, A.J., Elmes, M.B. and Prasad, A. (Eds.), *Managing the Organizational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of Workplace Diversity* (pp. 199-225). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Brinsfield, C. (2009). Employee Silence: Investigation of Dimensionality, Development of Measures, and Examination of Related Factors. UMI Dissertation Publishing (UMI No.3376084).

Brooks, B., Jarman, J., and Blackburn, R. (2003). Occupational Gender Segregation in Canada, 1981-1996: Overall, Vertical and Horizontal Segregation. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*; 40(2), 197-213.

Bronskill, J. (2011, December 9). Wanted: A few good women in RCMP. The Chronicle Herald, p. B3.

Bryant, A. (2007). A Constructive/ist Response to Glaser's "Constructivist Grounded Theory?" *Historical Social Research, Supplement*; 19, 106-113.

Bryant, A. and Charmaz, K. (Eds) (2007), The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory, Sage, London.

Burrell, G., and Morgan, G.(1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis: elements of the sociology of corporate life*. London: Heinemann.

Calas, M.B. and Smircich, L. (1996). From 'the woman's' point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C. and Nord, W.R. (Eds). *Handbook of Organizational Studies*. (pp. 218-257). London: Sage.

Calas, M.B. and Smircich, L. (2006). From 'the woman's' point of view ten years later: Towards a feminist organization studies. In Clegg, S.R. Hardy, C. and Nord, W.R. (Eds). *Handbook of Organizational Studies* (2nd ed, pp.284-346). London: Sage.

Catalyst Census (2012). Catalyst 2012 Census of Fortune 500: No Change for Women in Top Leadership. Retrieved January 15, 2013 from:http://www.catalyst.org/media/.

Catalyst-Knowledge (2004). New Catalyst Study Reveals Financial Performance is Higher For Companies with More Women at the Top, and 2003 Catalyst Census of Women Board Directors of Canada, Retrieved September 18, 2004 from: http://www.catalystwomen.org/knowledge/topics.shtml#glo.

catalystwomen.org (2004). "Networking / Mentoring", Catalyst Knowledge, Retrieved September 18, 2004 from: http://www.catalystwomen.org/knowledge/networking.shtml.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: a practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Church, Elizabeth (2004). Women still shut out of boardroom. *The Globe and Mail*, Friday, February 20, p. B3.

Cialdini, R. B, & Goldstein, N. J. (2004) *Social influence: Compliance and conformity*. Annual Review of Psychology, 55: 591-621.

Clarke, A. (2007). Feminisms, Grounded Theory, Situation Analysis. In Hesse-Biber, S. (Ed). Handbook of Feminist Research. London: Sage.

Clegg, S.R. & Hardy, C. (1996). Organizations, organization and organizing. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*. London: Sage.

Cohen, J. (1994). The earth is round (p<.05). *American Psychologist,* 49, 997-1003.

Conference Board Report, (2002). Women on Boards: not just the right thing but the 'bright' thing. Conference Board of Canada. Retrieved June 17, 2005 from: http://www.conferenceboard.ca/documents.asp?rnext=374.

Cooper Jackson, J. (2001). Women middle managers' perceptions of the glass ceiling. *Women in Management Review*, 30-44.

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

CTV News.ca (2011, June 20). Report paints stark picture of workplace mental illness. Retrieved September 19, 2011 from http://www.ctvnews.ca/report-paints-stark-picture-of-workplace-mental-illness-1.659819.

De Maria, W. (2006). Brother Secret, Sister Silence: Sibling Conspiracies Against Managerial Integrity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 65, 219-234.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2003). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.), *The Landscape of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-45). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Detert, J., and Burris, E. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(4), 869-884.

Dewalt, K. M and Dewalt, B. R. (2002). *Participant Observation: A Guide for fieldworkers*. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Dillon, D. R. (2012). Grounded Theory and Qualitative Research. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Dorrell, K. (2000). Eldercare crisis: Employees are struggling to care for their aging parents. Will employers help shoulder the burden? Benefits Canada, 24, 8.

Dyer, W. and Wilkins, A. (1991). Better stories, not better constructs to generate better theory: A rejoinder to Eisenhardt. *The Academy of Management Review*, 16(3), 613-619.

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*. 14(4), 532-550.

Elvira, M.M., and Cohen, L.E. (2001). Location matters: A cross-level analysis of the effects of organizational sex composition on turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 591-605.

Forward, D. (2003). A *Century of Service: The Story of Rotary International.* Evanston, Il.: Rotary International.

Gamba, M. and Kleiner, B. (2001). The Old Boys' Network Today. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 21, 101-107.

Gersick, C.J.G., Bartunek, J.M. and Dutton, J.E. (2000). Learning from academia: The importance of relationships in professional life. *Academy of Management Journal*, v. 43(6), 1026-1044.

Gherardi, S. (1995). *Gender, Symbolism, and Organizational Cultures*. Sage London.

Gladwell, M. (2000). *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference.* New York: Hachette Book Group.

Glaser, B. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis: Emergence vs forcing*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (Ed.). (1993). *Examples of grounded theory: A reader*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (Ed.). (1995). *Grounded theory 1984-1994* (2 vols.). Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: Issues and discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2002). Conceptualization: On theory and theorizing using grounded theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1(2). Article 3.

Glaser, B. (2002b). Grounded theory and gender relevance. *Health Care for Women International*, 23(8), 786-793.

Glaser, B. (2003). *The Grounded Theory Perspective II: Description's Remodeling of Grounded Theory Methodology*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. (2007). *Doing Formal Grounded Theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. and Straus, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Grafanaki, S. (1996). How research can change the researcher: The need for sensitivity, flexibility and ethical boundaries in conducting qualitative research in counseling /psychotherapy. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 24, 329-338.

Greenberg, J., and Edwards, M. S. (Eds.). (2009). *Voice and Silence in Organizations*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Press.

Grimm, R.; Spring K. and Dietz, N. (2007). The Health Benefits of Volunteering: A Review of Recent Research. Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Research and Policy, Washington, D.C.

Hall, A. and Rist, R. (1999). Integrating Multiple Qualitative Research Methods or avoiding the Precariousness of a One-Legged Stool. *Psychology & Marketing*, 16(4), pp. 291-304.

Hammersley, M. H. (1992). *What's wrong with ethnography?* Routledge: New York.

Hardy, C. (2001). Researching Organizational Discourse. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 31(3), 25-47.

Heath, H. and Cowley, S. (2004). Developing a grounded theory approach: a comparison of Glaser and Strauss. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 41, pp. 141-150.

Hirschman, A. (1970). *Exit, voice and loyalty: Responses to declines in firms, organizations and states*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Holland, R. (1999). Reflexivity, *Human Relations*, 52(4), 463-484.

Holton, Judith. (2007). The Coding Process and Its Challenges. In A. Bryant and K. Charmaz (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory* (pp. 237-261). London: Sage.

Hoobler, J.; Wayne, S. and Lemmon, G. (2009). Bosses's Perceptions of Family-Work Conflict and Women's Promotability: Glass Ceiling Effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 939-957.

Hughes, A. (2002). More Work, Less Pay: Study Shows the Corporate Glass Ceiling is Still Intact, *Black Enterprise,* Dec. Issue.

Ibarra, H., & Smith-Lovin, L. (1997). New directions in social network research on gender and organizational careers. In C. L. Cooper and S. E. Jackson (Eds.), *Creating tomorrow's organization* (pp. 359-383). New York: Wiley.

Jack, D. (1991). *Silencing the Self: Women and Depression*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jack, D., and Dill, D. (1992). The Silencing the Self Scale: Schemas of intimacy associated with depression in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 16, 97-106.

Jack, D. (1999). Silencing the self: Inner dialogues and outer realities. In T. Joiner, & J. C. Coyne (Eds.), *The interactional nature of depression* (pp. 221–246). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Jack, D. and Ali, A. (Eds) (2010). *Silencing the Self Across Cultures: Depression and Gender in the Social World*. Oxford: University Press.

Jenness, A. (1932). The role of discussion in changing opinion regarding a matter of fact. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 27, 279-296.

Johnston, B. (2000). *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics.* New York*:* Oxford University Press.

Jones, E. (1964). *Ingratiation: A social psychological analysis*. New York, New York: Appleton-Century-Croft.

Jones, R. and Noble, G. (2007). Grounded theory and management research: a lack of integrity? *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal.* 2 (2), 84-103.

Jorgenson, D.L. (1989). *Participant Observation: A methodology for human studies*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Kanter, R.M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation,* Harper Collins, New York.

Kanter, R.M. (1987). Men and women of the corporation revisited, *Management Review*, March, 39-46.

Kipnis, D, Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 440-452.

Kirchmeyer, C. 2006. The different effects of family on objective career success across gender: A test of alternative explanations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68:323-346.

Klonsky, M. (2010). Discussing Undiscussables: Exercising Adaptive Leadership. UMI Dissertation Publication (UMI No. 3426112).

Knapik, M. (2002). Ethics in Qualitative Research: Searching for Practice Guidelines. Online Symposium: Linking Research to Educational Practice II, July 5-7. Retrieved July 5, 2005 from: http://www.ucalgary.ca/~distance/cll_institute/Mirjam_Knapik.htm.

Korac-Kakabadse, N. and Kouzmin, A. (1997). Maintaining the rage: from "glass and concrete ceilings" and metaphorical sex changes to psychological audits and renegotiating organizational scripts - part 1 and part 2. *Women in Management Review*, Bradford, 12(5), 182-223.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Laturnus, T. (2001). Big shoes to fill at Ford: a woman of first, Bobbie Gaunt broke the auto industry's glass ceiling, *Financial Post*, F 14'01 p. E8.

Leck, D. & Saunders, D. M. (1992). Hirschman's loyalty: Attitude or behavior? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal. Special Issue: Research on Hirschman's Exit, Voice, and Loyalty model*, 5, 219-230.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985). Establishing trustworthiness, *Naturalistic Inquiry*, pp. 289-331. Thousand Oakes: Sage.

Linehan, M. (2000). *Senior Female International Managers.* England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Linehan, M. (2001). Networking for female managers' career development. *The Journal of Management Development*, 20(10), pp. 823-829.

Lipscombe, Kristen (2004). Wanted: More women in the political game, *The Halifax Herald Limited*. Thursday, June 3, p. B3.

Locke, K. (2001). *Grounded Theory in Management Research.* London, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Luckeroff, J., and Guillemette, F. (2011). The conflicts between grounded theory requirements and institutional requirements for scientific research. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(2), 396-414.

Lyness, K. and Judiesch, M. (2001). Are female managers quitters? The relationship of gender, promotions, and family leaves of absence to voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1167-1178.

Lyness, K.S. and Thompson, D.E. (1997). Above the Glass Ceiling? A Comparison of Matched Sample of Female and Male Executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (3), 359-375.

Neuwirth, K., Frederick, E., & Mayo, C. (2007). The spiral of silence and fear of isolation. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 450-468.

Maddock, S. (1999). *Challenging Women: Gender, Culture, and Organization,* Sage Publications, Inc., London.

Mainiero, L. A., & Sullivan, S. (2006). *The opt-out revolt: Why people are leaving companies to create kaleidoscope careers*. Mountain View, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

McCracken, G. D. (1988). *The long interview*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, Calif.

McGowan, R. (2003). Organizational Discourses: Sounds of Silence. Doctoral Dissertation, York University.

Merriam, S.B. (2002). Introduction to qualitative research. In S.B. Merriam (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for Discussion and Analysis* (pp. 3-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyerson, D. E. and Fletcher, J.K. (2000). A Modest Manifesto for Shattering the Glass Ceiling. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb, 127-136.

Milliken, F., Morrison, E., & Hewlin, P. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies, 40(*6), 1453-1476.

Mills, A.J. (2002). Studying the gendering of organizational culture over time: concern, issues and strategies. *Gender, Work and Organization,* 9(3), 286-307.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). An emerging strategy of direct research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 582-589.

245

Morris, R. (2001). Amazon Book Review on *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Can Women reach the top of America's Largest Corporations.* Retrieved July 25, 2005 from: http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0201627027/002-3149125-5134467?v=glance.

Morrison, A.M., White R.P., and Van Velsor, E. (1987 and 1992). *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Can Women reach the top of America's Largest Corporations.* Reading, Ma.: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Morrison, E., and Milliken, F. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 706-725.

Morse, J.M. (2003). Principles of Mixed Methods and Multimethod Research Design. In Tashakorri, A. & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research* (pp. 189-208). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

New Look. (2002). A New Look Through the Glass Ceiling: Where are the Women? Report Compiled by the U.S. General Accounting office and by John D. Dingell and Carolyn B. Maloney. Retrieved July 30, 2003 from: http://www.equality2020.org/glass.pdf.

Noelle-Neumann, E. (1974). The spiral of silence: A theory of public opinion. *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 43–51.

Noelle-Neumann, E. (1984). *The spiral of silence: public opinion, our social skin.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Noelle Neumann, E. (1993). *The Spiral of Silence: Public Opinion—Our Social Skin* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Univ. of Chicago Press.

O'Connor, M., Netting, E., and Thomas, L. (2008). Grounded Theory: Managing the challenge for those facing institutional review board oversight. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(1), 28-45.

Pajo, K., McGregor, J. and Cleland, J. (1997). Profiling the pioneers: women directors on New Zealand's corporate boards. *Women in Management Review*, Bradford, 12(5), 174-181.

Parker-Pope, T. (2007). Marital Spats, Taken to Heart. The New York Times. Published October, 2007. Retrieved December 5, 2011, from: http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/02/health/02well.html.

Parsons, D. B. and Mills, A.J. (2012). I've got a Gal in Kalamazoo: Rotary International, change and the outsourcing of gender. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 28(4), 311-320.

Pavey, L and Sparks, P. (2009). Reactance, autonomy and paths to persuasion: Examining perceptions of threats to freedom and informational value. *Motivation and Emotion*, 33 (3). pp. 277-290.

Perlow, L. (2003). *When You Say Yes But Mean No*. New York: Crown Business.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1983). On Studying Organizational Cultures. In J. Van Mannen (Ed.), *Qualitative Methodology,* California*:* Sage Publications, Inc.

Phillips, N. (1995). Telling Organizational Tales: On the role of narrative fiction in the study of organizations. Organization Studies, 16, 625-649.

Pinder, C. and Harlos, K. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as response to perceived injustice. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (pp. 331-369). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Popay J., Rogers A, and Williams G. (1998). Rationale and standards for the systematic review of qualitative literature in health services research, *Qualitative Health Research*, 8(3), 341-351.

Powell, G. and Butterfield, D. (2003). Gender, gender identity, and aspirations to top management. *Women In Management Review*, 18, (1/2), 88-96.

Prasad, Pushkala (2005). *Crafting Qualitative Research: Working in the Postpositivist Traditions*. London: M.E. Sharpe.

Rodafinos, A., Vucevic, A., and Sideridis, G. (2005, April). The Effectiveness of Compliance Techniques: Foot in the Door Versus Door in the Face. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(2), 237-239.

Rogers, B. (1988). *Men Only: An Investigation Into Men's Organisations*. London: Pandora.

Rotary History. (2003). "Today and Tomorrow", Retrieved August 8, 2003 from http://www.rotary.org/aboutrotary/history/todayandtomorrow.html#women.

Rudderham-Gaudet, E.(2006). A Motherist's Perspective: A Path Towards Theory of 'Mothering' in Organizational Research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Gender and Diversity Division, Atlanta, Georgia, Aug. 11-16.

Runte, M. and Mills, A.J. (2004). Paying the toll: A Feminist Post-Structural Critique of the Discourse Bridging Work and Family. *Culture and Organization*, 10(3), 237-249.

Rusbult, C. E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G., & Mainous, A. G. (1988). Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: An integrative model of responses to declining job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 599-627.

Rutherford, S. (2001). Organizational Cultures, women managers and exclusion, *Women in Management Review*, 16, 371-382.

Ryan, C. (2011). A Qualitative Approach to Spiral of Silence Research: Self-Censorship Narratives Regarding Environmental and Social Conflict. UMI Dissertation Publishing (UMI No. 3475847).

Ryan, K., and Oestreich, D. (1991). *Driving fear out of the workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ryan, M., and Haslam, S. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of Management*, 16, 81-90.

Ryan-Flood, R. and Gill, R. (2010). *Secrecy and Silence in the Research Process: Feminist Reflections*. New York: Routledge.

Schein, E. (1991). What is Culture? In P.J. Frost, L.F. Moore, M.R. Louis, C.C. Lundberg and J. Maritin (Eds), *Reframing Organizational Culture and Climate* (pp. xxiii-xxx), California: Sage.

Schriesheim, C., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 246-257.

Schwartz, F. (1992). *Breaking with Tradition*. New York: Warner Books, Inc.

Schwartzman, H.B. (1993). *Ethnography in organizations*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Shah, S., & Corley, K. (2006). Building better theory by bridging the quantitative and qualitative divide. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(8), 1821-1835.

Shojaie, S., Martin, H. Z., and Barani, G. (2011). Analyzing the Infrastructures of Organizational Silence and Ways to Get Rid of it. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 1731-1735.

Shpungin, E., Allen, N., Loomis, C., and DelloStritto, M. E. (2012). Keeping the Spirit alive: using feminist methodology to address silencing. Journal of Community Psychology, 40(1), 44-61.

Sicherman, N. (1996). Gender differences in departures from a large firm, *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 49, 484-495.

Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Singh, V. and Vinnicombe, S.(2004). The Female FTSE Report. Cranfield University, School of Mangement. Retrieved July 5, 2005 from: http://www.som.cranfield.ac.uk/som/research/centres/cdwbl/downloads/FT 2004FinalReport.pdf.

Soonhee, K. (1998). Organizational culture and New Your State employees' work-family conflict: Gender differences in balancing work and family responsibilities. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 18(1), 57-72.

Still, L. (1997). Glass Ceilings, Glass Walls and Sticky Floors: Barriers to Career Progress for Women in the Finance Industry. *Women and Leadership Working Papers Series.*

Strauss, A. L. and Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stroh, L.K., Brett, J.M., and Reilly, A. (1996). Family structure, glass ceiling, and traditional explanations for the differential rate of turnover of female and male managers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48, 99-118.

Suddaby, R. (2006). From the Editors: What Grounded Theory Is Not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49 (4), 633-642.

Tan, J. (2010). Grounded theory in practice: issues and discussion for new qualitative researchers. Journal of Documentation, 66(1), pp. 93-112.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Row.

Teddlie, C. and Tashakorri, A. (2003). Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences. In Tashakorri, A. & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research* (pp. 3-50). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tharenou, P. (2001). Going Up? Do Traits and Informal Social Processes Predict Advancing in Management? *Academy of Management Journal,* 44, 1005-1017.

Todd, P. and Bird, D. (2000). Gender and Promotion in Academia. *Equal Opportunities International*, 19(8), 1-16.

Tourish, D., & Robson, P. (2006). Sensemaking and the distortion of critical upward communication in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies, 43*(4), 711-730.

Travers, M. (2001). Qualitative Research Through Case Studies. Thousand Oakes: Sage.

Ussher, J. and Perz, J. (2010). Gender Differences in Self-Silencing and Psychological Distress in Informal Cancer Carers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34-2, 228-242.

Van Eeden, F. 1913. A study of dreams. Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research, 26:431-461.

Van Vianen, A.E.M. and Fischer, A. (2002). Illuminating the glass ceiling: The role of organizational culture preferences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 315-337.

Vickers, M. (2010). The Creation of Fiction to Share other Truths and Different Viewpoints: A Creative Journey and an Interpretive Process. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(7), 556-565.

Volunteer Growth in North America. (2006). A Review of Trends Since 1974. Retrieved November, 2009 from www.worldvolunteerweb.org/pdf/2006/06_1203_volunteer_growth.pdf.

Wadsworth, Y. (1998) What is Participatory Action Research? Action Research International, Paper 2. Retrieved August, 2005 from: http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/ari/p- ywadsworth98.html**.**

Whiteman, G. and Phillips, N. (2006). The Role of Narrative Fiction and Semi-Fiction in Organizational Studies. *ERIM Report Series Research in Management*. ERS-2006-079-ORG.

Wicks, D. and Bradshaw, P. (2002). Investigating gender and organizational culture: Gendered value foundations that reproduce discrimination and inhibit organizational change. In I. Aaltio and A.J. Mills (Eds), *Gender, Identity and the Culture of Organizations* (pp. 137-159). London: Routledge.

Williams, Jane C. *Reshaping the Work-Family Debate: Why Men and Class Matter.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, E. M. (1998). Gendered career paths. *Personnel Review,* 27(5), 396-411.

Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Wels, H. and Kamsteeg, F. (2009). *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life.* London: Sage.

Yin, R.K. (1989). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: Sage.

Yukl, G. and Tracey, J. B. (1992) Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(4), 525-535.

The Wheels of Humanity: Rotary International

The Wheels of Humanity Turning with Integrity
Done with – Dignity, And Great Generosity.
The Wheels of Humanity, International Rotary
Turning the World Around, Until all Polio is Found

Making a Difference, Showing the World We Care
Oh Won't You Share? Won't You Dare to Dream?
Of A World Without Poverty.
Bringing Water Where it Wasn't Before
Every Person Shall Thirst No More
United Nations Hear Rotary
We Want Peace in Every Country
We want Stronger Communities and Happier Families

Rotary International, Hearing the Children's Cries
Giving them a Chance in Life; No More Pain, Hunger or Strife.
The Wheels of Humanity, fighting poverty with literacy
Changing Our Hearts and Minds; Spreading Love and Tolerance.

Rotary International: The Wheels of Humanity

Appendix B: Memo Bank of Codes / Concepts

Fellowship	Insecurity	Speeches / Lecturing
Networking	Like Family	Competition
Work Pressure	Structure	Benefits
Balancing	Authority	Golfing
Membership Challenges	Chain of Command	The Before Meeting Drink
Interpersonal Conflict	Feeling it	Allegiance to RI Central
Politicing	History and Tradition	Next in line
Traditions	Glory Days of Rotary	Lingering talk
Intimidated	Suits, Leather, Air	Guilt
Change	Conditioning; Plain Colors	Roles
Change Resistance	Masculine Context	Time Constraint
Pressured	Welcoming	No time
Manipulated	Unwelcoming	Feeling Needed
Franchise	Jokes, Teasing	Health of the Club
Mother Ship	Delegating	Connected
Hierarchy	Emotional	Clubbish, Clickish
Ceremonial	Duty	Insulting
Formality / Elitist	Commitment	Futility
Camaraderie	True Rotarian	Circles of Friends
Morale	Paul Harris Fellow	Inner Circle
Frustration	Knife and Forkers	Personalities
Leadership	Similar Mindsets	Praising / Congratulatory
Poor Leader/Good leader	Participation Levels	Pats on the Back
Instituting Leadership	Cheque Writers	Bylaws versus Norms
Policy/Practice Conflict	Busy Bees	Bureaucracy
Quality of Members	Workhorse	Persuasion
Leadership Style	Minority / Majority	Loyalty Building
Stubborn	Democratic Rule	RINO; Deadwood
Mindset	Robert's Rulings	Dedication

Learning	Sgt at Arms - Militiary	Screening
Time Pressures	Felt Manipulated	Quality Members
Minority	Thanking the Thanker	Advancement Norms
Keeping the Peace	Value Driven	Proving Oneself
Cost/Benefit	No Overt Networking	Committing
Stressed	Givin'er / Giving it that ole	Experting
Thoughts of Quitting	College Effort	Minority
Nurturing Role	Domination	Unspoken Rules
Voicing Discontent	Compliance vs Loyalty	Presence
Avoiding Upset	Volunteering, it's all good	Selfless
Priorities	Shoulding	Long Hours
Personality Diff	Bad mouthing	Diversity
Socializing	Broadsided	Sharing the Good Feelings
Competing Interests	Miscommunication	Progress
Employee vs Employer	Norming; Storming	Bullshitting
No Self Promotion vs	Territorial	Moving On
Self-Promoting	Hegemony of Positivity	Masc vs Feminine
Social Class differences	Feeling it	Avoiding
Strategic planning	Burying Differences	Selflessness
Ageism	White Noise/Black Noise	Self-Sacrificing
Competing Agendas	Propaganda	Sexist Male Attention
Pushback	Impartial Informing	Performance Measures
Rationale for joining Rotary	Influencing	Kindness / Generosity
Lack of Succession	Disrespecting	Newcomer
Planning	Making up after storm	Exploiting
History repeating itself	Women REALLY feel it	Capitalizing
They know best; best to	Emotions Restrained	Differentiating
leave it to them	Personal Agendas	Pre-exposure
Strings attached. (external	Power Plays	Internalizing
pressuring).	Persuading	Holding Back
I am a Rotarian – identity	Pushy	Mindsets

Undue Influence	What is best for Rotary	Old Guard
Work-life balancing	Their Way is Best	Hands on Heads On
Code of Behavior	Club versus RI mandate	Taking Up the Slack
Sexist Stereotyping	Wheels turn Slowly	Old Boy's Club
Apathy	Inner Circle	New Boy's Club
Resigned	Reality Negotiation	Club Men-tality
Emotionally Charged(ing)	Mixed Messaging	Connections
Stonewalling	Feminine Ways	Role Modeling
Inappropriate behavior	Avoiding Advancing	Back Slapping
Coercion	Producing	Voicing Concerns
Political Correctness	Directing	Time crunching
Commitment levels	Transparency	Private Talking
Qualifying	Impression Management	Resigned
Negative Conflict	Status Quo	Rejection
Honeymoon Stage	Solicitation	Judging
Trooping-to fall in line	Put on the Spot	Worthiness
Girls vs. Women	Seniority	Adjusting
Defining Roles	Defiance	Coveting Privileges
Lies of Omission	Articulate	Cheerleading
Haystacking	Orientating	Motivating/Mottovating
Heckling	Fatique	Tolerance
Rituals	Reluctance	Attitudes
Sensitivities	Respecting Differences	Like-Minded
Criticizing	International Exposure	Trustworthiness
Leaders Chosen	Gender Issue	Governance
Resistance	Core Group	Posturing
Decision Making	Unfulfilled	Balancing Beliefs
Accountability	Bossing	Imposing Beliefs
Abandoning Ship	Quality Timing	Assuming the lead
Networking done covertly	Hesitant / Unconvinced	All talk no action

Appendix C: Memos / Concepts for Participatory Pressuring

Welcoming, Inviting and Friendly; Inclusive; Caring together; Every one Participates.

Having Fun Fundraising Together; United you stand, divided you fall.

Join the Club! By invitation only—selective to finding hardworkers.

The right fit? Fitting in to Service Above Self / Quality members only.

You joined = made a commitment to participate in most club activities.

Making a Difference = Hardwork You joined Rotary didn't you? /Can do better.

You should be ashamed of yourselves Stepping Up to the Plate.

Must be on a committee; Meeting Make-Ups, Attendance requirements & Awards.

Need to take a turn; Club Goals; Everyone Included

Prayer directing Rotarians; subtle ways Rotarians are encouraged to do more.

Can't let the Club down. Everyone needs to participate. Pressured into doing.

Women, they REALLY feel it. They want to help; they are the ones who will do most of it in the end; they always do.

You really have no choice, got to fall in line. Actions speak louder than words.

Someone to Spearhead / Champion the Project – looking for a hero to make it happen.

Nomination Committee to **identify** full slate, informed first then asked.

Told to do the job Pushed into it. Delegated to do more, not asked.

Wishing to be able to do more; haven't done enough, feeling bad.

A minority does the majority; a lot falls on the President.

The line of succession assumed; Assignment to committees. Getting Roped In.

You are the only one or there is only a few who haven't volunteered yet -- personalizing the burden and the guilt if you don't join in.

Proving worthy to be a member, not just a member in networking only.

Recognitions, Awards, Pedestal Positioning, Benchmarking – to do more

Lots of Talk; Not too much Action, some do a lot, a lot direct and do a little

Exclusionary Behaviours for Non Participation, If not a cheque writer need to do more.

Unwelcoming, Unfriendly – until YES. Labels of participation levels.

Time Pressures; Must meet goals; Must succeed.

Shoulding / Imposing Values even without having the authority. Just dating; feeling overwhelmed, pressured too soon in relationship.

Appendix D: Memos / Concepts for Strategic Self-Silencing

You bite your tongue – hard not to say anything, but you don't dare.

Wasn't going to get into it.

Mum's the word. Better that less know.

I didn't want to ruffle any feathers. United you stand, divided you fall

I pick my battles – for when it really matters to me.

I avoided the topic. I changed the subject real quick.

Chose peace. No time for battle, not going to win anyway.

Barely gave it a mention knew better to say any more.

I shut my mouth. I said enough.

Prefer to say nothing; Better to say nothing I learned.

Content to just follow along Conforming, norming– avoiding storming.

They know what is best / Expertise and they have years of experience.

Angry about how decisions were made without chance to give input.

Incident when she just walked out after the announcement of who was going to do what.

Same ole, Nothing ever changes. Same grind.

Closed Circle of Members – circle not opening up to include member just arriving.

Timely Leave of Absences keeps me sane.

Tired of Trying, Giving Up, He has a defeatist attitude.

Valuable Time not to be wasted. Don't have time for that.

Keeping the Peace, Just following along.

Won't Make any Difference Turned off / Pissed Off.

I had already spoken too much and you saw where that got me.

Saw how another was treated when they said too much.

Couldn't get a word in anyway. Senior leaders get most of the air time.

Left me speechless, shocked, surprised.

Minds are well set, time to turn the page – time to move on.

Not wanting to Burn any bridges – like to remain friends, keep good association.

It Doesn't Deserve a Response. Won't get an answer from me, avoiding, won't indulge.

He replied with a sigh. You could have heard a pin drop.

Appendix E: Definition of Influence Tactics

Tactic	Definition
Rational persuasion	The person uses logical arguments and factual evidence to persuade you that a proposal of request is viable and likely to result in the attainment of task objectives.
Inspirational Appeal	The person makes a request or proposal that arouses enthusiasm by appealing to your values, ideals, and aspirations or by increasing your confidence that you can do it.
Consultation	The person seeks your participation in planning a strategy, activity, or change for which your support and assistance are desired, or the person is willing to modify a proposal to deal with your concerns and suggestions.
Ingratiation	The person seeks to get you in a good mood or to think favorably of him or her before asking you to do something.
Exchange	The person offers an exchange of favors, indicates willingness to reciprocate at a later time, or promises you a share of the benefits if you help accomplish a task.
Personal appeal	The person appeals to your feelings of loyalty and friendship toward him or her before asking you to do something.
Coalition	The person seeks the aid of others to persuade you to do something or uses the support of others as a reason for you to agree also.
Legitimating	The person seeks to establish the legitimacy of a request by claiming the authority or right to make it or by verifying that it is consistent with organizational, policies, rules, practices, or traditions.
Pressure	The person uses demands, threats, or persistent reminders to influence you to do what he or she wants.