ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION: A CASE STUDY OF THE DAVIS COUNTY COOPERATIVE SOCIETY, THE LATTER DAY CHURCH OF CHRIST, OR KINGSTON ORDER

by

Amy Kathlyn Osmond

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Communication

University of Utah

December 2010

Copyright © Amy Kathlyn Osmond 2010

All Rights Reserved

STATEMENT OF DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The dissertation of [redacted] Osmond has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

[redacted]	**Chair**	[redacted]
[redacted]	**Member**	[redacted]
[redacted]	**Member**	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	**8/30/2010**
[redacted]	[redacted]	**8/30/2010**

and by Ann L. [redacted] Chair of the Department of Communication and by Charles A. Wight, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

In this dissertation, I address the concept of organizational identification in the Davis County Cooperative Society, or Kingston Order. Carefully crafted organizational rhetoric and powerful compliance structures to solidify the organizational messages produce a remarkably high degree of organizational identification among its members. After examining the historical and rhetorical influences that have led to the creation of the Kingston organization, I describe three major ideological platforms that guide the organization's policies and procedures: consecration/communal living, polygamy, and intermarriage (Chapter 2). I discuss three key terms that are instrumental to understanding organizational identification (OI) in the Kingston polygamous organization: rhetoric, organization, and religion (Chapter 3).

In Chapter 4, I explain rhetorical criticism as a middle ground between interpretive and critical aims and discuss data collection and analysis procedures: Bullis and Bach's retrospective interview technique; Extended metaphor analysis; Aristotelian analysis; and analysis using Burkean identification strategies.

The results of the Extended Metaphor Analysis (Chapter 5), as articulated by Albert and Whetten, highlight the identity of the Kingston organization as a hybrid organization with three fully integrated dimensions: normative (church), utilitarian (business), and family. The Aristotelian analysis and Burkean identification analysis (Chapter 6) reveals rhetorical types, decision premises, and rhetorical appeals used by the Kingston organization and its people. In Chapter 7, I discuss how the four aspects of identification are related to Lalich's systems of bounded choice and Burke's theory of logology and how they are used to create member loyalty in thoughts, words, and actions.

Finally (Chapter 8), I review the conclusions of the previous data analysis and discuss the generalizability and limitations of the study.

Three qualities produce a highly productive organization with significant power in both public and private sectors. First, the Kingston organization is a modern, hierarchical corporation with an intricate structure and complex power dynamics. Second, the Kingston organization is money-driven. And third, the Kingston organization is comprised of people who sincerely believe in the cause of building the Kingdom of God.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

LIST OF TABLES viii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS x

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Is the Kingston Organization Really an "Organization"? 3
Have Organizations With a Religious Component Been Studied From an Organizational Communication Perspective? 7
Advantages to Studying the Kingston Organization From an Organizational Communication Perspective? 10
Conclusion 15

2. DESCRIPTION OF CASE STUDY 17

Creation of the Davis County Cooperative Society 18
Three Ideological Platforms: Professed Value Commitments and Associated Practices 24
Official and Unofficial Texts 57
Conclusion 66

3. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND POSITIONS 67

Key Term #1: Rhetoric 68
Key Term #2: Organization 78
Key Term #3: Religion 91
Identification: Organization + Rhetoric 115
Unobtrusive Control and Compliance in the Kingston Organization 169
Conclusion 191

4. METHODOLOGY. 193

Methodological Framework 193
Methods 204
Conclusion 242

5. "KINGDOM OF GOD": THE DAVIS COUNTY CO-OP AND LATTER DAY CHURCH OF CHRIST 243

Extended Metaphor Analysis 243
The Triple Identity of the Kingston Organization 246
The Interdependent Dimensions 256
Conclusion 265

6. ARISTOTELIAN ANALYSIS 267

Plato's Tripartite and Aristotle's Bipartite Souls 267
Kinds, Premises, and Appeals of Rhetoric 273
Conclusion 321

7. BURKEAN IDENTIFICATION STRATEGIES: BOUNDED CHOICE IN "THE KINGDOM OF GOD" 323

Transcendental Belief System, Mythic Image, and Cognitive Identification: The Kingdom of God 324
Consubstantiality, Systems of Influence, and Conative Identification: Group Identity 330
Behavioral Identification, Perfection, and Systems of Authority: The Law 350
Affective Identification, Mystery, and Charismatic Authority: Becoming an Order Family 365
Bounded Choice: Loyalty in Thoughts, Words, and Actions 378
Conclusion 390

8. CONCLUSIONS AND GENERALIZABILITY OF THE STUDY 392

Theoretical Conclusions 393
Order Conclusions. 410
Limitations and Applicability of the Study 427

NOTES 432

APPENDICES

A: TO MY FRIENDS IN THE SAFETY NET COMMITTEE. 445

B: ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION TABLES 456

C: DEFINITIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION. 463

REFERENCES 466

LIST OF TABLES

1. Theories of Uncoerced Obedience 188
2. Data Sets and Analysis Techniques Used to Investigate RQs 240
3. Frequency of Rhetorical Appeals By Current and Former Members 305
4. Early OI Definitions 456
5. Theories Used to Define OI 457
6. Definitions: Social Identity Theory 458
7. Definitions: Rhetorical Theory 459
8. Comparison of OI Theories and Conceptualizations by Percentage 460
9. Measures Used 461
10. Types of Questionnaires 462

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to so many people, without whom this dissertation would not have been written. First and foremost, I am incredibly indebted to my committee chair, George Cheney, for his invaluable mentorship. I appreciate his much needed guidance and his patience with me over the past five years, especially as most of this was done long-distance. It is impossible to describe how much I have learned from him, both personally and academically.

I am also very grateful to my committee, Danielle Endres, James Anderson, J. Steven Ott, and Connie Bullis. Jim's classes on postmodernism forever changed my epistemological perspective. Steve's class got me interested in organizational structure and psychology—and made me want to start a nonprofit someday. Danielle's class on rhetoric taught me how to look more closely at the text as a data set. And Connie's classes helped me to see the value of integrating quantitative data into an interpretive perspective. Every member of my committee went out of his or her way to help me reach this point in the program, and I appreciate it so much.

Thank you very much to my dean at Arizona State University, Duane Roen, for giving me the opportunity to teach (and therefore remain a student in good standing) while I lived away from the University of Utah.

I am also so grateful to my amazing family and friends for being supportive of this program. First, thank you to my grandmother, Donna, for instilling me the desire to achieve academically and for financially supporting me during this process. Her name should be on my diploma, as well.

Thank you to my dear mother, Kathy, who babysat my children while I went to

class and worked on my papers. She sacrificed so many hours of her own time so I could finish the requirements of this degree. She has also been my number one confidant from start to finish—I couldn't have completed this process without her.

Thank you to my amazing father, Wayne, who always told me I was smart enough to be a doctor. Without his constant reassurance throughout my life, I could not have reached this point in my academic career.

Thank you to my beautiful sister, Michelle, and my awesome Aunt Debbie, who transcribed the interviews for me. Thank you also to my brothers Steve and Greg and my sister Sarah for listening to me talk about this—over and over—and for offering helpful suggestions and advice.

Thank you to my awesome friends, who babysat my children, helped me work out ideas, previewed my writing, and supported me emotionally throughout this process. Words can't express how much this support has meant to me and how grateful I am for your help and your friendship. I hope to be able to return the favor someday.

Thank you to my wonderful husband, Jeff, who has continued to support me in this endeavor throughout our married life. I am so grateful for his constant reassurance, the sacrifice of his time and financial resources, and his balanced approach to life. I love him with all my heart. Finally, thank you to my sweet, brilliant, and otherwise amazing children: Jacob, Maia, Lizzy, and Jenny. They have also been so supportive of my desire to complete this degree and took an active interest in how I was progressing. "Did you finish your dissertation?" was a common phrase in our house for several weeks. Thank you, my sweet children, for being so wonderful! I love you!

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"The Order is a place where we have friends and family that help each other and . . . in the Order, we want to do the things Heavenly Father wants us to do" (Order, 2009a, p. 1).

Approximately 30,000 people in Utah live in polygamy (Moore-Emmett, 2004). While a few of these are independent families, most belong to organized religious groups. One of these groups is the Davis County Cooperative Society, the Latter Day Church of Christ, also known as "The Kingstons" or "the Order" (Morris, Mark, & White, 2001). Although the practice of polygamy is illegal in Utah and the United States, the approximately 2000 Kingston members are so strongly identified with the organization and its ideals that they are willing to take considerable personal risks to do what they believe is best for the organization. Members express feeling a powerful sense of belonging/membership with the organization that cannot be explained adequately with appeals to coercion alone; in fact, members report high positive feelings towards the organization; they perceive shared characteristics with the organization; they desire to promote the best interests of the organization; and they define themselves significantly in terms of the organization. Current members assert that "It's a wonderful, wonderful life . . . I mean, I cannot tell you how wonderful it is" (participant 18). And they discuss their happiness: "I don't do it because I see it as practical. I do it because it's normal. Because I see it as a normal way to live. And it's a way that I like. It's something that makes me happy" (participant 1).

Some former members who have left the Kingston organization, however, have tended to become highly *dis*identified with the organization, accusing the organization and people within it of physical, sexual, economic, and psychological exploitation. One woman explained physical abuse by her mother: "If I'd ask her why about something, she'd smack me across the room, my mouth and my ear would be ringing. Bam. Smack across the room, have a bloody lip . . . bloody nose. She didn't care" (participant 24). Another former member talked about what she considered organizational psychological exploitation: "You get up and you say your morning prayers, then you meditate at 7:00 in the morning, and then you say your memory gems. Then at noon you meditate and say your memory gems, then at 7 at night you meditate and say your memory gems and have your family prayer and go to bed. It's just a steady thing that keeps you completely indoctrinated. But I was completely convinced that it was God's kingdom on earth and his one true church" (participant 5).

Because of this stark difference in orientations toward the organization, I have become very interested in the factors that contribute to organizational identification and disidentification[1] with the organization. In other words, what makes Kingston members stay, and what makes them leave, to the degree that they are exercising personal volition? It is with this explanatory-interpretive aim that I approach the Kingston organization. I have conducted this study recognizing the extraordinary characteristics of this organization but also seeking to learn more about the individual-organizational relationship writ large.

The purpose of this dissertation is to understand how organizational rhetoric and member (vernacular) rhetoric contribute to organizational identification and disidentification within the Kingston organization. In Chapter 2, a description of The Davis County Cooperative Society, the Latter Day Church of Christ (called "the Kingston organization" or "the Order" for convenience) is presented. Chapter 3 then outlines the theoretical perspectives and positions I will draw upon to conduct the study of the

Kingston organization. I will then turn to a full description of my methodological choices guiding the study in Chapter 4.

The next four Chapters highlight the results found from this rhetorical analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the results of the Extended Metaphor Analysis. In Chapter 6, I discuss the results of the Aristotelian analysis. Chapter 7 explains the results of the Burkean Identification Analysis, in which the rhetoric of members is analyzed in terms of identification strategies. Finally, Chapter 8 discusses the conclusions, implications, limitations, and possible extensions of this study. Through this dissertation, I hope to convince the reader that membership in the Kingston organization (and new religious movements in general is maintained and managed through rhetorical identification.

I recognize that using an organizational rhetorical framework to analyze identification with polygamous organizations is uncommon. Before proceeding further with the case study, I must provide some justification for using an organizational rhetoric lens. Organizational scholars reviewing this dissertation have asked three important questions that require some explanation. First, is the Kingston group really an organization? Second, is there a body of literature that supports the analysis of organizations with a religious facet? And third, are there advantages to studying a polygamous organization through an organizational communication lens, rather than from more traditional psychological or sociological perspectives? As I will explain, the answer to all of these questions is "yes."

Is the Kingston Organization Really an "Organization"?

Organizational communication research has typically focused on business organizations (see Edwards, 2005; Mumby, 2005). Though "organization" does not necessarily mean "business," the Kingston organization does fit the conception of "organization" in the specific sense of a firm (Gilman, 1969) and certainly as Barnard (1938) defines organization as "a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons" (p. 3). While the members of the Davis County Co-op operate

with a unified religious worldview, they describe the organization this way: “The Davis County Co-op is not a church. It’s cooperating. It’s a business organization” (participant 22). A mere glance at the Co-op’s business holdings confirms that what we are looking at is “a relatively self-sufficient economic empire” (Morris, Mark, & White, 2001, p. 35). In 1998, according to Department of Commerce Records, there were at least 48 businesses affiliated with the Kingston family, many of these held under the corporation “World Enterprises” (Adams, 1998). And apparently these businesses have grown. In a 2001 civil suit filed by Mary Ann Kingston against numerous Kingston members and businesses, the organization comprises at least the following businesses and perhaps more: AAA Security, Inc.; Able Distributing; Advance Emblem; Advance Vending; Advanced Auto; Advanced Self Storage; A&E Amusement; A-Fab Engineering, Inc.; Alan Jenkins, dba Bail Bond Specialists, dba Shoppers Western Wear, dba Shoppers Pawn Shop, dba Sportsmans Pawn Shop; American Digital Systems; American Federal Corporation; ANR Company; Arnold Custom Fiberglass, Inc., Arrow Real Estate; Bear Mining Company; Central Offices; Club 48 Management, Inc.; Coalt, Inc., dba Ibapah Trading Post; C.O.B., Inc.; C.O.P. Coal Development Company; C. W. Mining Company, dba Co-Op Mining Company; CTC Trucking; Davis County Cooperative Society, Inc.; Duco Du Company; East Side Market; El Cid Financial; Family Center; Family Stores Tru Value; Fidelity Funding Company, dba Fidelity Factoring; Fountain of Youth Health and Athletic Club; Four Corners Precision Mfg. Company, dba A-1 Disposal; Gabriel L. Reynolds, dba Gabriel Construction Company; Gamble Ranch; Hiawatha Coal Company, Inc.; Holtz, Inc.; Hyrum Kingston, dba HK Engineering; Lake El Sinore Card House CA; I. A. Castle Corporation; Ibapah Ranch; K. C. P. C., Inc.; Kearns Property Company, LLC; Kingston & Associates, LLC; Kingston Diary; Kingston Investments, Inc.; K. J. E., Inc.; KWIK Industries, LLC; Latter Day Church of Christ; Little Red House Montessori; Marco Polo, Inc.; Meadowsprings, Inc.; MFG Company; Midvale Family Center; Mineral Claim; Mountain America, Inc.; Mountain Coin Machine Distributors, dba Best Distributing

Amusement Games; Mountain Gold; M. S. C., Inc.; National Business Management, Inc.; Nephi Walton, dba Ensign Academy; N. P. M. C., Inc.; N. U. B., Corp.; N. U. R., Inc.; National Business Management, Inc.; P. Robinson, dba Advanced Copy & Printing; Park Valley Ranch; Perpetual Youth, Inc., dba Fountain of Youth; PGAC, Inc.; P. P. M. C., Inc.; Premier Vending; Property Management; Railco, Inc.; RE Company, Inc.; Rexburg Packing Plant; Rocky Mountain Enterprises, Inc.; Rocky Mountain Utah, Inc., dba A Sportsmans Bail Bond Specialists, dba A+ Sportsmans Bailbonds, Sportsmans FastCash, dba The Car Store Sale and Leasing, dba AAA Sportsmans Bailbonds, dba Statewide Bail Bond Information Recovery; Ruth Brown, dba NBM; Security Investment Corporation; Shoppers Boot Corral, dba Studio West; Shoppers Village; S. I. C., Inc.; Sierra Wholesale; Specialty Consulting Services, Inc., dba Spiffy Ice Company; Spectrum, Inc.; Spiking Tourist Lodge; S. P. M. C., Inc.; Sportsmans Pawn Shop; Sportsmans Bonds Specialists; Standard Industries, Inc., dba Standard Restaurant Equipment Company, dba International Gourmet; Star Distributing; U. P. C., Inc., dba Garco Industrial Park; Valley Coal; Wasakte Ranch; West Deep Creek Irrigation & Power Company; Westwood, Inc.; Westwood Village; Wine Cup Ranch; and World Enterprises, dba Michael Shoe Repair and Men's Store (Morris, Mark, & White, 2001, pp. 25-28). This list comprises 97 legal business entities that do business as over 100 business enterprises. To be sure, this multimillion-dollar corporation is an organization, by any definition.

Not only do the Kingstons own a large number of businesses, but the Kingstons spend the majority of their time engaged in business enterprises and are expected to place their duties in the co-op ahead of their personal interests. Almost all members of the organization work full time for cooperative business, and the ones who stay home and raise children also provide day care for those who work (participant 3). The businesses in which the people are employed are called "stewardships," and members are expected to change career paths and work in different businesses when they are called upon

to do so by the leaders. The adult training manual states: "Most order members have always been willing to help their fellow man and someone else's stewardship. People stepped up and made things happen. They were not here to only promote themselves or their own stewardships. They were here to help build the Kingdom of God, no matter what the price" (Order, 2009b, p. 6). The coal mine appears to be the lifeblood of the organization, and members are called upon to work there on weekends as needed, even if they are employed in other occupations during the week: "The Coal Mine has always been a very important part of the Order, and many of our young people will have the privilege of spending some time there" (Order, 2009b, p. 1). Regardless of the circumstances—whether a child has whooping cough (Order, 2009b, p. 4) or a grandchild is born (Gustavsen, 1949)—members willingly sacrifice their personal interests for Order businesses. As C. Elden Kingston, the organization's founder states: "the success of the order has always depended on the members being willing to sacrifice" (Order, 2009b, p. 6).

Though the nearly seamless integration of the business, family and religious aspects of this multifaceted, multimillion-dollar corporation almost defies description, we may conceptualize the Kingston organization as a "family firm" with a religious worldview. There is an extensive literature in numerous management, organizational, and finance journals describing the combination of "two systems of family and business" (Nordquist, 2005; see also Cucculelli & Micucci, 2008; Eddleston, Kellermanns, & Sarathy, 2008; among many others); thus, this dissertation (about a very large family owning a very large business) is in good company.

Taking an organizational communication perspective on the Davis County Co-Op can extend the discussion of organizational identification in multiple group memberships. Van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000) argue that multiple group memberships exist within an organization, that is, "one may simultaneously be a member of the organization as a whole, of a department within the organization, and of a within-department

work-group, and that all these memberships offer potential foci of identification" (p. 139). They found that work-group identification is stronger than OI and is more predictive of organizational attitudes and behaviors. They state that our understanding of organizational attitudes and behaviors has much to gain by "an open eye for the multiple foci of identification that are associated with organizational membership" (p. 137). Similarly, in the interviews I have conducted, I have found that the rhetoric from different organizational dimensions sometimes compete with one another. Numerous studies have identified differences between group (defined here as any lower-level group membership within an organization; see Bartels, 2007) and organizational identification (Richter et al., 2006; van Knippenberg and van Schie, 2000), but this study's contribution to organizational identification literature is the systematic analysis of the rhetoric between identification in groups to find out how they may differ from one another, which types of rhetoric are most influential in inducing identification, and how organizational members appropriate this rhetoric as a resource for identification and disidentification (including adapting, subverting, etc.; compare Hirschman's 1972 categories of exit, voice, and loyalty). Studies such as Foreman and Whetten (2002); Johnson (2002); Johnson et al. (2006); Larson and Pepper (2003); and Bartels et al. (2007) have emphasized the importance of "distinguishing between several organizational levels with which employees might identify themselves" (p. 174). This study, with its focus of organizational members' appropriation of rhetorical discourses in different organizational dimensions (i.e., family, church, and business groups that are identifiable as separate groups but with obviously overlapping membership), can help answer that question.

Have Organizations With a Religious Component Been Studied From an Organizational Communication Perspective?

Religious organizations have been studied from numerous disciplines, with several different emphases. In studies with a focus on psychology, abuse in one form or another within new religious movements has often been studied (Hassan, 2000; Langone,

1993; Singer, 2003; West & Langone, 1985;). Studies with a sociological focus have also examined new religious movements, with many emphasizing how they are assimilating into or are standing separate from mainstream society (Barker, 2006; Possamai & Possamai-Inesedy, 2007). Though these questions are interesting, I am more interested in studying the functional organizational aspects of the Davis County Co-op.

Numerous studies approach the religious organization from an organizational perspective. The financial and organizational aspects of nonprofit religious organizations continue to be studied in business-related academic journals (see Abreu, 2006; Dehejia, Deleir, & Luttmer, 2007; Hopfl, 2000; among many others). Chaves (2002), for example, differentiates between three types of religious organizations: congregations; denominational organizations (religious organizations that are not congregations but that mainly produce religion); and religious nonprofits (religious organizations that work mainly in functional fields other than religion). These studies do approach religion from an organizational perspective; however, none of these studies considers communication as central to the organizing process.

A few other studies have examined new religious movements from a communication perspective. Baffelli (2007) studied the role of mass media in the development of the Japanese new religious movement *Kofuku no kagaku,* examining how the media served to legitimize the authority of the leader and delegitimize his persona. Howard (2005) studied antisocial rhetoric circulated on the Internet by Heaven's Gate followers. And Joose (2006) studied the link between interpersonal silence and charismatic authority of new religious leader John de Ruiter, finding that silence was the most important rhetorical strategy that persuaded his followers to believe he was endowed with superhuman powers. However, most religious-based studies focus on more established religions. Bailey (2007), for example, examined the rhetoric of George Bush in terms of a Pauline Conversion narrative, suggesting that Bush deliberately used the form in his book, *A Charge to Keep,* to identify with evangelical Christian leaders

that would later support his run for president. And Snee (2005) studied the rhetorical differences between Martin Scorsese's *The Last Temptation of Christ* and the biblical accounts of Jesus. The *Journal of Media and Religion* and the *Journal of Communication and Religion* are devoted to studying the phenomenon of communication and its relationship with religion. There is certainly a dissertation to be written on the Kingstons' use of mass media, but it is not my purpose here.

There are a few recent studies that consider organizations with religious components from an organizational communication perspective; specifically, these are related to organizational identification. Adler (1995) uses Cheney's (1983b) identification strategies to examine identification rhetoric used by leaders of two Lutheran organizations, one newly formed and one established, finding that the rhetoric of the leader of the long-established church used significantly more common ground and "assumed we" appeals than did the leader of the newly established organization. Forward et al. (2009) studied the effects of communication, religiosity, and organizational support on student commitment at a church-related university. This university was studied as an organization per se with a religious component, much like I am addressing the Kingston organization here. Results revealed a strong relationship between organizational identity and commitment and perceived organizational support, communication satisfaction, and intensity of religious faith. Leeman (2006) presents an ethnographic account of a group of people who formed a housechurch organization, finding that organizing as a relationship-centered counterprivate proved to both enable and constrain the organization, as it championed equality but lacked growth and diversity. Frye, Kisselburgh, and Butts (2007) examine spiritual followership through functional, interpretive, and critical lenses, posing potential research questions from each perspective. And Hoffman (2007) found in a study of three communities of Benedictine nuns that the communication-based principles of equality, mutual support, listening, and empowerment are the core values that allow Benedictine women "to create a space in which they can uphold their most

central values and model organizational practices that they believe should exist across the institutional church" (p. 187). Still, there is a need for research on organizations with a religious component from an organizational communication perspective, especially given Mael and Ashforth's (2001) comment that "religious identification is the most compelling . . . form of identification" (p. 70) and that "research should be devoted to how people choose focal entities, why they reject inherited ones, the processes through which discernment and multiple identifications develop and are invoked, and how people avoid descending into the dark side of identification" (p. 216). This study may contribute to this body of literature by focusing on how communication, from official religious doctrine to vernacular expression of faith, is central to the organizing process of new religious movements and the creation and maintenance of organizational identification.

Advantages to Studying the Kingston Organization From an Organizational Communication Perspective?

An organizational communication perspective is well suited for the study of the Kingston organization because of its (1) unique organizational structure and its (2) pervasive use of ideological rhetoric to maintain organizational structures, roles, and processes. Therefore, a discipline which focuses on outstanding organizational features while viewing communication as the central means through which organizations are created and maintained is necessary.

An organizational communication perspective is justified because polygamy is not adequately researched at the level of "polygamy" per se; that is, sometimes these polygamous organizations have been lumped together to describe a single phenomenon (see Beall, 2005; Moore-Emmett, 2004), when, in reality, each of these organizations has different beliefs and practices. Utah is home to at least 10 fundamentalist polygamous groups such as the Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (FLDS Church); Bountiful Community; Centennial Park Group; Davis County Cooperative

Society (Kingstons); Apostolic United Brethren (AUB; Allred group); Alex Joseph Family; True and Living Church of Jesus Christ of Saints of the Latter-days (TLC; Harmstons); Nielsen/Naylor Group; Church of the First Born; The Righteous Branch of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Petersen Group); as well as independent fundamentalists. And each of these groups has different organizational practices. For example, some groups, such as the FLDS and Kingston groups, have reportedly allowed and encouraged underage marriages (Moore-Emmett, 2004; Polygamy Primer, 2006); others, such as the Centennial Park group, must wait until they are 18 years old to marry. Some groups, such as the FLDS church, educate their young people in church-sponsored and church-directed educational systems. Others, such as the Kingstons and the Alex Joseph Family, allow their children to attend public school. In some groups, such as the Kingstons, marriages can be arranged by the leader; in others, such as Centennial Park, women solicit whom they would like to marry (Polygamy Primer, 2006). While each of these fundamentalist groups is a break-off group (technically a sect; see Johnstone, 1997) of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Church), their differences are vast and warrant examination at the organizational level.

Weick (1979) states that communication is the core process of organizing, and organizations are the result of collective communicative processes of enactment, or ongoing interaction; selection of many possible interpretations of their enacted environment; and retention of those selected interpretations to be used in future patterns of interaction. Communication, as Taylor et al. (2000) explain, is thus "viewed as organization—constituting organizations and not just occurring within them" (p. 100). Taking an organizational communication perspective means analyzing an organization in terms of how the patterns of interaction (more specifically, rhetoric) within an organization create and maintain organized interaction patterns that support organizational structures and processes. This fits well with Tompkins (1989) definition

of organizational communication as "the study of sending and receiving messages that create and maintain a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more people" (p. 2).

An organizational communication perspective fits well with relevant research surrounding new religious movements from every discipline. Most current literature on new religious movements from psychological and sociological perspectives agree that new religious movements (called "cults" by some[2]) rely on a powerful persuasive techniques[3] accompanied by practices that support the doctrinal rhetoric (Langone, 1993; Singer, 2003). West and Langone (1985), for example, define a new religious movement as "a group or movement exhibiting a great or excessive devotion or dedication to some person, idea or thing and *employing . . . techniques of persuasion and control*" (italics added; see also Beall, 2005; Chambers, Langone, & Grice, 1994). Ofshe and Singer (1990) present a similar definition: "a group or movement that, to a significant degree, (a) exhibits great or excessive devotion or dedication to some person, idea, or thing, (b) uses a thought-reform program to persuade, control, and socialize members (i.e., to integrate them into the group's unique pattern of relationships, beliefs, values, and practices), . . . etc." (Langone, 1993, p. 5). Singer (2003) states that three factors work together to create a cult: a charismatic leader, an authoritarian organizational structure, and a coordinated program of persuasion. Note that these are not complete definitions, but the portions selected here underscore that—in every definition—persuasion emerges as a key component of socialization.

Communication is not just an important factor in recruitment and socialization of members into new religious movements; it is believed to be the primary factor. Although some researchers believe that a preexisting weakness in the state of mind or life situation of an individual predisposes him or her to join a new religious movement (Deutsch & Miller, 1983; Levine & Salter, 1976; Sirkin & Grellong, 1988; Spero, 1984),

the evidence is scant (Aronoff, Lynn & Malinoski, 2000). In fact, most scholars of cults, religions, and new religious movements today believe that new recruits of new religious movements are normal people largely devoid of psychological problems, dysfunctional family systems, or other predisposing factors (Almendros, Carrobles, & Rodriguez-Carballeira, 2007; Langone, 1993; Singer, 2003). The factor that former members of new religious movements cite in common is that they were assimilated into the group through persuasion and accompanying behaviors/rituals (Almendros, Carrobles, & Rodriguez-Carballeira, 2007; Singer, 2003). While certain elements of socialization into a new religious movement may be nonrhetorical (such as dietary restrictions; Hassan, 2000), communication is the central component of recruitment and socialization in new religious movements. Because of this emphasis on communication in the recruitment and socialization of members into new religious movements, including polygamous organizations, a communication emphasis is warranted.

As Singer (2003) explains, several scholars have made important advances in understanding how this rhetorical process occurs. Schein's (1961) *stages* of unfreezing, changing, and refreezing show chronologically the stages of socialization into a new religious movement. Lifton's (1961) *themes* of milieu control, loading the language, demand for purity, confession, mystical manipulation, doctrine over person, sacred science, and dispensing of existence are eight basic themes of organizational rhetoric that are particularly influential in members coming to identify with the organization. And Singer's (2003) *conditions* of unawareness, control of the physical environment, creation of dependency, instilling of new attitudes, and creating a closed system of logic identify the conditions that are necessary for this program of persuasion to be the most powerful. This study's contributions to understanding organizational identification in new religious movements are (1) to target specific narratives, identification strategies, and phrases that are particularly important in producing identification and (2) to provide a systematic

methodology for the targeting of specific words, phrases, and narratives that can be replicated among other new religious movements. Currently, Singer's (2003) criteria for systematic persuasion are (1) stages (Schein, 1961); (2) themes (Lifton, 1961); and (3) conditions (Singer, 2003). I hope to add (4) *rhetoric* to those criteria.

In short, the cultural attention that polygamy has received in recent years on statewide and national levels makes this a relevant study with potentially important practical benefits. Because each polygamous group has a different organizational structure, polygamous new religious movements should be studied individually, on an organizational level. The Kingston organization is a relatively self-sufficient economic empire boasting of somewhere around 2000 members and 100 businesses, making this an interesting organization to study. Because of the Kingston organization's focus on business, its ability to induce organizational identification among multiple groups of membership within the organization through powerful organizational rhetoric, and its intersection with a growing body of organizational communication research, a thorough study of organizational identification in the Davis County Co-op warrants our attention. *Topically,* this study is important because it offers a new lens through which social scientists can learn about the phenomenon of how new religious movements recruit and sustain membership. *Methodologically,* this study can provide insight into the ways in which rhetorical criticism can draw from qualitative interview data to evaluate how audiences interpret, use, and resist organizational texts. This study, for example, goes further than evaluating organizational texts; rather, it assesses which texts organizational members find most salient in influencing their identification with the organization. *Theoretically,* this study can make several interesting contributions, such as adding to our understanding of organizational identification in multiple group memberships; extending the boundaries of organizational communication to address new religious movements

(Singer, 2003); and contributing to our understanding of different types of rhetoric in organizations and how these may either compete with or build upon each other.

Conclusion

In the preceding pages, I have proposed that studying organizational identification in the Kingston polygamous organization will yield interesting results about the organization itself and, by extension, the organizational structures of polygamous organizations and new religious movements—and how rhetoric operates to induce identification within them.

Chapter 2 begins the study of this organizational phenomenon by giving a description of the case study in question: The Davis County Cooperative Society, the Latter Day Church of Christ (called "the Kingston organization" or "the Order" for convenience). Chapter 3 then outlines the theoretical perspectives and positions I will draw upon to conduct the study of the Kingston organization. I will then turn to a full description of my methodological choices guiding the study in Chapter 4. The next four Chapters highlight the results found from this rhetorical analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the results of the Extended Metaphor Analysis. In this Chapter, I discuss the identity of the Kingston organization as a triple hybrid organization with normative (church), utilitarian (business), and family dimensions (Albert & Whetten, 1985). In Chapter 6, I discuss the results of the Aristotelian analysis. Here, I argue that the addition of the behavioral component of OI (championed by Van Dick et al., 2005, among others) provides a four-dimensional model that corresponds well with Aristotle's bipartite soul (in contrast with Plato's tripartite soul of affective, cognitive, and conative aspects). From this analysis, we are better able to understand the relationships between Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice, Burke's (1950) logology, and Van Dick's (2005) four-dimensional organizational identification. Chapter 7 explains the results of the Burkean Identification Analysis, in

which the rhetoric of members is analyzed in terms of identification strategies. Finally, Chapter 8 discusses the conclusions, implications, limitations, and possible extensions of this study. Ultimately, I hope to convey that recruitment, socialization, identification, and retention of members in new religious movements is a rhetorical identification process with affective, cognitive, conative, and behavioral dimension

CHAPTER 2

DESCRIPTION OF CASE STUDY

"The Order is . . . the only place where we have Brother Paul to teach us how to be better people and live the kind of lives that will please our Heavenly Father"
(Order, 2009a, p. 3).

In 1935, the Great Depression was raging. Many people living in Utah were destitute. Their farms, their homes, their businesses—some lost everything. Banks closed, taking people's life savings with them. Children were hungry, but social services were scant. Men and women felt defeated, helpless, and desperate.

Against the backdrop of the Great Depression, Charles Elden Kingston formed the Davis County Cooperative Society. This society was created as an economic organization through which men and women could lift one another's burdens and work together to become economically prosperous.

In this Chapter, I will examine the historical and rhetorical influences that have led to the creation of the Kingston organization. I will first begin by describing how the Kingston organization was created by Charles Elden Kingston, the central figure and first "Leader" of the organization. Next, I describe three major ideological platforms that guide the organization's policies and procedures: communal living/consecration, polygamy, and intermarriage. Then, I will describe the official texts of the Kingston organization. In addition to original Kingston rhetoric, the Order borrows texts from mainstream Christianity, the LDS church, and LDS-based sects.

Creation of the Davis County Cooperative Society

Though the Kingston group officially began with Charles Elden Kingston as its first leader, the story of the Kingstons really begins with Charles William Kingston, Elden's father. Charles William married Vesta Minerva Stowell in the Logan, Utah LDS Temple on May 17, 1906. Their first child, Charles Elden Kingston, was born in a one-roomed house in Henry's Canyon, Idaho in 1910 (Gustafson, 1949), where Charles was homesteading a farm. After several years of crop failures, Charles took a job in 1922 working for the Ogden Shortline Railroad as a car repairman.

Excommunication From the LDS Church

Elden's father, Charles, believed that the LDS church had made a serious error by renouncing the practice of polygamy in 1890 and failing to require its members to live the "United Order," a system of communal living explained and experimented with by Joseph Smith, the LDS church's founder and first prophet. A leader in the LDS church, Charles desired to live the religion exactly as Joseph Smith, its founder and first prophet, described.

Over time, Charles became more interested in pursuing a lifestyle that would return to the original teachings of Joseph Smith, even if it meant breaking with the LDS church. In 1927, Charles took his wife, Vesta, to see Lorin W. Wooley, who reportedly received instructions in a secret meeting from former LDS president John Taylor to continue the practice of plural marriage, even if the LDS church later abandoned it. The meeting with Wooley left Charles determined to break with the mainstream LDS church.

Initially, Charles's parents, wife, and children were very upset. In August 1928, Charles was not allowed into the Salt Lake temple but his wife attended. When Vesta came out of the temple she said, "What is this you've been doing—going out with women, I suppose? I'm going back to Idaho Falls tonight on the 8 o'clock train and I'm going to leave you. The children are on my side. Your father and mother will be against you; the church will be against you; all your old friends and relatives will have it in for

you" (Hales, 2006, p. 247). Charles did not return to Idaho with his wife but walked the streets of Salt Lake City all night. The next day, Charles returned home, where he was greeted coldly by Vesta.

Elden Kingston was 19 at the time, and he confronted his father directly, saying, "It would be better for a person to lose his life than be cut off from the church." But within a short time, Elden had a lengthy dream in which he said an angel of the Lord visited him. Both Elden and Charles William interpreted this to mean that the Kingstons should leave the church (Hales, 2006). Elden also attempted to give all of his property to the LDS church (as he felt he was directed to do in the temple) but was told by LDS leaders that the church was not living communally anymore. So, as described by one participant, "he [Elden] felt like he made that promise to the Lord and he had to do it, so he followed whatever path that he felt like he had to, to make it possible for him to do that" (participant 18).

On March 4, 1929, the leadership of the LDS church in Idaho Falls excommunicated Charles William from the LDS church. One week later, on March 12, Charles William received what he described as a vision:

> Two men walked into my room. The one on my right took me by the right hand. . . . Strength and power flowed from him through my right arm into my body. He began to talk to me and the words were powerful and sweet. Such words I had never heard so powerfully expressed before, and I wondered who this powerful stranger could be. He made it known to me that my action before the High Council was approved. "It can't be the Lord," I said to myself. "He could not find time to come to a man like me." So, with my left hand I opened His handclasp far enough to see the palm of His right hand, and there I saw the scar between the bones of His first two fingers—the scar that was made by the nail that pinned His right hand to the cross. It was enough. I knew now who He was! (Hales, 2006, p. 247)

Despite their initial condemnation of Charles William's actions, Vesta, Elden, and the other children began to reconsider his actions. Vesta had the most difficult time with the idea, and it took 2 years to persuade her that Charles's actions were correct. Charles stated: "For more than two years she had been trying to gain the knowledge of the truth as I had tried to teach it to her. The fact that the children were on my side was an anchor

for her" (Hales, 2006, p. 247).

Two years later, in 1933, Charles and Vesta Kingston, Charles Elden Kingston, his unmarried sister Ardous V. Kingston, his brothers John O. and Merlin B. Kingston, his sister Orlean Kingston, and her husband Clyde Gustafson wrote a letter to the LDS church condemning their abandonment of original LDS church teachings, and all were excommunicated.

The Need for Economic Relief

Meanwhile, the Great Depression was raging, and people everywhere were looking for relief. Elden felt "that it was necessary for a person to live the law of consecration [communal living] . . . in order to earn the favor and protection of the Lord. So he made a list of all of his property and all his money and went to a man who he believed had the authority to accept the consecrations of the people and offered to turn everything in to this man" (Hales, 2006, p. 248). The man refused, and Elden was disappointed and did not know what to do. So he went to the top of a mountain after having fasted and prayed for guidance. At the top of the mountain he was reportedly given the "Covenant of Consecration" by the Lord and was told to start the United Order, himself (Erickson, 2005; Hales, 2006; Hall, 1999; participant 8). In 1935, Elden Kingston (who by this time had adopted the ideological convictions of his father) saw this as an opportunity to help his neighbors survive the depression and live what he believed to be the word of God. As one current member describes: "1935 was a time of depression. . . . We had families come together in a depressed kind of time, and they came together to work together" (participant 20; see also participant 14).

On January 1, 1935, Clyde Elden Kingston, age 25, and his two wives became the first members of the Davis County Cooperative Society. The rest of Elden's family soon followed, and they began a communal utopian society in which everything was shared—money, homes, and even marital relationships—for the expressed purpose of building the kingdom of God upon the earth.

First Days of the Davis County Cooperative Society

In the first days of what came to be known as "the Order," life was difficult. "Brother Elden," as he was called, decreed that the Order must "descend below all things" to establish the organization (Order, 2009a). Therefore, the members were required to give up nearly all of their earthly possessions.

An austere dress code of denim overalls for men and blue broadcloth dresses for woman was instituted. One member states: "When we first came to the Order, all the men and boys wore blue coveralls. The women and girls wore blue dresses. They were simple clothes, with no pockets, buttons or zippers. The coveralls were made of denim. They opened from the crotch to the neck and were kept closed with ties. The ties were under the overlap so when they were tied up you couldn't see the ties. The dresses were made of royal blue broadcloth and were open from the neck to a little above the waist. It was closed with ties like the coveralls. The sleeves came halfway between the wrist and elbow. The length of the dresses was halfway between the knee and ankle" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 44, p. 10). Shoes were forbidden (Gustafson, 1949, p. 5).

All of the members' personal items were given to the Order, down to the last baby blanket (Gustafson, 1949). Orlean Kingston Gustafson, an original Order member, writes in her journal, "We have been required to give up nightgowns. Now that winter is coming on it seems like no matter how many covers I put over Coreen she still sleeps cold" (p. 26). After a couple of years, her perceptions about clothing changed: "The thought came to me of how I used to dress the children up and take them to town, delighting when everyone seemed to notice them and think them cute. Instead of wanting praise from man I should have dressed them with an eye singled to the glory of God" (Gustafson, 1949, p. 34).

Living conditions were difficult and temporary. Order members moved out of their homes and into tents (p. 17). Orlean Kingston Gustafson recalls: "Brother 1 [Elden] came over and said, 'You will move into the tent as soon as it is finished. We moved and are now living in it. It is quite warm during the middle of the day but cool mornings

and night" (p. 18). Members were required to take off decorations from their walls and dispose of all but the most essential items. Members were also asked to move to different places on short notice: On January 25, 1939, Orlean Gustafson wrote: "Brother 1 came about 7 o'clock (the children were in bed) and told me to move over to mother's place tonight. . . . I threw some clothes in a box and we stayed at Mother's" (p. 59). On February 14, 1939, she stated: "Brother 1 said I could move back home today" (p. 59).

Food was heavily restricted. At one time, members of the Order were required to eat only one food per meal. They were restricted from salt, honey, and sugar (Gustafson, 1949). In the beginning, they "fasted every other day" and "grew very weak" (p. 6). One year, they were required to fast on both Thanksgiving and Christmas Day. They were also required to engage in lengthy fasts, from which some died. Elden promised them, however, that if they were completely obedient "the Lord will not have to take food, clothes, etc. so we will do his will" (Gustafson, 1949, p. 14). However, food continued to be scarce. Orlean wrote: "March 30, 1940: Due to financial conditions of the order we decided to quit using milk except for the babies and sell the cream" (1949, p. 66).

Names were replaced by numbers. Elden taught a guiding principle of the Order, called the Law of One above Another, in which every member was placed within a hierarchy designated by numbers. Each man received a number when Elden found him to be worthy to receive salvation in the afterlife. Elden was given the number "1," Clyde Gustafson "2," and so on. The wives of each numbered man were also given a number, based on their seniority in the marriage relationship. For example, the first wife of Elden was given the number "1-1," because she was the first wife of "#1." The second wife was given the number "1-2," because she was the second wife of "#1." Children born to these marriages were given numbers based on their age. For example, the third child of the second wife of the man given the number 15 would be given the number "15-2-3." In the early days of the Order, members referred to each other by these numbers in place of names. As Orlean Kingston Gustafson writes about her husband, "I dreamed we were walking on rails (2 of them about 2 feet apart) over water. 2 [her husband] and 2-2 [the

second wife] were dancing and laughing and not taking it a bit serious but I was coming behind crawling on my hands and knees" (1949, p. 37).

Gradually, these austere conditions improved. For example, Orlean Gustafson, wrote, "July 3: Salt was given to us in our diet" (Gustafson, 1949, p. 11). On August 5, they "had milk again after not having milk or butter for 3 months" (Gustafson, 1949, p. 16). On August 13, Orlean's "baby shawl and blanket came back" (p. 17).

While it has been reported by many former members that current living conditions among Kingstons are often difficult, current living conditions have certainly improved. However, members' living arrangements continue to be decided by the leaders. As one participant stated, "I stopped living with my mom. I started living with my sisters in the winter and then in the summer. My mom and people in the group decided that. . . . She pretty much did whatever they said. I don't think she liked it, but she did it because they told her to—the leaders of the group, Paul and those people" (participant 10). In addition, the practice of going on long fasts has been continued. But current members state that they are provided for well and feel secure in knowing that they will always have a place to live and always have a job (participant 2, participant 28, participant 22, participant 18).

Charles Elden Kingston has been heralded by his followers as the "one mighty and strong" spoken of in the LDS collection of Joseph Smith's revelations, canonized as the Doctrine and Covenants: "And it shall come to pass that I, the Lord God, will send one mighty and strong, holding the scepter of power in his hand, clothed with light for a covering, whose mouth shall utter words, eternal words; while his bowels shall be a fountain of truth, to set in order the house of God, and to arrange by lot the inheritances of the saints whose names are found, and the names of their fathers, and of their children, enrolled in the book of the law of God" (D&C 85:7-8). His followers believe him to be the original leader of a select few that are willing to live Joseph Smith's teachings in their purest form. Elden has been succeeded by his brother, Ortell, and Ortell's son, Paul.

Three Ideological Platforms: Professed Value Commitments and Associated Practices

Three major ideological platforms guide the organization's rhetoric, policies and procedures. These platforms, central to Kingston doctrine but rejected by mainstream society, are communal living (the "United Order"), polygamy, and intermarriage. These policies in combination make the Kingston organization unlike any other corporation or religious-based sect.

Communal Living/Consecration

In 1834, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS) adopted a practice among a select few leaders of the church, called the "United Order," or "the order of the church for the benefit of the poor" (Smith, 1834). Under the 19th-century guidelines of the LDS church, the United Order was a communal experiment begun in 1834 in which members of the church, especially the leaders, were asked to give their assets to the church (Smith, 1834). The assets were then distributed by church leaders to members according to need. It was thought that this type of living would ensure that the physical needs of all church members, many of whom were poor immigrants from Europe, were met. It was hoped that this type of communal-based living would produce a classless society in which there were no poor and, consequently, no economic tensions between the many divergent groups of people who called themselves "Latter-day Saints." The practice was disbanded, however, because of the people's unwillingness to participate; the United Order (also called "consecration") was discontinued in 1838 and replaced with the request for church members to donate ten percent of their income to the church (Smith, 1838).

Implementation of Communal Living

According to Kingston organizational rhetoric, after the practice of consecration was abandoned, many LDS people became increasingly materialistic. Some of the LDS

church leaders "tried to warn the people and get them to repent and live the Laws of the Heavenly Father. Sometimes when they would talk about those things in their meetings, the Holy Ghost would whisper to them and tell them that someday there would be people who would start living Consecration and the United Order and would build up the Kingdom of God" (Order, 2009a, p. 16). The "people" needed only to wait for a leader to practically implement their doctrine.

This leader was Elden Kingston. After returning from the LDS temple, where he promised God to live the United Order, he attempted to turn in all of his possessions to first the LDS church and second to an LDS-based sect leader. Neither would take it. Out of confusion, Elden "fasted and prayed to find out how keep the promises he had made to the Heavenly Father [and] found out that there was not any place for people to live consecration and he would have to be the one to make a place so other people could come and live the heavenly father's laws with him" (Order, 2009a, p. 206). Elden then focused his time on putting this system of communal living into practice.

Benefits

When Elden present the communal system to his friends, family, and neighbors, it was well received. Some people found the idea of the United Order appealing because of its spiritual dimension as an original teaching of Joseph Smith. One current member states: "Mama loved the gospel. Whenever she had time to sit down to rest, she would pick up her [scriptures] and read it. She was born and raised in the town of Orderville, Utah, where some of the members of the Latter Day Saints were living United Order. It became part of her life, and when they were told to dissolve the United Order, it was something she couldn't understand. It was a commandment of God that had to be lived and couldn't be broken" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 44, p. 9). Many of the original members joined the organization because they believed the teachings were doctrinally correct.

Other people were attracted to the economic benefits of the organization. One member recalls: "When my father joined, there was a joining fee, and he paid that fee.

. . . Let's say 20 guys wanted to pool money, and help each other buy a home. . . . If you're the first guy, then you get your home pretty quick, and you're the 20th guy, well, you wait a while. But you still do—you work together and help each other out. . . . The organization started in 1935 [and] from that day to this, not one person has lost their home because they couldn't pay for it, ever" (participant 23). The possibility of helping each other through the economic turmoil of the Great Depression was appealing to many.

Current Kingston Communal Living

In practice, the DCCS was much more than a joint economic venture. Though possessions were shared, they were tightly controlled by the leader. For example, early in the organization's history, Charles Eldon Kingston stated that the Lord required Kingston members to move out of their Utah homes and into tents during the winter. Elden taught that, in order to be like Jesus Christ, one must "descend below all things" (cf. Smith, 1832), as Jesus Christ himself had done. After the members of the organization had spent the winter in tents and had thereby proved themselves obedient to the leader's directives, the members were told to move back into their homes and remove wallpaper, wall coverings, pictures, and floor rugs to try to recreate the conditions in which Jesus Christ lived (Erickson, 2005).

Today, living the United Order in the Kingston organization means (1) working full-time for Order-owned businesses, or "stewardships"; (2) depositing all money, or "units," into the Kingston-owned bank; (3) shopping at Kingston-owned businesses; (4) working overtime for other stewardships in need of assistance; (5) creating a "surplus," or saving more in the Kingston bank than is spent; and (6) living a life of frugality and simplicity (Order, 2009a; 2009b).

Polygamy

Polygyny, or the marriage of one man and multiple women (commonly called "polygamy" or "plural marriage"), was sanctioned by the LDS church from

approximately 1841 to 1890, in response to the 132nd section of the LDS *Doctrine and Covenants,* which states that a man may be married to one or more wives through a "new and everlasting covenant" of marriage. According to LDS doctrine, this type of marriage links families together in mortality and continues into the afterlife (Smith, 1843). During this period of time, approximately 95% of LDS adult men and women were monogamists (Hartley, 1999; Hinckley, 1998), with about 30 % practicing plural marriage in St. George in 1870 (Logue, 1988) and a smaller percentage of the total LDS population elsewhere (Holzapfel & Allred, 1999). Richard van Wagoner states that polygamy "served to weld the Saints into a new fraternity of people—'a peculiar people'" (Van Wagoner, 1989, quoted in Holzapfel & Allred, 1999; see also Ballard, 2002; Compton, 1997; Walker & Dant, 1999).

LDS Church's Abandonment of Polygamy

Pioneers who practiced polygamy were viewed as self-sacrificing and righteous. As Compton explains: "Accepting polygamy was a matter of integrity for both Latter-day Saint men and women, given the restorationist underpinnings of their faith and their acceptance of Smith as a direct conduit of revelation" (p. 312, in Anderson & Faulring, 1998). And, as one 19th-century polygamist woman, Lucy Walker Kimball, wrote: "You learn self-control, self-denial; it brings out the noble traits of our fallen natures . . . and the lessons learned in a few years, are worth the experience of a lifetime" (quoted in Compton, 1997, p. 468; see Anderson & Faulring, 1998). But due in part to the United States government's imprisonment of polygamous LDS leaders and members, in 1890 the LDS church announced its abandonment of polygamy. The practice continued on a limited scale until the "Second Manifesto" was declared in 1904 by Joseph F. Smith (Hales, 2006, p. 40).

Mainstream LDS Doctrine

The LDS church continues to denounce polygamy and prohibits its members from practicing "the principle," even in countries where it is legal (Hinckley, 1998a). Former

LDS church president Gordon B. Hinckley (1998a) states: “I wish to state categorically that this Church has nothing whatever to do with those practicing polygamy. . . . If any of our members are found to be practicing plural marriage, they are excommunicated, the most serious penalty the Church can impose. Not only are those so involved in direct violation of the civil law, they are in violation of the law of this Church” (p. 71).

Kingston Doctrine

The Kingston organization, along with other LDS-based polygamous sects, believes that the LDS church “apostatized” from the true religion revealed by God to Joseph Smith when it renounced the practice of plural marriage. As evidence for this position, they cite what has come to be known as the “My Son John” revelation, written by Lorin Wooley (1929), who gives a first-person account of the event (although many of the events were remembered later in life).

In January 1885, John Taylor, the third president of the LDS church, received news that federal officials had ordered his arrest for practicing polygamy. On Feburary 1, 1885, he went into voluntary exile until his death in 1887 (“Historical,” 2005). During this time, LDS-based polygamous organizations believe he called a secret 1886 meeting in which he ordained five men to continue the practice of polygamy after receiving instructions to do so from Jesus Christ and Joseph Smith, who appeared to him the night of September 26, 1886.

The Kingston organization maintains (along with all LDS-based fundamentalist groups) that the practice of plural marriage is necessary to gain salvation in the afterlife (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000). Because of its spiritual nature, finding one’s “eternal mate” is a matter of fasting and prayer: “praying with Heavenly Father and learning who that person might be and where we would fit in and would be the happiest” (participant 2).

Polygamy in the Kingston Organization

Polygamy, practiced in the Kingston organization, varies greatly. The leaders of the organization (Paul Kingston and his six brothers) are married to many women. Paul is said to have between 25 and 40 wives and possibly more (Genealogy chart, 2005; Hales, 2006). Over 600 children have been produced as a result of these unions, as the following Genealogy list (2005) illustrates:

Paul Kingston's Wives and Children

Patricia Elaine Brown

- Joshua Paul
- Martha Elaine
- Robert John
- Mary Ann
- Katherine Anna
- Matthew Ortell
- Carolyn Ruth
- Paul Elden
- Patricia Elaine
- Joseph Elden
- Michael Ray
- Jared Ortell
- David Ortell
- Adam Paul
- Jason Ortell
- Rachel LaDonna
- Daniel Charles

Ruth Carol

Verla Richaun Dye

Richard Elden Knight

Rebekah Richaun

David Paul

Jacob Ammon

James Aaron

Sarah Aften

Stephan Ortell

Hanna Richaun

Ruth LaDonna

Rachel

Anna Vesta

Mary LaDonna

Michael John

Natalie Marie Dye

Nichole Marie Allen

Daniel Elden

Jessica Dawn

Raquel Ethel

Caleb Paul

Christian Elden

Myma Joy

Deborah Ellen Tucker

Deborah Amy

John Paul

Samuel Elden

Pamela Ruth

Lisa Marie

Amanda Marion

Julie Ellen

Charles Michael

Joseph Leone

Joshua Ortell

Mary LaDonna

Philip Ortell

Cara Vesta

Rulon Eskel

Abel Jesse

Cynthia Jean Kingston

Elden Clyde Austin

Richard Ortell

Shaun Charles

Ashley Jean

Bethany LaDonna

Holly Priscilla

Chastity Carol

Anna Orlean Gustafson

Peter Elden Gardner

Paul Aaron

Shem Alden

Joshua Ortell

Elden Paul

Johnathon Clyde

Ethan John

Abram Paul

Anna Elizabeth

Lori Vallanne Kingston

Allison Vallanne

Seth Elden

Summer Rhode

Colleen Ardous Gustafson

Solomon Elden

Bonnie Colleen

Jamie Maurine

Dawn Ardous

Melanie Brooke Jenkins

Melanie Brooke

Emily LaDonna

Chase Elden

Paige Jantel

Abraham Ortell

Becca Marie Finley

Ruth Marie Keddington

Rachel LaDonna

Amber Marie

Paul Nathaniel

Hyrum Ortell

Autumn Danielle

David Ortell

Jesse Paul

Desiree Becca

Leah Kendall/Finley

Grace Elizabeth Kingston

Grace Elizabeth

Michelle Rhoda

Katherine LaDonna

Andrew Paul

Chelsey Ardous

Christopher John

Molly Vesta

Carol Ann

Mark Ellery

Leslie Ann Kingston

Steven Elden Miller

Colleen Ann

Matthew Ortell

Michael Paul

Kent Charles

Andrew Clyde

Aaron John

Andrea Gayle

Danyeil Vesta

Jeremy Paul

Lindsay Ardous

Sandra LaDonna

Jared Paul

Wendy J. Stephens

William Ortell Parker

Christopher Wendell

Megan Wendy

Enoch Charles

Annalynn Jean

Shalley Annalynn

Nichole Ruth Peterson

Brigham Ortell Ashton Nichole

Dorothy Jill Stoddard

Jason William Sanders

Jolene Amanda

Luke Earl

Dorothy Jill

Jennifer Louise

Angela Marie

Paul William

Nathan Ortell

Jesse Elden

Charity LaDonna

Ren Ortell

Landon Charles

Betsy Marie Reynolds

Carrie LaVona Spencer

Jesse Elden

Harmony Marie

Betsy Pauline

Valene LaDonna

Sterling Paul

Ryan Ortell

Paul Bryce

Savanna Lynn

Chlsea Lynn

Wendell Paul

Minerva Spring Tucker

Charles Elden Prescott

Isaiah Ortell

Israel Ortell

Alma Paul

Raelynne Walton

Jolene Raelynne

Christine LaDonna

Katherine Myrna

Kimberly Ann

Tamara Stowell

Jacob Paul Stowell

Paula Maurine Gustafson

Bridget Jean Bennett

Heather Paula

Julie Thomas/O'Brian

Diane Kingston

Jessie Ann Kingston

Samantha Katherine

Erin Arlene Kingston

Isaac Paul Campbell

Hope Arlene

Ephraim Ortell

Carl Elden

Joseph Ortell's Wives and Children

Luana Joan Gustafson

Andrea Orlean

Joseph Peter

Rebecca Angelica

Jeffery Levi

Joseph Clyde

Lisa LaDonna

Diane LaDonna

John Ortell

Joseph Ortell

Lori Ann Dye

Christine Lori Kennedy

Carolin Afton

Michael Ortell

Nathan Elden

Adam Joseph

Charles Alex

Andrew Joseph

Jacob Ortel

Justin David

Kimberly LaDonna

Jesse Ortell

Lydia Ann Pratt

James Ortell Wyatt

Josua Arnold

Joseph Charles

Elden Ortell

Christopher

Elizabeth Elanor

Ruth LaDonna

Kathleen Kingston

Alma (Died)

Ethan John Tucker

Minerva Spring

Robyn Kathleen

Sterling Charles (Died)

Jonathan Ortell

Rachel Orlean Kingston

Nicholas Elden

James Charles

Gary Vincent

Holly Orlean

Justin Ortell

Heather LaDonna

Katherine Rachel

Jesse Clyde

John Paul

Jacob Elden

Rose LaDonna

David Ortell

Camille

Rhoda

Angelena

Jesse's Wives and Children

Janice Vesta Johnson

Jesse Isaac Kingston

Elden Ortell

John Michael

Charles William

Janice Lisa

Solomon Jesse

Derek Ortell

Thomas Paul

Jessica Vesta

Joanna LaDonna

Noah Ortell

Shem Orvil

Samuel

Nathan

Lizette A. Smith

Jennifer Velanne

John Robert

Matthew Wesley

Leslie Lizette

Lindsey Ardous

James Paul

Carolyn Mary Stoddard

Bill Jesse Hughes

Jessica LaDonna

Leanne Orlean

Dawn

Jolene Helen Johnson

Justin Orville Andrews

Mark Jesse

Aaron Jesse

Benjamin Ortell

JoyLynne LaDonna

David Paul

Angela Ruth

James Ortell

Kimberly Isabell

Orlean Harriet Kingston

Eric Ortell Methews

Mary Orlean

John Jesse

Elizabeth LaDonna

Joshua William

Anna Vesta

Ruth Ann Kingston

Vesta Ruth Davis

Jesse Ortell

Andrea Orlean Kingston

LaDonna Andrea

Rachel Luella

Catherine Orlean

Paul Jesse

Joseph Ortell

Charolette Marie Kingston

Rachel Marie Hilton

Jolene Charolette

Lorie Laurine Freeman

Carolyn Lori Carlson

Kelly LaDonna

Jacob Elden

Evelyn Kay Peterson

Nancy Evelyn England

John Hyrum

Jesse Ortell

Cindy Kay

Blake Elden

Michelle Afton Brown

Andrea LaDonna

Jesse Paul

John Elden

Charles Ortell

Michelle Ruth

Felicia Walton

Roselle Kingston

Jeannie Johnson/Lancaster

David Ortell's Wives and Children

Sharli Rae Jenkins

- David Alan Kingston
- Amy Sharll
- Katherine LaDonna
- Seth Paul Eskel
- Travis Ortel
- Ruth Molly
- Ortell Ray

Maryanne Johnson

- Jacob Ortell Isaacson
- John Charles
- Matthew Paul
- Kelly LaDonna
- Jessica Vesta
- Joseph David
- Laura Ruth

Carlene Rae Kingston

- Erica Ruth Kingston
- Mikel Rae Cannon
- Jamie Orlean
- Paul Ortell
- David Michael
- Caleb Elden

Jared Ortell

James David

Charles Caleb

Kara Carlene

Aleina Louise Kingston

Hyrum James Peterson

Martha Aleina

Samantha Janie

Rachel Ann Kingston

Daniel Kelly

Amanda Rachel

David Ephraim

Jayann LaDonna

Michelle Luana Kingston

Ammon David

Alisha Michelle

Joseph Ortell

Samuel David

Kimberly LaDonna

Shannon LaVionda Weaver

Zachary Dean Hardy

Katelyn Shannon

Jennifer Sarah

Mark Ran

JaquLynn Lucille

Christopher Jesse

Kimberly Ruth Brown

Ruth LaDonna Winters

Andrew David

Sarah Kimberly

Jeremy Ortell

David Ortell

Jacob Elden

Christine Bonnie Gustafson

Diana Christine

Lisa Catherine Kingston

David Shaun

Robert Elden

Promise Kimball

Maryann Nelson

Holly Young

Bethany Freeman/Jones

Lisa Kingston/Harrison

Kathy Johnson/Jacobs

John Daniel's Wives and Children

Rachel Ann Brown

John Daniel Kingston

Jacob Ortell

Rachel Ann

Ruth Ann

Job William

Isaiah Elden

Micah John

Deborah Carol

Elijah Elden

Jeremiah Daniel

Samuel Ray

Charles Enoch

Mary LaDonna

Susan M. Gustafson

Vesta Orlean Kingston

Mary Ann

Cheryl LaDonna

Eric Clyde

Esther Orlean

Charles Luke Nelson

Michelle Susan

Andrea Orlean

Melanie Orlean

Ortell

Krista

Patricia Lee Jensen

Julii Ann Robinson

Nephi John

Kristeen Noralee

Kyle O

Charles William

John Andrew

Cathryn LaDonna

Shera Ruth

John Joseph

David Ortell

Patrick Elden

Rachel Danniella

Vesta Ann

Margaret L. Owen

Charles Aaron Larsen

Ammon Jean

Jared Ortell

Dorothy Valayte

Hannah Lucy

Elizabeth Dawn

Dawn Elizabeth

Michael Elden

Solomon Wendell

Amanda Leanne

Bonnie Jean

Kelli-Lynne Mattingly

Joshua Elden Collins

Christopher Josiah

Nathan Andrew

Rachelle Lynne

Amber Marie

Ryan J

Jeremy Caleb

Kelli-Anne

Jennie Allison

Brenda Rachel

Shirley Grace Hansen

Gerald John Snow

Shanell Grace

Ketelyn Marla

Kathryn Rose

Kollene Dawn

Shaun Jacob

Shem Eskelsen

Nicholas Ryan

Sariah VeeAnne

Leanne Catherine Jensen

Rebekah Catherine

Samantha

Martha Julia

Jesse Ortell

Hannah LaDonna

Joshua Daniel

Heidi Mattingly

Stephanie Lynne Foster

Kevin John

Andrea Heidi

Matthew Elden

Melanie Victoria

Jennifer Ann

Kimberly Angelina

Michael Charles

Ronald Ortell

Laura J. Reynolds

Carol Lynne Fuller

Jolene Laura

LaDonna R.

John Elden

Charles David

Laura Ann

Beverly LaLena Finley

James Ortell

Beverly Ruth

Anna LaLona

April Lynn Kingston

John Ellery McKay

Jessica April

Nichole LaDonna

Joseph Clyde

Andrea Rhoda

Hannah Lynn

Holly Rhode

Heather Ardous

Valerie Beth Stephens

Jean Isaac Martin

Valerie LaDonna

Adam Ortell

Carolyn Beth

Benjamin Ren

Evelyn Holly

Emily Ruth

Katie Luella

Rosalynde Joy Kingston

Rodger William

Jacob Israel

Amanda Jane

Ellen Bridget Jensen

Hyrum Dalton's Wives and Children

Kathy Peterson

- Promise Kathy
- Charlotte Marie
- Hannah Judy
- Jessica Heidi
- Amanda Elizabeth
- Johnathan Hyrum
- Michael Paul
- Michelle LaDonna
- Hyrum David
- Katy Ann
- Matthew John
- Elizabeth Rachel

Suzanne Ruth Owen

- Lloyd Perry Madsen
- Robert David
- Blaine Charles
- Olivia Jeanne
- Tyler James

Mary Sue Strong/Owen

- Dalton

Andrew

Jared

Karen Crossley/Reynolds

Elaine Crossley

Jason's Wives and Children

Andrea Johnson (Died)

Jason

Rosalind Leanne Brown

Ruth Luella Kingston

Martha Elaine Kingston

Andrea Martha Nichols

Rachel LaDonna

Julie Ruth

Mary Elizabeth

LaDonna Elaine

Shirley Faye Brown

Faye LaDonna

Rebecca Angelica Kingston

LaDonna Samantha

John Ortell

Rachel Angelica

Hannah Judy Kingston

Angela Kathrine Myers

Joseph Hyrum

Mary Ann Kingston

Mary Elaine McKinley

Jason Paul

Eskel Raymond

Colette Ardous Benson

Sarah LaDonna

Jason Elden

David Ortell

Ginger Avery

Outside of the inner circle, it is not clear how many wives each man has. Monogamy does exist in the Order, but it appears to be temporary and somewhat rare.

Equal Treatment

Organizational policy states that men should try to treat their wives equally. However, in practice, both men and women agree this does not happen. One male former member states: "The thing of it is, no matter how fair a man tries to be, a woman's going to feel if he really loves somebody else more. You can spend a week here and a week here, split your money, split your time, everything you can possibly do to try to be even. But you're not going to hide that. It's not going to happen" (participant 5). Another woman states that her mother's husband, Ortell (the second leader of the organization), would come to see her mother only on their anniversary and her birthday after she was no longer able to bear children—and sometimes not even then (participant 25).

Interest in Participating

The interest in polygamy also varies. Some men reportedly love the "thrill of the hunt" and being sexually intimate with many women (participant 5). Other men, however,

view it as an undesirable (participant 12) but necessary (participant 20) condition of life. One participant explained it this way:

> [Marrying another woman] was really rough, because I knew what it was doing to [my wife]. It's like on our wedding night. Of course, she was at the wedding. And I stayed there and she went back to her mother's house, and I looked out at the house, and she was sitting in the car. I went out to say goodbye, and she was just crying, just sitting in the car crying. It was just awful. That's the one thing if I could take back—I've made a lot of mistakes in my life, but I've learned from a lot of them too, I think. But I just don't see where that did any good at all. It was just a bad thing. (participant 5)

Participant 5 continues, explaining that Kingston doctrine states that if he did not marry into a polygamous relationship, his current wife and children would be taken from him in the afterlife and given to someone else:

> Nothing was ever said solid, but there was some talk like that—that you need to have at least three wives to have a solid lock on the Celestial Kingdom. That really did concern me. Before I married the second wife, there was part of me that I couldn't stand the thought of doing it, but at the same time, I thought, how am I going to handle it if I die and then spend eternity alone because I didn't?" . . . That's basically what they teach. You'll have to live alone. Your family will be split up. If your wife is good enough, she'll be able to be married to someone who already did fulfill everything they needed to. . . I knew that was what I had to do to have Christy and our children on the other side, that I had to do that. She did too. That's what we're taught. (participant 5)

Women in the organization report that they are happy living "the principle" (participant 1, participant 3) and love their sister wives; but it is clear that sharing a husband is a spiritual sacrifice rather than a lifestyle choice (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000; participant 18).

Women in the Kingston organization are monogamous. And men reportedly tend to become more monogamous over time. One participant states: "I've noticed they'll start to spend the bulk of their time at the favorite wife's house, especially as they age. . . . Every big family in there. And not only can I pick the favorite wife, but everybody in the family knows, too. Oh yeah, and it won't be talked about unless somebody's mad or a fight breaks out or something. But everybody knows. I'll bet [Ortell] spent 5-6 nights

a week at Ladonna's house. And then there were a dozen other women he would split up the rest of that time with. Merlin, he's got Joyce as his favorite wife. And now as he's getting older, he's there 80-90% of the time. It's just how it seems to go" (participant 5).

In sum, though the numbers of wives and children vary, as do the desires of men and women to enter into polygamous relationships, it is clear that polygamy is viewed by the organization and members as a sacrifice—a defining spiritual covenant only through which men and women can receive salvation in the afterlife (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000).

Intermarriage

The third ideological platform that guides the organization's rhetoric is the practice of intermarriage between brothers and sisters (called "incest" in the AG's office and Safety Net Committee; but because of the pejorative nature of the term I will refer to it as "intermarriage.") Burton (1999) documents that the Kingston organization's practice of intermarriage had its roots in John Ortell Kingston's work with livestock inbreeding. Burton states that John Ortell, the second Order leader, at one time raised prized black-and-white milk cows and felt that this practice could also be used to breed a superior race of people.

Literal Descendents of Jesus Christ

The Kingston family traces its lineage back to Jesus Christ; so, certain Order members are thought to possess holy blood. It is not clear whether this organizational narrative was present from the beginning or whether this developed over time when the practice of intermarriage began. In any case, the practice of intermarriage among Kingston members is widespread. Of Ortell's seven male children (the current leadership of the Order), all but one is married to a half-sister. Order leader Paul is reportedly

married to five of his half-sisters (see 2005 genealogy chart above. Because of the sensitive nature of this information, I have chosen not to identify their names).

Practical Implications and Effects of the Doctrine

The Kingstons' radical revision of the Christian doctrine that humans are "children of God" (i.e., that they are literal descendents of Jesus Christ) has two practical effects: first, Kingstons believe they are elite, or genetically and spiritually superior to other people in the world. Second, they have a responsibility to keep the bloodline pure. Leaders assert that because the Kingston members are superior to others in the world, they will be saved in an afterlife while others are not—but only as long they are faithful to the doctrines of the organization, the gatekeeper to salvation. As a result, members are willing to follow demands they may not otherwise accept, such as polygamy, because they believe this practice is essential to salvation in the afterlife (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000).

Second, the belief that Kingstons are literal descendant of Jesus Christ sufficiently justifies in the mind of its members the Kingston directive to "keep the bloodline pure." As one Kingston member states, "it is not uncommon for half-brothers and sisters to marry, uncles and nieces to marry, aunts and nephews to marry, etc." (Moore-Emmett, 2004, p. 68). This practice of intermarriage has the dual effect of (1) keeping breeding practices within the organization—thus providing for an increase in organizational size and bodies for labor; and (2) causing members to be rejected by and withdraw from mainstream society because these practices are illegal, thus increasing organizational control. One unfortunate side effect: It has also been blamed for genetic defects, such as fused arms and legs, schizophrenia, and a rare form of dwarfism (Erickson, 2005). Recently, when this practice came under intense scrutiny by the Utah Attorney General's Office, the Kingston organization committed to stop this practice.

Resisting the Discourse

Former members have resisted this organizational narrative in many ways. Several report that this practice is uncomfortable for many and contributed to their decision to leave the organization (participant 8; participant 9). One member explains: "My wife's mother was actually married to my father and left him. He was her uncle. She just couldn't deal with it, left him, left the group, and went and married [my wife's] father" (participant 5). One member also reported that her decision of whom to marry was determined in part by who she was more distantly related to: "Well, see, it was either between him [her husband] or my brother. So I pretty much picked the less bad one" (participant 9). Former members also poke fun at it with this traditional poem (written long before the Kingstons but borrowed by them):

Many, many years ago when I was twenty-three,
I got married to a widow who was pretty as could be.
This widow had a daughter who had hair of red
My father fell in love with her, and soon the two were wed.
This made my dad my son-in-law and changed my very life.
My daughter was my mother, for she was my father's wife.
To complicate the matters worse, although it brought me joy,
I soon became the father of a bouncing baby boy.
My little baby then became a brother-in-law to dad.
And so became my uncle, though it made me very sad.
For if he was my uncle, then that also made him brother
To the widow's grown-up daughter who, of course was my step-mother.
Father's wife then had a son who kept them on the run.
And he became my grandson, for he was my daughter's son.
My wife is now my mother's mom, and it surely makes me blue.
Because, although she is my wife, she is my grandma too.
If my wife is my grandmother then I am her grandchild.
And every time I think of it, it simply drives me wild.
For now I have become the strangest case you ever saw.

As the husband of my grandmother, I am my own grandpa! (Erickson, 2005a)

Official and Unofficial Texts

The Kingston organization is a distinct entity unlike any other LDS-based sect. A relatively large group, its only competitors in numbers are the United Apostolic Brethren (or "Allred Group," numbering a few thousand) and the Fundamentalist Latter-day Saints (FLDS church, number approximately 10,000; see Moore-Emmett, 2004). The Kingston organization is the only group to incorporate intermarriage between brothers and sisters as an important part of its doctrine, and it is the only group to have an organizational model that integrates business and religious life so fully. Still, the Kingstons draw upon many of the same texts of the LDS church and LDS-based sects. Below are short descriptions of some of the most salient Christian, LDS, LDS-sect, and Kingston-specific texts that the organization leans upon to support its doctrines and policies.

Christian Texts

The major Christian texts that are accepted and used by the Kingstons are the Old Testament and New Testament portions of the Bible. In the Old Testament, the book of Genesis is especially emphasized and used to justify the practice of polygamy, as it is recorded there that religious leaders Abraham, Jacob, and Moses were polygamists, having both wives and concubines. For example, Genesis 21: 9 states: "And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham." In the Doctrine and Covenants, a compilation of Joseph Smith's revelations, section 132 states that Abraham and Jacob's practice of having multiple wives and concubines was accepted and advocated by God.

Like mainstream Christianity, the Kingstons worship Jesus Christ as the Savior of the world. The New Testament documenting the life of Christ and his apostles is accepted as part of the scriptural canon. The Book of Revelations is also important to the Kingston

organization, as it is believed to be a metaphorical account of current events beginning with the restoration of the gospel of Jesus Christ in its purest form by Joseph Smith in 1830 and culminating in the apocalypse and Second Coming of Jesus Christ.

LDS Texts

The Kingston organization is a sect of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, meaning that it advocates a return to the original LDS teachings as outlined by Joseph Smith. It accepts all LDS texts as valid before the 1890 Manifesto. Some of the extant texts of this period include the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and statements by LDS church leaders considered prophecies by the Kingston organization.

The Book of Mormon is believed to be an historical account of two ancient civilizations that lived on the Western Hemisphere from approximately 2000 B.C. to 420 A.D. This text, written on metal plates made of gold and found in 1821 by Joseph Smith under a large rock on the hill Cumorah in Western New York, was the catalyst that led Joseph Smith to founding The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, which he believed to be the gospel of Jesus Christ as it was taught by Christ on the earth.

Only one chapter in the Book of Mormon (Jacob 2) discusses the practice of plural marriage, and this Chapter condemns it, stating that people who desired wives and concubines like Old Testament patriarchs were under condemnation by God: “This people begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the scriptures, for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms, because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son. Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord” (Jacob 2: 23-24). The chapter later states that the men who had desired more than one wife had “broken the hearts of [their] tender wives, and lost the confidence of [their] children, because of [their] bad examples before them; [and] the sobbings of their hearts ascend

up to God against [them]" (Jacob 2:35). The chapter goes on to state that a man should have only one wife and be faithful to her (Jacob 2:27). Only in rare cases where the Lord "commands" a people to "raise up seed" is the practice of plural marriage ever accepted as a righteous practice by God (Jacob 2:30). Members of the LDS church believe their ancestors were commanded to "raise up seed" for approximately 50 years, from 1841-1890, after which God abolished the practice through Wilford Woodruff's 1890 Manifesto. Kingston doctrine separates from LDS teachings, believing that polygamy is a higher form of marriage than monogamy and should continue to be practiced.

The Doctrine and Covenants is a series of 135 sections or "revelations" recorded by Joseph Smith plus three revelations given to later prophets, comprising 138 sections. In the Doctrine and Covenants, there are two different sections regarding the nature of marriage. D&C 49:16 states that a man should have only one wife and be faithful to her: "Wherefore, it is lawful that he should have one wife, and they twain shall be one flesh, and all this that the earth might answer the end of its creation." However, D&C 132 presents a different view of marriage. First, it reveals the "new and everlasting covenant of eternal marriage" (v. 4) which states that marriage is an eternal law and one cannot reach his or her highest potential in the afterlife without being married:

> And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife by my word, which is my law, and by the new and everlasting covenant, and is sealed unto them by the Holy Spirit of promise, by him who is anointed, unto whom I have appointed this power and the keys of this priesthood; and it shall be said unto them—Ye shall come forth in the first resurrection . . . and shall inherit thrones, kingdoms, principalities, and powers, dominions, all heights and depths. . . Then shall they be gods, because they have no end; therefore shall they be from everlasting to everlasting, because they continue; then shall they be above all, because all things are subject unto them. Then shall they be gods, because they have all power, and the angels are subject unto them. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye abide my law ye cannot attain to this glory. (D&C 132: 19-21)

Second, the section outlines the conditions in which men can have more than one wife with God's approval:

> if any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent, and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery for they are given unto him; for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him and to no one else.
>
> And if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, and they are given unto him; therefore is he justified.
>
> But if one or either of the ten virgins, after she is espoused, shall be with another man, she has committed adultery, and shall be destroyed; for they are given unto him to multiply and replenish the earth, according to my commandment, and to fulfill the promise which was given by my Father before the foundation of the world, and for their exaltation in the eternal worlds, that they may bear the souls of men; for herein is the work of my Father continued, that he may be glorified. (D&C 132:61-63)

Third, the revelation states that wives should consent to this practice. Verse 34 states: "God commanded Abraham, and Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham to wife. And why did she do it? Because this was the law; and from Hagar sprang many people." Referring directly to Joseph Smith's first wife Emma, verse 52 states: "Let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me; and those who are not pure, and have said they were pure, shall be destroyed, saith the Lord God." And finally, consequences are given for women who are taught the practice but do not follow it:

> I say unto you, if any man have a wife, who holds the keys of this power, and he teaches unto her the law of my priesthood, as pertaining to these things, then shall she believe and administer unto him, or she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord your God; for I will destroy her; for I will magnify my name upon all those who receive and abide in my law. . . . Therefore, it shall be lawful in me, if she receive not this law, for him to receive all things whatsoever I, the Lord his God, will give unto him, because she did not believe and administer unto him according to my word; and she then becomes the transgressor" (D&C 132:64-65).

LDS-based polygamous sects typically regard this section as the crown jewel of the revelations and use it to justify their break from the LDS church, stating the revelation

clearly indicates that “the new and everlasting covenant of marriage” means “plural marriage.” The LDS church continues to accept this scripture as part of its canon but now separates “celestial marriage” from “plural marriage” and believes that monogamous marriages performed in the temple will continue to be valid in the afterlife. The LDS church also marginalizes the section in its teaching manuals, pulling out only select verses to discuss in the context of monogamous marriage.

The Kingston organization also accepts statements made by early LDS church leaders as prophecies. The Order lesson manual for children quotes Orson F. Whitney, an early LDS leader, as saying: “Many of this people are . . . following after the world in its mad race for wealth and pleasure . . . but I know there is a people, in the [midst] of this people, that will arise in their majesty in a day that is near at hand; a people who will stand up for God, fearing not what man can do” (Order, 2009a, p. 16). Heber C. Kimball, another early LDS leader, is often quoted by the Kingston organization: “But the time will come when the Lord will choose a people out of this people [the Mormons] [to] whom he will [give] his choicest blessings” (Order, 2009a, p. 16). The organization interprets both of these statements to be prophecies foretelling the creation of the Davis County Cooperative Society.

Texts From LDS Sects

LDS-based sects differ in many ways, but they all agree on one thing: Wilford Woodruff’s 1890 Manifesto abolishing the practice of polygamy in the LDS church was not a revelation. LDS sects believe that Wilford Woodruff cowardly succumbed to political pressure to avoid being jailed and to enable the territory of Utah to become a state. As evidence for this, they cite what has come to be known as the “My Son John Revelation” (Polygamy Primer, 2006), in which John Taylor, third president of the LDS

church, reportedly received instructions directly from Jesus Christ and Joseph Smith to continue the practice of plural marriage at all cost. Because this document, written by Loren Wooley, is to LDS-based polygamous sects what the Declaration of Independence is to American History, a large portion of it is quoted below:

> On September 26, 1886, George Q. Cannon, Hyrum B. Clawson, Franklin S. Richards, and others, met with President John Taylor at my father's residence at Centerville, Davis County, Utah, and presented a document for President Taylor's consideration. . . . That evening I was called to act as guard during the first part of the night . . . Sometime after the brethren retired and while I was reading the Doctrine and Covenants, I was suddenly attracted to a light appearing under the door leading to President Taylor's room, and was at once startled to hear the voices of men talking there. There were three distinct voices. I was bewildered because it was my duty to keep people out of the room and evidently someone had entered without my knowing it. I made a hasty examination and found all the window screens intact. While examining the last window, and feeling greatly agitated, a voice spoke to me, saying, "Can't you feel the Spirit? Why should you worry?" . . .
>
> When President Taylor came out of his room about eight o'clock of the morning of September 27, 1886, we could scarcely look at him on account of the brightness of his personage. He stated, "Brethren I have had a very pleasant conversation all night with Brother Joseph [Smith and] your Lord." We had no breakfast, but assembled ourselves in a meeting [that] . . . was held from about nine o'clock in the morning until five in the afternoon without intermission, being about eight hours in all.
>
> President Taylor called the meeting to order. He had the Manifesto [abandoning polygamy], that had been prepared under the direction of George Q. Cannon, read over again. He then put each person under covenant that he or she would defend the principle of Celestial or Plural Marriage, and that they would consecrate their lives, liberty and property to this end, and that they personally would sustain and uphold that principle. . . . he placed his finger on the document, his person rising from the floor about a foot or eighteen inches, and with countenance animated by the Spirit of the Lord, and raising his right hand to the square, he said, "Sign that document—Never! I would suffer my right hand to be severed from my body first. Sanction it—Never! I would suffer my tongue to be torn from its roots in my mouth before I would sanction it!
>
> After that he talked for about an hour and then sat down and wrote the revelation which was given by the Lord upon the question of Plural Marriage. Then he talked to us for some time, and said, "Some of you will be handled and ostracized and cast out from the Church by your brethren because of your faithfulness and integrity to this principle, and some of you may have to surrender your lives because of the same, but woe, woe, unto those who shall bring these

> troubles upon you" . . . After the meeting referred to, President Taylor had L. John Nuttall write five copies of the revelation. He called five of us together: Samuel Bateman, Charles H. Wilkins, George Q. Cannon, John W. Woolley, and myself.
>
> He then set us apart and placed us under covenant that while we lived we would see to it that no year passed by without children being born in the principle of plural marriage. We were given authority to ordain others if necessary to carry this work on, they in turn to be given authority to ordain others when necessary, under the direction of the worthy senior (by ordination), so that there should be no cessation in the work. He then gave each of us a copy of the revelation.
>
> I am the only one of the five now living, and so far as I know all five of the brethren remained true and faithful to the covenants they entered into, and to the responsibilities placed upon them at that time. . . .
>
> Many of the things I forgot, but they are coming to me gradually, and those things that come to me are as clear as on the day on which they were given.
>
> President Taylor said that the time would come when many of the Saints would apostatize because of this principle. He said "one half of this people will apostatize over the principle and possibly one half of the other half" (rising off the floor while making the statement). He also said the day will come when a document similar to that (Manifesto) then under consideration would be adopted by the Church, following which "apostasy and whoredom would be rampant in the Church."
>
> He said that in the time of the seventh president of this Church, the Church would go into bondage both temporally and spiritually and in that day (the day of bondage) the One Mighty and Strong spoken of in the 85th Section of the Doctrine and Covenants would come. (Hales, 2006, p. 315)

Several important points stand out from the passage above. First, an eyewitness gives an account of then-prophet of the LDS church John Taylor speaking with Jesus Christ and Joseph Smith. As John Taylor reportedly stated: "Brethren, I have had a very pleasant conversation all night with Brother Joseph [Smith and] your Lord." Second, this eyewitness states that the prophet John Taylor appointed people to continue the practice of plural marriage even while the mainstream church abandoned the gospel of Jesus Christ in its pure form and descended into "apostasy": "He then put each person under covenant that he or she would defend the principle of Celestial or Plural Marriage, and that they would consecrate their lives, liberty and property to this end, and that

they personally would sustain and uphold that principle." Third, this eyewitness did not remember some of this experience until later on in life: "Many of the things I forgot, but they are coming to me gradually, and those things that come to me are as clear as on the day on which they were given."

Fourth, and most importantly in terms of the Kingston organization, John Taylor reportedly stated that "in the time of the seventh president of this Church, the Church would go into bondage both temporally and spiritually, and in that day (the day of bondage) the One Mighty and Strong spoken of in the 85th Section of the Doctrine and Covenants would come." The seventh prophet of the LDS church was Heber J. Grant, who served as the prophet from 1918 until his death in 1945. Doctrine and Covenants 85:7 states: "And it shall come to pass that I, the Lord God, will send one mighty and strong, holding the scepter of power in his hand, clothed with light for a covering, whose mouth shall utter words, eternal words; while his bowels shall be a fountain of truth, to set in order the house of God, and to arrange by lot the inheritances of the saints whose names are found, and the names of their fathers, and of their children, enrolled in the book of the law of God." This scripture refers to a person whom God will call to set the house of God in order and arrange the temporal and spiritual welfare of the LDS people.

Charles Elden Kingston started the Davis County Cooperative Society in 1935, during the time that Heber J. Grant served as prophet of the LDS church. Before Elden was excommunicated from the LDS church in 1932, he attempted to follow the law of consecration, which he believed was required by the LDS teachings in the temple. After he was told by LDS church leaders that consecration of all of his property was no longer required, he looked for someone who would direct the "united order." Elden eventually began the sect to arrange the inheritances of the saints and set in order the house of God. The Kingstons believe Elden to be the "One Mighty and Strong." There may be

other texts accepted by all LDS sects, but they pale in comparison to the "My Son John Revelation," which is without doubt the major text in this category.

Kingston Organizational Texts

The Kingston organization has formalized its doctrines and policies in many different in-house organs. But because of the highly secretive nature of the group, these texts are not readily available. There are a few organizational documents, however, that have been made available by Mary Ann Kingston, a former member who sued the Kingston organization from 2001-2009. As a result, these documents are now in the public domain and available for perusal at the Matheson Courthouse in Salt Lake City. The documents I have been able to access are (1) an adult Sunday School lesson manual on the history of the Order; (2) a children's Sunday School manual for ages 6-7, entitled "I have Faith in Jesus Christ"; (3) the Kingston "Family Handbook"; (4) the Kingston "Administrative Working Manual"; and (5) an organizational chart created by former Kingston members showing the integration of the Davis County Cooperative Society, the Latter Day Church of Christ, and Kingston families to comprise "the Order."

In addition to the in-house organizational documents available at the courthouse, I have also been given documents by former members such as a (1) "Monthly statement" from the Kingston Bank; (2) "Perfecting Meditations," by C. Elden Kingston; (3) the diary of Orlean Kingston Gustafson, an original Order member and sister of C. Elden Kingston; (4) the diary of Mr. Eckstrom, an early member of the Order; and (5) the autobiography of Charles W. Kingston.

A quick glance at the above organizational documents shows that the Kingston organization, "the Order," is a highly complex organizational phenomenon that has been assembled from organizational text fragments from Christianity, the LDS church, and early LDS-based sects. A bricolage of organizational rhetoric, the Kingston organization

has selected the texts that support its own goals and organizational vision while marginalizing or refuting competing texts, such as the 1890 Manifesto. It, in turn, has produced its own compelling organizational rhetoric that serves to create and sustain a high degree of organizational identification among its members.

Conclusion

This Chapter examined the historical and rhetorical influences that have led to the creation of the Kingston organization. First, the historical events that influenced Charles Elden Kingston, such as his family's excommunication from the LDS church and the Great Depression, were discussed. The early days of the Order were also described. Next, I described three major ideological platforms that guide the organization's policies and procedures: communal living, polygamy, and intermarriage. Finally, I described the official texts of the Kingston organization, including texts that have been adopted from mainstream Christianity, the LDS church, and LDS-based sects. In the next Chapter, I will explain the theoretical perspectives and positions from which I will analyze the organizational and vernacular rhetoric of this unique organization.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND POSITIONS

The purpose of this Chapter is to reveal the theoretical perspectives and positions I am using to study the Kingston polygamous organization and highlight accompanying relevant literature. In this Chapter, I will highlight three key terms that are instrumental to understanding organizational identification (OI) in the Kingston polygamous organization: rhetoric, organization, and religion. In the first section, I will describe three key principles of rhetorical theory that inform my study based on the work of Kenneth Burke: rhetorical appeals, consubstantiality/identification, and hierarchy. In the second section, I discuss the interpretive turn in organizational communication, "identification" as a key component of organizational communication, and organizational rhetoric as a subdiscipline of organizational communication. In the third section, I address the guiding term "religion." In this section, I draw upon sociological literature to classify the Kingston organization as a sect; next, I show how psychology-based literature supports viewing new religious movements' recruitment and socialization processes as rhetorical; then, using Janja Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice, I will argue that four rhetorical-based processes produce identification and bounded choice within the new religious organization: charismatic authority/mystery; transcendental belief system/ mythic image; systems of control/perfection; and systems of influence/identification. Thus, an organizational rhetoric perspective is especially appropriate for this type of case In the fourth section, I highlight the two major theories of organizational identification: rhetorical theory and Social Identity Theory. Using Van Dick (2001), I explain organizational identification (OI) as a rhetorical process with four components: affective,

cognitive, behavioral, and conative (evaluative), which correspond roughly with Lalich's four organizational processes that produce bounded choice. Finally, in the fifth section, I apply this theory to the Kingston organization, highlighting different organizational dimensions that correspond roughly with different types of identification. In the end, I hope to show that organizational identification in new religious movements is produced and sustained through four rhetorical processes: emotional identification between leaders and members; cognitive identification through the promotion of a transcendental belief system/mythic image; behavioral identification where members act in terms of organizational interests through the rhetorical legitimizing of charismatic, traditional, and legal-rational authority; and evaluative identification between members perceiving shared characteristics/values with each other.

Key Term #1: Rhetoric

Rhetoric as a field of study has developed over a 2000-year period, beginning with the Sophists of Ancient Greece. In Ancient Greece and Rome, rhetoric was regarded as the center of a liberal education, the essential content of higher education, and the main vehicle for entering political life. It was viewed with some suspicion in Christian Europe but once again became the hallmark of the educated person during the Renaissance. During the Enlightenment period, it was reduced to a study of linguistic ornamentation for hundreds of years and reached a low point at the beginning of the 20th century, when it was regarded as inferior to science and positivism (see Herrick, 1997). However, modern scholars such as Hill (1972), Perelman (1969), Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), and especially Kenneth Burke (1950) have revitalized rhetoric as an important locus of study and as central to social and moral dilemmas.[4]

Kenneth Burke is widely regarded as the most influential rhetorician of the 20th century. As Herrick (1997) states, "the scope of Burke's work and thought is so vast as to defy summary, his ultimate influence so fundamental as to be impossible to estimate" (p. 224). Drawing upon classical Aristotelian theory, he expanded the range of rhetoric to

include not just formal persuasive settings (as in the traditional rhetorical situation of a single speaker presenting a complete, bounded text to a largely homogeneous audience.), but also a wide variety of social situations, as he states: "from the politician who, addressing an audience of farmers, says, 'I was a farm boy myself,' through the mysteries of social status, to the mystic's devout identification with the source of all being" (1950, p. xiv). His rhetoric, called "dramatism," is based upon the pentad, or five key elements of a rhetorical situation (act, scene, agent, agency, purpose), that paired together are able to identify and analyze the range of human motives. Burke borrows Aristotle's definition of rhetoric as "the art of persuasion" and expands it to mean "the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols" (p. 43). Using his rhetorical theory, I will address some of the key concepts that are especially important to my understanding of the rhetorical aspects of the Kingston organization: rhetorical appeals, consubstantiality/identification, and hierarchy.

Rhetorical Appeals

In *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1950), Kenneth Burke outlines his rhetorical theory, in which he first expands the range of rhetoric to apply to social situations. He then applies key principles of traditional rhetoric to great works of philosophy and literature, such as the writings of Bentham, Marx, and Machiavelli. In his third and final section, he discusses "Order" and the way that rhetoric plays to the human need to categorize and order society and life. While Burke expands Aristotelian rhetoric, his intention is to augment rather than supplant it. He states: "Traditionally, the key term for rhetoric is not 'identification,' but 'persuasion.' Hence, . . . our treatment, in terms of identification, is decidedly not meant as a substitute for the sound traditional approach. Rather, as we try to show, it is but an accessory to the standard lore. And our book aims to make itself at home in both emphases" (p. xiv).

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (app. 350-320 B.C.) is described by Herrick (1997) as "one of the most complete and insightful ever penned" (p. 92). Aristotle defines rhetoric as the

"art of persuasion" (2004), an oratory skill that can win the support of large audiences. Some of Aristotle's key principles are (1) rhetorical appeals, such as ethos, pathos, logos; (2) types of rhetoric, such as past-oriented forensic rhetoric, present-oriented epideictic rhetoric, and future-oriented deliberative rhetoric; (3) kernel elements of inductive (example) and deductive (enthymeme) rhetorical form; (4) *topoi,* topics, or points of reference; (5) *stasis,* or the status of an issue; and (6) hundreds of specific rhetorical forms (see Cheney, 2005).

For the purposes of this dissertation, rhetorical appeals are especially important. There are three types of rhetorical appeals: ethos, pathos, and logos. Ethos, regarded as the most persuasive appeal by Aristotle, is a "characterological" appeal (Hill, 1972) that attempts to persuade people based on the character of an individual. For example, a celebrity endorsement advertisement is an appeal to ethos, because it is using the character of an individual to persuade an audience. Pathos is an appeal to emotion. Aristotle states that this appeal has the ability more than any other to persuade people to act. Emotions such as anger and fear are especially motivating (Aristotle, 2004; see also Heinrichs, 2007). Examples using this type of appeal are a rousing call to arms by a military commander and a heart-tugging story of suffering children in a charity advertisement. Logos is the appeal to logic. Today, logos is generally the most highly regarded appeal. It is perceived in our legal and bureaucratic society as the most legitimate appeal, because it appears to be based in fact and logic (although postmodernists have taken issue with this assumption in recent years). Examples of this type of appeal are legal complaints filed by attorneys stating a chain of events leading to a lawsuit and formal dialectic reasoning.

Rhetorical appeals are especially important to this dissertation because of the connection they have with types of authority, as outlined by Weber. As will be discussed at length in the fourth section of this Chapter, Tompkins (1987) effectively links rhetorical appeals with types of authority: logos with legal-rational authority (used chiefly in bureaucracies); pathos with traditional authority (used most often in traditional

societies; a patriarchal society is the pure type); and ethos with charismatic authority (often used in connection with a political or religious leader and the society that is built around the person), arguing that the production of legitimate authority is a rhetorical process. In sum, Burke (1950) states, "in its essence communication involves the use of verbal symbols for purposes of appeal" (p. 271). In order to be skilled at the craft, rhetors must have knowledge of logical reasoning (logos), must be able to understand human emotions (pathos), and must know what constitutes good character (ethos).

Consubstantiality/Identification

Burke (1950) expands Aristotelian rhetoric from a craft where skilled orators deliberately use rhetorical forms to influence audiences to a permanent condition of language where "members of a group promote social cohesion by acting rhetorically upon themselves and one another" (p. xiv). These situations may or may not be deliberately persuasive, and Burke recognizes this when he expands his definition of rhetoric from "the art of persuasion" to "the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols" (p. 43).

One of the major aspects of Burke's rhetoric is the assertion that humans naturally become consubstantial, or identified, with one another. Consubstantiality refers to two or more people feeling that they are "consubstantial with another" (1950, p. 21). Burke explains: "A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B. Or he may identify himself with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so" (p. 20) When a person is identified with another, that person is "substantially one" with a person other than himself. There are a few major points to consider regarding the "doctrine of consubstantiality" (p. 21).

First, consubstantiality may be necessary to any way of life. Though philosophical quandaries about the use of the term "substance" remain, Burke states that the "acting

together" in which people have "common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, and attitudes that make them consubstantial" is universal to the human condition (p. 20). In fact, as Cheney (1984) explains, consubstantiality, or shared identity, is what makes us join together in groups: "Identification links individual and society in the way that 'I' often slides to 'we.' After all, as Charles H. Cooley explains, there can be no 'I' without a sense of others 'drawn from communicative life. . . . It is precisely because of the shared nature of identity—and the impossibility of divorcing the individual from the social—that Burke insists on treating 'individuals as members of groups'" (p. 110). Consubstantiality, then, is an integral part of forming social bonds, which is a necessary condition of human life.

Second, consubstantiality is a paradox, because people are and are not one in substance. As Burke states, "to identify A with B is to make A consubstantial with B" (p. 20). This identification makes A and B one in substance, but still distinct in substance: "two persons may be identified in terms of some principle they share in common, an 'identification' that does not deny their distinctness" (p. 21). People are at once joined and separate from each other. Insofar as people are joined together in a common purpose, interest, etc., they are consubstantial. However, they are still "unique" and distinct individual loci of motives (p. 21).

Third, the paradox of consubstantiality is the natural condition that makes rhetoric both necessary and inevitable. Burke states that if there were pure identification, "there would be no strife" (p. 25). If, for example, we all had one communal mind (think sci-fi thriller), there would be no need to persuade. But identification and separation exist in concert with one another. And if you "put identification and division ambiguously together, so that you cannot know for certain just where one ends and other begins . . . you have the characteristic invitation to rhetoric" (p. 25). In fact, Burke (1962) states that every rhetorical situation is an outgrowth of divisiveness and a search for commonality (see Baxter & Taylor, 1978; Burke, 1950).

Fourth, rhetoric is most persuasive when consubstantiality/identification is used as a persuasive strategy. Drawing on the classical ethos-building rhetorical technique of *decorum* (see Heinrichs, 2007), Burke states that the most persuasive appeals are based on the rhetor's ability to create consubstantiality between himself/herself and the audience. He explains: "You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* your ways with his" (p. 55). More succinctly stated, "a speaker persuades an audience by the use of stylistic identifications" (p. 46). As Cheney (1983b) elucidates, Burke identifies three basic stylistic identifications: "identification through similarity," or appealing to an audience through commonalities; "identification through antithesis," or identifying by rallying against a common enemy; and "identification through the use of the transcendent 'we,'" or using the term "we" to assume similarities between the rhetor and audience without stating what those commonalities are. Cheney (1983b) uses these strategies in an analysis of in-house corporate rhetoric and identifies a fourth strategy: the use of symbols designed to invoke an emotional response in the listener or reader.

Fifth, the paradox of consubstantiality views audiences as both actors with intentional action and subjects manipulated by institutional discourses. As individuals with distinct loci of motives, people are able to act individually and independently of one another. But as consubstantial with others in a group, people are significantly influenced by the discourses of the groups they belong to—sometimes without knowing it. Drawing upon Aristotle's concept of *topoi,* Burke explains that social groups and organizations operate within a prescribed system of values and decision premises governed by the language they use (1950). As people enter these groups, they (usually) automatically accept the decision premises already set. As Cheney and Tompkins (1985) explain, these decision premises—already set—function as unobtrusive control, because the actions of individuals within the group are powerfully guided and managed by the value and logical premises of the organization's discourses. Kinsella (2005) states, "this model

leaves substantial room for individual and intentional action . . . it stresses, however, that such action is bounded by and grounded in institutional motives that are consciously or unconsciously adopted by organizational rhetors and actors" (p. 307).

For the purposes of this dissertation, consubstantiality (or identification) is integral to understanding how people in the Kingston organization maintain social cohesion, that is, how they are persuaded by organizational rhetoric, how they come to think in terms of what is best for the organization, and how they permit the organization to set decision premises for them.

Hierarchy

Burke states that hierarchy, like consubstantiality, is a natural condition of humanity. Humans identify with and separate from each other—and identifying with one group means separating from another. Inherent in these separations is a hierarchical ordering. Humans are naturally inclined to organize their universe through categorization, and assigning what Burke calls "social ratings" (1950, p. 296) to these categories is a ubiquitous practice. Several points concerning hierarchy stand out as important to this case study.

First, hierarchy is grounded in language. Though the most overt instances of hierarchy appear in social or organizational systems, such as class stratifications or the employer/employee relationship, hierarchy is inherent first in language. Burke states: "The intensities, morbidities, or particularities of mystery come from institutional sources, but the *aptitude* comes from the nature of man, generically, as a *symbol-using animal*" (p. 279). Language, according to Burke, is what makes hierarchy possible, and institutions support this natural condition. Cheney and Tompkins elucidate this point:

> We can only appreciate 'A' in terms of what is 'not-A,' its dialectical opposite. Affirmation and negation are thus inextricably linked. In the social setting, we try to maintain our distinctiveness (our identity, if you will) by using terms of description which always imply their 'negation.' A man is not a woman, a blue-collar worker is not a while-collar one, a Democrat is not a Republican, a Jew is

> not a Gentile, an honest person is not untrustworthy, and so forth. (1984, p. 7; in Cheney, 1984, p. 105).

This natural dialectical tension is what creates "mystery," or estrangement, between groups. These groups, once separated, are then categorized and ordered into "a world hierarchically endowed" by symbolism (p. 305). Because of language, "hierarchy is inevitable" (p. 279).

The hierarchical nature of the linguistic is described best by Burke's conception of the "ultimate vocabulary." Burke states that there are three kinds of terms: *positive,* which refer to a "visible and tangible thing which can be located in time and place" (p. 183); *dialectical,* or terms that "refer to ideas rather than things" (p. 185); and ultimate, or positive and dialectical terms placed in "a hierarchy, or sequence, or evaluative series . . . arranged developmentally with relation to one another" (p. 187). Ultimate terms are different from dialectical terms in that "there would be a 'guiding idea' or 'unitary principle' behind the diversity of voices" (p. 187). They encapsulate positive terms by bringing them "to a head in a titular term which represents the principle or idea behind the positive terminology as a whole" (p. 189). Ultimate terms manage the dialectic between identification and separation because rather than negate dialectical terms, they put them in subordination to one another—so these terms can still be accepted on some level. As Burke states: "unless the terminology becomes ultimate, there is an unresolved, parliamentary jangle, a discordancy of conflicting voices which at best could attain an uneasy compromise and at worst arrive at the equating of vengeance with humility" (p. 194). However, by "using a graded vocabulary, you can instead recognize [dialectical terms] as genuine, but inferior" (p. 192). An ultimate vocabulary, or the hierarchical ordering of positive and dialectical terms encapsulated in a summarizing "god-term," is present in any political speech, religious doctrine, philosophical discourse, or social system. Hierarchy in language really is inevitable.

Second, the natural condition of hierarchy in language is reinforced by social and organizational institutions. Burke states that "in any order, there will be the mysteries

of hierarchy, since such a principle is grounded in the very nature of language and reinforced by the resultant diversity of occupational classes" (p. 279). Burke states that the stratifications of class, race, and gender make division a permanent part of society, allowing for rhetoric to persuade people to become consubstantial with each other. Burke explains, "rhetoric remains the mode of appeal essential for bridging the conditions of estrangement 'natural' to society as we know it (be it primitive, feudal, bourgeouis, or socialist)" (pp. 211-12). But these hierarchical divisions in society are necessary for rhetoric to continue. Just as "persuasion that succeeds dies" (because there is nothing left to persuade; p. 274), complete identification without division has no need for rhetoric. Therefore, the divisions in society and organizations are necessary for rhetoric to "court continually" (p. 271).

Third, hierarchy is infused with religious themes. In *The Rhetoric of Religion,* Burke makes it clear that his intention in using religiously-laden terms is not to show whether God "actually exists" (1961, p. 2) but to show how theology, with its hierarchic cosmology, is analogous to "logology," or the study of "words about words" (1961, p. 1). Burke explains that "statements that great theologians have made about the nature of 'God' might be adapted *mutatis mutandis* for use as purely secular observations on the nature of words'" (1961, p. 1). Still, through this extended analogy about words (present in both *Rhetoric of Religion* and *Rhetoric of Motives*) we learn much about the hierarchical nature of the religious cosmology created and sustained through rhetoric.

Burke borrows many religious terms to describe the realm of the verbal—from alienation to sacrifice to pure persuasion to feelings of elation. For example, the term "hierarchy" originally meant "priest-rule" (p. 306), and the term has "connotations of celestial mystery" (p. 306). From Burke's perspective, the social ratings or categories of mounting importance that humanity gives the world culminate in "God," "Destiny," or the "universal divine" (p. 307). Rhetoric that encourages consubstantiality with this ultimate hierarchy (whether religious or the poetic transcendental) can result in "ultimate

identification" and "mystic participation" (pp. 307, 328; manifest in a variety of ways; see James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*). "Walking with Destiny" and "walking with hierarchy" are two sides of the same coin, but one is "celestialized" (1950; p. 307). And a "god-term," which refers to a "summarizing word" that "sums up a manifold of particulars under a single head" (1961, pp. 2-3), is a linguistic analogue of the concept of God. Though these terms are explicitly designed to talk about the hierarchical nature of language, by virtue of analogy they do say something about the hierarchical nature of religion, as well.

Burke states, "all doctrine is by its very nature a system of words, or symbols—and so, there is always the wise possibility of using such theological nomenclatures for purely logological purposes" (1961, p. 301). In this dissertation, my discussions of the religious aspects of the Kingston organization are also "logological." My aim is not to ascertain the veracity or falsity of a doctrinal system; rather, my purpose is to understand how words persuade and produce identification and division among people who—like all humanity—are "symbol-using animals" who are "separated by natural conditions" and "goaded by the spirit of hierarchy" (1961, p. 41).

For this dissertation, the concept of hierarchy is important for two reasons: first, because the Kingston organization is hierarchically organized—every man, woman, and child is given a hierarchical code number that indicates where they "fit" in the organization (Order, 2009a). This fits Burke's description of "hierarchy" as "the motive of the socio-political order, made possible and necessary by social differentiations and stratifications due to the division of labor and to corresponding distinctions in the possession of property" (1961, p. 41). And second, because it appears there are instances in the organization of ultimate identification, which Burke describes as mystic experiences amplified by hierarchy. In fact, it can be argued that this organization is a close-to-ideal example of "universal order" in terms of hierarchy where, Burke states, "all classes of beings are hierarchically arranged in a chain or ladder or pyramid of mounting

worth, each kind striving towards the perfection of its kind, and so towards the kind next above it, while the strivings of the entire series head in God as the beloved cynosure and sinecure, the end of all desire" (p. 333). For better or worse, humans are inclined to categorize and order their world to make sense of it. Burke states: "Since, for better or worse, the mystery of the hierarchic is forever with us, let us, as students of rhetoric, scrutinize its range of entrancements, both with dismay and delight" (p. 333).

In sum, three key concepts of Burke's rhetoric—rhetorical appeals, consubstantiality/identification, and hierarchy—are particularly important in this dissertation. A study of the rhetorical appeals used by the Kingston organization helps us to understand the types of legitimate authority that operate within the organization and how people are persuaded (Logic? Emotion? Character?) to follow organizational directives. Understanding consubstantiality/identification and analyzing some of these persuasive strategies are integral to understanding how members of the Kingston organization define themselves in terms of the organization, think in terms of what is best for the organization, and allow the organization to set decision premises for them. Finally, the concept of hierarchy is vital to understanding how the Kingstons come to accept hierarchy as a natural way of life and how spiritual experiences can be experienced and produced. In the next section, I will discuss how Burke's rhetorical concepts extend to organizations and inform the field of organizational rhetoric.

Key Term #2: Organization

Kenneth Burke's influence has extended beyond the field of rhetoric to include other disciplines, including organizational communication. Though organizational communication originally took a managerial bias, by focusing on improving communication to increase organizational efficiency, the interpretive turn influenced by the work of Burke and others revitalized the discipline and extended its breadth to include a wide variety of perspectives and organizational phenomena. In this section, I will first discuss the interpretive turn in organizational communication. Then, I will discuss

"identification" as a key component of organizational communication. Finally, I will discuss organizational rhetoric as a subdiscipline of organizational communication.

The Interpretive Turn

Organizational communication as a discipline came into its own during World War II. As Redding (1985) states, it was the "triple alliance" of the military, industry, and academia during and following WWII that allowed for organizational communication to be recognized as a viable field. During WWII, there arose a need for basic communication classes for military and industrial personnel. These classes fell to the English and Speech programs, and academicians in these programs became interested in and recognized the importance of communication in military and industrial settings. These, combined with a "training in industry" program by the Manpower War Commission, gave organizational communication the legitimacy it needed to develop into a subfield. Called "business and industrial communication" until about the late 1960s (Redding, 1985) or early 1970s (Cheney, 2005), this subdiscipline used positivistic methods and had a realist ontology, an objectivist approach, and a managerial bias. As Tompkins (1984) states, the field of organizational communication was dominated by the "rational model" that "reified" the organization, viewing it as a "container" that existed independently of communicative processes. Communication, then, was viewed as something that was "inside" the organization (Cheney & Christensen, 2001).

In 1981, a seminal conference was held at Alta, Utah, where a "meaning-centered approach" was discussed as a viable alternative to neo-positivism. Called the "interpretive turn" in organizational communication, it followed the "interpretive turn" in continental philosophy (e.g., hermeneutics and phenomenology) and took an antirepresentational view of language as the medium of experience, rather than merely its expression. The phrase, "communication is constitutive of organizations," highlighted the symbolic action (Burke, 1966) of organizational members in the creation and maintenance of organizations—symbolic concerns that had been neglected in earlier postpositivistic

and manager-focused work (see Putnam & Cheney, 1987; Tompkins, 1984)—and became the new mantra for organizational interpretivists (Cheney & Cloud, 2006). The concept of Verstehen also became an important component in interpretive organizational communication research. This 1981 conference led to a series of conferences in Alta, Utah, an edited volume discussing the interpretive approach (Putnam & Pacanowsky, 1983), and a series of (1982) journal articles in *Western Journal of Communication.*

Redefining "Organization"

The interpretive turn in organizational communication led scholars to rethink what an organization "is." Tompkins (1984) proposes that "communication and organization should be conceived as synonyms: Communication constitutes organization rather than being something contained within the organization" (p. 660). Weick (1979) explains how this occurs. He states that communication is the core process of organizing, and organizations are the result of collective communicative processes of enactment, or ongoing interaction; selection of many possible interpretations of their enacted environment; and retention of those selected interpretations to be used in future patterns of interaction. Communication, as Taylor et al. (2000) explain, is thus "viewed as organization—constituting organizations and not just occurring within them" (p. 100). Cheney (1991) concurs that communication is a major force in the creation of organizations. Citing Chester Barnard's (1938) definition of an organization as "a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons" (p. 3), Cheney argues "this conception of organization recognizes communication as constitutive of organizations" (p. 3). As he states: "When we remove the physical environment of an organization and take away the parts of its members' lives that are not included within the organizational context, what we have left is a communicative system as the essence of the organization" (p. 3). From this perspective, human communication practices influence and to some degree constitute organizational reality.

Of course, organizations are not constituted fully by communicative practices. Anderson and Englehardt (2001) define organizations as being comprised of three elements: people, membership, and communicative processes. And McPhee (1985) highlights that while communication processes are central to organizational structures, organizations are also constituted by actions in time and material space. McPhee (1985) defines organizational communication as "communication which is shaped by, and shapes, task processes and formal structure in the organization" (p. 150) and emphasizes that structure has a wide range of meanings, such as an empirical object, an information processing tool, a power object or resource, and a carrier of social psychological processes. McPhee argues that while communication processes are central to the constitution of organizations and make human action meaningful and consequential (symbolic action rather than motion; see Burke, 1969; Giddens, 1981), organizational structure also includes task processes, physical structures, and actions like "conditions of employment . . . the official differentiation of divisions, departments, and work units . . . various systems for decision support, management information, work evaluation and compensation, and financial control" that are constituted, rendered meaningful and consequential, through communication (p. 149).

Verstehen

In addition to highlighting communication as a central organizing process, the interpretive turn in organizational communication also led researchers toward becoming a voice for the research population. The German term *Verstehen* (roughly translated as "meaningful understanding") was introduced to sociology by Max Weber and refers to an interpretive process in which a researcher becomes so immersed in a culture that he or she can represent the phenomenon from the participants' own point of view. Though it has been criticized by scholars such as Bakhtin as impossible and arrogant, other sociologists such as Talcott Parsons have championed the concept. Organizational communication scholars who take an interpretive perspective such as Bullis and Bach

(1989) also strive to "let participants speak for themselves." In this study, though I recognize the impossibility of removing my voice as a researcher, I also attempt to let participants speak for themselves. Indeed, my lifelong immersion in the LDS culture and five-year commitment to study anything Kingston-related can be viewed as a limited attempt to achieve *Verstehen.*

Organization and Identification

As Taylor et al. (2000) note, the interpretive turn not only expanded the boundaries of organizational communication, but it also provided a renewed stimulus to (especially Burkean) rhetoric. Among Burke's many rhetorical concepts, identification has emerged as a widely used lens through which to discuss unobtrusive control and social cohesion in organizations. Studies of organizational identification have proliferated since the 1981 interpretive turn, and the concept is being further refined and more widely applied. Burke is certainly not the only theorist to discuss identification; scholars such as Simon (1997) and Barnard (1938) have been used by Tompkins and Cheney (1983; 1985) and others to promote the concept of organizational identification. But from a rhetorical perspective, three major points concerning Burke's concept of identification stand out as especially important to this case study.

First, the identities of organizational members are constituted in large part through their identifications with the organization. As Cheney (1991) explains, communication in large part constitutes not only the organization, but also the identities, or representations of the "selves" of the organizational members (p. 9). Borrowing from Burke and Simon, among others, Cheney views identity as an "essence" and "uniqueness" well as "similarity" (pp. 13, 17). Cheney states that identification, or the appropriation of identity (p. 19), is a communication process—"formative and to a great degree constitutive of the self" (1985, p. 83). As Burke (1950) notes, the paradox of consubstantiality (one in substance while being an individual locus of motives) is fully realized in an organizational setting: We define who we are in large part through our collective membership in organizations.

Second, the identities of organizational members are sometimes influenced by the organization in ways they are not aware of and cannot control: As Cheney (1991) states: "Contemporary organizations do more than manage issues by inculcating values; they also manage identities. In fact, it can be said that the nature of organizational rhetoric in the industrialized world in the late twentieth century is the management of multiple identities" (p. 9). Members' identities are managed largely through "communicating and inculcating premises for decisions" (p. 8) that, when "internalized by an audience of an organization, its members can be depended upon to act in the best interests of the organization, as they understand them" (Simon, 1976; in Cheney, 1991, p. 8). This means that just as organizational members actively construct their reality through their communication processes, these organizational discourses also induce identification in organizational members and set decision premises for them (Tompkins, 1984), resulting in the organization being able to gain some control over what members believe, desire, and even think about. As Burke (1950) reminds us, the paradox of consubstantiality allows individuals to act independently at the same time that their thoughts, words, and actions are unobtrusively constrained by the rhetoric of the organization.

Third, while the identities of individuals are influenced by organizational rhetoric, these organizational members still have power to influence organizational discourses. As Taylor et al. (2000) discuss, people constitute organizations through their ongoing interactions (see Weick, 1979), and their identities are then partially constituted by the organization—which reflect back upon and may again influence the constitution of the organization. To explain, people use the constitutive power of communication to create organizational structures and functions. Values and norms are then created to justify and idealize the operations of the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Once these goals, values and norms are in place, organizational members are encouraged to identify with, or incorporate as part of their "selves," the organization's goals and interests. As Cheney states, "a decision maker identifies with an organization when he or she desires to choose

the alternative which best promotes the perceived interests of that organization" (p. 140). If this process is at least partially successful, then decision premises have been set to constrain future communication among members socialized in the organization. This communication that is constrained to align with organizational interests will then continue to communicatively constitute the organization. Viewed this way, we can understand the process of identification as an influential component of the overall communicative constitution of organizations. We can also define organizational life in terms of communication—as conceived "in terms of how identity is managed on the individual and collective levels" (p. 23). As Cheney emphasizes, communication, or more specifically, rhetoric, "makes possible the moves from 'I' to 'we' and 'we' to 'I'" (p. 20).

Organizational Rhetoric

As the interpretive perspective in organizational communication became a mainstay in theory and method, it diversified into a variety of approaches. One of these dominant approaches, as Taylor et al. (2000) explain, is organizational rhetoric. Crable (1990) heralds it as the "fourth great system of rhetoric" (p. 115). Founded upon Burkean rhetoric of identification, organizational rhetoric has also found room to house a number of critical rhetorical scholars, such as Peterson (1990) and Lair (2007). In this section, I will briefly describe the origins of organizational rhetoric. Then, I will explain some of its key principles.

The Beginnings of Organizational Rhetoric

Organizational rhetoric traces its origins to the 1970s (Lair, 2007). As early as 1975, Tompkins, Fisher, Infante, and Tompkins argued for the importance of studying Burkean notions of identification in organization. After the interpretive turn in 1981, organizational rhetoric grew rapidly throughout the 1980s and 90s. In 1988 and 1989, the Speech Communication Association held day-long seminars on organizational rhetoric, and the 1990 *Journal of Applied Communication Research* was devoted entirely to

the topic of research in organizational rhetoric. In that journal, Cheney and McMillan (1990) note: "organizations, by their very nature, are persuasive enterprises: they must, in Barnard's view (1) maintain a system of communication, (2) communicate a common purpose, and (3) secure the essential contributions of members" (p. 97). This is accomplished in part through organizational identifications developed and maintained through rhetoric.

Tompkins and Cheney have been particularly important to establishing organizational rhetoric as a viable field of study. Cheney (1983b) used Burkean identification strategies, such as identification by similarity, identification by antithesis, and identification using the transcendent 'we,' to analyze identification strategies in corporate in-house documents. Cheney (1983a) used a Burkean rhetorical framework along with qualitative interview-based methods and a qualitative questionnaire to examine organizational identification in a large industrial technology-related Fortune 500 corporation. Goldzwig and Cheney (1984) examined the rhetorical adaptation of U.S. Catholic Bishops in an analysis of their 1983 pastoral letter on nuclear arms, "The Challenge of Peace." Tompkins and Cheney (1985) used Aristotle's rhetorical enthymeme and coined the term "enthymeme 2" to discuss unobtrusive control of employees in organizations. Tompkins and Cheney (1987) wrote a state-of-the-art essay about organizational identification and commitment. Cheney and Tompkins (1988) applied Burke's rhetorical theory, especially his method of "indexing," to the notion of "text" and advocated using a metaphor of "intertextuality" when conducting social science research. Cheney (1985; 1991) explored rhetoric in an organizational society and multiple levels of organizational identification in a rhetorical analysis of the U.S. Catholic Bishops' letter "The Challenge of Peace." Cheney and McMillan (1990) lay the groundwork for considering organizational rhetoric as a subdiscipline in organizational communication by emphasizing the importance of organized persuasion and defining characteristics of organizational rhetoric. And Tompkins (1984) traced the role of rhetoric in organization theory from the classical period forward.

Following their lead, other organizational communication scholars, such as Conrad (1985; 1988); Crable (1986); Hart (1984); Jablonski (1988); McMillan (1982; 1987); and Sproule (1987) have studied the organizational dimensions of rhetoric and the rhetorical dimensions of organizations (see Cheney & McMillan, 1990). Most of these studies rely upon the Aristotle's classical forms and use a Burkean framework. For example, Tompkins (1987) applies Aristotle's rhetorical appeals of ethos, pathos, and logos to Weber's types of legitimate authority. Cheney and McMillan (1990); Cheney and Vibbert (1987); and Crable and Vibbert (1983) apply epideictic rhetoric to organizational studies. Crable and Vibbert (1985) use Aristotle's concept of stasis, or the status of an issue, in their analysis of issues management in public policy. And Sproule (1988) and Tompkins and Cheney (1985) both apply Aristotle's enthymeme to managerial rhetoric and corporate discourse, respectively (see Cheney, 2005).

Today, organizational rhetoric is an established perspective within organizational communication. While a traditional view of rhetoric within organizational rhetoric is still dominant, organizational rhetoric is increasingly being viewed from a critical perspective. Indeed, Meisenbach and McMillan (2006) foreground three contributions that organizational rhetoric has made to the discussion of power in organizations. First, "voice is power in the organization and is governed accordingly by the hierarchy; (2) truly committed workers and stakeholders must be persuaded, not coerced, and (3) these stakeholders also can 'talk back'" (p. 122). Meisenbach and McMillan (2006) state that one of organizational rhetoric's main contributions is its reconsideration of power as widespread and ubiquitous within an organization, rather than concentrated at the top. Given this view of power, "when power is widespread, workers are not inclined to be coerced, forced, or ordered; they must be persuaded (McMillan, 1990; Redding, 1987; P.K. Tompkins, 1984) and adjusted or adjusted to" (p. 113).

Examples of critical organizational rhetorical studies abound. Milne, Kearnins, and Walton (2006) provide a critical exploration of the journey metaphor promoted in

business discourse on sustainability. Kinsella (2005) explores the rhetorical practices within contemporary science and technology and argues that to an unprecedented degree the practices of science and technology are embedded within complex institutional systems. Durant, Gardner, and Taylor (2006) explore the ability of invitational rhetoric to invite dialogue and stories for collective sensemaking in organizations. Dennehy, Morgan, and Assenza (2006) analyze the rhetorical accomplishments of Thomas Paine through a critical organizational lens. Slocum (2006) explores the inherent racism in rhetoric of justice, good intentions, and sustainability in community food organizations. Hope (2006) employs a deliberately postmodern rhetorical perspective in her writings on women in combat. Kuronon, Tienari, and Vaara (2005) use critical discourse analysis, systemic functional grammar, and rhetorical structure theory to analyze a case of industrial restructuring in the financial services. And Zanoni and Janssens (2004) employ critical discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis to analyze text fragments on diversity produced in 25 interviews with human resource managers. Both traditional and critical perspectives are able to find a home in organizational rhetoric.

Key Principles of Organizational Rhetoric

As a combination of interpretive and critical approaches, organizational rhetoric has the ability to take into account both actors' agency in constructing discourses of reality and dominant power interests that skew this meaning construction in favor of their own interests (see Lucaites & Condit, 1999). In the following paragraphs, I will show how four key principles of organizational rhetoric as described by Cheney (2005) are pertinent to my discussion of the Kingston organization: organizational structure, organizations "speaking," power, and identity.

First, rhetoric is inherent in hierarchy, formalization, and specialization, the three main organizational structures in bureaucracy. As Cheney and McMillan (1990) note, hierarchy "necessarily shapes and constrains rhetorical practice" (p. 98), as those at the top of the hierarchy have more rhetorical privilege. Formalization entails writing

down rhetorical policy and, in so doing, selecting the terms to define it. This selection of one set of terms functions as a deflection of others and, as such, has rhetorical qualities (see Burke, 1937, p. 45). Specialization entails a division of labor and the adoption of different and various roles within an organization. To maintain these specialized roles, the rhetorical process of organizational identification may work on many levels, as an individual may feel identified to a work group as well as to an organization as a whole. One of the pressing tasks of the organization, then, is to rhetorically manage these multiple identities (see Cheney, 1991). In my case study, I am especially interested in understanding how the hierarchical structure, or the placement of the seven sons of Charles Elden Kingston (the founder of the organization) at the top of the economic and social hierarchy, is rhetorically managed and accepted by the average Kingston member. I am also interested in understanding the identification levels of members to their families, work groups, and other smaller groups within the organization relative to their organizational identification as a whole.

Organizational rhetoric is also inherent in all sectors of organizations (including, as in this case, corporations preaching religion as part of their business policies) and in all communicative activities, such as organizational recruitment, socialization, leadership, advertising, and identity management. In literature on new religious movements, for example, organizational recruitment and socialization are attributed largely to effective persuasion (Hassan, 2000; Singer, 2003). This principle is important to my study, because of the far-reaching impact that organizational rhetoric has upon organizational dimensions (family/church/business) and activities (recruitment, socialization, and identity management) of the Kingston organization.

Second, much of organizational rhetoric involves organizations "speaking," thus invoking the traditional rhetorical situation of speaker/message/audience. In organizational communication, however, the rhetorical situation is perceived as much more complicated than the rhetorical situation of the Ancient Grecian rhetor speaking to

a largely homogeneous audience with a discrete and bounded text. Rather, organizational communication views the rhetorical situation as many organizations speaking to many audiences through multiple means, and in an elusive search for a stable identity, in a sea of exploding and imploding communication (see Cheney, 2005). In this rhetorical situation, it is recognized that organizational speakers may be decentered, audiences may be multiple and heterogeneous, and the message may not be discrete or bounded. Much of my rhetorical analysis will focus on the organization "speaking," thereby invoking the traditional rhetorical situation. I plan to analyze organizational rhetoric such as formalized doctrine, written statements of church leaders accepted as sacred scripture, and oral speeches written down by audience members. The traditional speaker/message/audience rhetorical situation is applicable in this case especially because the Kingston organization has one clearly defined speaker "for" the organization [the leader, Paul Kingston]; has kept its organizational messages very "secretive," or bounded (until Mary Ann Kingston's lawsuit brought the organizational rhetoric into the public domain); and has a clearly defined and receptive audience, who largely accept the statements of the speaker without reservation.

Third, rhetoric is inherent in power and authority, when more than one outcome is possible and that outcome can be achieved through persuasive means. Burke (1950) effectively persuades us, using Machiavelli's *The Prince* as an example, that politics is a rhetorical enterprise designed to move a political public toward some end. Edelman (1971) concurs, stating that politics is "symbolic action" producing mass arousal and quiescence through rhetorical means. As Lincoln (1994) states, authority is a rhetorical construct, because it is founded upon the trust of the governed. This trust is gained through communicative practices. Tompkins (1987) also applies Weber's (1978) systems of authority to rhetorical appeals and states that different types of authority focus on different rhetorical appeals. Charismatic authority, for example, relies upon appeals of ethos, while traditional authority plays the pathos card. While some have criticized

Burke's rhetoric for not including a comprehensive theory of power, Cheney et al. (1999) articulate that Burke's theory of power is complex and well developed, albeit sometimes implicit in some areas. The element of power in rhetoric is important to this case study, especially as the "power" in the Kingston organization is said to be the intangible power of the priesthood (held by the men of the group) activated by the rhetoric of the priesthood holder. For example, the priesthood, conceived as the power of God on earth, is used in giving blessings of healing and giving commands. Regardless of whether a person believes in this power, the power is actualized only through the pronouncement of these blessings or commands. Thus, bracketing out the possibility of a supernatural power, the priesthood has significant power precisely because it is spoken and adhered to by the members of the organization. An in-depth discussion of the importance of power and authority in rhetoric is probed in section five of this Chapter.

Fourth, much of organizational rhetoric is tied up in issues of identity, especially in our (post)modern society. Decisions often do not depend on what is "true" or "false" but what group you belong to. As Cheney (1991) notes, individuals have a multiplicity of identities, and one of the goals of an organization is to manage them and rhetorically induce them to identify with the organization, or think in terms of what is best for the organization rather than what is best for the individual. For example, members are required to recite from memory at least once a day the overarching "memory gem," or organizational mantra: "It is my firm resolve and fixed purpose to give my all to the Lord; my time, my talents, all that I am or ever expect to be to the establishment of Zion and the building up of the Kingdom of God upon the earth" (Order, 2009a, p. ix). Through the recitation of this memory gem, members are reminded daily of their identity as a servant "in the Kingdom of God." One of the chief purposes of this study is to understand the rhetorical underpinnings of the Kingston organization's management of members' identities.

Since the 1970s, many organizations have sold "values" and identities as much as products and services. The Kingston organization is no exception. They are in

the business of selling both products—such as blocks of "spiffy" ice and restaurant equipment—and intangible identities, such as being one of the "saved" who has "eternal life." The Kingstons manage both products and identities by influencing members to think of themselves as "producers" not "consumers": One of the ABC Order Standards states: "I is for Incomings. Let all of my incomings and outgoings be in the name of the Lord. I watch what I spend and avoid extravagance. I will produce more than I consume and create a surplus" (Order, 2009a, p. ix).

Conclusion

In this section, I have discussed key term #2, "organization," as it is viewed through an organizational rhetorical lens. I first discussed the interpretive turn in organizational communication, showing how the conception of organization changed from a container model to being constituted in large part by communication. Then, I discussed "identification" as a key component of organizational communication, thus showing the connection between Burkean rhetoric and organizations. Finally, I discussed organizational rhetoric as a subdiscipline of organizational communication and highlighted four key principles of organizational rhetoric pertinent to my study: organizational structure, organizations "speaking," power, and identity. I turn now to my third key term, "religion," to better explain the role of rhetoric in religious-based organizations.

Key Term #3: Religion

Though Kenneth Burke's writings do not make his personal opinion on religion clear, the rhetoric of the religious realm is a topic frequently discussed. In the *Rhetoric of Religion,* for example, he delivers lengthy analyses of St. Augustine's *Confessions* and the book of Genesis. *A Rhetoric of Motives* is replete with examples of religious rhetoric to elucidate terms such as mystery, mythic image, perfection, and ultimate identification. And his (1940) "Hitler's Battle" article discusses the use of religious rhetoric by Hitler to persuade the German people to adopt anti-Semitism. His purpose is not theological,

but he is interested in "how theological principles can be shown to have usable secular analogues that throw light upon the nature of language" (1961; p. 2). In this section, I will discuss the interplay between key terms "rhetoric" and "organization" and their specific relation to religion. First, having discussed in Chapter 1 the Kingston organization as a large corporation, I will further classify the religious component of the organization—the Latter Day Church of Christ—as a sect, using Johnstone (1997), an extant text from sociology of religion literature. Next, borrowing from largely psychology-based literature on new religious movements, I will describe the importance of persuasion in new religious movements' recruitment and socialization of members. Finally, using Janja Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice, I will highlight the benefits of combining current literature on new religious movements with Burke's rhetorical theory and insights, making comparisons between her theory of bounded choice and Burke's theory of logology. By the end of the section, I hope to have successfully shown that (1) religious doctrine is rhetorical; (2) religions are organizations; and (3) four rhetorical-based processes produce identification and bounded choice within the new religious organization: charismatic authority/mystery; transcendental belief system/mythic image; systems of control/perfection; and systems of influence/identification. Thus, an organizational rhetoric perspective is especially appropriate for this type of case study.

Religious Types

The Kingston organization is a large corporation with over 100 separate businesses, encapsulated under the "Davis County Cooperative Society." Though the Kingstons have always been guided by a specific worldview, their religious conviction was not formalized until the late 1980s, when they created the Latter Day Church of Christ (formalized chiefly for tax advantages; Order, 2009b). Together, these two entities comprise what is known informally as "the Order." The Latter Day Church of Christ is a sect of the LDS cult-turned-denomination. Johnstone (1997) classifies religious structures into four basic types: church, denomination, sect, and cult. A brief look at

his authoritative revision of Weber's classic typology of church, sect, and cult can help elucidate exactly what this means.

A church is a far-reaching religious organization that (1) claims universality for all people. All people are told that the church is the means of spiritual salvation. It (2) claims monopoly of religious life and attempts to eradicate competition. (3) A church is allied with state and local powers, thereby being able to enforce its doctrines in society. (4) The church is bureaucratic in its structure, with a hierarchical division of labor and a formalized canon of scripture. (5) The church grows through natural reproduction; and (6) the church allows for diversity by creating different departments within a church. The Roman Catholic Church is one example of this type of organization, especially in the past and also in certain parts of Latin America and Europe.

A denomination has the following characteristics: (1) it is also friendly with state and local powers, but (2) it does not have a religious monopoly and adopts a religious pluralist position. It respects religious differences of others. (3) Members are encouraged to participate, at least on a limited basis, and the (4) members tend to be from upper and middle classes. The (5) church grows both through natural reproduction and converts, and (6) religious emotional expression and rituals are routinized. (7) Doctrine can be modestly changed to adopt to the current times, and (8) there is a trained and professional clergy. The LDS church, the Baptist church, and the Methodist church are all examples of denominations.

A sect is an organization that breaks away from a denomination (in the past, Baptists, Seventh-day Adventists) or a church (in the past, Lutheranism) because the church or denomination is seen to have become corrupt or divergent from the "truth." Sects hope to return to "pure religion." A sect can do one of three things: (1) become a denomination and routinize its practices if the sect grows; (2) institutionalize its policies if the sect doesn't grow; (3) or dissolve if policies are not institutionalized. The Kingston group is an example of a breakaway group that felt that a return to "pure religion" was needed.

A cult, defined by Weber (1978), is a religious organization that claims "new" or "forgotten" truth. The LDS church is a good example, as the Book of Mormon was said by Joseph Smith to be a lost scripture. New truth was said to emerge through a modern-day prophet. Cults often (1) grow in urban centers; (2) have a high membership of socially disenfranchised or poor; (3) offer individual peace and fulfillment; and (4) are transitory. In some cases, cults can become institutionalized and become denominations or churches. Christianity, Buddhism, and Islam all began as cults and have become major world religions.

The structure of each of these types of religious organizations is more fluid and changing than these typological characteristics suggest. For example, Liu and Leung (2002) remind us that the classical works of Troeltsch (1911) and Niebuhr (1929) suggest that sect movements within a church are often the origin of reform and revitalization of a church organization. In addition, different religious orders can exist within a church, itself, as occurred during the reform of the Catholic Church (Finke & Wittberg, 2000).

In addition, Weber's now-classical typology is only partially agreed upon by sociology of religion scholars (Johnson, 1975). It has been adopted and modified by scholars such as Ernst Troeltsch (1911) to include a tripartite typology of church, sect, and mysticism; McGuire (1997) to include the church, denomination, sect, and cultic/mystic; and Johnstone (1997), who presents the typology as church, denomination, sect, and cult (used here). Others, such as Martin Buber, believe mysticism is exclusively a psychological category and should not be included in the typology at all (see Daiber, 2002).

The Kingston organization, in terms of sociology of religion literature, is a sect that broke away from the LDS cult-turned-denomination after its abandonment of the practice of plural marriage and 1890 Manifesto outlawing future polygamous relationships. As a sect, the Kingston organization is especially dependent upon the

organization's rhetoric, because its survival is dependent upon members' acceptance of organizational doctrines and policies. As Johnstone (1997) states, a sect has to formalize its practices and policies through organizational dictums, whether or not it grows. If these formalized policies are not accepted by the members of the organization, the sect will dissolve. Therefore, rhetoric in this case study emerges as paramount to the organization's survival and success.

Psychology-Based Literature on New Religious Movements

Though from a sociological perspective the term "sect" fits the Kingston organization best, a psychology-based perspective would define it as a "cult." Though the term is technically not pejorative in sociology (although many sociologists use the term "new religious movement" in place of "cult"; Lalich, 2004), it has a negative connotation in psychology. In order to review the most salient literature on the Kingstons and new religious movements, it has been necessary to draw from this body of literature. It should be noted that this type of literature usually treats cults as exploitative; however, because this study is designed to let participants speak for themselves, I will not follow this evaluative trend and will utilize this literature for descriptive purposes only. In this section, I will first give a brief overview of the definition of a "cult" and then discuss how new religious movements (or "cults") use rhetoric to recruit and socialize organizational members.

Defintion of a Cult from a Psychological Viewpoint Versus Sociological "Sect" and "Cult."

When we think of a "cult," we may think of religious quacks doing crazy things (Singer, 2003), and there are many recent examples—from Elizabeth Smart's 2002 abduction (AP, 2003; Smart & Smart, 2003), to the Jonestown massacre in Guyana that killed 913 people and over 270 children (Knapp, 1998), to the murders directed by Ervil Lebaron in his religious polygamous cult called the Church of the Firstborn (Scheeres,

2006). Because of its controversial and pejorative connotative meaning, until recent years scholars have shied away from using the term (Lalich, 2004). The original theological definition of cult, found in church-sect typology in sociology of religion literature, stems from the Latin, *colere,* which means to worship or devote attention or care to a person or thing. But the current use of the word "cult" in psychology literature is a descriptive term that *refers to all types of groups with charismatic leaders who use persuasion, all-encompassing ideologies, and authoritarian organizational structures* (Singer, 2003). Cults, as the term is defined, may include religious fundamentalist groups (Galanti, 1993) such as the Church of the Firstborn and the Kingston polygamous organization (Moore-Emmett, 2004) along with secular organizations such as some commercial (Hassan, 2000) and therapeutic groups (Singer, 2003). While there can be a variety of motivations for these groups (Post, Ruby, & Shaw, 2002), cults are defined not by what they believe but what they *do* (Singer, 2003).

While it is acknowledged that not all cults are destructive (Hassan, 2000), most cult scholars, such as Singer (2003) and Lifton (1961; 1995) define cults in negative ways. West and Langone (1985) define a cult as a "group or movement exhibiting a great or excessive devotion or dedication to some person, idea or thing and employing unethically manipulative techniques of persuasion and control . . . designed to advance the goals of the group's leaders to the actual or possible detriment of members, their family, or the community (see also Beall, 2005; Chambers, Langone, & Grice, 1994). Singer and Ofshe (1990) present a similar definition:

> a cult is a group or movement that, to a significant degree, (a) exhibits great or excessive devotion or dedication to some person, idea, or thing, (b) uses a thought-reform program to persuade, control, and socialize members (i.e., to integrate them into the group's unique pattern of relationships, beliefs, values, and practices), (c) systematically induces states of psychological dependency in members, (d) exploits members to advance the leadership's goals, and (e) causes psychological harm to members, their families, and the community. (in Langone, 1993, p. 5)

Singer (2003) states that three factors work together to create a cult. First, the cult's success depends largely upon the cult leader. The cult leader is a self-appointed,

persuasive person who claims to have special knowledge or a special mission, tends to be charismatic and domineering, and centers veneration on him- or herself. Second, the cult must have an authoritarian structure. It is controlled by the cult leader, purports to be innovative and/or exclusive, and promotes honesty and loyalty within the group. Third, the cult must have a coordinated program of persuasion, combining behavioral and ideological control. It exhibits an extreme worldview, often ideological totalism (see Lifton, 1961).

In all of these definitions, at least one common theme emerges: cults gain and retain members through a socialization process of which rhetoric (i.e., persuasion) is a key feature. As Singer (2003) states, cults gain and retain members through "intense coordinated persuasion efforts" (p. 91) such as long and emotionally intense recruitment meetings; emotionally charged rhetoric combined with withholding of sleep and/or food; and memorization and repetition of organizational mantras.

Rhetoric and Cult Socialization

Cult scholars agree (though they do not use the term) that rhetoric defines and constitutes reality for cult members. Lifton (1961), for example, identifies eight conditions that result in what he terms "ideological control," or the defining of a particular worldview or reality by a cult. Most of these conditions are rhetorical, as well. (1) "Milieu control" is the limiting of all forms of communication with the outside world. (2) "Mystical manipulation" is the persuasive efforts used to convince a member that he or she is working for a 'higher' or 'divine' purpose. (3) "Sacred science" refers to the use of rhetoric purported to be scientific in nature that supports the doctrine of the cult. (4) "Subordination of person to doctrine" refers to the privileging of an ideology over a person's individual welfare. Thus, words are more important than people and feelings. (5) "Dispensing of existence" refers to the language that draws a sharp line between members of the cult who are "saved" and nonmembers who are "damned" or given a lower place of existence in the afterlife. Doctrinal vocabularies are built around this

concept, thus inducing fear in the cult member and reinforcing the separation between the cult and the outside world. (6) "Personal confession" is the communication to cult leaders of innermost anxieties, fears, and/or "sins." (7) "Loading the language" refers to the creation of a new cult vocabulary through the assignment of new meanings to familiar words or the use of new terms that only cult members are able to understand. (8) "The need for purity" refers to the doctrine that members must strive for perfection through their own works. If we view "dispensing of existence" and "need for purity" as rhetorical strategies, all of Lifton's eight conditions for ideological control, or the control of a person's conception of reality, are based in communication. Several key features important to this case study stand out in this literature.

First, most major cult scholars agree that organizational rhetoric defines or bounds the realities of the members (Hassan, 2000; Langone, 1993; Lifton, 1961; Singer, 2003). According to Singer (2003), the ability of new religious movements to effectively persuade people to join them has been called "thought struggle" (Tse-tung, 1929); "brainwashing" (Hunter, 1951); "thought reform" (Lifton, 1956); "debility, dependency, and dread" (Farber, Harlow, & West, 1957); "coercive persuasion" (Schein, 1961); "mind control" (Hassan, 2000); "systematic manipulation of psychological and social influence" (Singer, 1982); "coordinated programs of coercive influence and behavioral control" (Ofshe & Singer, 1986); and "exploitive persuasion" (Singer & Addis, 1992). To this list, I add "deception, dependency, and dread" (Langone, 1993), and "bounded choice" (Lalich, 2004). Despite all of these different terms, the concept is the same, one that is paramount to rhetoricians: *Rhetoric can be used to control and constrain beliefs and the experience of reality for members of a particular organization or society* (see McKerrow, 1989; Ono & Sloop, 1995).

Second, organizational rhetoric plays a key role in defining and building the identities of members of new religious movements (see Burke, 1950; Cheney; 1983; 1985; 1991; Cheney & McMillan, 1990; Cheney & Tompkins, 1987; McMillan, 1982).

To review, Kenneth Burke (1950) affirms that identification with a persuasive "other" is of fundamental importance in the persuasive process: "You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* your ways with his" (p. 55). And "as for the relation between 'identification' and 'persuasion': We might well keep it in mind that a speaker persuades an audience by the use of stylistic identifications" (p. 46). Identification, for Burke, is the medium through which people are persuaded—the rhetorical means to the socialized end. In classical rhetoric, Cicero also spoke of *decorum,* the first principle of an ethical appeal, in which a persuasive rhetor should assess a rhetorical situation and find ways to make his audience identify with him on some level (Heinrichs, 2007). Some of these particular strategies, such as finding common ground, identification by antithesis, and the use of unified symbols are analyzed in Cheney (1983b).

Findings in psychological cult literature are compatible with this view that persuasion and identity are integrally related, such as Schein's (1961) explanation of the process of coercive persuasion.[5] Applying Lewin's (1947) model for understanding organizational change to coercive persuasion, Schein states that the unfreezing, changing, and refreezing of beliefs is "best characterized as one of a *growing identification*" (p. 131). Schein then lists a six-step process through which coercive persuasion occurs, beginning with an identity crisis, moving to a search for and identification with an "other" whose identity is socially acceptable (even when the other was originally defined as an enemy), and culminating in "the acceptance of things this 'other' says and does" (p. 132). These stages are accomplished largely through rhetorical processes, such as storytelling and metaphors; chanting, praying, and singing; implanting false memories; indoctrination sessions; use of confession and testimonials; and group workshops that reinforce these newly taught beliefs. These rhetorical appeals, in conjunction with behavioral controls such as sleep and privacy deprivation and dietary restrictions, are, according to Hassan (2000), used in most if not all destructive cults.

As Singer and Ofshe (1990), West and Langone (1985), Chambers, Langone, and Grice (1994), Hassan (2000) and Beall (2005) emphasize, new religious movements use rhetorical methods to socialize members, leading them to accept and become devoted to a particular worldview. This method of using rhetoric in an organization or society to mold members' identities, inducing them to do what is best for the organization, is an example of organizational or social identification (see Burke, 1950; Cheney, 1985; 1991; McGee, 1980; and Simon, 1997, among others). Singer (2003) and Langone (1993) refer to this organizational identity as a "pseudopersonality" that eclipses any individual identity (Zimbardo & Andersen, 1993) and is kept in place by the organizational environment (Singer, 2003). Though when members leave a cult organization their former individual identities may return (Singer, 2003), they often struggle with "unclear thoughts" about their identities long after they leave (Langone, 1993, p. 222). While many organizational rhetoric scholars would take exception with the idea of an "authentic" personality, the dialectic between the individual and social selves has been discussed from Cooley (2004) and Mead (2004) to Tajfel and Turner (2004) and Burker (1950).

Third, rhetoric is the primary method through which new religious movements gain and retain members. As Zimbardo and Andersen (1993) state: "it is a person . . . in a convincing social situation—not gadgets or gimmicks—who control the minds of others" (p. 107). Despite their emphasis on persuasion, perhaps because their work resides largely in the discipline of psychology, a systematic critical rhetorical analysis of the discourses used in cult conversion has, to my knowledge, not as of yet been performed.

Singer (2003), one of the foremost scholars in cults for 50 years, centers her work on the persuasive aspects of cults. In her work, she identifies both "physiological" and "psychological" persuasion techniques of cults, such as hyperventilation, chanting, fasting, dietary restrictions, or even pressing on the optic nerve to produce flashes of light (physiological); and guided imagery, indirect directives, trickery, revision of personal history, peer pressure, and emotional manipulation (psychological). While this

information is elucidating and important, a thorough analysis of the actual discourses involved in persuading a person to join a cult could augment the important work on persuasion that has already been done. This, from my view, is where rhetorical analysis may make important contributions to the research on cult literature by analyzing how identities are constructed and who benefits from this construction (see Mumby, 2005). As I will elucidate in greater detail, I will argue that a rhetorical analysis of a new religious movement's organizational rhetoric can make important contributions to cult literature.

Lalich and Burke: Unlikely (but Complementary) Bedfellows

Janja Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice is one example of a good theory on new religious movements whose categories and conclusions could be fleshed out even more through rhetorical analysis. Lalich is a sociologist whose interest in the Heaven's Gate and Democratic Workers Party movements led to a rich analysis of the processes of socialization and identification informed by the theories of Anthony Giddens, Robert Lifton, Max Weber, and Herbert Simon, among others. Because of her sociological roots and use of theorists also important to the organizational rhetoric tradition, her work is particularly complementary to my own. Coupled with a couple of Burkean revisions, this theory is ready-made for use in the rhetorical realm.

Bounded Choice

Lalich (2004) states that four interlocking processes produce the structural social dimensions of cults that bind believers to cult ideology. These dimensions are (1) *charismatic authority,* or the emotional bond between leader and follower; (2) *the transcendent belief system,* or the overarching ideology that dictates the groups rules and norms; (3) *systems of control,* consisting of visible regulatory mechanisms such as rules, regulations, and procedures; and (4) *systems of influence,* consisting of human interaction and group culture from which members learn the informal rules pertaining to cult beliefs (p. 17). Drawing upon Simon's (1997), bounded rationality, Lalich asserts

this four-part system produces "bounded choice" that defines the parameters of reality for cult members: "as a person identifies and unites with the bounded reality of the group and its belief system, becoming a devotee by making that charismatic commitment to the self-sealing worldview, . . . individual perspective and personal decision making become limited and constrained, and that restriction comes from within as much as from without" (p. 21). Thus, the integrated operation of these four systems is the "linchpin" of commitment (p. 255).

In Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice, each of these interlocking processes has a different purpose. The goal of building of charismatic authority is to establish legitimate authority. The institution of the transcendent belief system is designed to provide meaning, purpose, and goals through an overarching worldview. The systems of control are put in place to establish organizational structure and discipline of members. And systems of influence are established and shaped by the organization to guide group norms and codes of conduct within the organizational culture.

All of these interlocking dimensions (the development of emotional bonds between the leader and follower, the ideological system, the establishment and maintenance of group rules and procedures, and human interaction and culture) are rhetorical. Without ever using the word "rhetoric," Lalich identifies a specific rhetorical strategy through which each of these dimensions is created and sustained. She states that charismatic authority is created through an emotional appeal to members' love and fear of their leader; the transcendent belief system is sustained through an appeal to members' need for purpose; systems of social control are maintained through emotional appeals of duty and guilt; and systems of influence are held in place through members' identification with the organization and internalization of its group norms. More explanation of each of these is warranted.

Charismatic leaders, Lalich states, must exhibit three characteristics: "effective oratory skills, the ability to create myth and legend, and a capacity for innovation and

success" (p. 137). In an extended discussion of the Democratic Workers Party (DWP), Lalich states that these leaders "used language as a tool to motivate and persuade, creating their own terms, phraseology, and images for use within the group to encapsulate their experience" (p. 138). Heralded as "master controllers" (p. 138), the leaders of both DWP and Heaven's Gate were able to engender among members both love and fear. Some of these member characteristics include feeling love for leader and group; enjoying group solidarity; feeling a sense of elitism; fearing disapproval of authority; fearing loss of meaning and purpose; fearing the outside world; and fearing they will be unable to function outside of the group.

The transcendental belief system is linked with a rhetorical appeal to members' need for purpose and meaning in life. As Lalich (2004) states: a member "believes she has found meaning and purpose. Yet this requires a commitment that demands singlemindedness, a way of thinking characterized by dogmatism and rigidity, and no identity outside the context of the group" (p. 255). Rhetorically, leaders appeal to this sense of purpose in order to produce commitment by encouraging a dualistic (black-and-white/good-and-evil) worldview; encouraging collectivity over the individual; and withholding information necessary for individual critical thinking (p. 273).

Systems of control are maintained through emotional appeals to members' sense of duty and guilt. As Lalich states, "the member's sense of duty shares space with guilt, always a forceful human motivator. Feeling duty-bound and obligated, members find themselves participating in activities that in other circumstances may have violated a personal ethical code. Now the leader is the only moral arbiter" (p. 256). Members persuaded by these appeals blame themselves for group failures; feel obligated to the leader and the group; feel duty-bound to the belief system; feel obligated to participate; and feel complicity in the recruitment and socialization of others in the group (p. 273).

Systems of influence are created and maintained through the processes of identification and internalization of norms. Under the influence of the organization,

as Lalich states, "the member feels in complete unity with the group and the leader. Although on occasion she may still experience dissonance or confusion over discrepancies, at the same time she has access to fewer and fewer outside sources of information and therefore little capacity for reality checks outside the bounds of the system. She feels completely separated from her own pregroup identities and cannot imagine life outside the group" (p. 256). A member who has identified with the informal norms and culture of the organization may strive to accomplish organizational directives; may experience cognitive insufficiencies or passivity because of mental/physical exhaustion; cannot imagine life outside of the group; and may feel a loss of their pregroup identities (p. 273).

Though Lalich's (2004) work culminates in the identification of these rhetorical strategies with processes that bound rationality and choice, she stops short of rhetorical analysis. We know that the emotions of fear, love, and guilt are paramount to sustaining these interlocking processes. But her work is sociological rather than rhetorical, so she ends her analysis at the level of social and organizational processes. In addition, rather than viewing the rhetorical use of emotion as a process whereby identification is established and maintained, she views it as a separate construct. We are left wondering exactly how identification is created and maintained and how rhetorical strategies in these interlocking processes are related. This is where a Burkean-style rhetorical analysis can contribute to the analysis of new religious movements.

Burke's Revisions

Lalich's theory is a prime example of how a sociological theory of new religious movements can be made more robust through an infusion of Burkean rhetoric. With an expanded definition of "identification" through Burke, we can view each of Lalich's processes as a portion of an overall strategy to create and sustain organizational identification. In the *Rhetoric of Religion,* Burke discusses each of Lalich's above-mentioned social processes as created through and driven by language, viewed through his logological lens.

Burke's theory of logology is particularly useful in a secular study of religion (e.g., his analysis of the book of Genesis; Lalich's study; this case study of the Kingstons). Logology is the study of "words about words" (p. 1). As humans are "typically symbol-using animals," it is natural that humans' thoughts of the divine are analogous to and "embody the principles of verbalization" (p. 1). Burke states that through logology, these principles of verbalization, which include terms like mystery, mythic image, perfection, and consubstantiality, have a celestial counterpart in the divinities that humans worship. He states, "This investigation does not require us to make any decisions about the validity of theology qua theology. Our purpose is simply to ask how theological principles can be shown to have usable secular analogues that throw light upon the nature of language" (p. 2). Therefore, a secular treatment of a new religious movement such as Lalich's (2004) is in harmony with Burke's secular purpose for analyzing religion and can throw new light upon the motives of religious organizations, leaders, and members.

Charismatic Authority

Lalich's first process is charismatic authority, sustained through members' love and fear of their leaders. Burke states that charismatic authority is created through language. The logological principle of *mystery,* inherent in all language, is the breeding ground for charismatic authority. As explained in the previous section on rhetoric, consubstantiality and division are natural and necessary parts of everyday life. Burke calls consubstantiality "identification" and division "mystery."

Mystery, or division, has two origins: different modes of being (ways of life) and different ranges of "intelligent ignorance" (fragmentary state of language/knowledge; p. 309). Burke states that mystery arises socially through "different modes of life. The king will be mystery to the peasant, and vice versa" (p. 308). Mystery also arises and is made permanent by the insufficiency of language to adequately represent knowledge: Mystery "is inescapable, insofar as temporal, factual knowledge is necessarily fragmentary,

and symbol-systems are necessarily inadequate for the *ab intr* description of the non-symbolic" (pp. 307-8). Because of this separation between classes and insufficiency of language to represent reality, mystery will always be a component of life.

It is only through the sustaining of "mystery" that the grounds for rhetoric are made possible. People are able to identify only because they are separate. As Burke states: "Identification is compensatory to division. If men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetoricians to proclaim their unity" (1950; p. 22). And again, "put identification and division ambiguously together, so that you cannot know for certain just where one ends and the other begins, and you have the characteristic invitation to rhetoric" (1950; p. 25).

The logological principle of mystery is the basis for members of new religious movements accepting and obeying charismatic authority. Inherent in mystery is both subjection and obedience. The natural tendency of men and women "goaded by the spirit of hierarchy" (1961; p. 40) and using a universal (hierarchical) vocabulary is to categorize and rank everything from knowledge to social life. And they are as ready to accept a place at the bottom of the hierarchy as at the top. Burke (1961) states:

> Once a believer is brought to accept mysteries, he will be better minded to take orders without question from those persons whom he considers authoritative. In brief, mysteries are a good grounding for obedience, insofar as the acceptance of a mystery involves a person in the abnegation of his own personal judgment. For in Earthy symbolicity, 'reason' will be closely associated with rule. So, if a man, in accepting a mystery, accepts someone else's judgment in place of his own, by that same token he becomes subject willingly. That is, subjection is implicit in his act of belief. (p. 307)

As W. C. Blum states, "In identification lies the source of dedications and enslavements, in fact of cooperation" (Burke, 1950, p. xiv). Burke, following Freud, calls this veneration and willing obedience "classical identification" (see Adorno's (1991) *Culture Industry* for a fuller explanation of a Freudian-based critical analysis on classical identification).

Lalich (2004) states that charismatic authorities use advanced oratory skills and strategic narratives to emotionally bind members (through love and fear) to themselves. Through this rhetorical analysis, we will be able to assess whether Kingston members are classically identified to their leaders through love and fear, or if there are other/additional binding strategies.

Transcendental Belief System

Lalich's second process is the transcendental belief system**,** in which an "overarching ideology" that includes full explanations of past, present, and future offers a path to salvation (p. 17). The most important part of this ideology is the specific "recipe" for personal salvation that each member commits to follow. A Burkean logological definition of this transcendental belief system is the "mythic image," also created and sustained through language.

Burke (1961) states that mythic images are not just expressed through language, they are created through language. A mythic image is a progressive and futuristic utopian ideology that has been built from a universal vocabulary and is encapsulated under a god-term, or a summarizing word that "sums up a manifold of particulars under a single head (as with the title of a book, or the name of some person or political movement)" (p. 2; see 1950). The term "God" is the most obvious "god-term," but other examples could include "Democrat," "Protestant," "Oprah," or "Justice"—any word that summarizes and encapsulates a large body of (even conflicting) ideas.

The mythic image is built through the ultimate vocabulary. In the rhetoric section, we discussed hierarchy in language as inevitable, as terms are first positive (that describe sensory images), then dialectical (that describe ideas), then ultimate (providing order to dialectical terms and placing them within an ultimate vocabulary). The mythic image, or transcendental belief system, would be built from "an ultimate order whereby ideas would transcend sensory images, and mythic images would in turn transcend ideas" (1950, p. 203).

Through the mythic image, members of new religious movements are able to find (as Lalich elucidates) purpose and meaning through their identification with this belief system. Here, as Burke states, the mythic image is able to gain adherents because it provides answers to life's questions without being subject to empirical analysis: "In the sense that discursive reason is dialectical, the mythic image may be treated as figuring a motive that transcends reason. It may also make claims to be 'religious,' since it presumably represents man's relationships to an ultimate ground of motives not available for empirical inspection" (1950, p. 203). Meaning within this transcendental belief system is not able to be logically argued against because it operates on a mythical rather than dialectical level.

This rhetorical analysis of the Kingston organization will help further Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice by highlighting not just what the transcendental belief system provides (purpose and meaning) and requires (commitment), but also the rhetorical devices that "enhance the persuasiveness" of the mythic image (Burke, 1950, p. 203). For example, what kinds of mythic images are used, and how do they appeal to members? What kinds of contradictory dialectical terms are ordered through the universal vocabulary? And what kinds of sensory experiences do they invoke? Through the rhetorical analysis of mythic image, we can flesh out Lalich's theory and understand how transcendental belief systems further the purpose and commitment of members.

Systems of Control

Lalich's third process is "systems of control," which refers to "the network of acknowledged or visible regulatory mechanisms that guide the operation of the group. This includes the overt rules, regulations, and procedures that guide and control members' behaviors" (2004, p. 17). We can gain a better understanding of how members adhere to new religious movements' systems of control through Burke's logological principle, *perfection.*

The principle or "logic of perfection" is based on the Greek term "entelechy" (1961, p. 300), which refers to an agent or force directing growth and life. In Burke's theory, he refers to perfection as the universal desire of humanity to arrive at logological perfection, or at the apex of a certain *kind*, as in "perfecting" a craft, a term, a theory, an argument, etc. Burke (1950) states:

> Since, for better or worse, the mystery of the hierarchic is forever with us, let us, as students of rhetoric, scrutinize its range of entrancements, both with dismay and delight. And finally let us observe, all about us, forever goading us, though it be in fragments, the motive that attains its ultimate identification . . . of the universal order—as with the rhetorical and dialectical symmetry of the Aristotelian in a chain or ladder or pyramid of mounting worth, metaphysics, *whereby all classes of beings are hierarchically arranged each kind striving towards the perfection of its kind, and so towards the kind next above it, while the strivings of the entire series head in God as the beloved cynosure and sinecure, the end of all desire.* (p. 333, my emphasis)

This principle of perfection is a not necessarily a moral striving for perfection but a hierarchical perfection, such as a "'perfect' ultimate design" of a social structure (Burke, 1961, p. 310) or "verbal perfection" (1961, p. 304). It not only places things or people at the top, but is also concerned with things or people being in the "right place." As Burke states, "to call something by its right name, as judged by the given symbol-system in terms of which it is being named, is the very essence of perfectionism" (1961; p. 298).

The "logic of perfection" (1961, p. 311) is based in language and fostered through the universal vocabulary. Burke states that "all doctrine is by its very nature a system of words, or systems" (p. 301). Just as mythic images are built upon the hierarchical nature of the universal vocabulary, the logic of perfection is the outgrowth of these images. Through these mythic images, or overarching progressive "utopian" ideologies, systems of dialectical ideas are ordered and "perfected," culminating in a judgment of the "best way." As Burke states: "Different situations will favor different kinds of government, through the perfectionistic tendency of theorists will plead for some one scheme as better than all others" (p. 304). This perfectionistic tendency can be seen in the political sphere (the doctrine of economic equality in the Democratic mythic image; the doctrine of

capitalism in the Republican mythic image) as well as the religious and serves to polarize as well as perfect. It also reduces some of these doctrines to "various oversimplified schemes that reduce human motives to a few drives or urges or itches involving food, sex, power, prestige and the like" (1961, p. 299).

The logic of perfection disciplines while it molds, leading to the control of lower, less "perfect," items of its kind. In terms of new religious movements, systems of control are put in place to "perfect" adherents while necessarily placing them in a hierarchical, orderly state with the "perfect" leader at the top. An ideal example of this is the Kingston's "law of one above another," in which members (who are told they are "cogs in the wheel" of the Order; Gustafson, 1961) are placed in a hierarchical number system. Elden Kingston, the founder, was number one; Clyde Gustafson, his brother-in-law and best friend, was number two; etc. Each person has to obey those "above" him or her without question. This control is rhetorical and allows a space for members and leaders to negotiate their placement in the social system. For example, whether or not a man receives a number depends on whether the leaders of the Order see him as an asset to the community—which depends on whether the leaders know the man, whether he communicates well with them, and whether he loyally turns in his money and works hard at his job. This rhetorical negotiation makes it difficult to evaluate a system of control from an ethical standpoint, because members are usually willing to cooperate with the rules and regulations of the group. As Burke states: "Who is to say, once and for all, just where 'cooperation' ends and one's partner's 'exploitation' of the other begins? The wavering line between the two cannot be 'scientifically' identified; rival rhetoricians can draw it at different places, and their persuasiveness varies with the resources each has at his command" (1950, p. 25).

Lalich states that systems of control are upheld by members' sense of duty and guilt. Rhetorical appeals to these emotions serve, as Aristotle (2004) identified thousands of years ago, as forceful motivators. Shame is also an associated emotion in this system (Lalich, 2004). This rhetorical analysis will assess the salience of these emotions in

motivating current and former members to commit to the Order; it will also analyze it on a closer level to find what types of speech induce these kinds of emotions.

Systems of Influence

Lalich's fourth process is systems of influence, which refer to the "networks of interactions and methods of influence residing in the group's social relations" (p. 17). This is the informal communication and organizational culture "from which members learn to adapt their thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors to their new beliefs" (p. 17). Tajfel and Turner (1979) and others refer to this member-to-member identification as "social identification."

Not surprisingly, Burke's logological counterpart to Lalich's "systems of influence" is "identification." The dialectic of "mystery/division," "identification/consubstantiality" is the joining together of substance discussed at length in section one of this Chapter. Identification, as Burke (1950) states, is the way "in which the members of a group promote social cohesion by acting rhetorically upon themselves and one another" (p. xiv). While much has already been said about identification (and much more will be said in terms of organizational identification in the next section), it deserves explanation as a major component in the elation sometimes experienced in religious contexts.

"Mystical exaltation," as Burke (1950) calls it, is an experience not easily explained. William James, in his *Varieties of Religious Experience,* identifies some of the expressions of faith that people use to describe this feeling of elation. Statements like feeling "oneness with . . . Infinite Power [and] Infinite peace"; "moments divine, ecstatic hours"; "instants of irresistible intuition"; a state where individuality seems to "dissolve and fade away into boundless being"; "a sense of exultation, of immense joyousness"; "experimental union of the individual with the divine"; and "total absorption in God" (Burke, 1950, pp. 329-330) are used to describe this elation. Taken together, these experiences feature two major points: (1) intense joy; and (2) a feeling of

consubstantiality with a Higher Power. One Kingston member called this experience a "little piece of heaven" (participant 3).

Burke (1950) explains this mystical elation as "ultimate identification," in which the paradox of consubstantiality is amplified through hierarchy. Burke states:

> The sublime resides in moral and intellectual 'immensities.' And even when the sublimities are represented by physical objects, like plains, sea, sky, and mountains, they are 'moral' because the contrast between us and their might and proportion is forcefully hierarchic. Next, insofar as sensory order and social order affect each other, awed and delighted identification with physical power can call forth a transcendent feeling of personal freedom. That is, by the paradox of substance, one can imaginatively identify oneself with the mountain's massive assertiveness while at the same time thinking of one's own comparative futility. The identification thus gives a sense of freedom, since it transcends our limitations (though the effect is made possible only by our awareness of these limitations). . . . The logical contradiction (of being simultaneously oppressed and free) is felt quasi-temporally, as a kind of fixed progression, or congealed sequence (as a change from oppression to freedom). The experience is thus "uplifting." (p. 325)

Thus, elation is felt as a person identifies with what he or she views as the "ultimate" source of power—and feels that surge of power in the process. Burke states: "Universalize the idea of purpose (as when the mark of God is seen in each creature). Then identify the individual with this universal design. The result is invigorating" (1950, p. 315). Four additional points about ultimate identification are worth mentioning.

First, transcendence is inherent in all identification—ultimate identification just amplifies the experience. Burke states: "Identification in itself is a kind of transcendence. For instance, since the individual is to some extent distinct from his group, an identifying of him with the group is by the same token a transcending of his distinctness. . . . identification attains its ultimate expression in mysticism, the identification of the infinitesimally frail with the infinitely powerful" (1950, p. 326). Feeling a sense of "belonging" or experiencing emotional attachment to an individual or group are common manifestations of identification. These attachments are amplified in an ultimate context: attachment becomes an intense feeling of belonging, and identification becomes a sublime experience of unity.

Second, just as identification is amplified in an "ultimate" context, separation from this ultimate identification is felt keenly in the reverse. Burke states: "Identify the individual with this universal design. The result is invigorating. But let anything go wrong with the identification, and all that is left is a sorely protruding ego, a very sick self. Hence, though the sense of mounting is kept vibrant while things are going well, when the withering of accidie set in, the exalted identification of the self with a nature itself identified with God is disrupted, and there is left the self alone" (1950, p. 315). This can help explain the despair that sometimes accompanies a member of a new religious movement who decides to leave the organization. Although the member may no longer believe in the claims of the organization, the feelings of loneliness and separation are amplified because of the ultimate identification that was once felt.

Third, the body's nervous system physically manifests the emotional feelings of identification, thus solidifying the mystical experience. While Burke does not deny the possibility of communion with supernatural sources, he asserts that—regardless—we should expect a bodily response to ultimate identification: "Even if you attributed the mystic state to supernatural sources, you could properly expect it to have its bodily counterpart" (1950; p. 330). Burke hypothesizes that when someone identifies with an ultimate source (thus becoming consubstantial and losing some individuality), the nervous system experiences a "radical passivity" whereby all nervous impulses "attitudinally glow" at once (pp. 330-31). This unusual sensory condition is experienced as knowledge: "the mystic would thus have a strong conviction that his experience was 'noetic,' telling him of a 'truth' beyond the realm of logical contradictions" (1950, p. 331). This triad of "language, the nervous system, and the 'eminences' of social hierarchy" (1950, p. 331) can help to explain how individuals from every walk of life can experience contradictory mystical "knowledge."

Fourth, the test of judging true "mysticism" from its "demonic" substitutes is whether "means" have become an "end" (1950, p. 332). Burke states: "even if you

believe in the validity of certain mystic revelations, you must agree that . . . there are substitutes for mysticism, *Ersatzmystiken,* as with drugs, insanity, crime, and the many fantastic appetites by which men are goaded, as by demons" (1950, p. 331, emphasis in original). When an "instrumentality of living" is sought as an end in itself (p. 332), men and women can lose themselves and their good judgment in pursuit. Burke states:

> when means become ends, and are sought to the exclusion of all else, then the man for whom they are thus transformed does indeed identify himself with a universal purpose, an overall unitary design, quite as with mystical communion. He has a god, and he can lose himself in its godhead. He is engrossed, enrapt, entranced. . . . There are many such Ersatzmystiken. There is a mysticism of sex, a cult wherein sex is sought as one's overwhelming aim, about which all other motives subordinately cluster. There are mysticisms of money, crime, drugs—and many other such goading that transform some instrumentality of living into a demonic purpose. (pp. 331-32)

Thus, as Burke states, "the test of such substitute mysticisms . . . is the transforming of means into ends" (p. 332). Kimball (2004), in his book *When Religion Becomes Evil,* identifies five characteristics of unethical religious organizations—and the transforming of means into ends is one of them. This study does not address the ethics of the Kingston organization; however, the means-to-end test is an interesting one that could be developed in future studies.

Ultimate identification is identification with an ultimate purpose or design. The three characteristics of language, social hierarchy, and the body's nervous system may produce an overwhelming response among members of new religious movements. And the experience of mystical communion appears to be relatively common. As Burke states, "Mysticism is no rare thing. True, the attaining of it in its pure state is rare. And its secular analogues, in grand or gracious symbolism, are rare. But the need for it, the itch, is everywhere. And by hierarchy it is intensified" (1950, p. 332).

Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice is an excellent theory to be used in conjunction with a study in organizational identification because of its sociological roots

and affinity towards rhetorical analysis. Her four processes roughly correspond with four of Burke's logological principles. Charismatic authority is explained more fully by Burke's principle of mystery; the transcendent belief system is much like Burke's mythic image; systems of control are elucidated by Burke's logic of perfection; and systems of influence are explained more fully by Burke's concept of identification. Ultimate identification is a type of identification often experienced in a religious context.

In this section, I classified the religious component of the Kingston organization—the Latter Day Church of Christ—as a sect, using Johnstone (1997), an extant text from sociology of religion literature. Second, I described the importance of persuasion in new religious movements' recruitment and socialization of members. And third, I showed the benefits of augmenting Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice with Burke's rhetorical theory. From this discussion of theory, it is apparent that religions are organizations and that religious doctrine is rhetorical. The next step to understanding the Kingston organization from an organizational rhetoric lens is highlighting one important stream of research in organizational rhetoric: organizational identification. Through a discussion of the development and major themes in organizational identification literature, I hope to show that our understanding of why members join, participate, and stay in new religious movements including the Kingston organization is largely dependent upon our understanding of how members identify classically, socially, and organizationally with leaders, members, and the organization as a whole.

Identification: Organization + Rhetoric

Organizational identification is a central component in both organizational communication and organizational behavior literature (Edwards, 2005). A special issue of *Academy of Management Review;* a special issue of *Journal of Organizational Behavior;* recent edited volumes on organizational identities (Hatch & Schultz, 2004 ; Whetten & Godfrey, 1998;); many articles in *Management Communication Quarterly* (DiSanza &

Bullis, 1999; Larson & Pepper; 2003; Scott et al., 1999); and articles in a recent issue of *Organization Studies* (Hatch & Yanow, 2008; Karreman & Rylander, 2008;) are representative of this interest (see Scott, 2005).

OI literature has grown rapidly since the mid-1980s (Bullis & DiSanza, 1999). In organizational behavior literature, OI is important because it is viewed as a key psychological state representing the bond between the organization and employee. As such, OI is viewed to be potentially capable of explaining and predicting workplace attitudes and behavior (e.g., Ashforth & Mael, 1989). In organizational communication literature (e.g., Bullis & Bach, 1989a; 1989b; 1991; Cheney, 1983a; 1983b; 1991), OI is often viewed as a rhetorical process as well as a product through which individuals come to identify with (e.g., Burke, 1950; Tompkins & Cheney, 1985) and act in the best interests of the organization (e.g., Cheney, 1983b; Simon, 1997; van Dick, 2001). This literature, while interested in predicting workplace attitudes and behaviors, is also concerned with *how* identification occurs through rhetorical processes.

Despite the importance of this construct to both sets of literature, the concept is still in a state of development and dispute, as different authors use the term in different ways. Because of the different conceptualizations of OI, the term is also operationalized in different ways with sometimes different results (Edwards & Peccei, 2007). Edwards (2005) states, "specific outcomes found to be associated with OI tend to vary, depending upon how OI is conceptualized and measured" (p. 209). These different methodologies and findings lead to scholars contesting the findings of an article whose methodology is disputed. As Edwards (2005) states, "after over half a century of discussion in the academic arena, it would seem that there is still considerable disagreement about the nature, meaning and measurement of OI" (p. 208).

Given the definitional dispute in OI literature, it is necessary to define OI as it is used in this case study. Drawing from Van Dick (2001), I define OI as a rhetorical process and product in which an individual (1) experiences feelings of oneness

with or belongingness to an organization, (2) defines him or herself in terms of the organization(s) in which he or she is a member, (3) desires to promote the perceived interests of the organization when making decisions; and (4) perceives him or herself to have shared characteristics with the organization. This definition includes affective, conceptual, behavioral, and evaluative dimensions and roughly corresponds with Lalich's four organizational processes: (1) charismatic authority, in which emotional identification is a key factor; (2) transcendental belief system, in which the organization's overarching ideology gives members a construct for self-definition; (3) systems of control, in which members conform their behavior to achieve organizational directives; and (4) systems of influence, in which members socially identify (or feel consubstantial) with others in their peer group, perceiving shared characteristics/substance.

In this section, I will first provide a brief review of literature on organizational identification and discuss the two dominant OI perspectives: one originating in social identity theory, and one based in Burkean rhetoric. Not surprisingly, I situate my theory of OI firmly in a Burkean tradition. Then, I will discuss each major component of my definition in depth. For the *affective* component (corresponding with Lalich's (2004) charismatic authority and Burke's (1950) mystery), I will discuss classical identification between a leader and members and its importance in new religious movements. Because of Burke's strong Freudian leanings, Adorno's (1951) psychoanalysis of the leader-member bond is especially appropriate for this discussion, augmented by Schwartz's (2004) organizational psychoanalytic perspective. For the *cognitive* component (transcendental belief system/mythic image), I will discuss Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges' (1988) discussion of labels, metaphors, and platitudes in organizational control. For the *behavioral* component (systems of control/perfection), I will discuss Tompkins's (1987) rhetorical treatment of Weber's authority. For the *evaluative* component (systems of influence/identification) I will use Tompkins and Cheney's (1985) article about communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations. Finally, I will

synthesize Lalich's (2004) sociological study of new religious movements and Van Dick's (2001) four dimensions of OI using Tompkins's and Cheney's (1985) four systems of control. This synthesis underscores the need for researchers to analyze organizational identification not only in terms of dimensions but also in terms of hierarchical levels.

Review of Organizational Identification Literature

In this section, I will briefly describe some of the early identity and organizational identification literature that shaped the field of organizational identification. I will then discuss the two major strains of literature on organizational identification: Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Rhetorical Theory (RT).

Early Identity Literature

Identification has been an important concept in social science literature since the first half of the 1900s, as pioneers such as Cooley, Mead, Freud, Tajfel and Turner, and Simon laid the groundwork for the study of organizational identification (Hatch & Schultz, 2004). Three points stressed by early theorists are particularly salient for my case: identities are affected by others' perceptions around us; identification has an emotional component; and an identified organizational member places the "good of the organization" ahead of the individual's needs.

The works of Cooley (2004/1902), Mead (2004/1934), and Tajfel and Turner (2004/1979) underscore that *identities are affected by others' perceptions of those around us*. Cooley set the stage for defining the self in social terms by explaining the intricate relationship between the individual and society: "'society' and individuals' do not denote separable phenomena, but are simply collective and distributive aspects of the same thing" (in Hatch & Schultz, 2004, p. 10). As Cooley (2004/1902) states, just as the individual self "is felt only in relation to other individuals" (p. 29), any group self "can be felt only in relation to a larger society" (p. 29). Thus, both individual and group identities are felt and defined in relation to other groups.

The work of George Herbert Mead is particularly important to the theoretical basis of OI from a rhetorical point of view. Discussed in depth by Cheney (1985), Mead's theory of the "I" and the "me" is one foundation upon which rhetorical-based OI is built. Mead (2004/1934) states that the self is composed of two basic aspects: the "I" and the "Me." The "I" is responsible for novel behavior, while the "me" is the "organized set of attitudes of others" assumed by the "I" (p. 31). When we think of our "self," we think of the "me" portion of the self. Identification occurs through the "me" portion of the self—community becomes part of the individual through the internalization of others' attitudes and expectations. Novelty of action occurs through the "I" portion of the self, "since the individual not only adjusts himself to the attitudes of others, but also changes the attitudes of others" (p. 34). Through this negotiation between the "I" and the "me," the social process is continually modified and negotiated (through rhetoric, I would add).

Tajfel and Turner (2004/1979) also proposed that "the essential criteria for group membership, as they apply to large-scale social categories, are that the individuals concerned define themselves and are defined by others as members of a group" (p. 59). Social identities, they state, are created to enhance individual self-esteem, through which in-groups are favored and out-groups are disparaged (see also Ashforth and Mael, 1989). In each of these theories, the self is defined in part by the perceptions of other group members.

Second, *identification is an emotional bond.* Freud (1930) viewing identification as a primitive emotional bond needed for the survival of the species, called this an "altruistic . . . urge towards union with others in the community" (p. 768). As Schwartz (1987/2004) explains, children are narcissistic: they feel they are and should be at the center of the universe. The response of caretakers oriented towards the children gives them their sense of importance. The love they feel from others allow them to love themselves. But when caretakers reject some of their actions as unacceptable, the children experience this as self-rejection, or guilt. This self-rejection becomes a permanent part

of our psyches and allows identification to occur: “a permanent wound to our narcissism is created, that we cannot permit ourselves to be what we are, thus that the locus of our identity shifts from who we are to who others will permit us to be” (p. 122). Freud’s work also stresses identification as defining oneself in terms of others, but he emphasizes emotional responses as the primary means through which this occurs—love and guilt/shame are driving forces in the development of identity. Freud (1922) states: “We already begin to divine that the mutual tie between members of a group is in the nature of an identification of this kind, based upon an important emotional common quality; and we may suspect that this common quality lies in the nature of the tie with the leader” (p. 62; in Simon, 1997, p. 284). Scholars such as Herbert Simon (1997), Schwartz (1987), and Dutton and Dukerich (2004) give thorough treatments of the role of emotion in identification.

Third, *an identified organizational member places the “good of the organization” ahead of individual needs.* Herbert Simon’s (1997) theory of decision making in organizations has made a lasting mark on social science. Both Lalich (2004) and Cheney (1983a) use Simon’s work extensively in their own theories. Simon states that in a perfect world, rational decision making would consist of people making systematic decisions from their available choices. But in the real world filled with complexity and uncertainty, we don’t know all of our choices in every possible scenario—so we operate using “bounded rationality.” Through a process Simon calls *satisficing,* we make “good enough” choices and settle for the first available choice that will allow us to meet our goal. Two universal elements of human behavior—authority and identification—are instrumental in managing employee decision making. The goals and values of an organization are imposed upon employees through authority, but Simon (1997) states, “to a large extent the values gradually become ‘internalized’ and are incorporated into the psychology and attitudes of the individual participants”—identification which “guarantees that his decisions will be consistent with the organization objectives” (p. 278).

Building upon Freud (1922) and Lasswell's (1935) models of identification, Simon applies the term in connection with employee decision making in organizations. Identification, he states, is when employees desire to act in the best interests of the organization: "a person identifies himself with a group when, in making a decision, he evaluates the several alternatives of choice in terms of their consequences for the specified group" (p. 284). Addressing specifically the phenomenon of employee decision making, Simon states that identification can either facilitate or undermine "correct" organizational decision making, depending on how closely employees' perceptions of organizational goals, objectives, and values reflect the actual organization. While Simon notes that no single mechanism can explain identification, some contributory factors are (1) a personal interest in organizational success; (2) private-management psychology that assumes that management will make decisions for the good of the organization; and (3) focus of attention upon the values and people affected by the organizational program (e.g., administrators managing the care of child cancer patients will feel more acutely the effects that policies will have upon their lives, resulting in an identification with an organizational objective).

Through the process of identification, organizational members acquire an "organization personality" which is distinct from his individual personality. The organization gives the member a role to play, specifying the values, facts, and alternatives "upon which his decisions in the organization are to be based" (p. 278). Organizations, then, are able to provide "what his frame of reference in decision-making is to be" (p. 279). Because of the organization's power to bound rationality and choice of its members through dictating the frame of reference, organizations are at least in part responsible for members' actions. Simon's theory that links identification and decision making is a strong component of Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice, as well as Cheney's (1985, 1991) concept of organizational identification.

Early Organizational Identification Literature

Identification became an important term in literature applied to organizations *per se* around the 1950s. Though definitions vary, three major themes run throughout this early literature: Identified members have common goals, have loyalty to the organization, and feel a sense of belonging. A brief review of some of the important early theorists is below.

Brown (1969) defined identification as a "self-defining response, set in a specific relationship" (p. 347) and argued that people accept organizational influence because of the intrinsic desire to maintain satisfying relationships with other people. Brown (1969) operationalizes this definition by stating that there are four basic components of OI: attraction to the organization, consistency of organizational and individual goals, loyalty, and reference of self to organizational membership (p. 349). This broad definition encompasses goals, loyalty, self-definition, and attraction.

Patchen (1970) viewed OI has having three components: an individual must have shared goals with other organizational members, a sense of belonging to the organization, and individual support of organizational goals and policies (in Edwards, 2005). In his 1964 study of workers in the Tennessee Valley Authority, Patchen measured responses to identification in terms of self-definition ("I work for TVA"), loyalty (getting angry when TVA is criticized), common goals (employees and TVA are "working together toward the same goal of building the Valley"), and job satisfaction (whether workers would "definitely" choose TVA again) (pp. 159-60). Scholars such as Rotondi (1975) and Cheney (1982; 1983b) later used Patchen's schema for their own work.

Lee (1971) stated that OI "is assumed to be the degree of the individiual's broad personal identification with the organization" (p. 215) that may be different for each individual but can be found as one or more of three types: "belongingness, loyalty, or shared characteristics" (p. 214). Belongingness may stem from common goals shared with other members of the organization or that the organization is perceived to meet the

personal needs of the individual. Loyalty can be discussed in terms of supportive attitudes and behavior toward the organization, such as taking pride in the organization, defending it to outsiders, and supporting organizational goals. Identification as shared characteristics implies similarities between the individual and other organizational members, such as sex, race, age, type of work, and education.

Hall, Schneider, and Nygren (1970) define OI as "the process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated and congruent" (p. 177). While this definition focuses on goals, Hall Schneider and Nygren, in a questionnaire to 220 professional foresters, also included as part of their definition a sense of belonging, a feeling of pride in being part of the organization, and support for the leadership skills of the organization.

Kaufman (1960), in an extensive case study of the U.S. Forest Service, used "conversations" (informally structured interviews), observations, and archival data to come to the conclusion that OI is a rhetorical process that practically merged the individual foresters' identities and the organization's identity: "the organization is as much a part of the members as they are part of it" (p. 197). OI developed through the use of rewards (promotions), symbols (uniforms, badges), participation (in decision making), and community involvement, among other things. OI resulted in foresters making decisions in terms of what would benefit the Forest Service. Because they were identified with OI, they made decisions that were intended to be in the best interests of the organization.

Edwards (2005) sums up Brown (1969), Patchen (1970), Lee (1971), and Hall et al. (1970), categorizing them into four basic positions. Brown includes loyalty, attraction, congruence of goals, and self-definition—a fairly broad representation. In addition to Brown's conceptualization, Patchen includes shared characteristics and feeling a sense of belonging to his conceptualization of OI. Lee divides identification into three types and says that common goals, loyalty, or shared characteristics can induce identification.

And Hall et al. focus on the emotional commitment resulting from identification with organizational goals (see Appendix B).

Despite their differences, three major themes run throughout this literature. First, all authors highlight the congruence of goals as an important factor in identification. Second, loyalty is a common theme (if support for/defense of organizational policies and attraction to/pride in the organization are viewed as indicators of organizational loyalty). Third, all but Brown emphasize the importance of feeling a sense of belonging in identification. These are the three factors highlighted by Patchen (1970) and used by scholars such as Bullis and Bach (1989a) and Cheney (1982) in his construction of the Organizational Identification Questionnaire (OIQ). In recent studies, loyalty (Tseng, Chen, & Chen, 2005; Foreman & Whetten, 2002); common goals (Edwards & Peccei, 2007), and a sense of belonging (Tseng, Chen, & Chen, 2005; Bellou & Thanopolous, 2006) have all been found to be positively related to OI, at least in Western organizational cultures (e.g., Maneerat, Hale, & Singhal, 2005, found that membership, similarity, and loyalty were not related to organizational identification in a Thai organization).

Social Identity Theory and Rhetorical Theory

Researchers interested in studying OI generally use one of two theories: Social Identity Theory (SIT) or Burkean-Based Rhetorical Theory (RT).[6] While many common threads run between them, there are three major differences that theorists consider before using one or the other. First, SIT tends to view identification as an end-result product, while RT highlights the continual process of rhetorical negotiation in the maintenance of OI; second, SIT views identification as a cognitive construct (and emotional response/connection as an antecedent to identification), while RT includes emotional bonds an integral part of OI; and third, SIT focuses on categorizing antecedents, consequences, and factors of OI, while RT focuses on the process of *how* identification occurs.

Social Identity Theory

Social Identity Theory is a social-psychological perspective developed largely by Henri Tajfel and John Turner that was adapted to the study of organizations by Ashforth and Mael (1989). Over the last 15 years, it has become one of the dominant approaches to the study of OI (Edwards, 2005). Stating that OI has become confused with similar terms such as organizational commitment, internalization, affect, and behaviors, Ashforth and Mael argue that social identity theory (SIT) can restore some coherence to organizational identification.

SIT posits that people classify themselves and others into various social categories, such as age, gender, and organizational membership, because it segments and orders the social environment. This allows people to define others and themselves from this perspective. The self, according to SIT, is a combination of a personal identity (idiosyncratic characteristics like interests, bodily characteristics, and abilities) and a social identity (a definition of how we belong in a group). Social identification, then, is "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to some human aggregate" (p. 135). In addition, people have self-esteem needs, and people will try to enhance a positive social image by defining themselves in groups that are constructed in a positive light (in-group bias) (Edwards, 2005).

Social identification, according to Ashforth and Mael's conceptualization of SIT, has four principles. First, social identity is a cognitive construct that is not necessarily associated with affect or action. That is, all that is needed is that people perceive themselves as "psychologically intertwined with the fate of the group" (p. 136). From this perspective, behaviors and feelings toward a group are consequences or antecedents, not identification per se. Second, social identification means personally experiencing the successes and failures of the group, such as great suffering, missed potential benefits, and task failure. Third, social identification is different from internalization. Social identification "refers to the self in social categories (I am)" (p. 136), but internalization

refers to beliefs and attitudes incorporated into the self (I believe). Fourth, group identification is similar to classical identification, or identification with another person. Though there are important differences (social identification is a desire for self-definition through association, while classical identification is a desire for self-definition through emulation), they are both bids for self-definition. Ashforth and Mael (1989) argue that organizations often attempt to generalize and routinize this classical identification through a charismatic leader of an organization.

Organizational identification, according to Ashforth and Mael's application of SIT, is a specific form of social identification. Defined as "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to a group," organizations, like other social categories, can potentially provide meaning, connectedness, and empowerment to individuals that join. Identification, however, does not have to occur on an organizational level. Identification can come from work groups, unions, lunch groups, age cohorts, and so on. Because of this, it is argued that holographic organizational identification, where individuals all share a common identity (see Albert & Whetten, 1985; Mintzberg, 1983; Ouchi, 1981) is relatively rare, especially in complex organizations; instead, ideographic identification, where individuals display subunit (i.e., work group, task force) identities, is more likely to occur. One result of ideographic identification is that people often retain multiple and sometimes conflicting identities.

While related, organizational identification is viewed as separate from organizational commitment. In contrast to Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) who defined organizational commitment as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization," Ashforth and Mael (1989) assert that belief in goals and values, a willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and desire to maintain membership are actually not part of identification. Commitment, they state, implies shared goals and values. But an individual can have shared goals and values but not be identified with or perceive a shared destiny with the

organization. Goals and values, they state, can transfer from one organization to another without the "psychic loss" involved in identification. As empirical support for this assertion, Mael (1988) constructed a six-item Organizational Identification Scale and compared it in a factor analysis with Mowday, Steers, and Porter's (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). Mael's two-factor model (OI and OC) had a goodness-of-fit index of 0.825, but the single-factor model had a goodness-of-fit index of only 0.780. This suggests that identification and commitment are indeed different constructs.

So far, I have discussed OI as a psychological construct where people perceive a sense of "oneness" with an organization. This sense of oneness implies that people feel they have a shared destiny with the organization, personally experience the successes and failures of the organization as their own, and feel a psychic loss when they are separated from the organization. This sense of oneness, according to Ashforth and Mael (1989), does not include behaviors and affective states. These are better viewed as antecedents and consequences of social identity theory, not as SIT theory per se.

According to Ashforth and Mael (1989), there are four factors that are likely to increase the tendency of a person to identify with a group. These antecedents are (1) the distinctiveness of the group (uniqueness); (2) the prestige of the group; (3) the salience of the out-group (there is greater homogeneity in a group when an out-group is present); (4) and a set of factors that are traditionally associated with group formation, such as similarity, liking, proximity, shared goals, common history, etc. These factors may affect the degree to which individuals identify but, according to SIT, are not necessary for identification to occur.

SIT literature identifies three general consequences of OI. First, people tend to support and commit to institutions that embody their identities. This support could be in many forms, from monetary donations to a university (e.g., Mael, 1988) to doing volunteer work in the church one attends. Second, identification affects the outcomes

conventionally associated with group formation, such as cohesion, cooperation, altruism, and positive evaluation of the group. Third, identification reinforces the antecedents of identification, such as distinctiveness, group prestige, competition with out-groups, etc.

OI from a social identity perspective has explanatory power in organizational socialization, role conflict, and inter-group relations literature. OI facilitates organizational socialization because it allows the newcomer to reify the organization and feel committed to it per se (e.g., rather than a charismatic leader), as well as assist in the internalization of organizational values and beliefs, especially in divestiture processes (where an organizational identity is supplanted in place of the individual identity; see Van Maanen, 1978). OI is involved in role differentiation, because roles are viewed as different identities that may conflict. These identities are typically not integrated but are instead ordered, separated, or buffered. The compartmentalization of identities can result in hypocrisy or double standards. OI is also related to intergroup conflict. Without a strong organizational identification, subunits of the organization tend to compete for favorable comparisons and scarce resources, resulting in the justification and contagion of stereotypes of out-groups.[7]

In summary, Social Identity Theory applied to organizations defines organizational identification as "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to a group" (p. 150). OI in this theory is a cognitive construct, a product involving personal experience of the organization's successes and failures but not including affective or behavioral states. Antecedents of OI include a view of the organization as distinctive and prestigious, viewing out-groups as salient, and factors traditionally associated with group formation, such as similarity, liking, etc. Consequences of OI include support of and commitment toward institutions that embody OI, as well as traditional outcomes associated with group formation, such as cohesion cooperation, and reinforcement of antecedents. OI is also an important construct in theories of organizational socialization, role differentiation and intergroup conflict.

SIT has much to recommend it. It provides a clear explanation of OI, differentiating it from constructs such as organizational commitment, loyalty, and internalization. It also separates OI from its antecedents and consequences, making a tidy theory from which identification in organizations can be measured and generalized. Although I recognize SIT's benefits, I see three problems with it as it is conceptualized by Ashforth and Mael (1989). First, OI is viewed primarily as a fixed and static psychological state that does not account for time, context, or targets. From my perspective, a comprehensive theory of OI should account for an individual's changing identifications over time and different identifications towards different people or groups in the organization. In this sense, OI should be viewed as a process as well as product. Second, a comprehensive theory of OI should include emotional components as well as cognitive ones. Indeed, Ashforth and Mael's (1989) assertion that individuals feel a "psychic loss" when they are removed from an organization they are identified with seems like an emotional component to me that should be included in the process of identification, not listed as a consequence of it. And third, a comprehensive theory of OI should be able to explain not only antecedents, consequences, and factors of OI but also be able to show how identification occurs. As Ashforth and Mael (1989) state, SIT is "relatively mute" about how identification occurs, and this is a drawback for me. Though SIT has made some adjustments for these drawbacks in recent years (see the 2005 article by Van Dick et al. arguing that OI is not "fixed and unchangeable," p. 213), its conceptualization as a static cognitive constructs restricts researchers in their understanding of how identification occurs.

Rhetorical Theory Applied to Organizations

Rhetoric-based studies of organizational identification are rooted in the interpretive turn of organizational communication. Championed by scholars such as Tompkins and Cheney, Burke's theory of rhetoric-as-identification is strong in areas that SIT is weak. In this section, I will first give an overview of the major components of

rhetoric-based OI theory, as described by Cheney. Then, I will discuss OI as a process with an emotional component that focuses on how identification occurs.

Cheney (1983), using Burke's (1950) rhetorical theory and Simon's (1997) decision making theory developed a "theoretically robust" (Bullis & Bach, 1991) conceptualization of organizational identification. While SIT views OI exclusively as a product, Cheney sees OI as also "an active process by which individuals link themselves to elements in the social scene" (p. 342). OI can help us make sense of our experiences, organize our thoughts, make decisions, and persuade or be persuaded. In addition, OI can be seen as a contingent product, a "snapshot" (Cheney, 1983) of organizational processes.

From a rhetorical point of view, the study of OI is important because (1) it has been linked to a variety of work attitudes, behaviors and outcomes; (2) it can help us explain the impact of organizational policies and activities, such as socialization, internal organizational communication, and public relations; (3) it is the source of "referent power," an important type of power in organizations (see French and Raven, 1968); and (4) it can help us understand the ethical question of "whether participation in modern organizations is destructive of 'individuality' and personal values and strivings" (p. 344). As Cheney (1983) states, "identifications are important for what they do for us: they aid us in making sense of our experience, in organizing our thoughts, in achieving decisions, and in anchoring the self. Perhaps most important for students of communication, identifying allows people to persuade and be persuaded" (p. 342; see Ferraris et al., 1993).

Cheney (1983a) and Tompkins and Cheney (1983; 1985), synthesizing Kenneth Burke's (1950) and Herbert Simon's (1997) conceptualizations of identification, outline a rhetorical model of identification. Simon (1997) treats identification as a central component in organizational decision making, defining OI as follows: "a person identifies himself with a group when, in making a decision, he evaluates the several alternatives of choice in terms of their consequences for the specified group" (p. 284). When making

a decision, Cheney (1983a) explains, someone who is identified with the organization or a subunit of the organization intends to (1) make a decision based on the interests of the organization; (2) will usually accept decisional premises communicated by the organization; and (3) will usually have a positive attitude toward the organization.

Burke's (1950) rhetorical theory is compatible with Simon's (1997) decision making theory in part because both view identification as a process. Identification, for Burke, is of course a rhetorical response to the division (of class, race, gender, etc.) that exists in society. It is a sense of belonging as well as an appeal to similarity between a speaker and an audience. Burke's theory of consubstantiality states that people act to identify with a target, or "think of [themselves] as 'belonging' to some special body more or less clearly defined" (1973, p. 268; in Cheney, 1983, p. 347). As consubstantial beings, they will also exhibit similarities. Burke states: "You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* your ways with his" (p. 55). For Burke, identification, and by extension OI, is a rhetorical process and the only way that socialization into groups can occur: "one's participation in a collective, social role cannot be obtained in any other way" than by identification (1937, p. 2:144).

Cheney (1983) states that both Simon and Burke consider identification as a process involving persuasion or inducement of an individual to act in relation to a group. The differences lie in the focus of the individual or organization. Burke "tells us how individuals 'approach' collectivities" (p. 347) and sees identification as a way to enhance one's "identity" through association with social groups. Simon, while recognizing the individual in the process of identification, demonstrates a managerial bias and focuses on identification as a way to induce workers to think in terms of what's advantageous to an organization.

Cheney (1991) presents two definitions of identification: broadly, it is "the appropriation of identity" (p. 140) which, as Cheney and Tompkins (1987) state, involves

the "development and maintenance of an individual's or group's sameness or substance" (p. 5); and in a more specific, operationalized way, we can say that "a decision maker identifies with an organization when he or she desires to choose the alternative which best promotes the perceived interests of that organization" (p. 140). So for Cheney, identification is not just defining one's self in terms of the organization (which in a later essay he includes as part of his definition; see Scott, Corman, & Cheney, 1998); it is also a sense of belonging, making decisions in the best interests of the organizations, and "consubstantiality" (Burke, 1950), or perceiving shared characteristics with the organization.

Three Areas of Concern

Burkean-based rhetorical theory is strong in three areas that SIT is weak. First, one major thrust of Cheney's (1983a) theory is that OI is both a product and a process. In his 1983a article, he states that despite the importance of OI, OI research exhibits two major deficiencies. First, it is viewed as a product (belief, attitude, etc.) but not considered as a process. Second, researchers' tendencies to ignore the process aspect of OI lead to research methods that ignore process-related questions. Questionnaires, for example, can gather information about a person's OI at a certain point in time (viewed as a product), but they can't tap into how this OI has developed (a process). As Maneerat et al. (2005) state, Cheney's theory encompasses both process and product: "Identification is considered a product in terms of employee beliefs, attitudes, intentions, or any combination thereof. Identification is a process in the sense that it requires ongoing communication efforts that foster work dedicated toward organizational goals and objectives" (p. 193; in Cheney, 1983a; 1983b). This emphasis on process has allowed researchers to address identification over time (e.g., Bullis & Bach's "turning point analysis"; 1989a, 1989b) and study different identifications depending on the communicative target, or resource of identity to which a person can become attached (e.g., Scott, Corman, and Cheney's "multiple targets," 1998; Cheney's view that organizational rhetoric is the "management of multiple identities"; 1991).

Second, Cheney's rhetorical theory of OI at least implicitly includes an affective component in the definition of OI. Ashforth and Mael (1989) assert that OI is only a cognitive construct: belief in goals and values, a willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and desire to maintain membership are actually not part of identification. In contrast, Tompkins and Cheney (1985) refer to identification as the *desire* of people to act in the best interests of the organization and view identification as including a sense (read feeling) of belonging. As Kuhn and Nelson (2002) note, in rhetorical theory the process of OI expresses individual attachments to identity structures, while also reproducing and transforming these same identity structures. If we view attachments as affective, we can concur with Bucher (2003) that "where members see themselves now, where they have come from, and the process of getting from one place to another, or moving from one identity to another, necessarily involves *feelings* of identification with someone or something else" (p. 9).

Third, Cheney (1983) notes that the outcome of viewing OI as product rather than process is that there has not been much effort to analyze *how* identification occurs. By focusing on Burke's (1950) assertion that rhetoric is the art of persuasion through identification, Cheney is able to view identification as a rhetorical process. And by using Simon's (1997) argument that identification is manifest through an individual's decision making processes in an organization, Cheney brings this rhetorical process of identification into the realm of organization theory. This juxtaposition of two different yet compatible theories allows Cheney to make available a whole arsenal of rhetorical figures and forms (classical rhetoric), framing devices (contemporary rhetoric), and critical constructs (critical rhetoric) to be used to explain *how* OI occurs.

Cheney's (1991) analysis of the development of U.S. Catholic Bishops' pastoral letter "The Challenge of Peace" is a good example of the practical insights that can come from viewing OI as a rhetorical process. At the end of his analysis, Cheney highlights 12 "principles" important to remember when studying OI. Some of these principles are

strategic; for example, he states "for a part of an organization to assert its autonomy and still remain in the organization, it must not challenge the basic identity of the organization as a whole." Other examples of strategic recommendations are "organizations must speak to outsiders and, in so doing, must not adapt so completely that their authority with insiders or their basic identity is threatened"; and "if organizational members wish to achieve change within an organization, they must justify that change in terms of the interests of an organization" (pp. 163, 181). These practical recommendations are important to academicians, organizations, and lay people interested in achieving social change.

Another example is Cheney's (1983b) study of corporate house organs, in which he argues that organizations attempt to induce identification through four techniques: (1) highlighting similarities between the organization and the individual (the "common ground technique"); (2) portraying outsiders as enemies ("identification through antithesis"); (3) using the "assumed we" in corporate discourse, and (4) using unifying symbols such as name, logo and trademark. These studies move beyond SIT-based research by addressing how OI occurs.

In sum, viewing OI as a process as well as product; including an affective component; and focusing on how identification occurs are three major reasons to prefer an RT-based theory of OI over an SIT-based theory. In Chapters 5-9, I further delve into how identification occurs through the use of two major rhetorical methodologies: a Aristotelian analysis augmented by Tompkins' and Weber's theories of organizational authority; and an analysis of Burkean-based identification strategies.

Definitions of OI Within SIT and RT

Although most literature uses either social identity theory or rhetorical theory to conceptualize OI, there is still much variation in the definitions of OI within these theories.[8] In SIT, the definition most often used is from Ashforth and Mael's (1989) seminal work that initially appropriated SIT to be used for the study of organizations.

The "perception of oneness with, or 'belongingness' to a social group" is used by many authors, such as Bartels et al. (2007), Richter et al. (2006), Nakra et al. (2006), Bartels et al. (2006), and Smidts et al. (2001). Other theorists such as Li et al. (2003) and Van Dick et al. (2006) utilize Pratt's (1998) definition of OI as "the process whereby an individual's beliefs about an organization become self-referential or self-defining." Still others use Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail's (1994) definition as "the degree to which a member defines him- herself by the same attributes that he or she believes define the organization" (Chreim, 2001, p. 239). In each of these definitions, certain themes emerge. Most researchers define OI as a psychological state that consists of (1) the member defining him or herself in terms of the organization; (2) the member having a sense of belonging to the organization; and (3) the member perceiving shared characteristics between him- or herself and the organization. While other concepts, such as congruence between individual and organizational values (Nakra et al., 2006; Tseng et al., 2005), pride in the organization (Smidts et al., 2001), and emotional attachment (Tanis, 2005) were occasionally mentioned, these three themes stood out as common to most definitions in SIT literature (see Appendix B). A complete list of definitions in 28 articles is provided in Appendix C.[9]

In rhetorical theory, many researchers base their work on Cheney's (1982) definition of OI as "including member feelings of similarity, belonging, and membership" (see Bucher, 2003; Bullis & Bach, 1989a; 1989b; Ferraris et al., 1993). Others use Tompkins and Cheney's (1985) definition of OI as "a decision maker identifies with an organization when he or she desires to choose the alternative that best promotes the perceived interests of that organization" (p. 194; see Kassing, 2000; Myers & Kassing, 1998). In RT-based articles, three dominant themes emerge: OI (1) is represented by shared characteristics and linkages; (2) is a process of relational development; and (3) includes a sense of belonging or membership. To a lesser extent, (4) congruence of organizational goals and (5) OI as defining self in terms of the organization are also cited as part of the definition of OI. Appendix B shows a breakdown of concepts used in the definitions of OI from a RT perspective.

While it is true, as Edwards (2005) states, that there is definitional divergence in OI literature, we can make some interesting comparisons between early OI literature, social identity theory, and rhetorical theory. As Appendix B shows, each set of literature has its own set of emphases, but there is some congruence in four areas. Most conceptualizations include a (1) sense of belonging and/or membership;[10] (2) shared characteristics and/or linkages;[11] (3) defining oneself in terms of the organization;[12] and to a lesser degree (4) making decisions in terms of organizational goals and values[13] (see Appendix B).

Van Dick (2001) defines OI in terms of four components, as well. He states that Tajfel (1981) describes three components of identification with a group: (1) a cognitive component, which is the knowledge of a certain group membership; (2) an affective component, which describes the emotional attachment to this group; and (3) an evaluative component, which is the value connotation assigned to that group. In other words, it is the perception of positive and negative assessments from outside the group. Van Dick also adds a fourth: (4) a conative (i.e., a behavioral) component, which describes participation in actions which are relevant for the group. Although not identical, this schema is similar to the four themes that I have identified as important in OI literature. Defining oneself in terms of an organization is a cognitive component of OI. Feelings of belonging and membership are affective components. Promoting the goals of the organization is a behavioral component. And though the conceptualization is not identical, "shared characteristics" can be seen in part as an evaluative component because, as van Dick states, this category "mostly consists of cognitions" in which individuals evaluate their group in relation to the ways that out-groups perceive it. When assessing whether an individual has shared characteristics with an organization, it is inevitable that the perceptions of "outsiders" will play a part in evaluating the characteristics for similarity. While Ashforth and Mael (1989) divorce the affective and behavioral components from OI to differentiate it from organizational commitment and involvement, respectively (see

van Dick, 2001), I prefer to use a broader conceptualization of OI and distinguish types of OI rather than limit OI to a cognitive factor. The assertion that there are at least cognitive and affective components of OI has been empirically tested and affirmed by Tanis (2005). Indeed, as van Dick (2001) states, even Ashforth and Mael (1992) include items in their OI scale that clearly reference an affective component in OI.

In addition, these four elements—highlighted by Van Dick and supported by the review of OI literature—also roughly correspond with Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice, in which four processes allow new religious movements to restrict the perception of members to view available choices for thought, language, and behavior. Lalich's concept of charismatic authority corresponds with Van Dick's affective component (and Burke's mystery, as discussed in the previous section), which highlights the emotional bond between leader and follower; Lalich's transcendental belief system corresponds with Van Dick's cognitive construct (and Burke's mythic image); Lalich's systems of control correspond with Van Dick's behavioral component (and Burke's perfection); and Lalich's systems of influence correspond with Van Dick's evaluative component (and Burke's identification). In the next section, I will discuss each of Van Dick's definitional components of OI, using extant works from OI literature to flesh out and justify the inclusion of each component.

Four Processes, Four Dimensions

Van Dick et al. (2005) flesh out the (2001) argument that organizational identification includes affective, cognitive, behavioral, and evaluative dimensions. In a series of 10 studies, they provide empirical evidence for "a cognitive, an affective, an evaluative, and a behavioral component" (pp. 211-12). In this section, each of these dimensions of identification will be explored. For the *affective* component, I will use Adorno's (1951) psychoanalysis of the leader-member bond.[14] For the *cognitive* component, I will discuss Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges' (1988) discussion of labels, metaphors, and platitudes in organizational control. For the *behavioral* component, I will

use Tompkins' (1987) discussion of rhetoric as legitimate authority; and for the *evaluative* component, I will use Tompkins and Cheney's (1985) article about communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations. Through this analysis, I will show that the four dimensions of OI described by Van Dick et al. (2005) roughly correspond with Lalich's four interlocking processes producing bounded choice and Burke's theory of logology.

Affective Dimension

The emotional bond between leader and member is a very important component of the new religious movement. Singer (2003), Langone (1993), Hassan (2000), and Lalich (2004) all emphasize the importance of the leader's charismatic authority in creating and sustaining members' identification with the group. Van Dick et al. (2005) reinforces this assertion, stating that research has shown that the emotional component of identification "is probably the best predictor of group performance" (p. 194). While Adorno (1991) does not hail from the same theoretical discipline, I have personally found his explanation of the charismatic bond between leader and follower to be unparalleled. In addition, his perspective on identification is founded upon the same psychoanalytic theory that informs Burke, Lalich, and Simon. As Adorno (1991) states, the intense identification between a charismatic leader and his or her follower is a natural emotional bond that is cultivated through a "truly systematical" method that "follows a rigidly set pattern of clear-cut 'devices'" (p. 133).[15] Charismatic leaders establish emotional identification through five major processes: idealization of himself/herself; emphasis on discipline; emphasis on hierarchy; repetition of a few sloganized ideas; and promotion of hostility toward out-groups.

Adorno's major concern is to understand why "modern men revert to patterns of behavior which flagrantly contradict their own rational level" (p. 135). Freud (1922) is also concerned with this on a psychological level. Freud states: "If the individuals in the group are combined into a unity, there must surely be something to unite them, and this

bond might be precisely the thing that is characteristic of a group" (p. 7; in Adorno, 1991, p. 154). Here, Freud is referring to the emotional libidinal bond that demagogues are able to synthetically reproduce through charismatic identification. To explain, Freudian theory states that men and women in a mass are able to experience a heightened stirring of emotion, a pleasurable experience that results from being brought under conditions which "allow him to throw off the repressions of his unconscious [violent] instincts" (Adorno, 1991, p. 136). These violent instincts are rooted in the Oedipus complex (desire to kill the father and be joined sexually with the mother) and are transformed by charismatic demagogues from sexual energy to love "feelings which hold masses together" (p. 137). In sum, men and women may act irrationally in groups because (1) they are instinctually predisposed to experience violent passions; and (2) are susceptible to persuasion by a leader who rhetorically frames their sexual energy as a love relationship (love of country, love of leader, love of God, etc.)

The transformation from libidinal bond to the bond between leaders and followers is identification. Adorno (1991) states: "the mechanism which transforms libido into the bond between leaders and followers, and between the followers themselves, is that of identification. A great part of Freud's book is devoted to its analysis" (p. 139). For Freud, identification is "the earliest expression of an emotional tie with another person, 'playing' a part in the early history of the Oedipus complex" (Freud, 1922, p. 60; in Adorno, 1991, p. 141). Identification, for Freud, is rooted in the narcissism of the infant. The infant thinks only in terms of herself, so any object that she loves is "devoured," or made part of herself. The beloved is viewed as a substitute for an unattained ego ideal and is thus "idealized," or made perfect in her eyes to satisfy her narcissism. This is a psychoanalytic explanation of Burke's theory of consubstantiality, where people view themselves as literally of one substance when they are identified.

As Adorno (1991) states, a charismatic leader follows a formulaic rhetorical script when persuading people to join and act as a group. He argues that this rhetoric is so formulaic, "it suffices in principle to analyze the statements of one of them in order to

know them all" (p. 133). Therefore, if we analyze the speech of one charismatic leader, we should be able to readily identify "the very limited number of stock devices" (p. 133). Following are a few of the stock devices.

First, the charismatic leader will promote idealization of himself. Because men and women are instinctually predisposed to idealize a love object, a charismatic leader will provide them the opportunity to do so. This allows members to feel that their narcissistic ideals have been satisfied: "by making the leader his ideal, he loves himself, as it were, but gets rid of the stains of frustration and discontent which mar his picture of his own empirical self" (p. 140). This identification-through-idealization is a collective one that is "effective in vast numbers of people with similar characterological dispositions and libidinal leanings [that] have substituted one and the same object for their ego ideal and have consequently identified themselves with one another in their ego" (p. 141). From this collective idealization, the leader is able to project "primal father-like omnipotence" (p. 141). In new religious movements like the Kingstons, the leader of the group idealizes himself as the "mouthpiece" of God and the direct conduit through which God speaks to the people. Because of this collective idealization, he is nearly omnipotent, as he is given the authority by the people to make decisions for them related to their spiritual, economic, and physical wellbeing.

At the same time the leader idealizes himself, he must also appear as an "everyman" so people will view themselves as similar enough to be consubstantial. Adorno states: "one of the basic devices of personalized fascist propaganda is the concept of the 'great little man', a person who suggests both omnipotence and the idea that he is just one of the folks, a plain, red-blooded American . . . the leader image gratifies the follower's twofold wish to submit to authority and to be the authority himself" (p. 142). Though this is a difficult task (Adorno states the leader has to "work the miracle"), leaders of new religious movements are highly skilled as projecting themselves as regular people with transcendent, magical qualities that put them on a higher spiritual and

intellectual plane. The vernacular use of "humble person" in the Kingston organization embodies both of these elements of idealization, as people are called "humble" when they are viewed by the Kingston organization to have high status but act like "regular" people. The leader of the Kingstons, believed to be a man endowed with magical qualities, is often called "humble" in this context.

Second, the charismatic leader will emphasize discipline. Because he will confront a disorganized and heterogeneous group before taking power, he will need to stress discipline and coherence to form them into a group. Adorno states: "part of the agitator's task consists in making the crowd believe that it is organized like the Army or the Church. Hence the tendency towards over-organization. A fetish is made of organization as such; it becomes an end instead of a means and this tendency prevails throughout the agitator's speeches" (p. 10). The fetish of over-organization is well illustrated in the Kingston Administrative Working Manual, as members are required to chart everything from physical activity to scripture study to what time they wake up in the morning.

Third, hierarchy will be stressed. Adorno (1991) states that a common trait of demagogues is that they "continuously emphasize ritualistic ceremonies and hierarchical differentiations. The less hierarchy within the set-up of a highly rationalized and quantified industrial society is warranted, the more artificial hierarchies with no objective raison d'etre are built up and rigidly imposed" (p. 143). This has roots in identification. A soldier, for example, may not be able to identify with the general, one who is so far his superior , with whom he has little in common, and with whom he has little interaction. The soldier may, however, identify with his commanding officer and follow his orders without question. The hierarchical stratifications allow individuals to identify with people who are similar to them while still identifying with the leader's objectives and person as a whole. Adorno (1991) gives Hitler's famous formula as an example: "*Verantortung nach oben, Autoritat nach unten,* (responsibility towards above, authority towards

below)" (p. 143). This mantra closely mirrors the Kingstons' "law of one above another" to obey the ones above and serve the ones below.

Fourth, the charismatic leader will continuously repeat a few ideas but not encourage in-depth thinking. Adorno (1991) states that "the speeches themselves are so monotonous that one meets with endless repetitions as soon as one is acquainted with the very limited number of stock devices. As a matter of fact, constant reiteration and scarcity of ideas are indispensible ingredients of the entire technique" (p. 133). Adorno states that charismatic leaders generally have great oratory skills with "a compulsion to speak incessantly" (p. 148). He states that their "orality" is the reason for the "famous spell they exercise over their followers" (p. 148). Adorno states: "language itself, devoid of its rational significance, functions in a magical way and furthers those archaic regressions which reduce individuals to members of crowds" (p. 148). This magical quality of language is sloganized, and repetition of the catchiest slogans appeal to the people's infantile wish for endless repetition.

Adorno gives us one example of rhetoric used by charismatic leaders. Leaders often metaphorically compare out-groups to low animals, such as pigs or rats. Adorno states, "since members of the in-group have supposedly 'succeeded in identifying themselves with one another by means of similar love for the same object' (Freud, 1922, p. 87), they cannot admit this contempt for each other. Thus it is expressed by completely negative cathexis of these low animals, fused with hatred against the out-group, and projected upon the latter. Actually, it is one of the favourite devices of fascist agitators . . . to compare out-groups . . . with low animals and vermin" (p. 147). This literary device is commonly used by the Kingstons (borrowed from the New Testament) to entreat members not to reveal the Order's secrets to outsiders. Kingstons state that if members reveal their secrets to outsiders, they are "casting their pearls before swine," the swine representing anyone outside of the Order (Order, 2009a).

Burke (1940) gives us further insight into the rhetorical devices of charismatic leaders. Burke analyzes the speeches of Hitler; and if, as Adorno (1991) states, the stock

devices of one charismatic leader are just like another's, every charismatic leader will have four major "unification" features to his rhetoric: (1) inborn dignity (elite status of members); (2) projection device (making an out-group a scapegoat); (3) symbolic rebirth (making people feel they are moving in a positive direction; and (4) commercial use (as Singer (2003) states, every demagogue has something to sell). In Burke's (1940) analysis of Hitler's rhetoric, these themes were achieved through the (1) repetition; (2) imagery (the creation of a positive worldview); (3) the use of devil terms to demonize the enemy; and (4) the distortion of religious principles to serve a political end. I am certainly not trying to make an ethical comparison between Hitler and new religious charismatic leaders, but I do agree that since Hitler is the epitome of a charismatic leader, an analysis of his rhetoric can present us with an opportunity to understand some of the "stock devices" to which Adorno (1991) refers.

Fifth, the charismatic leader will promote hostility towards an out-group to mask ambivalence within the group. As Freud (1922) explains, narcissism is at the root of hostility toward out-groups: "in the undisguised antipathies and aversions which people feel towards strangers with whom they have to do, we may recognize the expression of self-love—of narcissism. This self-love works for the self-assertion of the individual, and behaves as though the occurrence of any divergence from his own particular lines of development involved a criticism of them and a demand for their alteration" (pp. 55-56; in Adorno, 1991, p. 145). Through the criticism of out-groups, members feel that they are more elite simply by being included in the in-group. At the same time, as Adorno (1991) explains, "any kind of critique or self-awareness is resented as a narcissistic loss and elicits rage" (p. 145). Out-groups are not just groups of people with different ideas—they are a direct threat to the identities of members. Thus, "the concentration of hostility upon the out-group does away with intolerance in one's own group to which one's relation would otherwise be highly ambivalent" (p. 145). Burke calls this denigration of an out group to relieve guilt "scapegoating."

Though these five processes work in tandem to achieve classical emotional identification with the leader and his or her group, the super-ego perceives this to be fictitious on some level—and it precisely this "phoniness" that makes groups led by charismatic authorities so rigid and merciless. Adorno (1991) explains that the super-ego recognizes the "psychological impoverishment" that has resulted from identifying with the leader: "in these social atoms the psychological dynamic of group formation have overreached themselves and are no longer a reality. The category of 'phoniness' applies to the leaders as well as to the act of identification on the part of the masses and their supposed frenzy and hysteria. Just as little as people believe in the depth of their hearts that the Jews are the devil, do they completely believe in their leader" (p. 152). However, at this stage, group members are in so deep that disidentification is frightening to them. So, they "act this identification, perform their own enthusiasm, and thus participate in their leader's performance" (p. 152). They simply cannot suffer the "psychic loss" (Albert & Whetten, 1985) that results from disidentification. Adorno explains: "It is probably the suspicion of this fictitiousness of their own 'group psychology' which makes [these] crowds so merciless and unapproachable. If they would stop to reason for a second, the whole performance would go to pieces, and they would be left to panic" (p. 152). Some members of the Kingston organization have expressed this fear. One participant started searching for rational answers to his belief system. He was stonewalled and shamed, but he kept asking. When he went to the elders of the organization, they said, "You guys have to quit asking these questions." And one of them said specifically, "I've had questions, too, but if I let myself think about them I'd go crazy" (participant 5). Clearly, the fear of emotional loss from disidentification is a clear deterrent to leaving a group.

Though the "phoniness" of identification is a deterrent to leaving, others find it motivating. Another Kingston participant explained that she had a psychic/spiritual experience in which words came strongly into her mind: "What if you get to the next life, and they say 'April Fools,' the joke's on you!" For this participant the idea of "sacrificing

for nothing" was a motivator to rationally investigate the claims of the organization.

Emotional identification, a concept based in Freud's psychoanalytic theory, has heavily influenced the development of theories of identification in a wide variety of disciplines. Sociology (Lalich, 2004); rhetoric (Burke, 1950); critical theory (Adorno, 1991) and management theory (Simon, 1997) all depend heavily upon his concepts. Through an explication of Adorno's (1991) Chapter on classical identification, we can argue with confidence that identification indeed has an affective component (Van Dick, 2001). We now turn to the cognitive component of identification.

Cognitive Dimension

The cognitive component of organizational identification is regarded as the most salient aspect of identification by many researchers. As Van Dick et al. (2004) state, "self-categorization is the necessary first step of identifying a category" (p. 173). While researchers debate about whether emotion is an antecedent to or integral part of the identification process, all organizational identification scholars agree that the cognitive component—defining oneself in terms of the organization—is what distinguishes identification from similar constructs, such as organizational commitment and loyalty. "Identification," Van Dick et al. (2005) state, "reflects the extent to which the group membership is incorporated into the self concept" (p. 203), or to what extent members define themselves as "I am a member of X."[16]

Members who define themselves in terms of an organization adopt the transcendental belief system of the organization. The myths and narratives that form the ideologies of the organization become the member's own beliefs and stories. The mythic image, or forward-looking utopia created through the use of an ultimate vocabulary, frames the perception of reality for organizational members. This gives the organization the power to interpret members' experiences in ways that confirm the legitimacy of the organization. As Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges (1988) state, the linguistic devices used to form the transcendental belief system are used "to 'construct' reality for others,

convince others that things are what they think they are, are like they think they are, and are normal when they think they are normal" (p. 188). Because they build meaning through consensus rather than coercion, they are important tools that use identification to establish the member's sense of self-definition. A shared mythic image allows members to say, "I am a member of X" and know on a cognitive level what that means.

Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges (1988) discuss the organizational use of labels, metaphors, and platitudes to control members' frames of reference in their article, "How to Control Things with Words." Organizations, they state, "use linguistic devices for the purposes of organizational control" (p. 174). Labels define *what* things are; metaphors say *how* things are—they give life to the definitions; and platitudes say how things *should be*—they normalize and conventionalize organizational ideologies. Taken together, these three linguistic devices establish the transcendental belief system, or mythic image, that encompasses organizational ideologies and frames members' thoughts, words, and actions.

Labels define and categorize. Perceived as facts or classifications, successful labels are "clearly one of the keys to organizational power" (p. 175). Four characteristics stand out as important to our discussion of identification. First, labels are perceived as fact; therefore, they are rarely disputed. As Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges state, labels are "the most unobtrusive device: Who grows suspicious of a classification?" (p. 175). Second, labels are most effective when they are broad and abstract, because it allows organizations to manipulate their definitions to serve organizational ends without changing the label, itself. Decentralization, freedom, justice, and success are all highly abstract, positive organizational labels that are used in connection with organizational goals. (When these labels encompass and sloganize ideologies, Magee (1980) calls them "ideographs.") Third, values are attached to labels, which induce action. In their most negative form, labels may serve to stigmatize, or brand something or someone as an out-group. Once these labels are attached to a group, they are difficult to reverse (though it

can be done; cf. Butler, 1997). Here, we can see the obvious connection between rhetoric and its effects upon identification. When an organization scapegoats a common enemy, it is done partially through the use of stigmatizing labels. The Kingston organization, for example, uses terms such as "outsiders" and "evil" to describe out-groups. Finally, labels are accepted by organizational members because they remove ambiguity and uncertainty. Categorization and classification are used to reduce uncertainty, and labels give organizational members confidence that the organization has knowledge and can be trusted. *Because of the value-laden nature of labels, they can be viewed as part of an ultimate vocabulary that orders and structures the mythic image* (Burke, 1950).

Metaphors, as Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges (1988) state, are central to symbolism. Quoting Morgan, they state: "the process of metaphorical conception is a basic mode of symbolism, central to the way in which humans forge their experience and knowledge of the world in which they live" (Morgan, 1980, p. 610; in Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges, 1988, p. 178). As social beings who naturally respond to symbols (Burke, 1950), humans are predisposed to use metaphor to organize their realities. Metaphors can be of three types: (1) acceptable, when they evoke a desired association but fail to achieve metaphorical power (organization as "__"); (2) rewarding, when they evoke the association and the metaphor sticks (organization as a garbage can); and (3) defaulting (or deceiving), when the metaphor does not accurately describe the organization (organization as a seesaw) or is not illuminating (organization as a hierarchy).

The study of metaphors has become widely used and applied in organizational studies. Though they can be misapplied, metaphors are very powerful. They can be "symbolic expressions of instrumental schemes"; spread new ideologies; and convey new meanings. Metaphors are shortcuts for explanation, as an image can encompass "the entire range of meanings of the object" (p. 179). The salient point here is that metaphors serve to express, not reflect, reality—and their power lies in this expressive, persuasive

ability to unobtrusively promote basic organizational values and ideologies. For example, the Kingston organization uses the phrase "kingdom of God" as its overarching organizational metaphor. The metaphorical image of the organization as a kingdom at once brings to mind many concepts: a "king," or leader; a hierarchical structure; members as servants of the king; a utopian society unlike our present political system; and a place where traditional values of the "past" are championed ("kingdom" is used mostly to describe lands and political systems in the past). Thus, through this one term, this mythic image, the transcendental belief system is communicated. Salient ideologies include *service* (to a king); *obedience* (within the hierarchical structure); *humility* (as servants before a leader); *political change* (when the kingdom is instituted); and *values* (romanticized because they are in the past). Thus, *the organizational metaphor is the mythic image that encompasses and promotes the organization's transcendental belief system.* As Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges (1988) state, "the expression of ultimate values must rely on metaphor, both as a code for that which is valued most highly and for that which is opposed most strongly on organizational life" (p. 185).

Platitudes are overused slogans in vernacular discourse. They generalize everyday life and reduce uncertainty by framing experiences as commonly occurring. While platitudes are regarded as "bad writing" in the literary world, the rhetorical world views them as important verbal rituals whose repetition serves to enforce their taken-for-granted generalizations. Defining a new experience in terms of a platitude makes the experience seem safer and more routine. For example, a social situation filled with conflict can be normalized by the platitude, "Too many cooks in the kitchen." Uncertainty regarding a gift with a possible conflict of interest can be explained away with the platitude, "Don't look a gift horse in the mouth." As Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges (1988) discuss, "it's reasonable to expect many platitudes in a situation of organizational change, which by definition is filled with uncertainty" (p. 186).

Platitudes can also serve to enforce unpopular organizational ideologies. For

example, “True happiness is found in learning to like to do the things you want to do” and “If the Order doesn’t have it, we don’t need it” are two salient platitudes that Kingston members are asked to commit to memory and recite three times daily (participant 8). From these platitudes, we can infer that at least some Kingston members don’t “like” to do all of the work required of them and feel that they need material goods not offered by the Kingston organization. But, through repetition, these ideologies become normalized and incorporated into the transcendental belief system of the members. *Thus, through platitudes, organizational ideologies within the mythic image are normalized and routinized.*

Taken together, these three linguistic artifacts—labels, metaphors, and platitudes—are the “‘machines’ of the control system” (p. 190). Those that are successful are sold, borrowed, and/or adopted by other organizations seeking to control their members. However, these instruments of control are not fail-safe. They can be and often are resisted by organizational members who use the same linguistic devices—labels, metaphors, and platitudes--to disidentify with the organization and manage the psychic and emotional losses that inevitably come with this disidentification. Forms of resistance include doubting labels; creating new and conflicting metaphors for the organization; and ridiculing platitudes through irony.

Former Kingston members have used all three of these linguistic devices to manage their disidentification. For example, labels such as “manic depressive” and “paranoid schizophrenic” are used to label early organizational leaders of the LDS church, upon which the Kingston organization is based. These labels, widely accepted in psychology, are borrowed and used to provide alternative frames of reference for the spiritual experiences that these leaders reportedly had. Joseph Smith is labeled “spiritual” by current members but “paranoid schizophrenic” by former members. Former members and their allies also use an alternative metaphor to describe the Kingston organization. “Organized crime” replaces “kingdom of God” with interesting results. The ideologies

of servant, obedience, humility, political change, and values are all retained; however, a negative image of an exploitative mob boss running an illegal and immoral disutopia replaces the positive pastoral image of a benevolent king presiding over his happy constituents. Platitudes are also replaced: "Do a good deed; Don't spread your seed" is one ironic statement in the form of a platitude that serves to undermine the organizational ideology of having numerous children. It is important to note here that while there is clearly an emotional component to controlling the organization through labels, metaphors, and platitudes (the use of irony, value-laden labels that stir emotion, etc.), the overall effect of these literary devices is the creation of a transcendental belief system through which members define and categorize themselves in terms of the organization.

As Van Dick et al. (2005) state, the cognitive component is one of the most agreed-upon dimensions of organizational identification. Defining oneself in terms of an organization means that members adopt the transcendental belief system (mythic image, hierarchically ordered ideologies) of the organization, which frames their perception of reality. This transcendental belief system is managed by linguistic devices such as labels, metaphors, and platitudes. Through the construction of a salient mythic image and surrounding rhetoric, organizations are able to unobtrusively control what members do, say, and even think about.

Behavioral Dimension

Van Dick et al. (2005) argue that OI includes a behavioral component, in which members think in terms of what is best for the organization and act according to organizational goals. As Simon (1997) states: "a person identifies himself with a group when, in making a decision, he evaluates the several alternatives of choice in terms of their consequences for the specified group" (p. 284). Thinking in terms of what is best for the organization can be considered a cognitive aspect of identification; however, because thinking in terms of organizational goals and acting according to them often accompany one another, I include the entire process under the behavioral component. Lalich (2004)

refers to this process as "systems of control", and Simon (1997) calls this "organizational authority." As he states, "accepting authority in an organization . . . means accepting premises provided by other organization members as part of the basis for one's own behavior" (p. 202). In this section, I will first discuss the term "authority" using Simon (1997), Cheney et al. (1999) and Lincoln (1994). Then, using Tompkins (1987), I argue that behavioral identification, in which members think and act in terms of organizational interests, is produced through systems of control—or legitimate authority, created through the rhetorical process.

Definition of "Authority"

As discussed, Simon's (1997) *Administrative Behavior* has been instrumental in developing the concept of organizational identification in research today. In this work, he also spends considerable time discussing the concept of authority. Simon defines authority as "the power to make decisions which guide the actions of another" (179). Three functions of authority include (1) enforcing the responsibility of the individual to those who have authority; (2) securing expertise in decision making; and (3) coordinating activity. While Simon's discussion of authority is excellent, I believe he uses the terms "persuasion" and "authority" too narrowly. Specifically, authority is a rhetorical (persuasive) construction.

Simon states that, though they are both communicated verbally, persuasion and command by authority are two different phenomena. The verbal correlate of authority is the "command." Persuasion and command are often present in the same situation, but persuasion "centers around the reasons for or against a course of action" while authority describes "all situations where suggestions are accepted without any critical review or consideration" (p. 181). In essence, an organizational member submits to authority when "he sets himself a general rule which permits the communicated decision of another to guide his own choices (i.e., to serve as a premise of those choices) without deliberation on his own part on the expediency of those premises" (pp. 178-79). For Simon,

persuasion requires convincing; authority does not. Simon fails to see, however, that the setting of decision premises is a rhetorical process identified by Aristotle over 2000 years ago in his discussion of the enthymeme (which we now call "deductive reasoning"). What's more, the appeal to authority, or ethos, is one of the three major rhetorical appeals also identified by Aristotle (2004). What Simon calls "persuasion" refers to deliberate "classical" persuasion, while the setting of decision premises through authority relies "identification" through ethos—a less overt rhetorical strategy that produces unobtrusive control (Burke, 1950). The approaches are different, but they are all rhetorical.

Burke and Lincoln's Rhetorical Theories of Power

While Burke has been criticized for not making power a more overt component in this theory, Cheney, Garvin-Doxas, and Torrens (1999) argue that Burke's sometimes implicit theory of power is well developed and complex. Power is defined by Cheney et al. (1999) as "the ability of a group to act and achieve its goals, even against the resistance of the situation" (p. 140). Using this definition, they identify several key elements of Burke's conception of power which lead us to the conclusion that authority is a rhetorical construct.

First, power is diffused throughout society. Cheney et al. (1999) state, "Burke alerts us to the ingredient of rhetoric in all socialization" (p. 141), in which persuasion is a powerful medium that operates within a social situation and allows a group to act and achieve its goals. Power is diffused in social systems, and power is not easily identified with particular individuals. In contrast with critical theory, where power is viewed as being in the hands of the few at the top of the hierarchy, Burke's theory of power is more de-centered. Power, then, is not found in limited quantity—it is diffused throughout society and *available to all*.

Second, though power is diffused, hierarchy is a natural human condition through which people order their world. Humans, or social animals that naturally respond to

symbols, are also hardwired to order and categorize their universe through hierarchical levels that become social structures. Those people who hold the positions at the top of the social structure become authorities, but the emphasis is less on the people who hold the positions and more on the *messages* that they give which govern action (see Cheney et al., 1999, p. 144). *Authority is based more in rhetorical messages* than in people.

Third, when organizational members internalize the rhetoric of their social/ organizational systems (that humans are predisposed to build), the result is hegemony. Since Gramsci's (1971) seminal article, hegemony has been explored in-depth by critical writers. And, while not considered overtly critical, Burke comments on the role of language in producing hegemonic relations: "In 'magical' stages (during the hegemony of customer) the productive order is mainly regulated by unquestioned tests of property. If there is a slave function in such a culture, the class that so functions does not know itself as such. A true slave morality is implicitly obeyed—and while such morality is intact, the slave does not consider his obedience as slavery, any more than a child normally considers obedience to its parent slavery. Before such obedience can be explicitly considered a state of slavery, a perspective by incongruity must arise" (1966, p. 186; in Cheney et al., 1999, p. 142). While Burke recognizes the operation of hegemony in society, he is not deterministic. He departs from ideology critique by recognizing the agency of individual actors to resist. As Cheney et al. state, "it leaves room for individual choice and freedom, arguing simply that the resources that we use are mostly social" (1999, p. 142). Thus, authority—the power to make decisions which guide the actions of another—is, in Burke's terms, a state of hegemony in which organizational members willingly follow the messages conveyed at the top of the hierarchy. They have agency to resist but do not choose to resist, because they are cooperating in the hierarchical structure. Thus, the rhetorical messages are powerful because the members of the organizational system have accepted them. *Authority, then, relies upon the consent of the governed.*

Fourth, if and when these perspectives of incongruity arise, people still feel bound to the authoritative social structures that have oppressed or marginalized them because they have identified with the rhetoric of authority. Burke (1937) states: "even the dispossessed tends to feel that he 'has a stake in' the authoritative structure that dispossesses him; for the influence exerted upon the policies of education by the authoritative structure encourages the dispossessed to feel that his only hope of repossession lies in his allegiance to the structure that has dispossessed him" (1984 [1937], pp. 329-30; in Cheney et al., 1999, p. 144). This can help to explain why people who are cast out of one social system (i.e., the Kingston organization) spend years trying to get back in (by turning in their money and their children's money; participant 8). These people are not physically bound to the authoritative structure, but they have identified with the messages of authority; *these rhetorical messages are what continue to bind them*.

In sum, because humans are naturally predisposed to arrange symbols hierarchically, authority sustained through rhetoric will always be part of society. As Burke states, "obedience to the reigning symbols of authority is in itself natural and wholesome" (1984, p. 226; in Cheney et al., p. 143). And because power is diffused throughout society, the acceptance of authoritative messages is sustained by the members of that society, rather than only a few at the top of the hierarchy. In contrast to Simon's (1997) assertion, authority is not an absence of choice, although hegemony can obscure decision premises and limit the available choices that organizational members perceive. Cheney et al. (1999) state that theories have historically treated power as either invested in people or as pervasive, strategic, and employed as a tactic in human relations. Burke "includes both 'sides'" because his theory is "at once social and individual, with language as the creative resource for formulating those two levels and their interrelationships" (p. 148). Burke's theory of power also treats both instances where power is easily identified (as in the command "thou shalt not") and where it is subtle (as in the creation of a particular worldview and the suppression of some interests over others).

Burke provides the groundwork for viewing authority in rhetorical terms, and Bruce Lincoln (1994) treats the concept even more directly. He states that rhetoric is inextricably tied to the concept of authority. Lincoln defines authority as "the capacity to make a consequential pronouncement . . . the kind of speech . . . that brings a sale to fulfillment . . . [and] a speech that magically puts difficult questions to rest," based on the trust of the people whom the authority governs" (p. 6). Stated in another way, a rhetor with authority gains power based on the consent of the governed with whom he or she has gained trust and persuaded. Power, in this sense, actively requires the consent of the rhetorical audience, in this case organizational members.

Lincoln differentiates between authority and coercion, stating that if a leader operates on "pain and fear rather than on trust and respect, [the speech act of the leader] ceases to be authority and becomes [an attempt at] coercion" (p. 6). In other words, if a rhetor manipulates through fear rather than persuading through trust, the authority ceases to be legitimate and becomes, rather, a tyrant using coercion.

Defined this way, power is gained through the ability to persuade and rhetoric is the medium through which a person becomes an authority. McMillan (1982) concurs that organizations are rhetorical enterprises—they are about issues of motivation, persuasion, and sales. An organization's ability to gain uncoerced obedience of its members is largely dependent upon the rhetorical strategies the organization employs to be perceived as having legitimate authority. In the next section, using Tompkins (1987), I will describe how legitimate authority is constructed through rhetoric.

Rhetoric and Authority

Tompkins synthesizes Aristotle's (2004) rhetorical appeals and Weber's types of legitimate authority, creating a convincing argument that "Weber's work dealing with organizational theory, bureaucracy, is an extension of the classical concerns of rhetorical theory" (p. 79). Tompkins states that Aristotle explained uncoerced obedience, or

authority, as a product of three artistic proofs: ethos, pathos, and logos. Weber explained it as a product of legitimate authority, subdivided into traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal authority. Tompkins argues that Weber was unknowingly "mining rich rhetorical ore" and that there are strong similarities between the two. Ethos, the rhetorical power of "source credibility," is comparable to Weber's charismatic authority; pathos, the power of stirring the emotions, is related to Weber's traditional authority; and logos, the power of "proving a truth, or an apparent truth, by means of persuasive arguments" (Aristotle, 2004, p. 3), is comparable to Weber's rational-legal authority.

The first type of legitimate authority is "charismatic authority." Here, the source of devotion is a leader's charismatic or nonroutine qualities. (Charisma, in this sense, is value-neutral). This type of authority is the most dependent upon perceived legitimacy, because the leader must continually exemplify non-routine qualities to be perceived as legitimate. Here, "faith" is required; laws are based upon the statements of the leader; and the staff of the leader is chosen based upon personal devotion. Upon the death of the leader, three things can happen: (1) executors of the state become the new authority (in the mainstream LDS church, for example, Brigham Young assigned the 12 apostles, or leaders, to govern the church upon Joseph Smith's death in 1845); (2) the leader's statements are written down and canonized (as in Islam); or (3) a successor is chosen (in the LDS case, Brigham Young was chosen after a few months as the successor to Joseph Smith). In the Kingston organization, the church exhibits charismatic authority. The leader is said to be the direct "mouthpiece" of God (nonroutine quality). Visions and revelations are common, reinforcing the nonroutine quality of the leader.

While many figures of speech can be used to promote the authority of a charismatic speaker, several classical rhetorical figures, identified by the author of *Ad Herennium* (probably Cicero; 1954), help to establish ethos, or charismatic authority, and are pertinent to the discussion here. *Decorum* is an overarching term that is essential in establishing ethos with an audience. Succinctly stated, *decorum* is the art of being

socially appropriate, that is, to ascertain the appropriate branch of oratory (forensic, legislative, or epideictic); the appropriate stylistic devices; and the appropriate manner of presentation. The goal is to appear to embody the golden mean, or the epitome of moderation, which Aristotle viewed as the ethical ideal. *Anamnesis* is the process of reciting history (specifically past authors) from memory. This figure builds ethos because it suggests the speaker has intrinsic knowledge of the subject matter. *Epicrisis* is the quotation of a passage and interpretation of it, thus communicating the idea that the speaker has the authority to contribute to the existing body of knowledge. *Chreia* is the use of stories of well-known people, suggesting that the speaker is in the company of the great and famous.[17] All three of these figures are aimed to enhance the credibility of the speaker by suggesting that the speaker is knowledgeable and socially elite. In addition, *litote,* or deliberate understatement, is used to express modesty to gain the audience's favor (who doesn't like someone who is a little self-deprecating?) Rhetorical vices that can damage credibility if used inappropriately include *cacozelia,* or stylistic use of diction in poor taste (such as using foreign words unconvincingly to appear learned or using base puns or metaphors to disgust listeners). *Soraismus* (combining different languages without skill); *perissologia* (excessive wordiness); and *homiologia* (tedious repetition) are other rhetorical vices that affect ethos. Rhetoric, then, is intimately involved in establishing the perception that the speaker has credibility, or nonroutine qualities that make him or her stand out as a charismatic authority.

In traditional authority, legitimate authority is based on tradition. The pure type of this authority is patriarchy. Patriarchy consists of one man heading a household (which could range from one to many wives and their children, with accompanying servants and other household members). The patriarch operates on the basis of "cadi justice," that is, that the patriarch is bound by tradition but within that tradition may execute justice, utilitarian expediency, etc., according to how sympathy or antipathy may move him. The member of the household (wife, child, servant) is (1) loyal to the patriarch and has filial

piety, (2) is dependent upon the ruler, and (3) has little to no rights. The patriarch, for his rule to be seen as legitimate, has to be perceived to fall in line with tradition.

Traditional authority corresponds with pathos, or the appeal to emotion. As Tompkins states, any rhetorical appeal to tradition will include an element of emotion—the mention of traditional values, the way things "were," and historical rituals all evoke emotional responses. Classical rhetorical scholars Aristotle and Cicero went to considerable effort to classify the rhetorical devices that manipulate emotion to persuade. *Aganactesis* is an exclamation of indignation; *aposiopesis* is a dramatic pause, usually used to portray a speaker being overcome with emotion; *cataplexis* is when a speaker threatens revenge; *epimone* is the persistent repetition of the same plea to emphasize the emotional appeal; and *synonymia,* or the use of several synonymns together to amplify and add force to the message. Other figures that serve to amplify emotions in the audience include exuscitatio, or stirring others (usually to anger) by one's own passion; climax, or the arrangement of words, phrases, and clauses in order of increasing importance; and *synonymia,* or the use of several synonyms together to add force through a type of repetition.

In legal-rational authority, authority (or the ability of an organization to "win the trust" of the people; see Lincoln, 1994) is derived from a system of impersonal rules. The quintessential legal-rational authority is the bureaucracy (although academic committees, boards of directors or trustees, etc., are also examples). The bureaucracy in its pure form consists of the following characteristics: (1) Business operates on a continual basis. (2) Business operates on a system of rules that are (a) impersonal (applicable to everyone without consideration of prestige, status, etc.) and the officer has (b) limited authority and (c) limited coercion that allow him to do only what is set forth as his job through the rule of law. (3) Business is a vertical hierarchy, with lower participants obeying the instructions of upper management, etc. (4) There is a definite division of labor and specialization, in which different people have different spheres of authority in the

organization and are responsible for the resources allocated to them to do their job. (5) There is a separation between public and private life. (6) Offices are gained and retained based on merit, not relation or whim. (7) The business is based on formalization, that is, rules and procedures and business transactions are written down. The Kingston business organization functions as a bureaucracy. Employees are paid by the hour; they go to work in businesses operating in a capitalist society (over 100 businesses with assets of between $150-$500 million dollars; Kilzer, 2000); they have a definite division of labor and hierarchy as one would expect in a capitalist business; and they formalize their business transactions.

Rhetorical figures of reasoning are abundant. One important figure is the *enthymeme,* or a truncated syllogism (called "deductive reasoning" today) that begins with a conclusion (major premise) and is accompanied by a reason (minor premise). The *enthymeme* is the base from which decision premises are argued and accepted. Another important form is *apophasis,* or the rejection of several reasons of why something is/ is not valid and focusing exclusively on the most important one. *Expeditio* is a process whereby the speaker enumerates all of the possibilities of a given situation and, in the end, eliminates all but one. And *paromologia* is a form where the speaker admits a weaker point in order to make a stronger one. Logical fallacies are also abundant and include things like *ad hominem* (personal attack) and *tautologia* (tautology, or circular reasoning). Clearly, Tompkins's synthesis of Weber's (1978) organization theory and classical rhetorical theory opens the door wide to the analysis of authority from a rhetorical perspective.

In this analysis, I am not arguing that organizational authority is not an important concept in its own right. In fact, with a different purpose and different focus, one could subvert the terms and argue that identification produces authority. But if we view authority through the terministic screen of "organizational identification," the rhetorical construction of organizational authority is one of the four interlocking processes—the

systems of control—that produce organizational identification and resulting bounded choice. As Tompkins (1987) states, "the birth of the social sciences was but, under new labels and in new nomenclatures, the extension of the classical concerns of rhetorical theory. Even the particular case of Weber's sociology of organization (bureaucratization) was shown to be an outgrowth of the study of persuasion (that is, 'authority')" (p. 83).

Authority is created and maintained through rhetorical processes that require the consent of the governed to be perceived as legitimate. Organization authority is what governs the formal structure of the organization (Simon, 1997), the system of control that guides its formal rules and regulations (Lalich, 2004). Authority is the means through which organizational members allow decision premises to be made for them and, in turn, act in the best interests of the organization. This behavioral component (Van Dick, 2001), like affective OI and cognitive OI, is rhetorical.

Conative/Evaluative Dimension

Conative, or evaluative identification, is Van Dick's (2001) fourth dimension. Conation is the part of mental life having to do with striving, including desire and volition. Conative processes are directed toward action or change and including impulse, desire, volition, and striving. Van Dick et al. (2005) refer to this as an evaluative dimension, where members evaluate their own organization in terms of how they are viewed by outsiders: "an evaluative aspect that describes the value connotation assigned to that group from the outside" (Van Dick et al., 2005, p. 193). Organizational members identify with each other because they view each other as having shared values in comparison with people outside the group (see Van Dick, 2001). For example, Kingston members, partially in response to the value connotation assigned to them from the outside, evaluate themselves as a "peculiar people"—but an elite peculiar people. In terms of making decisions in crisis, Jin and Cameron (2007) state that conation "pertains to what stance a practitioner will take for his or her organization represented by movement on the contingency continuum of accommodation in order to deal with the

crisis for the organization" (p. 258). Here, conation is described as "stance movements," or what stance an organization will take with regard to how it responds to threats (p. 262). This is an evaluation of what "should" be done in a situation. Thus, the conative/evaluative aspect of identification is a type of social identification in which members perceive themselves as having *shared values* in comparison with those outside the group.

The evaluative aspect of organizational identification is similar to Lalich's (2004) fourth organizational dimension for creating bounded choice: "systems of influence." Systems of influence are defined as "the network of interactions and methods of influence residing in the group's social relations. This is the human interaction and group culture from which members learn to adapt their thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors in relation to their new beliefs" (p. 17). In contrast with systems of control—where members are influenced by the formal organizational structure—systems of influence are sustained through social identification with peers. Through social (peer) identification, members learn what is appropriate in the organizational culture[18] and identify with the shared values and new beliefs. Jackson (2008) observes how this process of acculturation is related to the conative aspect of identification. He states:

> the issue of acculturation is of critical importance to identification. Identification takes place as individuals become aware of the organizational culture and determine its relative similarity or dissimilarity to their own value system. Regardless of the policies and procedures mandated by the organization, Littlejohn and Foss (2005) pointed out that organizational members are constantly interpreting the artifacts, stories, and values of the organization in order to construct a mental reality out of the underlying structure of the organization. That reality is shared by organizational members and is the reality that new members must identify with if they intend to become acclimated to the organization. (p. 5)

This identification with the informal rules and norms of the organization are what create the most unobtrusive kind of control. Many, such as Larson and Tompkins (2005), argue this type of control is the most powerful: "the most powerful forms of control may be those that are 'fully unobtrusive' that 'control the cognitive premises underlying action" (p. 2; see Perrow, 1979, p. 151). This type of identification is facilitated through a process called "concertive control."

In their seminal article on communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations, Tompkins and Cheney (1985) introduce us to the concept of concertive control. They state that this recently emerged, postbureaucratic type of control "stresses teamwork and coordination at all stages of production" (p. 184). It promotes flexibility and innovation, teamwork, face-to-face interaction, and cooperation: "in the concertive organization, the explicit written rules and regulations are largely replaced by the common understanding of values, objectives, and means of achievement, along with a deep appreciation for the organization's 'mission'" (p. 184). Members of a concertive control system can be expected to act within a bounded range of choices presented by the organization and to be highly motivated in complying with them.

Concertive control is identification not with bureaucratic messages but with peers. Papa et al. (1997) give us further insight into the process by explaining that concertive control "is the type of control [in which] the locus of control shifts significantly from management to workers who collaborate to create rules and norms that govern their behavior" (p. 221). In this system, social identification with peers develops: "to accomplish tasks and reach goals, organizational members must act together. And in acting together, a feeling of camaraderie can develop among system members" (p. 223). By acting together, workers "empower themselves through specific communication strategies, such as negotiating, collaborating to reach decisions, and determining courses of action to achieve codetermined goals" (p. 223).

Tompkins and Cheney believe that this type of organizational identification—being socially identified with peers and perceiving shared values and fate—is based on an organizational revision of Aristotle's (2004) *enthymeme.* A rhetorical enthymeme (in contrast with a logical enthymeme, that we will not explain here), is what we normally refer to as deductive reasoning. In a rhetorical enthymeme, rhetoricians begin with a stated value premise shared by the audience and draw conclusions from this premise. These premises are the ordinary "beliefs, values, opinions, and expectations" held in

common by audience or organizational members. Aristotle (2004) very likely spoke to an audience that was largely homogeneous, while modern organizations speak through a "plurality of voices." Therefore, Tompkins and Cheney (1985) call Aristotle's enthymeme reconceptualized for the use of modern organizations "ethymeme$_2$" (p. 188). *Enthymeme$_2$* is defined as "a syllogistic decision-making process, individual or collective, in which a conclusion is drawn from premises (beliefs, values, expectations) inculcated in the decision maker(s) by the controlling members of the organization" (p. 188). Organizational members accept decision premises offered by the organization in exchange for compensation or inducements of some kind—at first. But then, once individuals are identified with these value decision premises, organizational members are psychologically predisposed to maintain these values and, therefore, "behave organizationally" (p. 189).

In addition to the nature of shared values of the audience, enthymeme$_1$ suggests that audiences have values already formed and the rhetor simply utilizes these values to persuade. This can happen in an organization, as well, as certain members are drawn to organizational values because they match their own. However, enthymeme$_2$ is a model "that highlights the organization as an important premise-source" (p. 189). This is when the organization is an important socializing force in itself. For example, several Kingston members—those who were not born and raised in the organization—have underscored the importance of enthymeme$_2$ in their development of conative identification. One woman, who identified her personal commitment level as 100% from day one but her identification level as increasing from 70% to 100% over time, stated: "There were many things about the foundation of beliefs of this organization that not having been born and raised here, I didn't understand. And so, being able to have my husband at my side, and his mother, and his father, and his family, nurture my understanding as things progressed . . . it sort of just reveals itself to you. . . . It's sort of an unfolding, but I never doubted. Never have, never will" (participant 22). When I asked whether her identification levels

changed as her religious beliefs changed, she stated: “I had to expand my understanding, and let go of some of my previously held judgments in order to open up the possibility for principles that had escaped me in my own personal scripture study in the past—and a deepened sense of how to apply those principles in your life” (participant 22). So, while her level of commitment to the organization remained the same, this woman revealed a growing conative identification with the values that were being taught and shared among peers in the organization. She did not at first identify with the values of the organization ($enthymeme_1$) but grew to accept the organizational value premises ($enthymeme_2$) as her own.

The differentiation between organizational commitment and organizational identification deserves some elaboration here. Both organizational commitment and conative organizational identification emphasize shared values; thus, researchers in the past have sometimes used them interchangeably. As Gautam et al. (2004) explain, organizational identification and organizational commitment are related but distinct concepts. There are four major distinctions. First, the source of motivation is different. As Ashforth and Mael (1989) state, organizational identification is self-referential, whereas organizational commitment is not. Identification has an internal locus of motivation, whereas commitment has an external one. In our case, participant 22 was 100% committed to the organization, but her identification levels grew over a period of 10 years because she had not yet internalized the values of the organization. Second, OI is very flexible and ever-changing. OC, on the other hand, is relatively stable and enduring once it is formed. Participant 22, for example, never wavered in her commitment, though her identification level changed over time. Third, the development of these components comes from different sources. OI is based in the “perceived similarity and shared fate with the organization” (p. 305; see Mael & Ashforth, 1992), while commitment develops because of exchange-based factors, such as remuneration between an organization and its employees (Simon, 1997; Tyler & Blader, 2000). Identified members will think in terms

of the organization's interests; committed members will comply with organizational rules but will not necessarily identify with them. In our case, participant 22 gave her commitment to the organization in exchange for the opportunity to be married to her husband. Fourth, commitment requires consistent affiliation and exchange between members, while identified individuals may remain identified despite being removed from communication and physical location with other members of the group (such as an employee working in another state, away from his peers). Though participant 22 was not physically removed from the organization, there are several cases in this study (e.g., participant 25) in which a woman was removed to a remote location but still identified with the organization completely. Thus, while organizational commitment and organizational identification both emphasize values as the basis for motivation, enthymeme$_2$ is related specifically to conative organizational identification.

While enthymeme$_2$ functions in both behavioral and conative dimensions of identification (i.e., members thinking in terms of what is best for the organization is identified in this dissertation as a behavioral dimension of identification), I am particularly interested here in the way enthymeme$_2$ works in systems of concertive control—how it inculcates values in informal systems of rules and norms managed by social identification with peer groups. To review, we have identified the behavioral component of organizational identification as members thinking in terms of organizational rather than personal interests (Simon, 1997). Barker and Tompkins (1994) explain that concertive control systems are effective only when workers identify with a set of value and factual decision premises that guide their work activities and cognitive decision making processes. And Papa et al. (1997) elaborate: "concertive control systems emerge when top management produces a value-based corporate vision that is intended to serve as a guide for member behavior and decision-making. Workers then exhibit their identification with this vision when, in making a decision, they perceive the organization's values or interests as relevant in evaluating the alternatives of choice

(Tompkins & Cheney, 1983). Through identification, the decision makers' range of "vision" is narrowed "by selecting particular values, particular items of empirical knowledge, and particular behavior alternatives for consideration, to the exclusion of other values, other knowledge, other possibilities" (Simon, 1976, p. 210). Indeed, the organizational member 'sees' that with which he or she identifies" (Papa et al., 1997, p. 223). So, the conative aspect of identification is related directly to thinking in terms of organizational interests—but it is even more unobtrusive. Not only do members identify with organizational interests, but these interests are also internalized to become a core set of shared values which guide the informal organizational culture. Members who perceive they have a common set of values and evaluate their choices based on these values without asking themselves what is in the best interests of the organization have moved to an even more unobtrusive level of control. Behavioral identification is taken one step further and internalized to become a set of core values that guide value premises.

Kaufman's (1960) study of identification among Rangers in the Forest Service is an excellent example of how concertive control functions to guide the shared values of an organization. Kaufman found that organizational use of symbols, such as uniforms and badges and participation in public relations campaigns, led to workers who conformed tightly to organizational decision premises even though they considered themselves free and autonomous actors. The importance of this paradox to this case study cannot be emphasized enough. In my interviews with the Kingstons, nearly all current members stated in one way or another that they freely choose the lifestyle; they are free to marry whomever they choose; they are not compelled or forced in any way; and they are free to walk away at any time. While some researchers may attribute this to a social desirability bias or being directed by the organization to falsify their experience (both factors I considered), it appears that in a system of concertive control employees may feel they are free at the same time they are being tightly controlled (see Tompkins & Cheney, 1985, p. 197). Papa et al. (1997) call this the "paradox of control": workers perceive they

have more freedom because they create their own control system; yet, they "actually experience less freedom within the work group because they must all keep an eye on one another to reach codetermined goals" (p. 235). Thus, though critics may say otherwise, the Kingstons are most likely acting authentically when they declare they are "free to choose" (participant 3).

Papa et al. (1997) offer further insight into the ways that concertive control is maintained. They found in a study of the Grameen Bank—an innovative bank in Bangladesh that offers microloans and various social services for the poor—that several elements contribute to identification within a system of concertive control. First, the metaphor of "team" is central to worker identification with the organization and the concertive control system. When members use "team" to define the organization, they frame the membership in positive terms and focus on the team-building aspects of the organization. Second, employees are given the responsibility to create and implement social and economic programs for the poor. This responsibility fosters a sense of empowerment, which then fosters a sense of pride in their accomplishments—and when members have a stake in the organizational policies, they want to make sure they are successful. Third, members put pressure on one another to meet very high standards and emphasize at team meetings "the importance of working together in pursuit of common goals" (p. 233). Fourth, sanctions in the form of communication are used widely among members: "field workers will criticize one another and make reference to the loan repayment records that are behind worker desks" (p. 234). Fifth, workers are monitored on a daily basis (p. 235).

The conative level of identification, as the most unobtrusive, is arguably the most powerful. The organizational construction of values and beliefs is an ethical one—one with severe consequences. As Tompkins and Cheney (1985) state, "communication, in our judgment, plays an important, perhaps its most powerful, role in the period temporally prior to decision; that is, in the process of inculcating enthymemic premises

of the organization. To the extent that enthymemic processes are unobtrusive and the receivers are predisposed to identify with the organization, it may be dangerous. We could just as well label the process of premise setting "as indoctrination, brainwashing, manipulation, and false consciousness" (Perrow, 1979, 152) It could even be called "consciousness raising" (p. 198). Indeed, former members frequently stated in the interviews that they were identified with the organization long after they left (participant 25) and their "false consciousness" (participant 15) took years to reverse. Though this study does not address the potential ethical concerns associated with organizational identification, it does emphasize that the organizational influence in members' development of values (in any organization, not just a religious-based one) is an ethics-laden act that should be recognized as such.

Conclusion

In the first section, I discussed Kenneth Burke's rhetoric and his application of rhetoric to the social realm. This rhetoric, termed "identification," is viewed as an accessory to traditional rhetoric, termed "persuasion." In the second section, I discussed the importance of rhetoric in creating and sustaining organizations. Organizations, it was argued, are created and maintained through a system of cooperative rhetoric—rhetoric of identification (see Burke, 1950; Barnard, 1938). In the third section, I discussed new religious movements as organizations that also used rhetoric to create and sustain the organization. Janja Lalich's (2004) four sociological processes in her theory of bounded choice were compared to four Burkean principles in his theory of logology: Lalich's charismatic authority corresponds with Burke's mystery; transcendental belief system corresponds with mythic image; system of control corresponds with perfection; and system of influence corresponds with identification. In the fourth section, I discussed organizational identification and noted similarities between Burke's theory of logology and Lalich's theory of bounded choice. Specifically, Van Dick's (2001) four dimensions of organizational identification correspond roughly with Lalich's four processes, as well:

charismatic authority corresponds with the affective dimension; transcendental belief system with the cognitive dimension; system of control with the behavioral dimension; and system of influence with the conative dimension. In this formulation, Lalich's (2004) "four interlocking structural dimensions that make up the framework for the social dynamics found in [new religious movement's]" (p. 17) are all viewed as aspects of organizational identification. Lalich herself views this as a process of identification, as she states that "the intense process of transformation to which I am referring involves a reorganization of the person's inner identity, or sense of self" (p. 16).

Lalich states that these four processes powerfully restrict the rationality and choices of the members of new religious movements. But why are these structural dimensions so powerful? And how are they seamlessly interwoven into the social structure? To answer these questions, we turn to the final part of the theory section and apply it to the Kingston organization. To explore these questions, we go back to Tompkins and Cheney's (1985) theory of unobtrusive control.

Unobtrusive Control and Compliance in the Kingston Organization

Lalich (2004) makes a persuasive case that four interlocking processes in new religious movements "create a bounded reality and contribute to a state of personal closure for the individual participant. Charismatic authority and a transcendent belief system are crucial to the creation of such a reality, while the systems of control and the systems of influence uphold the other two structural dimensions and reinforce the confines of the bounded reality. Enmeshed in such a social system, the individual is apt to become closed off to ideas and experiences outside this system" (p. 259). Lalich further states that through these interlocking processes, individuals' identities are reconstructed to suit organizational ideals and preferences. But how does this organizational identification occur? We have gained some insight by reformulating each process as an aspect of identification. But to answer the question of how they interlock and yield so much power, we turn to Tompkins and Cheney's (1985) theory of unobtrusive control.

Four Levels of Organizational Control

Power is "the overarching factor" in determining regularities in organizational behavior, state Tompkins and Cheney (1985, p. 179). Power is defined by Tompkins and Cheney as the "ability or capacity to achieve some goal even against the resistance of others" (p. 180) and is compared with control, defined as "the exercise or act of achieving a goal" (p. 180). Power is not directly observable or easily measured—it is the latent ability that is seen when it is exercised, that is, when it fuels a system of control.

As described in Tompkins and Cheney (1985), Edwards (1981) outlines three different strategies of control: (1) *simple control,* in which leaders exercise power "openly, arbitrarily, and personally"; (2) *technical control,* in which the control is embedded in the "physical technology" and knowledge of the organization; and (3) *bureaucratic control,* in which control is embedded in the "social organization of the enterprise, in the contrived social relations of production" (p. 161; in Tompkins & Cheney, 1985, p. 181). Tompkins and Cheney add a fourth kind of control (which we discussed in the previous section): *concertive control,* in which "explicit written rules and regulations are largely replaced by the common understanding of values, objectives, and means of achievement, along with a deep appreciation for the organization's 'mission'" (p. 184).

Tompkins and Cheney elucidate that each system of control has developed historically and sequentially in response to economic conditions or workers' resistance to the previous system of control. Technical control developed in response to the industrial age (and workers' resistance of the intense supervision that often accompanied factory jobs); and bureaucratic control developed as a way to counter worker apathy and resistance to technical control. Concertive control has developed in response to the discontent, boredom, and general dissatisfaction of workers in bureaucratic organizations.[19]

Though these types of control developed historically, all four types of control can be found in modern organizations. As Tompkins and Cheney (1985) state, "all exist today,

and often in various combinations rather than in pure forms or 'ideal' types" (p. 185). Simple control is still the method for small business owners (one person is "in charge"), although this is not the type of control used in the complex modern organization. Technical control is still used in assembly lines of manufacturing plants. Bureaucratic control is found in most complex organizations. And concertive control is increasingly found in organizational systems that value teamwork, flat hierarchies, and coordination. The Kingston organization utilizes all four of these control strategies.

Simple Control

According to Tompkins and Cheney (1985), simple control in business organizations was exemplified in the late 19th century with the tyrannical bosses to "had the power to hire, set work rates, assign tasks, discipline, and even fire workers" (p. 182). This control is arbitrary, subject to leaders' personal preferences, and absolute. The Kingston organization gives simple control to the charismatic leader. With reference to Weber's (1978) classic forms of legitimate authority,[20] the leader is a charismatic authority for the entire organization.

Charismatic authorities are given simple control over the organizations. Followers believe these leaders possess magical or nonroutine qualities. Charismatic leaders fit Edwards' (1981) definition of simple control as "open, arbitrary, and personal." Charismatic leaders usually interface with their constituents (open); decisions are subject to whim (arbitrary); and the charismatic leader's staff members are selected according to the personal devotion they exhibit (personal). Followers are required to have faith, lack of which brings punishment.

The leader of the Kingston organization, Paul Kingston, is given simple control over all aspects of the organization. Paul Kingston is at once the Order's CEO, Patriarchal family leader, and charismatic spiritual leader. As the sole source of new official organizational rhetoric, Paul has the ability to make pronouncements on anything from the number of wives a man should have to the number of baths members should take per

week (Order, 2009a). This simple control is shown through an open, personal relationship with them and his arbitrariness in making commands.

Paul is open with his followers—in fact, he is closely related to most of them. His nonroutine qualities include being chosen by God to lead the people (Order, 2009a); knowing people's thoughts through spiritual inspiration given to him to lead the people (participant 17); having the pure blood of Christ flowing through his veins (participant 13); and having the ability to make consequential pronouncements that God accepts, such as granting contingent salvation to people by giving them numbers in the New Years' meeting (participant 5). These nonroutine qualities are seen by participants as they interface directly with him (participant 3).

Consistent with simple control, charismatic leaders' decisions are arbitrary. The leader has the final say in all things—arranging marriages (participant 25), selecting employees for a business (participant 2), granting eternal life (participant 5), and giving permission to go to the hospital (participant 13). The leader selects his right-hand men based on their faith. Paul Kingston's brothers, for example, are given a lot of power in the organization because they follow his lead; members who question the leader's statements, however, are blacklisted and called "Satan" by other members (participant 8). The leader's decisions stand, without question and without the need for a legal code to back it up. For example, one man went to the leader to ask permission to marry a woman he loved. The leader, however, desired to have the woman himself, so he assigned the man another woman to marry, forbid him to talk to the woman he loved, and married the woman himself. The man and woman were completely heartbroken, and the man reportedly cried for weeks. However, the man did not openly question the leader's decision and continued to remain part of the Order.

Paul Kingston's simple control is also exhibited through the personal decisions he makes for others in the organization. For example, the leaders of the Kingston organizations advise their members to avoid modern medicine whenever possible. These

decisions often carry more weight than technical expertise. One participant states: "My little boy . . . had an irregular heartbeat before he was born. We probably got it about a month before he was born. So they wanted to induce my wife. They wanted to have a c-section. They wanted to do cardio something on his heart. Cardiogram, I think it was. . . . We had faith in the Lord that he would work things out, make sure that he was okay, everything was ok. And he was born, and he was fine, . . . and he's never had any health problems" (participant 26). This man followed the leader's advice over the advice of physicians and ultimately served to increase the participant's belief in the leader's non-routine quality of spirituality and knowing the will of God.

Simple control may utilize the affective component of organizational identification, or the bond that leaders and members share. However, affective identification is not a necessary component for simple control to exist; nor does affective identification necessarily translate into positive feelings about an individual or organization. For example, many employees have historically resisted simple control (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985); and Adorno (1991) describes in detail that the emotional attachment of Germans to Hitler was not one of love but one of fear—Hitler exploited the image of the primal father and used this unforgiving and threatening image to control the people (see Lalich, 2004). But when identification does exist in simple control, it will be through the affective dimension of identification.

Technical Control

The Kingston organization utilizes technical control in *business, spiritual, and family dimensions.* Technical control, defined by Edwards (1981), refers to the type where "the control mechanism is embedded in the physical technology of the firm, designed into the very machines and other physical apparatus of the workplace" (p. 161; in Tompkins & Cheney, 1985, p. 181). Tompkins and Cheney identify this type of control as more than the machine pacing of assembly lines; rather, in this system of control the technology of an organization directs the work processes to the point that the simple control model

is no longer needed (p. 182). In their various businesses, the Kingstons utilize physical technologies that ensure efficiency. For example, the coal mine, which is the economic lifeblood of the organization, utilizes machines such as rotating steel drums with tungsten carbide teeth that continuously scrape coal from the rock. This steel drum operates at a consistent speed and systematizes the extract process. Conveyors transport removed coals. And remote-controlled or computer-controlled robotic miners may also be used. These technologies systematize the coal production process and rate of return. Foremen are no longer needed to encourage workers to mine at a certain rate; rather, machines operate at a constant speed to accomplish the same job in much less time.

The type of technical control I find most interesting, however, is found in the spiritual realm. Specifically, the Kingston organization manipulates and appropriates the bodily experiences of their members through the transcendental belief system to serve organizational ends. These physical experiences control the members' behavior on a more indirect level and make simple control less necessary. I recognize that the relationship between technical control in business and technical control in new religious movements may not be easily apparent, so some explanation is needed here. Technical control in business organizations discipline the bodies of workers through the use of expert knowledge in order to produce what the organization is selling. For example, the bodies of assembly line workers at an automobile manufacturing plant are controlled through the expertise used to build assembly lines. In this case, the assembly line disciplines the speed of the workers' bodies. In much the same way, the bodies of the Kingstons are manipulated through the use of expert knowledge to produce what the organization is selling: spiritual experiences that support a transcendental belief system and bodies able to work. The bodily responses, rather than the direct commands of a leader, direct the course of action. Control is therefore less obtrusive because members perceive the commands to be coming from an omniscient otherworldly source communicating through their bodily experiences.

Bodies are disciplined through technical control to serve organizational ends in three ways: dreams, physical deprivation, and sexual practices. Dreams are the lifeblood of the spiritual dimension of the organization. Dreams are believed to have magical qualities and are said to be direct revelation from God. Women's dreams about men are usually interpreted to mean that women received "direction" on whom to marry (participants 3, 17). One woman explains that an Order member should engage in "praying with Heavenly Father and learning who that person might be and where we would fit in and would be the happiest" (participant 2). Sometimes dreams are used to self-discipline. In Orlean Kingston Gustafson's journal we read: "February 15, 1940: I dreamed the end of my tongue had been cut off. It was swollen and sore, so sore, I could hardly speak. It was so bad that I only spoke when it was absolutely necessary. I awoke: The meaning is to cut out all idle talk and only speak when necessary and be careful of my speech to those above me" (1949, p. 67). Orlean came to this conclusion after years of hearing the same thing from leaders (simple control), but because the dream came from her own body, she did not experience it as a control mechanism. Of course, these dreams are subject to the interpretation of the leader, as dreams can be interpreted incorrectly. Orlean's journal is again instructive: "December 30, 1939. Last night Brother 1 came and said, 'These dreams are all from the wrong source.' I felt bad because I had continually striven with the Lord that the evil one would not be allowed to come in and give me dreams or anything like that to deceive me" (1949, p. 63). Leaders retain the right to interpret members' dreams but state the dream comes from God's expert knowledge. Thus, by interpreting dreams to support organizational ends, leaders draw upon the perceived expert knowledge of the transcendental belief system to discipline members' bodies.

Physical deprivation is another technique used by leaders to discipline the body. As Hassan (2000) explains, many new religious movements subject new recruits to physical deprivation such as hunger or fatigue to induce altered states of mind that are

interpreted as spiritual experiences. Then, leaders interpret these altered states of mind by appealing to the expert knowledge of the transcendental belief system—which makes their power less obtrusive. The importance of fasting has emerged as a central doctrine in the Kingston organization, with the most devout members going on weekly and even monthly fasts to increase their spirituality. Orlean Gustafson recalls in her journal: "Recently I have been shown that I must fast 34 days before the summer is gone. Today I am fasting the 4th day. I eat my food raw and fast 2 days a week on water" (Gustafson, 1949, p. 97). According to family and friends that knew her, this led to altered states of mind in which she appeared to be communing with beings in a spiritual realm (participant 15). The leader guided her through these altered states of mind by appealing to the transcendental belief system to interpret her bodily experiences. The month-long fast of the leader Ortell was also celebrated in the Kingston manual as a highly spiritual endeavor that only those most worthy of God's approval could undertake (Order, 2009b).

Sexual practices are a final compelling form of technical control for both women and men. The transcendental belief system of the organization dictates that bodies are to be used to build the kingdom of God (Order, 2009a). These bodies build the kingdom of God not only through physical labor in the organization but also through bearing children. Women are typically married in their teens and begin having children soon thereafter. Men are required to impregnate these women throughout their childbearing years in order to build the kingdom of God. It is not uncommon for men to schedule their visits with their women according to their ovulation schedule; in fact, many women are required by their husbands to inform them when they are ovulating. The appeal to the expert knowledge of God (encapsulated in the transcendental belief system) allows leaders to characterize the systematic production of children as a spiritual endeavor rather than an economic one (i.e., producing children to labor in Kingston-owned businesses). In addition, the Kingstons' tabu sexual practices of intermarriage serve to strengthen their identification with the transcendental belief system, because most other belief

systems reject this practice. In sum, forms of technical control discipline the bodies of organizational members through what members perceive as "expert knowledge" to serve organizational purposes.

If we view technical control as a system in which "the control mechanism is embedded in the physical technology of the firm" (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985, p. 183) and define "technology" as a system of expert knowledge, then technical control can be compared to Weber's traditional authority. In Weber's system of traditional authority, the leader receives his legitimate power not from his charismatic personal qualities but from his deference to tradition, which operates as a transcendental beliefs system. Though technical control in business organizations is less obtrusive and is guided by the expert knowledge of machines, technical control still requires the use of managers to assist with the administration of this technical control. In similar ways, the patriarch defers to a system of knowledge—tradition—but is still present to administer the system of control.

Weber's second ideal type, traditional authority, "rests on the belief in the sacredness of the social order and its prerogatives as existing of yore" (p. 6). Patriarchal authority is its pure type. The patriarch's authority depends on his adherence to tradition, which states his household's duty should also follow tradition and filial piety.[21] The patriarch rules through "cadi justice"—or by considering tradition, equity, justice, or utilitarian expediency rather than the rule of law. Here, the patriarch is not all-powerful, because he receives his authority based on the perception of his household that he honors tradition, a transcendental belief system with elite knowledge that guides. In practice, the patriarchal lord rules at will, as sympathy or anger move him. He can advance favorites or punish at will, and members of the household and group support his decisions. Household members function out of personal loyalty and dependency, because they have few if any rights.

The Kingston family structure follows this ideal type nearly perfectly; in fact, the father is called the "patriarch." Kingston members believe that the patriarchal family

system is a structure revealed by God and given to men to follow. In this system, men are viewed as "gods in embryo" (Moore-Emmett, 2004). As tradition states that men have the priesthood, or the power of God on earth, women and children must follow their lead and are only able to attain salvation by hanging on to their coattails as they go to heaven. The doctrine that a man must have more than one wife to get to heaven (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000) reinforces this traditional structure.

Patriarchs utilize technical control, as members of the household recognize their authority only as they follow the commands of the transcendental belief system believed to contain elite knowledge. Men are regarded as "gods in embryo" in their own households, and women and children are required to obey every command, as dictated through the "law of one above another," since the patriarch is the "one over them." Men are given control over the money that their wives earn in Kingston businesses, thus preventing women to spend the money contrary to the wishes of the patriarch. The women's personal bank accounts can also have a "hold" put on them by their husbands, which prevents them from drawing out their own money unless their husband gives his approval. Women are also required to present their administrative working manuals (which document their daily lives in detail, including the times they woke up in the morning and went to bed in the evening) to their husbands monthly. In all of these situations, the control of the patriarch is significant; but he is bound by the belief system that requires this type of control.

The control of the father/husband is limited to the family sphere. But because of the organization's tabu practice of intermarriage, Paul Kingston utilizes traditional authority over the organization as well as charismatic. In a very real sense, Paul Kingston is not just the leader of the Order—he is the patriarch of the very large family. The practice of intermarriage within the Kingston organization ensures that most of the approximately 2000 members belong to the same family. Intermarriage ensures the traditional patriarchal structure of one man governing a large household with many

dependents. As explained in Chapter 1, the Kingstons' inner circle consists of 7 brothers and over 600 children. As the patriarch rules through "cadi justice" rather than the rule of law, so do the leader's wishes supersede Order members' adherence to the rule of bureaucratic law in American government. The adult handbook emphasizes that the "law" adults are to follow is the "law of God" (the transcendental belief system) rather than the law of the land, if the two conflict (Order, 2009b; participant 10).

Cognitive identification with the transcendental belief system, through which members define themselves as Order members, is the type of identification that is associated with technical control. Members are persuaded to believe that through the magical, nonroutine qualities of the charismatic leader (i.e., direct revelation from an omniscient God), they have been given elite scientific knowledge that transcends the advances of science on earth. Indeed, in the Kingston organization, God is believed to be a scientist that operates through natural laws of nature. As with simple control, identification is not a necessary component of control. But for technical control to operate, organizational members must be persuaded on some level that the mythic image, the transcendental belief system, is a system of expert knowledge. Once accepted by members, the transcendental belief system provides a framework through which members define themselves and discipline their own bodies to serve organizational ends.

Bureaucratic Control

As Tompkins and Cheney (1985) state, bureaucratic control in industry arose in response to worker resistance and resentment of technical control: "worker resistance motivated other large corporations to seek a less obtrusive method of control . . . bureaucratic control" (p. 183). This type of control appeals to the "rule of law—the law as handed down by the corporation to its members" (p. 183). Legal-rational authority, as described by Weber (1978) legitimizes this type of control, as laws are changed not by the whim of a leader or the spiritual vision of a guru, but by formal procedure. Hierarchy, as Burke, 1950 identifies, ensures its success. As Tompkins and Cheney (1985) state: "Good

jobs up the hierarchical ladder become available to workers loyal to the firm; the firm uses its policy of promotion from within as one conscious strategy of identification" (p. 83).

Weber (1978) gives us insight into this type of control, governed by seven principles. First, official business is conducted on a continuous basis. There are normal operating hours, and people come into work each day. Second, official business is conducted with a series of rules, which include impersonality (the duties of each official are delimited in terms of impersonal criteria, such as a checklist); limited authority (given the authority necessary to carry out his assigned functions); limited coercion (the means of coercion at his disposal are strictly limited and conditions of their use strictly defined—beatings do not usually occur at places of employment); hierarchy (every official's responsibilities and authority are part of a vertical hierarchy of authority, with respective rights of supervision and appeal); responsibility for resources (officials do not own the resources necessary for the performance of their assigned functions but are accountable for their use of these resources); separation between official and private business and income; offices are given to employees based on merit, not relationship, money, etc.; and formalization (business is conducted on the basis of written documents).

The qualities exhibited by a bureaucratic official are the following: the official is appointed to the position based on merit and conduct; impersonal rules guide and limit his or her authority; and work is a full-time, salaried occupation.

A bureaucracy can experience common problems, such as overspecialization, making employees blind to larger consequences of their actions; rigidity in making decisions because of formalized rules; groupthink, as employees think in terms of the organization to the point that the organization is unable to realize its own mistakes; disregard for dissenting opinions; contradictory rules, especially as the organization becomes complex; and restriction of critical thinking in employees, as they rely increasingly upon arbitrary rules than common sense when making decisions.

The day-to-day *business dimension* of the Kingston corporation operates largely on bureaucratic control. First the 100+ businesses operate continuously in capitalist society. Kingstons compete with other businesses for customers mostly in Salt Lake City and surrounding areas, but also in other areas in the West, such as Idaho and Colorado (Order, 2009b). Kingstons follow a series of formalized rules for business, and these rules are reinforced in their Sunday school classes (Order 2009b). For example, one of the "gospel principles" taught in the adult lesson manual is "punctuality," or arriving to your place of employment early to prepare. Rules are impersonal (as we will see in Chapter 8, Kingstons are very good at following checklists); workers are given only the authority needed to carry out their employments, or stewardships; and coercion at the place of business is limited.

Kingston businesses are especially good at instituting a hierarchical order that follows the system of hierarchy emphasized in at church. The law of one another clearly dictates that those "above" them--to whom they should demonstrate complete obedience—are those that have "stewardship over them." In the business realm, this refers to their bosses. Ultimately, it means that every member is accountable to Paul Kingston, the corporation's President and CEO.

Kingston members are also held accountable for the way they utilize resources. They do not own the business assets and are cautioned to use them wisely. In fact, as part of a communal society, all assets are Order assets and do not belong to the people; as a result, former members report that the Order micromanages people in this area, down to the squares of toilet paper they are allowed to use (participant 5). Business is also formalized. As Orlean Gustafson stated in her journal, Elden Kingston taught that "We are all as cogs in a machine" (1949, p. 22).

The Order business sector departs from legal-rational authority in one main area: separation between public and private business and income.[22] Whereas in bureaucratic control employees are each privately responsible for how they use their income, the Order

requires its members to keep their income in the Kingston bank for use by the Order. In addition, there is not a clear separation between official and private business: the Order reaches into the private lives of its members by controlling family and religious/ community life. In this corporation, there is virtually no difference between public and private spheres, as members are instructed that all of their actions (from shopping at Order stores to having children to daily meditations on Order-based memory gems) are either contributing to or detracting from the "kingdom of God." The specific laws governing Order members' private and public lives are able to be created and changed by the leader, Paul Kingston.

The *family and religious dimensions* of the organization also utilize bureaucratic control. In the family system, women and children are required to fill out charts that formalize their personal behaviors, such as their exercise, grooming, and reading habits. The charts ask them to routinize behaviors such as making children's lunches, reading scriptures, praying, reciting memory gems, and even taking free time. The administrative working manual for the mother integrates all of the Kingston organizational dimensions—family, church, and business—and synthesizes them into one large packet for the father's review every month. This emphasis on rules, regulations, and the completion of charts is comparable to the most complex bureaucratic reporting system.

As is probably apparent, bureaucratic control is compatible with Lalich's (2004) system of control and Van Dick's (2001) behavioral identification. Lalich defines systems of control as "the network of acknowledged, or visible, regulatory mechanisms that guide the operation of the group. This includes the overt rules, regulations, and procedures that guide and control group members' behavior" (p. 17). Systems of control in new religious movements are typically hierarchical structures with centralized authority and many overt rules that guide a member toward the attainment of a spiritual goal. Van Dick's behavioral identification refers to members who desire to make decisions in terms of organizational goals and interests. This is similar to Simon's (1976) definition of authority in a

bureaucratic organization: "accepting authority in an organization . . . means accepting premises provided by other organization members as part of the basis for one's own behavior" (p. 202). Members often feel guilt and shame if they think in terms of their own interests rather than organizational interests (participant 5) and desire to build the Kingdom of God.[23] And through this identification, they perceive that the organization has their best interests in mind, as well.[24]

In sum, bureaucratic control in new religious movements is guided by members' adherence to the prescribed rules and regulations and behavioral identification with the organization. Members think in terms of achieving goals that are in the organization's interests and, goaded by the spirit of hierarchy (Burke, 1969), work to rise the corporate ladder.

Concertive Control

Concertive control, as described by Tompkins and Cheney (1985), is a postbureaucratic type of control that "stresses teamwork and coordination at all stages of production . . . flexibility and innovation . . . 'flat' hierarchy . . . blurring of line and staff distinctions . . . intense face-to-face interaction concerning non-routine decisions . . . and relative value consensus. In the concertive organization, the explicit written rules and regulations are largely replaced by the common understanding of values, objectives, and means of achievement, along with a deep appreciation for the organization's 'mission.' This we call—to modify a phrase in current use—the *'soul of the new organization'* (p. 184). As discussed, concertive control corresponds with Lalich's (2004) systems of influence, which is "the network of interaction and methods of influence residing in the group's social relations" (p. 17). It is also the "human interaction and group culture form which members learn to adapt their thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors in relation to their new beliefs" (p. 17). It also corresponds with Van Dick's (2001) conative dimension of identification, through which members socially identify with each other by perceiving shared values and characteristics.

Though Weber's premature death prevented him from writing about it, Cheney (1999) convincingly argues that "Weber may have had in mind a fourth type of organization, organization dedicated to higher human values and committed to periodic reflection on them. Two insightful scholars, Joyce Rothschild-Whitt (1979) and Roberta Satow (1975), have argued that there is a gap in Weber's own typology; that his discussion of organizational types or categories was incomplete; that there are hints of a value-driven organization scattered throughout his works and notes" (p. 15). Cheney states that whether or not Weber was planning to write about a value-driven organization, his doubts about "the long-term soundness of modern organizations, when they fall into bureaucratic myopia, are undeniable" (p. 15). Cheney goes on to argue for the existence of a value-driven organization that describes what Thompson and Cheney (1985) allude to as the "soul of the organization." Though Cheney's treatment is focused on ethical concerns such as organizational integrity, I am interested specifically in his work as a descriptive categorization of an ideal organizational type.

Cheney first points to the increase in value-driven organizations. He states that "while most organizations use a mix of methods to control employees' behavior (including outright coercion!), the use of values to motivate employees internally is generally on the rise" (p. 27). From large corporations to small religious movements, organizations talk to us about values to be perceived as legitimate, to be competitive, and to mask underlying motives of profit and mass production. Values are important to people for many reasons: they structure their lives, control the behaviors of other, and serve of points of reference to guide behavior. Organizations communicate values to members through rhetorical forms such as *epideictic* rhetoric (or "praise" and "blame" rhetoric; see Cheney, 1999; Aristotle, 2004); and members internalize these values, inculcate them into new members, and use them to discipline one another.

Through his investigation of the Mondragon Cooperative Corporation in Basque Country (Euskadi), Cheney (1999) draws some practical lessons and characteristics

for value-based organizations. First, fostering a *consensus on values* is necessary "to sustain a high degree of commitment to the cooperatives" (p. 114). Value consensus may be weakly held or merely articulate, but "some degree of commitment and coordination" is essential. Second, value-driven organizations should be acutely *aware of the organizational-environmental relationship*, especially when these organizations define themselves as different or better from others. Cheney states that "for all value-driven organizations, not only religious ones, the choice between being open and being closed is difficult and inescapable" (p. 118). Denominations, for example, receive broad external support but risks having its identity "dissolved into the larger pool of society." Cults have clearly defined identities but risk rejection from outside society and may be too cut-off to maintain themselves. Sects may be "energetic and well-defined" but risk institutionalization as they seek legitimacy (p. 118). Third, value-driven organizations must find *leaders who communicate lofty goals needed for continued individual identification and commitment* with the organization. Organizations must also anticipate the succession of leadership when a charismatic leader leaves or dies: "an organization that depends to some extent on the charisma or exceptional personal qualities of its founders must then strive to install specific and qualified successors while in some way institutionalizing the special qualities of the founders" (p. 120). Fourth, value-driven organizations must *conserve a common mission,* or find a way to adapt to change while maintaining their identities. Cheney states: "if the organization does not update, alter, and renew its mission, it necessarily defines itself as one that values its past more than its present or future, locking employees and decision making into a predetermined model of organizational identity and activity (Westenholz 1991). But if the organization adapts too much . . . the break with tradition can signal to its internal and external constituencies that there is nothing fundamental or enduring about its commitments. . . . for the organization that is grounded in core values and seeks to promote them, the need for solutions is more pressing" (p. 125). Fifth, value-driven organizations must *balance social and economic*

motivations. Business organizations unable to make a profit can sustain the morale of workers through the social side of organizational life; but economic factors provide motivation and purpose in the organization. Sixth, Cheney (1999) states that value-driven organizations *should be democratic,* defined as "a system of governance which truly values individual goals and feelings (e.g., equitable remuneration, the pursuit of enriching work and the right to express oneself) as well as typically organizational objectives (e.g., effectiveness and efficiency, reflectively conceived), which actively fosters the connection between those two set of concerns by encouraging individual contributions to important organizational choices, and which allows for the ongoing modification of the organization's activities and policies by the group" (p. 133). Because this is an ethical stance (that I, of course, agree with), I will not treat it here.

The Kingston organization functions as a value-based organization in many ways, and this value-based system of authority is diffused throughout *all organizational dimensions*. First, value consensus is vital. The organization insists on not just the outward adherence to values but also the inward "testimony" that the values communicated from God through the leader are "true." The statement often communicated by members is "I know this church is true." Second, the organization is acutely aware of its environment and delicately balances between working in society with clients on the "outside" and forming relationships almost exclusively on the "inside." The organizational mantra appropriated by members is "being in the world but not of the world." Third, the leadership of the Kingston organization is considered charismatic by virtue of position and birth, which allows for the smooth transition of succession. Elden Kingston is perceived to have had nonroutine magical qualities. He is thought to have been a literal descendent of Jesus Christ who, by virtue of his divine heritage, was imbued with these qualities from birth. In addition, the Kingston organization is thought by members to be approved by God as the only organization that operates through the use of the priesthood, or God's power on earth. The role of leader, then, is the position

that allows the person to have these charismatic qualities—by virtue of his position. So, when Elden Kingston died, his brother Ortell (who had the same lineage) was able to fill the position and draw upon both his heritage and his role to establish legitimacy among the Kingston members. Paul, the third (current) leader, is the son of Ortell, who also draws upon his birth and position for legitimacy. Fourth, the Kingston organization has a common, unchanging mission to "build the kingdom of God" to prepare for Christ's Second Coming. This mission statement (of sorts) integrates the work done in business, religious, and family dimensions and provides one common goal for all organizational activities. Finally, the Kingston organization balances economic and social dimensions of the organization by providing both employment and social opportunities for its members. After a full day of work, social occasions such as picnics, dances, and young people's meetings are scheduled to keep members as socially integrated into the organization as possible.

Synthesis of Theories of Uncoerced Obedience

When I first began this study, I hypothesized that the Kingston organization's three major dimensions (the corporation--Davis County Cooperative Society; the church--Latter Day Church of Christ; and the family) would each use a different type of legitimate authority. Indeed, it seemed appropriate that a family system structured similarly to Weber's systems of legitimate authority (church/charismatic; family/traditional; business/legal-rational) would each operate using a different system of authority. Upon further investigation, however, I have found that each system is integrated so completely into the others that it is impossible to tell where one kind of authority/control ends and another begins. Paul Kingston, the charismatic authority, operates with simple control over family, business, and religious dimensions. The patriarch/father of each family, operating with traditional authority, presides with a form of technical control over the family but also monitors his family's employment and spiritual lives. I originally thought that bureaucratic control, which operates with legal-rational authority, was reserved for

the business sector but actually is diffused throughout the organization and finds its most powerful source of control in the administrative working manual in the family system. Finally, I had not even considered the value-based authority of the members utilizing concertive control throughout all organizational dimensions.

From my perspective, *the diffused and integrated systems of control, actualized by different dimensions of rhetorical identification, are what create the powerful interlocking social structures that create bounded choice*. Though these comparisons are not perfect, there is a high degree of similarity between several related theories of uncoerced obedience, as illustrated in Table 1 below. The guiding terms of emotional bond (affective dimension);[25] cognitive categorization (cognitive dimension); organizational action (behavioral dimension); and cultural values (conative dimension) guide the comparisons.

The relationships between each of these theories have been explicated throughout this Chapter. In the first section, I discussed the primacy of rhetoric in social life and introduced Burke's concept of identification as rhetoric-in-society. In the second section, I explored the application of his theory of rhetoric to the field of organizational

Table 1. Theories of Uncoerced Obedience

Rhetoric (Burke)	**Sociology** (Lalich)	**Psychology** (Van Dick)	**Org Comm** (Tompkins/Cheney)
Mystery	Charismatic Authority	Affective Dimension	Simple Control
Mythic Image	Transcendental Belief System	Cognitive Dimension	Technical Control
Perfection	Systems of Control	Behavioral Dimension	Bureaucratic Control
Identification	Systems of Influence	Conative Dimension	Concertive Control

communication, specifically organizational rhetoric. In the third section, I introduced Lalich's four interlocking structures that create bounded choice and compared them with Burke's rhetorical theory of logology. Here, I made the case that Lalich's structures are created and maintained rhetorically. Lalich's charismatic authority is related to Burke's concept of mystery; transcendental belief system to mythic image; systems of control to perfection; and systems of influence to identification. In the fourth section, I introduced the concept of organizational identification and argued that organizational identification has four dimensions (following Van Dick, 2001): affective, cognitive, behavioral, and evaluative. These four dimensions of OI correspond with Burke's theory of logology and Lalich's theory of bounded choice in new religious movements: the affective dimension with charismatic authority/mystery; the cognitive dimension with transcendental belief system/mythic image; the behavioral dimension with systems of control/perfection; and the evaluative dimension with systems of influence/identification. By making these comparisons, I highlighted that bounded choice is a rhetorical process of organizational identification. Finally, in the fifth section, I discussed why these interlocking aspects of organizational identification are so powerful by comparing them with Tompkins and Cheney's (1985) systems of control. In the Kingston organization, the leader uses simple control sustained through affective identification; the patriarch uses technical control sustained through cognitive identification; bureaucratic laws use bureaucratic control sustained through behavioral identification; and the organizational culture of members uses concertive control sustained through conative/evaluative identification.

This theory is not intended to be a grand narrative that explains every contingency of identification in organizations; in practice, charismatic, traditional, bureaucratic, and value-driven authorities utilize a combination of different forms of control, depending upon the context and unique characteristics of the organization. In addition, while authorities tend to rely upon a certain type of identification (e.g., charismatic authority with affective identification), they may utilize any type of rhetorical strategy or

identification to further their goals. But the similarities between these various theories of unobtrusive control are so salient, they should not, in my opinion, be ignored. Therefore, *I argue that the interdisciplinary theory building I have done in this Chapter should be viewed as a tentative framework through which to view possible linkages and connections between theories of uncoerced obedience in rhetoric, sociology, psychology, organizational communication, and organization science*.

I also agree that this study focuses specifically on rhetoric, to the exclusion of material elements in organizations. While rhetorical identification is extremely important in creating the bounded choice in the Kingston organization, I recognize that it is not the only factor. As Gramsci (1971) states: "Hegemony is also carried in cultural, political, and economic forms—in non-discursive practices as well as in rhetorical utterances" (p. 113, quoted in Mumby, 2001). An as McGee (1980) quips, "one cannot write a house to live in." Referring briefly to Etzioni (1961),[26] three types of power exist in social systems: coercive (identified by threat of or implementation of physical force); remunerative (identified by control over material resources, such as salaries and wages); and normative (identified by control over symbols in the organization, such as rewarding prestige and a high social status). I view this rhetorical case study as an explanation of Etzioni's normative type of power, which elucidates both pure normative power, a vertical type of power in which hegemonic leaders rhetorically manipulate esteem, prestige, and ritualistic symbols; and social power, a horizontal type of power in which peer groups allocate positive responses and acceptance if the organizational member is compliant. Etzioni (1961) states that this type of power "becomes organizational power only when the organization can influence the group's powers, as when a teacher uses the class climate to control a deviant child, or a union steward agitates the members to use their informal power to bring a deviant into line" (p. 89).

In the following Chapters, using the Kingston organization as a case study, I hope to show that *new religious movements use four rhetorical dimensions of organizational*

identification to powerfully construct organizational identities and create bounded choice.

Conclusion

In this Chapter, I discussed three key terms that are instrumental to understanding organizational identification (OI) in the Kingston polygamous organization: rhetoric, organization, and religion. In the first section, I explained rhetorical appeals, consubstantiality/identification, and hierarchy in Burke's theory of rhetoric. In the second section, I discussed the interpretive turn in organizational communication, "identification" as a key component of organizational communication, and organizational rhetoric as a subdiscipline of organizational communication. In the third section, I classified the Kingston organization as a sect; described new religious movements' recruitment and socialization[27] processes as rhetorical; and argued that four rhetorical-based processes produce identification within the new religious organization: charismatic authority/mystery; transcendental belief system/mythic image; systems of control/perfection; and systems of influence/identification. In the fourth section, I explained organizational identification (OI) as a rhetorical process with four dimensions and argued that organizational identification in new religious movements is produced and sustained through four rhetorical processes: emotional identification between leader and members; cognitive identification through the promotion of a transcendental belief system/mythic image; behavioral identification where members act in terms of organizational interests through the rhetorical legitimizing of charismatic, traditional, and legal-rational authority; and evaluative identification between members perceiving shared characteristics with each other. In the fifth section, I further compared these aspects of identification with Tompkins and Cheney's (1985) systems of control and Weber's (1978) type of authority.

In the next Chapter, I discuss this study's methodology to understand the rhetorical processes used by the Kingston organization to promote identification among its members. This method includes data collection using Bullis and Bach's

(1989) retrospective interview technique (RIT), along with the assembling of relevant organizational documents. To analyze these texts, I employ three rhetorical methods: Albert and Whetten's (1985) extended metaphor analysis; Hill's (1972) Aristotelian method; and Cheney's (1983b) Burkean-inspired analysis of identification strategies.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

In this Chapter, I outline the methodological and conceptual framework used to investigate organizational identification in the Kingston organization. The first part of this Chapter outlines the methodological assumptions that guide the analysis of this case study, informed by the methodological preferences of the participants, themselves. Pro-polygamy advocates argue for an interpretive perspective; antipolygamy advocates argue for a critical analysis. The use of rhetorical criticism as a middle ground between interpretivism and critical theory aims to facilitate understanding of participant narratives while also including an analysis of the intentional persuasive features of the organizational and participant narratives. Rhetorical criticism bridges the gap between the two while striving to treat each perspective with the attention it deserves.

The second part of this Chapter explains the methodology used for data collection and data analysis, providing a step-by-step account of how empirical material was collected and analyzed. Bullis and Bach's (1989) Retrospective Interview Technique was used for data collection, accompanied by the assembling of relevant organizational documents in the public domain. Three types of rhetorical analysis—extended metaphor analysis, Aristotelian analysis, and analysis of identification strategies—were used for data analysis.

Methodological Framework

When I first became interested in analyzing the Kingston organization, I was met with many questions by the Safety Net Committee, the Attorney General's Office, and

nonprofit organizations. What kind of study is this going to be? Is it going to require interviews? Is it going to address the political maelstrom that has muddied the waters of this issue? Is it going to represent the Kingston organization as a business or a church? But first and foremost, the major question was "Whose side are you going to take?"

My goal, as I told the participants, was to hear the stories and understand the perspectives of both sides. But this was not an easy task, because not only do they have opposing viewpoints, they view the organization in fundamentally different ways. Pro-polygamy advocates argue that their perspectives have never been adequately represented by an outside researcher. They believe themselves to be actively participating in building a benevolent organization directed by a higher power. They also assert that they have agency to choose whether to be part of the organization and are not dominated or exploited. They ask to be heard and represented fairly. In short, they ask the research to be guided by an interpretive perspective that gives voice to their perspectives and seeks to understand their choices.

Antipolygamy advocates argue that the Attorney General's office has listened too much to polygamists' perspectives and has ignored the misuse of power within the organization. Calling the Kingston organization a system of "organized crime," former members insist that members do not have freedom of choice or even thought in the organization; members, they state, are compliant in their own domination because the organization has almost total control of the ideologies perpetuated and resources distributed among the people. In sum, former members are asking for a critical study of the ideology critique vein, where the iron fist of the Kingston leader, clothed in the velvet glove of religion, is exposed (see Mumby, 2004).

In order to achieve my stated purpose of representing the perspectives of both current and former members, I have chosen to take a middle road. Rhetorical criticism strikes a balance between the interpretive aim to understand and the critical aim to demystify discourses of domination by showing how organizational discourses produce

identification among organizational members, set decision premises, and function as unobtrusive control. First, I will outline some of the key elements of interpretivism and some of its limitations. Next, I will explore some key elements of a critical perspective and some of its limitations. Then, I will discuss my analysis of organizational identification and how it manages both interpretive and critical concerns.

Key Elements of an Interpretive Perspective

Mumby (1997; 2000) helps us understand some of the key elements of interpretivism, or what he terms the "discourse of understanding." Interpretivism has its roots in the linguistic turn in continental philosophy (i.e., hermeneutics and phenomenology) and in Geertz's interpretation of cultures. First, communication takes a social constructionist perspective, meaning that organizational participants socially construct intersubjective systems of meaning and reality through communicative processes (see Berger & Luckmann, 1969). As Mumby (2000) states, this perspective takes serious "the idea that communication is not simply a conduit for ideas about the world, but actually constitutes that world. Thus the discourse of understanding is premised on a dialogic, social constructionist approach to society" (p. 79). Second, an individual is a knowing subject with agency that has the power to produce truth through communication. From this perspective, communication is not the reproduction of truth but its production. Third, because individuals construct their own truth (rather than reproduce it from the physical world "out-there"), there is an ethical component to this discourse. Participants should suspend judgments, eradicate stereotypes, and engage in perspective taking to ensure that everyone is able to participate in the construction of truth. Fourth, while universal knowledge is eschewed, rationality is not negated—just the narrow interpretation of it as scientism and instrumental rationality. Rather, rationality and truth can emerge through dialogic and participative processes of communication. In terms of organizational communication, "what creates community and identity is not structure or physical location but the linguistic construction of shared assumptive grounds

of what is real and meaningful." Fifth, while Habermas (1971) states that the purpose of this discourse is understanding, Mumby (2000) notes that researchers "understand" by "actively engaging with the people that they study in producing truth claims about the world" (p. 79). So, it is impossible for researchers to claim a neutral position "the knowledge they produce, given that they are not simply conduits of those knowledge claims" (p. 79).

There are several benefits of utilizing an interpretive perspective. Researchers utilizing this perspective can provide considerable insight into how texts constitute meaning and reality for members of organizations. Using the hermeneutic circle (Gadamer, 1976; Heidegger, 1962), or by looking at the research phenomenon in comparison with the larger organizational or social context, researchers can come to a depth of understanding of organizational phenomena beyond what a positivistic emphasis on data can generate. Researchers can also strive to represent participants' perspectives and, thus, give voice to participants by letting them speak for themselves. However, critics have often argued that research from an interpretive perspective ignores power that produces and shapes narratives and rhetoric that organizational members use to socially construct meaning. In trying to give equal voice and importance to members' meanings, research from an interpretive perspective can be too relativistic to be practical. As Cheney (2000) states, "by taking multiplicity and polysemy seriously, and by placing variant meanings on equal footing, we may become blind to the workings of power in the situation that have helped to create the very parameters for those meanings. Some of the basic assumption about participant, especially on the part of different groups (by class, educational level, ethnicity, and gender) in the organization may exist on what we may call a 'deep structural' level and may be appreciated well only through attention to issues of power on a scale that transcends the boundaries of the workplace and organization" (p. 34). Ignoring the workings of power on organizational and broader levels can prevent the researcher from seeing important ways that power shapes the way meanings are

constituted and represented. Taking an "'every meaning is sacred' sensibility" also makes it impossible to make value judgments important to practical decision making (Cheney, 2000, p. 35).

Key Elements of a Critical Perspective

This perspective, called a "discourse of suspicion" by Mumby (2000), descends in part from two traditions of Marxism: Western Marxism and Neo-Marxism.[28] Habermas (1971) states that the purpose of this perspective is for "emancipation." In this discourse, the social constructionist orientation of interpretivism is retained but is problematized by showing how power can distort organizational members' production of systems of meaning in ways that favor dominant power interests. From this perspective, power is viewed as a hidden, deep-structure that determines subjects' identities in ways that they can't control and aren't even aware of. Instrumental rationality is viewed as oppressive and counterproductive to alleviating oppression, so oppression can be alleviated by reclaiming reason from it and scientism. Communication is viewed as constitutive to the overcoming of oppression, as reason is re-situated in "practical rationality," or the "lifeworld," in which coercion-free discourse and consensus are viewed as possibilities (see Habermas, 1984). Much organizational communication research from this perspective involves attempting to show, through the birds-eye, elite view of the critic, how identities are constructed and determined by deep-structure power relations (see Adorno, 1991; Althusser, 1971; Blair, Baxter, & Brown, 1994; Clair, 1996; Cloud, 1998; 2004; and Mumby 2004).

Mumby (2004) states that critical research can be divided into two main camps: ideology critique, and dialectics of power and resistance. Early critical perspectives were mostly of the first type, and the "principal goal of much of this work was to expose the ways in which dominant forms of ideological meaning functioned to reproduce extant power relations and foreclose possibilities for resistance and emancipation" (p. 240). From this perspective, texts are seen as fairly complete discursive sites of domination

reproduction, where inequitable relationships of power are normalized and naturalized to the point that organizational members willingly participate in their own domination. Power is seen as held in the hands of the few, is pervasive, and is fairly immune to resistance or transformation (p. 241). Overall, the ideology critique perspective privileges domination and control over resistance and views texts as reproductive of dominant interests in organizational processes (p. 251). As Jermier (1998) states: ideology critique examines "how societies control their members by clothing the iron fist of power in a velvet glove" (p. 236; in Mumby, 2004, p. 241). Most of this critique descends from the Marxist tradition, which views power as a hidden, deep-structure that determines subjects' identities in ways that they can't control and aren't even aware of (with emphasis on the word "determines"). Ideology critique views subjects as being "hailed" and "interpellated" by the discourses of the dominant (see Althusser, 1971).

The second type of critical research described by Mumby (2004) views power as a "dialectical phenomenon characterized by interdependent processes of struggle, resistance, and control" (p. 241). Here, the contradictions and tensions between agency and structure are explored, and the "ability to act otherwise," or resist domination, is a possibility, however limited. Resistance and domination are not binary opposites; rather, they exist in a mutually interdependent relationship, where one text can be subject to multiple interpretations, both of domination and resistance. Texts are seen here not as complete discourses but as fragments of larger social texts (see McGee, 1999) that can be sites for resistance as well as domination; thus, textual analysis should also be supported by an analysis of how the text relates with similar narratives, the larger social structure, and other interpretations of the text by different interest groups (p. 244). Power is seen as contested, productive, and able to be harnessed by multiple and varied interest groups. The goal of the critical-dialectic approach "is not to frame [texts] as either hegemonic or subversive, but rather to critically analyze such narratives as performances within complex discursive articulations that both enable and constrain possibilities for human

communicative praxis" (p. 246; see also O'Connor, 2000). In other words, researchers must analyze how social actors are both subjects and objects of discursive processes (see Foucault, 1994), how they "negotiate the contradictions and tensions of organizational relations of power" (p. 251), and how they produce knowledge through their social systems.

There are several benefits of utilizing a critical paradigm. As goal of the critical perspective in communication theory is to emancipate, researchers pay attention to instances of domination produced by the rhetoric of the powerful. Cheney (2000) identifies three hallmarks of a critically orientated perspective on communication research: "(1) an explicit concern for making value-based assessments; (2) paying special attention to relations of power inwhatever situation is under study; and (3) penetrating and ongoing questioning of basic assumptions (both practically and theoretically speaking)" (p. 36; see Deetz, 1992; Mumby, 1997). However, there are also some limitations. First, Deetz (1992) argues that a researcher who is too sensitive to power and domination may produce a study that is hypercritiqued and overly negative (see Grant, 2005). For example, the positive aspects of an organization may be ignored. Second, a critical approach that is explicitly concerned with value-based judgments may draw criticism from researchers who feel that research and social activism (including taking positions on politics or ethics) should be separated at the risk of invalidating the objectivity of the study. Third, a researcher who has a strong commitment to a value or ethical issue that informs a research phenomenon may, as Cheney (2000) states, "unknowingly suppress certain meanings (or forms of 'evidence') that counter our view. In an effort to advance the 'counterfactual' argument, as many critical researchers do, one incurs both a tremendous burden of proof and a risk of the overzealous pursuit of one's case" (p. 37).

Rhetorical Analysis of Organizational Identification

As Mumby (2005) states, a rhetorical perspective combines interpretive and critical elements by focusing on how rhetoric unobtrusively but powerfully guides

the formation of values and decision premises in organizational members. Expanding this discussion to include all four of Van Dick's (2001) dimensions of organizational identification, the rhetorical study of communication in organizations combines interpretive and critical elements to explore how (1) communication creates and augments leader/member and member/member emotional bonds; (2) a transcendental belief system narrows the available options for organizational members' cognitive identity construction; (3) decision premises are set through organizational rhetoric; and (4) members emphasize important values and discipline each others' adherence to those values through concertive control. Cheney (2000) identifies that there are "many meanings of interpretive" and states that, because of this, an interpretive researcher should identify exactly what they mean when they invoke the term. In the following paragraphs, I will show that my methodological framework combines elements from both interpretive and critical perspectives; but, because of the political context surrounding this dissertation, I lean heavily toward an interpretive perspective.

Analysis of Affective Identification

A rhetorical perspective combines interpretive and critical perspectives by analyzing how social actors create meaning through rhetoric while acknowledging that some messages are more powerful than others. The bond between leader and member in new religious movements has always been viewed as a hierarchical bond, where the leader holds charismatic power over members—and members blindly follow their lead. An interpretive perspective takes the position that members are social actors and have the capacity "to make sense of the world and therefore in certain ways to make it" (Cheney, 2000, p. 22). Rather than being brainwashed followers, members are able to take organizational messages and interpret them rationally. However, this interpretive perspective does not fully account for the emotional bond, the desire of members to follow their leader (Adorno, 1991)—and the physical, emotional, and psychic consequences if they do not. From this perspective, I take a mixed interpretive/

critical view of power. Like Burke (1950), I view power as pervasive and able to be utilized by members as well as leaders. However, I also believe that the emotional bond developed and sustained through rhetoric significantly reduces the desire of members to question or resist organizational messages. Several participants cited the emotional bond they developed with the leader as important identification experiences. From the leader speaking to "little old me" (participant 3) to the leader rubbing a 12-year-old boy's head with affection during a baseball game (participant 23), the ability of the leader to connect emotionally with the people gives the leader substantial power over the people. The members *want* to believe in the leader, and they *desire* to do what he says, which of course inculcates his rhetorical messages with power. Etzioni (1961) calls this type of power "vertical" normative power.

The emotional identification between members is also laden with what Etzioni (1961) terms "social" normative power. Former members in this study frequently referred to their emotional bonds as the overriding factor that caused them to stay for so long. They didn't want to leave their families and friends for a life that they knew nothing about. Only when former members were already being ostracized by their leaders and families did they leave (participant 4, participant 10). This type of power is not just emotional; social normative power is found in the value-based conative identification component, as well. But power, indeed, is held in the hands of many. And by taking a largely interpretive perspective and trying to understand the perspectives of all members of the group—current and former, male and female, young and old—we come to a much richer understanding of organizational identification than a critical one, where the power dynamics are emphasized to the exclusion of how organizational actors collectively create meaning. *Thus, an interpretive perspective is foregrounded.*

Analysis of Cognitive Identification

An analysis of cognitive identification entails coming to understand how members identify with the mythic image, or transcendental belief system, and incorporate this

overarching god-term and the ideologies it encapsulates into their identities. The god-term "kingdom of God" and everything that encapsulates is used by Kingston members to define themselves. "We are members of the Order" (Order, 2009a); and "the Order is the Kingdom of God on Earth" (Order, 2009a) are mantras frequently stated by the Kingston's organizational rhetoric. This inculcation of the transcendental belief system begins at birth and is formally taught by the organization by age three (Order, 2009a). But if we merely focus on what the rhetorical messages are, we miss much of the complexity of cognitive organizational identification. These members willingly incorporate this mythic image into their psyche and interpret organizational mantras in a variety of different ways. Thus, while a critical perspective would agree with critics of new religious movements that organizational members are hailed and interpellated by the messages they encounter, an interpretive look at the ways that members appropriate these messages is more complex and, in my view, more accurate. These people are not without agency—a number of them do, in fact leave the organization—and they are able to interpret the organizational themes and images in a variety of ways. Thus, while we must have, as Cheney (2000) states, a "profound awareness of the power of labeling in the creation of our world" (p. 23), we should also stress the "socially constructed aspects or nature" of social reality (p. 23). *An interpretive perspective is again emphasized.*

Analysis of Behavioral Identification

As Mumby (2005) states, part of the task of rhetorical criticism in organizational communication is to show how decision premises are set by organizational rhetoric. This specific purpose is decidedly critical. In behavioral identification, we are attempting to understand how organizations entice and persuade individuals to adhere to a system of hierarchical authority that controls their behavior. However, an interpretive lean complicates this analysis by showing how members construct the system of authority and are able to resist instances of domination in these systems of control. Here, an analysis of power and authority tends to be more dialectical, where membership is

actively negotiated by the members themselves. Rather than being viewed as merely dominated (as cult studies scholars tend to emphasize), an infusion of interpretivism into the discussion of power and authority allows us to see where the vernacular rhetoric of members subverts authority and even sterilizes it to some extent. For example, in a polygamous patriarchal system, power does seem monolithic and held in the hands of the few. However, several female participants have emphasized that they have a greater degree of control over their lives than many women. Several have stated that, because of polygamy and the network of sister wives, they are able to have a career and numerous children at the same time—it is a difficult task for all women, but they say it is less difficult for them. In addition, the fact that the husband is often not present in the home allows them a greater degree of control over the day-to-day aspects of their lives. One current member states: "My friends in the MBA program (I still go to lunch with them and different things), I've watched their monogamous relationships, you know. And it seems like that I have quite a bit more freedom than they do. It's totally opposite from what the media portrays it to be. As you know, submissiveness, in chains. It's crazy" (participant 27). *Thus, while an analysis of the behavioral aspect of identification tends to be critical, an interpretive lens renders the phenomenon of power more complex than at first glance.*

Analysis of Conative/Evaluative Identification

As Cheney (2000) states, an interpretive lens brings to the foreground an "awareness of the multiplicity of perspectives within any social situation, unit, institution, or process" (p. 23). This is especially important in the discussion of new religious movements. Many people think of a new religious movement as a group of mindless followers brainwashed by the leader. In reality, there are a variety of perspectives within the social network, and leaders and members of the organization discipline these perspectives. For example, as in any culture, families retain their own set of values and emphasize some values over others. The Kingston Administrative Working Manual

penetrates the family system by requiring that organizational values are taught and reported; but there still appears to be some heterogeneity in the values of the individual families. Some Kingston families value education; some value money. Some Kingstons try to adhere to every commandment from the leaders; others obey because it is a requirement, not an internalized value. Some Kingstons think it is sinful to curse; others have no problem with it but feel uncomfortable around the most prudish of the group (participant 10). Although there is an extensive network set up by the organization to discipline and monitor the value system of the family, there is little doubt that there are a variety of perspectives within this organization. *The analysis of the conative dimension of identification is largely interpretive* but does bring into focus the attempts of organizational rhetoric to control these values on individual, familial, and organizational levels.

Methods

In this section, I will discuss the methods I have used to understand organizational identification in the Kingston organization. First, I will discuss the qualitative data collection and analysis process. Next, I will discuss the research questions that inform this study. Then, I will discuss the data collection procedures. Finally, I will discuss the specific data analysis methods used.

Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis

Ruona (2005) reminds us that qualitative data analysis is a process that involves (1) sensing themes, (2) making constant comparisons, (3) recursively analyzing data, (4) using inductive and deductive thinking, and (5) interpreting to generate meaning. Themes are of primary importance to qualitative research. As Merriam (1998) states, qualitative data analysis is "the process of making sense out of the data" (p. 178; in Ruona, 2005, p. 236). This process of sensemaking typically involves being immersed in the data, being open to change the ways things are categorized, and being flexible to

see things in different ways. But most important, analyzing qualitative data involves being able to identify and interpret major themes that emerge from the data. As Ruona (2005) states, "the process of data analysis begins with your ability to recognize the codable moment—that is, to sense the themes emerging from the data" (p. 237). In this study, the study of themes in the Kingston organization is central to my study. Rhetorical themes are analyzed in all three data analysis techniques: extended metaphor analysis, Aristotelian rhetorical analysis, and identification strategy analysis. Thematic analysis is important to understanding a myriad of organizational phenomena, such as how the Kingston organization's identity has shifted; how identification by antithesis is utilized in organizational rhetoric; and how bounded choice is created through the strategic narrowing of themes among members.

Constant comparison is an important element of the data analysis process. The constant-comparative method originally developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) identifies some of its key features: "the researcher begins with a particular incident . . . and compares it with another incident in the same set of data or another set. These comparisons lead to tentative categories that are then compared to each other and to other instances. Comparisons are constantly made within and between levels of conceptualization until a theory can be formulated (Merriam, 1998, p. 159; in Ruona, 2005, p. 237). In my analysis of the Kingston organization, the constant-comparative method is utilized—not as a narrow methodology—but as a general framework. Much of rhetorical analysis involves looking at rhetorical strategies on different levels of analysis, such as narrative, theme, paragraph, and word. And while these rhetorical strategies are being identified, certain patterns begin to emerge. For example, while I originally thought that former members would characterize the organization in economic terms and current members would speak of it as a normative organization (a church), the rhetorical patterns that emerged showed that both former and current members perceive it as a economic organization; the difference is in members' orientation towards it (see Etzioni,

1961). Former members tend to take a critical perspective, characterizing it as "organized crime" or "communism." Current members, on the other hand, put a positive spin on it, preferred not to use labels, and spoke of it as a place where members "come together," "work together," and "help each other" (see Order, 2009). Thus, through constant comparison, I was able to inductively construct categories that fit the data set.

Recursiveness is a third important component of qualitative data analysis. As Ruona (2005) states, "you should not wait to begin your analysis until after all of your data have been collected. Rather, you should begin your analysis with the first interview or observation" (p. 237). Analyzing data at the onset of the data collection process enables researchers to see emerging patterns. It also enables researchers to (1) widen or narrow the scope of the study; (2) adjust the methodology if needed; (3) identify "leads" to pursue and plan further data collection; (4) ask other participants about tentative emerging themes; (6) reflect on potential biases; (7) consider viewing the organization from other metaphors to foreground or background themes; and (8) stimulate literature review (p. 237). This process of simultaneous data collection and analysis has been utilized extensively throughout this case study. For the past 6 years, I have viewed the Kingston organization from a variety of metaphors (machine, political system, psychic prison, instrument of domination, culture, and network of communication; see Swanson, 2005) and used a variety of approaches. I have used a Neo-Marxist perspective to examine the Order as a site of materialist domination; Burke's pentad to understand a former member's "Plyg-opoly" game as a mode of resistance; and a critical rhetorical perspective to examine the organization's use of emotion to persuade. Finally, I have settled on an interpretive approach to understand how the Kingston organization fosters organizational identification among its members.

The use of both inductive and deductive thinking is a fourth component of qualitative data analysis. Sometimes, qualitative data analysis is viewed as an inductive process, while quantitative analysis is seen as a deductive process. Ruona (2005) explains

that an inductive research process "builds abstractions, concepts, hypothesis from the data with the belief that themes will be revealed from the close inspection of accumulated observation and cases" (p. 238). A deductive process, on the other hand, tests a theory by collecting data and comparing the data against the hypothesis to confirm or disconfirm a theory. While a large and fundamental process of qualitative data analysis is inductive, where researchers identify themes that emerge from the data, deductive reasoning is also used as "tentative categories, properties, and hypotheses continually emerge and must be tested against the data" (p. 238). In this research study, the interview data were collected over a period of a year and a half. Beginning in June 2008, I was able to interview 14 current and 14 former members. This took some time for several reasons, the most important of which being that the Kingstons wanted to test the research process with a few participants before they allowed the rest to be subjected to the interviews. The gathering of organizational documents took place before the interviews started and ended several months afterwards, as new documents were released into the public domain through the court system. During the past several years, I have gone over the data again and again, searching for patterns and themes that shed light on the process of organizational identification. After several years of testing many different theories in many different disciplines, I can say that the categories explained in the theory section are the best ones I can find to explain the phenomena I observed and recorded. Once these categories were constructed, I used deductive analysis to test the data and see how well it fit with the categories and themes.

Fifth, interpreting to generate meanings is also an important component of qualitative data analysis. During the analysis of data, we must engage in the creative work of interpretation. We offer our own perspective of what is going on in the data. In this interpretive research, the goal is to offer my interpretation of how *members* interpret and socially construct their organization. Regardless, the coherence of the study is found not by examining what's "in" the data but what the data means. Coffey and Atkinson (1996) refer to this as *abductive* reasoning. This is when we

> start from the particular . . . and try to account for that phenomenon by relating it to broader concepts. We do so by inspecting our own experience, our stock of knowledge of similar, comparable phenomena, and the equivalent stock of ideas that can be included from within our disciplines (including theories and frameworks) and neighboring fields. In other words . . . we seek to go beyond the data themselves to locate them in explanatory or interpretive frameworks. (p. 156; in Ruona, 2005, p. 239)

This interpretive process of theory building generates two main types of theory, as identified by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Substantive theory makes sense of the particular, or the information about the case study that emerges from the data. Formal theory is more generic and seeks to apply the theory to a broader scope of organizational phenomena. Abductive reasoning incorporates both by pushing beyond the particular to see whether the data is able to be utilized in other contexts. As Ruona (2005) states, the abductive process strives to create formal theory where "our inferences allow us to move conceptually across a wide variety of social contexts . . . moving toward the development of theory to explain the data's meaning, [and enabling] a qualitatively new understanding of relevant fragments of social reality" (p. 240; see Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). In my prospectus meeting, one of the major concerns of the committee was whether this study would be sufficiently generalizable, that is, whether formal theory could be developed from the particular case study. I have been sensitive to this concern especially during the past two years, as I have tried to engage in abductive reasoning and move from substantive theory to formal theory. Through this process, I have been able to recognize patterns in the data that correspond with theory on a broader level. Specifically, the particular data in this case fit very well with theories of unobtrusive control in several disciplines: rhetoric (Burke, 1950); sociology (Lalich, 2004); psychology (Van Dick, 2001); and organizational communication (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985). After exploring the data in the case study in depth, I feel confident saying that formal theory can be constructed based on this data that is generalizable at least to organizational identification in new religious movements. According to Burke (1950), the hierarchical, rhetorical

identification patterns we are seeing with respect to unobtrusive control are universal; but without examining whether these same data are seen in other types of organizations, I do not feel comfortable making sweeping generalizations.

In sum, the qualitative data collection and analysis process used in this case study is guided by five major processes: sensing themes, constant comparison, recursiveness, the use of both deductive and inductive reasoning, and interpreting through abductive reasoning.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to understand rhetorical appeals and identification strategies that contribute to organizational identification and disidentification in the Kingston polygamous organization and which organizational dimensions they highlight. Following are the research questions I used to explore these phenomena.

> RQ1 (re: Rhetorical strategies): What types of rhetorical strategies are used to promote member identification in the Kingston organization and which organizational dimensions are highlighted by them?

This RQ was intended to assess the different types and frequency of rhetorical strategies used *by the organization* to promote OI. I wanted to understand which types of rhetorical strategies are used by the organization. By organizational "dimensions," I mean the business, religious, and familial aspects of the organization. Examples of organizational rhetoric include key doctrinal texts (e.g., the Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants, or "Perfecting Meditations"); in-house documents (e.g., Sunday School lesson manuals for adults and children); and administrative checklists and charts in the Administrative Working Manual. See the methodology section for a specific list of key documents that were used in the rhetorical analysis.

> RQ2 (re: Member identification): How do members account for their identifications with the organization, and in what ways do they draw upon rhetorical resources of the organization?

This RQ was intended to assess how members interpreted and drew upon organizational rhetoric to explain their membership and identification with the organization. This was done through analyzing narrative accounts of identification turning points provided in the Retrospective Interview Technique, or RIT (Bullis and Bach, 1989), explained in detail in the methodology section below.

> RQ3 (re: Turning points in the individual/organizational relationship): How do members account for possible turning points in their relationships with the organization, in terms of the establishment, strengthening, weakening, or severance of bonds?

This RQ was intended to assess the different types of rhetoric that promote (dis) identification. The Retrospective Interview Technique enabled me to assemble a rich text of member narratives about the organizational rhetoric that was most salient to them. Using the transcripts as a rhetorical text, I looked specifically for rhetoric that participants cited as important in inducing a change in identification levels.[29]

Mumby (2004) states that the critical perspective is a version of the modernist, Enlightenment project, "with its efforts to emancipate human beings from conditions of domination and oppression" (p. 237). Scholars who invoke the "critical" perspectives are committed to exploring "underlying structures of domination, resistance, and interest-driven discursive strategies that lurk beneath ostensibly consensual meaning systems" (p. 237). Organizations, from this perspective, are "political sites where various organizational actors and groups struggle to 'fix' meaning in ways that will serve their particular interests" (p. 237; see also Deetz, 1992). An organization is a site of power where people in organizations struggle to fix meaning, or set decision premises.

Data Collection

For the data collection process, I conducted elite interviews and gathered salient written organizational rhetoric. I conducted the interviews using Bullis and Bach's (1989) retrospective interview technique to help interviewees focus on specific rhetoric

that contributed to their organizational identification or disidentification. I also gathered salient written documents in two categories: (1) current in-house corporate rhetoric, such as Sunday School lesson manuals for adults and children, the Administrative Working Manual, and the Family Handbook; and (2) documents written by early members during the first years of the organization (between 1930 and 1950), such as the diary of Orlean Kingston Gustafson (the founder's sister), the autobiography of Charles William Kingston (the founder's father), and "perfecting meditations," written by founder C. Elden Kingston.

Elite Interviews: The Retrospective Interview Technique

Baxter and Bullis (1986) and Bullis and Bach (1989) used what is called the "Retrospective Interview Technique" (RIT) to assess turning points in organizational identification. Miell (1984) found the technique was valid after finding that people were highly accurate in recalling turning points. And Stohl (1986) found that an "overwhelming percentage of respondents were able to recall a specific message which had a lasting influence on their life" (p. 278). In the following section, I will give a brief explanation of the use of the Retrospective Interview Technique and the advantage of using it to study organizational identification.

Baxter and Bullis

In Baxter and Bullis's (1986) study, participants were asked to identify all turning points in their relationships since first meeting their relational partners. They were also asked to plot on graphs both the time in months from the first meeting that the turning point occurred and the strength of the relationship commitment. As each point was plotted, interviewers asked for additional information about the point. In interviews, participants were introduced to the purpose of the study and provided the definitions of turning points and of identification. They were also provided assurances of confidentiality. Graphs divided by monthly intervals and levels of identification were

then provided. Participants plotted and explained identification levels at the time of the interviews and at the beginning of the academic year to provide anchor points to judge the changes in identification levels. Then they plotted points in between these points when identification increased or decreased. As each point was identified, interviewers probed for details regarding the change in identification. Then, the participants drew lines between points to show how their levels had increased or decreased. At the end of this process, participants were instructed to look back over the entire graph and make any changes they considered appropriate. Levels of identification with the organization were then assessed with a shortened version of the OIQ developed by Cheney (1982; 1983a).

Bullis and Bach

While Baxter and Bullis (1986) used RIT to identify turning points in romantic relationships, Bullis and Bach (1989) apply RIT to organizational identification. They state that OI research has over-emphasized the organization's perspective and under-emphasized that of the individual. Identification research, they state, has "focused on organizational strategies more than individual experiences" (p. 275). Turning point analysis (of which retrospective interview technique is a part) is a method used to focus on the perspective of the individual and measure OI both quantitatively and qualitatively. Bullis and Bach (1989) state that through this analysis, "researchers may 'listen' to participants' points of view" (p. 273).

Bullis and Bach state that theories on organizational socialization have often used stage models to conceptualize and measure the socialization process over time (e.g., Feldman, 1976; Schein, 1971; Van Maanen, 1975). These models typically have between three (Van Maanen, 1975) and six (Wilson, 1984) stages through which individuals move to become socialized to the organization and often eventually come to identify with it. Identification is defined by Bullis and Bach as "a fundamental process of relational development and as a product involving feelings of similarity, belonging, and membership" (p. 275; see also Cheney, 1982). OI is often included in organizational

socialization models and treated as an outcome of OI socialization (see Jablin, 1986). The drawback, Bullis and Bach state, is that while these models are helpful in understanding change as a broad phenomenon, they do not describe specific points of change (p. 274).

Bullis and Bach state that turning point analysis focuses on the perspective of the individual and attempts to pinpoint specific points of change in OI. Bolton (1961) first used the term to discuss patterns of change, and Baxter and Bullis (1986) defined a turning point as "any event or occurrence that is associated with change in a relationship" (p. 470) and argued that turning points constitute "the substance of change" (p. 470, in Bullis & Bach, 1989, p. 276).

Bullis and Bach (1989) state that analyzing turning points has numerous benefits. First, it does not assume that the socialization (and identification) process follows a clear pattern of growth. In this it differs from phase models and earlier identification research. Second, it allows a detailed examination of change as identified by participants. In this way, change patterns are able to be viewed based on the participants' perspectives, not forced into a "researcher-generated definition" (p. 276). Third, the method advocates collecting self-reports in the recent past, not distant past, thus increasing the potential for accuracy. And fourth, turning point analysis relies on the individual's perspective, not the organization's perspective.

Because Bullis and Bach's (1989) retrospective interview technique figures so prominently into my data collection, it is important to describe RIT as it was used by Bullis and Bach. In Bullis and Bach's study, 28 graduate students in three different communication departments were contacted during the first week of class and asked to participate in a study throughout the academic year. This study intended to answer five research questions: (1) what phenomena comprise socialization turning points in the perceptions of organizational newcomers? (2) Do specific turning point events coincide with specific socialization phases? (3) Do types of turning points differ in the degree to which they affect participants' experiences of immediate change in organizational

identification? (4) Is organizational identification (as outcome) associated with the presence or absence of specific types of turning points? And (5) does organizational identification (as outcome) increase over time?

RIT was used to direct interviews. In both interviews, participants were first asked to describe their level of identification with the department at the time of the interviews and four months prior to the interview to provide anchor points by which to judge changes in identification. Participants plotted these anchor points on a graph. They then plotted points between these anchor points to show when identification increased or decreased. As each point was identified, interviewers asked for details about the experience in which change in identification occurred. At the end of the interview, participants completed the OIQ to assess identification levels.

When interviews were completed, notes were condensed into concise descriptions of turning point events. Turning point types were then inductively derived based on the data provided by participants. Bullis and Bach derived a set of 15 turning point types. Each researcher then independently generated a set of turning point categories using the "clustering" technique described by Miles and Huberman (1984). Categories were then compared and collapsed into a single set. Inter-researcher reliability was found to be .85 using Cohen's kappa.

In Bullis and Bach (1989), two interviews were conducted with each participant. The first was conducted approximately 4 months after the beginning of the academic year (when the study began); and the second was conducted 4 months afterwards, or 3 weeks prior to the end of the academic year. Bullis and Bach (1989) were able to overcome potential drawbacks of memory erosion (Kram, 1985) and static models of relationships among variables (Bullis and Bach, 1989, p. 278) by employing the RIT at 4-month intervals. It is the assessment of change in identification between first and second interviews that turn the retrospective interview technique into turning point analysis. Unfortunately, because of limited access to Kingston members, I was fortunate that members agreed to be interviewed once, so I was limited to using the RIT and not the full turning point analysis.

Following is the interview format I used to collect interview data used to help answer research questions 1, 2 and 3: "What types of rhetorical strategies are used to promote member identification in the Kingston organization, and which organizational dimensions are highlighted by them?"; "How do members account for their identifications with the organization, and in what ways do they draw upon rhetorical resources of the organization?"; and "How do members account for turning points in their relationships with the organization, in terms of the establishment, strengthening, weakening, or severance of bonds?" These research questions served as guidelines for me, the researcher, to focus the interview on rhetorical strategies of the organization and members' uses of rhetoric (including appropriation of organizational rhetoric) in connection with organizational identification. These questions were semi-structured with one overarching question: "How would you rate your identification with the Kingston organization, and what were these important identification experiences that produced, maintained, or decreased that identification?"

Introduction

First, as interview participants entered the room, I greeted them, introduced myself, and outlined the purpose of the study. I had participants sign a consent form and explained the procedures of the interview, as well as safeguards taken to ensure their privacy and the confidentiality of the interview. All participants agreed to have their voices recorded to later be transcribed.

Anchor Points

First, I asked participants to plot their current identification levels. Then, I asked them to plot identification levels when they entered the organization. All but one of the participants were born into the organization or joined with a parent as young children, so they plotted their beginning anchor point from the first time they recalled feeling identified with the organization. I asked participants especially about the experience

of identification at the time of entry and looked for a narrative about the event. I asked questions focusing on cognitive ("what were you thinking?"); affective ("what were you feeling?"); evaluative ("how did others respond to your identification?"); and conative or behavioral ("what were you doing?") elements within the narrative that led them to describe their organizational identification and organizational rhetoric that produced that identification (Van Dick et al., 2001). I also probed for specific rhetoric ("What did the speaker say, exactly?" or "What did you read that led to your identification with the organization?") that led to this identification. Probes for anchor points and turning points included but were not limited to the following: (a) "what were you thinking?"; (b) "how did you feel?"; (c) "how did others respond to this identification?"; (d) "what were you doing?"; (e) "what did the speaker say?"; (f) "what was written that led you to identify with the organization?" A deliberate effort was made to ensure that probes were not leading or otherwise manipulative. They were used with the express purpose of highlighting rhetorical strategies used to facilitate the process of organizational identification.

Turning Points

After anchor points were plotted, I asked participants to plot other experiences in which they felt a change in identification with the organization, either positive or negative. I asked them to tell about the specific experiences that led to this change in identification, focusing on cognitive, affective, evaluative, and conative elements of OI in the narrative. Nearly all current member participants were either unwilling or unable to express less than 100% identification with the organization, so to continue the interview I rephrased the question and asked them to chart "important identification experiences that stood out" in their minds, even if they were not responsible for changing their identification levels. Current member participants were able and willing to talk about identification experiences in these terms. So, while I was unable to gather valid turning point data, I was able to gather rich textual data that I later analyzed rhetorically.

Concluding the Interview

At the end of the interview, I had participants look at the identification graph with plotted turning points (or, in the case of current member participants, "important identification experiences") and asked if the chart was complete and whether they wanted to add or change anything. Then I thanked them for their participation, and they left the room.

Portions of the interview with participant 2 are included below to illustrate the interview procedure.

Sample Interview (Participant 2):

Researcher: How would you rate your identification with the Davis County Cooperative Society? Identification is your feeling of oneness or belongingness to the organization, like feeling loyalty to the organization or feeling a sense of pride that you're a member.

Participant 2: I think it's a hundred percent. [charts]

Researcher: What was the first time you remember feeling identified? When you were a little girl? When you were baptized? When you were married? When you really felt like you belonged.

Participant 2: I think that because I was born into it, it was always there. Of course you always have your family unit when you're a little kid—your mom, your dad, your brothers and sisters. Then I grew up in a community that was all people were part of the Davis County Cooperative Society. You had your friends that you played with. . . . That was just life, we didn't know we were any different.

I didn't know that we were polygamists until the kids at school told me. At that time, there was just a mom and a dad and kids. [My dad] only had the one family. But we were living on the farm, and we were known as the polygamist farm. That didn't make sense to me. I have red hair, my brothers and family had red hair and there were three of us that had brown hair. We'd go on the bus and they'd say, "well they have the same dad but different moms." I'd look at them like, "what are you talking about? We have the same mom and the same dad. It's not unusual for the same mom and the same dad to have kids with different colors of hair. But my dad had red hair and my mom had brown hair. So half of us had red hair and half of us had brown hair. So it wasn't until I got into school that I learned we were different.

My dad, later on, did get another family, did get an addition to his family, and I was old enough to know and he sat us down and explained to us kids what was going on. . . .

living the principle of plural marriage. So he took on another family.

Researcher: How did you feel at that time?

Participant 2: I was fine with it. I actually—the woman that came, that joined with my dad—I became best friends with her younger sister. It was nice for me because she became like a sister to me. It was like getting another sister. So from that point, I knew what it was like to have what you call an "extended family." The way things worked out, my mom actually died when I was quite young. I was 15 when she passed away. We still had the family structure. I know it wasn't the same as it would have been if my mom would have survived, but . . . she died of cancer.
Anyway, I think that it always felt like a part of things. There was always the family unit and the community unit, then the broader picture of people you met. My dad actually started having dances. He's the one that started holding dances and inviting everybody that was part of the group to the dances. That helped the group, socially, I'm sure.
He would have them once a month. That helped to bring people together socially, so everyone got to know each other. . . .

Researcher: What was an experience that stands out in your mind as moving from the childhood sense of "I belong because I'm part of the family" to "I belong on my own? I am connected, myself, too?"

Participant 2: I would say it's probably when I began working in one of the businesses. I had the feeling like I was accomplishing things for the business. It made me feel like I was part of things, not just because my family was, but because I was. They made me feel like I was an important part of things—that what I was doing was important. . . .

Researcher: So where would you put that experience?

Participant 2: I'm going to stay up here [charts at 100% throughout the interview. At this point in time, participant 2 talked about how she had always felt 100% identification, so I adjusted my question to continue receiving information about rhetoric that influenced her organizational identification.]

Researcher: What's another time that you remember feeling very connected?

Participant 2: Probably when I found my eternal, lifelong, mate.

Researcher: Can you describe that experience?

Participant 2: Well, finding what we consider our eternal mate is a process where, the way we believe is basically have you heard the phrase "match made in heaven?" so we believe in praying with Heavenly Father and learning who that person might be and where we would fit in and would be the happiest. Just finding who that person is and connect with him. . . . [the interview continues.]

Researcher: Are there any others that stand out in your mind as being important to your identification?

Participant 2: No, not really, I don't think so. You know, when you have a lot of kids, and sickness, sometimes you have to go to the hospital, there's different things like that that tear at your emotions. But anytime anything like that happens it just makes you stronger.

[I turned off the voice recorder and thanked her for participating. We chatted for a little bit to make the atmosphere more relaxed and comfortable for her, then she left the room.]

Collecting Data in a Politically Heated Environment

The question of whether I would be able to find valid data in a politically charged environment was forefront in my mind during the data collection stage. To protect the safety and privacy of interview participants, Institutional Review Board (IRB) protocols do not allow cold calling; and advertisements asking for volunteers from the Kingstons certainly would not work. Kingston members have traditionally been especially reticent about volunteering information about the organization, and it has been only recently that they have decided to let their voices be heard about fundamentalism and religious freedom.

Before I began the data collection process, I received approval from the IRB to conduct the study. Both my committee chair and I were deeply concerned with the political climate and wanted to be sure that all protocols were followed exactly to ensure the safety and privacy of all participants.

While I consulted with the Attorney General's office before the data collection stage, I was not required to submit my interview questions or data collection procedures in advance. The Attorney General's office was not formally involved in the study, although they were very helpful in introducing me to key people who represented both current and former members. One woman in particular, Carlene Cannon, represented the interests of the Kingstons in the Safety Net Committee. Over the course of several

years, Carlene and I had the opportunity to become better acquainted. Because of her prominent position in the Kingston organization, the Safety Net Committee, and Plural Voices for Polygamy, Carlene was well positioned to solicit interview participants and agreed to do so in the fall of 2008. Carlene asked me to send her a list of questions and more information about what the interview process would be like. I explained the RIT interview (as explained above) and sent her Bullis and Bach's (1990) article as an example of another study that used the Retrospective Interview Technique. The RIT was a good interview structure to use, because Carlene could be assured that a standard format would be followed and that the interview would stay positive and on-task. We communicated through email for approximately 1 week; Carlene did not ask me to make any changes, nor did she attempt to change the interview process in any way. She was concerned only with the safety and privacy of the interviews, as was I. After the interview study was explained sufficiently, she then agreed to help me find interview participants.

Rowenna Erickson, a former member of the Kingston organization and a co-founder of Tapestry Against Polygamy, was the woman who found former Kingston members to participate in the interview process. Rowenna served in the same capacity for former members that Carlene did for current members. Rowenna, however, was not concerned with the interview format and did not require any advance questions or summaries of the study.

Each of these women found participants for me to interview. I did not choose from a pool of participants; they were selected independently by each of these women. Carlene, especially, was concerned about the participants' privacy, so I met most of them at an office location owned by the Kingstons in downtown Salt Lake City. I did not know their names, nor did I have any interest in finding out that information (although some of them volunteered and all signed consent forms). I was concerned only with

finding participants who would speak honestly about their experiences. Former members tended to want me to meet them at their homes for the sake of convenience. Most of the interview participants were female, but three former and four current male members participated.

Because Carlene and Rowenna selected participants (and because each of these women is or has been deeply involved with an advocacy group related to polygamy), I assume that the interview participants selected tended to be the "best" and "worst" of the bunch. I imagine that Carlene asked the individuals most satisfied with the organization to participate in the interview; and I imagine that Rowenna asked the individuals most dissatisfied with the organization to participate. Because of the small sample size, politically charged environment, and limited access to the population, it was necessary to select the sample in this manner. Because of these limitations, I was not able to analyze for any patterns of difference between the demographics of people who agreed to be interviewed and those who did not agree. But because I was able to secure the help of both Rowenna and Carlene, I do believe that the perspectives are balanced, if more extreme than the average current or former member. I also believe that Rowenna and Carlene would affirm that they solicited participants that represented the average current or former member, rather than an outlier.

Relevant Written Organizational Rhetoric

The elite interviews were conducted with the primary focus of understanding which aspects of formal and informal organizational rhetoric are the most persuasive to members in the organization. While there were some gems of organizational rhetoric embedded in the interviews, members appropriately focused on their personal identification with the organization and how they and others appropriated the organizational rhetoric they were taught. The bulk of organizational rhetoric analyzed in

this study came from four sources: “I have faith in Jesus Christ” (Sunday School lesson manual, ages 6-7; Order, 2009a); “The Order: Our Heritage” (adult Sunday School lesson manual; Order, 2009b); “Family Handbook” (Order, 2009c); and “Administrative Working Manual” (Order, 2009d). This organizational rhetoric, previously withheld from public perusal, came into the public domain when it was used as evidence for a civil suit filed by Mary Ann Kingston against the members and businesses that comprise “the Order” (which settled for an undisclosed amount in April 2009). Though these are not the only organizational manuals in the Order, they do give us insight into the organizational rhetoric directed toward children, adults, families, and women. Each one of these documents is described below.

Children’s Sunday School Lesson Manual

“I Have Faith in Jesus Christ” is a year-long Sunday School course for 6- and 7-year-olds “designed to place a desire to do what is right in the heart of every child. The children will learn that by having faith in Jesus Christ, they will please our Father in Heaven” (Order, 2009a, title page). This lesson manual consists of 35 lessons that cover in general terms the religious topics emphasized in the Kingston organization. Some lessons are similar to principles taught by nondenominational Christian groups, like “Jesus Want Us to Love” and “Jesus Loves Each of Us.” Other lessons are based on religious principles taught by the LDS church, such as “A Prophet to Guide Us,” “The Gift of the Holy Ghost,” and “Priesthood Blessings.” Then, there are lessons that are Kingston-specific, like “We Receive Blessings as Members [of the Order],” “Direction in Marriage,” and “The Lord Preserves His Covenant People.” In addition to the lessons, there are three preliminary sections called “Helps for the Teacher,” “ABC Order Standards,” and “Orientation.” These Chapters are directed not toward the children but to the teacher.

Lesson manuals are standardized with the following sections in each Chapter: purpose, preparation, lesson guideline, scriptural supplement, discussion, summary/ closing, homework for children, and prayer calendar. A few of these categories require further explanation. In the "lesson guide" section, there are several subsections: opening your Sunday school class, which contain guidelines for the teacher such as "openly greet the children" and "remind the class to be quiet" (p. 117); and the ABC order standard, in which the featured Order standard is explained and illustrated by a story of an Order member who exemplifies the standard. For example, one order standard is "L is for Loyalty. I will not betray the trust of any of my brothers or sisters or of the Order." The story that follows is about Brother Ray Brown, a current member of the Order who has always been faithful and loyal: "Brother Ray has been loyal to the Order and to its leaders since he joined and received a number. . . . True loyalty and a strong testimony are very necessary for every Order member" (p. 118). In the "scripture supplement" section, teachers are told which stories and events from accepted Order scriptures will be used to illustrate the Order principles taught (some of these supplements are videos). In the "discussion" section, teachers are told to "discuss with the children the following questions." Then several questions are posed with the answers following in parentheses. For example, under the discussion topic "How our leader can help us to be safe" are the following questions and answers: "Whom should we believe? (Our leader) Whom should we obey (Our leader)" "What is the name of the leader? [teacher inserts current leader name here]" (Order, 2009a, p. 120). In the "summary and closing" section, teachers are asked to "testify" of the truth of the principles taught in the lesson, sing a song, say a prayer, and review questions about the lesson. At the end of the lesson children are given one page of homework to review the lesson over the week. On this homework sheet is a set of short-answer questions that children must complete during the week, a place for the

teacher to rate the child's behavior in class on a scale of 1-10, and a prayer calendar for the week (where children check off the days that they meditated on the Order standard of the week and prayed). The formalized and standardized documents (especially the homework sheet), accompanied by the systematic teaching method (i.e., associating a standard with each letter of the Alphabet and studying a new one each week) are powerful organizational rhetorical tools that function as unobtrusive control and set decision premises for young children.

Adult Sunday School Lesson Manual

The lesson manual, "The Order: Our Heritage," is an adult Sunday School course about pre-Order and early Order history. Labeled "adult course E-6, part 2," it is apparently one of many adult courses taught. This particular lesson manual has 34 lessons on topics important to Order history, such as "The Dairy Farm at Woods Cross 2," "Valley Feed and Coal," "History of the Legal Profession of the Order," and "Dragerton Department Store." Almost every Chapter features a different business of the Order (e.g., "CTC Equipment Service"; "Railco") and those that do not discuss important events in Order history, such as the time (in 1959) when Kingston members went before a Grand Jury, and the 1978 establishment of the Latter Day Church of Christ as a nonprofit entity with tax advantages. Only a few topics would be considered "spiritual" by the casual observer, such as "fasting."

Each lesson has the following subsections: purpose (with gospel principles covered in the lesson identified), preparation, and major points of the lesson. There are some interesting features about these lesson plans that should be discussed here. First, teachers for the adult class are expected to be fully prepared and are required to "prayerfully study the lesson a minimum of two weeks in advance, to become familiar with and understand the meaning of the material provided" (Order 2009b, History of the

Legal Profession, p. 1). Second, the prominence of Order businesses in the lesson manual underscores the theme that Kingstons believe they are literally "building the Kingdom of God" through their service in the corporation. Third, gospel principles outlined are not what you might expect from a religious organization; they read more like instructions on how to be a good employee. For example, the gospel principles associated with the "Dragerton Department Store" Chapter are (1) Be genuine, having nothing to hide; (2) Punctuality; and (3) Order standard of chastity and virtue. "Be genuine" is a plea to be honest with the organization and cites a group of "dishonest" people who had "stolen from the store on a regular basis" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 34, p. 3). "Punctuality" is characterized by a story in which a woman learned the importance of being to work an hour early (Order, 2009b, Chapter 34, p. 5). The Order standard of "chastity and virtue" told about the people in Dragerton who had respect for Order members because they were treated well when they came into the store (p. 6). To be sure, business values are emphasized over values that most people identify as "spiritual."

Family Handbook

The Family Handbook is the manual identifying the structure that an Order family should have. It can be characterized as a smaller work-group inside of the organization. The family handbook includes the following sections: family mission statement; introduction (how to use this manual); law of one above another; what is my family (defining your family); responsibilities; and family management. The family mission statement section is a section describing how each family can create a family mantra, or quotable statement describing the identity of the family. The introduction includes advice on how to use the family manual and how the various sections in the manual should be used. These sections include the family handbook, the command center monthly chart, the family home evening resource manual, the monthly packet, the father's and mother's checklists, the training supplement, and the administrative working manual.

The family handbook next discusses the law of one above another and how this principle can be implemented to create a family where everyone knows "where they fit." Under the "relationship with ones under us," mothers and fathers are counseled: "no person is able to find true happiness unless they are able to find and fit in their place. In this government every person's thoughts should be directed toward those under them . . . let every man see well to himself and those placed under his charge and trust in those over him to arrange the affairs above you . . . This life giving force comes from Christ to the anointed one and then down to the fathers to the wives and children in the homes" (Order, 2009c, Chapter 3, p. 1). The section concludes with the statement, "the greatest gift a mother can give her children is a love for their father" (p. 1). Women are given the following counsel in the section, "relationship with ones over us": "if you cannot respect him above you who you can see, how can you respect the Lord who you cannot see? If a woman cannot respect her husband and refuses to have the proper attitude of unity toward him she is being directed from another source . . . The channels of the spirit of the Lord to direct comes from the Lord through his appointed servants down through husbands to wives and to their children" (p. 1). As is readily apparent here, the law of one above another creates the perfect conditions for the organization to set decision premises for its members. The Order leader, through this law, is able to send organizational messages to the leaders of the group, who in turn disseminate it to the men below them, who pass it along to their wives and children. With the members in agreement to follow the ones above them, the leader can be assured that his rhetoric is heard and followed.

The command center monthly chart is a complex organizational chart that every woman is required to complete for her household. The chart, discussed at length in Chapter 8, is truly a rhetorical masterpiece that integrates the multiple roles of each family member in each organizational dimension. The family home evening resource manual provides suggestions to make family home evening interactive and interesting for each family member. Family home evening is a bimonthly family meeting where a

gospel principle is taught by the parents to the children. The monthly packet is a series of charts that each woman is required to turn in to her husband for review each month. This helps to ensure that the father is aware whether his family is complying with organizational requirements related to personal discipline. The father's and mother's checklists are a series of rhetorical questions asked by the organization to its adult members. These checklists are required to be reviewed monthly. The training supplement is a packet of information designed to help fill in the gaps of the family handbook, and the administrative working manual is a document designed to help Kingston members manage their multiple roles and responsibilities.

Administrative Working Manual

This manual is "intended to complement the Family Handbook" and "includes all of the things [the] family will include on a daily, weekly and in some cases a monthly basis. The purpose of it is to help you tie everything together and bring things to a daily action so they will actually happen" (Order, 2009d, p. 1).

The working manual is basically the instruction manual for personal life. It "is what you should have with you during your daily routine" (Order, 2009d, p. 1). The working manual consists of many different charts and lists to manage different aspects of life, tied together by the "command center calendar" which integrates all of the various roles and responsibilities of the Order member. Also accompanying this master calendar includes the household daily schedule, the administrative checklist, the personal checklists, projects and to-do lists, monthly budgets and expense sheets, monthly menus and shopping lists, a monthly activity calendar, and a monthly summary, which the father will read each month to assess how each family is doing.

The working manual is appropriately named, because completing it is a lot of work. Mothers are encouraged to walk around the house with their book in hand and check off children's responsibilities as they complete them (p. 3). Also encouraged is a

place in the working manual to write down thoughts of additional items that an individual wants to accomplish: “Sometimes as we go through our day we need to take a few moments and remember what we are here for and what we are trying to accomplish” (p. 4). Members are encouraged to think constantly of building the Kingdom of God and add to their lists if possible.

In this section, I identified the major sources of data I collected for the study of organizational identification in the Kingston organization. First, I explained the Retrospective Interview Technique and the benefits of using this technique to assess Organizational Identification. I also discussed the necessary adjustment I was required to make during the elite interviews (i.e., encouraging current members to talk about “important identification experiences” rather than “changes in identification levels”). Second, I explained the four major sources of written organizational rhetoric from which the bulk of my examples are gathered: The children’s Sunday School lesson manual, the adult Sunday School lesson manual, the family handbook, and the administrative working manual. I turn now to the procedures for data analysis that were used to assess OI in the Order.

Data Analysis

In the political arena, the debate about the acceptability of polygamy in American society (and the Kingston organization, specifically) is directly related to issues of organizational identity and identification. In relation to the Kingston organization, proponents and detractors characterize the organization in different ways, which lead them to advocate different positions regarding polygamy and the Kingston organization. Two central issues are characterized in fundamentally different ways.

First, there is much debate about what kind of an organization the Order is. It has been characterized by some as an extended network of corporations, and by others a church deserving of religious freedom. Those who characterize the Order as a church are more likely to argue that the Kingstons should be able to practice polygamy as a religious

freedom. Those who characterize the Order as a business are more likely to argue that the Kingstons emphasize polygamy to guarantee cheap and continuous labor for their businesses. Each side views the identity of the organization in fundamentally different ways and forms action plans for redress based on their version of the organization's identity. Those who view the Order as a religious institution are pushing to decriminalize polygamy. Those who see it as a business are pushing for prosecution.

Another political argument about the acceptability of a polygamous lifestyles centers on how members participate in the organization. While some former members assert physical abuse and brute domination, most current and former members agree that members willingly participate in organizational objectives. They define themselves in terms of the organization ("we are members of the Order"; Order, 2009a); they allow the organization to set decision premises for them ("we believe"; Articles of Faith; participant 3; participant 2); and they think in terms of what is best for the organization (their chief objective being to "build the Kingdom of God"; Order, 2009a). However, former members claim that they have been duped and exploited, and their identification was the result of psychological manipulation. Current members, as expected, state they freely choose to participate in the organization and their identification is an individual decision. The issue of exploitation versus free choice is also fundamental to discussing the acceptability of polygamy in American society.

In their seminal article about organizational identity, Albert and Whetten (2004) propose that "organizational identity" has two uses: First, it is used as a scientific concept to examine what is central, distinctive, and enduring about an organization; and second, it is a self-reflexive concept that organizational members use to establish a self-identity. In the first definition, organizational identity is focused on the question, "what kind of organization is it?" In the second question, organizational identity is focused on the question, "how do members use the organization to define themselves?" (see p. 90).

This dissertation aims to explore both definitions of organizational identity, the second encapsulated under the term "organizational identification."

In order to evaluate a complex organization that defies being typified as well assess how members identify with the organization (which includes things like defining oneself in terms of the organization and making decisions based on what is good for the organization), more than one research tool will necessarily be employed. Alvesson and Deetz (2000) state that researchers need to be equipped with a variety of paradigmatic, theoretical, and methodological skills to make good interpretations. Alvesson and Deetz (2000) call this the researcher's "interpretive repertoire" (p. 184, in Grant, 2004, p. 157).

This dissertation used three methodological tools, all from a rhetorical perspective, that shed light on the central issues of organizational identity and organizational identification. Specifically, it addressed the questions, "What kind of organization is the Order?" "What kind of organizational identity(ies) does it have?" "What types of rhetorical strategies are used to promote member identification in the Kingston organization and which organizational dimensions are highlighted by them?" and "How do members account for their identifications with the organization, and in what ways do they draw upon rhetorical resources of the organization?" While participant reactions to data collection procedures did not allow turning point analysis to be used, the interviews collected were rich in data and ideal for rhetorical analysis. The first and second questions were addressed using Albert and Whetten's "Extended Metaphor Analysis." The third and fourth questions were addressed using Cheney's (1984) analysis of Burkean identification strategies and Aristotelian analysis of ethos/pathos/logos (Hill, 1972).

Turning Point Analysis Discontinued

After interviews were completed, audio tapes were transcribed and deidentified,

using code numbers rather than names to protect the identities of interviewers. The compilation of interviews produced a rich organizational document that I analyzed using Aristotelian analysis and Burkean identification (following Cheney, 1983b). Initially, I intended to follow Bullis and Bach's data analysis procedures by categorizing turning points; compiling and comparing them; employing another researcher to categorize turning points; and using Cohen's kappa to measure intercoder reliability.[30] However, current members as a whole were reluctant to express anything less than 100% organizational identification; even those that did "dip" either blamed it on "being a teenager" (participant 18) or said it was not a question of identification—just a "difficult time" in life (participant 1). A chart that showed a horizontal line running across the top of the page was typical.

Current members were much more hesitant than former members to talk about organizational rhetoric, and I felt that if I pushed them it would make them feel uncomfortable—something that I wanted to avoid, because it was apparent that they felt they were taking a personal risk just talking with me.

Turning point analysis worked better for former members, but with these interviews I had the opposite experience: While it was difficult for current members to talk about organizational rhetoric, former members explained the events that led to their disidentification with the organization in vivid detail, almost as if they were reliving the experiences as they told them. Sometimes a statement about something would remind them of another experience, and they would immediately begin a new narrative where the last one ended. I attempted to have participants go back and plot turning points, but many of them (most likely unintentionally) ignored my requests and kept talking about the experiences they had in the organization. Their interviews contained so much valuable organizational rhetoric I worried that focusing too much on plotting the turning points, themselves, would stifle their narratives. I felt the data I was gaining from their autobiographical narratives were more important to my research questions than

the graphs; so while I repeatedly asked former members to plot their turning points on the graph, when they did not do so I chose to continue listening to their very interesting and data-rich narratives. Though I asked participant 5 to plot his turning points on the graph a few different times, he simply drew a line downward from one turning point and said his identification levels "went like this." The chart did not reflect his actual changes in identification, because his narrative was replete with turning points and actually gave me more information on specific organizational rhetoric that influenced his identification levels than any other participant.

In retrospect, though it appears the charts did not accurately describe the turning points of organizational members' identification levels, they were extremely valuable in framing the discussion of organizational identification. The charts may not have charted every turning point, but they kept the interview focused on identification and the participants' narratives on track with the major research questions of the study. Thus, though the turning points cannot be analyzed quantitatively with confidence, it was advantageous to rhetorically analyze the transcripts to understand what the major categories of these turning points are. Because the retrospective interview technique and accompanying charts framed the discussion so well, I do not regret using this method to gather data about members' responses to organizational rhetoric.

Extended Metaphor Analysis

Extended metaphor analysis is, as Albert and Whetten (2004) state, "a strategy for discovering the dimensions of identity" (p. 104). Described as a technique of sensemaking following Weick (1969), EMA is "a method [that] consists of the evocation and testing of comparative and metaphoric statements" (p. 114) that probe the questions, "Is the organization more like an X organization or a Y organization?" and "Is an

organizational event better understood if we think of it as occurring in organization x rather than y?" This analysis can help to explore the question of whether the Kingston is chiefly a church or business organization—or is truly a hybrid organization.

In terms of characterizing an organization, Albert and Whetten (2004) delve further into the concept of organizations with dual identities. They state that "many, if not most, organizations are hybrids composed of multiple types" and are "difficult to classify" (p. 95). Many have both normative and utilitarian components, whose pure types are best represented by "church" and "business" organizations, respectively. These dual-identity organizations also exist in two different formations: as ideographic organizations or holographic organizations. In an ideographic organization, different subunits of the organization exhibit only one identity, "the multiple identities of the organization being represented by different units" (p. 96). In a holographic organization, each internal unit exhibits properties of the organization as a whole, and different identities are diffused and blended evenly throughout the organization. Albert and Whetten state that holographic and ideographic organizations exhibit very different types of behaviors. Ideographic organizations are more likely to possess greater variety and be able to adapt to diverse environmental conditions, but they tend to have greater difficulty in gaining commitment from its members. Holographic organizations have less diversity to draw upon to formulate organizational decisions and are less adaptive; however, once an organizational decision is made it is easier to gain consensus and commitment from organizational members.

The Kingston organization is composed of both business and church components. The Davis County Cooperative Society, the business component, began in 1935. The Latter Day Church of Christ, the religious component, was officially registered as a nonprofit organization in 1978. Together, these entities comprise the Order. What

was not clear, however, was whether this organization is a holographic or ideographic organization. In addition, a third component, the family, muddied the waters in terms of characterizing the organization. Because of these stated dual identities (with the additional complexity of membership primarily being composed of one extended family), extended metaphor analysis is an especially appropriate tool.

Extended metaphor analysis, as articulated by Albert and Whetten (2004) is comprised of five steps. First, a group of puzzles, difficulties, features, characteristics, and dilemmas were assembled for the Kingston organization. Second, a set of alternative organizations were characterized and broadly defined. In this case, it was simple to identify these organizations, and the Kingstons themselves stated that their organization is both a business and a church. Third, I analyzed how the target was like each of the metaphor candidates. In this case, I analyzed the Kingston organization in terms of both a business and a church. Fourth, I determined whether the target organization faced any of the six conditions predicted to be times when the issue of identity was especially salient. These six points include the formation of the organization, the loss of an identity-sustaining element, the accomplishment of an organization's raison d'etre, extremely rapid growth, a change in the "collective status," and retrenchment. And fifth, using each metaphoric identity (in this case, church and business), a new set of difficulties were predicted based on what would be central issues of identity given the metaphoric identity (e.g., if the Kingston organization were viewed as a church rather than a business).This type of analysis is a very broad-level analysis related to the organization's identity as a whole.

Classical Aristotelian Analysis

To be sure, there are many different types of rhetorical analysis available and many different rhetorical tools upon which to draw. Aristotelian analysis is important to

my case for the following reasons. First, the purpose of classical Aristotelian rhetorical analysis, as defined by Hill (1972), is to discover "whether the speaker makes the best choices from the inventory to get a favorable decision from a specified group of auditors in a specific situation" (p. 374). This is my purpose, as well, as I aim to assess which organizational and member rhetoric is most effective in inducing and sustaining identification. This approach is designed to assess whether a rhetorician achieved certain results with a specific audience on a specific occasion and doesn't necessarily ask us to estimate the truth or reality of statements or values.

Edwin Black (1965) describes one possible method of Aristotelian criticism as follows: "The primary and identifying ideas of Aristotelianism that we find recurring in the critical essays of this school are the classification of rhetorical discourses into forensic, deliberative and epideictic; the classification of 'proofs' or 'means of persuasion' into logical, pathetic, and ethical; the assessment of discourse in the categories of invention, arrangement, delivery, and style; and the evaluation of rhetorical discourse in terms of its effects in its immediate audience" (p. 31). Hill limits his analysis even further, stating that the task of an Aristotelian critic is to outline the rhetorical situation; specify the audience; define the decisions they are to make; reveal choice and disposition of three persuasive factors—logical (logos), psychological (pathos), and characterological (ethos); and evaluate choice against standard of the Rhetoric. Rhetoricians such as Hill (1972), Black (1965), Wander (1984), and McKerrow (1989) debate about the task of the rhetor and how Aristotle's Rhetoric should be applied; but they all agree that the Rhetoric should be applied. I take a classical Aristotelian approach, bracket out the ontological and epistemological issues, and use the Rhetoric as a method for analysis of the organizational and vernacular rhetoric of the Kingston organization—a method that sheds much light on the use of rhetoric to induce and promote organizational identification.

Second, Aristotelian criticism, with its focus in part on rhetorical appeals, is obviously highly congruent with Tompkins's (1987) theory that different types

of authority in organizations (traditional, legal-rational, and charismatic) maintain legitimacy through the use of different appeals (pathos, logos, and ethos, respectively). It is only natural, then, that a rhetorical case study of an organization that includes three different types of legitimate authority should use Aristotelian analysis to analyze whether the rhetorical appeals are indeed congruent with types of legitimate authority.

In the Aristotelian analysis, I used the following guidelines for analysis.

1. First, I outlined the rhetorical situation in terms of speaker, message, and audience. Because this organization has a single speaker that represents the organization at large (Paul Kingston, the leader); the texts/messages of the leader are clearly defined as official or unofficial (i.e., rhetoric spoken in church meetings is clearly defined as an official organizational text; rhetoric spoken to his wife is not); and the audience is largely homogeneous and bounded (i.e., they are encouraged to eliminate the influence of competing rhetorical messages from the "outside" in their lives), the traditional model of the rhetorical situation is applicable.
2. Next, I specified the audience to whom organizational messages were specifically targeted and defined the decisions that organizational rhetors had to make in terms of rhetorical type (forensic, epideictic, deliberative). Where possible, I also identified the premises (value, predictive) accepted by the audience. Much of the organizational rhetoric falls into epideictic and deliberative types. The more the organization can set the values of the members and direct what they praise or reject, or set decision premises for them, the more power organizational messages will have. Because the Order is continually directing members to focus on the reward and/or consequences in the afterlife, deliberative rhetoric is also used.
3. Then, I analyzed the rhetoric in terms of rhetorical appeals: logical (logos), psychological (pathos), and characterological (ethos). As will be explained in detail in the next Chapter, pathetic appeals by the organization were used with much higher frequency than ethical or logical appeals.

4. Finally I evaluated organizational rhetoric against standard of the Rhetoric. The verdict? Rhetorical strategies of the Order are highly persuasive, and they are becoming more so over time.

The unit of analysis in the Aristotelian analysis is the episode. In the interviews, chunks of data were broken up by participants, themselves, into "important identification experiences." This had two major benefits. First, the structure of the interviews made it easier to code data systematically, because there was a predefined unit of analysis. Second, it ensured that both current and former members received equal attention in the analysis, because participants, themselves, told me what should be regarded as an important identification experience. However, it should be noted that because former participants gave many more identification experiences than current members, the perspectives of former members may have been represented with more frequency in the dissertation (although special care was taken to present the perspectives of members equally). The previous four steps were taken for each one of these episodes.

In addition to this interview data marked as episodes by participants, the Order's written organizational rhetoric was also analyzed. Here, data were used in a supplementary role to support emerging data from the interviews. The written organizational rhetoric was perused and studied numerous times but was not easily broken into systematic chunks of data.

In summary, Aristotelian analysis can help us understand the rhetorical types, premises, and appeals that are most effective in creating and sustaining identification and legitimate authority in the Kingston organization. This classical focus assumes a traditional rhetorical situation, where a single speaker is giving a bounded text to a largely homogeneous audience.

Burkean Identification Strategies

In addition to using a Aristotelian approach to analyzing rhetorical appeals, I adopted a Burkean framework to analyze rhetorical strategies that are particularly salient to

Burke's theory of consubstantiality ("to identify A with B is to make A 'consubstantial' with B"; 1950, p. 21). Scholars such as Cheney (1983) and Adler (1995) have used this perspective to examine how organizations encourage identification through the use of three rhetorical strategies: identification through similarity, identification through antithesis, and identification through the common "we." Burkean (Burke, 1950) rhetoric broadens the scope from obvious instances "persuasion" or attempts at such to "identification," encompassing a range of connections between the receiver and resources of identity (including associations with words, people, objects, ideologies, etc.). Adler (1995), specifically, uses these strategies to examine identification rhetoric used by leaders of two Lutheran organizations, one newly formed and one established, finding that the rhetoric of the leader of the long-established church used significantly more common ground and "assumed we" appeals than did the leader of the newly established organization. My analysis consisted of the following:

1. First, I looked for rhetoric that attempted to identify through similarity, through antithesis, through the common "we," and through unifying symbols.
2. Next, I broke down rhetoric that identified through similarity into Cheney's (1983b) common ground technique categories: (1) Expression of concern for the individual; (2) recognition of individual contributions; (3) espousal of shared values; (4) advocacy of benefits and activities; (5) praise by outsiders; and (6) testimonials by employees. While most of the rhetoric fit nicely into one of these categories, some resisted categorization, which led me to identify a new common ground category: "listening to/understanding another's perspective." I felt that in this case study, "espousal of shared values" and identification through the common "we" were too similar in practice to separate; in addition, they are both identification strategies designed to induce

people to cooperate based on commonality; therefore, I combined these two categories.

3. Third, I identified the types of people that the Order used identification by antithesis against. Most were well educated people, like doctors and teachers.
4. Fourth, I identified instances where the "assumed we" was used. I identified rhetoric as an "assumed we" when participants referred to "we believe that . . ." or "in our organization, we . . ." I identified types of decision premises that were set through the "assumed we" strategy.
5. Finally, I identified unifying symbols that, just by virtue of their form, carried with them positive identification with the organization. Some of these symbols included praying with hands in a unified prayer position and facing the "holy spot" to pray.

As in the Aristotelian analysis, data were derived from the interviews. The unit of analysis was the episode bracketed by participants as an "important identification experience."

In sum, though turning point analysis was not used in the data analysis, turning point analysis yielded rich participant narratives suitable for rhetorical analysis. These interviews, combined with relevant organizational documents, were analyzed using Extended Metaphor Analysis (Albert & Whetten, 1985), Aristotelian analysis (Hill, 1972), and Burkean identification strategy analysis (Cheney, 1983b). Table 2 summarizes my methodological approach.

Table 2. Data Sets and Analysis Techniques Used to Investigate RQs

Research Question	Data Set/Texts for Analysis	General Approach to Data Collection	General Approach to Data Analysis
RQ1 (re: Rhetorical strategies): What types of rhetorical strategies are used to promote member identification in the Kingston organization, and which organizational dimensions are highlighted by them?	RIT Narratives	Conducted elite interviews from Dec. 2009-Dec. 2009.	Rhetorical Analysis: 1. Aristotelian analysis; 2. Burkean identification strategies; 3. EMA analysis (to understand the types of organizational dimensions)
	Organizational in-house Documents: 1. children's Sunday School manual; 2. adult Sunday School manual; 3. family handbook; 4. administrative working manual.	Obtained materials from Matheson Courthouse in Salt Lake City	
RQ2 (re: Member identification): How do members account for their identifications with the organization, and in what ways do they draw upon rhetorical resources of the organization?	RIT Narratives	Conducted elite interviews from Dec. '09-Dec. '10.	Rhetorical Analysis: 1. Aristotelian analysis; 2. Burkean identification strategies.
	Diary of Orlean Kingston Gustafson; Autobiography of Charles William Kingston	Obtained materials from former Kingston members.	
	God's Brothel (2004); *Polygamy Primer* (2006); *Voices in Harmony* (2000)	Published books.	
RQ3 (re: Turning points): How do members account for possible turning points in their relationships with the organization, in terms of the establishment, strengthening, weakening, or severance of bonds?	RIT Narratives	Elite interviews with current/former Kingston members.	Rhetorical Analysis: 1. Aristotelian analysis; 2. Burkean identification strategies.

Conclusion

In this Chapter, I discussed the methodology I used to analyze the Davis County Cooperative Society/Latter Day Church of Christ, also colloquially called the Kingston organization or the Order. In the first section, I explained rhetorical criticism as a middle ground between interpretive and critical aims. In the second section, I first discussed data collection procedures: Bullis and Bach's (1989) retrospective interview technique along with collecting in-house organizational documents. Next, I explained the data analysis procedure, where I used three different types of rhetorical analysis: (1) Extended metaphor analysis; (2) Aristotelian analysis; and (3) analysis using Burkean identification strategies (Cheney, 1983b).

The next four Chapters highlight the results found from this rhetorical analysis. Chapter 5 discusses the results of the Extended Metaphor Analysis. In this Chapter, I discuss the identity of the Kingston organization as a triple hybrid organization with normative (church), utilitarian (business), and family dimensions (Albert & Whetten, 1985). In Chapter 6, I discuss the results of the Aristotelian analysis. Here, I argue that the addition of the behavioral component of OI (championed by Van Dick et al., 2005, among others) provides a four-dimensional model that corresponds well with Aristotle's bipartite soul (in contrast with Plato's tripartite soul of affective, cognitive, and conative aspects). The four component of the bipartite soul are all related to one another, a theory which explains the results of the Aristotelian analysis of rhetorical proofs. From this analysis, we are better able to understand why Lalich (2004) states that the four dimensions of bounded choice are interlocking. Chapter 7 explains the results of the Burkean Identification Analysis, in which the rhetoric of members is analyzed in terms of identification strategies. Finally, Chapter 8 discusses the conclusions, implications, limitations, and possible extensions of this study. Ultimately, I hope to convey that

recruitment, socialization, identification, and retention of members in new religious movements is a rhetorical identification process with affective, cognitive, conative, and behavioral dimensions.

CHAPTER 5

"KINGDOM OF GOD": THE DAVIS COUNTY CO-OP AND LATTER DAY CHURCH OF CHRIST

"What is the Order? The Kingdom of God on this Earth" (Order, 2009a, p. 47).

In the previous Chapters, I laid out the theoretical and methodological frameworks for this study. Chapter 5 now discusses the results of the Extended Metaphor Analysis articulated by Albert and Whetten (1985). This analysis highlights the identity of the Kingston organization as a hybrid organization with three fully integrated dimensions: normative (church), utilitarian (business), and family.

Extended Metaphor Analysis

As explained at length in Chapter 4, qualitative data analysis is a combination of inductive and deductive thinking. Abductive reasoning is used, in which substantive theory is transcended by pushing past the particular case to construct formal theory that has wider application to a variety of social phenomena (see Ruona, 2005). Albert and Whetten (1985) discuss the benefits of utilizing abductive reasoning (although they call it something different) in the analysis of organizational identity.

Albert and Whetten (1985) state that identity as a scientific concept can be conceived as a "multidimensional construct where the problem is to identify, define, and then measure the dimensions of interest" (p. 104). There are two broad, well-established approaches to approaching organizational identity. The first is inductive, where an organization is examined in detail without a theoretical point of view; the

organization's identity, or the organizational dimensions that are central, distinctive, and enduring, are arrived at through induction, or generalization from the organization's peculiar characteristics. The second approach is to work deductively from a theory that "supplies relatively well defined identity-relevant dimensions" (p. 105). Nonprofit versus profit is one example of a well-established framework. Albert and Whetten suggest a third alternative that "adopts a middle course" (p. 105). In this middle ground, which they call extended metaphor analysis, organizations are not defined but characterized. They explain:

> If there is no comprehensive theory to predict how many identities an organization has, or how the dimensions of each are to be defined, then another alternative is to characterize rather than to define each provisional identity and then carry out what we call extended metaphor analysis (EMA) as a way of retrospectively sharpening the definition of each identity and the dimensions that underlie or compose it. (p. 105)

Extended metaphor analysis, then, aims to define one organization in terms of another. While EMA is conceived as having broader application, the example they give of analyzing an organization in terms of a business or church fits very well for our purposes. Albert and Whetten state: "With respect to the normative-utilitarian dimension, EMA is a way of asking in what ways a given organization is like a church (representing a normative organization), or a business (representing a utilitarian organization)" (p. 105).

Extended metaphor analysis is especially appropriate for analyzing organizations that appear to have two or more identities encapsulated in one organization. Albert and Whetten state: "The ability to sustain two alternative metaphoric descriptions of the organization is the primary test of duality. To establish duality it must be shown that each metaphor can be applied to events of fundamental character that distinguish the organization from others, over time. The hypothesis of duality also assumes power to the extent that the metaphor is capable of being applied to a wide variety of organizational events" (p. 105). The fit between two metaphoric analogues must be both close and extensive.

As an example of EMA, Albert and Whetten (1985) characterize the university as a combination of utilitarian and normative organizations. Luckily for us, these are

also the perfect metaphoric analogues for the Kingston organization, so most of the work characterizing utilitarian and normative dimensions has already been done. Drawing upon Parsons (1960), Etzioni (1975), and Cummings (1981), Albert and Whetten state that a utilitarian organization is "one that is oriented towards economic production" (p. 106). The ideal type is the business firm, where values of economic rationality, the maximization of profit, and the minimization of cost are central. Remuneration is the type of control that this organization exerts, and as a result, commitment to the organization is viewed in terms of self-interest: "an employee is expected to be paid what his services are worth as determined by a competitive market and will not be blamed for quitting if he can do better" (p. 106). In terms of structure, the business firm is relatively centralized and hierarchical. Legitimate authority is drawn from the members' beliefs that "management will be competent and that the interests of management and of the employees will be similar" (p. 106). Organizational messages are largely viewed as "information"; and an emphasis on logic and rationality guides communication patterns.

A normative organization, defined by Albert and Whetten (1985), is an organization with a primarily cultural, educational, and/or expressive function (p. 106; see Parsons, 1960). A church is an ideal type of the normative organization, but other normative examples include political organizations with strong ideological programs, general hospitals, universities, and voluntary associations. Normative power (Etzioni, 1961) is the type of control exerted over participants. This type of power usually produces a high degree of positive involvement and is managed through the symbol system (i.e., verbal and visual rhetoric) of the organization, such as leadership rituals, manipulation of social and prestige symbols, and motivating speeches. Whereas business employees are motivated by remuneration, members of normative organizations are intrinsically identified with the value system and ideologies in place. Organizational messages are viewed as "ideologies," in contrast with the business emphasis on "information."

Cummings (1981) explains the difference between emphasizing information vs. ideology in organizational rhetoric. He states: "management by information places major

emphasis upon the instrumental function of managerial action and of organizational roles in society. . . . Management by ideology . . . aims to design . . . organizational systems to serve the expressive functions of organization in a society. The roles of leaders and followers are quite different in this management system. The purposes of organizations are assumed to be posterior, they are assumed to be basically rationalizations for organizational action. In addition, *the cohesiveness of organizations is provided not by information, logic, and rationale, but by the acceptance of shared values, shared beliefs, and intensive socializational experience.* (p. 2; in Albert & Whetten, 1985, p. 107). Thus, according to Albert and Whetten, members' identification with shared values and their socialization into the organization are what produce strong organization, providing further support for Etzioni's (1961) statement that normative organizations are the strongest and produce the highest level of commitment.

The Triple Identity of the Kingston Organization

The Kingston organization is definitely a hybrid organization. As Albert and Whetten state, a hybrid must be able to sustain two (or more) metaphoric descriptions of the organization and be able to show that each metaphor can be applied to a wide variety of fundamental events. What is most interesting about this organization is that it has a *triple* identity of church, business, and family. In fact, the Order is legally all three: business, church, and family. The legal corporate entity is the Davis County Cooperative Society, which holds over one hundred businesses, along with an undisclosed amount under the corporation, World Enterprises. The normative entity is the Latter Day Church of Christ, established in the late 1980s to economically benefit the organization (i.e., for the tax advantages associated with being a 501C3). And the legal marriages and birth certificates of these families are registered through the state of Utah. Though the normative component was not officially added until forty years after the corporation was created, the business was guided by the charismatic leader/patriarch.

As we learn from the description of the case study in Chapter 2, the Davis County

Cooperative Society began in 1935. Economic deprivation during the Great Depression, along with the excommunication of Charles Kingston's family from the LDS church, drove the creation of the organization. Charles Elden Kingston was a devout member of the LDS church and promised in the LDS temple to consecrate all of his material possessions to build the kingdom of God on the earth. The LDS church once practiced this system of shared material goods, called the "United Order," but abandoned it after a short period of time and replaced it with a tithe of 10% of members' money. The temple promise is now regarded as more of a symbolic commitment, but Elden Kingston felt that the United Order should still be practiced as it was originally conceived. Against the economic backdrop of the Great Depression and the spiritual backdrop of Elden's commitment to the United Order, the Davis County Cooperative Society was born (Order, 2009b). It originally consisted exclusively of the Kingston family, but a few friends later joined and married into the family. While it appears that current and former Kingston members as a whole do not differentiate between the three types of organizations, they do tend to emphasize certain elements over others, depending on the context.

The Utilitarian Order

The Kingston organization, the Order, is viewed by many current participants as a business organization. Participant 23 states:

> The Davis County Co-op is not a church. . . . It's cooperating. It's a business organization. . . . . When my father joined, there was a joining fee, and he paid that fee. And the whole family joined the organization at that time. They pooled their money, they helped each other out. Like a cooperative, the money was pooled into a pot. Let's say 20 guys wanted to pool money, and help each other buy a home, let's say. You might make a mortgage and buy a home in 30 years, 35, 40. But in pooling their money, being able to put it in there, I think it took them between 5 and 7 years for each person to get a home. If you're the first guy, then you get your home pretty quick; if you're the 20th guy, well, you wait a while. But you still do. I mean, you work together and help each other out. When the organization started in 1935, from that day to this, not one person has lost their home because they couldn't pay for it, ever. We help each other out. Never lost a car. Nobody ever lost a home or a car or couch. That's one of the reasons I love it. Never go without a meal. (participant 23)

Thus, because of the emphasis on consecration, or giving all of your money to the organization for the benefit of everyone, the Kingston organization is appropriately conceived as a business organization.

The theme of "working together to help each other out" is an organizational mantra that was repeated often by the participants (participant 27, participant 23, participant 19). Participant 19 describes: "1935 was a time of depression. We had families come together in a depressed kind of time, and they came together to work together. . . . Even today, we have the idea of oneness and togetherness, camaraderie, with each other." Participant 27 states, the Davis County Co-op is "mainly just working together. Yeah, I don't know how else to explain it." The Order also helps the members who are unable to work. Participant 12 describes: "This woman in particular that I know that's in the Order, she won't wake up to go to work, so if she was ever to leave the Order she could never hold down her job 'cause she won't wake up to go to work. She doesn't really tend her kids. She has like five kids and her mom takes care of them for her, and she's about my age. She could never take care of herself if she was to leave, and so for her, she's probably better off there . . . I don't think that she'd be able to leave and make it" (participant 12). So, regardless of an individual's circumstance, the Order provides economic sustenance to all of the members.

While it appears that the economic structure of the organization is designed to distribute wealth evenly, it falls short of this organizational goal. Former members consistently stated that certain privileged members of the organization were given fewer tasks and more compensation for the work they performed. Participant 6 explains: "Everybody is the little worker bees that are making less than minimum wage and here they are [the leadership] with all this money that they've got stowed away somewhere. Their salaries aren't minimum wage" (participant 6). Even current members agree that poverty is the norm. When asked to describe a decrease in her identification levels, participant one stated: "It's just burdens. I had a lot of small children. I was basically

living on my own. Couldn't get the budget to balance, so it was just stress with how do you spend time with your family and work the hours that you need to. . . . I couldn't solve it on my own. So the support system, the support that came from the recognition pulled me up" (participant 1). Participant 1 framed this difficulty in a positive way, by demonstrating how the ties to her family helped her in a time of crisis.

Several former members described that this economic disparity decreased their identification levels and was the catalyst that drove them to leave. One former member states:

> I'd been working late one night and I was driving home about two in the morning and it was pitch black outside. The cows had gotten out . . . I wasn't going particularly fast, but it was so dark I didn't see them . . . there was a big black cow there, and I hit it and smashed the front end of my truck.
>
> I ordered some parts to fix my truck, because I had to have a vehicle for the job I was doing; so I would do my job, and then after work I'd spend about four or five hours working on my truck, trying to get it fixed. And I'd been going to work a little bit late in mornings.
>
> Daniel [one of the seven brothers] got upset at me about it and asked me if I just wanted to leave. I told him, "Yeah, I just want to leave. I don't want to work anymore." So he said, "Fine. Pack yourself up and go." So I packed my stuff up and I left.
>
> That weekend I had a meeting with Daniel and Paul, and we decided where I was going to go to work. I went up to work at the mine and because Daniel was upset at me; then they lowered my wage to $300 a month. So, I was like, "That's not going to work." I didn't find out for a few months and I was like, "No, I'm not doing that." And that's when I left. That's why I packed up and came up and just moved to Salt Lake. (participant 12)

In sum, the Order is an economic cooperative in which goods are distributed to every member of the organization. Current members and one former member commended the organization for its ability and mission to provide economic sustenance to each member regardless of circumstance; former members emphasized that except for those at the top of the hierarchy, members live in poverty.

The Normative Order

While some participants emphasized the business aspect of the organization, many others emphasized the spiritual side of the organization. The Order, while established as an economic cooperative, was imbued with a transcendental belief system

similar to the early LDS church. So, while the acts were physical, the symbolic meaning for the acts was spiritual. This has continued to the present day.

The spiritual dimension of the organization permeates all aspects of organizational life. If you work, you do it because you are building the Kingdom of God. If you have family home evening, you do it because God has required it. One participant talks about the spiritual blanket that covers the organization: "Probably my family is the most important thing to me. There's all these different aspects of your life, and spirituality is kind of an umbrella over all of them. My family would come first, then my job. The spirituality (and the church) is an umbrella—it goes into every aspect of your life" (participant 3). So, while this participant places her family before the business, she thinks of both in terms of the spiritual belief system that guides her life.

The spiritual beliefs tied to organizational actions are excellent motivators and produce very hard workers. Participant 8 states: "Whatever job you do, you know, you're taught in Sunday School that that's how you build the kingdom of God. You're getting the place ready for Jesus to live when he comes back" (participant 8). Participant 13 states that Order members are taught not just that they are building God's kingdom, but that that they are working to literally save the world from an impending apocalyptic destruction: "For us, we were . . . you were working for God's kingdom, you were going to save the world. The weight of the world was on us." Church on Sunday also tends to focus on economic concerns imbued with spiritual significance. Participant 5 states: "I would say the spiritual aspect first, and then because I was part of the family. The business end of it was just is so ingrained. The church they have on Sundays is probably 75% business. What it is, they'll talk about to please God you have to do good on your job, that kind of thing" (participant 5).

It is this factor that—while extremely motivating to those highly identified members—produces bitterness when members leave. Participant 13 states: "When I quit working for the Order businesses and went and worked on the outside, in the first year my income went up by $10,000, and I started at the bottom of Jenny Craig, with

$5-something an hour. So, in there, you paid piss-poor wages, you're not supposed to have vacation because Order people don't need vacation and, you know, you're supposed to work your butt off for supposedly God's kingdom, you know, all your money goes to God; how he gets it, I don't know. . . . But, you know, getting more involved with the outside world made me see more that is crazy." So, the organizational rhetoric that imbues "working" with spiritual significance is highly motivating but also produces anger and bitterness among those who are disidentified.

The spiritual beliefs are also an excellent form of organizational control. By tying in the "law of one above another" to business practices, the Order is able to keep employees compliant. Participant 8 states: "the one above me was Ronald; the one above him was his boss at work; and the one above his boss was usually Paul. So, you know, that's another thing, that's how the church ties in with the business." The hierarchical structure of the spiritual organization matched with the hierarchical structure of the economic organization produces a highly compliant and highly identified set of workers (see Etzioni, 1961); because an act of resistance affects not only the member's job, but also his or her spiritual standing in the church and, ultimately, with God.

Finally, spiritual beliefs are an excellent form of family control. From childhood, young members are taught that their primary spiritual goal in life is to find the person that they should marry. Participant 6 states: "They tried to do like family home evening, but they didn't really, they just taught, you know, ;God will guide you and teach you who it is that you're to marry' . . . And they'll never line you up with somebody who's not as smart as you." And participant 3 elaborates further, from a highly identified perspective:

> We grew up knowing that there's a one and only for every person. You had your one and only mate that Heavenly Father had for you. It was your responsibility and your privilege to be able to pray to your Heavenly Father and find out who the one special person was you were supposed to marry. And so as I went into my teenage years then you're wondering, where do I fit? Kind of in limbo, waiting to go onto the next step in life, thinking "is it really going to happen to me? Is He really going to show me this special, number one choice for me?" You have that period of wondering, where do I fit? Where's my place? Am I special enough that Heavenly Father's going to show me? You hear that other people who have received special divine guidance.

By keeping members focused on finding whom they should marry, the organization narrows members' range of available options for life. Members are not told that they should find out what God wants them to do for employment, or where they should live, or what will make them happy in life. These issues are reserved for the organization to decide. But asking members to find out who God would have them marry allows members to feel that they have free choice in the system and are in control of their lives. However, this choice is heavily disciplined by the organization, as a woman must receive the approval of both the Kingston leader and her parents before she may accept a proposal of marriage.

In sum, the spiritual aspect of the organization permeates all aspects of organizational life. It imbues the economic and family dimensions with meaning and functions as a motivating factor for employees to work hard. It also acts as a way to control the sexual practices and intermarriages of the families.

The Family Order

While the economic dimension governs the practices of the organization and the spiritual dimension governs its beliefs, the family is the heart of the organization. It is the primary reason that people stay members of the organization, and the primary reason that they leave. Current members cite family as a primary source of identification: "I think the family, community, church, is more important to me. The business, I see it as more as a benefit from the other two. It's more of a financial benefit. You could call it job security" (participant 1). Former members agree that the family system is the most important. Participant 4 states: "They're committed to their family, basically. I know a few people that won't leave because they know they will have to lose their relationship with their family. So they stay."

The fear of losing their family members in the afterlife is a major reason that members participate in polygamy. Participant 5 states that according to the transcendental belief system, if you didn't practice polygamy, "you'd be single, a ministering angel for

all eternity. That's basically what they teach. You'll have to live alone. Your family will be split up. If your wife is good enough, she'll be able to be married to someone who already did fulfill everything they needed to" (participant 5). So, this man in particular married another woman to preserve the relationship with the first woman he loved.

Families are also a source of identification among members because they allow members to feel successful in life without being wealthy. Participant 12 states: "That's center of their religion, to have families, to have a big family. I guess you could say that if they're looking at someone's life that they can look at theirs. This could be one of the poorest people . . . but have a huge family (and maybe that's what's brought them down). They had a really hard time being able to support this big family and there could be this person that could be a millionaire and not have any kind of a family. They would think of this person [with a large family] as a success opposed to this person" (participant 12). By believing in an afterlife where success is judged by the number of children rather than the number of dollars, economically disadvantaged people can feel they have equal or superior status to those who are financially well off.

While the fear of losing connection with family is a major source of identification, the family is also the area in which organizational members can test their identification. The family is the one dimension in which the organization does not have full control. While the organization institutes a system of checks and balances designed to discipline members in the private realm (see Administrative Working Manual, 2009), the family has the ability to resist organizational norms more directly. One former member states: "Our family was just kind of like in there, you know, like our own little pod inside of this bigger pod, where we just did our own thing and almost had our own types of beliefs. Where we amongst our family could kind of challenge those things and question them a little bit more than the other people. We didn't marry into x's family or to those Kingstons. We kind of kept our own out, so as far as actually experiencing a lot of those things that they did, we didn't" (participant 6). For this family of eight children,

the ability to challenge and question organizational norms led every member of the family except for the father (who had another family with his first wife) to leave the organization.

Family ties are so important to members that they often stay even after they are no longer identified. When I asked one former member why she stayed so long in an organization she no longer believed in, she said, "I had a family there. I had my sisters there. I had my mom. I mean, I had other people there. It wasn't just about [my husband]. I had all my nieces and nephews and I knew that if I left I would lose all of that, all communications with them. That's just the way they are. Once you leave, you're done. . . . I knew that my mom would still talk to me, but it wouldn't be the same. It wouldn't be as much. But, I mean, and there was a lot of activities I'd go to and I had friends, and so those were a lot of the reasons I continued to stay" (participant 9). Because of this, most former members leave the group when they are in close contact with family members who have already left. Participant 13 stated this was a factor in her decision to leave: "My mom had siblings that were not really in. Her sister married out. So it was kind of like an accepted thing, and I saw that, and my dad had sisters who were not part of the group too, and when we would have family get-togethers, had things, I saw them. I saw them what they had, and how they had nice things, they were happy, and life and things were better, and it was like, I want that." Seeing the connection on the outside gave this participant hope for a positive future on the outside.

In sum, the family is the organizational dimension that can either cement a member's identification with the group or subvert it, depending on the rhetorical messages promoted within the system. Members may stay identified because they fear to lose their family or because they see their family as central to their success. Members may also stay in the organization long after they are not identified because they do not want to cut the ties with the family.

The Interdependent Dimensions

In the preceding paragraphs, I have show how the economic, spiritual, and family dimensions are interwoven into one large system. As participant 8 states: "It's your whole life because you go to church and everyday your job. You're building up the kingdom of God. Whatever job you do, you know, you're taught in Sunday School that that's how you build the kingdom of God. You're getting the place ready for Jesus to live when he comes back. And the people you work with are the people you go to church with. . . . It's just the whole package; it's the church; it's the religion; it's the whole."

Although separating these dimensions is impossible, we can compartmentalize them somewhat by saying that the practices of the members are performed in the utilitarian dimension; the beliefs of the members in the spiritual dimension; and the emotional attachments of the members in the family dimension. These dimensions are not physical, as they work, worship, and live together in a variety of contexts. However, these dimensions are partially separable based on their function.

The organizational rhetoric cited by participants appeared to address each dimension roughly equally. This evidence suggests that each dimension is considered important to the organization. However, there are a few themes that stand out significantly. "Members are elite (9 times)" "Leaders must be obeyed (10 times)" "Members must sacrifice to the Order (13 times)," and "The Order was created/leaders were chosen by God (10 times)" stood out significantly in the narratives. These themes of obedience, sacrifice, and individual/organizational eliteness stand out significantly among the written in-house corporate organs, as well, as will be shown in detail in Chapters 6-8.

ORGANIZATIONAL RHETORIC (by Org Dimension)Times \cited by participants	
CONCERNING ORGANIZATION AS A WHOLE	23
Leaders must be obeyed	10
Members are elite	9
Outsiders and lifestyle are evil/should be avoided	5
CONCERNING BUSINESS	15
Members must give money/sacrifice financially to Order (subset of 2)	8
Members must sacrifice/give everything to Order (general)	5
Kingstons should not be welfare dependent (at beginning of DCCS)	1
Participant should not go to college but should work in business	1
CONCERNING FAMILY	13
Kingstons should marry to produce the best bloodlines	3
not date before marriage	2
Kingstons should lie to outsiders to protect their families	1
Kingstons should have clearly defined gender roles (girl's job/boy's job)	1
Kingston women are responsible for their own miscarriages (sin)	1
Do Specific marriage commands (do/do not marry ___)	1
Do not talk about Kingston fathers	1
Spiritual men want to have sex with many women	1
Kingstons who cannot live polygamy are lesser/bad people	1
Mothers are to blame for children's disobedience	1
CONCERNING SPIRITUALITY	19
Order was created by God/Leaders chosen by God	10
Kingstons should read scriptures and have family night	2
Members can receive divine guidance (whom to marry)	2
Members can receive divine guidance (general)	2
Kingstons should be baptized	1
Kingstons should face holy spots when they pray	1
Kingstons should pray to have DNA changed in incest case	1
Kingstons should not utilize modern medicine without the leader's approval	1

Figure 1. Organizational Rhetoric

The themes in Figure 1, along with the rhetoric that surrounds them, show that the organizational rhetoric from one dimension supports other dimensions. For example, the focus of the economic rhetoric is on sacrifice of material goods for spiritual reasons. The focus of the family rhetoric is on creating bodies to work in the economic organization. And the focus in the spiritual organization is to encourage members to create polygamous families. If we include the written in-house organizational rhetoric, we see a clear picture of a fully integrated system of three dimensions—but with an emphasis on the economic side of the organization.

Integration of Business and Religious Dimensions for Children

Young children (I have access to the 6- and 7-year-old manual; Order, 2009a) are typically not required to work at Order businesses. Therefore, financially "building the Kingdom of God" is not yet required of them. So, business and spiritual life appear to be separated. The lesson plans for this age group appear to be Christian in theme with some specific Order material added. For example, the lesson plans, "Show Love for Jesus," "Faith in Jesus Christ," and "Jesus Christ is the Good Shepherd," are mainstream Christian and do not contain much if any material aberrant from Christian teachings. However, these lesson plans appear between other lessons on "Direction in Marriage," "A Prophet to Guide Us," "We Receive Blessings As Members," and "The Lord Preserves His Covenant People." In these lesson plans, children are introduced to organizational concepts important to inducing identification, such as adopting an elitist identity as a member of the group, faith in the leader of the organization as the Lord's mouthpiece, and the importance of plural marriage (Order, 2009a).

Business and Spiritual Dimensions (Adult)

For adults in the Order, business and spiritual dimensions of the organization are integrated seamlessly. The Order is "the kingdom of God on the earth," and members are required to help build that kingdom through faithful service in Order businesses. As one

participant stated, being a faithful member of the organization means doing well at your place of employment (participant 5). In the adult lesson manual I have access to (Order Pre-History and Early Order History), Each Chapter topic covers the development of a particular Order business and the gospel principles that were required to build it. For example, one Chapter is about building the Dragerton grocery store "stewardship," or business, and gospel principles are taught. As participant 8 states: "Whatever job you do, you know, you're taught in Sunday School that that's how you build the kingdom of God. You're getting the place ready for Jesus to live when he comes back."

For example:

> I was hearing a lot of complaints that my prices at East Park were too high. I had been using the percentage mark-up that Guy had told me to do so I didn't know what the problem was. Associated was offering a service we could subscribe to for a fee, that each week would list each grocery item and the price that it was selling for in each of the four main competitors in the Utah area. I asked Brother Ortell if I could sign up for it, and he gave his approval.
>
> I studied their pricing structure and could soon see what they were doing. My prices overall were actually lower than theirs, but there were selected items that were much lower. I could soon see the pattern as I watched the women do their shopping. . . . I went through my store and lowered the price on maybe two dozen items to match the price in the supermarkets. Everything else in the store I raised the price on. Everything. The customers began to say, "I see you are finally getting your prices down." Those who think that prices are lower at the big supermarkets than at our store would do well to remember this story. (Order, 2009b, Chapter 35, p. 2)

This is paired with the following scripture from the Bible: "And he brought him to Jerusalem, and set him on a pinnacle" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 35, p. 2).

Business and religious life are so tied together, they are seamlessly integrated as one entity. In fact, business principles such as "punctuality" are called "gospel principles" in the Order's adult training manual (see Order, 2009b, Chapter 34, p. 6). In the Chapter on the Grand Jury called to investigate Kingston business practices, Brother Elden's prayer quoted below gives further insight into the integration of business and spiritual dimensions:

> How long can you, our Heavenly Father, let this sort of thing continue. And now

> they are about to take Sister Ardous up in the court, next Tuesday and oppress her with jail sentence or fine because she is striving to protect thy law and commandments against this wicked and sinful generation. To confine her in jail would jeopardize thy work by depriving it of her service. Thou knowest they are trying to *destroy the sacred funds which are the consecrations of people. So we ask thee to protect these funds against these wicked people and let thy hand fall against them according to thy oath and covenant.* (Order, 2009b, Chapter 37, p. 2)

One current member provides an appropriate analogy for the dimensions: "I'd have to say that they all blend together. Just everything all together. It's kind of like what makes a good cake. It's not the flour. You need them all together" (participant 26).

Though business and religious rhetoric are seamlessly integrated, it appears that the focus of the religion *is* business. In other words, the religious rhetoric is designed to support the businesses, and not the other way around. As one former member stated: "The church they have on Sundays is probably 75% business. They'll talk about to please God you have to do good on your job, that kind of thing. So the whole thing is tied together to such an extent, you really couldn't separate the business end from the religious part. It's just all one big thing. It's completely combined" (participant 5).

The economic dimension of the Kingston organization seems to be privileged above the church organization in the sense that you can belong to the Order without belonging to the church dimension; but you can't belong to the church without belonging to the economic cooperative (participant 23). Participant 27 states: "Davis county co-op is not necessarily a religious society, it's more of a place where, even if you weren't the same religion as me, you could practice your religion, and have freedom of religion in there as long as everyone worked together in harmony." However, when I pressed her further about how these dimensions are separated, she was able to define the Order only through spiritual and family dimensions: "basically, it's the same gospel principles of being together in harmony and all that. Just the families. Everybody is part of a cooperative organization where if I'm over here in my family, and I need help, I can call."

The organizational in-house rhetoric (i.e., the religious handbook) confirms the assertion that the religion is focused on the business. In one lesson plan, members are given Charles W. Kingston's formula for being a good employee:

> Brother Charles gave us a formula for [good] habits in his 100% workman article for the railroad:
>
> Performance of a Workmanlike Job 55%
> Exceeding Foreman's Instructions 5%
> Job Executed in Good Time 5%
> Reporting Work Correctly 5%
> Cleaning Up After Job 5%
> Good Set of Tools Well Kept 5%
> Working Safely 5%
> Attitude Toward Work 5%
> Desire to Advance 5%
> Attitude Toward Fellow Workers 5%
> Total 100% (Order, 2009b)

In another lesson plan, members are taught that Ortell (the second leader) prophesied that the Order's Mountain Coin business would overtake the Dan Stewart Company in the years to come: "Struve didn't know he was up against an organization of people who were working together and receiving the help of the Lord. We are now the largest distributor in the Western United States and the second largest distributor in America. We are a major factor in the coin-operated machine industry. We control a sizable percentage of all the machine sales in America. Our sales have exceeded many times the amount Brother Ortell prophesied, at the time we first got into the business. His prophecy had been fulfilled many times over" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 42, p. 8).

Perhaps most convincing that religious rhetoric is used largely to support the Order businesses is the fact that the religion itself, the Latter Day Church of Christ, was created so the Order could realize nonprofit tax benefits. One member states in the adult lesson manual:

> Brother Ortell asked us what we thought about setting up a church that would be recognized by the I.R.S. and the State of Utah as a religious organization for tax and other purposes. I think we all were a little surprised by the suggestion, because we had all heard Brother Clyde [#2] get up in our Sunday meetings and tell us how Brother Elden [#1] said that the time would come when all organizations that flew under a religious flag would go down. . . . That Bro. Elden said that making religious claims was like putting a chip on your shoulder and daring someone to knock it off . . . That it would just cause contention and

> trouble. . . . In February 1978, we received notice that they recognized us as an I.R.S. exempt religious organization, for all purposes. (Order, 2009b, Chapter 40, pp. 2-3)

Though the original leader of the organization, Elden Kingston, intended for the Davis County Cooperative Society to be a business with a religious transcendental belief system, Ortell felt the tax benefits were significant enough to officially recognize the organization as a religion.

Though the integration of rhetoric in business and religious lives appears to be persuasive among members, it appears inauthentic to some and factors in their decision to leave. One participant stated: "When I did try to go back and was going to church all I could think about is, How can they fall for this? How could they say this is church? Because a lot of it is just how to manage your money and not to spend money and to save it for them and to… I mean, there's not a whole lot of talking about Jesus Christ or the Bible or even the Book of Mormon. . . . It's basically meeting, telling everyone what they need to do with their lives and how they need to live it" (participant 10). Most members, however, completely believe in the organizational mission and sacrifice much to build the kingdom of God.

The economic dimension appears to be privileged above the family organization, as well. A former member states, facetiously: "Yeah, but it was such a privilege to work for the Order even if you gave up children and husbands and wives" (participant 8). In addition, many children understand the economic part first, which suggests that this dimension may be emphasized. One former member states that as a child, "I had a sense of belonging to something. Because I certainly didn't understand the beliefs that much, and the commitments other than turning in my money. We'd call it turning in, depositing, keeping track of every penny we ever found or made, or had. . . a record of it, and it was consecrated" (participant 14). So while the family and religious dimensions are integrally interwoven into the fabric of the organization, it appears the economic dimension is—at least in some cases—privileged above other dimensions.

While the Order focuses on the business dimension to its members, it focuses on the religious dimension to the government and public. Citing freedom of religion, the Order states that the practices of its members are protected because of "freedom of religion." Because of Americans' sensitivity to minority groups; their belief in equality; and their moral relativity (their reluctance to declare one system of morality higher than another), the Order has been able to avoid widespread prosecution of these practices. Former members believe that this system of ideologies is not a valid religion but an illusion created to disguise exploitation. One former member states: "It all falls underneath the freedom of religion. Okay, you can practice polygamy if you want to under the freedom of religion if you're calling it a religion, but when you take it out where you're not supporting the children and they're being abused and they're being neglected and they're not being cared for and they're living off the state, then it needs to be stopped" (participant 6).

The economic dimension governs the organizational practices and the religious dimension governs the public relations of the organization, but the family system is the place where most resistance is found. This is both the weakest and strongest link in the system of organizational control. The Kingston organization has recognized this and has instituted a complex system of charts and lists to discipline members' family behaviors (see Administrative Working Manual, 2009). Former members (participants 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15) cite their family systems as being instrumental in giving them the perspective and freedom of thought to be able to leave the organization. These members come from families where messages other than organizational rhetoric were entertained and discussed. These members were not regarded as "good" members, because they did not comply 100% with organizational norms. One woman states that the Kingstons "saw us as different. I don't know. It's like we almost didn't accept the teachings or the beliefs like all the other ones did, and somehow we've always kind of had higher standards than what they all did" (participant 6). Current members (participants 1, 2, 3, 17, 18) also cite their families as being the most important to them. In time of difficulty, these members

have drawn upon the love and resources of their families to survive. Former members concur, stating that the major factor in keeping them from leaving was their ties to their family. As participant 14 states: "You couldn't leave one world and go to another because most people that left the Order no longer have their family, their backing of their family, the support, or anything like that." Because the organization encourages members to cut ties with family members who leave the organization, this fear of being alone and losing their emotional bonds, as well as the strength and happiness they find in associating with their families, keeps people in the organizational system.

Conclusion

Because this is an interpretive study, the ethical evaluation of these systems as a researcher is inappropriate; however, a few practical points should be noted. From the perspective of the Kingston organization, organizational control is most effective among members whose families are highly identified with the organization. The members who left almost invariably came from families who allowed organizational rhetoric to be challenged and questioned in the family system (participants, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15). When this element was not present, members left only when they felt the leaders and members of the organization had rejected them or looked down upon them (participants 5, 8, 25, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15). Most often, both elements were present when individuals finally left (participants 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15).

From the perspective of government leaders, there has been much debate within the Safety Net Committee and Attorney General's office in terms of whether to prosecute the Kingston organization as a whole (i.e., the practice of polygamy is illegal); or whether to decriminalize polygamy (i.e., members should have religious freedom). As explained in the introduction to this dissertation, government leaders usually view the issues in terms of a dichotomy: abuse versus religious freedom. The AG's office has taken a middle road and has decided to prosecute only those who are involved in domestic violence, child abuse, and fraud.

In contrast with this position, I believe the Kingston organization should be looked at in terms of all three dimensions and not in terms of the religious freedom versus abuse dichotomy (Safety Net Committee, 2003). Viewing the organization in terms of its dimensions—i.e., the practices (utilitarian); beliefs (normative); and emotional attachments (family)—provides a better framework from which to view the organization. The present dichotomy is too reductive and does not address the highly complicated interplay between the pursuit of wealth, spiritual devotion, and family bonds.

Finally, members should evaluate their own practices in terms of these dimensions to understand the costs and benefits associated with their membership in the organization. From the analysis of these interviews, it is clear that the identification that members have with this organization is necessary for them be able to fulfill the many demands placed upon them. Men and women alike work long hours, have many family responsibilities, and are required to maintain a personal (spiritual) growth regimen that is physically, mentally, and emotionally strenuous. Even the most identified members of the organization (e.g., participants 1, 3) described a time in their lives where they doubted they would be able to fulfill these many demands. Analyzing these three dimensions in terms of their costs and benefits will allow members to analyze what they are getting "out" of the system compared to what they are putting into it.

CHAPTER 6

ARISTOTELIAN ANALYSIS

In this Chapter, the results of the Aristotelian analysis are discussed. First, I argue that scholars' introduction of the behavioral component of organizational identification fits well with Aristotle's revision of the soul as bipartite. This conception of the bipartite soul helps to explain why all four components of OI (Van Dick et al., 2005), as well as Lalich's four processes of bounded choice, work together to produce overall identification. In the second part of the Chapter, I discuss the results of the Aristotelian analysis, highlighting three areas: rhetorical types, decision premises, and rhetorical appeals.

Plato's Tripartite and Aristotle's Bipartite Souls

As I have discussed in other places in this paper, the rhetoric of Ancient Greece has at times been viewed as the hallmark of an educated person (Ancient Rome, Italian Renaissance), and at times has been viewed with suspicion (Medieval Christian Europe) or as inferior to philosophy and science (Enlightenment). However, the Ancient Greece philosophy of the soul retained an important place in the development of both Christian Doctrine and philosophy. W. W. Fortenbaugh (2008/1975) describes the importance of the conception of the soul as it relates to different dimensions of rhetoric.

Plato's Tripartite Soul

As Fortenbaugh (2008) states, Plato's Republic is explicit that the soul has three psychic parts: the appetitive part, which refers to "hunger, thirst, sexual appetite, and a desire for money and gain" (p. 32); the spirited part, which is "connected with a desire for dominance and honour" (p. 32); and the reasoning part, which is connected with "the desire for knowledge" (p. 32). Not surprisingly, the reasoning part of the soul is privileged over the other two "lower parts of the tripartite soul" (p. 33).

The appetitive part of the soul, according to Plato, is connected with the desire for money. It's sometimes called the "money-loving" or "gain-loving" part of the soul. Emotions such as avarice are housed in this part of the soul, as well as bodily drives for food, drink, and sex. According to Fortenbaugh (2008), the fundamental drive in this part of the soul is noncognitive, "which is not to be reasoned with but rather cured by age" (p. 34). Because these drives are noncognitive, they are not opened to reasoned argumentation.

The spirited part of the tripartite soul is somewhat cognitive. It is not connected with bodily drives, but Socrates identifies it as an animalistic drive akin to the appetitive part of the soul. Most emotions, such as anger, are housed here. However, in this portion of the soul, Socrates is unclear. He suggests that the soul is noncognitive but also argues that animals and children's undeveloped reasoning is found in this part of the soul (as well as anyone who does not develop the full capacity for reason) (p. 36). Apparently, the word "spirit" (thymos) is ambiguous because it can refer to both anger in humans and the spirited reactions of animals (p. 37).

The reasoning part of the soul is what we normally think of as "logic." This is the reasoning portion of the soul that can logically deduce or induce, and this faculty grows stronger with education and age. Calculation is assigned to this part of the soul, "that part whereby a man calculates and comes through deliberation to a reasoned conclusion" (p. 38). The Catholic Church adopted Plato's conception of the tripartite soul (New Advent, 2010), and its conception is widely accepted today in the form of pop psych programs to improve the interrelationship between the "mind, body, spirit."

As can be easily seen here, Aristotle's objection of the tripartite soul has to do with the aspect of cognition. How can avarice, not a bodily drive but an emotion that requires an evaluation, be housed in the appetitive part of the soul, while most emotions come from the spirited part of the soul? And how can the spirited part of the soul be noncognitive (like spirited animals) but still house emotion? As Fortenbaugh (2008) states,

> tripartition as formulated in the *Republic* made considerable room for bodily drives and animal behavior, but it never offered a psychic part totally divorced from cognitive capacity. To be sure, calculation is assigned entirely to the reasoning part of the soul, that part whereby a man calculates and comes through deliberation to a reasoned conclusion. But not all judgment and opinion belong to the reasoning part. The spirited part is associated with typical human emotions like anger and fear which are cognitive phenomena involving the thought of outrage and imminent danger. The appetitive part is associated primarily with bodily drives, but it is also connected with avaricious desires which do not depend upon a bodily cause but upon an evaluation. (p. 39)

Fortenbaugh aptly concludes that tripartition does not account well for the *Republic's* theory of moral education. Plato recognized this difficulty on some levels, and through his later writings we discover a latent theory of bipartition (p. 10). Aristotle took the seeds of a theory of the bipartite soul and developed it fully.

Aristotle's Bipartite Soul

Aristotle recognized that cognition exist in emotional response. This is the basis for his formulation of the bipartite soul. As Forenbaugh states, "Aristotle's analysis of emotion made clear the relationship of emotion to reasoned argumentation. By construing thought or belief as the efficient cause of emotion, Aristotle showed that emotional response is intelligent behavior open to reasoned persuasion" (p. 17).

Aristotle's bipartite soul consists of two parts: a logical part and an alogical part. Within the logical part is reasoned reflection, along with the actions that accompany them. Decision premises of fact are reasoned and acted upon through this portion of the soul. Here, the cause of the action is reason. The alogical part consists of belief and emotion. In this system, belief is the cause of emotion. Belief is stated as the efficient cause of emotion, for without the thought of and reflection upon an action, there is no emotion. Fortenbaugh states: "an emotion like anger is directed at a person because of a belief concerning the person" (p. 14). See Figure 2, which illustrates the bipartite soul:

	Logical Half	Alogical Half
Cause	Belief	Reason
Effect	Emotional Response	Reasoned Response

Figure 2: Aristotle's Bipartite Soul

There are several advantages of Aristotle's bipartite soul with regard to this case study. First, regarding the subject of bounded choice, the element of cognition in emotion is vital to understanding why individuals remain in systems that oppress them and devoted to individuals that treat them poorly. Why are these people not angered when they are treated unjustly? The answer lies in the cognitive component of emotional response. Aristotle (2004) defines anger as "a longing, accompanied by pain, for a real or apparent revenge for a real or apparent slight, affecting a man himself or one of his friends, when such a slight is undeserved" (p. 173). We see here that without the thought of an outrage, there is no anger. Fortenbaugh (2008) explains: "Including the thought of outrage among the essential components of anger has the necessary consequence that a man cannot be angry when he thinks himself treated justly" (p. 14).

Second, in terms of rhetorical analysis, incorporating an element of cognition into the emotional response (and developing the notion of the bipartite soul) gave the emotional appeal new dignity within the field of rhetoric and suddenly became an artificial proof worthy of study and equal to logic and character. Rather than viewing emotional appeals as charms and enchantments like rhetoricians such as Thrasymachus and Gorgias, emotion became integral to the process of persuasion. Viewing the soul as composed of two parts each capable of cognition allowed Aristotle and others to address why people are motivated to act in ways that are "unreasonable."

Third, regarding organizational identification, we see that a shift from a conception of the soul from tripartite to bipartite incorporates the element of behavioral identification, which we have discussed here as a significant dimension of organizational identification. Organizational identification is regarded by many as having three elements:

affective, cognitive, and conative (Van Dick, 2001). This developed from the belief of the psyche as being composed of affective, cognitive, and conative dimensions popular in the discipline of psychology. This version of the psyche was in fact an outgrowth from the Catholic Church's borrowing of Plato's tripartite soul. As the university was originally an extension of the Church (Albert & Whetten, 1985), many of the ideas promoted by the Church retained their significance in developing academic fields, such as psychology (New Advent, 2010). As the Catholic Dictionary states, the affective, cognitive, and conative dimensions of the psyche found in psychology were developed from Plato's appetitive, reasoning, and spirited elements of the soul, respectively (New Advent, 2010). But with the addition of the fourth dimension which Van Dick (2005) and others argue is essential to understanding organizational identification, these dimensions do not correspond with this version of the psyche. However, if we view the soul as bipartite, all four dimensions of identification correspond well with the portions of the logical and alogical half—and demonstrate their interrelationships. Conative identification, or identification with beliefs and values of the organization, will most likely result in emotional attachment, as emotional responses are the effects of reasoning about beliefs. Emotional identification, or emotional identification with the leader, will most likely be attached to a leader who encompasses desired values (or virtue; Aristotle 2004), as the two are inseparably connected. Logical reasoning used in cognitive identification will most likely result in reasoned responses, as people can be persuaded to act when they are convinced through reason it is the correct course of action (Aristotle, 2004). And behavioral identification is based upon the decision premises that the organization promotes as reasonable and self-evident (see Simon, 1997; Tompkins & Cheney, 1985). Of course, the logical half and the alogical half of the soul are also interrelated, because people are motivated to act not just through reason but also by appeal to the character and emotion. Affective identification, for example, may occur not just through the

identification with leaders' characterological appeal (Hill, 1972; Tompkins, 1987), but also through physical acts such as sexual intercourse and acceptance of their logical reasoning. This interrelationship of logical and alogical halves demonstrates how the three rhetorical proofs—ethos, pathos, and logos—build upon each other to induce affective, conative, cognitive, and behavioral identification.

Viewing the four components of organizational identification in terms of the soul does two important things. Just as Aristotle treats both emotion and reason as processes involving cognition, OI is conceptualized as being governed through an overarching cognitive process, which is advocated by Ashforth and Mael (1989) and supported by many other organizational identification scholars (especially those using social identity theory), such as Richter et al. (2006), Bartels et al. (2006), Van Dick et al. (2006), Tseng et al. (2005), Tracy (2005), Vora et al. (2005), and many others (see Appendix B).

Second, viewing identification in terms of the bipartite soul gives us greater insight into the process of consubstantiality and the psychic depth that it entails. As we recall, Burke (1950) states that the process of identification involves people feeling that they are one in substance while being distinct in body and loci of motives. If we view OI in terms of being consubstantial with parts of the soul, we can better understand that identification involves not just agreeing with someone, admiring his values, being emotionally attached, or imitating his behaviors; it is something more akin to what some describe as a "soul connection" or becoming "one" with each other. Nowhere is this more poignantly stated than in the Christian intercessory prayer in John 17 (and because this is a study of a Christian-based new religious movement that uses Burke, it is appropriate here):

> Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; That they all may be one; as thou, Father, *art* in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. (John 17:20-24)

This description of consubstantiality describes the depth of identification that has motivated many millions of people to become emotionally, cognitively, evaluatively, and behaviorally identified with the teachings of Christianity. We can expect that, rhetorically speaking, the same depth of identification may be experienced in new religious movements.

In the following section, I will analyze the rhetorical strategies of the Kingston organization using the rhetorical strategies that Aristotle states affect and motivate this bipartite soul. Rhetoric, as Aristotle (2004) states, is a system used to examine how people are persuaded, or "the reason why some attain their end by familiarity and others by chance" (p. 3). Its function is to "find out in each case the existing means of persuasion" (p. 13), and to "deal with the things about which we deliberate, but for which we have no systematic rules" (p. 23). Rhetoric is in all disciplines and in all forms of communication: "rhetoric does not deal with any one definite class of subjects, but, like Dialectic, is of general application" (p. 13), and it is "defined as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever" (p. 15). So, rhetoric is everywhere and utilized in subjects about everything. In my case study, I am interested in the rhetoric which permeates the new religious movement to induce organizational identification.

Kinds, Premises, and Appeals of Rhetoric

Individuals with bipartite souls are able to be persuaded both rationally and emotionally. They are able to be persuaded on matters of expediency, virtue, and justice in the future, present, and past. They are able to be persuaded by arguing from commonly accepted premises of fact and value. And they are able to be persuaded through the appeals to emotion, character, and logic. The first section will be devoted to the kinds of rhetoric: deliberative, epideictic, and forensic. The second section will address decision premises, and the third will analyze rhetorical appeals.

Kinds of Rhetoric

Aristotle (2004) states that there are three kinds of rhetoric: deliberative, forensic, and epideictic. Each of these kinds of rhetoric has a different purpose. The deliberative kind of rhetoric exhorts or dissuades (p. 33); it considers that which is expedient, and therefore is related to the future (p. 59). Questions like "what should the course of action be?" and "what is necessary for x to happen?" are questions for deliberation. The forensic kind of rhetoric accuses or defends (p. 33). The purpose of this kind of rhetoric is to make a judgment of past actions. This kind of rhetoric is most suitable for the court. Questions like "what happened?" and "was this just or unjust?" are taken up by forensic rhetoric. The epideictic kind of rhetoric praises or blames (p. 33). It is concerned especially with what is "noble and disgraceful" (p. 91). This kind of rhetoric is oriented in the present tense and is especially concerned with values, or virtue and vice. The overall goal of analyzing this type of rhetoric is to understand what men and women are concerned about. Therefore, Aristotle goes into depth about what he feels men and women consider *expedient*; *virtuous*; and *just*. An analysis of the three different kinds of organizational rhetoric in the Kingston organization shed light on the way that the organizational rhetoric is able to induce identification with its members.

Deliberative Rhetoric: The Greater Good

Many people wonder how a new religious movement is able to inspire such identification that members choose organizational interests rather than personal interests. An analysis of the deliberative rhetoric surrounding the term "salvation" sheds light on this process.

Aristotle (2004) states that a deliberative orator is concerned with what is the expedient. With this purpose in mind, Aristotle states that men deliberate about how to arrive at this expedient goal. He states that "men deliberate, not about the end, but about the means to the end, which are the things which are expedient in regard to our actions"

(p. 59). Therefore, in order to understand what men deliberate about, a discussion of "the elementary notions of good and expedient in general" are necessary (p. 59).

Aristotle states that "good" is defined as "whatever is desirable for its own sake and not for anything else" (p. 71). For the sake of simplicity, let us assume as other researchers have done that "good" is defined as what is desirable for its own sake. Aristotle states that things that are agreeable and beautiful are good, "for the former produce pleasure, while among beautiful things some are pleasant and others are desirable in themselves" (p. 61). In sum, the object is *happiness* (p. 61). Aristotle states that the things that lead to happiness and are generally recognized as good are (1) virtues of the soul, such as justice, courage, self-control, magnanimity, and magnificence; (2) virtues of the body, such as health and beauty; (3) wealth, since it is the "excellence of acquisition and productive of many things; (4) friendship; (5) honor and good repute; (6) virtues of the mind, such as natural cleverness, good memory, readiness to learn, and quick-wittedness; and (7) justice, since it is expedient in general for the common good (p. 63). The opposite of these will not lead to happiness and will be an advantage to enemies.

The Kingston organizational rhetoric promotes as expedient many of these "goods." Virtues of the soul, virtues of the body, and virtues of the mind are highly regarded. Justice is also prized. However, wealth, good repute in the outside world, and friendship with spouses are not highly regarded. In fact, personal wealth is regarded as evil rather than good, because it is an indication of selfishness and not aligned with building the Kingdom of God, or contributing to the organization's resources. Good repute in the outside world is also subverted, as members take pride in being "a peculiar people" (Order 2009b). Finally, friendship with spouses is not highly regarded as important to building the Kingdom of God (although it is considered to some extent). Assuming that wealth, a good reputation, and friendship are ordinarily desirable things, we begin to wonder how the organization is able to subvert these goods that lead to happiness while still maintaining identification with the organization. This is a central

question in studies of new religious movements—one that has perplexed both researchers and the outside family members of NRM recruits. The answer lies in Aristotle's concept of the "greater good."

Aristotle states that, oftentimes, two virtues will clash with one another, and it is left up to men and women to decide which is more important. He states: "since men often agree that both of two things are useful, but dispute which is the more so, we must next speak of the greater good and the more expedient. Let one thing, then, be said to exceed another" (p. 69). (As a sidenote, this is comparable with Burke's theory of the universal, hierarchical vocabulary.) The Kingstons subvert wealth, good reputation, and a type of friendship as goods leading to happiness by appealing to the greater good of eternal salvation, which will lead to greater happiness.

The Kingstons deliberate that the only way to achieve ultimate happiness in the future is through eternal salvation in God's kingdom. To achieve this, they state first that eternal life demands a worldly sacrifice and appeal to organizational rhetoric canonized as scripture. In terms of general sacrifice, they use scriptures like Doctrine and Covenants 97, verse 8: "Verily I say unto you, all among them who know their hearts are honest, and are broken, and their spirits contrite, and are willing to observe their covenants by sacrifice—yea, every sacrifice which I, the Lord, shall command—they are accepted of me."

Next, they state that sacrifice requires members to be willing to sacrifice anything and everything. With regard to the sacrifice of wealth, the organization states that money is the root of evil, that it corrupts men's souls, and that the pursuit of money for its own sake will lead to unhappiness, as captured in the scripture: "the laborer in Zion shall labor for Zion; for if they labor for money they shall perish" (2 Nephi 26:31). The sacrifice of good reputation for the cause of building the kingdom of God is regarded as noble. Citing Joseph Smith History 1:33, organizational leaders state that working for the cause of Zion (building the kingdom of God) will result in slander by the evil but adulation by

the good. As Joseph Smith states: “God had a work for me to do [and] my name should be had for good and evil among all nations, kindreds, and tongues, or that it should be both good and evil spoken of among all people” (JS-H 1:33). This is also supported by the Christian beatitude, “Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute *you,* and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake” (Matthew 5:11). Finally, the friendship and love between family members is also subverted and regarded as inferior to the love that members should have for God. To do this, Kingstons draw upon biblical scriptures such as Matthew 10: 37: “He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.” It should be noted here that the subversion of these values are not unique to the Kingston organization; in fact, many religious institutions view poverty as a virtue rather than a vice (see Albert & Whetten, 1985), and biblical scriptures are used to support organizational ends wherever possible. Critics of the organization state that what is unique to the organization is that this subversion is taken to extremes.

Then, the Kingstons make the greater good of eternal life more desirable by conceptualizing it as scarcer and greater. Aristotle (2004) states, “that which is scarcer is a greater good than that which is abundant” (p. 75). In Kingston doctrine, only 144,000 men plus their wives and children will receive eternal life (participant 15). The billions of humans left will not receive God’s greatest gift, because they were not chosen as elite and did not work hard enough for it. In addition, Aristotle (2004) states that the greater the good, “the more it is desired” (p. 81). Eternal life is widely regarded—not just by Kingstons or Mormons or Christians but by people of many faiths—as the epitome of blessedness and happiness. Mosiah 2:41, a verse from the Book of Mormon that both mainstream LDS people and Kingston members accept as scripture, states: “And moreover, I would desire that ye should consider on the blessed and happy state of those that keep the commandments of God. For behold, they are blessed in all things, both temporal and spiritual; and if they hold out faithful to the end they are received into

heaven, that thereby they may dwell with God in a state of never-ending happiness." Thus, Kingston members believe the scarcity and greatness of the goal justifies the significant sacrifice they are asked to bear.

Subverting the goods of wealth, good repute, and friendship by appealing to sacrifice is effective in three ways. First, sacrifice causes members to deny themselves of what Aristotle identifies as expedient goods, which makes them more invested in believing in the greater good—which is unattainable and unable to be disproved in this life. One former member stated that sacrifice was continually ingrained into the psyche of the members: "If I was supposed to marry the most sickening, disgusting person in the Order and that's what the Lord wanted me to do, then I would do it, because you would get in your mind that the Lord will never make you do anything that you're not capable of doing or that you can't do. So, you get yourself in the mindset that you can basically do just about anything. If you were supposed to marry this yuck-o person, I guess I could do that. I guess I could handle that. So, around 14 or 15, I more or less had myself convinced that I could do whatever he wanted me to do" (participant 14). In this case, this participant was committed to acting contrary to her own best interests if it were required of her. Members' sacrifices produce the desire to identify with organizational goals that will lead to the greater good. Second, when organizational members are persuaded to sacrifice for what the organization states is the greater good, they believe that the organizational directives—which are literally the will of God—will lead to their happiness. Thus, they are more willing to suspend critical thinking and accept the organization as knowing best what will bring them happiness (i.e., accepting organizational decision premises). One current member explains that she received a personal revelation that she was to marry a man (through a dream, which the organization states reveals the will of God) that she had not before considered and was not sure she wanted to marry: "I always had a strong desire in my heart to do what Heavenly Father wanted me to do. That was the foremost thing in my heart. So that was where

my foundation was. If I know for sure that this is what Heavenly Father wants me to do, then that's what I want, too. The thing that I want the very most is to find that place, and I know and I believe with all my heart that Heavenly Father would not give me a person that I wouldn't be happy with. I knew that I was going to be the most happy and I was going to have the best life, and things were going to be the very best for me. If I could find that divine guidance and find that person that Heavenly Father had for me. So I ultimately made the decision that I was going to go ahead and do that" (participant 3). This participant had a boyfriend whom she loved but decided to go with what she felt God was telling her (by adhering to the organizational rhetoric that dreams were revelations from God) and marry another man, instead—because she believed that this marriage would eventually result in greater happiness.

Third, because of this identification with organizational goals, members willingly reject evidence that does not fit with their vision that the organization can offer them a greater good. One former member states: "[The church] would have garbage piled up as you would come in the entry way, like rotten produce that they got out of the dumpster to disperse to everybody. You didn't have to spend money on groceries—or you shouldn't—because you could have this rotten produce. . . . I'd try to look at everything and think, 'Well, if you painted this, to the wall, or if you refinished the wood floor this could look so neat,' to try to convince yourself that in a way it's not so bad" (participant 14). This woman, once identified, tried to rationalize her disappointment with the organization because she did not want to believe her sacrifice would not lead to the greater good she was hoping for. This is one example of the bounded choice that Lalich (2004) describes.

Former members state that the identification which comes from being persuaded to act against one's own interests for the greater good is difficult to overcome—but it can be done. As explained previously, one woman described a psychic/spiritual experience in which words came strongly into her mind: "What if you get to the next life, and they say 'April Fools,' the joke's on you!" While this woman experienced this insight as a spiritual

experience, scholars of new religious movements such as Singer (2003) would state that this was a revitalization of the rational mind resulting in a burst of reasoned clarity.

In sum, by analyzing the deliberative rhetoric of the Kingston organization, we can better understand how organizational members are persuaded to act against what appear to be their own interests. Through Aristotle's concept of the greater good, we can understand that Kingston members are not blindly rejecting happiness but are willingly sacrificing it for the ultimate greater good of eternal life.

Epideictic Rhetoric: Praising the Leader

Epideictic rhetoric, as Aristotle (2004) explains, is concerned with "virtue and vice, of the noble and the disgraceful" (p. 91) in the present tense. This kind of rhetoric makes a person "appear of such and such a character" (p. 91) and aims to praise or blame him by revealing this character. Through this method, rhetoricians are "able to inspire confidence in ourselves or other in regard to virtue" (p. 91). Virtue, Aristotle states, "is a faculty of providing and preserving good things" (p. 91). So, if we are to use epideictic rhetoric to inspire confidence in another's virtue, we are going to promote his virtues by showing how he provides and preserves good things.

Aristotle states that the components of virtue are (1) justice; (2) courage; (3) self-control; (4) magnificence; (5) magnanimity; (6) liberality; (7) gentleness; and (8) practical and speculative wisdom. Aristotle states that the virtues are the greatest that are the most useful to others, so justice (being the most useful to others in peace) and courage (being most useful to others in war) are the greatest virtues. Liberality is next in order of greatness, because "the liberal spend freely and do not dispute the possession of wealth, which is the chief object of other men's desire" (p. 91). Justice correctly assigns what is due to each man according to the law; courage allows men to perform noble acts in dangerous situations; self-control keeps the pleasures of the body within the limits of the law; magnanimity is a generous mind with great benefits; magnificence produces greatness in "matters of expenditure"; and practical wisdom (one of the most

extensively treated by Aristotle) is "a virtue of reason, which enables men to come to a wise decision in regard to good and evil things, which have been mentioned as connected with happiness" (p. 93).

In the Kingston organization, much effort is expended in the organizational documents to praise the virtuous qualities of the leader. Current members praised the leader by describing two virtuous qualities: practical (and magical) wisdom ("somebody who we respect being able to get divine guidance"; participant 3) and gentleness (in the form of kindness; participant 18). Former members criticized the leader by describing vices: the lack of liberality (stinginess and greed); the lack of wisdom; and the lack of self-control, or "licentiousness" (Aristotle's word choice; p. 93).

Current members cited the practical wisdom of the leader as important identification experiences. One participant told about her first meeting with the leader, in which she was overcome that such an important person would condescend to meet with her. She said that she needed guidance on whom to marry, but thought,

> I called him on the phone expecting that, if I'm really lucky, he'll probably make an appointment in the next couple of months that I could go to talk to him. When I talked to him, he said, "Oh, sure, come on over right now." So anyway, I told him what I was feeling. I told him I was thinking I was ready to make that decision but I wasn't sure that was still what I was supposed to do. I wasn't sure what these people would think if I did it. He told me, "You need to do what you feel you're supposed to do and nobody else can make that decision but you. If you know that is what Heavenly Father told you to do, then that is what you should do." Anyway, we did talk for probably at least an hour. After that I was feeling really good. (participant 3)

Other members described their interactions with the leader as enlightening experiences, in which he gave them guidance about private matters he could not have personally known about, which added to his ethos as a charismatic leader with nonroutine, magical qualities (participant 17).

The other virtuous quality that member emphasized is gentleness. Members describe the leader as "really nice" and "amazing." One woman explained her experience with the leader when her son died this way:

> Our leader, I just can't even tell you how wonderful he is . . . I mean, I can't tell you how busy he is. I mean, I can't even tell you how busy he is. He was up to the hospital before I was holding him and [he was] holding me and telling me how sorry he was. We went to the funeral home. We got [her son's] clothes and I saw his little bare feet and said, "Oh, I didn't get him any socks, and he's going to be so cold." Me and my emotions were flying all over the place. . . . I didn't think about it again, you know, I was just trying to get things taken care of and everything else. So I come to the funeral home the next day and here he is. He reaches in his pocket and he pulls out these warm socks and he said, "Here." And I thought, "I cannot believe that you would do that for little old me and my child." It was just amazing. So, the thing I want you to know about our organization is that there is so much love and support, so much love and support, and if anyone loves the Lord, it is our leader, and he loves him with all of his heart. Anyway, I just wanted to say that because he is an amazing, amazing man. (participant 18)

The appreciation that this woman felt for a leader who would remember her and the bare feet of her deceased son despite his busy schedule is profound. Other members describe the leader in much the same way, describing a small act of kindness that members greatly appreciated.

Former members, however, tell a different story of the leader. Not once do they describe his gentleness or practical wisdom. Rather, they describe a greedy, licentious leader who lacks wisdom. One former member states:

> My grandma's dad is the person who started the whole Order, Brother Eldon, I think. She left all the kids with a piece of the land in Cottonwood, and then my dad, when he was the leader, was trying to sign over to my aunt so that they [the other brothers] couldn't have any of the stuff that was put into their name. So there is a whole big issue that [the leaders] were trying to steal [the property] from the Browns. (participant 9)

Another former member describes the economic disparity that exists between the leader's family and other members: "Ortell's family, the group's leader, they had everything they wanted. . . . The rest of his wives' kids did because they saw, they were in it, they saw it all the time, they knew what they had, what his family had. . . . People started to tell me that his 7 kids had their own private accounts, and their mom put money into it and they had whatever they wanted. And that was something we don't talk about. So then when all of it started to go downhill, and hear all of the stories, you know they're true. They're all true. They pull the wool over your eyes, and took advantage" (participant 14). This

woman describes a leader who favors only one of his many families and leaves even his other families in poverty.

Licentiousness is another vice emphasized by former members. One former member describes how the leader deceived her mother and her mother's boyfriend because of the leader's sexual desire (I am including the story in full because of its poignancy):

> There was a boy in the group that was not a Kingston that she fell in love with and they dated through high school for a couple of years. Everyone assumed that they'd eventually get married. This guy went to the leader, who was my father, and asked for permission to marry her. And of course, my father had already decided that he was going to marry her. So he told this boy . . . they would have to go through a trial, and prove that he was worthy to marry her. And in order to do that, they would have to separate for a year. And not date at all. And not have any contact, and not talk to each other. If after a year, they still wanted to marry, then that would be fine.
>
> At the time there was also another girl that was a little rebellious and she was going to run away with a boy that she liked. She was going to leave the Order. . . . So the story was, "Well you stay apart for a year, and marry this other girl, because she's going to leave, and you're going to save her soul by keeping her here. So you marry her, and in one year, then you can marry the girl that you really love." And so that was the plan. He got married to this other girl that he definitely wasn't in love with. And he definitely wouldn't have gone out with her. But he agreed to do it to save her soul and to keep her from leaving. And to prove he was worthy to marry the girl he truly loved. . . .
>
> My mother was heart-broken. All of a sudden this boy who she assumed that she was going to marry for several years just dropped her and married someone else and didn't talk to her. So she was heart-broken. And then her father came and told her that he thought she should marry Ortell [the leader, and the participant's father]. She didn't have any reason not to because in her mind, she'd lost the one she loved. And she trusted her father enough [and believed] her father would not advise her wrongly. And so she married my father. I heard from another family member that my grandfather received a big piece of land in southern Utah for trade.
>
> This boy that had wanted to marry her, that was waiting for the year, when he found out that she married someone else, apparently he just burst out in tears. And just sobbed for weeks. Just was heart-broken. Because he thought that it was a set deal. And my mother never ever heard about any of that. I heard about it after I was married from his family members, because they had all since left the Kingston group. And you know they told me in confidence, and I never said anything to my mother. . . . It would have hurt her further. (participant 25)

According to this former member, the licentiousness of the leader (who already had numerous wives when he married this woman) was a vice that lead to the unhappiness of numerous people.

The lack of practical wisdom was a third vice that former members attributed to the leader. In the interviews, former members often compared the leader's reasoning with the values of the outside world they are now living in to demonstrate the lack of wisdom. One former member stated:

> Toward the end of 9th grade I had a meeting with Paul, because he was the leader. . . . He said, "We need to determine what you're going to do with your life." At the age of 15. A lot of my friends were already married or getting married. He said, "How are you doing in school?" My mom said, "Some classes she's doing better than others." He said, "If you're not going to get straight As, then you might as well not even go." I said, being a bratty teenager, "Well, I'm not going to get straight As. I've got to work every day after school. I don't have time for homework." So he said, "You're not going to school next year. Finish off the year, then don't worry about going to school next year." So then the last month of 9th grade, Jeremy [her ex-husband] started asking for me. I was able to put it off for a month. I said, "I don't feel like I'm ready." He said, "If you're not ready by now, there's something in your life that you're doing that's not right. Fix whatever you're not doing. Be ready at the age of 15 to be married to this guy." (participant 4)

This participant, using the values of mainstream society, emphasized that the leader's decisions that she quit school and be ready at 15 to get married were unwise. Other examples of unwise behavior included everything from "I couldn't go to the hospital until the leader of the Order came to the house and said it was okay for me to go to the hospital" (participant 13) to the leaders asking a man to live on $300 per month (participant 12).

The different characterizations of the leader by current and former members were expected; but what was not expected was lack of experiences describing the two virtues. Former members provided plenty of examples of what they perceived as the leader's vices. But current members failed to provide examples of the prophet being "so nice" or "amazing." To explain, Aristotle (2004) states that in order to be persuasive using epideictic rhetoric, a technique called "amplification" should be used. Amplification,

he states, “is most suitable for epideictic speakers, whose subject is actions which are not disputed, so that all that remains to be done is to attribute beauty and importance to them” (p. 105). There are three different levels of amplification described by Aristotle. First, a man’s great deeds should be described as evidence of his virtue: “if a man has done anything alone [or] been chiefly responsible for it; all these circumstances render an action noble” (p. 103). Second, if great deeds are not readily available, if “he does not furnish you with enough material in himself, you must compare him with others” (p. 103). It is best to compare him with “illustrious personages, for it affords ground for amplification and is noble, if he can be proved better than men of worth” (p. 103). Third, if he cannot be favorably compared with illustrious personages, then “you must compare him with ordinary persons, since superiority is thought to indicate virtue” (p. 105).

Current members described the Kingston leader (whether it was Eldon, Ortell, or Paul) with the following adjectives: “so nice” (participant 1); “really nice” (participant 3); “wonderful” (participant 18); and “an amazing, amazing man” (participant 18). With these expressions of adoration, we would express the virtuous and noble acts of the leader to be equally great. What we see, however, are descriptions of ordinary acts that are attributed to be great deeds by organizational members. Recall a previous example of a woman’s encounter with the leader, in which the leader brought socks for her deceased child. While some might consider this act a small example of being an “amazing, amazing man,” the appreciation this woman felt was sincere and profound. Another participant (31) recalled an experience where he played baseball with the leader and caught a fly ball: “He ruffled my hair and said, ‘Good catch.’ That made me know that’s where I wanted to be.” What is interesting about this example is even though the act was ordinary, the participant attributed so much meaning to this experience, he became tearful upon recalling it. One other example of a great deed deserves mention. One woman received a blessing from the leader (where the leader is thought to act as a conduit and reveal a message from God to the individual through a prayer). She stated: “I’m trying

to remember what was said, but I just remember that it was exact and I knew that it was nobody else--I hadn't even told Scott [her husband] about some of the things that I was worried about. There was nobody that knew anything that I was thinking, and there's no other way I can explain that that would be possible" (participant 17). Because this leader prayed for her concerning things she was privately worried about, she attributed his insight to be a magical spiritual quality that is worthy of a great deed.

The deeds that the members recall in connection with their leader are relatively ordinary, but members still attempt to portray the superiority of the leader (that Aristotle states is necessary for the amplification of a leader's virtues) by using terms that lessen their own status. For example, two participants (3 and 18) used the term "little old me" to describe themselves. Participant 18, in connection with her admiration for the leader that brought socks to the funeral said she couldn't believe he "would do that for little old me and my child. It was just amazing." Participant 3 described herself in the same way when she called the leader to request an interview: "I thought, I don't want to trouble him, little old me. . . . I called him on the phone expecting that, if I'm really lucky, he'll probably make an appointment in the next couple of months that I could go to talk to him. When I talked to him, he said, 'Oh, sure, come on over right now.'" So, one way to increase the importance of their leader is to decrease their own importance.

In sum, epideictic rhetoric is concerned with the virtues and vices of men, and its purpose is to praise or blame. Only two of Aristotle's virtues and three vices are given as examples of the Kingston leader's character. Furthermore, the examples that describe the virtues of the leader appear to members to be great deeds but may appear to be somewhat ordinary to the outsider. However, we see that these examples do produce affective identification, as it is apparent by the adjectives used to describe the leader and emotion associated with the narratives that they are emotionally bonded. Rhetorical tools such as amplification of the leader and diminution of themselves are used by members to promote and sustain the identification they have with the leader. Through these processes

of amplification and diminution, they are able to perceive their leader as a great and noble man worthy to be followed.

Forensic Rhetoric: Appeal to the General Law

Forensic rhetoric is concerned with justice and injustice. Injustice is defined as "voluntary causing injury contrary to the law" (p. 105), and justice is "a virtue which assigns to each man his due conformity with the law" (p. 93). Through forensic rhetoric, we make judgments of actions in the past. Deductive reasoning, or the enthymeme, is the proof most commonly used with this type of rhetoric. As Aristotle (2004) states: "Enthymemes are most suitable for forensic speakers, because the past, by reason of its obscurity, above all lends itself to the investigation of causes and to demonstrative proof" (p. 105). Aristotle states that the skilled use of enthymemes "makes a man a master of rhetorical argument" (p. 7). Ideally, this type of rhetoric should consist of reasoned deliberation alone, because "justice should consist in fighting the case with the facts alone, so that everything else that is beside demonstration is superfluous" (p. 347). However, Aristotle recognizes that "the corruption of the hearer" makes this impossible (p. 347), and the use of emotion should also be skillfully employed.

Aristotle states that there are many motives for men to act unjustly, and a complete list will not be articulated here. He also discusses the state of mind when men act unjustly. First, men do wrong "when they think that it can be done and that it can be done by them; when they think that their action will either be undiscovered, or if discovered will remain unpunished; or if it is punished, that the punishment will be less than the profit to themselves or to those for whom they care" (p. 129). So if a man (without virtue) thinks he can get away with a crime without discovery or with little to no punishment, he will be unjust. Men who act unjustly are most likely to remain undiscovered (1) when their personal qualities do not match with the crime (such as a weak man being charged with assault and battery); (2) when their acts are done openly (as if there is nothing to hide); (3) when their acts are of such great magnitude no one

considers them; (4) when they have no enemies (because they are not watched); (5) when they have many enemies (because they are watched too closely); and (6) when they have enough means to conceal their acts (such as hiding stolen property). Men are most likely to avoid punishment (1) when they are able to delay the trial; and (2) when they are able to corrupt the judges. Men are most likely to commit the crime, anyway, (1) when the profit is great but the punishment is small; (2) when the profit is certain but the punishment is uncertain; (3) when the profit is immediate and the punishment is remote; and (4) when the profit is a real gain and the only punishment is disgrace.

Justice has direct reference to the law. Justice, as Aristotle (2004) describes, is "a virtue which assigns to each man his due conformity with the law" (p. 93). Aristotle states that there are two kinds of laws: particular and general. Particular laws are defined as "those established by each people in reference to themselves, which again are divided into written and unwritten" (p 139). General laws are "those based upon nature" (p. 140). These are the unwritten laws of society that are held to be self-evident (e.g., "equality" is considered a self-evident truth by Thomas Jefferson). In addition to the two types of laws, there are two ways to inflict it: upon the individual and against the community: "he who commits adultery or an assault is guilty of wrong against a definite individual, he who refuses to serve in the army of wrong against the State" (p. 141).

When a man is accused of committing a crime, there are several ways he can defend himself. First, he can deny the crime. This is a question of *fact,* or *an appeal to the particular law*—did he or did he not commit the crime? Second, he can deny the description of the charge (p. 143). Perhaps he "borrowed" something but didn't "steal" it or "discussed" something with his enemy but did not "conspire" with him. This is a question of *morality,* an *appeal to the general law,* or "to know whether the supposed offender is a wrongdoer and a worthless person, or not" (p. 143)—was the act actually representative of the crime the man stands accused of? Third, he can petition for leniency by appealing to circumstance or equity. Let's say a man steals a loaf of bread to feed

his family. He is guilty of theft, and the crime is punishable by a year in jail. But the circumstances surrounding the crime are such that we wish to treat him with leniency. Aristotle calls this "equity" and states that "errors, wrong acts, and misfortunes, must not be thought deserving the same penalty" (p. 147). This is a question of *equity*—does the punishment fit the crime?

There is no question that the Kingston organization violates the particular law. In the past few decades, it has promoted incest by marrying half-brothers and half-sisters to each other; it also promotes polygamy. Both of these violations are felonies in the Utah court. However, the Kingstons are extremely successful in appealing to the general law to avoid prosecution as a whole. They tell members that polygamy is the higher moral law (the general law) and that the lawmakers who made the practice illegal are "unrighteous" (Order, 2009a). For example, in the Order Sunday School handbook for 6-year-olds, the "laws of the land" are discussed. It states: "We should all be thankful for the brave men and women who made it possible for use to have this great country, the United states of America, a place where we are allowed to have our church and worship our Heavenly Father in the way that we know in our hearts is right. It is our responsibility to be good citizens and an example to all. We must obey the laws and trust in our Heavenly Father to protect us against any unrighteous men if they make unjust laws" (Order, 2009a, p. 248). This statement is illustrative of the difference that Kingston members make between particular and general laws. They state that their members should obey the laws of the United States unless "unrighteous men" make "unjust laws." In this case, they appeal to the general law of their organizational morality (what they believe to be "God's law") and state that it supersedes the particular, unjust law created by the state of Utah.

Members of the Kingston organization appeal to the general law not only to their own members but to government officials, as well. This has been working very well. In the state of Utah, many of the leaders' ancestors practiced polygamy. Stories of their great-grandmothers and grandfathers hiding from government officials and being put in

jail in the early days of the LDS church are still widely circulated among members of the LDS church. While government officials reject the idea that they are influenced by their own heritage, the LDS folklore surrounding polygamy suggests otherwise. Polygamous ancestors are praised as righteous church members who sacrificed literally everything for the gospel, and polygamy is still regarded by the LDS church as an acceptable practice in the afterlife (although it is downplayed and no longer regarded as essential for exaltation). As the majority of Utah's population is LDS, we can argue that this general (moral) law is accepted by the majority of Utah citizens—and both the Attorney General and the Governor of Utah are active members of the LDS church. With the common acceptance of this general law, it is difficult to ignore the Kingston pleas that resemble the pleas of their ancestors. This is not to say that the LDS population currently views the practice of polygamy as an acceptable practice. Rather, most LDS people view sects such as the Kingstons as corrupt and unlike their ancestors in character and practice. But, because of the common acceptance of a general moral law, Utah lawmakers have tended to be soft on polygamy.

Surprisingly, Utah lawmakers have generally not prosecuted the Kingston practice of incest. Incest, as Burke (1950) states, is a social taboo in nearly every society. The LDS church never condoned this practice, even in its polygamous days. Even most polygamous groups do not practice incest. So there is no generally accepted moral law that might trump the written particular law in the state of Utah.

The narratives of the Kingston organization emphasize having the "right blood" (participants 9, 13). One former member states: "They have this whole bloodline thing, you know, where it's supposed to be this royal or holy thing . . . a lot of them were taught that if you came from a certain bloodline, you could do no wrong" (participant 14). Former members state that the Kingstons believe they are directly descended from Jesus Christ; and to keep this bloodline pure, they must intermarry. So, the particular law of the Kingstons (to participate in incestuous practices) and the particular law of the Utah state government (to avoid incest) directly conflict with each other.

When a particular law and a Kingston law conflict, the Kingston law is nearly always obeyed. To help encourage obedience to the Kingston law, the Kingston leaders employ two effective rhetorical strategies. First, they reframe their particular law as a general law by stating that their law is in accordance with "God's law," or nature. Therefore, the Kingston law of intermarriage is the higher law that should be obeyed. Second, the Kingstons discredit the characters of the people who enforce the laws. Lawmakers, for example, are called "unrighteous men" (Order, 2009a). And by engaging in this practice, members who marry incestuously (as many of them do) become even more identified, as they take another step away from mainstream society and toward the incompatible values and practices of the organization. The more they engage in practices that are unacceptable by mainstream society, the more they have to lose by disengaging with the organization—and the more they want the organization to be what it professes to be: the "kingdom of God on earth" (participant 5).

The effectiveness of these strategies to persuade members to practice incest is frustrating to former members who are highly disidentified with the organization. Knowing that the AG's office has the power to incarcerate the members, they wonder why nothing is being done. One woman stated: "The Attorney Generals aren't doing anything. They keep saying they're doing something but they're not" (participant 4). She suggested a conspiracy theory: "I don't know if I should say anything—I've always been told not to say anything, but I don't see why. But the Attorney General had gotten threatening phone calls. And the judge had got threatening phone calls, like you'd better leave those cases alone or something's going to happen to you" (participant 4). Another participant, after being promised by the Attorney General's office that the Kingstons would be prosecuted for incest if there were sufficient evidence, compiled a genealogy chart (reprinted in Chapter 2) that outlined which of the members were practicing incest (participant 15). So far, it appears that one or two people have been convicted of incest (participant 14), but nothing is being done on a large scale. While none of the current

members have spoken to me about this practice, it is rumored that they promised the AG's office to discontinue incestuous marriages.

In sum, forensic rhetoric is concerned with what is just and unjust. It is especially concerned with the law. The general law, the particular law, and equity are all elements to consider in the prosecution of an injustice. The Kingston organization is especially effective in avoiding prosecution for illegal practices by reframing their laws as "general laws" that supersede the particular laws of the State of Utah.

Conclusion

An analysis of the types of rhetoric in the Kingston yields important insights into the ways that the Kingstons promote identification among its members. Using deliberative rhetoric, the Kingstons subvert "goods" of wealth, friendship, and good repute and replace it with a greater good of "eternal life," which is achievable through sacrifice. This leads to members being willing to act contrary to their personal interests, to allow the organization to set decision premises for them, and to reject evidence that does not fit with their concept of the organization as the provider of the greater good. Using epideictic rhetoric, the Kingstons promote identification with their leader by amplifying his virtues while minimizing their own status to promote a perception of superiority, which leads to members being able to perceive their leader as a great and noble man worthy to be followed. Using forensic rhetoric, the Kingstons are able to avoid being prosecuted for illegal practices by reframing their laws to members and Utah state government officials as "general laws" that supersede the particular laws of the state. This allows members to feel that they are being treated justly by the organization and unjustly by the state of Utah; and their acceptance of the illegal practices move them further away from mainstream life. There are, of course, many other issues related to the Kingston organization that are able to be probed by analyzing the three types of rhetoric. But these illustrations serve to demonstrate that rhetorical analysis is yields practical insights into the central political and moral issues surrounding the organization.

This illustration of demonstrative rhetoric setting decision premises for members fits with what we have termed behavioral identification. The example of epideictic rhetoric illustrates the affective identification that develops between member and leader and underscores that this identification process is as dependent upon the members as it is upon he leaders. And the example of forensic rhetoric promotes conative identification with the organization, as members move towards the values of the organization and away from the values of mainstream society.

In the next section, we will discuss the effects that organizational decision premises have on the members of the Kingston organization.

Decision Premises

Decision premises are the common assumptions held by an audience that a rhetor builds upon to make an argument. These are "maxims," or the premises or conclusions of enthymematic syllogisms that do not require any formal reasoning, because they are already accepted. Aristotle (2004) states: "Maxims are the premises or conclusions of enthymemes without the syllogism. For example: 'No man who is sensible ought to have his children taught to be excessively clever' is a maxim; but when the why and wherefore are added, the whole makes an enthymeme . . . 'For, not to speak of the charge of idleness brought against them, they earn jealous hostility from the citizens'" (p. 281). The maxim is the assumption, the decision premise, "already known" or "generally agreed" by the audience (p. 281). So, the task of the rhetor is "to guess how his hearers formed their preconceived opinions and what they are, and then express himself in general terms in regard to them" (p. 287).

In order to argue based upon a decision premise, a rhetor must be acquainted with the "elements of the question" (p. 291): "for if you know none of these things, you will have nothing from which to draw a conclusion" (p. 291). Rhetors must also argue "from an examination of the circumstances of the case" (p. 291) to consider the question in light of "what is inherent in justice or the good" (p. 293). So, knowing the question and

knowing the circumstances surrounding the case are vital to arguing what is expedient, virtuous, or good.

The topics we are most concerned with in this discussion of organizational identification are those that concern the identity of individuals—those that inform the cognitive aspect of identification, that allow members to define themselves through organizational rhetoric. One major topic generally accepted by the organization is "inequality," which runs counter to mainstream American society's promotion of "equality." This topic is developed and promoted by organizational rhetoric surrounding four major themes: organizational inequality, gendered inequality, inequality of bloodline, and racial inequality. Here, I do not use the term "inequality" as an ethical evaluation of the organization but simply as a description of the organizational rhetoric.

Organizational Inequality

The Kingston organization is hierarchically ordered, down to the last person. While many organizations hierarchically organize their members by grouping them together in levels (i.e., the individual contributor; the manager; the vice president, etc.), the Kingston organization numbers each member using a number system. The "Law of One above Another" has been explained elsewhere in this dissertation; but it is worth revisiting here to show how it formalizes and regulates organizational inequality. (Note: Several organizations, including the United States military organizations, also use a numbering system to order their employees. So, this is exceptional not in the utilitarian dimension but in the normative (spiritual) and family dimensions.)

The "law of one above another" (Janovsky, 2003) states that individuals must act obediently to organizational authorities above them. The prophet is at the head of the organization and assigns numbers to the men of the church, creating a hierarchical order. According to the doctrine of the church, every person needs a number to receive eternal exaltation (the greater good that deliberative rhetoric emphasizes), and the number received is thought to reflect a person's standing in the kingdom of God. For example, #2

is the right-hand man of the prophet, #3, is just below him, etc. From there, women are ordered by their place in the family (how long they have been married to their husbands), and each woman's children receives a number according to birth order. For example, the second child of the third wife of the man with the designation of #7 would be represented like this: "7-3-2." The third child would receive this number: "7-3-3."

In the organization, each member further down in the hierarchical system is required to obey the ones above him or her. A #4 man would have to obey a #3 man, but a #5 man would have to obey #4. A second wife of #4 would have to obey the first wife of #4 but could command the third wife. Likewise, the children of #5 would have to obey their mother, but when mother and father's commands differed, father would always be obeyed. And if a husband requires something of his wife, she is bound to complete the task. If the task is "evil," the one obeying is not held responsible in the afterlife (the person issuing the command is responsible) but must still complete the task in this life. This hierarchical system allows organizational roles to be rigidly defined with little room for expression of disagreement.

Not only does the law of one above another influence the organization's structure, but this law also influences individuals' identities. People accustomed to this numerical system begin to discipline their actions, expressions, and even thoughts to comply with the numerical code. In some cases, people's numbers even serve as replacements for their names. Orlean Kingston Gustavsen was one of the original members of the Kingston organization. Her brother, Elden, began the religion, and her husband, Clyde, was given the designation of #2. Many in the organization, including Clyde, accepted these identities wholeheartedly—he was called by other members of the religion "brother 2" or simply "2," even by his own wife (Gustavsen, October 17, 1939, p. 60). And Orlean tried unquestioningly to accept all of the commandments of her husband, as he was the one directly "over" her. As she wrote in her journal, "Wives should obey the husband, the husband should obey the one over him, etc." (Gustavsen, January 30, 1946, p. 98). Orlean also accepted her identity as "under" her husband and attempted to discipline her actions accordingly, upon fear of death and punishment. She stated:

> Tonight I became angry at Brother 2. Instead of acknowledging the hand of the Lord in what had happened and trying to profit by it I in an angry voice accused him and said words I shouldn't have said. When I went to bed it seemed like I was in a stupor. I heard the evil power all around me like a ringing or buzzing sound. It seemed as though an evil spirit had possession of my body . . . These thoughts came. I should have acknowledged the hand of the Lord in everything with his spirit. It was a test to see if I could keep the spirit. I fell short. I was going to be held accountable for everything I lost in the spirit in anger. (Gustavsen, March 18, 1936, p. 38)

Though their marriage was troubled from the beginning (October 9, 1935, p. 22), because Orlean and Clyde accepted their unequal organizational identities, the blame for the marriage was placed squarely on Orlean's shoulders (July 2, 1935, p. 9; October 17, 1939, p. 60). Orlean's acceptance of this identity caused her to discipline her behavior to the extent that she decided to "cut out all idle talk and only speak when necessary and be careful of my speech to those above me" (February 15, 1940, p. 67). She fully accepted her identity as a servant of Brother 2.

The Kingston organization persuades members to accept identities of inequality by stating that this is the only way to find true happiness. Eldon Kingston, the first leader, states: "No person is able to find true happiness unless they are able to find and fit in their place. In this government every person's thoughts should be directed toward those under them. Never mind about the mistakes of those above so long as it does not affect your actions as to right and wrong to lead into error, which course should be directed by the spirit, but let every man see well to himself and those placed under his charge and trust in those over him to arrange the affairs above you. Strength, power, and growth do not go from the leaves to the branches and then to the tree, but they flow from the tree to the branches and leaves, and so it is in God's Kingdom, this life giving force comes from Christ to the anointed one and then down to the fathers to the wives and children in the home" (Order, 2009c, Developing a Relationship with family, p. 1). Here, the leader of the organization through metaphor states that true happiness results from spiritual growth; and just as a tree receives its nourishment from the strongest part of the tree, so does the individual receive nourishment from the strongest people in the organization.

Second, Kingstons persuade members to adopt these identities by stating that this law is universally applied. As God is believed to be the head of the Kingston organization, even the leader is completely subject to the will of God. The Adult Sunday School Manual states: "Brother Ortell was one of the most intelligent and capable on the earth, but even in addition to that, it was apparent that he had access to information from beyond his own realm. This is a very good example of the law of one above another. By living that law, he was able to operate on a level higher than himself" (Order, 2009b, p. 6). The organization states that if members accept their identities of inequality, they will have access to the knowledge of those who are above them. This applies as much to the leader as to anyone else.

Third, the Kingstons persuade through interpreting widely accepted Christian scripture to fit with organizational directives. Some of the scriptures used to justify the law of one above another are Malachi 4:6 ("and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse") and John 5:30 ("I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me" (Order 2009c, Developing a Relationship with Family, p. 1). The LDS church interprets the first scripture to refer to connecting children with their ancestors by doing family history work; and mainstream Christians interpret the second to refer to following spiritual promptings from Christ, not organizational directives. But these scriptures, because of their ancient status and inability to be logically refuted, add credence to organizational directives (see Aristotle, 2004).

The identities created by the promotion of organizational inequality serve to reinforce organizational roles, structures, and authority. One example comes from the Adult Sunday School manual, which relates a story of a young man who did not want to work for a difficult employer any longer and told his mother. "She listened to what I had to say and said it would be all right if I quit, but first I would have to go to Brother Ortell

and tell him what I wanted to do. When I thought about it for a while, I just couldn't bring myself to tell Brother Ortell that I was unable to make a success of the job he had given me. So I went back to work with Ben and made up my mind that I was going to make a success of the job and try to please Ben no matter what the cost" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 42, p. 3). Here, rather than follow his own inclination, the young man accepts the decisions of the organizational leader and complies, as his organizationally prescribed identity admonishes. And in our preceding example of Orlean Gustafson, because Orlean accepted her identity prescribed by the law of one above another, she adhered to the organizational role given to her by the leader to be submissive to all commands of her husband. Orlean attempted to achieve peace and obey Clyde to the extent that she thought the spirit of the Lord told her to speak only when necessary. She also thought the Spirit told her to obey upon pain of death: "someone talked to me in a dream and said, you must overcome hurt feelings [regarding her marriage] and be happy and cheerful. If you don't you will be taken away and some happy cheerful person will be put in your place" (July 2, 1935, p. 9). Orlean accepted her organizational role, which dictated her identity, which further reinforced her organizational role to be submissive to her husband. Through this acceptance of her organizationally prescribed identity, Orlean's voice was literally silenced and body disciplined to unquestioningly do the bidding of the organization.

In sum, the *topic* of organizational inequality results in an efficient organizational system but can potentially undermine the individual identities of members.

Gendered Inequality

In the Kingston organization, the Law of One Above Another dictates that every wife is subject to her husband. He is the "one over" her. As such, she is directed to ask the following questions each day: "Have I asked my husband if he needs anything? Do I know that what I'm working on is what my husband wants me to do? Have I asked my husband if they need anything or how I should spend my time? Do my activities completely support what my husband is trying to accomplish?" (Order, 2009c,

Completing Mother's Checklist Detail, p. 3). Here, a woman is to think first of her husband and his needs before her own.

When women accept this gendered inequality, they believe that their husbands are able to receive revelation for them and their children. In practice, this means there is no difference between the commands of her husband and the commands of God. What her husband says is the same as if God says it. One example of this comes from the Adult Sunday School handbook:

> In the Spring of 1946 I began to neglect my prayer and striving. 'I got so busy with my young kids and my earthly duties. In September I had a dream that said I only had 'five minutes' to gain the knowledge necessary to stay with the Order people. I tried to reach the Lord in prayer to find out what he wanted me to do. But my prayers were empty and remained that way for two months before I asked Brother Ray (her husband) what I should do. He told me I needed to offer my life to the Lord.
>
> I left the children with Ray and went down towards the canyon north of the house and sat under the big pine tree at the top of the canyon. I meditated and prayed for 3 or 4 hours and did offer my life to the Lord. My prayers were so empty it frightened me for I thought the Lord no longer accepted me in His Work. When I found that the Lord had told Bro. Ray that now I was to be his wife in name only, I thought that Ray would keep the children and the Lord would cause me to leave.
>
> Ray went to work and I spent the rest of the day trying to plan a life out in the world without my husband and children. The feeling inside of me was really empty and lonely and every kind of a life I could think of was unacceptable to me. Then I remembered a story I had heard about a person who wasn't doing what they should and the Lord took their life to get them away from hindering people. Then I knew what I wanted to do.
>
> When Ray came home from work, I told him, "I am going to stay right where I am until you find someone else to take care of you and the children. The Lord can take my life if He wants me out of here." As I uttered those words the Spirit of the Lord came flooding back with His acceptance and I knew for sure that the Order was truly the Lord's work and was where I belonged. I did have to continue to prove to the Lord that I meant what I said, because it was 2 full months more before He allowed Ray to treat me again as a true wife. (Order 2009b, Chapter 44, p. 7)

In this example, the woman relating the experience fully accepts that Brother Ray's statements were really the statements of God. When Brother Ray did not have sexual

relations with her for 2 months, she accepted this as the will of the Lord. When she feared that she would be kicked out of her home, she attributed it to the will of God, not her husband trying to get rid of her. By accepting all of their husbands' statements as coming from God, women may leave themselves open to being abused by men who may exploit their power.

If a woman fails to adopt an identity of gendered inequality, she is regarded by the organization as being influenced by the devil and not worthy of exaltation (the greater good). Brother Elden (the first leader) states: "If you cannot respect him above you who you can see, how can you respect the Lord who you cannot see? If a woman cannot respect her husband and refuses to have the proper attitude of unity toward him she is being directed from another source . . . The channels of the spirit of the Lord to direct comes from the Lord through his appointed servants down through husbands to wives and to their children" (Order, 2009c, Developing a Relationship with Family, p. 1). In sum, the *topic* of gendered inequality results either in the submissiveness of women to their husbands or being derogated by the organization.

Inequality of Bloodline

The Kingston organization focuses on the importance of having a divine birthright. While many denominations believe that humans are God's children, the Kingston organization radically revises this belief and asserts that they are literally descended from Jesus Christ (i.e., Jesus was married and had children). Because of this belief, the organization believes in keeping the bloodline as pure as possible. Burton (1999) documents that this belief grew into the practice of incest when Ortell Kingston applied his work with livestock inbreeding to the Kingstons, asserting that—just as inbreeding results in prize cows—this practice of intermarriage could be used to breed a superior race of people.

In addition to intermarriage, plural marriage appears to be in part a way to preserve the bloodline and produce the children who have the right genetic combinations

(participant 8). One woman explains: "Romance is really, really nice, but it is not what marriage is about. . . . With the fellow that I married, I loved him with all my heart, but I didn't love him in a romantic way and I don't think he loved me in a romantic way, either. I married him because I felt like the Lord wanted me to and that the children that would come from that marriage would be something that the Lord could use" (participant 18). So members' choices in marriage are determined not only by their preferences and the preferences of their leader and families, but also by the bloodlines from which they descend (participant 12).

Kingston bloodlines are believed to be the most pure of the human race, but they are not considered to be equally pure. One former member explains: "They have this whole bloodline thing, where it's supposed to be this royal or holy thing . . . a lot of them were taught that if you came from a certain bloodline in there, I mean, you could do no wrong. . . . Elden came from Charles and Vesta and so that bloodline was supposed to have been better than the ones that came from Charles and LaVanda. From Vesta and Charles came my grandpa Eldon and Ortell, which is the one that took over the Order after my grandpa died. All of his boys are in charge of it now" (participant 14).

Members in the Order have a hierarchy of bloodline and know among themselves whose blood is considered to be more pure: One former member explains:

> We were supposed to have come from the elite, but then I think since my dad married my mom and my aunt, they were not from a bloodline that wasn't looked up to. They weren't looked upon as high as his brother's kids. . . . It was like you belonged, but you didn't. I mean, because you could sit there in church and observe all these other people. I was really quiet growing up, didn't talk a lot, so I watched. And you would watch the behavior of all of these people and it was like, "Oh, my gosh!" It was bizarre, and you would try to convince yourself that it was okay because they were the chosen; they were special people. (participant 14)

Those with the most pure bloodline have special advantages, such as being located higher up in the organization and being able to repent more easily (participant 14). In sum, the *topic* of inequality in bloodline is supported by the practices of intermarriage and polygamy, which results in members' becoming more identified with the organization (as

they engage in practices only their organization will accept; see the section on forensic rhetoric) and has been reported by former members to lead to physical difficulties such as genetic deformities or mental difficulties such as Downs Syndrome (participant 15).

Racial Inequality

Racial inequality is not a topic commonly talked about in connection with polygamy. As a minority group themselves, they are often supportive of legislation which grants rights to other minority groups (e.g., legislation that supports gay rights). However, the Kingstons view race as an important classification. Believing that the White race is the most superior, they look down especially upon people with African descent, who are considered to be tainted and impure.

No one with any "black blood" is permitted to be part of an Order family. One former member explains:

> As our kids got older, we started to see that people were shunning our kids, more or less. What it is, is my wife, her mother was actually married to my father and left him. He was her uncle. She just couldn't deal with it, left him, left the group, and went and married [wife's] father. There were rumors that he was part black, which is a terrible thing in the order. Even having one drop of black blood you can't be a part of the priesthood, you can't gain make it to the celestial kingdom.
>
> I really didn't think people believed that until our kids started getting older. Then we saw how people were shunning them. We had boys that would start to be interested in our daughters, and then they would talk to Paul or one of the other brothers, and they would tell them to stay away from them because they were part black, so make sure you don't get involved with them. A couple of them actually told our girls things like that: "I really like you, but this is the way it's gotta be." It kind of forced me to start taking a serious look at what the Order was doing. It just progressed over probably six years that we just gradually started realizing that it wasn't what we thought it was. We finally left. (participant 5).

Another participant who was believed to have black blood in her ancestry was told by other members that her children would be "better off" if they never married but stayed single and simply worked for the Order. She stated: "When we realized that the only the only future our kids had in the group was to be cheap labor, then we started thinking we better make sure this is the kingdom of God if we are going to subject our kids to that.

We had people coming and telling us, 'Your children would be a lot better off if they never married or had children. If all they did was build the kingdom of God then they would be better off'' (participant 8).

The leader of the organization also reportedly promotes racial inequality. When this woman's daughter was 16 or 17, men in the organization started asking for her. She states: "We realized that Paul was telling the boys . . . 'Well, you need to go back and get direction on somebody who's meant to be here' and 'No, you can't marry her because you don't want to mix your blood.'" In sum, the rejection of groups based on their race is a *topic* that also runs contrary to mainstream society's treatment of minority groups.

Conclusion

The *topic* of inequality is a generally accepted commonplace from which the Kingston organization builds its arguments to promote organizational, gendered, bloodline, and racial inequality in the organization. It serves not only to control members of the organization but also strengthens their identification, because this commonplace runs in opposition to the topic of equality widely celebrated in American society. The more members accept values that reside outside of mainstream society's system of values—the more they accept as virtues what are considered vices by the average American—the more members will experience conative identification with the organization. A break with the organization into mainstream society would mean a revision of their fundamental value system and questioning of the topics that they have been taught from childhood to be self-evident.

Rhetorical Appeals

Two basic questions drove the analysis of rhetorical appeals—questions that are very important to scholars of New Religious Movements. First, I wanted to see if the data supported the assertion of NRM scholars such as Singer (2003) that new religious movements use persuasive tactics that focus on emotion and suppress reasoning. If this were true, I would expect to see rhetorical examples that used ethos and pathos but

excluded logical appeals. Second, I wanted to understand the kinds of rhetorical appeals that members described as important identification experiences.

Reason in the Kingston Organization

To assemble the data, I first tagged rhetoric in the interview transcripts labeled by members as important to their identification experiences. Second, I grouped each of these rhetorical phenomena and into current and former member categories. That is, the rhetoric important to former members was divided from the rhetoric important to current members. Third, I analyzed the rhetorical situation (the speaker, message and audience) and especially highlighted the role of the speaker to understand which people had the greatest rhetorical influence on members. Fourth, I analyzed the rhetorical themes of this rhetoric (discussed in Chapter 5). Fifth, I analyzed each incidence of rhetoric for its appeal (ethos, pathos, logos). If an example utilized more than one rhetorical appeal, I characterized it based on its dominant appeal, drawn from participants' interpretation of the experiences. An example with the phrase, "After they said x, I was scared," would be characterized as a fear-based appeal to pathos. Similarly, an example ending with a phrase like "I couldn't believe that a man that important would pay attention to little old me" would be characterized as an appeal to ethos. An example ending with "that really didn't make sense to me" or "I woke up one day and realized" would be characterized as a logos-based appeal. The results are as follows.

Former members cited many more examples of rhetoric important to their identification levels than did current members. 10 of 14 (71.4%) current members gave specific examples of rhetoric, while 14 of 14 (100%) former members cited rhetoric important to their organizational identification. Of the 163 examples of rhetoric, only 35 examples were cited by current members, while 128 examples were cited by former members. This means that on average, each current member gave approximately 2.5 examples of rhetoric, while each former member provided approximately 9.14

examples per person. It is unknown why former members were so much more willing to provide examples of rhetoric that contributed to their identification levels. Perhaps current members were more uncomfortable with the interview process; perhaps they were worried about giving an example that could be construed as negative about the organization; or perhaps they didn't recognize the rhetoric as easily. But for whatever reason, former members were much more willing to discuss the organizational and member rhetoric. So, while in the following paragraphs I will describe the incidence of rhetorical appeals cited among current and former members, it is worth noting that these data may be skewed because of the general reticence of members to divulge specifics about the organizational and member rhetoric.

In the 163 examples of rhetoric analyzed, current members cited a total of 18 ethos-based, 8 logos-based, and 9 pathos-based examples of rhetoric. In the examples cited among current members, 51.4% were examples of ethos; 22.8% were examples of logos; and 25.7% were examples of pathos. Former members cited 32 ethos-based, 26 logo-based, and 71 pathos-based examples (24.2% ethos; 20.3% logos; and 55.5% pathos). Table 3 showing these descriptive statistics follows.

Table 3. Frequency of Rhetorical Appeals By Current and Former Members

	Current	Former	Total
Ethical Appeal	18	31	49
Logical Appeal	8	26	34
Pathetic Appeal	9	71	80
Total	35	128	163

From this table, we are able to see that current members identified ethos-based appeals most frequently as particularly important to their identification experiences, while former members cited pathos-based appeals most frequently. Logos was cited the least frequently. While these data do not provide reasons for the use of the appeals, one possibility is that people who are most persuaded by ethical appeals are more persuaded by the ethos-focused organizational rhetoric, while former members tend to be people who are persuaded more by emotional appeals. This makes sense, given the Kingston rhetoric's emphasis on authority and the ethos of the prophet. Likewise, personal emotions are downplayed and disciplined by organizational rhetoric, such as in the concept of "pleasing obedience." Thus, it would make sense that people more drawn to appeals of ethos would find the organizational rhetoric more appealing than people drawn to appeals of pathos, where organizational rhetoric uses primarily negative emotions such as fear, guilt, and shame, to establish legitimacy.

The lack of emphasis on logical appeals by both current and former members is particularly interesting, because it does provide possible support for Singer's (2003) assertion that critical reasoning skills are suppressed in new religious movements. If members of the organization do not base their decisions on logical reasoning, they will not be persuaded by this kind of appeal. However, it is also possible human nature is motivated less by the logical half of the soul (reason) than the alogical side (emotions/values). While a thorough explanation of these rhetorical appeals is not forthcoming from the data, we are able to understand more about these appeals by qualitatively examining each of these appeals in turn. Let's start with ethos.

Ethos

To review, Aristotle states that ethos is concerned with the "moral character of the speaker" (p. 17). The speaker persuades by moral character "when his speech is delivered in such a manner as to render him worthy of confidence" (p. 17). Aristotle states that ethos is the most effective of the proofs: "moral character, so to say, constitutes the most effective means of proof" (p. 17).

Ethos appears to be particularly important to current members. Eight different members cited ethos as an important identification experience, citing 18 different rhetorical-based experiences (51.4% of their rhetorical identification experiences). All but two (daughter, boyfriend) were spoken by authority figures. The leader and the father were cited the most often as the speakers in connection with the ethical appeal (3 each); this is not surprising, given the high degree of esteem that the organization confers upon them. "Mother" and "parents" were listed next, with two references each; and the "nicest girl" in the organization, a boyfriend, and a daughter with spiritual qualities were referred to once each. Generally speaking, the Book of Mormon was cited once, as was general organizational rhetoric ("we believe"; 4 times).

Among former members, 12 different members cited ethos-based rhetoric as important identification experiences, citing 32 examples. All of the speakers were authority figures. The leader (7); higher-ups in the bloodline (4); mother (4); and father (3) were mentioned the most. Daniel, one of the seven brothers, was referred to once, but negatively in a way that diminished identification. Parents were also referred to once, as was a first wife. In terms of organizational rhetoric, General organizational rhetoric was mentioned nine times, and the bible and Joseph Smith were each mentioned once.

It is no surprise that the leader is mentioned the most in connection with ethos. As we have described in detail earlier in the Chapter, the leader has an immense amount of ethos, because he is accepted by all in the group as the direct conduit through which God speaks to his people. Members are committed to following the leader by virtue of his position as a charismatic leader. As we have described in detail, the leader is viewed as being endowed with virtue and having access to special information akin to a magical kind of practical wisdom. To avoid redundancy, I will not explain all of these concepts again. But there are a few interesting things revealed by these data that should be noted.

First, former members described that the ethos of the leader extends not just over spiritual and personal matters but also over finances and matters of health. One former member states: "They used the deal where they say they're getting direction on that right

now, so it wouldn't be the best time for you to *buy* that, and a lot of people in there think, 'Well, he knows. They know what's best for me'" (participant 12). Matters of health are also controlled by the leader: "I couldn't go to the hospital until the leader of the Order came to the house and said it was okay for me to go to the hospital" (participant 14).

Second, the law of one above another adds additional importance to the charismatic qualities of the leader and strengthens control. One woman states that the law of one above another is "a law that God revealed to Brother Eldon that would help all of us get to the highest degree of glory and help us live like heaven on earth and that is--you do what the Lord tells you to do and you look to them. Anyway, we had to look to the one above us as if they were the highest God in heaven and do whatever they told us even if we thought it was wrong. And if it was wrong, then they would pay for it on the other side and not us. I mean, that was big. That was so big" (participant 8).

Although organizational identification and organizational control ordinarily go hand-in-hand in this organization, controlling practices can occasionally lead to disidentification or even a breaking point—even when the member is identified. One woman did not like her husband and attempted to stay away from him by moving to her mother's house: "I was staying at my mom's like downstairs and he was staying upstairs. . . . The [leaders] said I had to start staying over that night with him, so I left for good" (participant 9). This woman stated she was not particularly identified with the organization at this time, and the degree of organizational control that was being placed on her life was enough for her to leave. Another participant said that when the organizational leaders got involved in his personal life, he started becoming disidentified: "I had a girlfriend and I guess they [the leaders] didn't like her parents. You know, they thought that her family was down here and my family was up here, and so he [Daniel] would always talk to me about that girl, and he would tell me that it would be fine if I married that girl, but she couldn't be my first wife. After he started talking like that, I just started thinking, this can't be right" (participant 12). This man's personal values conflicted with organizational directives, and personal values won. Still another woman described being fully identified with the organization when she left: "I decided I was

going to leave, and I didn't care. I believed completely in what the Kingstons were doing. And I believed that I was going to go to hell for leaving. But the life there was so horrible . . . I didn't dare care about anything. I didn't dare care about people; I didn't dare make plans. I basically didn't dare to live. So life was so unpleasant . . . I'd watched my mother go through pregnancies every year and working and trying to take care of the kids. And her life was so horrible and I watched her go through this, day after day. And I was horrified that she wanted me to live this same way. And so I thought, I might go to hell when I die, but if I stay here, this is really a hellish life, and I don't want to stay" (participant 25). So, when organizational control gets to a certain level, members may become disidentified or leave, and the leader no longer has ethos.

As parents were also regarded as important in ethos-based appeals, a few comments should be made about their role, as well. The father is upheld by organizational rhetoric as a god in his own household. Therefore, it is not surprising that they are sources of ethos. However, the role of the mother in ethos-based appeals should not be discounted. Many participants, both current and former, cite their mothers as sources of ethos-based appeals. One current member states, "I remember as you would listen to stories being told in family home evening, like when Joseph Smith had his first vision and he was only 14 years old. My parents told me those stories, and I had a lot of faith in my parents, so I believed those stories were true" (participant 3). And a former member concurs: "my mom was the most stable thing I had ever had in the life, and so whatever she told me I believed" (participant 8). In my estimation, the fact that mothers emerge so prominently in the ethos-based rhetorical examples of the participants is significant. While they are considered lesser than the father and the leader, their rhetoric appeared to be just as significant as that of the father (six times each). From the rhetoric analyzed, the rhetoric of mothers is as salient as the father's; and they are just as complicit in keeping organizational members in line with organizational goals. *The idea promoted by some critics of the organization that women have no power to resist organizational directives is simply not true.*

Logos

Aristotle states that logos is an extremely important part of rhetoric. This type of rhetoric appeals to the rational mind and aims to promote practical wisdom in the audience. An especially effective logical argument will be clear and concise, "the result of which the heaers foresee as soon as they are begun, and not because they are superficial (for as they listen they congratulate themselves on anticipating the conclusion); and also those which the hearers are only so little behind that they understand what they mean as soon as they are delivered" (p. 325). Aristotle spends a considerable amount of time detailing ten different kinds of logical fallacies (pp. 325-33) and different kinds of enthymematic and inductive proofs. An entire dissertation could be devoted to examining these, and this is not our purpose here. But suffice it to say that a logical argument should be clear and contain a premise, evidence to support it, and a conclusion to be considered logical.

Five different current members cite appeals to logos as important identification experiences eight times. Six of eight instances were spoken by authority figures. All but four instances of logos were stated given by one individual (participant 18), who cited her father (the father of the first leader, Elden) four times and brother once. Other current members cited logical appeals one time each. All together, father was cited five times; husband one time; brothers one time; and self one time.

Ten different former members cited hearing or reading logos-based rhetoric as an important identification a total of 26 times. Interestingly, two of these sources were outside texts—a scientific article and religious texts of other faiths. Also interesting here is the "self" was cited six times as the source for logical argument. In these situations, former members' exercise of reasoning directly led them to be able to resist organizational rhetoric. Among former members, leaders were cited as the source of logos-based rhetoric seven times; the self was next (six times); then general organizational rhetoric (four times); unidentified order members (three times); and a brother, a family, a son, a scientist, and early LDS teachings one time each.

Two logos-based examples stand out as important in the creation of the Order. The first is the faulty use of mathematical reasoning to persuade members that the creation of the Order was foretold in the book of Daniel. Orlean Gustafson's diary records Elden's justification of the creation of the Kingston Order based on these mathematical calculations. (I have included the example in full because of its illustrative power.)

> Tonight when the bible class was ended No. 1 told what the dates given in Daniel meant. We look back through history and find out a lot of important days at the time they came forth. They came in such a way that there were very few that understood them when they happened. In the last Chapter of Daniel there are two figures given. 1290 and 1335 days. In another place it is represented by time, times and ½ time. This is also represented by times, time and 1/2 time in the 12th Chapter of Revelations.
>
> It takes 360 degrees to make a whole of anything in a circle. Time 360, times 720 and ½ time equals 1260. In Joseph Smith's translation it states specifically this means years. The time the woman was driven into the wilderness, that must have been during the dark ages or before the gospel was restored to Joseph Smith. 1335 days. It appears there is a period there that is not as choice; or blessed is he that waiteth and cometh after this period. To me 1290 and 1260 are very closely associated and refer to the same period.
>
> 1905 is the period or time when Michael stood up and began to plow the ground and a foundation was laid to prepareth the earth for the millennium. There is preparation to all these things. The thirty years represent the preparation. We might think the 1260 years was from Joseph Smith's time to the Savior's time; as 1830 was the end of this space of time, which is 1260 years. We might count back and see what time that started. 1830 subtract 1260 = 570. We know the gospel didn't stay in Jerusalem until then. And it didn't stay on this Continent until then. The Savior after he came here was to go to the tribes of the North. The gospel stayed here after he came longer than it did at Jerusalem and it must have been among the ten tribes.
>
> The gospel was kept until this time, by the ten tribes. Add 1335 to 570 and that brings 1905. 1290 and 1260; it seems as though they are very close and probably represent the same thing. Subtract 1260 from 1290 = 30 years. 30 years added to 1905 = 1935. In 1830 the gospel came to the earth. Not on a firm foundation. The Lord by special revelation, when the twelve apostles were chosen, they were told this gospel must be preached and rejected.
>
> There is 6000 years for the world to be in the Telestial Glory as preparation for the 7th thousand years. Ninety five years preparations is not very long. All of these changes in the world came about in natural ways. That work that is started now will gradually grow until the beginning of the millennium. The year 1935 marks the time when the seed was sown. 1936 marks the time when it is up

above the earth and can be seen. It took one year for the seed to germinate.

360 = time
+ 720 = times
+ 180 = half a time
1260 years of darkness

1830 = church started
-1260 = time, times and half a time
570 A.D. = When the gospel left the earth
+ 1290 = 2nd date in Daniel, time of darkness
1860

570
+ 1260 = first date in Daniel
1830 = when church commenced

1860
-1830 = 30 years difference in dates in Daniel
1335 = blessed is he who comes at this date
+ 570
1905 = When Michael stood up and began to plow the ground

1936 = date on the great pyramid. It says even the angels in heaven will not know this Date. It was revealed to Brother 1 after this work commenced in 1935.

1936 = It had grown till people of world noticed it
1905
+ 30 = years difference in dates in Daniel
1935 = the date the Kingdom of God started in the earth

Though the message cited above was intended to provide support for the creation of the organization, it is barely intelligible. The reference to "days" in Daniel are inexplicably compared with degrees of a circle. The 1260 years are subtracted from 1830, the day the LDS church was formed, for no apparent reason. The number 1260 is subtracted from 1290, which is then added to 1905. Through a series of mathematical gymnastics, we come to 1935, or the day when the Kingston organization began. Though this type of reasoning is not persuasive to the average reader, it was proof of the "truth" of the organization to Orlean, who was already identified.

A second logos-based example was important in the creation of the Order. The Order was concerned with having the correct priesthood authority to administer the gospel to its members. As former LDS members, they still believed that power had to be given directly to men from God, and they were concerned about how they were going to get it. It was illogical to them to start an organization without having the correct authority. So a story was created to fill in the logical gap. Participant 5 describes it this way:

> They teach in the homes [that] Brother Elden was the one mighty and strong. There's a story about him going and fasting in a cave just before he started the Order. They say that Jesus came and visited him and told him to start the Order. The funny thing is that he never told anybody that. That story was made up by Clyde Gustavsen. When we traced it down, it was made up by Clyde Gustavsen. Clyde even admitted it when he said, 'He didn't like to talk about these kind of things, but I think this might be what happened in that cave.' . . . When we finally talked to Merlin, we had pretty well found everything out. Merlin was finally straight with us and he says, 'the reality is that Brother Elden was born with the authority he needed.' It was kind of like, 'Man this whole thing really is just everybody's wants and wishes, there's nothing valid here.' What we had been told, anyway.

In this case of this former member, tracing the origin of the story that filled in the gap between the need for priesthood authority and Eldon's leadership led to his disidentification with the organization.

The Order also provides a logical explanation for arranged polygamous marriages, by reasoning from the decision premise of inequality of bloodline. One former member states: "They would always tell us . . . that we didn't get married for a relationship with another person, we got married for the children God wanted us to produce. Who would have the best genes that would make the right children. I mean, you had to marry who you were supposed to so you could have the right children. And so, we, as girls, were taught you have to look at the man or boy in the Order that you like the very, very least and be willing to marry that person if that's who the Lord tells you to marry. And so, growing up, you don't ever think you're going to actually marry somebody you love, and you may never love. But, you'll love your kids and that's all that counts" (participant

8). Though this is illogical according to mainstream societal standards, this is a reasoned argument based on the value premise of preserving a superior bloodline.

Through an analysis of the logos-based rhetoric, it appears that when organizational members are identified, they are unwilling to engage in reasoned-based argument that does not support organizational goals. One former member states: "I think a lot of people are able to see [the Order isn't true], but they just don't want to believe it. Like, especially with my mom, I think she was able to see everything, but she didn't want to believe that she had wasted her whole life" (participant 12). Here, a woman is unwilling to look at the Order logically because she had sacrificed so much for it. Another former member states that in a conversation with a leader, the leader said, "I've had questions too, but if I let myself think about them I'd go crazy." It appears that the sacrifice involved in being a member of the Order (as explained in depth in the deliberative rhetoric section) is a major deterrent to logical reasoning.

Although identification is a deterrent to logos-based reasoning, many members do develop it, especially over time. One member's reasoning skills started developing when she read a scientific study that did not support the assertions of the Book of Mormon. She states:

> When I was a kid, I loved the Book of Mormon and I would think, 'One of these days science is going to develop enough so that people will know the Book of Mormon is true. You know, they'll find something.' And there was a documentary on…through DNA evidence in archeological evidence that the Indians were Asian. I thought, 'That can't be true.' And I just…I mean, I couldn't even think about it then. But, when we started questioning, I thought, 'I need to question everything.' And with all the evidence of the DNA, I thought, you know, if Joseph Smith was wrong about that, maybe he was wrong about polygamy. . . . I was going to teach my daughters to live polygamy, and how could I do this if the Indians aren't Jewish? I just couldn't do that. So that was kind of the beginning of us questioning the doctrine of polygamy. (participant 8)

For one woman, it was the simple reasoning of her 2-year-old son that stirred her logical reasoning:

> [The church] would have garbage piled up as you would come in the entry way, like rotten produce that they got out of the dumpster to disperse to everybody.

> You didn't have to spend money on groceries—or you shouldn't—because you could have this rotten produce. . . . You didn't dare drink out of the cups but, you know, everybody else would, and there were dirty diapers in the bathroom on the floor. That was supposed to be God's house, you know, that cleanliness is next to godliness.
>
> Just before I stopped attending church and everything, I was in the back kitchen area with my son. He was not quite two yet, but he would say, "Look, Mom. Look! There's a hole up there. Well, look, there's a bird." or "Look, Mom. That's broken. Why doesn't someone fix it?" Here he is just two and he could see all of this—and he's pointing all of this out—and all these adults were totally blind to everything. (participant 14)

So, while this woman's identification was decreasing over time, it was the simple statements of a 2-year-old that finally led to her break with the organization.

For still another woman, the development of her logical reasoning came by reading literature from other religions.

> I slowly realized a lot of things probably weren't true, and one day it just hit me. And after that, I spent about 10 years studying probably more than 10 years, I read everything about different religions. I read about Joseph's witnesses, and about the Jewish history, and history of the bible. A history of the Catholic Church, history of Lutherans, and I just really wanted to understand how people could base so much on beliefs that . . . didn't have anything behind it. So I just had a really strong need to study that. And as I did, it just really kind of verified the fact that this is just one more really weird set of people that have some strange ideas. (participant 25)

In sum, it appears from the analysis of the data that the pursuit of reason did indeed lead several former members to disidentify with the organization. While fewer examples of logical reasoning were cited as important identification experiences, logic does emerge as important *not to identification but to disidentification.* While the organization does reason with its members (e.g., concerning the creation of the organization and arranged marriages), it appears that logic contributes the least to the identification process but contributes significantly to the disidentification process.

With regard to Singer's (2003) assertion that the reasoning faculties of members of new religious members are suppressed, the data suggest that *reasoning is not suppressed, for the organization reasons with its members, and members reason*

with each other; rather, it appears that the decision premises upon which reasoning is based are shifted in new religious movements like the Kingston organization—so what is generally accepted as self-evident by members is not by the outside world, and vice versa. For example, if we accept the topic of inequality (whether it is gendered, racial, organizational, or in reference to bloodline), then the reasoning of the organization makes sense. However, most Americans do not accept this topic; so, the Kingstons' arguments for intermarriage and polygamy appear unreasonable.

Pathos

Aristotle (2004) devotes a considerable amount of time identifying emotions and how to use them in rhetoric. As we explained earlier in the Chapter, one of Aristotle's major contributions to the field of rhetoric is his advances in the analysis of emotion. Emotions, he states, "are all those affections which cause men to change their opinion in regard to their judgments, and are accompanied by pleasure and pain" (p. 173). Emotions such as anger, pity, fear, shame, and their counterparts are given special consideration.

In this study, 6 different current members described 9 examples of pathos-based rhetoric as important in their identification experiences. Pride was cited four times; fear was cited twice; and happiness, anxiety, and love were each cited once. Twelve former members described pathos-based rhetoric for a total of 70 times. Fear was the most common emotion (27 times) to which pathos-based rhetoric appealed, followed by guilt/shame (21 times). Appeals to pride were next (9 times), followed by anxiety (pressure to marry; 3 times); jealousy and sadness (2 times); anger (1 time); loyalty (1 time); sadness (1 time); and happiness (1 time). Two instances of rhetoric that led directly to members leaving the organization appealed to trust (3 times) and pride (1 time). While a separate study could focus exclusively on pathos-based rhetorical appeals, that is not my purpose for this study. However, a few comments should be made about the most common appeal, fear.

The appeal to fear is by far the most commonly used appeal that members cite as important to their identification levels. This means that while the organization may use other appeals just as frequently, the fear-based tactics apparently work quite well. So, what are members afraid of?

First, members are afraid they will go to hell in the afterlife. One woman states: "You were just pretty much scared into it. They told you you're gonna go to hell if you're not here; this is the only place for you" (participant 9).

Second, members are taught to be afraid of the people in the outside world. One former member states: "You're born and raised, you're taught that's the only way to make it to heaven. You're also taught that when people leave, they get on drugs or run with the wrong crowd and you can't trust anybody out of the Order, and there's not good people out of the Order. . . . It's just a scary, scary place to be out of the Order" (participant 4).

Third, members are afraid they will not be able to survive financially outside of the organization, because they will not be able to get their money out of the organization or they will not be able to find a job. One woman states: "you live so poor, you barely have the things you need. You don't have anything extra. . . . you can't do anything. I mean, if you don't have anywhere to go, you can't go anywhere. If you can't get money, you can't go anywhere" (participant 9). Another former member states that fear lies in the unknown: "you leave and you don't know if you'll ever get a job or how to even get a job, so it's kind of scary that way" (participant 10).

Fourth, members are afraid their life on the outside will be no better than their life in the Order, that they will sacrifice a great deal to leave, only to be disappointed: "They tell you, you know, you can never find anyone else better. You're never going to find a better husband. No one's going to want you. You know, you've already been with someone, so no one is going to want you now" (participant 9).

Fifth, former members report being afraid to leave because they did not want to break family ties: "I had a family there. I had my sisters there. I had my mom. I mean,

I had other people there. It wasn't just about [her husband]. I had all my nieces and nephews and I knew that if I left I would lose all of that, all communications with them. That's just the way they are. Once you leave, you're done. . . . I knew that my mom would still talk to me, but it wouldn't be the same. It wouldn't be as much. But, I mean, and there was a lot of activities I'd go to and I had friends, and so those were a lot of the reasons I continued to stay and the fact that I had a job" (participant 10).

Sixth, members are also afraid that their children will leave, because it is considered a disgrace among Order members. Participant 8 explains: "When your child leaves, then they're almost no longer your child. I mean, there is very limited contact with them anymore. [It's] a horrible embarrassment to their parents [because] you're an Order member and you have a child that leaves. You obviously did not do what it takes to make a child, you know, or raise a child that can make it to the highest degree of glory."

Former members report that fear of the outside world lessens significantly when members have family outside of the organization. One member states: "We had some friends who left, and their parents told them that if they do, that's it. They basically wrote them off and never saw them for years after that. . . . It would be hard. You're just out by yourself" (participant 14). In fact, it is contact with the outside world that seems to be one of the most significant factors in encouraging people to leave the organization. This same former member states: "My mom had siblings that were not really in—her sister married out. So it was kind of like an accepted thing, and I saw that. My dad had sisters who were not part of the group, too. When we would have family get togethers, I saw them. I saw them what they had, and how they had nice things, they were happy, and life things were better, and [I decided], I want that. It was like nice to have that connection outside something to be connected to something out there some hope, I guess. That it's doable" (participant 14).

One current member states that she does not feel the organization appeals to fear. She states: "The kids, everyone is free to make their own choice. Some of them

will say, 'I was scared to leave.' There's no fear there. There's no fear that if you leave, we're gonna come after you. None of that. I don't know where they're getting that from" (participant 2). This woman reported having a very happy life and felt that former members' disidentification with the organization was a result of things not working out well for them "in their personal lives." For this member, fear was not part of her organizational experience. But for former members, fear figured significantly into their decisions to stay as long as they did.

In the previous analysis, I used cues from participants to suggest a dominant rhetorical appeal for experiences. While this may look reductive to a scholar of rhetoric, I purposely utilized this strategy for two reasons important to New Religious Movement scholarship: first, to address the issue of whether New Religious Movements suppress logic in their organizational rhetoric; and second, to ascertain what kinds of appeals participants found most useful. However, as William Grimaldi (1972) states, Aristotle views the most effective rhetoric as including all three kinds of rhetorical appeals.

A More Complex Look

Grimaldi (1972) states that "rhetorical discourse ideally should integrate these three elements [ethos, pathos, and logos] which lead to conviction" (p. 136). While Grimaldi concedes that Aristotle "recognizes that any of the three *pisteis entechnoi (pragma, ethos, pathos)* can be used independently to effect belief or conviction" (p. 140), he insists that Aristotle agrees that "pathos, ethos, and reason are intimately united in praxis" (p. 146). Reason has the power to change people's perceptions; ethos is the "disposition produced by a dominant appetitive faculty under the control of reason" (p. 145) through which reason and logic are filtered (in other words, it is "the moral element in character," the will; p. 145); and emotions "are those things through which men alter and change their decisions" (p. 147). Aristotle argued that, as Grimaldi explains, "discourse must be unified in both its argumentation and its language" (p. 150). Judgment is "an integral action and implicates reason and appetition working together" (p. 150).

As Grimaldi succinctly states, “if the whole person acts, then it is the whole person to whom discourse in rhetoric must be directed” (p. 150). This is true not just for analysis of rhetorical appeals, but for rhetoric as a whole. The integration of the rhetorical appeals is important not only to rhetorical strategies but also to the very constitution of rhetoric.

Taken together, Kingston organizational rhetoric is extremely effective rhetoric and utilizes all three rhetorical appeals in much of its discourse. As was before explained, the assertion made by many scholars of new religious movements that the organizations suppress logical faculties may pertain somewhat to the Kingston organization, since members appeared to be persuaded less through logical appeals and more through ethos and pathos (although in the section on decision premises, we explored the more likely possibility that the Kingston organization did not attempt to subvert logic; rather, the organizational rhetoric changed the decision premises upon which reasoned decisions were made). However, the organizational handbooks are replete with logical explanations that, combined with ethos and pathos appeals, produce highly effective reasons for participating in the Kingston organization.

For example, Lesson 13 in the children’s manual states that the objective of the lesson is to help the children better understand the “that the people of the order and church are the Lord’s covenant people” (Order, 2009a, p. 82). According to Kingston rhetoric, “The children should understand that the lord has preserved the line of his covenant people throughout the ages of the earth” (p. 82) and that the Kingstons are the modern-day children of Israel protected by God. From this decision premise, seemingly reasonable conclusions can be derived that extend far beyond the norms of mainstream society. The logic works something like this: If the Kingstons are the chosen people, then they are given elite status by God. If the Kingstons are elite, then they are better than other people in the world. If they are better than other people in the world, then the laws that apply to most people may not apply to them. If God is the head of their organization, then they should obey God’s law rather than man’s law. If God set apart the

people as chosen or elite, then they have a responsibility to keep that elite status pure. If they need to keep their elite status pure, then they should keep their bloodline pure and unfettered by people who are not chosen. In order to keep their chosen line pure, they must participate in incestuous marriages because of the small number of chosen people. Thus, we can see how a decision premise such as "the people of the Order are the Lord's chosen people" can lead to a reasoned explanation of why incest is a necessary practice. Combined with the appeal of pathos, where members are taught to feel both pride at being selected (participant 1) and fear that they will not complete everything required of a chosen person (see participant 5), and the appeal of ethos, where they believe that God himself gave the command, the organizational rhetoric supporting incestuous marriages becomes extremely persuasive.

An exhaustive explanation of how rhetorical appeals work together in Kingston organizational rhetoric to produce highly effective rhetoric is a very interesting study for another time. For now, suffice it to say that while members tended to identify rhetorical examples with one kind of appeal (they felt fear, they were overcome by the ethos of the prophet, they realized something, etc.), Kingston organizational rhetoric is replete with examples of highly effective organizational rhetoric that, as Grimaldi emphasizes, utilizes all three *pisteis* together in rhetorical splendor.

Conclusion

In this Chapter, I discussed the results of the Aristotelian analysis. First, I argued that rhetorical scholars should, following Aristotle, view the soul as bipartite for three reasons. First, in the bipartite soul emotion is regarded as a cognitive process and shows how a person cannot be angry if he does not feel he has been treated unjustly. This is important to the concept of bounded choice and helps to explain why members willingly identify with organizations that oppress them (it also helps to explain the slave mentality described by Burke (1950)). Second, Aristotle's concept of the bipartite soul gave emotional appeal new dignity within rhetoric and allowed him to discuss emotional

appeals as integral to the process of persuasion. Third, the four-dimensional conception of organizational identification fits neatly with Aristotle's bipartite soul.

In the second section of the Chapter, I highlighted rhetorical types, decision premises, and rhetorical appeals. The Kingston organization's deliberative appeal to the "greater good" allows them to subvert the goods of wealth, friendship, and good reputation by offering eternal salvation in exchange for sacrifice. The purpose of the organization's epideictic rhetoric is to praise the leader's virtues. Amplification of the leader's virtues and diminution of the members' social status makes the leader appear superior and worthy of praise. Forensic rhetoric appeals to the general law to convince members that the practices of intermarriage and polygamy are just. It is also effective in minimizing prosecution of these practices by the Utah state government. In the decision premises section, the topic of injustice is described as a commonplace in the Kingston organization with at least four dimensions: organizational inequality, gendered inequality, inequality of bloodline, and racial inequality. And in the rhetorical appeals section, the rhetorical appeals of ethos, logos, and pathos are described. Through this analysis, it appears that the ethos of the leader can go far in producing organizational identification; but taken to extremes, organizational control can lead to disidentification or a break with the organization, even when members are still identified. The logos-based reasoning in the organization appears to be alive and well; and it is the shift in decision premises that leads the organizational rhetoric to be regarded as illogical to outsiders. The pathos-based rhetoric that is salient to organizational members appeals most often to fear but also commonly appeals to other emotions such as shame and pride.

CHAPTER 7

BURKEAN IDENTIFICATION STRATEGIES: BOUNDED CHOICE IN "THE KINGDOM OF GOD"

Just as Burke wrote his *Rhetoric of Motives* as an accessory to Aristotle's *Rhetoric,* this Chapter analyzing Burkean Identification Strategies is intended to elucidate the Aristotelian rhetorical analysis and apply it even more directly to the process of identification. Specifically, I will show how the rhetoric of the Kingston organization and its members support Burke's concepts of mystery, mythic image, perfection, and identification that correspond with Lalich's (2004) bounded choice processes of charismatic authority, transcendental belief system, systems of control, and systems of influence; and Van Dick's (2001) affective, cognitive, behavioral, and conative dimensions of identification. In the first section, I will discuss cognitive identification in terms of Burke's mythic image. I argue that cognitive identification relies upon the mythic image of the "kingdom of God," through which all organizational rhetoric is filtered. In the second section, I argue that conative identification, which corresponds with Lalich's systems of influence and Burke's identification, is created and maintained through the promotion of a group identity. In this case, the organization attempts not to manage multiple identities (Cheney, 1991) but to eliminate them. And members utilize common ground techniques, identification by antithesis, the assumed "we," and unifying symbols (Cheney, 1983b) to concertively control members to adhere to this group identity. In the third section, I argue that behavioral identification, or members' acceptance of organizational decision premises, is set by two overarching doctrines that, together, are intended to create unity within the organization. In fact, the topic of inequality, which is directly related to the organizational practices that reside outside of social norms, is produced through the interplay of these two doctrinal decision premises. In the fourth section, I argue that emotional identification with the leader of

the family home (the father—and in many cases the father is also the leader) effectively disciplines the family system. This emotional identification is the lynchpin of the system—for as stated in Chapter 5, the family dimension of the organization is both the strongest and weakest system of control, depending on the relationships between these members. Finally, in the fifth section, I show how these four processes of organizational identification produce loyalty to the organization in thoughts, words, and actions.

Transcendental Belief System, Mythic Image, and Cognitive Identification: The Kingdom of God

To review, Burke states that a mythic image is a progressive and futuristic utopian ideology that has been built from a universal vocabulary and is encapsulated under a god-term, or a summarizing word that "sums up a manifold of particulars under a single head (as with the title of a book, or the name of some person or political movement)" (1961, p. 2; see 1950, p. 199). The mythic image is built through the ultimate vocabulary, which combines dialectical terms into "an ultimate order whereby ideas would transcend sensory images, and mythic images would in turn transcend ideas" (1950, p. 203). Meaning within this transcendental belief system is not able to be logically argued against because it operates on a mythical rather than dialectical level.

McGee (1980) takes the idea of Burke's mythic image and makes it applicable for use in the political and social realm by accounting for material as well as symbolic concerns. Noting deficiencies in the materialists' failure to explain socially constructed realities and symbolists' failure to explain the impact of material phenomena on the construction of social reality, McGee posits that ideology conceptualized as "political language preserved in rhetorical documents with the capacity to dictate decision and control public belief and behavior" (p. 5) can account for both symbolic and material aspects of social life.

Like Burke, McGee (1980) asserts that ideology is transcendent and pervasive. It is transcendent in that it applies to all individuals within the culture, the powerful and the

powerless alike. Ideology is not simply an illusory justification for hegemonic material interests, but is "as much an influence on the belief and behavior of the ruler as on the ruled" (p. 5). Ideology is also pervasive, manifest in ordinary language as ideographs, or "slogan-like terms signifying collective commitment" (p. 15). Terms such as "equality," "liberty," and "peace"—abstract "slogans" or "one-term sums of an orientation" (p. 7) representing commitment "to a particular but equivocal and ill-defined normative goal" (p. 15)—fill our society as the linguistic building blocks that enable a group to act as a collective. Where there is an act of power, there will be a justification for the behavior in the name of an ideograph representing a culturally accepted ideology (e.g., "in the name of justice" or "truth," etc.). Here we see that McGee has taken Burke's concept of "god-term" and now calls it an "ideograph." It's trendy, so we'll go with it.

Ideographs (or "god-terms"), as the building blocks of ideology, are what socialize and unite individuals into a collective and enable social control. A cluster of ideographs is a vocabulary that individuals must accept before being recognized as members of a group. When members of a group accept a vocabulary of ideologies, or ideographs, they are socialized into the group and are constrained to act within certain prescribed parameters, what McGee calls "prior persuasion" (p. 5). McGee also argues that the collective acceptance of ideographs is what essentially defines a social unit: ideographs "define a collectivity, i.e., the outer parameters of a society, because such terms either do not exist in other society or do not have precisely similar meanings. . . . One can therefore precisely define the difference between the two communities, in part, by comparing the usage of definitive ideographs" (p. 8). These vocabularies, or ideographs, function as "guides, warrants, reasons, or excuses for behavior and belief" (p. 6); and as one-term sums of a widely held orientation, they are accepted as "normal"

versions of reality. As Burke states, a full explanation of the social effects of a god-term/ ideograph can be found by constructing a grammar of past uses of the word through time (diachronic analysis) and a rhetoric of all of the different meanings of the word as it is currently used (synchronic analysis).

"Kingdom of God"

As McGee (1980) observes, ideographs must be part of the everyday vocabulary of the culture in which they operate (p. 7). So in order for a phrase to be an ideograph, it must be ubiquitous in the everyday speech and written documents of the culture in which it resides. In the case of the Kingston organization, "kingdom of God" is a phrase that is part of their everyday speech and part of their canonized scripture and is used in terms of both increasing spirituality and physical amassing of wealth. In order to better explain the diachronic and synchronic nature of the ideograph, I will first explain the historical use of the phrase "kingdom of God," as it was borrowed from the LDS Church. I will then explain the current use of the phrase in Kingston life to justify its economic policies.

Diachronic Use of "Kingdom of God"

As we know, the Kingston organization began with Eldon Kingston and his two wives (Hall, 1999). Kingston was excommunicated from the LDS church in 1832 and spent the rest of his young life preaching frugality and polygamy as the way to build the kingdom of God on earth (Erickson, personal communication, July 2005).

The Kingston organization borrowed the term "kingdom of God" from its LDS roots, as it is found in Mormon canonized scripture (Book of Mormon, Bible, and Doctrine and Covenants). In what is currently deemed canonized scripture by the Kingston organization, the phrase "kingdom of God" is mentioned 120 times. In the New Testament of the Bible, for example, the phrase is found 54 times in the Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John) alone. Fifteen additional references are found in the New Testament from Acts through 2 Thessalonians. The Book of Mormon contains 35

references to the "kingdom of God," and the Doctrine and Covenants uses the phrase 16 times ("kingdom of God," 2005, n.p.). In addition to the dominant presence of "kingdom of God" in scripture, the 9th Article of Faith, written by Joseph Smith and canonized as scripture by the Mormon church, reads, "We believe all that God has revealed, all that he does now reveal, and we believe he will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the kingdom of God" ("kingdom of God," 2005, n.p.). As the Kingston organization purports to believe Mormon doctrine up to 1890, when the practice of polygamy was discontinued by the LDS church, the organization accepts this creed.

Synchronic Use of "Kingdom of God"

While "kingdom of God" may not rise to the level of cultural ideograph in mainstream Christianity (including Mormonism), the phrase is used so extensively in the Kingston PO to justify its policies, the phrase does operate as a cultural ideograph/ god-term in this microcosm of several thousand members. In fact, Rowenna Erickson's parents were among the first to join the Kingston organization, and the phrase "kingdom of God" was used in persuading them to join. Erickson states that "Eldon [Kingston] came to Idaho and preached to them about restoring the kingdom of God and restoring beliefs that the Mormon church no longer partook of" (Erickson, personal communication, July 2005).

The Kingston organization deems itself the kingdom of God on earth. According to Erickson (personal communication, July 2005), the doctrine of the Kingston organization states that only 144,000 people will be numbered in the kingdom of God in the last days. And in order to become part of the kingdom of God, you have to have a certain amount of money in the Kingston-owned bank and demonstrate your work ethic and frugality. When Erickson was a member, "In the Kingston group, they numbered [people who were in the kingdom of God]. The lower the number, the more privileged you were." Not everyone in the organization got a number; in fact, the assets in the Kingston-owned bank largely determined whether you would receive the privilege of

being numbered in the kingdom of God. “Guys would go without and do everything they could to earn a number. It was an absolute privilege to be one of the 144 thousand. When Ortel [Kingston] was in charge, he made everyone work their ass off to get a number and would announce numbers in New Years’ Meeting. Everyone there was hoping they would get a number. Hardly anyone got one.” Erickson called this reservation of spiritual blessings for the financially blessed the “carrot before the horse syndrome,” as members would deprive themselves of economic necessities for the nebulous promise that they might one day be numbered in the kingdom of God. As Erickson stated: “You have to earn your way, you have to buy your way into heaven through sacrifice.”

As the Kingston organization represents itself as the “kingdom of God,” all church members are required to sacrifice their own property and possessions to increase its financial holdings. Members typically live in poverty (Moore-Emmett, 2004). One former member, Bill Adams, states: “’My son-in-law’s sister is married to [Paul Kingston]. . . She’s 30 years old and has nine kids. And she has to decide each month whether she’s going to pay the rent or feed some of the kids’” (Kilzer, 2000). As the Denver Rocky Mountain News states (Kilzer, 2000),

> Despite the vast wealth the group has accumulated, group members and even some of their leaders live in hovels scattered throughout Salt Lake City and nearby towns. Some of the homes are mildewed, with rotting, unpainted walls and cheap, tattered rugs. The male members own the run-down housing, with a house reserved for each wife. But the wives of the Kingston brothers must pay rent from their earnings at mostly minimum-wage jobs at family-owned companies, according to former members. . . . [Says one former member], “You would be amazed at the lengths they go to save money. They even tell you you’re only supposed to use three squares of toilet paper. And they used to go get garbage out of the back of large grocery stores and eat it.

Despite their poverty levels, in order to renew their memberships each year, members must sign a document that reads: “I voluntarily transfer all claim and title to all my possessions to said society as a Gift. I also agree to turn the results of my labor, together with the results of my wife and family’s labor, to the society, as long as we are members. In case I or we ever withdraw from the society, I or we claim no equity

whatsoever in the society" (Kilzer, 2000). The transfer of all members' property and assets in exchange for membership in the Kingston organization is what the Kingstons term the "building of the kingdom of God." Erickson (2005) succinctly states: "They believe that financial and spiritual should be equal. So if you're really up spiritually, you should be up financially."

Though the term "kingdom of God" is not a large part of mainstream American culture, it does have presence in Christian literature in general, evidenced by the number of times it is used in the New Testament of the Bible, Mormon literature, and especially in the Kingston organization. As the Kingston organization is highly secretive and isolationist (Emmett-Moore, 2004; Kilzer, 2000), members of the organization can be adequately described as existing within a hegemonic subculture of Utah and American culture. And because the Kingstons number several thousand (Emmett-Moore, 2004; Erickson, 2005b), they can be deemed a small "culture" within a culture. It can be argued that, because of the dominance of the subculture in religious, political, economic, and familial aspects of life, a phrase that is so ubiquitously present and pragmatically implemented as the "kingdom of God" may rise to the level of cultural ideograph and god-term. In sum, the mythic image of the kingdom of God guides the practices and goals of family, religious, and business dimensions of the Kingston organization.

Through this god-term, members acquire cognitive identification, or knowledge of who they are. In the Order's Sunday school handbook, this cognitive identification is boldly declared in numerous statements: 'I am a member of the Order. We are members of the Order'"; and "Of all the millions of babies born in all of the world, the Heavenly Father picked us out to be that very special person, an Order member" are examples (Order, 2009a, p. 3). This group identity of members building the kingdom of God will now be explained more fully in the conative identification section.

Consubstantiality, Systems of Influence, and Conative Identification: Group Identity

In the Kingston organization, fostering a group identity is very important. A group identity encourages cooperation among members, makes members more compliant to organizational directives (there is no argument if everyone is the same), and creates a sense of belonging in the organizational culture. In a very real sense, members of the organization feel consubstantial with one another.

Through the vernacular rhetoric in the informal organizational culture, or systems of influence, Kingston members use identification strategies to concertively control one another. Organizational rhetoric uses identification strategies, to be sure, but this study focuses on Burkean identification strategies used in vernacular rhetoric. In the first part of this section, I will describe vernacular as articulated by Ono and Sloop (1995) and Burkean identification strategies, articulated by Cheney (1983b). In the second part, I will discuss how Kingston members use identification strategies to encourage a group identity. It is fostered by establishing this identity at a young age; instilling a sense of pride among members by comparing them with outsiders; and internalizing an organizational set of values.

Vernacular Rhetoric and Identification Strategies

Traditional rhetorical studies have focused on rhetoric spoken or written by dominant power interests (Aristotle, 2004; Hill, 1972; Quintilian, 1969). While this approach has yielded important information, the field has until recently excluded the study of vernacular rhetoric (or the study of rhetoric in marginalized or powerless communities; Ono & Sloop, 1995). As Ono and Sloop (1995) contend, focusing exclusively on the hegemonic rhetoric of the powerful is incomplete without looking at how these discourses are accepted or resisted by the audiences for which they are

intended.

Vernacular Rhetoric

Ono and Sloop (1999; Lair, 2007; Sloop & Ono, 1997) state that to present a fuller picture of the way rhetoric influences power critics must study vernacular discourse. While they favor studying out-law discourse (the kind of vernacular rhetoric that resists organizational rhetoric rather than supports it), I believe that studying dominant vernacular discourse (vernacular rhetoric that supports and defends organizational rhetoric) is equally telling. From the first type we are able to see gaps and fissures in organizational rhetoric, which are possibly sites for resistance. In the second type, we are able to see what types of rhetoric are the most persuasive to the vernacular community. By including an analysis of vernacular rhetoric along with organizational rhetoric, a critic is better able to achieve a holistic criticism which, as Lair (2004) explains, simultaneously engages both critiques of domination and freedom by identifying and understanding what a given discourse is designed to do.

This type of analysis is especially appropriate for studying what Lalich (2004) terms "systems of influence," or the organizational culture and concertive control system in which conative organizational identification is especially salient. Focusing on the vernacular rhetoric gives us insight into which organizational messages are the most persuasive to members (by looking at which organizational rhetoric they appropriate into their own rhetorical messages). It also allows us to assess which types of rhetoric are used by members the most, and with what results. By using Cheney's (1983b) analysis of Burkean identification strategies, we can analyze the types of values that organizational members talk about and emphasize. Note here that while Cheney uses identification strategies to understand organizational rhetoric, this strategy is used here to understand member's vernacular rhetoric with each other.

Identification Strategies

Cheney (1983b) states that identification strategies are essential to organizational

life: “identification strategies (and their more focused forms, tactics) take on tremendous importance when viewed in contemporary organizational life; they are intentional and unintentional attempts by the organization to induce identification on the part of the employee members” (p. 156). Identification within an organization is largely concerned with the inculcation of values among its members. Cheney states: “Corporations often assume the congruence of individual and organizational values, goals, and interests. In the process, distinctions between individual and organization and between organization and society become rather fuzzy” (p. 156). So, in the fuzziness of vernacular rhetoric, we would expect the identification strategies to include both member rhetoric and appropriation of organizational discourses.

Cheney draws upon Barnard (1983), who states that any individual in an organization must give up a certain degree of autonomy to be part of a collective. As members of this collective group, they adopt the values and messages of the organization as their own. Indeed, “organizations are in the business of ‘congregation.’ . . . In short, fostering identification is the ‘intent’ of many corporate policies, for with it comes greater assurance that employees will decide with organizational interests uppermost in mind” (Cheney, 1983b, p. 157). Cheney states that identification strategies can be grouped into four categories: identification through similarity, identification through antithesis, identification through the assumed “we,” and unifying symbols.

Common Ground Strategies

Cheney (1983b) operationalizes Burke’s identification strategies for the study of formal communication in organizations. The first strategy is called “the common ground technique.” In this technique, a rhetorician links himself overly, suggesting commonalities in values, goals, and identity. Cheney describes six types of this strategy, all of which are used to some extent by the Kingston organization in the 34 examples cited by participants.

Expression of Concern for the Individual

While organizational rhetoric fosters a group identity, many of the current members express that their identification with the organization stems from members' showing concern for other individuals. This is the most commonly used common ground technique among members. Of the 34 common ground strategies identified in the narratives, 14 of them have to do with concern for the individual. One member explains: "I just knew I was in the right place. I never fit in anywhere growing up because I didn't belong to any churches or anything, and so you go to school and lots of kids and groups and they all know each other from somewhere, and I never felt like I belonged. Sorry, now I'm going to cry. Anyway, I just never felt like I belonged and this really is the only place I've ever felt like I fit in. Scott's family has been really good to me and always included me. . . . They have always made me a part of everything, anytime the sisters did anything they would include me" (participant 17). Here, the dual strategy of fostering a group identity through organizational rhetoric and showing concern for the individual through the service of members to each other work in harmony to produce identification on both organizational and smaller-group (family or work group) levels.

Recognition of Individual Contributions

The recognition of individual contributions was mentioned by two participants (2 and 3) cited as an important identification experience by one of them (participant 2). This woman described her relationship with her boss in this way: "She started working with me and actually training me in pattern making and that kind of thing. She made me feel like—how many 16-year-olds get the chance to learn how to make patterns? . . . They made me feel like I was a part of it. . . . It was praise, but it was also that they had confidence in me at such a young age, that they felt I would be able to do the things they were showing me and teaching me" (participant 2). This participant felt identified with

the organization because she was regarded as a contributing member.

Espousal of Shared Values

Many times in the interviews members made comments such as “we believe” or “in our organization, we are taught” (see participant 3). This technique is an integration of this technique and the assumed “we” strategy. Because of its importance on its own, I will treat it in the “assumed we” section.

Advocacy of Benefits and Activities

This type of common ground strategy was mentioned only by current members, and was described as an important identification experience by two participants (2 and 3). While members did not always cite this identification strategy as important to their identification levels, many of them mentioned in passing some of the benefits of membership, such as (1) stability of always having a job (participant 28); (2) feeling like you “belong” somewhere (participant 17); (3) having others to rely on to help; and (4) happiness (participant 1). One woman described it this way:

> One of the things that really bothers me is people who misjudge. They have these preconceived notions that we are hillbillies—barefoot and not encouraged to go to school .. . . I had this one lady who liked to find out everything about everyone, maybe going so far as to saying nosey. But she asked me [how many children I had], and I always give honest answers. And I said 9. “Oh, 9 children!” And I said, “Because they’re worth it. My kids are everything to me. They’re my enjoyment, they’re my life, they are my everything.”
>
> They went to from the beginning, thinking I was crazy or strange or whatever, to . . . saying [to her husband], “you have an amazing wife.” I’m kind of a humble person, you know. I’m not normally a “look at me, look at me.” It just kind of surprised me a little bit. Everyone: “You have an amazing wife, amazing all this stuff she does.” I thought, “huh!” And then I started thinking, “I couldn’t do that without being here. I couldn’t do that to the degree without being part of the organization.” I think that’s what helps me to identify the most. (participant 26)

Praise by Outsiders

This identification strategy was cited by one participant as important to her identification; but as expected, this strategy did not emerge as important to identification

levels. In fact, there is ample evidence suggesting that derogation by outsiders, not praise, strengthens these people's identification. One participant told me about a time where a social service worker quit her job rather than continue to harass participant 2 and her family. She states:

> The DCFS woman that came, she was just amazed. . . . she couldn't believe all the people were there, painting and finishing construction. It was just at the finishing staged. . . . She also said she had never met anybody as nice as the kids' father. . . . Before we got the kids back, and they were only gone about a week, the DCFS woman, she quit. She said, "I don't see any reason that these kids shouldn't be back in the home. There's nothing wrong here. There's nothing stopping them. Physically, mentally, emotionally." She didn't like what the prosecutors were doing to us. So she quit her job.

Praise by this outsider was an important identification experience for this woman.

Testimonials by Employees

Testimonials by other members figured prominently into two identification experiences. One man stated: "When I was young I had a lot of older brothers and sisters, and they would talk about being a part of things. They would tell me I was a part of things, so I began to get sort of a sense of pride in being there. You know, in the early 80s, when you had Ronald Reagan as president and everyone in kindergarten, would sing, "I'm proud to be an American." . . . It was kind of the same effect, so I began to identify it at that point when I was roughly, in my first memories, ages 3 and 4. . . . Well, there was just talk about being a part of a society where we could make things better and just general things like that" (participant 16). This man also spoke about the testimonial of his father being important to his identification: "It's when my father started getting me involved in his business . . . I would watch what he does and I would listen to the things that he was saying, why he was doing those things, and it kind of got me more involved in being part of the Davis County Co-op, I guess. . . . When we are at work and we have all our family at work, you know, he says the reason we can do this is because we are part of a group where we can work together and where we can go for a common purpose" (participant 16).

Testimonials of employees emerge strongly in the organizational rhetoric. The

Adult Sunday School lesson manual is replete with testimonies of the members; and so is the children's lesson manual (Order, 2009a; 2009b). The Book of Mormon, which the Kingstons accept as scripture, begins with two written documents: the testimony of three witnesses and the testimony of eight witnesses. In the first, the three witnesses state that they saw both the golden plates from which the Book of Mormon was translated and an angel. The eight witnesses stated they saw the golden plates and were able to touch and handle them. But it is interesting to note that while testimonials of employees is an important strategy of organizational rhetoric, it did not figure strongly into members' stated identification experiences.

It is also worth noting that, in the interviews, numerous participants gave me their own employee testimonials. For example, one woman talked about the financial benefits: "life has been good. I've been on several trips, because we've been taught to be frugal with our money. . . . I've been to Hawaii, to the Bahamas, to Mexico, on the cruises. You can still do that, but you do it because you learn to do without the hamburger or the fast foods. We eat careful, and we eat good wholesome foods that don't cost so much. In my family, we don't go out and buy fancy boats, because we save it for things that really count" (participant 19). Another participant emphasized the children: "I just feel that life would have been so empty without all of us, all of the kids, and the connection and bond the kids have with each other. It's just, it's really nice" (participant 2). Another participant spoke highly of her sister wives: "I actually love my family to death. I feel like the other women in my family are my best friends, and I don't know what I would do without them. I always have felt like I have been blessed with the best family in the world, because they're all so sweet and nice. Sometimes you hear about that not-so-nice person in the family that maybe might cause a little bit of tension, but we don't have that in ours. We've got all nice people" (participant 3). And about the spiritual benefits, participant 18 states: "And, I had a good friend whose brother left the Order and joined the LDS church, and she said, 'You know, I've often wondered about Rulon. As soon as he left the Order,

he became a bishop and everything. I just wonder if he just wasn't quite evolved enough to be here, but he could excel there."' And, that's the way I feel. I just think, you know, some people just, it's too hard for them. It isn't hard if you understand and if you have a relationship with the Lord, but when you think, 'What about me? What about me, me, me, me, me?' It's hard." For this woman, the Kingstons are the most spiritually evolved.

A couple of common ground strategies did not seem to fit into the six categories listed above, because there was not enough information to classify them. Two participants spoke of the general kindness of members figuring importantly into their identification experiences. They could have possibly been categorized as "concern for the individual," but it was not clear in the text—so I classified them as general kindness. One other participant cited an experience where her father-in-law came over and tried to stop her from leaving. As she described it, it was his presence more than his words that had such significant impact. I did not know how to classify this, so I listed it as "unclear"; however, it best fits in the "concern for the individual" category, as well.

In sum, all six common ground strategies were used in members' rhetoric of identification. Of the 34 examples listed, the "concern for the individual" technique was used the most (14 times), followed by espousal of shared values (11), testimonials of employees (2 times), advocacy of benefits and activities (2 times), recognition of individual contributions (1 time), and praise by outsiders (1 time). Of the three examples that were unable to be classified, they appeared to be most related to the concern for the individual (bringing this to a total of 17). Here, it is apparent that while a group identity is fostered by organizational rhetoric, the rhetoric most persuasive to members is related to their individual identities.

Identification Through Antithesis

Identification through antithesis is described by Cheney as "the act of uniting against a common enemy" (p. 148). What Burke (1940) terms the "perfect enemy" is very useful for identification because it provides a scapegoat for organizational problems that

may arise and allows internal criticism and conflict to be efficiently directed towards a source outside of the organization. Through this identification through antithesis, Cheney states that "corporations implicitly stress identification with 'insiders' (i.e., members of the organization) as an effort toward achieving unity and collective acceptance of organizational values.

Identification through antithesis is used frequently in the rhetoric of the Kingston organization. In organizational rhetoric, for example, outsiders are compared with "swine" in the Sunday School manual for children: "Pearls represent things that are precious and valuable, like our Sunday Schools and meetings, our home evenings and the things we are taught here; and the very special families that we have. The swine represent people that do not understand the precious things of the Heavenly Father and only ask questions because they are curious or want to make fun of us. Sometimes if we were to tell special Order things to someone at school they might even tell someone else who would try to hurt us" (Order, 2009a, pp. 258-59).

The organizational rhetoric also describes the bad things that happen to their enemies as God's justice: The Adult Sunday School lesson manual states: "Attorney General Walter L. Budge was encouraging the Grand Jury to prosecute Polygamists and spoke in state legislative meetings about stamping out Polygamy in the state of Utah. . . . On October 30, 1961 he was taken to the hospital because of an illness. The doctors couldn't find anything wrong with him but on Dec 11, 1961 Walter Budge died of an internal hemorrhage. He was 55 years old" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 37, p. 3). Here's another example, also from the lesson manual: "The District Attorney, Roland Anderson, who was prosecuting the trials became ill before trying all of the cases, so they postponed the rest of the trials indefinitely. When he did get well he didn't push for the trials to go on. He was running for reelection that year. . . . A few years later, Robert Trump who served as deputy sheriff at the time of the Grand Jury, was killed in an automobile accident" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 37, p. 4). And the most explicit example: "We told him

. . . you better be honest with Mr. Kingston. If you're not something will happen to you . . . There was a truck going slow through the cows. It looked like the horse was going down off the side of the highway so the truck sped up. Just then the horse backed up into the truck. The . . . man was taken to the hospital with a broken leg. Mr. McElprang said, 'We knew it happened because of how he treated Mr. Kingston'" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 41, p. 5).

Vernacular rhetoric of this type (identification through antithesis) that emerged as important to members' identification experiences can be divided into two categories: outsiders and disobedient members. While outsiders are usually spoken of in general terms, specific outsiders such as a therapist, the Lebarons, and Black people were targeted. Of the 14 examples of identification by antithesis in the interviews, 7 refer to outsiders, and 7 refer to specific members. References to outsiders included three general references, two references to Black people, one reference to the Lebarons (a different polygamous group known for being especially violent), and a therapist. References to outsiders took two forms. They were either characterized as evil or unequal to the Kingstons.

Outsiders

Rhetoric about the Lebarons is a good example of identification through antithesis concerning outsiders. The Lebarons and the Kingstons were involved in a feud that spanned two decades. One participant explains:

> Ervil LeBaron was trying to get the Order to join his thing, because the Order had all the money, but he supposedly had all the keys [priesthood power]. He was trying, coming to the church a lot and the different businesses and things, and I remember seeing, he was a big guy, but then you would hear the stories too of what they would do to the people in Mexico. You know, light their houses on fire and when they'd come out they'd shoot 'em dead . . . When they came into the scene . . . I'd get all scared and think, "Oh, great! They're gonna get me when I get off the bus, 'cause they know who I am." (participant 13)

Whether or not the fear about the Lebarons was justified (the leader of the group spent numerous years in jail for having two of his wives kill the leader of a rival

organization), the Kingstons used this rhetoric to encourage members of the group stick closer to each other. Participant 13 continues: "We had armed guards at the church. There were people that would sit out in front of the church in the pickup trucks with their guns, you know, just in case the LeBarons came to get us" (Participant 13). Through this rhetoric, the Lebarons became the perfect enemy (Burke, 1940)—and the common fear of this enemy encouraged identification with the organization for protection.

Disobedient Members

The other group targeted by rhetorical strategies that used identification by antithesis was disobedient members. Members who leave are considered evil or unworthy to be there. Participant 18 explains: "There are people who struggle in the Order, and they don't understand. . . . I had a good friend whose brother left the Order and joined the LDS church, and she said, 'You know, I've often wondered about Rulon. As soon as he left the Order, he became a bishop and everything. I just wonder if he just wasn't quite evolved enough to be here, but he could excel there.' And, that's the way I feel. I just think, you know, some people just, it's too hard for them" (participant 18). Other organizational members are not so kind. In fact, participant 5 was widely regarded as "Satan" when he started asking questions about the creation of the Order: "I had one little five-year-old boy sneak down to play with our four-year-old and he says, 'Don't tell my mom and dad I'm here, because my daddy says your daddy is Satan. Is your daddy really Satan?'" (participant 8). Other members (participant 13, participant 10, participant 9) recall being derogated by the organization for small slights. For example, according to participant 13, false rumors were spread around the community that participant 13 slept around (which in the Kingston organization is a sin that approaches murder).

This disdain or mistrust of outsiders serves the purpose of isolating Kingston members emotionally, even while they are going to school with them: "It was weird, because you couldn't really get close to friends because they would want you to come over there and sleep over or they'd want to come to your house, but you couldn't let your

world intertwine" (participant 14). One current member stated it a little more delicately: "You had your outside friends, and you had your inside friends, but you always felt more comfortable with your inside friends because you've known them all your life. The one drawback is if you make a mistake . . . you know, in high school if you mess up on something, everyone remembers you for it, then you're never going to see those people again. They're going to graduate and go their separate. But on the inside, you hope they forget because you know you're going to see them forever" (participant 28).

In sum, identification by antithesis creates a perfect enemy that organizational members can fear and blame. This technique encourages members to stick closer to each other and isolate themselves out of fear (that they will be hurt by outsiders) and pride (that they are better than outsider).

The Assumed "We"

As Cheney (1983b) states, "The assumed 'we' is both a subtle and powerful identification strategy because it often goes unnoticed. Uses of this strategy allow a corporation to present similarity or commonality among organizational members as a taken-for-granted assumption. To the extent that employees accept this assumption and its corollaries unquestioningly, they identify with their corporate employer" (p. 154). This type of strategy is used when organizations use the pronoun to bypass formal persuasion and include identification as taken for granted. Cheney illustrates corporate statements such as "we are against new taxes on profits" as an example of the assumed "we."

The assumed "we" is used extensively in the Kingston organization. As Cheney (1983b) states, it is both subtle and powerful, and it filters into the vernacular discourse imperceptibly. The assumed "we" did not figure prominently in the identification examples provided by interview participants, but it was used extensively in the interviews of current members to tell me what they believed as an organization. The term "we believe" was used 6 times in current members' interviews, compared with zero times in former members' interviews. Of course, this is expected, because former members are

now disidentified. They used the term "they believe," instead (9 times compared with current members' 2 times about people outside of the organization). It is also expected that members would use the assumed "we" without it being the center of a rhetorical identification experience. This is because the technique is unobtrusive and largely undetected by the members, themselves. The assumed we figured more prominently in the rhetoric current members used to explain what they believed in the interviews. One participant referred to the leader as "somebody who we respect being able to get divine guidance" (participant 3). Another person used it to refer to the organizational belief that children go to heaven (participant 17); another to the belief that people must be Order members to go to heaven (participant 18). A 4th participant used the strategy to state the members believe they covenanted with their families before mortality (in a place called "the pre-existence") to be family members; and still another talking about the organizational belief that spouses are chosen by God (participant 2). Finally, a 6th individual used the term to refer to the belief that the leader and parents should both approve of a marriage choice before it is presented to a woman. In sum, the assumed "we" figures importantly into vernacular rhetoric (and is all over the place in the organizational rhetoric); and the fact that members use the phrase frequently but do not cite it as an important rhetorical identification strategy is evidence of its unobtrusive power.

Unifying Symbols

Cheney found in his analysis of corporate house organs that a type of organizational rhetoric "suggests the notion of commonality among organizational members, but only implicitly. Hence, it cannot be typed as a common ground tactic. On the other hand, this statement of the individual-organization relationship is too direct to be considered evidence of the assumed 'we.' For purposes of this discussion, I label this additional category 'unifying symbols'" (Cheney, 1983b, p. 155). This type of rhetoric, Cheney feels, is better analyzed with respect to form rather than content. Through

citing Burke, Cheney states that "the sheer appeal of a form may induce an auditor to participate, and 'this attitude of assent may then be transferred to the matter which happens to be associated with form'" (p. 155). Thus an individual may come to accept signs of identification such as logos or trademarks as referents of written organizational rhetoric.

Unifying symbols are used often to guide the actions of the members. Unity is stressed as one of the most important organizational goals; and the organization stresses adhering to certain rituals to symbolize the unity that they hope members are feeling. The children's Sunday School lesson manual teaches children to "hold our hands like the one who is leading the prayer" (2009a, p. 149). This is "because we are all supposed to be in perfect harmony with that person. We should listen to what he or she is saying and pray in our hearts for the same things" (p. 149). So holding hands like the one leading the prayer (i.e., arms folded or hands clasped together) symbolizes the harmony (unity) that organizational members strive to achieve. Other rituals include reciting memory gems, or organizational mantras, two or three times per day that stress group identity and unification with organizational goals (participant 5, Order 2009a); facing toward one of two holy spots when they pray; fasting without food for at least 24 hours; and having a marriage ceremony to solidify the ties between a man and wife. While none of the members cited unifying symbols as directly relevant to their identification levels, members referred to them constantly throughout the interview. These data suggest that unifying symbol have significant unobtrusive power to conform members' actions to organizational goals.

The analysis of Burkean identification strategies reveals that members amply utilize these identification strategies in their vernacular rhetoric. The most commonly used common ground strategy was concern for the individual (14 examples), which is interesting given the focus on group identity (which was cited next, with 11 examples). Identification by antithesis focused on two groups: outsiders and disobedient members.

The assumed "we" and unifying symbols were also used frequently but were not cited as central rhetorical identification examples, probably because these types of organizational power are more unobtrusive. In sum, members used these strategies to influence one another and attempt to increase people's organizational identification. As one current member aptly states: "It's human nature to identify with wherever we are, whether it's our class or our family, or if we're close to our neighbors or not. Whatever we experience a lot, put forth effort, or have an interest, we identify with" (participant 20).

Organizational Rhetoric and Group Identification

In the previous section, we identified some of the rhetoric that members use to persuade and identify with each other. In this section, we will focus on the Burkean identification strategies that are also used in organizational rhetoric. Unity is stressed by the Kingston organization as the ultimate goal of the Kingston organization. In order to achieve this, a group identity is encouraged. This is done by establishing group identity at a young age (using common ground strategy); appealing to the pride of members as elite by virtue of their group membership (using identification by antithesis); and inculcating organizational values through the memorization and recitation of official organizational rhetoric (using the assumed "we").

Establishing Identity at a Young Age

The first lessons of the children's manual (ages 6-7) are dedicated to helping the children establish organizational identities. Teachers are given specific instructions to facilitate this identification: "Point to each child and ask, 'Who are you?' Have each child answer by stating his or her name. Explain that each of us is a unique person. State very clearly: 'I am a member of the Order. We are members of the Order'" (Order, 2009a, p. 3). By stating that each member is unique but defining them in terms of the Order, the organization is implying that members are unique not because of their individual characteristics but because they belong to a unique group.

In addition to defining children in terms of the group, happiness and wellbeing

are taught as achievable only through the organization. The children's Sunday School lesson manual states: "The Order is a wonderful place where we have lots of friends and family that help each other and want to do the things Heavenly Father wants us to do. He wants us to love one another, be obedient to our parents, be kind, and live clean, pure lives. What is Our Church? Our church is the place we go to learn how to live Jesus' commandments" (Order, 2009a, p. 3). Teachers are taught to instill in students that only through the Order can they be happy, thus tying the Order principles into their personal wellbeing.

Parents are also taught by the organization to teach their children to think in terms of organizational goals. A section in the Adult administrative handbook states: "It would be unwise to think that when it is time for our children to take an important step, that they will just 'know' what is right. For example; if we think that our daughter will understand that it is important to live the high order standards and marry the one the Lord has chosen for her the day before she is to be married, we are foolish. Obviously, we know that we need to start those thought and ideas when she is very young. Our children will be preparing for those steps long before they actually take them" (Order, 2009c, Steps of Progression Introduction, p. 3). Parents are taught not just to instill values but to actually teach them to think organizationally. The Order's Administrative Working Manual, which outlines the responsibilities and duties of members, states: "The older children's job routine is similar but with the added requirements of the following: Ask Parents: What is my duty to the Lord's work today? Ask Parents: Where do I fit in the Lord's work? Children are also expected to ask themselves the following questions at the close of the day: 'Have I done any good in the world today?' 'Did I help my brother or sister today?' 'Was I a good example to those around me?' and 'Do my friends support my tie with the one above?'" (Order, 2009d, Older Kids Checklist, p. 1). Mothers are taught to encourage their children to think first of the Order (the Lord's work); to respect authority (by considering where they "fit" and the "one above"); and to act in accordance with

organizational goals (being a good example; doing good in the world).

Peculiar (Elite) People

In addition to teaching children from an early age, the Order also fosters a group identity by appealing to the pride of members. This pride of being elite pits members against outsiders, who do not have this elite status and are therefore considered inferior. Identification through antithesis is a common strategy.

Members of the organization are taught from a young age that they are special. The children's manual states: "Why did our Heavenly Father pick the ones that He did? Out of all the people in the world, He picked only a few families" (Order, 2009a, p. 41). Order members are taught that God hand-picked Order members in the "spirit world. Jesus knew who they were, and chose us because we were the ones who would work, worship and play together and learn to get along with each other in peace and harmony and live our lives for Jesus" (Order, 2009a, p. 41). In another section, the lesson manual continues: "The children must learn that the people of the Order and church are the Lord's covenant people, and that he chose for us to be here. The children should understand that the Lord has preserved the line of his covenant people throughout the ages of the earth" (p. 82). So, organizational doctrine emphasizes that members are special but must fulfill their obligations as faithful Order members to retain this status.

By assigning an elite status to members of the organization, it is very easy to implement the strategy of identification through antithesis. If members are superior (and good), then outsiders are inferior (and must be bad). The children's handbook states: "It is very, very important for us to have other people around us who have the desire to live Jesus' laws. If we tried to live His laws around people who did not have that desire it would not work. There is not any other place on the earth where we can live His laws. If we tried to live them with the people that were not valiant in the cause of Jesus, they would just trample us right into the ground" (Order, 2009a, p. 42). So, in one set of statements, the organization (1) appeals to the pride of members by referring to them as people who live Jesus' laws; (2) characterizes outsiders as people of lesser status who do not live Jesus' laws; and (3) creates fear of being hurt by outsiders (through identification

through antithesis), thus creating what Burke (1940) states is the perfect enemy. The perfect enemy then functions to maintain identification, because it can act as a scapegoat for organizational problems and keep participants worried about their own protection, not about organizational control. (Indeed, Aristotle (2004) states that tyranny, or complete organizational control by one man, is perceived as being justified when members are concerned with their own protection.)

Order Standards

A group identity is fostered in a third way—through the recitation and memorization of Order mantras and mission statements. One excellent example of this is the ABC Order Standards, a document created by organizational leaders to help young children learn the many rules of organizational life. The standards are as follows:

> A is for Appreciation. I appreciate my life and all the wonderful blessings, and gifts my Heavenly Father has given me. I cherish my membership in the Order and thank the Lord each day for this gift, "Membership in the Order is like a hunting license. It doesn't guarantee anything, but gives you the right to hunt and seek for life eternal."
>
> B is for Brother. I will be my brother's and sister's keeper. I love my brothers and sisters and will never raise my hand against them.
>
> C is for Charity. I have charity for my brothers and sisters in the Order. Jesus tells us, "Love our neighbor as ourselves." Charity is the pure love of Christ.
>
> C is for Consecration. It is my firm resolve and fixed purpose to give my all to the Lord; my time, my talents, all that I am or ever expect to be to the establishment of Zion and the building up of the Kingdom of God upon the earth. This is Consecration.
>
> D is for Dress. I keep myself clean and dress in a modest way that is pleasing to my Heavenly Father.
>
> E is for Eternal Life. I will put gaining eternal life first before anything else in my life.
>
> F is for Faith. I have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. I acknowledge His hand in all things. I have faith in my parents, the leaders of the Order and the Kingdom of God.
>
> G is for Golden Rule. I will live the Golden Rule and do unto others as I would have them do unto me. I love my neighbor as myself and never raise my hand

against them.

H is for Hope. I have hope in the Kingdom of God, in my future posterity, in my success and my salvation.

H is for Honesty. Honesty is a part of what I am, unchanging, a permanent part. It is not something that must be decided anew each day.

H is for Honor. I will live my life in such a way that will bring honor to my parents and to be deserving of the honor of my children.

I is for Incomings. Let all of my incomings and outgoings be in the name of the Lord. I watch what I spend and avoid extravagance. I will produce more than I consume and create a surplus.

J is for Janitor. I would rather be a janitor in the house of the Lord than anything in any other kingdom.

K is for Kiss. My first kiss on the lips will be on my wedding day during the ceremony with my husband or wife. I will not hold hands with anyone as a boyfriend or girlfriend until I am engaged to be married to them.

L is for Love. I will obey God's command to "love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." I will show this love by giving my all to the Lord. I will strive to love others as Jesus loves me."

L is for Loyalty. I will not betray the trust of any of my brothers or sisters or of the Order.

M is for Marriage. I will wait to form any ties with a boy or girl and will ask my Heavenly Father for His direction and guidance in choosing my future husband or wife. I will save myself for the one I marry, for Heavenly Father delighteth in virtue.

N is for Natural. A natural man is an enemy to God I will "put off the natural man" and will not watch movies, visit web sites, or read books or magazines that show immoral pictures or promote immoral thoughts or actions.

N is for Name. I will bring honor to my family name.

O is for Obedience. I obey my Heavenly and my earthly father and mother and those who are over me. I have a complete desire to please My Heavenly Father and those who are over me.

P is for Prayer. I begin and end each day with prayer and remember my meditation. Prayer and meditation and the help of the Lord will help me make my decisions, and help me be one with the Order.

Q is for Quality. I will improve the quality of my life by using my time for the benefit of others.

> R. is for Respect. I have respect for other people and their property, first the leader of the Order and my parents, and to anyone over me in a stewardship, home, Sunday School and school. This includes any official in the Order and the Latter Day Church of Jesus Christ.
>
> S is for Speak. When I speak, the words that I saw are clean and pure. I will not swear or use my Heavenly Father's name in vain.
>
> T is for Truth. I always tell the truth, and am honest in all that I do. I never take anything that is not mine. If I ever borrow anything, I ask permission first, and I return it.
>
> U is for Understanding. I will understand the feelings and actions of other people and not be quick to judge them.
>
> V is for Voice. I listen to the still small voice within me. It tells me what is right and wrong. If I listen and obey, it will guide me every day.
>
> V is for Virtue. I will save myself for the one I marry. I will save my body, my mind, my thoughts, and my desires.
>
> W is for the Word of Wisdom. I obey the Word of Wisdom and eat and drink only the things that are good for me and my body. I will never taste an alcoholic beverage or drug. I will never put a cigarette in my mouth.
>
> X is for eXercise. I will exercise my mind and my body with clean thoughts and wholesome activities.
>
> Y is for Youth. I represent the youth of Zion and am a good example to my younger brothers and sisters.
>
> Z is for Zest. I do my work with zest and do more than I am asked to do. I thank my Heavenly Father each day for my opportunities and blessings (Order, 2009a, pp. viii-x).

By reading these Order standards, we can see that the language of these standards is crafted to help children take their individual identities—their concepts of "I"—and modify them to conform to group standards. The use of the word "we" is implicit: the focus is on changing the "I" to a "we"; but the process is the same. If members adhere to these Order standards, it is a good bet that they will think, act, and even feel in terms of organizational values.

This conative identification is present in every aspect of their lives. Children and adults commit to discipline their bodies (their food and drink, exercise regimen, sexual

practices, work hours); their minds (thanking Heavenly Father for the blessings of the Order; loving others; being understanding of others); and their spirits (meditating and praying) to conform with group norms. And the values reach into every organizational dimension ("incomings" and "zest" deal with the economic dimension; "marriage" and "kiss" concern the family dimension; and "virtue," "voice," and "prayer" relate to the spiritual dimension) and govern all aspects of life. In sum, the conative identification that is developed through member and organizational identification strategies permeates all aspects of life and supports the mythic image of building the Kingdom of God. Following Burke, we can see how cognitive and conative identification are related. The kingdom of God is an all-encompassing god-term that cognitively orders all of the ideologies, or values, of the mythic image (McGee, 1980; Burke, 1950). Stated in terms of bounded choice, the transcendental belief system provides an overarching ideology that makes sense of organizational values, which in turn support the belief system in place. Stated in terms of identification, cognitive identification orders the values that uphold conative identification; and conative identification supports the activity of self-definition inherent in cognitive identification. We turn now to the behavioral dimension of identification.

Behavioral Identification, Perfection, and Systems of Authority: The Law

"To choose the Order is to choose the Right" (Order, 2009a, p. 43).

In this section, I argue that behavioral identification, or members' acceptance of organizational decision premises, is set by two overarching doctrines that, together, are intended to create unity within the organization. In fact, the topic of inequality, which is directly related to the organizational practices that reside outside of social norms, is produced through the interplay of these two doctrinal decision premises: the law of one above another and the law of sacrifice. In the second part of this section, I address more specific decision premises that are derived from the two overarching premises that guide

the behaviors of organizational members. These premises are contained in Charles W. Kingston's "memory gem," which is required to be repeated by memory "at least once a day" by all Kingston members, young and old: "It is my firm resolve and fixed purpose to give my all to the Lord, my time, my talents, all that I am or ever expect to be to the establishment of Zion and the building up of the Kingdom of God upon the earth" (Order, 2009a, p. 17). The requirements of the Kingston organization in every aspect of life can be encapsulated by each one of these commitments.

Two Doctrinal Decision Premises

In Kingston doctrine, every behavior, word, and thought should be unified. The children's Sunday School lesson manual states: "Zion is the place that the Lord said would be established in the last days. A place where His people will be gathered to live His laws. He also said, if you are not one, you are not mine. If we help to establish Zion, we must do it by each one of living as Jesus wants us to and being one, or in other words, living in peace with our brothers and sisters" (Order, 2009a, p. 17). This "oneness" or unity is the ultimate goal for every member of the Order. Eldon Kingston states: "If we would be one with our Father in Heaven, we must be one with our brothers and sisters here. . . . [What] shall we do to know that we are truly his servants . . .? One important part is that we are one as a people (Order, 2009b, Chapter 37, p. 3). So, in order to live in Zion, members of the Order must live in peace with their brothers and sisters. And to live in peace, they must be "one," or live in unity with each other.

The Law of One Above Another

Kingston organizational rhetoric states that unity is achieved through the Law of One Above Another and the Law of Satisfaction. The Law of One Above Another is taught to be the method through which unity is achieved. Eldon Kingston states: "To be one with each other means that each one of us is *one with the one above"* (Order, 2009b, Chapter 37, p. 3). Being "one" with the "one above" means respecting the "'chain-of-

command' starting with Heavenly father, through Jesus, Bro. Paul, numbered men, etc." (Order, 2009a, p. 76). By respecting this chain of command, members can draw upon the power of God to help them in their lives.

This principle is so important to Kingston doctrine, it is what members are asked to think of first. The children's Sunday School lesson manual states: "When we think of the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the first thing that we should think about is obedience. We should always do what our parents and teachers want us to do. Brother Elden taught us that the Law of Obedience to the one over us is one of the first principles of the Order. We should be obedient to our brothers and sisters" (Order, 2009a, p. 12).

So, this hierarchical numbering system is a method through which perfect unity can be achieved.

The Law of Satisfaction

This is the second doctrine, or the other leg that allows the concept of unity to stand in the Kingston organization. Kingston members feel that to achieve unity, members must not just be obedient to the commands of the ones above them, they must also perform these tasks willingly and appreciatively. Elden Kingston taught that, in addition to the Law of One above Another, the Law of Satisfaction "is also one of the first principles of the Order. This means that we get along with our brothers and sisters and don't ever quarrel or fight with them. Brother Elden said we can call that the 'Golden Rule.' Jesus said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself'" (Order, 2009a, p. 12). Members consider this law so important, that the "lack of appreciation" is considered a "major crime" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 43, p. 7).

A good attitude is regarded by members as paramount to living successfully in the Kingston organization (participant 18). One current member gives an interesting analogy with regard to happiness in plural marriage: "Someone that's living the principle [of plural marriage] or not, there are going to be issues or not either way. A home that

has certain needs no matter what. They need to work those things out together, no matter what. Of course there is an extra dynamic, but from what I've seen, it's definitely not what someone from the outside in would think of. It's kind of like if someone was diagnosed with a serious disease, it's like, oh, what's that like? I feel so bad. How do you go through the day? That person, they can decide anyway. They can fight this, or I can enjoy the rest of my life. I can be happy, or I can be miserable" (participant 20). The Kingstons take seriously the idea that "things are easier to make a part of us when we take them with a smile instead of a frown" (Gustafson, 1949, p. 14).

From organizational rhetoric and data from participant interviews, it appears that members are generally obedient to organizational rules and directives; but it also appears that complying with these organizational directives are not always leading to happiness or satisfaction with life. As a result, the Kingston organization encourages a good attitude by celebrating the deeds of current and past members in their organizational rhetoric. One such example is found in the adult Sunday School lesson manual.

> Sister Lucy Whitmill was asked to move to the mine. Some people told her she was moving to the "worst run-down shack at the mine." She replied, "It's not going to be a run-down shack when I live there." When Lucy saw what was to be her home, she sat down and cried. "It was truly the most run-down shack she had ever seen. . . . the floors had patches of worn-out linoleum here and there. The yard was hard, black bug-dust laced dirt. You couldn't say there was cold running water in the house--it was more like cold, dripping water. The only inside plumbing was a tap in the sink which, when turned on, offered water slightly more than a drip at the time. There was no indoor bathroom; the bathroom was an outhouse in the back on the hill.
>
> She found some good boards nearby and made good use of them. She sawed, hammered, and plugged rat and mouse holes. It wasn't long before all the rough woodwork was covered with new coats of white paint. She mixed up and boiled flour and water together, then spread it on rags to fill in the holes in the walls a layer at a time. As each layer dried, she added another until all the holes were smoothed out. The boxes she had packed her belongings in were used to line the rotting floorboards with layer of cardboard before she covered the floors with bright, new linoleum. The leftover was tacked onto the drain board and the shelves around the sink. She put in windowsills for plants, baseboards, and made little shelves. Then she decorated the walls with clean, cheery wallpaper. (Order, 2009b, Chapter 44, p. 8)

While outside members may be surprised that the Kingston organization admits to providing its members with substandard accommodations, the point is that the organization celebrates the member who can take a bad situation, appreciate its merits, and improve upon it.

If the situation cannot be improved upon, the organizational rhetoric also credits those people who do not complain. The adult Sunday School lesson manual relates the following story: "When we went to Woods Cross . . . I got out of the car and went and looked in the window of the house we were to move into. What I saw was very discouraging. The hard conditions I had lived with at the mine were as a drop in the bucket compared to what it was when I looked in that window. When I went back to the car I cried silently. I never did let anyone know how I felt" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 44, p. 5). So, improving upon a situation and avoiding complaint are two virtues that are used to support the Law of Satisfaction.

The organization also uses the Law of Satisfaction to threaten members who complain with disappointment or despair. Orlean Kingston Gustafson, an original Order member, writes in her journal: "The order of God in the home is man at the head. The devil tries to change his order. If he can win over the wife to not be satisfied with the home it will lead to a broken home" (Gustafson, 1949, p. 14). In this case, Orlean was instructed that complaints on her part were nothing more than listening to the devil.

As is probably apparent, the law of one above another combined with the law of satisfaction allows the Kingston organization to retain a high degree of control. The law of one above another dictates that members must be obedient to leaders; and the law of satisfaction states that members must be happy about. If not, members may experience guilt, physical discomfort and punishment in the afterlife. The diary of Orlean Gustafson identifies each of these consequences when the law of satisfaction (not the law of one above another) is broken.

Pertaining to guilt, Orlean relates an experience of another member of the Order: “Last week Brother 1 and 4 were fixing pipes in the bathroom of Brother 15. Brother 1 and 4 fixed them and Sister 15-3 complained about them getting the floor dirty when fixing them. Brother 1 said we’ll have to mop this floor. They got down on their hands and knees and mopped the kitchen floor and then mopped the bathroom floor. It made 15-3 feel bad. She told Brother 15 that she would behave herself next time. She afterwards apologized to Brother 1” (Gustafson, 1949, p. 33). Here, a woman broke the law of satisfaction by not appreciating what those over her had done. As a result, she felt guilty.

Physical pain is also a possible symptom of breaking the law of satisfaction. Orlean writes: “Tonight I became angry at Brother 2. Instead of acknowledging the hand of the Lord in what had happened and trying to profit by it I in an angry voice accused him and said words I shouldn’t have said. When I went to bed it seemed like I was in a stupor. I heard the evil power all around me like a ringing or buzzing sound” (Gustafson, 1949, p. 38). In this situation, Orlean actually felt physical symptoms from breaking the law of satisfaction and becoming angry with the one above her (her husband).

Finally, punishment in the afterlife is a suggested consequence of failing to keep the law of satisfaction. After Orlean became angry at her husband, she was racked with guilt and physical discomfort. Then she stated: “I should have acknowledged the hand of the Lord in everything with His spirit. It was a test to see if I could keep the spirit. I fell short. I was going to be held accountable for everything I lost the spirit in anger” (Gustafson, 1949, p. 38). Though it appears from the context of the situation that Orlean was responding to a verbal attack from her husband, she accepted full responsibility for the situation and felt that she—not her husband, the instigator of the argument—would be the one held accountable, because she was the one bound by the law of satisfaction.

Unity and Happiness

So, do the twin doctrines of the law of one above another and the law of satisfaction lead to happiness? Current organizational members agree that it does

(participant 1, participant 2, participant 3, etc.). But former members cite the law of satisfaction as a deterrent to expressing disappointment with the organization. One participant states:

> I think a lot of people would say they're happy, but I think that when they're by themselves and think they're talking amongst their friends and they don't think that anyone else is going to hear, I think that they would say that they're not as happy as they wished they were. I think they'd be a lot happier if they weren't in that situation, but I think a lot of them would never say that; they would never say that they're not happy and it's kind of like along with their teachings, you know, they believe that you should be happy, learn to be happy with what you've got. . . . That's what they teach you. You should learn to be appreciative of the things you have and like not try to have all this nice expensive stuff. . . . One big thing they always would say is, 'Would you rather buy a hamburger now or would you rather have a Cadillac later? But a lot of times, they'll have you save your money for something later and then they'll say, "Well, now's not a good time to buy that." (participant 12)

"Pleasing Obedience"—When Members Identify

The Kingstons aim to inculcate this doctrine of obedience with a smile into the decision premises of members. And when members do, indeed, think first of organizational needs, they have a special term for it: "pleasing obedience." Obedience, or "to do what your told" (Order, 2009a, pp. 216-17), can be divided into two types: first time obedience and pleasing obedience. First time obedience is "to do what you're told the first time you're told with a smile and willingness in your heart. First time obedience means you must do the job when your told the first time, and feel good about doing the job your asked to do. It isn't good enough to just do the job because you were asked, you have to be happy while you're doing what you've been asked to do with a smile" (p. 217). Here, the law of one above another (doing what you're told) and the law of satisfaction (doing it with a smile and willingness) are working together. But pleasing obedience goes one step further: "Pleasing obedience is doing what you're told before your told to do it. If you know that your parents want you to do something, you should do it before you have to be asked" (Order, 2009a, pp. 215-18). In this organizational rhetoric,

children are being taught how to think organizationally, or how to think it terms of what is good for the organization. This is a direct reference to behavioral identification, where members inculcate the decision premises of the organization and think in terms of what is good for the organization before what is good for the individual (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985).

Organizational Behaviors

Having talked about "pleasing obedience" as a term that describes behavioral identification with the Kingston organization, we should now discuss the behaviors that the organization requires. Charles W. Kingston, the father of Elden Kingston, created a "memory gem" that encapsulates the basic behaviors required of organizational members. The organization requires this memory gem to be repeated by memory "at least once a day" by all Kingston members, young and old. It states, "It is my firm resolve and fixed purpose to give my all to the Lord, my time, my talents, all that I am or ever expect to be to the establishment of Zion and the building up of the Kingdom of God upon the earth" (Order, 2009a, p. 17). The requirements of the Kingston organization in the economic dimension can be encapsulated by each one of these commitments, which are built upon the laws of one above another and satisfaction.

Firm Resolve and Fixed Purpose

This phrase "means we decide we are going to do something and don't give up or put it off until we have done it" (Order, 2009a, p. 17). A strong work ethic in the Kingston organization is highly prized. This is necessary for the members to be able to complete the many tasks assigned to them. Kingston members work long, hard hours; and they need this strong work ethic to finish their work. An example of this virtue is given in the adult Sunday School lesson manual: "When we first started almost everyone was eager and willing to help. After a few months some of the men started making up reasons and

excuses so they wouldn't have to work, as it was very hard work and we worked long hours. How often that happens, everyone gets all enthused at first, but as it gets 'old hat' and they find it hard to do, only the solid ones are left. This put an extra burden on the ones who would work as they had to work more weekends so we would have enough men to make up a crew. Which kind are you?" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 29, p. 7).

The firm resolve applies not just to working late but also to working while sick: "Brother Elden (22) gives the following story: 'One weekend one of the men on my crew would not go. . . . I called Brother John Gustafson to see if he could fill in for that man that weekend. He immediately agreed, even though he had worked the prior weekend. (Picture John Gustafson). When I picked him up I could see that he wasn't feeling very good. His cheeks were swollen up and he didn't look very good. I asked him if he felt like going to work and he said he was fine. . . . [later that day] I felt his head and he had a fever of about 103. Then he told me he had two wisdom teeth pulled that day and that's why his face was swollen up. I sent him down to camp to lie down and I finished his shift. I marveled that John was willing to work and take the place of this other man even though he was that sick" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 29, p. 8). In this example in the adult lesson manual, working while sick is stated as an organizational virtue.

The organization expects this virtue to be used to build the kingdom of God—which, in this context, means privileging the business dimension over the others. Orlean Gustafson writes: "August 3, 1942: A week or so I and the children walked a little more than 5 miles in one day besides doing the housework and cooking for a family of eight. Last night and the night before we walked better than 2 miles each night. . . . I woke mother. She got up and commenced making fire at 4 o clock. I went to the bathroom and before she could summon aid or make the fire I called to her. She came and before I could get back to bed a six-pound baby girl was born. It was wrapped in the corner of the bathrobe Mother wore. It was born between ten and twenty minutes past four for when

we again looked at the clock it was 4:20 a.m. Mother expected to stay with me that day but a call came from the coal office where she worked and she had to go" (1949, p. 89).

In sum, having a strong work ethic, or a firm resolve and fixed purpose to build the kingdom of God, means that members will work hard at the businesses they are assigned to build. But they must be careful to always use this strong work ethic for the sake of the organization, because "persistence is a good quality, but only if used in doing what the Lord wants you to do" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 38, p. 4).

Sacrifice Time

Charles Kingston's memory gem also states that members voluntarily sacrifice their time to build the kingdom of God. Two examples of this are found in the adult lesson manual: "In the 1970s Brother Ortell could see we were not going to be able to pay all of our payments. He knew we would have to do something or the Order would not be able to survive. Also, our mine production was not enough to fill our contracts. Brother Ellery suggested having men for Salt Lake work on weekends in order to get that extra production. Brother Ortell thought that might be a good idea. He said we could have two crews per weekend and run two shifts, so the mine would work steady all weekend" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 29, pp. 6-7). The coal mine is the lifeblood of the Kingston organization, and members are expected to work there on the weekends.

Women are also expected to sacrifice their time and work late hours. "Mom and Clover were tending our children from 7:00 in the morning to 10:00-11:00 at night so the mothers of the Order could work their regular jobs and sew on the coats after work . . . we would sew until 10-11-12 at night trying to get the coats out on time. This is a story of the woman in the Order who came together to do a job, something like you weekend crews do" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 43, p. 6). Here, it is interesting to note that the economic dimension is privileged, as women are celebrated who left their families for long hours to work (in other contexts, that would be seen as a vice rather than a virtue).

Sacrifice of time is quite literally a sacrifice, because there is little material compensation for their efforts in comparison with minimum wage standards today. One woman relates in the adult lesson manual: "[Sister Ardous] told us it was very important for us to get to work by 8 a.m. each morning. She said that the people who got to work early were the ones the business could depend upon and had the respect of the other people on the job. . . . She said that every day we arrived after 8 a.m. we would lose a quarter per hour for that day. We were only making $1.00 per hour so it was quite a big cut in our wages. So after that, neither Mary nor I arrived after 8 as long as we were in Dragerton. It has helped me all my life to make sure I arrived places on time" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 34, p. 5).

In sum, the sacrificing of time is an important guideline that members use when making decisions about work. This appears to be focused exclusively on the economic dimension of the organization.

Sacrifice of Talents

Kingston members are committed to using talents to benefit the Order: "The Lord has blessed us each one with special talents, such as music, art, a good memory, special abilities in some kind of work like building houses, taking care of animals, etc. Since the Lord gave them to us He expects us to use them in the way He wants" (Order, 2009a, p. 17). In other words, members must be willing to work in any capacity that the Kingston organization decides.

Members are taught from an early age that working for the organization means doing whatever the organization asks. The most prominent attorney of the organization states: "Becoming a lawyer wasn't something I wanted to do, but my mother told me what my father wanted and I never questioned that decision" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 38, p. 1).

Because the Kingstons operate businesses in mainstream society, to compete

at least some of their members must have college educations. This can be a problem, as members have tended to leave once they go to college. This led the organization to issue the following statement: "Today, many of our young men and women have the opportunity to go to the college to receive the education needed in our stewardships. In doing so, they are among people who do not have the standards of the Lord's people. Chastity and virtue are almost non-existent and alcohol and drugs are common in the world today. If Brother Paul had need of one of you to go among the people to gain a certain knowledge, can he trust you to remain true to the standards of the Order?" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 42, p. 3). But it is not only chastity and virtue that the organization is worried about. The organization wants to make sure that the investment they make in giving their people college educations will be profitable. They have had difficulty keeping the women in the organization when they are educated and single (participant 7); so women are reportedly encouraged to receive educations only after they are married (participant 13, participant 14).

In sum, members are expected to give their talents and "prepare ourselves to serve in whatever way the Lord wishes" (Order, 2009a, p. 11) to build the kingdom of God.

All That I Am or Ever Expect to Be

As the children's lesson manual states: "We all will be learning more and increasing our talents and abilities as we grow up. It means no matter how high or how good we get at anything we still use it the way the Lord wants us to" (Order, 2009a, p. 17). In practice, this means changing careers if the Kingston organization feels it is necessary.

One example is the change of one Kingston man's career from attorney to shoe salesman. The adult lesson manual states: "After a little more than a year, the State ran out of money to fund the investigation, and the State persecution stopped. There was very little legal work for an Order attorney to do after that, so [this man] continued to manage Ensign Shoe Company full time" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 38, p. 2). Several former

members related their disappointment that although this man was an attorney, he was not able to practice law--instead, he sold shoes and made a very small salary (participants who will not be divulged because of confidentiality). The Kingston-ordered change in career led several members of this man's family to believe that this was due to jealousy among the seven brothers and the desire to suppress any potential rival to the leadership of the organization. However, this is not an isolated case: members are often shifted from job to job, depending on the need of the organization (participant 3, participant 12). Members are encouraged to serve wherever they are called.

Members are not only expected to change types of jobs; they are also expected to change locations and move wherever the Order requires, even as children. The adult lesson manual relates the experiences of one faithful member: "He worked on the Woods Cross farm when he was just a boy. It meant he had to live away from his mother's home, but his mother knew how important it was to work where our Heavenly Father wanted him to. When he finished high school he would have liked to have gone to college, but Brother Ortell asked him to work at the mine instead, which he did, until Brother Ortell had him return to start working on the Order books" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 42, p. 9). This man's actions are hailed in the lesson manual as heroic.

To the Establishment of Zion and the Building Up of the Kingdom of God upon the Earth

One of the major themes of the Order is the need for members to sacrifice their own material goods in order to build the Kingdom of God. The children's lesson manual states: "In the first days of the order members were required to go below all things and give up many things. They gave up all of their clothing and had a special uniform of the order. The uniform was only a pair of blue coveralls for the men and blue dresses for the women. They didn't wear any shoes and the coveralls and dresses didn't have any buttons or pockets. They were only made out of denim. Sometimes, Brother Ortell and Brother

Merlin would have to go to town to get the mail if brother Elden wasn't able to. They would walk in their blue coveralls and the other kids in the won would laugh at them and call them names. But the boys wore the coveralls anyway because that was how Brother Elden wanted them to dress" (Order, 2009a, p. 35).

Saving money for the Order is one of the major foci of the Order. One of the main "gospel principles" is as follows: "Gospel Principle 2: Rules of Success, No matter how little you make, see to it you save some of it. On this principle, always leaving something to grow with, worlds, yes galaxies, are created" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 42, p. 4).

In the lesson, "History of the Legal Profession in the Order," it was stated that Brother Carl "has probably saved the order more money than any other person" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 38, p. 1). And members are considered contributors to the kingdom of God when they "turn everything we [they] have to the storehouse and shop at the Order stores [and] work for Order stewardships" (Order, 2009a, p. 17). The adult lesson manual credits the actions of the following man, who spent little on his family but saved a lot for the Order: "Brother Deward was very successful selling fruit but he spent very little on himself and taught his family that it isn't how much you make that counts. It is how much you save. He appreciated the order and wanted to be sure he lived all the laws of God." (p. 210).

Order leaders state that without members saving money, "we would not have all the things that the Order have today; all of the business that provide our jobs, all of the nice homes, all of the nice cars" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 42, p. 4). Leaders state that members are the ultimate beneficiaries of this principle. But former members describe that most members live in conditions of poverty: "You don't get to move until you are bursting at the seams wherever you are. We lived in a 12 x 60 trailer with five kids before we got to move into a little bit bigger trailer . . . we were living in a place until we had kids sleeping on the couches, sleeping on the floor. The last place that we got in

Huntington at the mine we got because we had more money saved than other people that wanted it. It was a trailer [that] sat on a basement with a roof over it" (participant 8).

Conclusion

In sum, behavioral identification is facilitated by rhetorically setting decision premises of obedience (the law of one another) and willing acceptance of organizational decrees (the law of sacrifice) to create pleasing obedience to build the kingdom of God. The behaviors considered praiseworthy by the Order, and encapsulated in Charles Kingston's memory gem, are all related to acting upon that pleasing obedience and sacrificing desires, time, talents, and material goods to build the Kingdom of God. As Orlean Gustafson writes: "We must ask the Lord to help us to continue to get rid of things he don't want us to have" (Gustafson, 1949, p. 14). The behaviors promoted by the organization are exemplified by the following poem, written by Elden Kingston.

> **Success**
>
> To be able to carry money without spending it.
> To bear an injustice without retaliating.
> To be able to do one's duty when not watched.
> To be able to make use of criticism.
> To be able to keep at a job until finished.
> Seeing wealth without coveting it.
> Seeing happiness without envying the happy.
> Seeing rejoicing without sneering at the joyful.
> Seeing honor without being cynical.
> Being insulted without retaliating.
> Being ignored without worrying, that is self mastery.

Through obedience to the hierarchical system (see Burke's hierarchy, 1950), members can ultimately arrive at a state of perfection, where Kingston doctrine states they will become gods in the next life. An examination of the Kingston organizational rhetoric makes clear the link between setting decision premises, behavioral identification, and arriving at a state of perfection through obedience to hierarchy.

Affective Identification, Mystery, and Charismatic Authority: Becoming an Order Family

Affective identification is the fourth dimension of organizational identification. Lalich (2004) calls this "charismatic authority" and Burke calls this "mystery." As we have conceptualized this dimension, affective identification is concerned chiefly with the emotional ties between leader and members, and the devotion that individuals feel to the Kingston leader is a good example of this. However, affective identification does not necessarily need to be restricted to the emotional response to the leader (as Lalich's conception of bounded choice implies). Rather, mystery, or division between groups of people (Burke, 1950), facilitates this emotional identification. In the Kingston organization, those "below" identify with those "above." In the family system, which current and former members universally state is the most important dimension of the organization (e.g., participant 3, participant 6), identification with those "above" begins at an early age. Children identify with both mothers and fathers, as they are "above them." And wives emotionally identify with their husbands, who are "above them." Just as individuals identify more readily with their work group compared with the organization (Bartels et al., 2007; Richter et al., 2006; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000), the family is the most immediate source of identification for Kingston members and is, I argue, the most powerful. In the first section, I discuss the roles of each family member, as explained through Kingston organizational rhetoric. In the section, I discuss the members' experiences with their families and highlight that families are regarded as the most important organizational dimension. Using examples from the interviews, I argue that the Kingston family members are both the strongest and weakest links in the four-dimensional process of identification.

Roles of the Family

Kingston members are taught that through strict obedience to the laws and principles of the organization, they will be given the opportunity to evolve to a higher

spiritual level and eventually achieve godhood as part of a family unit. In Kingston doctrine, it is believed that God is a man who spiritually evolved to the point that He became omnipotent and omniscient. He created children in spirit form and desires that they also evolve into perfect beings. Part of this plan, termed "The Plan of Salvation" includes receiving a physical body, so He created the Earth, where spirit children come down from Heaven (called the "Pre-Existence"), reside in mortal bodies, and experience trials designed to test His children's faithfulness to universal spiritual principles and help them evolve spiritually. Depending on the level of spiritual evolution a person attains, at the Judgment Day after a person dies, he or she will be sent to the Celestial Kingdom, the Terrestrial Kingdom, or the Telestial Kingdom. The Celestial Kingdom is the only place where people will become Gods, which means they will continue to be organized into family units, be married and able to have their own spirit children, and create new worlds for their children to live. Kingston members believe that they can only attain the Celestial Kingdom through membership in the Order and as part of a family unit practicing plural marriage. As the children's handbook states, "Tell the children that when their parents were married, like the chain they became linked together. Then help the children add a link for each child in their family. When a link has been added for each family member, make a circle of the chain. Tell the children that when their family members are sealed together in the Order, they are all linked together forever. They can become an eternal family, just like the circle that goes on forever" (Order, 2009a, p. 51).

The organizational rhetoric in this area overlaps in some ways with building the Kingdom of God, but here family development is stressed. The Order emphasizes that eternal salvation in the next life is contingent upon faithful obedience to the Kingston laws: "How impossible it would be to try to live the laws of our Heavenly Father anywhere else in the world other than right here in the order" (Order, 2009a, p. 40). While spiritual development is stressed in the Order, the structure of the family is tightly controlled and run like a corporation. If we compare the roles of the family to a

corporation, the Order's leader (Paul) is the CEO, his brothers are upper management, the father is the manager, the mother is the employee, and the children are the products.

Role of Father/Manager

The father's role consists of working at Order businesses and presiding over the wellbeing of his family. The father's direct role in the family varies, depending on the number of wives and children he has and the time he chooses to spend with them. Some fathers, especially those with fewer wives, appear to have a more direct relationship with their families, while others do not see their families frequently (sometimes living in other states). Some fathers provide financial assistance for their families, while others do not. Each father manages the money that his wives and children earn, however, so he is in control of the budget and can determine how much money each family should receive. A husband has the ability to put a "hold" on the wife's money in her account if he chooses: "[the Kingston bank] just said you couldn't spend it because your husband put the hold on it, so you can't spend it unless he knows what you're spending it on. . . . they only give you like a certain amount that you can spend each month and if you spend more and need something else, you can't get it unless you ask them. Like a budget" (participant 9).

Fathers are to gather the monthly packet received by each wife and her children to review to see whether they have been following all Order requirements in their daily personal lives. While the role of the father is extremely important on an organizational level with respect to discipline, the father does not appear to be highly involved in the day-to-day lives of his family. As the Administrative Working Manual states: "Although [the administrative checklist] doesn't take very long to complete, it is a very good way to track your progress and help the father to know how things are going" (Order, 2009d, Administrative working manual, p. 2).

Though there is no chart for the father to fill out, there is an organizational checklist that each father is to review monthly. Some of the questions the father is to ask himself include the following: "Have I asked the one over me on the stewardship

if they need anything? Do I know that what I'm working on is what the one over me wants me to? Have I asked the one over me in the family if they need anything or how I should spend my time? Do my activities completely support what the one over me is trying to accomplish? Do I have a complete family mission statement? Is my family organizational chart complete? Are there any updates? Does each person in my family know and understand where they fit into the family organizational chart and what their responsibilities are in that position? Are the spiritual needs of my family being met? Are the temporal needs of my family being met? Are there any updates in the command center? What steps need to be or can be taken to prepare for marriage? How is each child doing in school? What activities are scheduled in my family this month?" (Order, 2009c, Father's checklist, p. 1).

Because of the relative lack of involvement in the family's day-to-day life and the management responsibilities given to him by the Order, the father's role can be compared to that of the manager.

Role of Mother/Administrator

The mother is called the "administrator" on the "Administrative Checklist," and that is exactly what she is. She is the one who keeps the family running. In addition to working full time, she is expected to have many children and care for their physical, spiritual, and emotional wellbeing. As explained in the family handbook, the mother has direct responsibility for the children's lives and identification: "The responsibility of mothers is great. Brother Paul has said that they have the most influence on their children's attitudes and choices. The tone of the mother sets the tone of the whole household. The way she starts her day, the attitude she has, the meals she prepares, the television shows she watches all affect what her children's lives will be.

"Mothers need to know what steps their children are preparing to take. If she has a child that is having trouble telling the truth, she needs to watch for things that come up during that day to help teach that child the importance of honesty. So it is with

each principle, and with each step. If she has a child that is six or seven, she needs to start talking about baptism. She should watch for conversations where she can bring up the subjects her children are working on and/or lacking in" (Order, 2009c, Steps of Progression Introduction, p. 3).

The mother disciplines herself and keeps her many responsibilities organized through the use of the administrative checklist. Through the use of this chart, she is also accountable to her husband and the organization for the way she spends her time—down to the minutes that she wakes up and goes to sleep. Her day is organized into daily morning, afternoon, and evening tasks, with a section for personal health—to fit in when she has time.

The morning routine consists of writing down what time she wakes up, saying morning prayers, getting ready for the day, writing down what she ate, 7:00 a.m. meditation, reciting memory gems, holding family prayer, connecting with each child, connecting to the one above her (saying "good morning" to her husband's picture is suggested), saying something good about the family and the order, talking about the children's father at least 20 times during the day, and getting everyone, including herself, to school/work/church on time.

The daily afternoon routine begins after a full day of work. She is to refer to the monthly section of the chart to see if there are any jobs left undone, work on family training, prepare dinner, have 7:00 p.m. meditation and recite memory gems, and read scriptures.

The daily evening routine, also called "closing out the day," consists of having family prayer, planning the next day's schedule, saying good night to each child and to her husband, reviewing how many times she talked about the children's father, and writing down what time she goes to bed.

In addition to the daily routine, she is also asked to write down whether she ate healthy (meaning no sugar or white flour), exercised, and ate her comfrey, eggshells, and vitamins.

Weekly duties include assigning family jobs, planning the week's activities, holding family home evening (biweekly), working on completing the family handbook, and attending church on Sunday.

Monthly duties include reviewing household daily schedule; filling in calendar; updating personal checklists for children; completing portions of the checklist for the children; making changes to job lists and cleaning kits if needed; planning the dinner menu; making a shopping list and going shopping; scheduling the month's activities; going through "steps of progression" interviews with children; planning family home evening; and identifying gifts needed for the month.

Finally each woman is to ask herself the following questions: Does the one above need anything? Have I asked the one above how I should be spending my time? Do my activities support the one above me? Do I have a complete Family Mission Statement? Are there any updates to my Family Mission Statement? Do my children know and have a copy of the Family Mission Statement? Are there any updates to family or personal policies? Have I informed my children of those updates? Do they know the family policies? Which goals will I work on? Which new goals need to be added? Are the spiritual needs of my children being met? Are the temporal needs of my children being met? Do I understand the next step for each child in my family? How is each child doing in school? Is each child heading in the right direction, academically? Are there any special academic needs that need to be addressed?

Asking these questions leads women to reinforce the hierarchical structure in their own minds. Orlean Gustafson writes: "I asked also in my prayer to show me how I could better please those above me. During the night someone said, 'As soon as Brother 2 [her husband] requests anything do it as soon as he asks" (1949, p. 64).

Role of Children/Products

Current and former members both report that while childhood is strict, many homes are enjoyable. The roles of children are divided up into younger and older children.

On the "Younger Kids Daily Checklist," children's responsibilities are divided into "morning" and "evening" sections. The morning responsibilities include the following: wake up happy; get ready for the day; say prayers; make your bed; tell mother "Good Morning"; tell ___ "Good morning" (I assume this is where the father's name goes when he is there); eat good breakfast; brush teeth; have 7:00 a.m. meditation, memory gems, and family prayer; go to school.

The afternoon routine consists of the following: change out of school/church clothes; get a snack; clean up your room; do family job; do Sunday school homework and read scriptures; do school homework and projects; choose your clothes for the next day; have 7:00 meditation and memory gems; review daily value with Mom; develop your talents; work on family training; have free time; eat a healthy dinner; take your comfrey; take your eggshells and vitamins; brush teeth; wash up and/or bathe and change into night clothes; family prayer; say "Good Night" to Mom and ___; say prayers, and write down what time you go to bed.

The older children's job routine is similar but with the added requirements of the following: Ask Parents: What is my duty to the Lord's work today? Ask Parents: Where do I fit in the Lord's work? Was I on time for work/school/church today? Write down number of hours or amount of stewardship responsibilities; do church responsibilities; complete something from a PPJ, Steps of Progression book, or work on family training; ask parents if they need me to do anything else today; and do some type of physical exercise. Children are also expected to ask themselves the following questions at the close of the day: "Have I done any good in the world today?" "Did I help my brother or sister today?" "Was I a good example to those around me?" and "Do my friends support my tie with the one above?" Figures 8 and 9 are the Younger Children's Checklist and

the Older Children's Checklist, respectively.

The Order family works together to produce a child that is identified with the organization with all of the qualities needed to be a model organizational employee: to sacrifice time, talents, material resources, and desires to build up the kingdom of God on the earth with fixed resolve and firm purpose. Father and mothers are judged by the organization according to how well their children adhere to these organizational goals (participant 4).

Strength of the Family System

The family dimension of the organization is viewed as the most important and the one in which the most affective identification is found. Former and current members concur that the family organization means the most to them: participant 3 echoes the sentiments of all participants by stating that of the three dimensions (work, church, and family), "my family is the most important thing." If there is one thing that is agreed upon by former and current members (and there are not many), it is that the family system is the most important organizational dimension because of the emotional bonds between the family members.

The family is also regarded as the place that either produces strongly identified

of the family system and states that it is the most important organizational dimension because of its power to affect identification. The Family Handbook states: "The family is the most important thing there is. It is the building block of all society. No other organization has more impact of good or ill than the family. The best thing you can do for your family is work together with the whole family on a Family Mission Statement. . . . It is what the family is all about and their purpose and the values the family will act upon. . . . What values do you want to live by? . . . What is [your] identity as a family?" (Order, 2009c, How to Create a Family Mission Statement, p. 1). One current member aptly states: "I think you find differences in your religion as we do in my religion. It depends on the family, it depends on the people."

A family that is highly identified with the organization and insists on following all organizational rules produces children that do not doubt organizational directives. One former member (who began disidentifying with the organization only when his own children were being treated poorly by other organizational members), stated: "I thought it was the kingdom of God and his one true church on earth. Because that was my reality. We had been taught that since childhood—and I don't know how familiar you are, but a good order member—you get up and you say your morning prayers, then you meditate at 7:00 in the morning, and then you say your memory gems. Then at noon you meditate and say your memory gems, then at 7 at night you meditate and say your memory gems and have your family prayer and go to bed. It's just a steady thing that keeps you completely indoctrinated. But I was completely convinced that it was God's kingdom on earth and his one true church" (participant 5).

One reason for this high level of identification is that children born into a system automatically accept it without question. One current participant states: "It's human nature to identify with wherever we are, whether it's our class or our family. If we're close to our neighbors or not. Whatever we experience a lot, put forth effort, or have an interest, we identify with" (participant 20). In the Kingston organization, children identify first with their families (as do most people), because that is the reality that is given to them from birth. Participant 20 states he first felt an "identification with [his] family, then as you grow, you go to school, there's a neighborhood, there's a community . . . I didn't know anything else."

A family that is not highly identified with the Order—or who is highly identified but does not follow all of the organizational rules—may produce children who question beliefs. Participant 6 gives an example of her family:

> Our family was . . . like our own little pod inside of this bigger pod, where we just did our own thing and almost had our own types of beliefs. Where we amongst our family could kind of challenge those things and question them a little bit more than the other people. . . . I remember, one person had gone to my father [to ask to marry participant 6] and he said, "Well, she's going to school." The person was like absolutely, "Are you kidding me?" And then his little brother years later called me when I was at my mom's with my boyfriend asking, "Can you go up to Idaho? I'd like to give you this opportunity." And I'm like, "Opportunity to marry you?" I was very mean to him on the phone and, you know, it felt good.

In this woman's family, critical thinking was valued and extended to the women of the family, as well. Allowing women to attend college before getting married is a major departure from Kingston norms, and this appeared to make a big difference in the lives of this family. All eight children in this family left the organization, along with the mother.

However, members leave even when families follow all of the organizational rules and procedures. This may result from a variety of factors, such as abuse in the family (participant 24, participant 4); watching parents live unhappy lives (participant 25); experiencing an unhappy marriage (participant 10; participant 4); and becoming educated (participant 6; participant 7; participant 14). But the common factor that leads people to leave even in a highly identified family unit is feeling outcast by immediate or extended family members. This can be as simple as having false rumors spread by aunts and cousins (participant 4; participant 13); or it can be the rejection of children for marriage (participant 5; participant 8). It can also stem from leaders' rejection of a loved one (participant 12); or a husband's rejection of a wife (participant 10). But for whatever reason, the common thread that runs through the narratives of participants who leave highly identified families is feeling personally rejected by the immediate or extended family.

In sum, current and former members, along with Kingston organizational rhetoric, agree that the family system is the most important because of the strong emotional bonds—the affective identification—that is found there. All also agree that it is both the strongest and the weakest link in organizational identification. Those families who are strongly identified and adhere to organizational rules and regulations are the most likely to produce children that become productive members of the organization. Those who are less identified (or even strongly identified but do not follow all rules and regulations) are less likely to produce organizationally-minded children.

The four systems of identification—cognitive, conative, behavioral, and evaluative—work together to produce what Lalich (2004) terms "bounded choice."

In other terms, these four processes work together to produce strong organizational identification and resulting loyalty. In the following section, I will describe three types of organizational loyalty that members experience: loyalty in thought, loyalty in words, and loyalty in action.

Bounded Choice: Loyalty in Thoughts, Words, and Actions

The Kingston organization stresses the importance of complete loyalty to the organization in thoughts, words, and actions. This loyalty is felt internally as organizational identification and expressed externally through organizational behavior that is consistent with organizational goals and directives. As stressed in the Order handbook, "the Lord picked the people he could depend on to see to it that Satan was bound and the Lord's purposes were carried out. . . . Let each one of us see to it that we do our part and do not fail him" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 36, p. 3). There are three types of organizational loyalty referred to by the organization: loyalty in thought, loyalty in words, and loyalty in actions.

Loyalty in Thought

Thirteen of fourteen current participants cited 100% identification at the time of their interview. (One person said she was 95% identified.) And while most participants stated they had been through a difficult time in their lives ("the budget doesn't balance," participant 1), nearly all insisted that they had never been anything less than 100% identified with the doctrines of the organization. This loyalty to the organization rendered turning point analysis an ineffective way to understand organizational identification--because they were unwilling or unable to cite anything less than complete identification; however, the phenomenon itself demonstrates the power that the organization has over the thoughts of the people.

Figure 4: Younger Children's Checklist

Restricting Thoughts

At first, I felt that their unwillingness to cite less than 100% identification was a fabrication. I thought perhaps they were afraid to share their true feelings or wanted to make the organization look good at all costs. But when former members, who currently feel antagonistically toward the Order, cited 100% identification at one point in their lives, I began to change my mind. Participant 5, for example, stated, "I was completely convinced that it was the Kingdom of God on the earth."

The organization states that restricting thoughts to be in line with organizational goals has spiritual blessings. Orlean Gustafson, one of the original members, states, "We must control our minds and make them in harmony with law" (Gustafson, 1949, p. 15). She was taught: "we get all our knowledge from those above us, through their sacrifice in our behalf or by the law of atonement" (p. 18). So, if members restrict their thoughts and think in terms of organizational rhetoric, then they will be blessed with greater knowledge from those above in the hierarchical order.

In the Kingston organization, there is a hymn called "School your Feelings," and this is exactly what members are expected to do. One woman explains.

> [Living plural marriage] wasn't difficult for me. However, I have a chance to counsel a lot of people and I find that if a person doesn't have a personal relationship with the Lord plural marriage is almost impossible to live. Because you compare yourself: She's prettier, she's smarter, she's greater. She's this. He likes her better. You know, I never ever compared myself. I didn't ever think she is prettier than me or she's skinnier than me . . . I didn't ever think about what my body looked like. I didn't ever think about if I was pretty. I didn't ever think about, does he think my hair is beautiful? I didn't think about those things. It just wasn't part of my nature and I am not a jealous person. I never felt the feelings that I have seen so many people feel, but I do know that there is a reason for it and that is: I think the Lord expects us to school our feelings so that when we move on to the next life that we will have tempered ourselves so that we can be our brother's keeper and not think . . . that you just want to get somebody out of the way 'cause they're competition or whatever. I mean, plural marriage is hard; it's really hard. It wasn't for me. (participant 18)

In sum, the organization encourages loyalty in thoughts by advocating that members restrict their thoughts and school their feelings.

Figure 9. Older Children's Checklist

Loyalty in Words

The Kingston organization asks members to be loyal in their words as well as thoughts. To be loyal to the organization, the children's handbook states: "We can give our time and talents to the Order, we can shop at order stores, we can turn in our money, we can be a help to our parents. But one very important thing we can do when we go to school; *we can see to it we do not talk to the people there about the very special things about the Order and our families*" (Order, 2009a, p. 258). Here we see that from a very early age, members are taught to discipline their words by refraining from criticizing organizational leaders, withholding information from outsiders, and sometimes lying to protect the organization.

Refrain From Criticism of Organizational Leaders

One of the most important directives of the Kingston organization is to speak only good of their organizational leaders. For the women, this means speaking only positive things about their husbands and to their husbands. This directive is drilled into Kingston members from an early age. An experience in the journal of Orlean Kingston Gustafson (an original member) exemplifies this directive: "Towards morning the spirit of the Lord came to me and showed me how glad we should be to do as those above us ask us to do and what a privilege it is to be able to do it and please those above us and that we should do it with gladness" (p. 65). Speaking negatively about husbands or organizational leaders requires repentance by the one who criticizes. Orlean writes: "It has been hard for me to do as I should do and hard for me to please those above me. I have been careless with my speech and haven't kept the spirit of the Lord with me as I should. This morning (in a

had been cut off. It was swollen and sore, so sore, I could hardly speak. It was so bad that I only spoke when it was absolutely necessary. I awoke: The meaning is to cut out all idle talk and only speak when necessary and be careful of my speech to those above me" (1949, p. 67). Of course, this is an organizational ideal rather than an actuality, as participants state there are strong women in the organization that speak their minds (participant 6).

Withholding Information From Outsiders

The organization states that to be loyal, members should not "do or say anything that will hurt the people we love, like our family and the other Order members" (Order, 2009a, p. 258). This includes withholding information from outsiders that could harm or incarcerate members. The children's handbook states: "What are the rules we should follow? (1) Don't start talking about Order things ourselves. Sometimes some of us seem to think it makes us look smarter if we tell everything we know. It really makes us look not as smart. (2) If someone asks us a question it doesn't hurt us to say 'I don't know.' There again, some think people will think we are not smart to say we don't know. It's a lot smarter not to tell everything we know" (Order, 2009).

Lying for the Lord

It appears that while Order members are encouraged to follow the laws of the country, they are asked sometimes to choose the Order principle when laws and Order standards conflict. As we have discussed in Chapter 5, this is the forensic appeal of the general (moral) law over the specific law. For example, the Independence Day lesson is supportive of "the country we live in, and for the sacrifices made by the men and women who made it possible for us to have a place where we can worship our Heavenly Father" (p. 246). However, while members are encouraged to "be good citizens" and "obey the laws," they are also asked to break the "unjust laws" and trust in God to protect them "against any unrighteous men" who might prosecute their illegal activities (Order, 2009a,

p. 248).

Lying is considered necessary to protect greater truths, such as those found in the Order. The children's lesson manual states: "Suppose you lived in Nauvoo in the days of Joseph Smith. Suppose that a mob was after him and was going to tar and feather him. Suppose he came to your house to hide from the mob so you let him hide in your house. If the mob came to your house and knocked on the door, you answered it and they asked, 'Is Joseph Smith in your house?' What would you say. Would you tell the truth and say yes so they could take him and tar and feather him? Of course you wouldn't. You would say no to protect the Prophet Joseph Smith. Sometimes we have to say no to protect the Order." (Order, 2009a, p. 259). Here, the lies that members tell about the Order's activities are compared to protecting Joseph Smith from pain and possibly death. While this may seem to be a false analogy to outsiders, current members believe that the organizational values they are protecting are every bit as important as saving a man from death.

One poignant example is found in the adult lesson manual about when the state of Utah attempted to prosecute plural marriage in the 1980s. A woman named Sister Ardous, the sister of the leader Ortell, was detained in jail because she was the secretary of the organization and had important records that could incriminate the Order. The handbook states: "Sister Ardous had been asked to provide the statements, the financial statements and all the records and the names of the members in the order, the bank statements, how much money was going in and out of the order and who was depositing and so on. She was ordered to produce all the minutes of the meetings of the Davis County Cooperative since 1956, tax records of the Order since 1956, financial records of all the businesses in the Order" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 36, p. 7).

The initial strategy of the Order was to drag out the trial for as long as possible. Each week, Ardous was issued another subpoena from the state of Utah. She gave excuses of sickness or appointments for many weeks until "the judge told her that the next time she returned she would have to have a note from the doctor saying she was sick

the times she didn't come or be charged with contempt of court" (2009b, Chapter 36, p. 7). So the organization employed deception to avoid being prosecuted. The handbook explains:

> Sister Ardous didn't have a doctor and hadn't been to a doctor for many years, but there was a good customer, Dr. Lane, in Dragerton who was sympathetic to the people of the order. When he was told of Sister Ardous's dilemma, he wrote a note for her saying that she was sick all of the times she couldn't make it. They didn't like it very well but accepted it. (Order, 2009b, Chapter 36, p. 7)

This deception bought the Order more time, but the judge eventually said that "if she did not produce the information they wanted, the judge would put her in jail for contempt of Court" (2009b, Chapter 36, p. 7). The morning she was to return to the court with the necessary information, Ortell asked her not to take it and she accepted, knowing that she would be put in jail. "When the judge asked her for the records and she told him she didn't have them, he was furious and sentenced her to thirty days in jail for her contempt. He ordered the bailiffs to take her to jail immediately" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 36, p. 7).

Sister Ardous spent 30 days in jail but did not give the records to the state of Utah. She "knew in her heart that if she had to stay in jail for the rest of her life that's what she would do" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 36, p. 8). Ardous was told that if she brought the records, she would be released. She "did not bring anything that they had ordered but a ledger or two of the business records they had provided for the IRS. But the jury had already decided to finish the afternoon of December 29th and the Grand Jury, by law, could not continue after the end of the year and there would not be enough time to go over any further records before the jury dissolved" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 36, p. 9). Because of this deception, Ardous is commended by the organization as one of the most righteous women who will surely be guaranteed eternal life. For the organization, the violation of a particular law to uphold a greater general law was the will of the Lord.

According to interview participants, lying for the sake of the Kingdom of God is sometimes difficult. One participant states about her mother: "And she really completely believed in the way they lived. So she would have done anything he [her husband, the

leader] asked her to do and she did do all kinds of things that were not in her nature. Like lying. She went in and applied for welfare and told the state that her husband was a truck driver and that he'd abandoned her. And it was really really hard for her to do that because it was hard for her to lie. And her family never lied about their beliefs, but the Kingstons really strongly believed that they shouldn't tell anybody—not your neighbor, not your sister. My mother lied to her family about what was going on" (participant 25). Again, here is an example of a woman who violated one moral principle to support another.

The organizational directive to lie to government officials is one major factor that led to a participant leaving the organization. When asked to lie about her marriage to the opposing attorney, she became confused and told the truth. David, one of the seven brothers in the hierarchy of the organization, said, "You are not to tell anybody you're married. You are to take that wedding ring off until this case is over and don't you ever tell anybody that again. You need to go back to the office and tell Paul what you just did." This participant was afraid, thought she "messed up," and went to see the leader: "I went in to see Paul, and he said, 'Good grief. You can lie and cover up for Mary Ann, but you can't do that for us?' And I was like . . . 'I never lied to cover up for Mary Ann." And Paul said, 'Don't lie to us now.' He just ripped me a new one. And now that I think about it . . . What kind of ethics is that?"

In sum, loyalty to the organization is achieved in words by refraining from criticizing organizational leaders, withholding information, and sometimes lying to protect the Order principles.

Loyalty in Actions

The Kingston organization states that "to Choose the Order is to Choose the Right" (Order, 2009a). For the Kingstons, this means to obey every organizational directive with a willing heart and good attitude. The behavioral requirements of members have been discussed elsewhere in depth. But one important aspect that has not yet been covered is how the Order is able to discipline the actions of members through the use

of spiritual experiences. This is done by (1) giving direct revelation, (2) the power of organizational suggestion, (3) reserving the right to interpret members' spiritual experiences, and (4) appealing to the pre-existence. Still, it appears that both current and former members believe they have received spiritual experiences independently of organizational direction.

Giving Direct Revelation

One way organizational leaders are able to make decisions without objections from the group is to state that the decree is the will of the Lord. This method is powerful because it appeals to a being that all regard as omnipotent and omniscient. Because all members of the group also believe the leader is the direct conduit to God, the leader's organizational decisions are rarely questioned. This appeal to ethos is salient with members.

Even former members recognize the power of this method: "For the first five years after I left, I believed that there was some truth there. And after about five years, I realized that they believe what they're doing, but they're wrong. You know, their ideas are coming out of their own heads. . . . It's a lot of manipulation to control the members and it's an organization, a corporation, like anything that is involved with money. And they have a way of making money and controlling their employees" (participant 25). The organizational rhetoric of the Kingstons is full of direct revelations from God, and members find this type of rhetoric quite persuasive. It has the advantage of not being able to be verified independently by members.

Power of Organizational Suggestion

The Kingston organization is also able to discipline the actions of members by suggesting a course of action—then asking members to verify it through prayer. This does two things: first, members feel that they are free to make their own choices, because the final word is between them and God. Second, because members already believe that the Kingston leader speaks for God, they will (perhaps subconsciously) attempt to discipline

their spiritual experience to concur with what has already been said. If they receive an opposite answer, they will be forced to admit the possibility that the leader was wrong or feel they are not able to receive an answer from God. Either way, members desire to produce a spiritual experience that "matches" the suggestion of the leader. One example is found in the adult lesson manual: "I was 17 years old when [my wife's] family moved to the mine. They had been there about a week when Brother Charles told me that I was supposed to marry Price Johnson's oldest eligible daughter. I had a dream that verified that. Eleanor was 14. Her father gave me permission to propose to her the day before her 17th birthday" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 44, p. 4). In this case, an already identified member has a dream that he interprets as a spiritual experience to verify a leader's statements.

A few former members state that they never received the spiritual experiences that the organization stated would verify their decrees. For them, the power of organizational suggestion did not work, because the spiritual experience did not come to verify the statements. One participant explains: "I was about 15 or 16. I had all these men come to me and had direction to marry me. Here I am, 15, 16 years old. Well, I hadn't had any dreams. What am I supposed to do, marry all y'all?" (participant 24). Another member states: "I'd have a meeting with them and they would say, 'While you pray this weekend, we'll talk about it.' You know, 'Pray this week and I'll pray this week and then we'll talk about it at our next meeting and we'll see what we can figure out.' And I knew they had a few girls that they kept trying to push me towards, you know, and I knew then no matter what they were going to try and say, 'Well, I have direction on this girl for you'" (participant 12). In these two cases, these participants felt that the organizational "direction" was inauthentic.

The power of organizational suggestion works in another way: by narrowing the choices of members, they feel like they are still exercising free will while they stay within the limits of what is organizationally acceptable. This is especially important in the organizational orchestration of spouses.

In marriage, a woman's choice to marry is narrowed by a series of steps. First, a

man decides to present himself to the woman's family as a choice for marriage. This can happen in a few different ways. Sometimes the leader suggests the choice to the man, or sometimes the man asks the leader for permission to present himself as a marriage choice. Either way, the leader consents to the marriage beforehand. Then the man presents himself to the woman's parents and receives the consent of the parents. Afterwards, the man presents himself to the woman, herself, and she is allowed to choose from the men accepted by both the leader and the parents. One current member describes the process this way:

> There were actually several young men that came and talked to my father and my mother. . . . It sounds really calculating, but I looked to see what kind of character they had—what kind of father would they be—because that was important to me. . . . I wanted a large family. I looked at the way they treated their mothers. That was one thing my father really stressed: If you want someone who will treat you good, look at the way they treat their mothers now. So that's what I did. And I did a lot of praying , and when it came time and I felt like I was ready to get married, he had actually come and talked to me and presented himself as a choice. And when I had made my decision, then I went and talked to him. At first I talked to my mom and dad. Then I actually talked to him and his wife together. (participant 19)

Current members feel that their marriages are made with free will. But former members insist that their marriage choices were minimal. One woman stated it "was either between [my husband] or my brother. So, I pretty much picked the less bad one . . . Well, they didn't go out and say it. It's just like, you know, 'What do you think about this person? What do you think about this one?' And then they tell you, you know, you need to fast until you decide which one" (participant 9).

Reserving the Right to Interpret Spiritual Experiences

As the proclaimed direct conduit to God, the leader of the organization reserves the right to interpret members' spiritual experiences and rewrite them if they do not meet organizational objectives. Orlean Gustafson, an original member (and sister of the leader), writes in her journal: "December 30, 1939. Last night Brother 1 came and said, 'These dreams are all from the wrong source. I felt bad because I had continually

striven with the Lord that the evil one would not be allowed to come in and give me dreams or anything like that to deceive me" (1949, p. 63). I didn't see this revision of members' revelations in the narratives; however, this poignant example of disciplining spiritual experiences is present in Orlean's journal. If it is used widely in the Kingston organization, this is also an important rhetorical tool used for spiritual discipline.

Appealing to Preexistence

The final strategy for spiritual discipline of members' actions is the appeal to the preexistence. Order members are told that they were given free choice whether to belong to the organization—in the preexistence. The adult lesson manual states

> In the first place, we may be mistakenly looking at membership in the Order as a hardship when in fact it is the greatest privilege that a person can ever be offered on this earth. We first were given the opportunity to choose to be a part of it on the other side before we were ever born. Now that we are here we make that choice over and over every day in our thoughts and our actions. Some have made the choice to not be here by failing to live up to the Order standards and thus in their actions do not qualify for so great a privilege. That shows us that with a privilege comes a responsibility. With a freedom to choose what is right comes a responsibility to live that choice. (Order, 2009b, Chapter 44, p. 4)

By appealing to the preexistence, the organization is able to control members through guilt and fear: guilt that they are rejecting a choice that they had already made, and fear that they will not receive the blessings they are promised if they fail to uphold their end of the deal.

Spiritual Experiences

While it is clear that organizational rhetoric is an important in disciplining the spiritual experience of its members, it is also clear that both current and former members believe they have received actual spiritual experiences independent of organizational rhetoric. These experiences served to strengthen their resolve and identification with the organization. One former member states:

> Yeah, you know, I'll tell you one of the weirdest things, and I don't know how to explain it to this day. I was a foreman down at the mine. I worked down there for

> about 20 years. . . . I had two wives at the time, and I had a number.
>
> I had a dream one night that a person came to me and said, "Today is going to be a really special day." It kind of sent a chill down me. I said, "what do you mean? What's going to happen?" The person kind of smiled and said, "It's going to be a really special day." I said, "Can you tell me what you mean?" He opened a curtain and I looked in, and there was some cotton laying in there. And I went and looked and there was a foot laying in there and some fingers laying in cotton. I thought, "Oh no, somebody's going to get hurt." I looked at him, and he kind of nodded, and I woke up. It kind of startled me awake.
>
> So all day I was trying to decide who could that be? I finally figured out it's gotta be this guy. When he got there, I told him, "I want you to stay in here [in the belt tunnel] the whole shift today, 'cause it's got to be really clean. The inspectors are going to be here, I need you to stay in here." I had thought about it and I felt he would be safe in here. . . . I told him I wanted him to not even leave this tunnel this whole shift. He wasn't an order member, so I didn't really want to tell him exactly why and explain it.
>
> So he was in here for a while, then I went down to a foreman meeting. He took off, left, and went down to the scale house and was talking to the secretaries down there. Then a truck came up to be loaded and he had to go and load it. So he went running out up on the side of the truck, right up there with him. He jumped and grabbed for it, and his foot slipped and fell down and the truck ran over his foot and his fingers. Broke his foot and smashed his fingers. . . .
>
> So there's things that—it wasn't something that shocked me or surprised me, because it was the kind of thing everybody there expects. If you're in tune and you're in line, you're going to have extra help and guidance and all these things. (participant 5)

Most of the spiritual experiences told by current members had to do with receiving divine guidance on whom they were to marry:

> We grew up knowing that there's a one and only for every person. You had your one and only mate that Heavenly Father had for you. It was your responsibility and your privilege to be able to pray to your Heavenly Father and find out who the one special person was you were supposed to marry. And so as I went into my teenage years then you're wondering, where do I fit? Kind of in limbo, waiting to go onto the next step in life, thinking, "Is it really going to happen to me? Is He really going to show me this special, number one choice for me?"
>
> One night I had a dream and it showed me that I had my first child, and I was pacing, waiting for the father to come home. I had a picture in my mind of who that father was. Before this, I had totally never, it had never even entered my mind about this person. I woke up because it shocked me, that person was a surprise. I thought "I've just been shown." And that wasn't all. At that very minute, I felt, I don't know how to explain the rest of the other than to say a piece of heaven came down and rested on me. I felt this spirit come and rest on me. It was the

> most beautiful, wonderful spirit I have ever felt in my entire life. . . . it was so strong and so powerful that it actually scared me. So I tried to shake it off and if I had only had that dream for the rest of my life I could have dismissed it, saying "it was just a dream." But there's no way on earth that I could ever dismiss that feeling and I know without a doubt that that was Heavenly Father. . . . Because of that, I knew from then on that was where I was supposed to be and that's what Heavenly Father wanted. And I knew that I wanted to do what Heavenly Father wanted. (participant 3)

Another current member experienced a type of communion with a child who had died, which strengthened her identification with the organization.

> When my second son died, he was 24, and he was married and he had three children. I thought I was going to lose my mind. I was sitting in this chair thinking, "I can't do this again, Lord. I can't, I can't, I can't." [She had one other son who had died.] And all of a sudden, I heard Mason's voice and he said the words to the song, "Today While the Sun Shines": "Work with a will, today all your duties and labors fulfill." The last part of it—and he said this real clear—"Call life a good gift and call the world fair." So, I thought, you know, he doesn't want me to mourn him for one minute. He wants me to keep walking . . .
>
> Anyway, the next day I went to church. I didn't want to because I . . . I cry at a drop of a hat, so I was crying my eyes out. I thought, "Well, I'm going to stay at the back of the room so nobody will see me while I cry." We get up to sing the first song and guess what it was? [Today While the Sun Shines.] And I just thought, "Oh, thank you Lord. They're with you and I am not going to worry about them one more time and I'm going to quit worrying about me, too." So, you know, with each hard thing, then, you just know that the Lord is going to just back you up and so those hard times only solidified my love for this work. (participant 18)

Though the organizational rhetoric effectively disciplines organizational members' spiritual experiences, it appears that there have been psychic events that members draw upon to support their membership in and identification with the organization.

Conclusion

In this Chapter, I discussed how the four aspects of identification are related to Lalich's systems of bounded choice and Burke's theory of logology; and how they are used to create member loyalty in thoughts, words, and actions. In the first section, I argued that cognitive identification relies upon the mythic image of the "kingdom of God," through which all organizational rhetoric is filtered. In the second section, I argued

that members utilize common ground techniques, identification by antithesis, the assumed "we", and unifying symbols (Cheney, 1983b) to concertively control members to adhere to this group identity. In the third section, I argue that the law of one above another and the law of satisfaction are two organizational decision premises that effectively discipline the behavior of organizational members and induce them to think organizationally. In the fourth section, I argued that the family is the most important of the organizational dimensions and that affective identification found within it is both the strongest and weakest system of control, depending on the relationships between these members and their adherence to organizational regulations. Finally, in the fifth section, I showed how these four processes of organizational identification produce loyalty to the organization in thoughts, words, and actions.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS AND GENERALIZABILITY OF THE STUDY

In this dissertation, I explored organizational identification in the Kingston organization in depth. I conceptualized organizational identification as a rhetorical phenomenon, using Aristotle (2004) and Burke (1950). I probed the different definitions of organizational identification and argued that organizational identification has four dimensions: affective, cognitive, conative, and behavioral. I compared these four dimensions to Burke's (1950) theory of logology and Lalich's (2004) theory of bounded choice, arguing that organizational identification can be explored from a rhetorical perspective in the realm of new religious movements. I explored power in organizational identification by comparing the four dimensions to Tompkins and Cheney's (1985) theory of unobtrusive control, in which four types of organizational control are utilized and have significant similarities to the dimensions of organizational identification. This theory of organizational identification was tested by applying three rhetorical research methodologies to the data (Extended Metaphor Analysis, classical Aristotelian analysis, and Burkean Identification Strategies), which were collected through the retrospective interview technique and the assembling of relevant organizational rhetoric. Through the analysis of the data, the theoretical and methodological issues involved with organizational identification were explored, as well as case-specific issues about how to interpret the actions and identification of members in the Kingston organization.

In order to arrive at useful conclusions about the Kingston organization (and, by extension, contemporary Utah polygamous organizations), theoretical bridges and linkages were built between three bodies of literature: organizational identification, rhetoric, and new religious movements. The bodies of literature upon which this study's theory is built are interdependent and build upon one another. For example, I argue that Lalich's (2004) four processes of bounded choice are very similar to Van Dick's (2001) four components of identification and Burke's (1950) rhetorical logology. This theory

building allows us to make useful comparisons between organizational identification and religious identification; draw from insights across all three bodies of literature; as well as apply rhetorical tools used in organizational identification to studies of new religious movements. If we accept the theories upon which these conclusions are based and the methodological choices that propelled the study forward, then we can accept the conclusions as valuable resources that can shed light upon a deepening social conundrum within the state of Utah (and other pockets of America). Assuming this, the following Chapter is divided into three portions: theoretical conclusions concerning organizational identification and rhetoric; conclusions pertaining to the Kingston organization, specifically; and limitations and applicability of the study.

Theoretical Conclusions

Theoretically, this study contributes to organizational identification literature, organizational rhetoric literature, and literature about new religious movements. Regarding organizational identification, this study promotes the use of four categories of organizational identification (rather than three); elucidates organizational identification in oppressive circumstances; asserts that individuals most readily identify with smaller work groups rather than the organization as a whole; prefers a rhetorical approach in contrast with Social Identity Theory; and concludes that the conative level of identification is the most unobtrusive and powerful. Concerning rhetoric, this study asserts that a Burkean rhetorical framework accompanied by Burkean and classical tools delivers a robust analysis of new religious movements.

Organizational Identification

This study contributes to organizational identification theory in five ways. First, it promotes the use of four categories of organizational identification (rather than three), which enables important linkages to be made between rhetoric and new religious movements; second, it contributes to our understanding of organizational identification

in oppressive circumstances; third, it asserts that individuals most readily identify with smaller work groups rather than the organization as a whole; fourth, it prefers a rhetorical approach in contrast with Social Identity Theory; and fifth, it concludes that the conative level of identification is the most unobtrusive and powerful.

Four Components of Organizational Identification

One of the major theoretical developments of this dissertation is that there is much evidence to suggest that organizational identification is a process with four components rather than three. Traditional psychology borrowed a Platonic conception of the soul divided into three parts: appetitive, reasoning, and spirited. The development of the concept of identification (and, later, organizational identification), mirrored this Platonic conception of the soul with the divisions of affective, cognitive, and conative parts of identification. However, recent scholars such as Van Dick (2001; 2005; 2006) have argued that there is also a behavioral component of organizational identification. A four-part conception of identification corresponds well with Aristotle's bipartite soul with logical (cognitive, behavioral) and alogical (affective, conative) halves. Aristotle's model of the bipartite soul is essential to the bridges that have built between organizational identification and rhetoric; and organizational identification and new religious movements.

Rhetorical organizational identification. Aristotle's bipartite soul did wonders for the field of rhetoric 2000 years ago. To review, Aristotle believed contrary to Plato that an element of cognition was present in the emotional response and that it could not be separated from the cognitive-related spirited and logical components of the soul. By incorporating an element of cognition into the emotional response, Aristotle gave the emotional appeal new dignity within the field of rhetoric and suddenly became an artificial proof worthy of study. Rather than viewing emotional appeals as charms and enchantments like rhetoricians such as Thrasymachus and Gorgias, emotion became

integral to the process of persuasion. Viewing the soul as composed of two parts each capable of cognition allowed Aristotle and others to address why people are motivated to act in ways that are "unreasonable."

The four-component model of organizational identification also corresponds very well with Burke's theory of logology. Affective identification and mystery; cognitive identification and mythic image; behavioral identification and perfection; and conative identification and consubstantiality are all highly correlative theories. Through these linkages, we are able to transfer theoretical and methodological advances from one discipline to another. For example, rhetorical scholars have been saying for some time that organizational identification is a rhetorical process. This is one further linkage that supports this assertion. And by showing how Burkean rhetoric is similar to organizational identification, we make a strong case for using Burkean rhetorical analysis to understand the process of organizational identification.

Religious organizational identification. A four-component model of organizational identification helps to elucidate new religious movements, as well (assuming that Lalich's (2004) model of bounded choice is generalizable to all new religious movements). There is a strong connection between bounded choice and organizational identification. Affective identification and charismatic authority; cognitive identification and transcendental belief systems; behavioral identification and systems of control; and conative identification and systems of identification are all highly correlative. Singer (2003), Lalich (2004), and Langone (1992) all call for studies that move beyond categorization and description of new religious movements to elucidate how identification occurs in new religious movements. Through the linkages made between rhetoric, organizational identification, and new religious movements, this study was able to do just that.

Understanding Organizational Identification in Oppression

One of the major questions people ask about new religious movements is, "How

can people be committed to values and lifestyles that seem to be so oppressive?" This is one of the major reasons I felt compelled to begin this research project. (In this case study, because I have bracketed out the issue of "abuse," I take a strictly materialist stance and refer to "oppression" as the condition of being compensated for work in an organizational system that is below market value.) It is no secret that members of the Kingston organization are poorly compensated for their work in the businesses. Even current members acknowledge that they work for much less than what the market pays. Still, members assert that they are very happy, while former members assert they were very unhappy in the organization. There appear to be at least three major reasons that people become identified with systems of economic oppression. First, they may not be cognitively aware of their under-compensation; second, they may believe that the tangible or intangible goods they are promised in exchange for material sacrifices will materialize; and third, the benefits of organizational membership may exceed the costs.

First, employees may not be cognitively aware of their under-compensation and are therefore not angered. Aristotle's conception of the bipartite soul (along with the introduction of the cognitive component to emotion) helps us to understand this phenomenon. Aristotle (2004) defines anger as "a longing, accompanied by pain, for a real or apparent revenge for a real or apparent slight, affecting a man himself or one of his friends, when such a slight is undeserved" (p. 173). In other words, whether or not an action or system is oppressive depends entirely on the perspective of the individual. Fortenbaugh (2008) explains: "Including the thought of outrage among the essential components of anger has the necessary consequence that a man cannot be angry when he thinks himself treated justly" (p. 14). One former member described this well when she said, "I thought I was happy, because I didn't know any different" (participant 15).

By encouraging members to work for the organization, the Order is able to prevent members from experiencing the advantages of higher wages. One participant stated: "When I quit working for the Order businesses and went and worked on the

outside, in the first year my income went up by $10,000, and I started at the bottom of Jenny Craig, with $5-something an hour. So, in there, you paid piss-poor wages, you're not supposed to have vacation because Order people don't need vacation and, you know, you're supposed to work your butt off for supposedly God's kingdom . . . . But, you know, getting more involved with the outside world made me see more that this is crazy" (participant 13). So, members must be cognitively aware of their undercompensation—and have something to compare it with—to feel that it is oppressive. Burke (1950) refers to this as a "pure slave mentality."

Second, even if employees are aware of their under-compensation and have an outside experience to compare it with, they may be willing to work for small wages in exchange for a large payout, later. The commission system, which is dominant in many industries such as restaurant, real estate, retail, and finance, is based on this idea. Kingston members work for the organization because they believe they are building the Kingdom of God, but it is not all altruistic. Kingston members have been promised by leaders that they will receive things such as (1) elite status in heaven; (2) eternal life; (3) mansions in heaven; (4) servants (i.e., non-Kingstons); (5) youthful, immortal bodies; (6) a utopian environment where streets are paved with gold; and (7) eternal bliss. Kingston members acknowledge that they are undercompensated materially but believe they are saving their money for a huge payout in the afterlife. One former member stated it this way: "You have to earn your way; you have to buy your way into heaven through sacrifice" (Erickson, 2005).

According to former members, resisting these discourses are difficult because the promised reward is vast, and the idea of sacrificing for nothing is difficult to bear. No one wants to believe that all of that hard work is for nothing. When one former member started asking questions about the organization and its sacred organizational stories and myths, he was met with much resistance. One leader of the Kingstons stated, "I've had questions, too, but if I let myself think about them I'd go crazy" (participant 5). Another

Kingston participant explained that she had a psychic/spiritual experience in which words came strongly into her mind: “What if you get to the next life, and they say ‘April Fools,’ the joke’s on you!” (participant 15). But while some Kingston members eventually decided the promised reward is imaginary and left the organization, others experienced spiritual communion with a divine presence affirming their knowledge of the existence of this reward (participant 1, participant 3). Whether the reward is real or imaginary is an issue that current and former members must deal with, and members tend to believe that the reward is real because of the costs associated with leaving.

Third, even if a member acknowledges being undercompensated for work and does not believe in the reward, there may still be reasons for being identified. Several current members affirm that their lives are happy and that they can’t imagine life without the Order (participant 2, participant 3, participant 1). One former member states that there are people in the organization who do not feel identified to the ideologies or the economic aspect of the organization but stay because of their family: “They’re committed to their family, basically. I know a few people that won’t leave because they know they will have to lose their relationship with their family. So they stay” (participant 4). Another former member states that the organization may be the best place for some people who are unable to work: “This woman in particular . . . if she was ever to leave the Order she could never hold down her job . . . She could never take care of herself if she was to leave, and so for her, she’s probably better off there . . . I don’t think that she’d be able to leave and make it” (participant 12). The organization provides basic needs to everyone, regardless of circumstances. So—even economically—there are benefits associated with membership.

In sum, the second theoretical benefit associated with organizational identification

deals with organizations that are materially oppressive, that is, they compensate employees below market value. This study found that cognitive awareness of material oppression; belief in a large tangible or intangible reward; and membership benefits that exceed the costs of association are three major reasons that individuals choose to work in organizations that underpay them.

Work Group Versus Organizational Identification

The third theoretical conclusion about organizational identification is that smaller work groups are more highly identified with each other than with the organization as a whole. As van Knippenburg and van Schie (2000) state, there is a need in organizational identification literature to study how OI may differ between groups (work groups, departments, teams, etc.) within the organization. An analysis of the organizational and vernacular rhetoric of the Kingston organization found that OI does differ between work groups and the organization. While the study was not constructed to analyze differences in levels of identification, it can qualitatively affirm that members more readily identify with the family (i.e., the smaller unit work group) than the organization as a whole.

Rhetoric-based Organizational Identification

The next OI-related conclusion is that while social identity theory is widely utilized to explain organizational identification, a rhetorical-based approach has three advantages: First, a rhetorical conception of OI accounts for changing identifications over time and different identifications towards different people or groups in the organization (i.e., it is viewed as a process as well as a product). Second, rhetorical OI accounts for an emotional component of OI, rather than viewing it as an exclusively cognitive construct. And third, while social identity theory is "relatively mute" about how identification occurs, rhetorical OI has the tools to explore this in depth.

Process and Product

Maneerat et al. (2005) state that organizational identification is both process

and product: "Identification is considered a product in terms of employee beliefs, attitudes, intentions, or any combination thereof. Identification is a process in the sense that it requires ongoing communication efforts that foster work dedicated toward organizational goals and objectives" (p. 193; in Cheney, 1983a). This emphasis on process has allowed researchers to address identification over time (e.g., Bullis & Bach's "turning point analysis"; 1989a, 1989b) and study different identifications depending on the communicative target, or resource of identity to which a person can become attached (e.g., Scott, Corman, & Cheney's "multiple targets," 1998; Cheney's view that organizational rhetoric is the "management of multiple identities"; 1991).

This study has utilized this process-based rhetorical approach. Methodologically, participants were asked to chart their identification levels over time; this allowed me to view organizational (dis)identification not as a static product but as an ever-changing process. Because of this, I was able to see some of the rhetoric associated with changing identification levels, which allowed me to better understand what types of organizational rhetoric are particularly important to sustaining and subverting organizational identification. This is an important departure from most current analysis of the political situation in Utah. Propolygamy and antipolygamy groups are most often seen as polarized, opposing, static factions—rather than individuals with varying levels of identification with the organization. By analyzing turning points in identification levels (or, in the case of current members, important identification experiences), we are able to see hot-spots and possible areas of common ground. These potential areas of common ground will be discussed a future section of this Chapter.

Emotional Component of Organizational Identification

While scholars of Freud and others have long argued that identification has an emotional component, proponents of social identity theory such as Ashforth and Mael (1989) assert that OI is only a cognitive construct: belief in goals and values, a willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and desire to maintain

membership are actually not part of identification but are consequences of identification. In contrast, Tompkins and Cheney (1985) refer to identification as the *desire* of people to act in the best interests of the organization and view identification as including a sense (read feeling) of belonging. As Kuhn and Nelson (2002) note, in rhetorical theory the process of OI expresses individual attachments to identity structures, while also reproducing and transforming these same identity structures. If we view attachments as affective, we can concur with Bucher (2003) that "where members see themselves now, where they have come from, and the process of getting from one place to another, or moving from one identity to another, necessarily involves *feelings* of identification with someone or something else" (p. 9).

In this study, I have made a case for viewing organizational identification as a four-component process, which includes an affective dimension. Viewing OI as having an emotional component allowed me to utilize an important rhetorical tool—rhetorical appeal analysis. Through this process, I was able to analyze the emotions most directly associated with identification and disidentification. *This study found that fear was the emotion most commonly associated with identification.* This result was important, because it supported the assertions of researchers such as Schein (1961), Singer (2003), and Lalich (2004) that some new religious movements use fear as a dominant motivating force for recruitment and socialization of members.

Analyzing How Identification Occurs

Cheney (1983) notes that the outcome of viewing OI as product rather than process is that there has not been much effort to analyze *how* identification occurs. By focusing on Burke's (1950) assertion that rhetoric is the art of persuasion through identification, Cheney is able to view identification as a rhetorical process. And by using Simon's (1997) argument that identification is manifest through an individual's decision making processes in an organization, Cheney brings this rhetorical process of identification into the realm of organization theory. This juxtaposition of two different yet

compatible theories allows us to make available a whole arsenal of rhetorical figures and forms (classical rhetoric), framing devices (contemporary rhetoric), and critical constructs (critical rhetoric) to be used to explain *how* OI occurs.

Cheney's (1991) analysis of the development of U.S. Catholic Bishops' pastoral letter "The Challenge of Peace" is a good example of the practical insights that can come from viewing OI as a rhetorical process. At the end of his analysis, Cheney highlights 12 "principles" important to remember when studying OI. Some of these principles are strategic; for example, he states "for a part of an organization to assert its autonomy and still remain in the organization, it must not challenge the basic identity of the organization as a whole." Other examples of strategic recommendations are "organizations must speak to outsiders and, in so doing, must not adapt so completely that their authority with insiders or their basic identity is threatened"; and "if organizational members wish to achieve change within an organization, they must justify that change in terms of the interests of an organization" (Cheney, 1991, pp. 163-81). These practical recommendations are important to academicians, organizations, and lay people interested in achieving social change.

Another example is Cheney's (1983b) study of corporate house organs, in which he argues that organizations attempt to induce identification through four techniques: (1) highlighting similarities between the organization and the individual (the "common ground technique"); (2) portraying outsiders as enemies ("identification through antithesis"); (3) using the "assumed we" in corporate discourse, and (4) using unifying symbols such as name, logo and trademark.

The major purpose of this study was to understand how identification occurs in the Kingston organization and, by extension, new religious movements in general. Therefore, a rhetorical-based approach was a natural fit. In the next section I will discuss in more detail how this identification took place. In sum, viewing OI as a process as well as product; including an affective component; and focusing on how identification occurs are

three major reasons to prefer an RT-based theory of OI over an SIT-based theory.

Conative Level of Identification

The fifth and last theoretical conclusion related to organizational identification is that the conative level of identification is the most unobtrusive and, therefore, the most powerful. As we recall, Tompkins and Cheney (1985) identified concertive control as the most unobtrusive and most powerful type of organizational control (superseding simple, technical, and bureaucratic control). This control is managed by inculcating organizational values and directives into the value system of the organizational members (see pp. 196-200 for a full discussion). Because values are often the premises upon which logical decision making is based, members accept organizationally directed values as "givens." Members do not resist these organizational values and goals because they have adopted the organizational values as part of their own value system—no one resists control that they do not recognize.

In Chapter 3, concertive control was linked with conative identification. Concertive control is maintained by the organization through conative identification, that is, through the management of member identification with the values of the organization. In other words, conative identification makes concertive control possible; and concertive control maintains and manages conative identification. Conative identification, then, is the most powerful and unobtrusive form of organizational control.

Conative identification does not stand alone, however. Each of the four interlocking types of identification is dependent upon the others. For example, conative identification is dependent upon cognitive identification, or the mythic image/ transcendental belief system of the organization. In the case of the Kingstons, the mythic image is a utopian Kingdom of God, which is promoted through linguistic devices such as labels, metaphors, and platitudes. Through the use of organizational rhetoric, members work toward building that image. The values that support building the Kingdom of God, such as unity, industriousness, and a communal worldview, are promoted by the

organization. These values, pushed by the organizational rhetoric, permeate all aspects of life and further support the mythic image of building the Kingdom of God. Stated in terms of bounded choice, the transcendental belief system provides an overarching ideology that makes sense of organizational values, which in turn support the belief system in place. Supporting organizational rhetoric sets members' decision premises (bureaucratic rhetoric) and manages their emotions (especially fear, pride, and guilt/shame), producing behavioral and affective types of identification.

Through the rhetorical construction of a salient mythic image and careful management of emotions and behavior, organizations are able to work their rhetoric into the core of members' value systems and—once there—unobtrusively control what members do, say, and even think about.

Because of this powerful control over the hearts, minds, actions, and values of its members, value-based organizations are potent forces for social change. Any group of fully identified members, regardless of size, will be able to accomplish more than individuals belonging to bureaucratic organizations or professional associations with which they are identified only partially. But the all-encompassing organizational control of value-based organizations is both motivating and potentially fearsome.

In the case of the Kingston organization, appealing to religious freedom has worked well among law enforcement officials in the Utah Attorney General's office. The AG's office has accepted the "religious freedom" argument of many value-based organizations (i.e., the ones that characterize themselves as "religious") as legitimate and is attempting to enforce crime within these organizations without altering the organizations, themselves. In other words, individuals within organizations are sometimes prosecuted for various offenses, but they are seen as separate from the organizations that produced the values upon which they acted. It's another version of "killing the messenger." Rather than taking a hands-off approach to value-based organizations, in my estimation the AG's office should view value-base organization as highly complex

systems of concertive control through which conative identification is produced. A systems perspective would, I believe, be the most fair, humane, and kind approach to members within the system—for how can someone who was born and raised in an organization (with almost inevitable conative identification) be expected to adhere to values that conflict with ones they have adopted from the organization and inculcated as their own? Either the AG's office needs to decriminalize polygamy, incest, and underage marriage and allow organizations such as the Kingstons to exist without fear; or it needs to take a more proactive role in guiding the value inculcation of organizational members toward mainstream social values. The Safety Net Committee has taken vital steps forward in establishing an important and necessary dialogue between the government and polygamous new religious movements. But it remains to be seen what the long-term effects of this committee will be and whether the government will influence the values of polygamous new religious movements or vice versa. At this point in time, former members of the Kingston organization feel that the AG's office is in bed with the polygamous organizations. Current members, on the other hand, continue to feel threatened and worry that their lifestyle would be prosecuted if the state were given additional resources to do so.

In sum, this study makes five tentative theoretical conclusions about organizational identification. First, it makes a case for the existence of four components of organizational identification: affective, cognitive, behavioral, and conative. This enables Lalich's (2004) sociological theory of bounded choice to be viewed through a different lens as a robust theory of organizational identification in new religious movements. Second, this study contributes to our understanding of organizational identification in oppressive circumstances, concluding specifically that three major factors determine whether or not a member will voluntarily stay in a materially oppressive circumstance: (1) awareness of oppression; (2) belief in a greater eventual reward for material sacrifice; and (3) benefits of organizational membership exceeding

the costs. Third, this study is one more case that affirms individuals most readily identify with smaller work groups rather than the organization as a whole, as current and former members differentiate between levels of identification in different organizational dimensions (e.g., some former members specifically stated their identification levels with family were 100 %, while their identification with the economic and spiritual sides were zero; participant 6, participant 13, participant 14). Fourth, this study concludes that a rhetoric-based organizational identification theory is preferable to Social Identity Theory because it (1) includes an emotional component of identification (long argued for by Freudians but marginalized by SIT); (2) emphasizes OI as a process as well as a product; and (3) better addresses how identification occurs. Finally, this study concludes that the conative level of identification is the most unobtrusive and most powerful. Viewed in terms of organizational identification, the practices of value-based organizations should be viewed in terms of the level of control they exhibit over the hearts, minds, actions, and values of members.

Rhetoric and New Religious Movements

One of the aims of this study was to show how classical rhetoric is as applicable in our postmodern world as it has ever been. This is certainly not a new position; but literature surrounding new religious movements has not yet fully utilized this very helpful resource. Although this literature emphasizes the centrality of communication in inducing identification with the organization (Singer, 2003; Langone, 1993), it does not explore how this is accomplished, rhetorically. This study advances literature on new religious movements by taking an established sociological theory of new religious movements (Lalich, 2004) and adding organizational identification (Cheney, 1983) and rhetoric (Burke, 1950) literature to build a rhetoric-based theory of new religious movements with the analytical tools to take an in-depth look at *how* rhetoric creates identification and what rhetorical strategies are most influential.[32]

This study found the four processes of bounded choice were managed by

organizational rhetoric that produced four kinds of identification. Each of these kinds of identification corresponds to one of the four processes of bounded choice: affective identification/charismatic authority process; cognitive identification/transcendental belief system process; behavioral identification/systems of control process; and conative identification/systems of influence process.

By studying rhetorical types, topics, and appeals of Kingston organizational rhetoric, we are able to make numerous practical observations about the ways that the organization is structured and how it functions. This information is not just interesting; it is vital to helping government agencies and individuals make decisions about the value and contributions the organization makes to individuals and society. Some of the most important observations about the Kingston organization are explained in detail later in this Chapter. Without a classical approach to organizational rhetoric, most of these observations would not have been made. Suffice it to say that there's a reason Aristotle's rhetoric has been around for over 2000 years. It is that good—and scholars and students of new religious movements should utilize it more.

For future studies of new religious movements (or any organization, really), the tasks of rhetorical analysis for each of the dimensions of organizational identification are as follows: for affective identification, an analysis of the organizational and vernacular rhetoric helps to explain how the emotional bond between leaders and members is created. This study analyzed the emotions associated with important identification experiences to assess which emotions were important in strengthening or weakening members' bonds and found that fear was the primary motivating emotion associated with important identification experiences.

An analysis of cognitive identification assesses how members identify with the mythic image, or transcendental belief system, and incorporate this overarching god-term and the ideologies it encapsulates into their identities. This study found the overriding god-term to be "Kingdom of God," a god-term that ordered all dialectical terms beneath

it and focused the organizational rhetoric.

In terms of behavioral identification, Mumby (2005) states that part of the task of rhetorical criticism in organizational communication is to show how decision premises are set by organizational rhetoric—and this is specifically the aim of the rhetorical analysis of behavioral identification. This study found that Kingston members accepted two major decision premises from which organizational and personal decisions were made: the Law of One Above Another (i.e., structured inequality, of which four types were found in the Aristotelian analysis) and the Law of Satisfaction (i.e., willing acceptance of authority). Together, these decision premises work together to foster unity, the Order's ultimate organizational goal, and provide the lens through which the following organizational mantra is interpreted: "It is my firm resolve and fixed purpose to give my all to the Lord, my time, my talents, all that I am or ever expect to be to the establishment of Zion and the building up of the Kingdom of God upon the earth."

Finally, an analysis of conative identification assesses the values that drive the organization, especially in the informal organizational culture. In this study, an analysis of the vernacular rhetoric in the Order found that Kingston members use several identification strategies—such as establishing this identity at a young age, instilling a sense of pride among members by comparing them with outsiders, and internalizing an organizational set of values—to encourage a group identity. It was also found that although people tend to think of a new religious movement as a group of mindless followers brainwashed by the leader, in reality there are a variety of perspectives within the Kingston social network, and leaders and members of the organization discipline these perspectives through organizational and vernacular rhetoric. This study focused on the vernacular rhetoric of lay members in the organizational culture; but in future studies, organizational rhetoric scholars could assess the values embedded in organizational rhetoric, as well as vernacular rhetoric.

Inconclusive Results

Tompkins's (1987) theory that Weber's systems of authority correspond neatly

with Aristotle's rhetorical appeals has become a canonized work in organizational rhetoric; specifically, Weber's legal-rational authority is maintained and legitimized through logos; charismatic authority through ethos; and traditional authority through pathos. However, to my knowledge, this theory has never been tested.

My case study was extraordinary in that one organization encapsulated all three Weberian ideal types. The family dimension was structured just as Weber describes the patriarchal traditional system of authority. The religious dimension perfectly fit Weber's type of an organization led by a charismatic leader. And the business dimension, the corporation that is estimated by some to be worth somewhere around $500 million dollars, fits Weber's ideal type of a bureaucratic organization. I was awestruck that all of these organizational dimensions were seamlessly integrated into one large organization; and because of this, I felt that this was the perfect organization to test whether Tompkins's (1987) theory was accurate. If so, then the business dimension would rely mostly on logical argument to persuade; the family dimension would rely mostly on emotional arguments to convince; and the church dimension would rely mostly on rhetorical exploitation of members' belief in the nonroutine qualities of the speaker (ethos).

Unfortunately, this study was unable to test for the validity of Tompkins's claims. The organizational dimensions were interlocking, interrelated, and unable to be compartmentalized. Paul Kingston is—at once—the CEO, the Patriarchal family head, and the spiritual leader; and his rhetoric, as well as the canonized rhetoric of the organization, seeped into all dimensions. In church, business was primarily discussed. The business dimension was infused with spiritual meaning. And families were created with the express purpose of building the kingdom of God, which translates into Kingston language as increasing the material holdings of the Kingston organization.

In sum, the theoretical conclusions are as follows: (1) there are four categories of organizational identification (rather than three): affective, conative, cognitive, and

behavioral; (2) three major factors determine whether or not a member will voluntarily stay in a materially oppressive circumstance: (a) awareness of oppression; (b) belief in a greater eventual reward for material sacrifice; and (c) benefits of organizational membership exceeding the cost; (3) individuals most readily identify with smaller work groups rather than the organization as a whole; (4) a rhetorical approach to OI is advantageous because it considers both process and product, includes an affective component, and analyzes how identification occurs; (5) the conative level of identification is the most unobtrusive and powerful, suggesting that value-based organizations may be the most powerful types of organizations; and (6) studies of new religious movements can benefit from a rhetorical perspective, because they are able to utilize tools that analyze the persuasive organizational rhetoric and better understand how rhetoric contributes to identification in these organizations.

Order Conclusions

Throughout the various stages of this study, I have been completely mesmerized by this organization. At times, I was thunderstruck by its organizational effectiveness; at other times, I was saddened that current and former members felt they had been mistreated by each other. As a researcher, I have done my best to accurately represent the perspectives of everyone involved—to design the study with an interpretive focus but address the power dynamics; to allow participants of each side to speak for themselves; to address the political imbroglio without vilifying any party; and to set aside my personal biases and focus on the textual information placed before me. As a human being, I acknowledge that it is impossible to be 100% unbiased. But I can say with confidence that I have been fair and responsible in my rhetorical analyses.

In this section, I will discuss this study's major conclusions about the Order as an organizational phenomenon: in the context of Utah's political scene, regarding its organizational identity, how it creates organizational identification among its members, and how it strengthens organizational identification already in place.

Political Scene

As discussed in the foreword of this book, lawmakers and state government officials analyze and evaluate the Kingston organization through a religious freedom/abuse dichotomy. These are the rhetorical arguments presented to the Attorney General's office, so they naturally tend to think in terms of them. Current members argue that polygamy should be decriminalized because their membership in the Order is a religious freedom. Former members argue that the organization is an example of organized crime where a myriad of abuses take place. As a result, the Utah Attorney General's office has tried to appease both sides by taking a middle ground: incest, domestic violence, and fraud will be prosecuted but the lifestyle and membership in the organization will not. By choosing not to prosecute, former members feel the Utah Attorney General's office has given tacit approval of the organization and its practices, while current members believe that they would be prosecuted if the government had additional resources and continue to push for decriminalization of polygamy.

Because of the subjective quality of the term "abuse," the absence of information about these communities, the lack of empirical data on abuse in polygamy, and the emotional and political nature of the situation, the question of abuse will remain a contested issue. Rather than focus on the question of abuse, the Safety Net Committee, government agencies, nonprofit associations, and interested individuals will find more value in studying how a person comes to accept membership into a polygamous organization and how this membership is maintained. Carefully crafted organizational rhetoric in the Kingston organization produces four interlocking dimensions of organizational identification among its members; a study of these phenomena is more productive than a muddied and polarized argument about the question of abuse.

In addition to organizational *identification,* the AG's office and relevant government bodies should look at the Order's organizational *identity.* Rather than view the Order as one giant organization, the Order should be looked at as a complex three-

dimensional organization with a triple identity—business (utilitarian model), church (normative model), and family—and evaluated in terms of its practices (utilitarian); beliefs (normative); and emotional attachments (family). Conceptually dividing the organization into these three categories allows lawmakers and social service representatives to address the highly complicated interplay between the pursuit of wealth, spiritual devotion, and family bonds (see Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion). With that in mind, let's take a closer look at organizational identification and organizational identification in the Kingston organization.

Organizational Identification

The Order masterfully manages its organizational rhetoric and its organizational culture, (which produces vernacular rhetoric) to create four types of organizational identification: affective, cognitive, behavioral, and conative. Affective identification centers in the organization's veneration of the current leader; cognitive identification is produced by fixating on building the kingdom of God; behavioral identification is created by managing two decision premises: the correctness of inequality and willing sacrifice (pleasing obedience) to produce unity; and conative identification is created through the rhetoric of organizational participants as they build upon common ground, identify through antithesis, identify through the assumed "we," and identify through unifying symbols.

Venerating the Leader: Affective Identification

Affective identification is the fourth dimension of organizational identification. Lalich (2004) calls this "charismatic authority" and Burke calls this "mystery." As we have conceptualized this dimension, affective identification is concerned chiefly with the emotional ties between leader and members, and the devotion that individuals feel to the Kingston leader is a good example of this. However, affective identification does not necessarily need to be restricted to the emotional response to the leader (as Lalich's

conception of bounded choice implies). In this section, I discuss affective identification with the two most important leaders: the organizational leader (Paul Kingston) and the family leader (the father).

The organizational leader. Affective identification is produced in part through epideictic organizational and vernacular rhetoric, in which the virtuous qualities of the leader are praised with the intent to establish an affective bond between leader and members. Current members praised the leader by describing two virtuous qualities: practical (and magical) wisdom ("somebody who we respect being able to get divine guidance"; participant 3) and gentleness (in the form of kindness; participant 18). Former members criticized the leader by describing vices: the lack of liberality (stinginess and greed); the lack of wisdom; and the lack of self-control, or "licentiousness" (Aristotle's (2004) word choice; p. 93).

The different characterizations of the leader by current and former members were expected; but what was not expected was lack of experiences describing the two virtues. Former members provided plenty of examples of what they perceived as the leader's vices. But current members failed to provide examples for why a man was "so nice" or "amazing." To explain, Aristotle (2004) states that in order to be persuasive using epideictic rhetoric, a technique called "amplification" should be used. Amplification, he states, "is most suitable for epideictic speakers, whose subject is actions which are not disputed, so that all that remains to be done is to attribute beauty and importance to them" (p. 105). There are three different levels of amplification described by Aristotle. First, a man's great deeds should be described as evidence of his virtue: "if a man has done anything alone [or] been chiefly responsible for it; all these circumstances render an action noble" (p. 103). Second, if great deeds are not readily available, if "he does not furnish you with enough material in himself, you must compare him with others" (p. 103). It is best to compare him with "illustrious personages, for it affords ground for amplification and is noble, if he can be proved better than men of worth" (p. 103). Third,

if he cannot be favorably compared with illustrious personages, then "you must compare him with ordinary persons, since superiority is thought to indicate virtue" (p. 105).

Current members described the Kingston leader (whether it was Eldon, Ortell, or Paul) with the following adjectives: "so nice" (participant 1); "really nice" (participant 3); "wonderful" (participant 18); and "an amazing, amazing man" (participant 18). With these expressions of adoration, we would express the virtuous and noble acts of the leader to be equally great. What we see, however, are descriptions of ordinary acts that are attributed to be great deeds by organizational members. For example, one woman was overcome that the leader brought socks to the funeral for her deceased child. While some might consider this act a small example of being an "amazing, amazing man," the appreciation this woman felt was sincere and profound. Another participant recalled an experience where he played baseball with the leader and caught a fly ball: "He ruffled my hair and said, 'Good catch.' That made me know that's where I wanted to be." What is interesting about this example is even though the act was ordinary, the participant attributed so much meaning to this experience that he became tearful upon recalling it. One other example of a great deed deserves mention. One woman received a blessing from the leader (where the leader is supposed to act as a conduit and reveal a message from God to the individual through a prayer). She states: "I'm trying to remember what was said, but I just remember that it was exact and I knew that it was nobody else--I hadn't even told Scott [her husband] about some of the things that I was worried about. There was nobody that knew anything that I was thinking, and there's no other way I can explain that that would be possible" (participant 17). Because this leader prayed for her concerning things she was privately worried about, she attributed his insight to be a magical spiritual quality that is worthy of a great deed.

The deeds that the members recall in connection with their leader are relatively ordinary, but members still attempt to portray the superiority of the leader (that Aristotle states is necessary for the amplification of a leader's virtues) by using terms that lessen

their own status. For example, two participants (3 and 18) used the term "little old me" to describe themselves. Participant 18, in connection with her admiration for the leader that brought socks to the funeral said she couldn't believe he "would do that for little old me and my child. It was just amazing." Participant 3 described herself in the same way when she called the leader to request an interview: "I thought, I don't want to trouble him, little old me. . . . I called him on the phone expecting that, if I'm really lucky, he'll probably make an appointment in the next couple of months that I could go to talk to him. When I talked to him, he said, 'Oh, sure, come on over right now.'" So, one way to increase the importance of their leader is to decrease their own importance.

The family leader. Affective identification applies not just to the organizational leader, but also to the family leader. Mystery, or division between groups of people (Burke, 1950), facilitates this emotional identification. In the Kingston organization, those "below" identify with those "above." In the family system, which current and former members universally state is the most important dimension of the organization (e.g., participant 3, participant 6), identification with those "above" begins at an early age. Children identify with both mothers and fathers, as they are "above them." And wives emotionally identify with their husbands, who are "above them." Just as individuals identify more readily with their work group compared with the organization (Bartels et al., 2007; Richter et al., 2006; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000), the family is the most immediate source of identification for Kingston members.

Kingston members are taught that through strict obedience to the laws and principles of the organization, they will be given the opportunity to evolve to a higher spiritual level and eventually achieve godhood as part of a family unit. In Kingston doctrine, it is believed that God is a man who spiritually evolved to the point that He became omnipotent and omniscient. He created children in spirit form and desires that they also evolve into perfect beings. Part of this plan, termed "The Plan of Salvation" includes receiving a physical body, so He created the Earth, where spirit children come

down from Heaven (called the "Pre-Existence"), reside in mortal bodies, and experience trials designed to test His children's faithfulness to universal spiritual principles and help them evolve spiritually. Depending on the level of spiritual evolution a person attains, at the Judgment Day after a person dies, he or she will be sent to the Celestial Kingdom, the Terrestrial Kingdom, or the Telestial Kingdom. The Celestial Kingdom is the only place where people will become Gods, which means they will continue to be organized into family units, be married and able to have their own spirit children, and create new worlds for their children to live. Kingston members believe that they can only attain the Celestial Kingdom through membership in the Order and as part of a family unit practicing plural marriage.

While spiritual development is stressed in the Order, the structure of the family is tightly controlled and run like a corporation. If we compare the roles of the family to a corporation, the Order's leader (Paul) is the CEO, his brothers are upper management, the father is the manager, the mother is the employee, and the children are the products. The Order family works together to produce a child that is identified with the organization with all of the qualities needed to be a model organizational employee: to sacrifice time, talents, material resources, and desires to build up the kingdom of God on the earth with fixed resolve and firm purpose. Father and mothers are judged by the organization according to how well their children adhere to these organizational goals (participant 4).

In sum, epideictic rhetoric is used specifically to build affective identification between the leader and organizational members. Two of Aristotle's virtues and three vices are given by participants as examples of the Kingston leader's character. Furthermore, the examples that describe the virtues of the leader appear to members to be great deeds but may appear to be somewhat ordinary to the outsider. However, we see that these examples do produce affective identification, as it is apparent by the adjectives used to describe the leader and emotion associated with the narratives that they are emotionally bonded. Rhetorical tools such as amplification of the leader and diminution of themselves

are used by members to promote and sustain the identification they have with the leader. Through these processes of amplification and diminution, they are able to perceive their leader as a great and noble man worthy to be followed. In addition, affective identification among family members is facilitated by prescribed organizational roles that preserve the mystery and division between fathers, mothers, and children.

Creating the "Kingdom of God": Cognitive Identification

The "Kingdom of God" is the Kingston's mythic image, a progressive and futuristic utopian ideology that has been built from a universal vocabulary and is encapsulated under a god-term, or a summarizing word that "sums up a manifold of particulars under a single head (as with the title of a book, or the name of some person or political movement)" (1961, p. 2; see 1950, p. 199). The god-term or ideograph (see McGee, 1980) is, of course, "kingdom of God," and all Kingston beliefs and practices are imbued with the purpose of "building the kingdom of God." Building the kingdom of God requires material sacrifice by all members, and the organization facilitates that by subverting the goods of wealth, good repute, and friendship in deliberative rhetoric and emphasizing the necessity for sacrifice.

As McGee argues, the collective acceptance of what the "kingdom of God" means is what essentially defines the Kingston members' identities: ideographs define the parameters of a society, and the difference between two communities can be defined by comparing how ideographs are used. So, while mainstream Christianity, the LDS church, and the Kingston organization all utilize the term "kingdom of God," they all use the term in different ways. Only the Kingston organization emphasizes the term to the point that it can be definitively accepted as the overarching god-term that subsumes and hierarchically orders all other terms beneath it. As Burke (1950) states, a full explanation of the social effects of a god-term/ideograph can be found by constructing a grammar of past uses of the word through time (diachronic analysis) and a rhetoric of all of the different meanings of the word as it is currently used (synchronic analysis).

Diachronically, the Kingston organization borrowed the term "kingdom of God" from its LDS roots, as it is found in Mormon canonized scripture (Book of Mormon, Bible, and Doctrine and Covenants). The phrase is often utilized in LDS scripture but refers to the Kingdom of God as a spiritual realm, whereas the Kingston organization believes that its economic enterprises are materially building the kingdom of God.

Synchronically, the Kingston organization deems itself the kingdom of God on earth. According to Erickson (2005), the doctrine of the Kingston organization states that only 144,000 people will be numbered in the kingdom of God in the last days. And in order to become part of the kingdom of God, you have to have a certain amount of money in the Kingston-owned bank and demonstrate your work ethic and frugality. In this organization, all church members are required to sacrifice their own property and possessions to increase its financial holdings. In order to renew their memberships each year, members must sign a document that states that members voluntarily transfer all property to the Davis County Cooperative Society as a gift and agree to give all future salaries to the society. The transfer of all members' property and assets in exchange for membership in the Kingston organization is what the Kingstons term the "building of the kingdom of God."

Building the kingdom of God requires every member to sacrifice material goods. The Kingston organization produces people who are willing to sacrifice by subverting the goods of wealth, good repute, and friendship (common in deliberative rhetoric) and appealing to sacrifice. This is effective in three ways. First, sacrifice causes members to act in contrary to their own happiness, which makes them more invested in believing in the greater good—which is unattainable and unable to be disproved in this life. Second, when organizational members are persuaded to sacrifice for what the organization states is the greater good, they believe that the organizational directives—which are literally the will of God—will lead to their happiness. Thus, they are more willing to suspend critical thinking and accept the organization as knowing best what will bring them

happiness (i.e., accepting organizational decision premises). And third, because of this identification with organizational goals, members willingly reject evidence that does not fit with their vision that the organization can offer them a greater good.

In sum, the mythic image of the kingdom of God guides the practices and goals of family, religious, and business dimensions of the Kingston organization. Through this god-term, members acquire cognitive identification, or knowledge of who they are. They define themselves in terms of the Order and describe themselves as members of the kingdom of God. Because of the sacrifices required of every member when building the kingdom of God, these two terms go hand-in-hand. Members

Setting the Ground Rules: Behavioral Identification

Behavioral identification is facilitated by organizational rhetoric that sets decision premises of obedience (the law of one another) and willing acceptance of organizational decrees (the law of satisfaction) to create unity (i.e., pleasing obedience) to build the kingdom of God through bureaucratic rhetoric (i.e., formalized laws repeatedly stressed by the organization). Willing adherence to these two laws creates the rhetorical *topoi* of inequality—a topic upon which Kingston members base their logic and reasoning.

Unity

The Kingston organization stresses the importance of unity. Citing biblical passages of the importance of oneness, the Kingston organization states that heaven is reserved only for members of the Order who live in unity with each other. This is achievable by careful adherence to the law of one above another and the law of satisfaction. Current organizational members insist that unity is possible through adherence to organizational rhetoric (participant 1, participant 2, participant 3, etc.).

The Law of One Above Another

Kingston organizational rhetoric states that unity is achieved through the law of one above another and the law of satisfaction. The Law of One Above Another is taught

to the be the method through which unity is achieved. Eldon Kingston states: “To be one with each other means that each one of us is *one with the one above”* (Order, 2009b, Chapter 37, p. 3). Being “one” with the “one above” means respecting the “‘chain-of-command’ starting with Heavenly father, through Jesus, Bro. Paul, numbered men, etc.” (Order, 2009a, p. 76). By respecting this chain of command, members can draw upon the power of God to help them in their lives.

This principle is so important to Kingston doctrine, it is what members are asked to think of first. The children’s Sunday School lesson manual states: “When we think of the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the first thing that we should think about is obedience. We should always do what our parents and teachers want us to do. Brother Elden taught us that the Law of Obedience to the one over us is one of the first principles of the Order. We should be obedient to our brothers and sisters” (Order, 2009a, p. 12). This hierarchical numbering system is a method through which perfect unity can be achieved.

The Law of Satisfaction

This is the second doctrine, or the other leg that allows the concept of unity to stand in the Kingston organization. Kingston members feel that to achieve unity, members must not just be obedient to the commands of the ones above them, they must also perform these tasks willingly and appreciatively. Elden Kingston taught that, in addition to the Law of One above Another, the Law of Satisfaction “is also one of the first principles of the Order. This means that we get along with our brothers and sisters and don’t ever quarrel or fight with them. Brother Elden said we can call that the ‘Golden Rule.’ Jesus said, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself’” (Order, 2009a, p. 12). Members consider this law so important, that the “lack of appreciation” is considered a “major crime” (Order, 2009b, Chapter 43, p. 7).

A good attitude is regarded by members as paramount to living successfully in the Kingston organization (participant 18). From organizational rhetoric and data from

participant interviews, it appears that members are generally obedient to organizational rules and directives; but it also appears that complying with these organizational directives is not always leading to happiness or satisfaction with life. As a result, the Kingston organization encourages a good attitude by celebrating the deeds of current and past members in their organizational rhetoric. The organization celebrates the member who can take a bad situation, appreciate its merits, and improve upon it. If the situation cannot be improved upon, the organizational rhetoric also credits those people who do not complain.

Unity/"Pleasing Obedience"

The Kingston organization inculcates this doctrine of obedience with a smile into the decision premises of members. And when members do, indeed, think first of organizational needs, they have a special term for it: "pleasing obedience." Obedience, or "to do what your told" (Order, 2009a, pp. 216-17), can be divided into two types: first time obedience and pleasing obedience. First time obedience is "to do what you're told the first time you're told with a smile and willingness in your heart. First time obedience means you must do the job when your told the first time, and feel good about doing the job your asked to do. It isn't good enough to just do the job because you were asked, you have to be happy while you're doing what you've been asked to do with a smile" (p. 217). Here, the law of one above another (doing what you're told) and the law of satisfaction (doing it with a smile and willingness) are working together. But pleasing obedience goes one step further: "Pleasing obedience is doing what you're told before your told to do it. If you know that your parents want you to do something, you should do it before you have to be asked" (Order, 2009a, p. 218). Here is a unified member with the goal of building the kingdom of God. In this organizational rhetoric, children are being taught how to think organizationally, or how to think it terms of what is good for the organization. This is a direct reference to behavioral identification, where members inculcate the decision premises of the organization and think in terms of what is good for the organization before what is good for the individual (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985).

Inequality

Through the development of unity/pleasing obedience to the organization, members come to accept inequality as a self-evident truth, or rhetorical topic, from which to build their logic. Inequality runs counter to mainstream American society's promotion of "equality." This topic is developed and promoted by organizational rhetoric surrounding four major themes: organizational inequality, gendered inequality, inequality of bloodline, and racial inequality. (I do not use the term "inequality" as an ethical evaluation of the organization but simply as a description of the organizational rhetoric.)

While some scholars of new religious movements (such as Lalich, 2004, and Singer, 2003) assert that the reasoning faculties of members of new religious members are suppressed by organizational rhetoric, the data from this study suggests that reasoning is not suppressed—the organization reasons with its members, and members reason with each other; rather, it appears that the decision premises upon which reasoning is based are shifted in new religious movements like the Kingston organization—so what is generally accepted as self-evident by members is not by the outside world, and vice versa. For example, if we accept the topic of inequality (whether it is gendered, racial, organizational, or in reference to bloodline), then the reasoning of the organization makes sense. However, most Americans do not accept this topic; so, the Kingstons' arguments for intermarriage and polygamy appear to be unreasonable.

In sum, the law of one above another combined with the law of satisfaction creates unity, or pleasing obedience, among members, which allows the Kingston organization to retain a high degree of control. The law of one above another dictates that members must be obedient to leaders; and the law of satisfaction states that members must be happy regardless of the circumstance. Members who resist may experience guilt, physical discomfort and fear of punishment in the afterlife.

Persuading Each Other: Conative Identification

This type of identification is produced by the vernacular rhetoric of the members, themselves, as they draw upon rhetorical organizational resources and use their own persuasive powers to concretively control their fellow members. This is done through what Cheney (1983b) identifies as common ground strategies, identification through antithesis, identification through the assumed "we," and identification through unifying symbols. In addition, the rhetorical power of women as members of the community is discussed.

Identification Strategies

All six common ground strategies were used in members' rhetoric of identification. Of the 34 examples listed, the "concern for the individual" technique was used the most (14 times), followed by espousal of shared values (11), testimonials of employees (2 times), advocacy of benefits and activities (2 times), recognition of individual contributions (1 time), and praise by outsiders (1 time). The three examples that were unable to be classified appeared to be most related to the concern for the individual (bringing this to a total of 17). Here, it is apparent that while a group identity is fostered by organizational rhetoric, the rhetoric most persuasive to members is related to their individual identities.

Identification by antithesis creates a perfect enemy that organizational members can fear and blame. This technique encourages members to stick closer to each other and isolate themselves out of fear (that they will be hurt by outsiders) and pride (that they are better than outsider).

The assumed "we" figures importantly into vernacular rhetoric (and is all over the place in the organizational rhetoric); and the fact that members use the phrase frequently but do not cite it as an important rhetorical identification strategy is evidence of its unobtrusive power.

Unifying symbols are used in the Kingston organization. Some of these

symbols include holding hands like the one leading the prayer; reciting memory gems, or organizational mantras, two or three times per day that stress group identity and unification with organizational goals (participant 5, Order 2009a); facing toward one of two holy spots when they pray; fasting without food for at least 24 hours; and having a marriage ceremony to solidify the ties between a man and wife. While none of the members cited unifying symbols as directly relevant to their identification levels, members referred to them constantly throughout the interview. These data suggest that unifying symbol have significant unobtrusive power to conform members' actions to organizational goals.

Power of Women

One final observation about the Kingston's organizational culture should be noted here. From the rhetoric analyzed, the rhetoric of mothers is as salient as the father's; and they are just as complicit in keeping organizational members in line with organizational goals. The idea promoted by some critics of the organization that women have no power to resist organizational directives is simply not true. From an analysis of the narratives in this study, it appears that women are highly identified, willing participants with significant rhetorical power in the circles given to them by their prescribed organizational roles.

Organizational Identity

The Kingston organization is appropriately classified as a sect in sociological terms and a new religious movement (or cult) in psychology-based literature. The Kingston organization has a *triple* identity of church, business, and family. In fact, the Order is legally all three: business, church, and family. The legal corporate entity is the Davis County Cooperative Society, which holds over one hundred businesses, along with an undisclosed amount under the corporation, World Enterprises. The normative entity is the Latter Day Church of Christ, established in the late 1980s to economically benefit the

organization (i.e., for the tax advantages associated with being a 501C3). And the legal marriages and birth certificates of these families are registered through the state of Utah. These dimensions are interrelated and inseparable, but it appears the economic portion is emphasized most strongly by the organization.

The family system is both the strongest and the weakest link in organizational identification. Those families who are strongly identified and adhere to organizational rules and regulations are the most likely to produce children that become productive members of the organization. Those who are less identified (or even strongly identified but do not follow all rules and regulations) are less likely to produce organizationally-minded children.

Members should evaluate their own practices in terms of the three interrelated organizational dimensions to understand the costs and benefits associated with their membership in the organization. From the analysis of these interviews, it is clear that the identification that members have with this organization is necessary for them be able to fulfill the many demands placed upon them. Men and women alike work long hours, have many family responsibilities, and are required to maintain a personal (spiritual) growth regimen that is physically, mentally, and emotionally exhausting. Even the most identified members of the organization (e.g., participants 1, 3) described a time in their lives where they doubted they would be able to fulfill these many demands. Analyzing these three dimensions in terms of their costs and benefits will allow members to analyze what they are getting "out" of the system compared to what they are putting into it.

Strengthening Organizational Discourses

The Kingston organization is excellent in creating organizational identification in every part of the soul: the mind (cognitive), the heart (affective), the body (behavioral), and the spirit (conative). The Kingstons further strengthen this identification by (1) emphasizing loyalty in thoughts, words, and actions; and (2) disciplining spiritual experiences.

Loyalty

The Kingston organization stresses the importance of complete loyalty to the organization in thoughts, words, and actions. This loyalty is felt internally as organizational identification and expressed externally through organizational behavior that is consistent with organizational goals and directives. As stressed in the Order handbook, "the Lord picked the people he could depend on to see to it that Satan was bound and the Lord's purposes were carried out. . . . Let each one of us see to it that we do our part and do not fail him" (Order, 2009b, Chapter 36, p. 3). There are three types of organizational loyalty referred to by the organization: loyalty in thought, loyalty in words, and loyalty in actions. The organization encourages loyalty in thoughts by advocating that members restrict their thoughts and school their feelings. Members are taught to discipline their words by refraining from criticizing organizational leaders, withholding information from outsiders, and sometimes lying to protect the organization. And members are taught to adhere to all organizational objectives with "pleasing obedience."

Spiritual Discipline

The organization engages in spiritual discipline by (1) giving direct revelation, (2) the power of organizational suggestion, (3) reserving the right to interpret members' spiritual experiences, and (4) appealing to the preexistence. Still, it appears that both current and former members believe they have received spiritual experiences independently of organizational direction.

In this section, I discussed the political scene surrounding the Kingston organization, its rhetorical strategies to produce organizational identification, its organizational identity, and its strategies to encourage loyalty among members who are already identified. In the next section, I will discuss the limitations and generalizability of this study.

Limitations and Applicability of the Study

There are several limitations to this study, and most of them are methodological. On a broad level, one of the study's major strengths is its ability to understand "how" identification occurs; this is possible because the rhetorical tools I used allowed me to dig deeply into the rhetoric. As this was the major focus of my dissertation, I stand by my methodological choices. However, restricting my methodological scope to rhetorical analysis prevents this study from being compared statistically with postpositivist studies of organizational identification. For example, through the rhetorical analysis of interviews, I found that participants who discussed which organizational dimension was the most important universally stated that their family was the most important. However, because this was not a standardized interview question, I was not able to glean descriptive statistics that could tell me whether the family dimension was universally viewed as the most important or how much more they value their families than other dimensions of the organization. This may be an opportunity for future researchers who are interested in how the dimensions of family, spirituality, and materiality are interrelated and affect one another.

Concerning validity, there is some concern that current and former member participants are withholding information that may not reflect favorably upon them. This is to be expected from any interview participant but especially from participants who participate in activities not accepted by mainstream society. For example, in two cases, current members asserted that they never felt a decrease in identification with the organization. However, as the interviews progressed, they revealed experiences that they acknowledged were extremely difficult. They still asserted that these experiences did not alter their identification levels, but their initial reticence led me to believe that at least some members were selectively editing content to reflect favorably upon them. This is not a criticism of the participants themselves; in fact, one of the strengths of this study is the unprecedented access participants allowed me so they could voice their experiences. I believe that every experience related by current and former members is authentic; still, individuals should be aware that a full spectrum of experiences—(bad ones from current

members and good ones from former members)—is most likely not represented in the interviews.

With regard to sample selection, it is expected that the worst and best cases of identification were represented, because of the partisanship of the third parties used to solicit participants. As a researcher, IRB protocol restricted me from making cold calls, and the political situation and limited amount of participants in the organization did not warrant my random solicitation of participants through advertising. In order to solicit participants, two representatives from nonprofit associations (one from Tapestry Against Polygamy to represent the former members; one from Plural Voices for Polygamy to represent current members) called individuals and asked them to participate in the study. In this study, most current members were 100% identified, while most former members were 0% identified (or at various degrees of negative identification).

Because of these extremes, it is possible that employees who were at identification levels between them were not represented. However, I believe this was a fairly representative sample for one reason: The Kingston organization promotes black-and-white thinking. In Kingston theology, either something is true or something is not; and it is the responsibility of every individual to pray and receive "knowledge of the truthfulness of the gospel." In this study, both current and former participants associated identification with believing that the organization is "true." Even though current members expressed that they had experienced times of difficulty, loneliness, pressure, and sadness, nearly all of them affirmed that they were still 100% identified with the organization, because they associated identification with believing in the doctrines and practices of the organization. Similarly, former members generally associated their decrease in identification levels with doubts about the veracity of the organizational rhetoric. So, because of this, I would expect another group of participants to associate identification with believing organizational rhetoric; and I would expect the extremes to be similar.

Topically, one possible limitation is that the integration of business, religion, and family systems in the Kingston organization appears to be unparalleled. The other two large polygamous organizations in the state of Utah (FLDS church and Apostolic United

Brethren, the Allreds) do not appear to have the same degree of integration, productivity, or intermarriage. The Kingstons separate from mainstream community in three areas—polygamy, consecration, and intermarriage—but the other polygamous organizations appear to separate mostly on the polygamy issue (although it appears there is some level of consecration of physical property involved). Still, this organization appears to be the product of the same fundamentalist thought as other organizations. The difference is the Kingstons are especially effective in translating beliefs to practices.

While this is a possible limitation of the study, it can be argued rather persuasively that the Order is not an outlier but, rather, is an exemplary example of both organizational effectiveness and hierarchy.

In terms of organizational effectiveness, the Kingstons have been able to achieve economic and spiritual integration (widely heralded as a social ideal called the "United Order" among Mormon-based break-off organizations) to a degree that other similar organizations have not. Members of the Order "practice what they preach."

In terms of hierarchy, we refer back to Burke's (1950) discussion, in which people's natural inclinations to order their world through social ratings lead to "all classes of beings are hierarchically arranged in a chain or ladder or pyramid of mounting worth, each kind striving towards the perfection of its kind" (p. 333). The Kingstons have arrived at the top of this chain of break-off organizations by taking underdeveloped or implied doctrines accepted by LDS break-off groups, fleshing them out, and executing them. In this sense, the Order truly has reached the perfection that it strives for.

The Kingston organization is a prime example of the hierarchical perfection that Burke (1950) talks—and warns us—about. In Weberian terms, this is an ideal type of bounded choice. As an ideal type, the lessons learned from this organization can be applied to any organization that uses these processes. It is estimated that between 30,000 and 100,000 people are members of polygamous organizations in the US (Moore-Emmett, 2004). Many of these groups are sects of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. As such, these groups have many of the same rhetorical resources, like

statements from early LDS prophets, such as Joseph Smith and Brigham Young, and common sacred scripture, such as the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants. So, while each polygamous organization is different, there are common rhetorical devices used that may be generalizable across all "Mormon fundamentalist" organizations.

The Kingston organization's recent association and alliances with other LDS-based fundamentalists groups is further justification that these groups have much in common. The Kingstons belong to a network of polygamous organizations called Plural Voices for Polygamy. Plural Voices has representatives from most, if not all, LDS-based fundamentalist organizations and is the political power that speaks for these organizations as a whole. What's more, these groups have now been meeting together for several years as part of the Safety Net Committee, created by the Utah and Arizona Attorney General's Offices. The Apostolic United Brethren (approximately 7000 members); Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (approximately 10,000-15,000 members); and Latter-day Church of Christ (Kingstons; approximately 2000-3000 members) are the three largest LDS-based fundamentalist groups. All three are part of the Safety Net Committee. And all three are represented by Plural Voices. Other independent groups, as well as smaller organized sects (some of which are break-offs from larger LDS-based fundamentalist groups) such as The True and Living Church of Jesus Christ of Saints of the Last Days (approximately 300 members); The Church of the First Born of the Fullness of Times (approximately 500 members); The Church of the Lamb of God (approximately 100 members); The Church of Jesus Christ of the United Order (approximately 70 members); The Righteous Branch (approximately 100 members); and the Patriarchal Hierarchy (approximately 50 members) are also affected by the policies and practices of Plural Voices and the Safety Net Committee. With the recent collaboration and united political presence of LDS-based fundamentalist groups, these groups are exhibiting further similarities as they are increasingly regulating and standardizing their policies and practices (per the insistence of the Safety Net Committee and Plural Voices). While a detailed description of these convergences is outside the

purview of this dissertation, it is a reminder that a thorough examination of the Kingston rhetoric has much applicability outside of the organization (see Moore-Emmett, 2004; Polygamy Primer, 2006).

Furthermore, if we concur with Lalich (2004) that new religious movements/ cults are defined by the organizational use of bounded choice, then this study applies to a myriad of organizations that fall under the term "cult." As Singer (2003) states, it is not the doctrines but the practices that define what a cult is. If we accept that new religious movements are not defined by the particular ideologies they promote but their universal use of bounded choice processes, then the Kingston organization is generalizable to *all* new religious movements.

Finally, while such an interesting and complex organization defies essentialization, three conclusions about the Kingston organization itself stand out to me as rather important in trying to conceptualize what kind of an organization this is. First, the Kingston organization is a modern, hierarchical corporation with an intricate structure and complex power dynamics. This organization is not a backwoods community reminiscent of a simpler time (as polygamous organizations are sometimes characterized)--it is a progressive organization that utilizes all four types of control to further its goals: simple, technical, bureaucratic, and concertive. Second, the Kingston organization is money-driven. The overarching goal is to build the kingdom of God, which is interpreted literally as the accumulation of monetary assets for the organization. Thus, policies and procedures are directed toward a concrete monetary goal. And third, the Kingston organization is comprised of people who sincerely believe in the cause of building the Kingdom of God. As this analysis of organizational and vernacular rhetoric reveals, many current members feel completely identified with the organization and its goals. This high level of organizational identification produces highly productive workers who are willing to sacrifice personally in pursuit of an organizational utopia and consider it a privilege to do so. These three qualities produce a highly productive organization with significant power in both public and private sectors.

NOTES

1 I use the term "disidentification" in a way similar to Pratt (2000), meaning identifying oneself in opposition to the organization, when members "maintain a sense of self-distinctiveness through perceptions and feelings of disconnection" with an organization (see also Elsbach & Bhattacharya, 1997, p. 3). Like Pratt (2000) in his work with Amway distributors, I was drawn to this organization in part because the Kingstons seem to have "lovers" and "haters" but not much in between. However, as I become involved with the study, I may find a more diverse group of people, like Pratt did, with ambivalent identification (where participants identify with some aspects or dimensions of the organization but not others) and deidentification (where participants fail to identify with the organization but do not have negative associations with it) in addition to disidentification. If this is the case, I will include in my analysis ambivalent identification and deidentification in addition to identification and disidentification.

2 Because this is intended to be a descriptive rather than evaluative study, I am attempting to remove "devil terms," that is, language that is considered pejorative by the general reader. Therefore, while many of the scholars I am quoting would refer to a new religious movement as a "cult," the terms are interchangeable—and I prefer to use the one that will offend fewer people.

3 For Singer (2003), cult leaders combine two methods of persuasion: (1) "inducing predictable physiological responses by subjecting followers to certain planned experiences and exercises, and then interpreting those responses in ways favorable to the leaders' interests" (p. 126); and (2) "eliciting certain behavioral and emotional responses by subjecting followers to psychological pressures and manipulations, then exploiting those responses to induce further dependence on the cult" (p. 126).

4 *Rhetorical appeals, types, forms, and kernel elements from Ancient Greece.* Rhetoric began in Sicily about 5th Century B.C. There, Sophists such as Gorgias, Protagoras, and Isocrates taught individuals (who, under Greek law had to represent themselves in court) the art of persuasion (app. 450-380 B.C.). Citizens who were skilled in the art of rhetoric were successful in court and public oratory, so sophists were highly sought after by politically ambitious men. Sophists, according to Herrick (1997), emphasized the centrality of persuasive discourse to social life, explored the power of language, argued for truth as relative to times and places, and placed rhetorical training at the center of educational endeavors.

Platonists (or reformed Platonists such as Aristotle), rejected the Sophists' assertions that rhetoric participated in truth-making and argued that truth was a universal "given" (approximately 390-350 B.C.). Aristotle (approximately 350-320 B.C.), especially, reworked rhetoric into a limited methodology and defined rhetoric as "the faculty of discovering the available means of persuasion in any setting" (Herrick, 1997, p. 92). He stated that rhetoric worked best as an oratory skill to win the support of large audiences who were not skilled in dialectic. In order to be good at the craft, rhetors must have knowledge of the arguments (logos), must be able to understand human emotions (pathos), and must know what constitutes good character (ethos). A natural dramatic ability and a knack for making language aesthetically pleasing was also helpful.

Aristotle's theory, says Herrick (1997), remains "one of the most complete and insightful ever penned" (p. 92). Aristotle (2006) defined rhetoric as "the art of persuasion" and is famous for advancing rhetorical theory about (1) rhetorical appeals, such as ethos, pathos, logos; (2) types of rhetoric, such as past-oriented forensic rhetoric, present-oriented epideictic rhetoric, and future-oriented deliberative rhetoric; (3) kernel elements of inductive (example) and deductive (enthymeme) rhetorical form; (4) *topoi,* topics, or points of reference; (5) *stasis,* or the status of an issue; and (6) hundreds of specific rhetorical forms (see Cheney, 2005).

Rhetorical canons and parts of oral speeches in the Roman Empire. Rhetoric in the Roman era was based on the Aristotelian tradition of Ancient Greece. It was the center of a liberal education and the essential content of higher education. According to Herrick (1997), rhetoric in Rome served three major purposes. First, it was a means of achieving personal success in politics; second, it became a method of conducting political debates; and third, it produced verbal skills that were signs of wisdom and refinement. From Cicero's (106-43 B.C.) *De Inventione* came the five canons: (1) invention, or the source of ideas; (2) arrangement, or the structure and organization of ideas; (3) style, or the use of language and other symbols to persuade; (4) delivery, or the presentation of the message; and (5) memory, which was central to the oral tradition (see Cheney, 2005; Heinrichs, 2007; Herrick, 2007).

Quintilian (A.D. 35-100), in *Institutes of Oratory,* presented a guide to achieving excellence as a public speaker, especially in judicial speeches. He proposed, for example, that there were three bases in forensic cases that would have to be addressed to resolve a case: (1) existence, or what had occurred; (2) definition, or how to categorize the event; and (3) quality, or the severity of the act once it had been defined. He also defined five parts of a judicial speech: (1) exordium, or introduction; (2) narratio, or facts related to the case; (3) confirmatio, or the presentation of evidence to support claims made in the narratio; (4) confutatio, or refutation of counterarguments; and (5) peroratio, or conclusion where the orator demonstrates the full strength of the case. Quintilian is most famous for defining rhetoric as "the art of the good citizen speaking well" (p. 113), implying that rhetorical powers should be used for the benefit of society.

Longinus (A.D. 213-273) presumably wrote *On the Sublime,* a rhetorical treatise discussing principles of good writing. For example, Longinus states that there are five sources of great writing: (1) vigor of mental conception; (2) strong emotion; (3) adequate fashioning of figures; (4) nobility of diction; and (5) distinguished word arrangement. Longinus contributed most to the development of rhetoric by focusing on the emotional power of words—and cataloguing the rhetorical forms that produce this emotional power. Longinus also focused on written rather than oral rhetoric, marking a shift in emphasis from earlier rhetoricians (see Herrick, 1997).

Rhetoric in the later Roman Empire declined to a method of training administrators of the Roman Empire. As democracy dwindled, so did rhetoric. However, it remained the main vehicle for entering political life and was also a source of public entertainment, as audiences gathered in large crowds and arenas to hear Sophists perform feats of speaking and memory.

Rhetorical preaching in Christian Europe. Rhetoric was viewed with suspicion in Christian Europe (A.D. 350-1300) as a manifestation of the immorality of pagan Rome.

Because of this, only a few "antiseptically technical Roman works," such as writings of Cicero, formed the basis of rhetorical scholarship in medieval study. Capella (A.D. 560-636) and St. Augustine of Hippo (A.D. 353-430) translated Cicero's rhetoric into Church-sanctioned language. Rhetoric was aimed at "correcting error and teaching truth" (Herrick, 1997, p. 131) through *ars praedicandi,* the art of preaching, *ars dictaminis,* the art of letter writing, and *ars poetriae,* the art of poetry.

Contributions to a critical rhetorical social interventionist approach in the Renaissance. Rhetoric was revitalized in the Renaissance (approximately a.d. 1400-1700). During the Renaissance, rhetoric had more influence over a civilization than ever before. A large number of Greek and Latin texts became available for study. Skill in rhetoric "became the hallmark of the educated person" (Herrick, 1997, p. 151). Rhetoric was "the means both of self-discovery and of effective government" (p. 166).

Lorenzo Valla (a.d. 1405-1457), a Rennaissance Humanist, was deeply interested in rhetoric. Valla, perhaps the most influential Humanist scholar (Herrick, 1997, p. 152), suggested that human understanding should be based on rhetoric rather than philosophy. Valla, in *De Voluptate,* called rhetoric "oratory" or "eloquence" and privileged orators over philosophers. Says Herrick (1997): "philosophers [from Valla's viewpoint] dealt only with academic questions, which they debated endlessly within the confines of their universities. Orators employing rhetoric, on the other hand, were active in civic life, working for the good of the society" (p. 153). In addition, Villa subordinated the ethical ideals of philosophers to the common sense of the common people, stating that rhetoric had a role "in shaping and perpetuating the moral precepts of common sense" (p. 153). In Villa's work, the beginnings of what contemporary rhetorical theory sees as two hallmarks of a "critical rhetorical" perspective were formed: social intervention and discourse constituting knowledge.

Italian Humanists, such as Petrarch (1303-1374), Pico (1463-1494), and Vives (1492-1540), contributed to developing rhetoric. While they emphasized an importance on "getting the [Classical] texts right" (p. 157) and thus maintained a belief in the ability of language to reveal truth, they did historicize the texts, thus contributing to hermeneutics (the science of textual interpretation; p. 157). They also attempted to "expose or challeng[e] historical myths" (p. 157). Petrarch focused on the power of rhetoric. Pico "exhibited the Italian Humanists' tendency to see people as the creators of their world through the humanizing use of language" (p. 159), suggesting the beginnings of a constitutive theory of discourse. And Vives advocated a social interventionist approach to rhetoric (p. 161).

In Later Italian Humanism, Vico (1668-1744) emerged as the most prominent Humanist philosopher; and through his rhetoric, he was persuasive in arguing for rhetoric as an epistemology. Vico "attempted a philosophy centering not on metaphysics but, rather, on human history" (p. 160). He felt that "language allowed people to impose order on their existence, to create meaning out of meaninglessness, and to establish society" (p. 160). In matters that could not be solved through scientific analysis, such as law, art, ethics, and politics, the public had the opportunity to craft knowledge through practical judgment, or prudence. In opposition to Descartes, Vico thought that insight into human relationships could not be logically deduced; rather, relationships must be elucidated through "*ingenium,* the innate human capacity to grasp similarities or relationships"

(p. 161). Here we have the beginnings of a rhetorical theory that posits social life as an identification process (see Burke, 1950).

Despite its widespread use in the Renaissance, critics such as the Dutch Agricola (1444-1485) and the French Ramus (1515-1572) favored dialectics. Ramus divorced rhetoric's first two cannons, "invention" and "arrangement," from the other three, "delivery," "style," and "memory" and argued that the first two were better placed in dialectics rather than rhetoric. In doing so, he contributed to the emasculation of rhetoric, where it was reduced to a study of ornamentation for hundreds of years.

Rationality and truth in rhetoric during the Enlightenment. Herrick (1997) places the Enlightenment around the end of the 17th century until around 1900. Calling it the "modern" age, he views characteristics of this period as "questioning the received truths of Christian tradition, elevating rationality over other sources of truth such as authority, seeking solutions to social problems by means of scientific method, and viewing the universe as governed by inviolable physical laws" (p. 172). Scholars such as Newton (1942-1727), Locke (1632-1704), Hume (1748), Rousseau (1712-1778), and Voltaire (1694-1778) based knowledge in rationality and centered government on the individual. In rhetorical theory, Sheridan (1719-1788) attempted to provide students with a public speaking guide, mostly with the aim to help in religious preaching (p. 176). The Belletristic Movement, represented by Lord Kames (1969-1782) and Hugh Blair (1718-1800), attempted to formulate principles by which students of rhetoric could develop taste, eloquence, critical acumen, and style, as well as understand how language persuades.

5 In British rhetorical theory, George Campbell (1719-1796) and Richard Whately (1787-1863) emerged as the dominant rhetorical critics of the time. Whately's work (1828, *Elements of Rhetoric*) was strictly methodological, stressing the practical and public nature of rhetoric, but Campbell's work was more complex. In *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776), Campbell argued that rhetoric and philosophy were related; however, he viewed rhetoric as a scientific, "organized and rational account of a subject" (p. 182). Campbell's theory of rhetoric was a theory related to the practical concerns of a public figure, and he viewed rhetoric as a "window on the human mind." Herrick states that Campbell's theory is much like Plato's definition of rhetoric as "art of influencing the soul through words" (p. 188). Philosophy, in his conception, still had domain over knowledge, and rhetoric largely remained a methodology through the use of which knowledge could be revealed.

6 To get a general layout of the field, I conducted a survey of literature on organizational identification. I wanted to see how current communication and organization literature defined "organizational identification"; which theories were used to conceptualize it; how it was studied methodologically; and with what results. Using multiple databases on EBSCOhost (i.e., Academic Search Premier, Business Source Premier, and Communication and Mass Media Complete, comprising a total of approximately 7400 journals), I entered the keywords "organizational identification" and "communication." I used the key term "organizational identification" not "organizational identity" for this search because there is some difference in the use of "organizational identity" and "organizational identification" (organizational identity is often described as that which is distinct, central, and enduring about an organization; see Albert & Whetten,

1985); while organizational identification can be viewed as the individual appropriation of that identity; see Cheney; 1991). It should be noted that important works pertaining to organizational identification (such as Ashforth & Mael, 1992; Cheney, 1983b; Humphreys & Brown, 2002; Mael, 1988) were not listed when I used these key words. I do not view this as a problem, however, as this survey of literature is not intended to catalog every article important to organizational identification; instead, it's meant as a parenthetical example highlighting some theoretical trends. Also, because I wanted to highlight OI studies that emphasized communication, I included "communication" as a key word.

Initially, 58 entries were listed. After eliminating articles that were either duplicates (e.g., a conference paper that later became a journal article; see Maneerat, Hale, & Singhal, 2003); were incomplete due to being published only in abstract form (e.g., Carmeli & Gilat, 2005; Church, Rowbotham, & Enns, 2005; Bertolotti, Mattarelli, & Tagliaventi, 2005); were not available in full on EBSCOhost (e.g., Tangirala, Green, & Ramanujam; 2007; Lammers & Barbour, 2006; Scott, 2007; Cheney & Tompkins, 1987); or only briefly mentioned OI without defining it (e.g., Chakrabarti, 1973; Brooks & Anderson, 2005); 28 articles were left. Then I looked at each one to find out how OI was defined. As Table 4 in Appendix B shows, rhetorical theory applied to organizations and social identity theory were used most often. While the articles usually highlighted one theory over another, three articles used both theories (Nakra, 2006; Van Riel & Balmer, 1997; Vora, Kostova & Roth, 2005). In these cases, social identity theory was privileged (indicated by the double "x"), and rhetorical theory was used to supplement it.

Sixteen articles used social identity theory and 18 articles used rhetorical theory applied to organizations to define OI (see Table 6). Structuration theory was used one time; however, structuration theory draws from and synthesizes both SIT and RT; therefore, we could argue that it is a hybrid of the two. It is also interesting to note that studies in the 1980s tended to use a rhetorical model, while more recent studies have shifted to social identity theory or a social identity/rhetorical hybrid (e.g., the Rotterdam Organizational Identification Test; see Van Riel & Balmer, 1997; structuration-based, situated model of OI; Scott, Corman, & Cheney, 1998). It appears that both social psychology and rhetorical theory can be used to address the concept of "organizational identification" effectively. But what are the differences? In the next section, I will explain and then compare and contrast social identity theory, represented by scholars such as Scott (2007), Hatch & Schultz (2004), and Ashforth & Mael (1989), with rhetorical theory applied to organizations, represented by scholars such as Cheney (1983; 1991) and Bullis & Bach (1991; 1989a; 1989b).

7 *Organizational socialization.* Organizational newcomers, according to Ashforth and Mael (1989), have a lot of uncertainty as to how they fit within the organization; as a result, they are highly concerned with building both a situational definition (an explanation of the organization's policies, expectations, power structures, etc.) and a self-definition (of which a social identity within the organization is likely to comprise a large part). People become socialized, or learn the values, customs, and attitudes of an organization, through nonverbal and verbal communication; and this interaction imposes "an informational framework or schema on organizational experience" (p. 143) that allows them to resolve ambiguity and oftentimes internalize the organization's values and beliefs.

Organizational identification can help us understand organizational socialization in three ways: first, while internalization of organizational values and goals can sometimes occur without a person identifying with an organization, it appears that the identification process is a necessary component of socialization when individual identities and organizational goals are incompatible. According to Van Maanen (1978), identification can be of two types: investiture, where individual identities are ratified, and divestiture, where individual's identities are replaced with an organizational identity. In cases where organizational values are incompatible with a newcomer's individual identity, identification through divestiture processes is necessary. This new identity can be created through removing symbols of previous identities, isolation, disparaging newcomers' abilities or status, imposing new identification symbols, and rewarding the assumption of new identity (Fisher, 1986; Goffman, 1961; Van Maanen, 1978). Second, OI can occur separately from identification with people. I can say, for example, that I am an American without identifying with the beliefs or actions of particular Americans. This is described by Ashforth and Mael as "reification" and explains how people can continue to believe in the integrity of an organization "despite wrongdoing by senior management or can feel loyal to his or her department despite a complete changeover of personnel" (p. 145). And third, OI is managed symbolically, through the manipulation of symbols like "traditions, myths, metaphors, rituals, sagas, heroes, and physical setting" (p. 145). This explains how charismatic leaders, who are adept at manipulating symbols, are "likely to engender social and/or classical identification, that is, identification with the organization, the leader, or both" (p. 146) and thus socialize new members into a group.

In sum, organizational socialization is "an attempt to symbolically manage newcomers' self, if not situation, definitions by defining the organization in terms of distinctive and enduring central properties" (p. 146). Essentially, organizational socialization is the attempt to define oneself in terms of the organization's identity. OI, the perception of oneness with an organization, is a mechanism whereby people can feel loyal and committed to the organization *per se* and internalize organizational values and beliefs.

Role Conflict. People usually belong to a number of groups. Because of this, their roles in these groups may conflict. SIT views these differing roles as multiple social identities and the social identity of a person as an amalgam of identities. In organizations, some of these possibly conflicting identities are nested within each other; that is, the work group identity is viewed as "inside" the department identity, which is inside the organizational identity. But conflict between these identities may still occur.

Ashforth and Mael (1989) identify four ways that conflicting identities tend to be cognitively resolved. First, people might identify themselves by their most salient identity (e.g., "I am a mother more than I am a student"). Second, people might defer to the identity that experiences the "greatest environmental press" (p. 148) and minimize, rationalize, or deny the conflict (e.g., "I've had to neglect my kids or I wouldn't have passed my comprehensive exams). Third, people might cognitively separate identities so that conflicts are not perceived (e.g., "I'm not neglecting my children by studying for comps"). And fourth, people might comply sequentially with conflicting identities so inconsistencies don't need to be resolved (e.g., "I'm going to neglect my kids until comps are over; then, I'm going to put my kids first").

These strategies for resolving identity conflict underscore the idea that identities are not unified, consistent, or perceptually whole but are instead, fragmented, fluid, ambiguous, partial, and sometimes conflicting. People slide fairly easily into different identities, and conflict is perceived only when these disparities are made salient. It also provides a reason (compartmentalization of identities) that double standards and hypocrisy occur. As Ashforth and Mael state, perhaps "wisdom is little more than the ability to remember the lessons of previous identities, and integrity is the ability to integrate and abide by them" (p. 149).

Intergroup relations. SIT posits that conflict between groups stems from the very fact that groups exist. SIT argues that (1) social identities are maintained primarily by intergroup comparisons and (2) groups seek positive differences between themselves and others. When a group's identity is "insecure" (Tajfel, 1978), that is, when a group's domain or resources are threatened, the tendency to differentiate is exacerbated.

The primary locus of intergroup conflict is the subunit. When people regard their workgroup identities as synonymous with their organizational identities, they will regard other groups positively. But when workgroup and organizational identities differ, biased intergroup comparisons will result with the following effects. First, out-groups could be stereotyped negatively, with out-group members depersonalized. Second, this subordination and distancing of out-groups is justified. Third, because of "symbolic interactionism" (i.e., communication), desire for positive differentiation, and stereotyping, biases may become contagious (Tajfel, 1978, p. 150). This can result in polarization and increased competition. And fourth, intergroup conflict exacerbates the above tendencies (stereotyping, justification of stereotypes, contagion). Interestingly, intergroup competition appears to be most fierce when groups are similar to, not different from each other (Turner, 1978).

Although subunits of organizations compete with each other, this competition is limited in three ways. First, groups usually restrict their comparisons to similar or salient workgroups. Second, comparisons of other groups can be on multiple levels, and in-group and out-group favoritism are not mutually exclusive. For example, in-groups sometimes acknowledge that an out-group is superior on some level, especially when that level is regarded as unimportant to the in-group (Mummendey & Schreibner, 1984). And third, groups are less likely to show in-group bias when social comparisons or the distribution of limited resources is viewed as legitimate by the in-group. Some in-groups may view themselves as less deserving or inferior and thus not question preferential treatment being given to out-groups. In sum, OI is important to intergroup relations because without it, the desire for positive in-group comparisons generates much conflict between work groups. This is especially true if a work group is insecure (Tajfel, 1978).

8 Using the same 28 studies I surveyed earlier, I examined how the authors of each work defined OI.

9 In Appendix B, I included elements of OI that were included as part of what I

considered the "official" definition of OI as well as surrounding explanatory comments. Because some of the articles chose to explain OI rather than provide a definition outright, I felt it to be more true to the article's conceptualization of OI to categorize the explanatory comments as well as a one-line definition. Therefore, while Appendix B's list of definitions is interesting for comparative reasons, it may not reflect all of the categories I checked in the tables. Please refer to the individual articles for this explanatory prose surrounding the definitions.

10 The early OI literature (Brown, Patchen, Lee, & Hall et al.) used this construct to define OI in 75 % of its literature. From the EBSCO host sample I presented, 56% of both social identity theory and rhetorical theory articles used this conception in their definitions, as well.

11 At least 25% of articles in all three categories used this construct to define OI.

12 Self-definition emerged as an important construct, especially in SIT literature but also in more than 20 % of RT literature, as well.

13 Part of the definition of OI in at least 19 % of all three categories

14 While Adorno (1991) does not hail from the same theoretical discipline, I have personally found his explanation of the charismatic bond between leader and follower to be unparalleled. In addition, his work is based on Freud's explanation of identification and is often used in organizational communication to explain power relationships between leaders and the masses from a critical standpoint.

15 Adorno speaks specifically of "political agitators," or demagogues who gain followers through "psychological calculations" rather than rational aims. Following his lead that "the similarity of the utterances of various agitators . . . is so great that it suffices in principle to analyze the statements of one of them in order to know them all" (p. 133), I use his analysis of classical identification to apply to leaders of new religious movements, as well. In addition, Lalich (2004) does not differentiate between religious or political charismatic authorities or transcendental belief systems. Whether it is politics or religion, each type of leader gains followers to promote a different way of living, a different worldview.

16 It can certainly be argued that Simon's theory of identification (1997), where members desire to act in the best interests of the organization, is a cognitive construct. Thinking in terms of organizational goals is an act of cognition. However, because thinking in terms of what is best for the organization is also accompanied by acting according to organizational goals, I include this component of identification under the "behavioral dimension."

17 All of these forms and figures are found in Aristotle's (2004) *Rhetoric;* they are also listed and explained in detail at rhetoric.byu.edu, from where I retrieved them.

18 Croucher et al. (2009) explore the differences between organizational identification and organizational culture. They state that organizational culture is difficult to define because "it is so rich" (p. 77). Alvesson (2004) defines it as "a socially shared orientation to social reality created through the negotiation of meaning and the use of symbolism in social interactions" and "a sytem of common symbols and meanings, not the totality of a group's way of life" (p. 318; in Croucher et al., 2009). Culture is also viewed as a process of sensemaking through understanding the stories, vocabulary, and rituals important to the organization (Eisenberg & Riley, 201; Pacanowsky &

O-Donnel-Trujillo, 1982; in Croucher et al., 2009). Croucher et al. (2009) state that the relationship between organizational identification and organizational culture is "a dynamic process, 'involving mutual interdependence' between the two concepts (Hatch & Schultz, 1997, p. 361). In essence, if individuals have been effectively assimilated into a group/organization using stories, vocabulary, and rituals, then the individuals will have a more developed understanding of the organization and a stronger identification with the organization (Cheney, 1991; Cheney et al., 2004; Croucher et al., 2006; Glaser et al., 1987; Hatch & Schultz, 1997; 2002)" (Croucher et al., 2009, pp. 78-79). So, organizational identification is a possible result of individuals becoming acculturated into the organization.

19 Tompkins and Cheney's systems of control are very similar to Weber's (1978) ideal types of legitimate authority, discussed earlier in this Chapter. As I will show in the following paragraphs, simple control is utilized in charismatic authority; technical control is used in legitimate authority; bureaucratic control is used in legal-rational authority; and concertive control is used in what Cheney (1999) argues may be an undeveloped Weberian fourth category where authority is derived from the values of the organization. But, to avoid overcomplication here, I will just include this as a parenthetical "hmm."

20 As Weber explains, there are three clear-cut grounds on which to base the belief in legitimate authority. Given pure types, each is connected with a fundamentally different sociological structure of executive staff and means of administration. An "ideal type" is a characterization and synthesis of one or more points of view into a unified analytical construct. Weber's typology is an oversimplification of organizational authority but, as Lukes (1993) outlines, this "exaggerated and simplified representation . . . captures the essentials of what is represented" (p. 19; see also Blau & Scott, 1962). Therefore, while the Kingston organization (like most organizations) does not fit perfectly into the ideal type, we are still able to capture some of the "fundamentally different sociological [and communicative] structures" of organizations (Weber, 1922, p. 1). In the sections below, I will outline the salient features of Weber's ideal types and how the Kingston organizational dimensions fit.

21 Other types are patrimonial government (including military, administration appointed by ruler) and feudalism. Dynasty rulers, monarchies and some autocracies, oligarchies, theocracies, and patriarchies are ruled by traditional leaders.

22 Former members take issue with this lack of separation between public and private life. One woman states: "When I quit working for the Order businesses and went and worked on the outside, in the first year my income went up by $10,000, and I started at the bottom of Jenny Craig, with $5-somethin' an hour. So, in there, you paid piss-poor wages, you're not supposed to have vacation because Order people don't need vacation and, you know, you're supposed to work your butt off for supposedly God's kingdom, you know, all your money goes to God. How he gets it, I don't know. My theory is that he comes down in a flying saucer and gets it, you know, how he gets it, beats me. But, that didn't make my dad very proud when he heard I thought that God gets his money from a flying saucer" (participant 14).

23 One former member discusses the guilt he felt withdrawing money from the Kingston bank, because he did not want to overspend Order money.

> They send you a statement at the end of the month, it's pretty much like

> a bank statement where they show your income and your expenses. If you want money, you have to go to the office and draw money out. . . . This is one of the things I've talked to several people that have left, and it's one of the funniest things to us. The first time I went to the bank, on the outside I was driving up to the window, waiting in line, and my stomach was just in knots, because I wanted to get a hundred dollars out of our checking account. I was just sitting there thinking, "What am I going to say I need it for? What can I say I need it for?" This was at an outside bank, the first time I went to get my money after we left the Order. I was just a nervous wreck. My heart was pounding, my stomach was in knots. On the way up, I thought, "I wonder if I had better just ask for $50. Should I just ask for $20? I wonder what they're going to say." I finally just went up there and said, "I want to get 100 dollars out of my checking." It was "Ok, yeah. Here," and put a couple of suckers in the thing and sent it. I just sat there, stunned.
>
> To go to the office and get money was an ordeal, especially if you're trying to be a loyal order member, because they don't like you spending cash in the first place. You shouldn't spend anything that you don't have to spend. In fact, at the young people's meetings [a focus is] to be frugal in the way you live, right down to the amount of toothpaste you use, down to the squares of tissues you should use. It's everything. I don't think there's one thing they don't cover. Then of course they tell you that if you can use a check to pay for something, then the cash is still in the Order and the Order is using that cash until the check comes due, so it leverages their money a little bit.
>
> To actually get cash, there would be a lot of times where you'd go to the Order and say, "Can I get 20 dollars?" and they'd say, "20 dollars, huh? Do you really need it right now?" And there'd be other times where they'd say, "The Order's in a bind right now. Can you wait? We don't really have it." Sometimes they'd just tell us, "We don't have cash right now." It was quite an ordeal. But you work, get a statement that tells you what you made that month, [and] have a balance there." (participant 5)

24 For example, one member states: "I worked in retail business doing cashiering for a little while. After that, I worked as a paralegal for my father for a little while. After that, I started in telecommunications business. By this time I was 18. At that age, I became a manager of a telecommunications business. I was really young. I managed about five or six people at that job. I feel like I've been very lucky, because I've been able to get experience at a really young age and enough experience to be a manager at 18, where a lot of people at 18 start college or get their very first job. At that age, I had already had quite a few years of experience. So I was able—I kind of felt I had a jump-start on life" (participant 3). This particular woman is highly identified with the organization and believes in the mission to "build the kingdom of God," or think in terms of organizational objectives. As a result, she interprets experiences that some would call a violation in child labor laws (participant 15) as a personal benefit that comes from putting the organization first.

25 It is important to note here that the guiding term "emotional bond" does not refer to the system of rhetoric that corresponds with Weber's types of authority. Recalling that Tompkins's (1987) rhetorical comparison between Aristotle's rhetorical appeals and

Weber's systems of authority suggests that charismatic authority is sustained through ethos; traditional authority through pathos; and legal-rational authority through logos, it may be tempting to state that the emotional affective bond between leader and follower is facilitated chiefly through pathos. Instead, I believe that the affective bond is sustained through a variety of rhetorical appeals, but mostly a combination of ethos and pathos. Legal-rational authority may chiefly use logos, but bureaucratic control utilizes all of the rhetorical appeals on various levels. Thus, this schemata does not contradict Tompkins (1987) but does complicate it.

26 In addressing the place of rhetoric within an organizational system, Etzioni's (1961) compliance structures can be instructive.

Etzioni states that there are three basic types of power that an organization can exert and three basic types of involvement that lower participants can have. The type of power exerted and the type of involvement of lower participants determine the compliance structures. The types of power are coercive (identified by threat of or implementation of physical force); remunerative (identified by control over material resources, such as salaries and wages); and normative (identified by control over symbols in the organization, such as rewarding prestige and a high social status). The types of involvement are alienated (high negative-intensity orientation to power, like prisoners to guards or servants to masters); calculative (low intensity positive or negative orientation, like continued business clients to owners); and moral (high positive intensity, like church members to a religion). These orientations are as follows.

	Alienative (or Coercive)	Calculative	Moral
Coercive	1	2	3
Remunerative	4	5	6
Normative	7	8	9

Types 1, 5, and 9 are called "congruent" types of compliance structures and are the types that most often occur. For example, it's not often that coercive power of an organization leads to high-intensity positive involvement by a lower participant (although it can happen.) These types of congruent relationships are called "coercive," "utilitarian," and "normative," respectively. In other words, coercive power most often yields a highly negative orientation to involvement; utilitarian compliance's remunerative power produces a low-intensity positive or negative orientation to involvement; and normative compliance's normative power produces a highly intense positive orientation to involvement.

If we compare these types of congruent compliant structures to Kingston types of organizations, we get the following:

	Business (legal-rational authority)	Family (traditional)	Church (charismatic)
coercive		X?	
utilitarian	X?	X?	
normative	X?	X?	X?

As we can see from this graph, based on the accounts that I have read thus far (Batchelor,

Watson, & Wilde, 2000; Moore-Emmett, 2004), the family exerts all three types of compliance structures: coercive compliance is commonly used to discipline children (Marianne Kingston, for example, was taken up to a ranch in Idaho called Washake by her father and beaten for running away from her husband/uncle; Broughton, 2003). Utilitarian compliance is also common (men control the finances in each household; Order, 2009c). So is normative compliance (church teachings are integrated into the family structure through family home evening, recitation of memory gems, family prayer, and Sunday School homework; Order, 2009c). The business has utilitarian compliance (businesses pay wages and have control over material resources); it also has normative compliance (members willingly sacrifice material possessions for the "building of the kingdom of God"). And, as will be explained fully in Chapter 5, the church sector uses normative compliance as well as utilitarian compliance, something that I had not considered before analyzing the data of this study.

While Etzioni states that many types different types of power may be neutralized when two or more are used (e.g., a church probably will not be effective if it beats people while trying to establish high positive feelings), Etzioni states that "the opposite argument can be made." The more a person's basic needs are dependent on organization's control over resources, the more a person will be compliant.

27 Bullis (1993) defines socialization as "a central process through which individual-societal relationships are mediated. More narrowly, it is examined as a process through which newcomers become organizational members" (p. 10). Yi and Uen (2006) define organizational socialization as "the process in which a newcomer in an organization learns and adapts to the new environments (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). The original definition of organizational socialization was to 'know the rules' for a newcomer, but now has evolved into the process of making a person understand his roles or the organization's values, philosophy, social network (Louis, 1980). This process of becoming acclimated to an organization is crucial to an employee's future success" (p. 363). Organizational identification is described as "whether or not an employee belives he or she is a part of the organization, identifies with the organization's mission, vision, values and goals, and takes organizational interests into account when making various decisions [and] the extent to which an employee defines himself or herself in terms of an organization" (p. 363). Yi and Uen cite Ashforth and Saks (1996) in describing the difference between the two. Socialization is a tactical process that conveys what the organization represents and how new members should interpret events and meaning. These tactics produce the correct interpretations that provide a "relatively clear referent for identification" (p. 363). Yi and Uen found that socialization tactics are used to increase overall organizational identification. Socialization, in rhetorical terms, is conceived as a process of persuasion in which a terministic screen is constructed that allows members interpret events and experiences that conform with organizational norms. This process provides the lens through which members view the organization; and this leads to organizational identification.

28 In Western Marxism (Gramsci, 1971; Lukacs, 1970), the base of economic relations is ignored (i.e., Marx viewed capitalism as inherently unequal and flawed) and superstructural elements of power are exclusively focused on. In NeoMarxism of the Frankfurt School (i.e., Adorno, Habermas, Horkheimer, Benjamin), researchers study

among other things the relationship between capitalism, domination, and the culture industry (Adorno, 1991).

29 In order to better focus this study, I will drop abuse, compliance, and ideology components of this dissertation, relegating those aspects to background information.

30 Jennifer Cummings and I used this process when identifying possible sociopathic communication cues in narratives of purported victims of sociopaths. The paper, "Sociopathic communication cues," was presented at NCA in 2007.

31 "Members' rhetoric refers not only to how current/former members of the Kingston organization reference, interpret and are perhaps persuaded by the formal organizational rhetoric, but also refers to the vernacular rhetoric they produce on their own, in the form of personal experiences, family folklore, advice from trusted friends, etc. This is important to differentiate because of the LDS-based emphasis on personal revelation, where individuals are encouraged to gain a personal "witness" from a higher power that their decisions and behaviors are correct. Therefore, individuals in the LDS church and its sects (including the Kingston organization; see Moore-Emmett, 2004) are conditioned to look for meaning not only in organizational rhetoric but also in rhetoric from other sources that could be a manifestation of the will of God, or personal revelation for their individual lives. For example, one woman in the Kingston organization had a dream that she was going to marry a cousin whom she disliked. Because she was told by family members (what I term "members' rhetoric") that dreams are signs from heaven, she believed that this dream was God's will for her and married the man (see Moore-Emmett, 2004).

32 As we recall, Burke (1950) borrows Aristotle's definition of rhetoric as "the art of persuasion" and expands it to make it applicable to social situations rather than a formal rhetorical situation (pp. 44-45). Burke originally conceived his Rhetoric (1950) as an "accessory" to classical rhetoric, rather than a revision of it. Persuasion, for Burke, is accomplished through strategic identification: "You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* your ways with his" (p. 55). And "as for the relation between 'identification' and 'persuasion': We might well keep it in mind that a speaker persuades an audience by the use of stylistic identifications" (p. 46). Burke's revised definition of rhetoric is "the use of symbols to induce cooperation in beings who naturally respond to symbols" (p. 44), and the shorthand definition of Burkean rhetoric is "identification."

APPENDIX A

TO MY FRIENDS IN THE SAFETY NET COMMITTEE

The political situation in Utah surrounding polygamy is complex and heated. Once legal in Utah, polygamy was discontinued as a practice by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1890 as a condition of statehood (Peterson, 1990). Despite—or perhaps because of— the abandonment of this practice, numerous fundamentalist sects have sprung up in Utah and Colorado, maintaining that polygamy is a religious freedom and is essential to salvation in an afterlife. Although it is illegal, the Utah State government has allowed the practice to continue, in part because of a public outcry after a failed raid on the Short Creek Community (now the FLDS church) in Hilldale, Utah in 1953 (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000; Polygamy Primer, 2006).

Abuse: The Central Issue Among Policy Makers

Abuses incurred against women and children living in polygamy in Utah have received national attention in recent years. Perhaps best known is the account of Elizabeth Smart, a young teenage girl who was abducted at knife point from her Salt Lake City home, kept in a hole in the ground for several weeks, repeatedly raped, and forced to live as a second wife for 9 months until she was found (CNN, 2003; Smart & Smart, 2003). Another young woman, Mary Ann Kingston, ran away from home at age 16 to avoid marrying an uncle 20 years her senior. Mary Ann's father found her and beat her to unconsciousness. She, in turn, filed a $110 million dollar lawsuit against her father, Daniel Kingston, and 240+ other members of the polygamous Kingston organization (Broughton, 2003). Nationally syndicated television programs, such as 20/20, A Current Affair, A&E, Dateline, Oprah (Oprah, 2005), and, most recently, Dr. Phil have devoted entire programs to polygamy abuse. The *Salt Lake Tribune, Denver Rocky Mountain News, Ladies' Home Journal,* and full-length book, *God's Brothel,* are only a few of the

many written pieces maintaining that polygamous organizations are exploitive. The *Salt Lake Tribune* has written over 200 articles documenting abuse in polygamous clans since 1998 (*Salt Lake Tribune,* 2005).

Former members of polygamous organizations insist that polygamous organizations are designed to ideologically and economically control women and children to the point that they become compliant in the face of physical, emotional, sexual, and economic abuse (Moore-Emmett, 2004). Those who have left often claim they were not able to think for themselves but were victims of oppressive ideologies (Beall, 2005; Moore-Emmett, 2004). Many former members affirm that religion in polygamous organizations is an illusion to distract the Utah public and government officials from the true base of the organization: economic and sexual exploitation of its members. The Kingston organization is given as an example of exploitation, as it boasts assets of over $150 million while its members live in poverty, sometimes resorting to scavenging food from the garbage dumpsters of grocery stores in order to eat (Kilzer, 2000). Former members hope to ultimately convince the Utah public and government that polygamous organizations are money-making enterprises that use religious and patriarchal rhetoric to persuade their members to work for the good of the organization, at their own expense (Lincoln, 1994; Mansueto, 1988; Walby, 1989). For these former members, polygamy is considered *organized crime*.

Despite accounts of abuse (Moore-Emmett, 2004), many men and women living in polygamy state that they are happy living the lifestyle and have not been abused in any way (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000). One woman (wife no. 3) stated: “I freely choose a lifetime and an eternity of holy, celestial plural marriage. My sister wives are my heart’s choice among noble women. My husband, before his new geographical location in heaven, grew more and more toward becoming a king and priest in heart and nature” (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000, #92, p. 218). Another (wife no. 7) said, “I have been a monogamist, a divorced wife, a plural wife, and a wife with others coming

in after me. After being a plural wife, I would not live any other way! The joy and companionship I have with my sister wives is priceless. They love me and I love them. They are noble and virtuous women, and it is my holy privilege to be united with them" (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000, # 94, p. 221). Still another (wife no. 2) said, "I was sealed by priesthood authority in celestial plural marriage as a second wife to [a] good man, with whom I have spent nearly 25 very happy years" (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000, #95, p. 221). Organizations designed to educate the public and interface with government officials in support of a polygamous lifestyle are Plural Voices for Polygamy and the Centennial Park Action Committee, among others. From their perspective, abuse in polygamy occurs, but no more than in monogamous relationships (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000). Here, polygamy is viewed as a *religious freedom* unlawfully deprived to citizens by the government.

Becoming Aware of an Underserved Population

In the early 2000s, the Utah Attorney General's office became aware of a woman named Carolyn. She was a sixth-generation polygamous wife with eight children, who was 18 years old when she became the fourth wife of a 50-year-old man. She stated that she grew up in a society based on secrecy and survival. Although she was firmly entrenched in this lifestyle, three factors persuaded her to leave: her husband was violent; she was afraid that her 14-year-old daughter would be forced to marry an older man; and teenage boys were going from home to home determining whether a family was "righteous." If the family was determined to be "unrighteous," the children could be given away to someone else (Polygamy Primer, 2006, p. 4).

Because Carolyn was watched at all times, she left her home and community at 4 a.m. in a minivan with no insurance, no driver's license, and only enough gasoline to get her and the children 3 miles out of town. When her children finally figured out that she was leaving, one child said, "Mother is taking us to hell." And once she finally got out of town, receiving government assistance was difficult, because there were no provisions

to help someone living her lifestyle. “I just didn’t fit in the system,” she said (Polygamy Primer, 2006, p. 4).

From the experiences of Carolyn and other women, it became apparent to the Attorney General’s office that members of polygamous communities who needed the help of government services were often afraid to ask for it (thereby gaining the governmental designation “underserved population”). They had been told by leaders of polygamous organizations that family members would be taken to jail or prosecuted if they asked for government assistance. And unfortunate experiences, such as the 1953 Arizona National Guard raid on the Short Creek community in Hilldale, Utah, and Colorado City, Arizona, provided support for this belief (Polygamy Primer, 2006, p. 6). It was clear that unless bridges of trust were built between the polygamous communities and the Attorney General’s office, individuals in these communities would not feel safe to appeal to government agencies for assistance with domestic violence or child abuse. As a result, the governments of Utah and Arizona decided that, although the lifestyle remains illegal, polygamy per se would not be prosecuted. The law enforcement agencies would prosecute only crimes that involved domestic violence, child abuse, and fraud (Polygamy Primer, 2006). As Mark Shurtleff, Utah’s Attorney General, stated, “For over 50 years, the people living in polygamous communities have been ignored and have not had equal protection under the law” (Shurtleff, 2005, p. 1). To help remedy this, Utah and Arizona state governments committed to avoid prosecuting polygamy as a lifestyle.

The Safety Net Committee

In August, 2003, law enforcement officers and social service providers in Utah and Arizona met together at an historic “Polygamy Summit.” The summit broached the many issues surrounding polygamy and discussed problems and possible solutions. It was here that the Safety Net Committee was born (Polygamy Primer, 2006).

The Safety Net Committee is an amalgam of government agencies, nonprofit organizations and citizens with the goal of helping to break down barriers and provide

justice and social services to members of polygamous communities. A committee within the Office of the Attorney General, the Safety Net Committee is the official government entity assigned to work specifically with polygamous community members. It meets once per month in one of three alternating locations: Salt Lake City, Utah; Colorado City, Arizona; and St. George, Utah. Meetings were originally conducted by Paul Murphy, director of communication in the Utah Attorney General's Office, and later by Pat Merkley, director of the Safety Net Committee. Meetings are attended on average by 30-100 people. This committee meeting is well attended by many government agencies, nonprofit agencies, polygamist groups, and interested individuals. Some of the government agencies involved are the Utah and Arizona Attorney Generals' offices, the Utah Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS); the Utah State Senate; the Utah Board of Education; the Utah Office of Recovery Services; the Utah Department of Workforce Services; and various school districts. Nonprofit agencies who attend the Safety Net Committee include Family Promise; Job Corps; the Utah Domestic Violence Council; the Utah Coalition against Sexual Assault; Principle Voices (in favor of polygamy); Diversity Foundation; New Frontiers for Families; and the HOPE organization. Some of these groups, such as the HOPE organization, are focused on addressing abuse in polygamy; other groups, like Principle Voices, focus on protecting polygamy as a lifestyle; still others, such as the Utah Domestic Violence Council, focus on domestic abuse in any kind of relationship. Polygamous groups who attend are the Apostolic United Brethren (AUB, Allreds); Centennial Park; the Davis County Cooperative Society (Kingstons); and independent families. A few interested individuals, such as a psychologist, a physician, a researcher, former polygamists, and a banking representative, have also attended the committee (Salt Lake City Government Agencies, 2007).

Although there is a vast disparity between the goals and ideals of these multiple organizations, they all have one common goal—to bring justice and safety to an

underserved community. The Safety Net Committee mission statement reads: “The Safety Net Committee brings together government agencies, non-profit organizations and interested individuals who are working to open up communication, break down barriers and coordinate efforts to give people associated with the practice of polygamy equal access to justice, safety, and services” (Polygamy Primer, 2006, p. 49). This mission statement was unanimously adopted by the committee on June 18, 2005. The focus of the committee is to establish a dialogue with polygamous communities and establish enough trust that members of these underserved communities will reach out to government agencies when abuse of some kind occurs. The committee is also designed to help educate members of polygamous organizations on how to access these services. In these meetings, committee members plan town hall meetings to educate the public; government agencies give presentations about their services to polygamous groups; and committee members brainstorm additional ways that the needs of polygamous communities can be met.

Three Perspectives on Abuse in Polygamy

So, is polygamy organized crime or a religious freedom? Within the Safety Net Committee, there are three major perspectives, represented by former polygamous members, current members, and the Office of the Attorney General, respectively.

Former polygamists believe the polygamous lifestyle is always abusive. As one woman said, “This culture promotes dominance/submission . . . the perpetrators are protected and victims can be revictimized” (Grant, 2004, p. 2). They report that members of polygamous organizations are commonly victims of domestic violence, child abuse, intermarriage, forced marriages, and daughter swapping.

Current polygamists report that abuse is no more common in polygamy than in monogamy and that they are happier living a polygamist lifestyle than a monogamist one. One woman stated, “I have lived the law for 26 years and am my husband’s first wife. I had him to myself for seven years. I testify that through living the principle of

plural marriage, I have experienced more happiness and blessings than I could ever have dreamed of had I chosen to live forever in monogamy. I express my gratitude for the privilege to speak out in defense of this holy law" (Batchelor, Watson, & Wilde, 2000, #52, p. 152).

The Utah and Arizona Attorney General's offices (as a whole) have attempted to maintain a neutral position as to whether polygamy is a good/bad lifestyle. Rather, they have decided to set aside the lifestyle question and focus on bringing justice to victims of crime. As Utah Attorney General Mark Shurtleff stated, "While others debate about legalizing polygamy or locking up every polygamist, the Attorney General's Office is making a difference [by investigating] crimes involving abuse, domestic violence and fraud. . . . We are not here to attack sincere religious beliefs" (Shurtleff, 2005, p. 1). It is clear that the question of whether domestic violence and child abuse in polygamy is part of the organizational structure needed to maintain control and ensure compliance or whether it is an aberrant anomaly not often present in the communities will most likely not be resolved soon.

Confusion surrounding abuse in polygamy is due to two major factors: *first, the definition of "abuse" is rather subjective.* "Abuse" is defined by Utah Attorney General's office as "intentionally or knowingly causing, or attempting to cause, a cohabitant physical harm; or intentionally or knowingly placing a cohabitant in reasonable fear of imminent physical harm" (Polygamy Primer, 2006, p. 32). But these terms are also subjectively determined—what one person defines as an "abusive behavior," another may not. Domestic violence, also included as a type of abuse, is defined by the Attorney General's office as "a systematic pattern of abusive behaviors used in relationships by an intimate partner or cohabitant . . . domestic violence is about power, control, domination

and fear" (Polygamy Primer, 2006, p. 32). Again, determinations as to what constitutes abusive power, control, domination, and fear are somewhat subjective. Other definitions of domestic violence are also subjective. The National Women's Health Information Center defines domestic violence as "when one person purposely causes either physical or mental harm to another" (NWHIC, 2005, emphasis added). The United States Department of Justice defines domestic violence as "a pattern of abusive behavior in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner. . . . This includes any behaviors that intimidate, manipulate, humiliate, isolate, frighten, terrorize, coerce, threaten, blame, hurt, injure, or wound someone" (USDJ, 2006, emphasis added). The National Domestic Violence Hotline defines domestic violence as "a pattern of behavior in any relationship that is used to gain or maintain power and control over an intimate partner" (NDVH, 2006, emphasis added). While each of these definitions is slightly different, consistent elements are found: Domestic violence consists of intentionally harming someone to control or exert power over him or her. This is verified by the Mayo Clinic's Domestic Violence Resource Center, a resource utilized by the AG's office, which states: "in all cases, the abuser aims to exert power and control over his partner" (Mayo Clinic, 2006, emphasis added). While these definitions are consistent with each other, it is a subjective determination as to when a person exerts power and control over another, as well as when this becomes harmful.

Second, in part because members of polygamous organizations worry that they will be arrested or separated from their families for living a polygamous lifestyle (Grant, 2004), their societies are "closed" and members are reluctant to speak about their experiences (Grant, 2004). Members who do come forward and state their perspectives (either for or against polygamy) will often do so only when they can be guaranteed anonymity. Former and current members also worry about speaking out against polygamous organizations, because they are afraid that the polygamous organizations will harm them or their families in some way. This can range from being "handled," or disciplined by church leadership (Polygamy Primer, 2006, p. 8), to having wives and

children being taken from the home and placed in another home (Polygamy Primer, 2006), to being excommunicated from the church and having all personal property confiscated (Polygamy Primer, 2006). Bardin (2006), in a qualitative interview study of former members from fundamentalist polygamous communities, found that children and adults may be reluctant to talk about abuse because they fear "bringing evil" in to the lives of their families (i.e., being punished by God); they have been intimidated or threatened by fundamentalist leaders; or in some cases they may be fully accepting of the ideologies of the group and do not see group practices as wrong. Because of these factors, it is difficult to assess whether abuse figures prominently in these communities.

Addressing Organizational Identification Rather Than Abuse

Because of the subjective quality of the term "abuse," the absence of information about these communities, the lack of empirical data on abuse in polygamy, and the emotional and political nature of the situation, this question will remain a contested issue. As Elbedour, Bart, and Hektner (2007; 2003) show, even "objective" measures and quantitative analysis of polygamous groups yield different results, depending on the way that data are collected, analyzed, and interpreted. During the course of this 6-year study, I have come to believe that any study attempting to objectively assess whether or not Utah fundamentalist polygamous organizations are abusive would be nearly impossible. In addition, abuse per se is outside the purview of a communication-centered study. Propolygamous organizations accuse detractors of prejudice when the practice of polygamy is called into question and the term "abuse" is invoked (Bardin, 2006), and antipolygamous organizations categorically attack organizations that view polygamy as anything short of intrinsically abusive organized crime (Moore-Emmett, 2004). What is more, as is evidenced by their written organizational rhetoric, polygamous groups such as the Kingston organization subscribe to a standard of ethics incompatible in some ways with current laws and social norms. Attaching a label of "abuse" to beliefs and practices central to their worldview serves only to inflame tensions between the groups and

mainstream society.

Rather than focus on the question of abuse, I believe that the Safety Net Committee, government agencies, nonprofit associations, and interested individuals may find more value in studying how a person comes to accept membership into a polygamous organization and how this membership is maintained. Carefully crafted organizational rhetoric produces a remarkably high degree of organizational identification among its members. It is important to remember, however, that these rhetorical discourses are influential but not causal (McKerrow, 1989), that within these discourses there is space for agency and resistance to these discourses (Lucaites & Condit, 1999), and that rhetoric involves intentionality—actors have motives and use rhetoric deliberately (Burke, 1969). This contextualization of agency as "bound in relationship, rather than as the solitary product of some sort of determinism (be it economic or biological) or autonomous free will" (Lucaites & Condit, 1999, p. 612) is summed up nicely by Burke (1969): "In reality, we are capable of but partial acts, acts that but partially represent us and that produce but partial transformations" (p. 19).

As I have become acquainted with the people involved in this complex situation, I have developed sincere and meaningful friendships with people from every perspective, something that I could not foresee 6 years ago. Both current and former members have expressed a great deal of fear that I will not respect their viewpoints or the experiences that are meaningful to them. I would like to reaffirm to them and to anyone that reads this paper that I have done my very best to represent both perspectives accurately and let participants speak for themselves. I have also deliberately avoided making personal evaluations of values, actions, or ideologies; rather, I have attempted to act as a voice for both sides that have been marginalized by each other.

Two potential issues with this dissertation require explanation here. First, because of the hierarchical structure of the Kingston organization, it has been necessary to discuss the element of power in organizational, family, and spiritual life. However, I view power

as potentially productive. Please do not read my discussion of the hierarchical structure of the Kingston organization as a criticism. Second, in many places in the dissertation I label myself as a rhetorical researcher that balances interpretive and critical perspectives. In this dissertation, "critical" means that I analyze how power is created and maintained through organizational communication, generally, and rhetoric, specifically. Though "critical" and "criticize" are similar terms, they have different meanings here. My task for this case study is not to criticize. Therefore, when you read the discussion of taking a "critical" stance, it simply means that I look at the integration of power, knowledge, and communication in organizations and society.

I am very grateful to you all for your help and cooperation in this study, and I hope you will find it to be of some value.

APPENDIX B

ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION TABLES

Table 4. Early OI Definitions

	Attraction to/pride in org	Deciding in terms of org goals, values	Loyalty to org	Self-definition	Support for/defense of org policies	Shared characteristics, linkages	Personal comfort/security in org	Emotional attachment	Process of relational development	Sense of belonging, membership	Personalization of org successes/failures
Brown (1969)	x	x	x	x							
Patchen (1965;1970)		x	x	x	x					x	
Lee (1971)	x	x	x		x	x				x	
Hall et al. (1970)	x	x			x					x	
Total	**3**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**0**

	Social Identity Theory	Rhetorical Theory	Structuration Theory
1. Bartels et al. (2007)	x		
2. Richter et al. (2006)	x		
3. Nakra (2006)	xx	x	
4. Bartels et al.(2006)	x		
5. Van Dick, Ullrich, and Tissington (2006)	x		
6. Tseng, Chen, and Chen (2005)	x	xx	
7. Tracy (2005)	x		
8. Maneerat, Hale, and Singhal (2005)		x	
9. Vora, Kostova and Roth (2005)	xx	x	
10. Scott (2005)	x	x	x
11. Tanis (2005)	x		
12. Li, Huang, and Peng (2003)	x		
13. Bucher (2003)		x	
14. Gossett (2002)		x	
15. Li, Xin, and Pillutla (2002)	x		
16. Smidts, Pruyn, and Van Riel (2001)	x		
17. Chreim (2001)	xx	x	
18. Kassing (2000)		x	
19. Wiesenfeld, Raghuram, and Garud (1999)	x		
20. Roach (1998)		x	
21. Myers and Kassing (1998)		x	
22. Van Riel and Balmer (1997)	xx	x	
23. Ferraris, Carveth, and Parrish-Sprowl (1993)		x	
24. Bullis and Bach (1991)		x	
25. Peterson (1990)		x	
26. Bullis and Bach (1989a)		x	
27. Bullis and Bach (1989b)		x	
28. Cheney (1983)		x	
Total	**16**	**18**	**1**

Table 6. Definitions: Social Identity Theory

	Attraction to/pride in org	Deciding in terms of org goals/values	Loyalty to org	Self-definition	Support for/defense of org policies	Shared characteristics, linkages	Personal comfort/security in org	Emotional attachment	Process of relational development	Sense of belonging, membership	Personalization of org successes/failures
1. Bartels et al. (2007)				x						x	
2. Richter et al. (2006)				x						x	
3. Nakra et al. (2006).		x				x				x	
4. Bartels et al. (2006)				x						x	
5. Van Dick et al. (2006)				x		x					
6. Tseng et al. (2005)		x		x	x						
7. Tracy (2005)				x						x	
9. Vora et al. (2005)				x		x				x	x
10. Scott (2005)						x					
11. Tanis (2005)				x				x		x	
12. Li et al. (2003)				x							
15. Li et al. (2002)				x		x					
16.Smidts, et al. (2001)	x			x						x	
17. Chreim (2001)		x		x		x					
19. Wiesenfeld et al. (1999)										x	
22. Van Riel, Balmer (1997)											
Totals	**1**	**3**	**0**	**12**	**1**	**6**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**9**	**1**

Table 7. Definitions: Rhetorical Theory

	Attraction to/pride in org	Deciding in terms of org goals/values	Loyalty to org	Self-definition	Support for/defense of org policies	Shared characteristics, linkages	Personal comfort/security in org	Emotional attachment	Process of relational development	Sense of belonging, membership	Personalization of org successes/failures
3. Nakra et al. (2006)		x				x				x	
6. Tseng et al. (2005)		x		x	x						
8. Maneerat et al. (2005)	x					x	x				
9. Vora et al. (2005)				x		x				x	x
10. Scott (2005)						x					
13. Bucher (2003)				x		x				x	
14. Gossett (2002)		x				x		x	x	x	
17. Chreim (2001)		x		x		x					
18. Kassing (2000)		x									
20. Roach (1998)						x					
21. Myers, Kassing (1998)	x	x				x				x	
22. Van Riel, Balmer (1997)											
23. Ferraris et al. (1993)						x			x	x	
24. Bullis, Bach (1991)						x			x	x	
25. Peterson (1990)						x			x		
26. Bullis, Bach (1989a)						x			x	x	
27. Bullis, Bach (1989b)						x			x	x	
28. Cheney (1983)						x			x	x	
Totals	**2**	**6**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**15**	**1**	**1**	**7**	**10**	**1**

Table 8. Comparison of OI Theories and Conceptualizations by Percentage

	Attraction to/pride in org	Deciding in terms of org goals/values	Loyalty to org	Self-definition	Support for/defense of org policies	Shared characteristics, linkages	Personal comfort/security in org	Emotional attachment	Process of relational development	Sense of belonging, membership	Personalization of org successes/failures
Early OI Literature	.75	1.00	.75	.50	.75	.25	0	0	0	.75	0
Social Identity Theory	.06	.19	0	.75	.06	.38	0	.06	0	.56	.06
Rhetorical Theory	.11	.33	0	.22	.06	.83	.06	.06	.39	.56	.06

Table 9. Measures Used

	Questionnaire	Interview	Textual analysis
1. Bartels et al. (2007)	x		
2. Richter et al. (2006)	x		
3. Nakra (2006)	x		
4. Bartels et al. (2006)	x		
5. Van Dick et al. (2006)	x		
6. Tseng, Chen, and Chen (2005)	x		
7. Tracy (2005)		x	
8. Maneerat, Hale, and Singhal (2005)	x	x	
10. Scott (2005)	x		
11. Tanis (2005)	x		
13. Bucher (2003)		x	
14. Gossett (2002)		x	
16. Smidts, Pruyn, and Van Riel (2001)	x		
18. Kassing (2000)	x		
19. Wiesenfeld et al. (1999)	x		
20. Roach (1998)	x		
21. Myers and Kassing (1998)	x		
23. Ferraris et al. (1993)		x	x
24. Bullis and Bach (1991)	x	x	
25. Peterson (1990)			x
26. Bullis and Bach (1989a)	x	x	
27. Bullis and Bach (1989b)	x	x	
28. Cheney (1983a)	x	x	
Total	**18**	**9**	**2**

Table 10. Types of Questionnaires

	3-item OI Scale van Knippenberg et al. (2002)	6-item OI Scale Mael and Ashforth (1992)	5-item OI Scale Smidts et al. (2001)	4-item OI Scale Doosie et al. (1995)	4-item OIS Van Dick et al. (2006)	25-item OI Scale Cheney (1982) OIQ
Bartels et al. (2007)	x	x	x			
Richter et al. (2006)				x		
Nakra (2006)		x				
Bartels et al. (2006)	x	x	x			
Van Dick et al. (2006)					x	
Tseng et al. (2005)						x
Maneerat et al. (2005)						x
Scott (2005)						x
Tanis (2005)		x		x		
Smidts et al. (2001)			x			
Kassing (2000)						x
Wiesenfeld et al. (1999)		x				
Roach (1998)						x
Myers and Kassing (1998)						x
Bullis and Bach (1991)						x
Bullis and Bach (1989a)						x
Bullis and Bach (1989b)						x
Cheney (1983a)						x
Total	**2**	**5**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**10**

APPENDIX C

DEFINITIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION

1. Bartels et al. (2007): "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, where the individual defines him or herself in terms of the organization(s) in which he or she is a member" (p. 174).

2. Richter et al. (2006): "the perception of oneness with, or 'belongingness' to, a social group" (p. 1252).

3. Nakra et al. (2006): "the social and psychological tie binding employees and the organization" (p. 43), combining "the perception of oneness with, or "belongingness' to, an organization" (Ashforth & Mael, 1989); "individual's beliefs about his/her organization becoming self-referential or self-defining" (Pratt, 1988); and a "cognitive link" built when "a person's self-concept contains the same attributes as those in the perceived organizational identity" (Dutton et al., 1994); manifest by a subordinate making decisions that are best for the organization (Cheney, 1983).

4. Bartels et al. (2006). "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, where the individual defines him or herself in terms of the organization(s) in which he or she is a member" (p. 52).

5. Van Dick et al. (2006): what insiders believe is central and distinctive about the organization . . . the extent to which [organizational] beliefs become self-referential" (based on Pratt, 1998).

6. Tseng et al. (2005): "organizational identification concerns a referral structure of common ideologies and regulations" (p. 295).

7. Tracy (2005): "feelings of belonging and increased commitment" (p. 276).

8. Maneerat et al. (2005): OI in Thailand was defined by "pride in membership (life values), fit with organization (social values), and comfort zone (personal values)."

9. Vora et al. (2005): OI is "a cognitive state of psychological attachment whereby individuals define themselves in terms of the organization and personalize its successes and failure" (p. 331).

10. Scott et al. (1998): “the forging, maintenance, or alteration of linkages between persons and groups. . . . When the target of this perceived connection or linkage is the organization, one refers to that as organizational identification” (p. 3).

11. Tanis (2005): “an employee’s tendency to positively discern his or her own organization (ingroup) from other organizations (outgroup) by defining him- or her-self in terms of the salient categorization, and attaching emotional value to this categorization” (p. 14).

12. Li et al. (2003): “the process whereby an individual’s beliefs about an organization become self-referential or self-defining” (p. 5; see Pratt, 1998).

13. Bucher (2003): “including member feelings of similarity, belonging, and membership” (p. 9; see Bullis & Bach, 1989).

14. Gossett (2002): “process . . . feeling of mutuality that enables individuals to share the emotions, values, and decisions that allow them to act together” (p. 386).

15. Li, Xin, and Pillutla (2002): “individuals perceive themselves and their work organizations as intertwined, sharing common characteristics and destiny. They derive their self-identity from the organizations they belong to” (p. 323).

16. Smidts, Pruyn, and van Riel (2001): “the perception of ‘oneness’ with an organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). . . It conveys the extent to which an individual perceives him/herself as belonging to the group and as being a typical member of it. The affective component (feelings of pride in being part of the organization or feeling acknowledged in it) is important in the creation of a positive image of one’s own organization, or achieving a ‘positive social identity’” (p. 1051).

17. Chreim (2001): “the degree to which a member defines him- herself by the same attributes that he or she believes define the organization” (p. B1; see Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994, p. 239).

18. Kassing (2000): “a decision maker identifies with an organization when he or she desires to choose the alternative that best promotes the perceived interests of that organization” (p. 389; see Tompkins & Cheney, 1985, p. 194).

19. Weisenfeld et al. (1999): “strength of an individual’s cognitive attachment to the organization” (p. 778).

20. Roach (1998): “the degree to which an employee ‘identifies with’ an org is the degree to which he/she shares substance with the organization” (p. 355).

21. Myers and Kassing (1998): “leads the decision maker to select a particular alternative, to choose one course of action over another” (p. 72; see Tompkins & Cheney, 1985).

22. Van Riel et al. (1997): “a feeling of belonging, congruency between organizational goals and values, positive organizational membership, organizational support, recognition of distinct contributions, a feeling of acceptance, and security” (p. 347).

23. Ferraris et al. (1993). “OI is defined as a fundamental process of relational development, and a product involving feelings of similarity, belonging and membership” (p. 345).

24. Bullis and Bach (1991): “OI is both a process and product involving the development of a relationship between individuals and organizations. . . . that allows the organization to manage individual decision making through communication. . . . Individuals are considered to identify with organizations to the extent that thye feel a sense of belonging, membership, and similarity” (p. 183; see Cheney, 1982).

25. Peterson (1990): “Identification with organizations, essential for member satisfaction and commitment, is also achieved in large part through rhetoric” (p. 168). Not explicitly defined but references Cheney and Burke; therefore “Process” and “shared characteristics” were marked.

26. Bullis and Bach (1989a): “a fundamental process of relational development and as a product involving feelings of similarity, belonging, and membership” (p. 275; see Cheney, 1982).

27. Bullis and Bach (1989b): “sense of belonging, membership and similarity . . . both process and product” (p. 202).

28. Cheney (1983b): “a person identifies with a unit when, in making a decision, the person in one or more of his/her organizational roles perceives that unit’s values or interests as relevant in evaluating the alternatives of choice” (p. 346). This identification is a process (p. 348) and a state with 3 components: membership, loyalty, and similarity (p. 349).

REFERENCES

Adams, B., & Mburugu, E. (1994). Kikuyu bride wealth and polygyny today. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *25*(2), 159–166.

Aghanwa, H., Dare, F., & Ogunniyi, S. (1999). Sociodemographic factors in mental disorders associated with infertility in Nigeria. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 46* (2), 117-23.

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. (1985). Organizational Identity. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 7,* pp. 263-95. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Al-Issa, I. (1990). Culture and mental illness in Algeria. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, *36*(3), 230–240.

Al-Krenawi, A. (1998). Family therapy with a multiparental/multispousal family. *Family Process*, *37*(1), 65–82.

Al-Krenawi, A. (1999a). Explanation of mental health symptoms by the Bedouin- Arabs of the Negev. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, *45*(1), 56–64.

Al-Krenawi, A. (1999b).Women of polygamous marriages in primary health carecenters. *Contemperary Family Therapy*, *21*(3), 417–430.

Al-Krenawi, A. (2001). Women from polygamous and monogamous marriages in an out-patient psychiatric clinic. *Transcultural Psychiatry, 38* (2), pp. 187-199.

Al-Krenawi, A., & Lev-Wisel, R. (2002). Wife abuse among polygamous and monogamous Bedouin-Arab families. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 36* (3/4), 151-166.

Al-Krenawi, A., & LIghtman, E. (2000). Learning achievement, social adjustment, and family conflict among Bedouin-Arab children from polygamous and monogamous families. *Journal of Social Psychology, 140* (3), 345-55.

Al-Krenawi, A., Graham, J. R., & Al-Krenawi, S. (1997). Social work practice with polygamous families. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, *14*(6), 445–458.

Al-Krenawi, A., Graham, J., & Al-Krenawi, S. (1994). Social work practice with polygamous families. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 14* (6), 445-458.

Al-Krenawi, A., Graham, J., & Ben-Shimol-Jacosen, S. (2006). Attitudes toward and reasons for polygamy differentiated by gender and age among Bedouin-Arabs of the Negev. *International Journal of Mental Health, 35* (1), 46-61.

Almendros, C., Carrobles, J., & Rodriguez-Carballeira, A. (2007). Former members' perceptions of cult involvement. Cultic Studies Review, 6 (1). Retrieved November 24, 2007, from http://www.culticstudiesreview.org/csr_member/mem_articles/ almendros_carmen_formermemberpercept_csr06.01a.htm

Alston, J., & Aguirre, B. (1979). Congregational size and the decline of sectarian commitment: The case of the Jehovah's Witnesses in South and North America. *Sociological Analysis, 40* (Spring), 63-70.

Altman, I., & Ginat, J. (1996). *Polygamous families in contemporary society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Alvesson, M. (1990). Organization: From substance to image? *Organization Studies, 11,* pp. 373-94. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies, 39,* pp. 619-44. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, J., & Englehardt, E. (2001). *The organizational self and ethical conduct: Sunlit virtue and shadowed resistance.* Fort Worth: Harcourt.

AP (2003). Authorities examine bond between Elizabeth Smart, captors. March 14, 2003. Retrieved November 2, 2006 from http://www.courttv.com/news/2003/0314/smart_ap.html.

Aristotle (2006). *The "art" of rhetoric.* 1926. London: Harvard University Press.

Aronoff, J., Lynn, S. J., & Malinoski, P. (2000). Are cultic environments psychologically harmful? *Clinical Psychology Review, 20* (1), 91-111.

Ashforth, B., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14,* 20-39. Reprinted in *Organizational identity: A reader,* M. Hatch and M. Schultz (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baffelli, E. (2007). Mass media and religion in Japan: Mediating the leader's image. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture, 4* (1), 83-99.

Bailey, D. (2007). Enacting transformation: George W. Bush and the Pauline conversion narrative. Conference paper, National Communication Association.

Bardin (2006). In Polygamy primer (2006). The Primer: Helping victims of domestic violence and child abuse in polygamous communities, ed. M. Shurtleff and T. Goddard. Available at www.attorneygeneral.utah.gov/polygamy/The Primer.pdf

Barge, J. (1988). A critical evaluation of organizational commitment and identification. *Management Communication Quarterly, 2* (1), 116-34.

Barker, J., & Tompkins, P. (1994). Identification in the self-managing organization. *Human Communication Research, 21* (2), 223-241.

Barnard, C. (1938). *The functions of the executive.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bartels, J., Douwes, R., De Jon, M., & Pruyn, A. (2006). Organizational identification during a merger: Determinants of employees' expected identification with the new organization. *British Journal of Management, 17,* 49-67

Bartels, J., Pruyn, A., de Jong, M., & Joustra, I. (2007). Multiple organizational identification levels and the impact of perceived external prestige and communication climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28* (2), 173-90.

Batchelor, M., Watson, M., & Wilde, A. (2000). *Voices in harmony: Contemporary women celebrate plural marriage.* Salt Lake City: Principle Voices.

Baxter, G., & Taylor, P. (1978). Burke's theory of consubstantiality and Whitehead's concept of concrescence. *Communication Monographs, 45* (2), 173-81.

Baxter, L., and Bullis, C. (1986). Turning points in developing romantic relationships. *Human Communication Research, 12* (4, Summer), pp. 469-93.

Beall, L. (2005). The impact of modern-day polygamy on women and children. Unpublished manuscript given to me by Rowenna Erickson on June 9, 2005. Later published in Polygamy Primer (2006). The Primer: Helping victims of domestic violence and child abuse in polygamous communities, ed. M. Shurtleff and T. Goddard. Available at www.attorneygeneral.utah.gov/polygamy/The Primer.pdf

Bergstrom, P. (1994). On the economics of polygyny. Available: htt://econwpa.wustl.edu/eprints/mic/papers/9410/941000Labs

Bertolotti, F., Mattarelli, E., & Tagliaventi, M. (2005). How networks of practice and organizational identification affect inter-group knowledge transfer. Managerial and Organizational Cognition conference paper abstracts. *Academy of*

Management Proceedings, 1-39.

Bhattacharya, C. B., & Elsbach, K. D. (2002). Us versus them: The roles of organizational identification and disidentification in social marketing initiatives. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 21* (1), pp. 26-36.

Boyd, J. (2004). Organizational rhetoric doomed to fail: R.J. Reynolds and the principle of oxymoron. *Western Journal of Communication, 68* (1), pp. 45-71.

Brooks, B., Anderson, M. (2005). Defining quality of nursing work life. Nursing Economica, 23 (6), pp. 319-26.

Broude, G. J. (1994). *Marriage*, *family*, *and relationships. A cross-cultural encyclopaedia*. Denver, CO: ABC-CLIO.

Broughton, A. (2003). Sex abuse victim sues Kingstons. *Salt Lake Tribune,* August 29, 2003, pp. A1, A4.

Brown, M. (1969). Identification and some conditions of organizational involvement. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 14,* (3), pp. 346-355.

Bucher, H. (2003). Influences on career development: A critical incident analysis. *Conference papers—International Communication Association.*

Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1969b). *A rhetoric of motives.* 1950. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bullis, C. (1993). Organizational socialization research: Enabling, constraining, and shifting perspectives. *Communication Monographs, 60* (1), 10-18.

Bullis, C. (1999). Mad or bad: A response to Kramer and Miller. *Communication Monographs, 66* (4), 368-73.

Bullis, C. (1993). Organizational socialization research: Enabling, constraining, and shifting perspectives. Communication Monographs, 60, 10-17.

Bullis, C., & Bach, B. (1989a). Socialization turning points: An examination of change in organizational identification. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 53* (3), 273-93.

Bullis, C., & Bach, B. (1989b). Are mentor relationships helping organizations? An exploration of developing mentee-mentor-organizational identifications using turning point analysis. *Communication Quarterly, 37* (3), 199-213.

Bullis, C., & Bach, B. (1991). An explication and test of communication network content and multiplexity as predictors of organizational identification. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 55* (2), 180-97.

Burke, K. (1937). *Attitudes toward history.* New York: New Republic.

Burke, K. (1950). *A rhetoric of motives.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1973). The rhetorical situation. In *Communication: Ethical and moral issues,* L. Thayer (Ed.) (263-75). London: Gordon and Breach.

Carmeli, A., & Gilat, G. (2005). The role of perceived organizational prestige in organizational identification and work outcomes. Organization and Management Theory conference paper abstracts. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* 1-92.

Chakrabarti, A. (1973). The effects of techno-economic and organizational factors on the adoption of NASA-innovations by commercial firms in the U.S. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* 469-475.

Chaleby, K. (1985).Women of polygamous marriages in an inpatient psychiatric service in Kuwait. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *173*(1), 56–58.

Chaleby, K. (1987). Women of polygamous marriages in outpatient psychiatric services in Kuwait. *International Journal of Family Psychiatry*, *8*(1), 25–34.

Chambers, W., Langone, M., & Grice, J. (1994). The group psychological abuse scale: A measure of the varieties of cultic abuse. *Cultic Studies Journal 11*(1).

Chan, S. (2006). Organizational identification and commitment of members of a human development organization. *Journal of Management Development, 25* (3), 249-68.

Cheney, G. (2000). Interpreting interpretive research: Toward perspectivism without relativism. In *Perspectives on organizational communication: Finding common ground,* S. Corman and M. Poole (Eds.). New York: Guilford.

Cheney, G., & Lair, D. (2005). Theorizing about rhetoric and organizations: Classical, interpretive, and critical aspects. In S. May & D. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging organizational communication theory and research: Multiple perspectives.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cheney, G. (1983a). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification. *Communication monographs,* 50 (4), 342-63.

Cheney, G. (1983b). The rhetoric of identification and the study of organizational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 69* (2), 143-59.

Cheney, G. (1985). Speaking of who "we" are: The development of the U.S. Catholic Bishops' pastoral letter *The Challenge of Peace* as a case study in identity, organization, and rhetoric. Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University.

Cheney, G. (1991). *Rhetoric in an organizational society: Managing multiple identities.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Cheney, G., & Christensen, L. (2001). Organizational identity: Linkages between internal and external communication. In *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication,* F. Jablin and L. Putnam (Eds.) (pp. 231-58). Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Cheney, G., & Tompkins, P. (1987). Coming to terms with organizational identification and commitment. *Central States Speech Journal, 38*, 1-15.

Chreim, S. (2001). Organizational identification during major change: The dynamics of dissociation and re-association. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* 2001, 1-6.

Chreim, S. (2002). Influencing organizational identification during major change: A communication-based perspective. *Human Relations, 55* (9), 1117-1138.

Church and State (2000). Utah Senate tries to crack down on polygamy. *Church and State, 53* (4), p. 22.

Church, R., Rowbotham, K., & Enns, J. (2005). Individual and organizational factors affecting volunteers' identification and satisfaction. Public and Nonprofit Conference Paper Abstracts. *Academy of Management Proceedings,* 1-31.

CNN (2008). Polygamist ranch raid climaxed with nonviolent protest at temple. April 11, 2008. Retrieved May 2, 2008 from http://www.cnn.com/2008/CRIME/04/10/polygamist.ranch/

CNN (2003). Elizabeth Smart found alive. March 13, 2003. Retrieved July 30, 2005, from http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/West/03/12/smart.kidnapping/

Cole, M, & Bruch, H. (2006). Organizational identity strength, identification, and commitment and their relationships to turnover intention: does organizational hierarchy matter? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27* (5), 585-605.

Colvard, K. (2002). Commentary: The psychology of terrorists. *British Medical Journal 324* (7333), 359.

Conrad, C. (1985). *Strategic organizational communication: Cultures, situations, and adaptations.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Conrad, C. (1988). Identity, structure, and communicative action in church decision making. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 27,* 345-61.

Conrad, C., & Millay, B. (2001). Confronting free market romanticism: Health care reform in the least likely place. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 29,* 153-70.

Cooley, H. (1902). Society and the individual. *Human Nature and the Social Order.* Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Crable, R. (1986). The organizational "system" of rhetoric: The influence of megatrends into the twenty-first century. In L. W. Hugenbert (Ed.), *Rhetorical studies honoring James L. Golden* (57-68). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Crable, R. (1990). Organizational rhetoric as the fourth great system: Theoretical, critical, and pragmatic implications. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 18* (2), 115-129.

Crable, R., & Vibbert, S. (1985). Managing issues and influencing public policy. *Public Relations Review, 11* (2), 3-17.

Czarniawska, B. (1997). Narratives of individual and organizational identities. *Communication Yearbook, 17,* 193-221. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds.). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Daiber, K. (2002). Mysticism: Troeltsch's third type of religious collectivities. *Social Compass, 49* (3), 329-41.

Deetz, S. (2005). Critical theory. In S. May and D. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging organizational communication theory and research: Multiple perspectives.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dennehy, R., Morgan, S., & Assenza, P. (2006). Thomas Paine: Creating the new story for a new nation. *TAMARA: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science, 5* (3/4), 183-92.

Detsch, A., & Miller, M. (1983). A clinical study of four Unification Church members. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 140* (6), 767-70.

DiSanza, J., & Bullis, C. (1999). "Everybody identifies with Smokey the Bear": Employee responses to newsletter identification inducements at the U.S. Forest Service. *Management Communication Quarterly, 12,* 347-99.

Doosje, B., Ellemers, N, & Spears, R. (1995). Perceived intragroup variability as a function of group status and identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31,* 410-36.

Dowhower, R. (1993). Guidelines for clergy. In *Recovery from cults,* M. Langone (Ed.). New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Durant, R., Gardner, C., & Taylor, K. (2006). Indexical antenarratives as invitational rhetoric. TAMARA: *Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science, 5* (3/4), 174-82.

Dutton, J., & Dukerich, J. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: Image and identity in organizational adaptation. *Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 517-54. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds.). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Dutton, J., Dukerich, J., & Harquail, C. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39,* 239-63.

Edwards, J., & Winkler, C. (1997). Representative form and the viaual ideograph: The Iwo Jima image in editorial cartoons. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 83* (3), 289-311.

Edwards, M., & Peccei, R. (2007). Organizational identification: Development and testing of a conceptually grounded measure. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 16* (1), 25-57.

Edwards, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A conceptual and operational review. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 7* (4), 207-30.

Elbedour, S, Bart, W., & Hektner, J. (2007). The relationship between monogamous/ polygamous family structure and the mental health of Bedouin Arab adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 30* (2), 213-30.

Elbedour, S., Abu-Bader, S., Onwuegbuzie, A., Abu-Rabia, A., & El-Aassam, S. (2006). The scope of sexual, physical, and psychological abuse in a Bedouin-Arab community of female adolescents: The interplay of racism, urbanization, polygamy family honor, and the social marginalization of women. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 30* (6), 577.

Elbedour, S., Bart, W., & Hektner, J. (2000). Scholastic achievement and family marital structure: Bedouin-Arab adolescents from monogamous and polygamous families in Israel. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 140* (4), 503-14.

Elbedour, S., Bart, W., & Hektner, J. (2003). Intelligence and family marital structure. The case of adolescents from monogamous and polygamous families among Bedouin Arabs in Israel. Journal of Social Psychology, 142 (1), 95-110.

El-Islam, M. (1975). Clinical bound neurosis in Qatari women. *Social Psychiatry, 10* (1), 25-29.

El-Islam, M. F. (1975). Clinical bound neurosis in Qatari women. *Social Psychiatry*, *10*(1), 25–29.

El-Islam, M. F. (1989). Collaboration with families for rehabilitation of schizophrenic patients and the concept of expressed emotion. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *79*(4), 303–307.

Elsbach, K., & Kramer, R. (1996). Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the Business Week rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41,* 442-76. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds.). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Espen, V., Al-Gazali, L., Bin-Othman, S., & About-Saleh, M. (1998). Mental health problems among schoolchildren in United Arab Emirates: Prevalence and risk factors. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 37* (8), 880-86.

Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations: On power, involvement, and their correlates.* New York: Free Press.

Farber, I. E., Harlow, H. F., & West, L. J. (1956). Brainwashing conditioning and DDD: Debility, dependency, and dread. *Sociometry, 20,* 271-295.

Ferraris, C., Carveth, R., & Parrish-Sprowl, J. (1993). Interface precision benchworks: A case study in organizational identification. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 21* (4), 343-357.

Finke, R., & Wittberg, P. (2000). Organizational revival from within: Explaining revivalism and reform in the Roman Catholic Church. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 39*(2):154-70.

Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. In K. M.. Rowland & G. K. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol 4). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Foote, N. N. (1951). Identification as the basis for a theory of motivation. *American Sociological Review, 16,* 14-21.

French, J., & Raven, B. (1968). The bases of social power. In *Group dynamics: Research and theory,* 3rd ed., D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.) (pp. 259-69). New York: Harper and Row.

Freud, S. (1930). Civilization and its discontents. In P. Gay (2005), *The Freud reader.* New York: W. W. Norton and Co.

Galanti, G. (1993). Reflections on "brainwashing." In *Recovery from cults: Help for victims of psychological and spiritual abuse,* M. Langone (Ed.) (pp. 66-72). New York: W. W. Norton.

George, C., Kaplan, N., & Main, M. (1996). Adult Attachment Interview. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley (3rd ed.).

Ghubash, R., Hamdi, E., & Bebbington, P. (1992). The Dubai community psychiatric survey, I. prevalence and socio-demographic correlates. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *27*(2), 53–61.

Ginzel, L, Kramer, R., & Sutton, R. (1993). Organizational impression management as a reciprocal influence process: The neglected role of the organizational audience. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 15,* 227-66. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M.

Schultz (Eds.). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). The arts of impression management. In *The presentation of the self.* London: Penguin Books. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds.). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Gossett, L. (2002). Kept at arm's length: Questioning the organizational desirability of member identification. *Communication Monographs, 69* (4), 385-405.

Grant (2004). Grant proposal for federal funds to support the Safety Net Committee. Unpublished manuscript given to me by Paul Murphy, director of communication in the Office of the Attorney General, August 15, 2007.

Hall, D., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. (1970). Personal factors in organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 15* (2), 176-190.

Hart, R. P. (1984). The functions of human communication in the maintenance of public values. In C. Arnold and J. W. Bowers (Eds.), *Handbook of rhetorical and communication theory* (pp. 749-91). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hassan, S. (2000). Releasing the bonds: Empowering people to think for themselves. Somerville, MA: Freedom of Mind Press.

Hassouneh-Phillips, D. (2001). Polygamy and wife abuse: A qualitative study of Muslim women in America. Health Care for Women International, 22, 735-48.

Hatch, M., & Schultz, M. (2002). The dynamics of organizational identity. *Human Relations, 55,* 989-1018. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hatch, M., & Schultz, M. (Eds). (2004). Introduction to *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hogg, M., & Terry, D. (2001). Social identity theory and organizational processes. In M. Hogg & D. Terry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts* (pp. 1-12). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Hope, A. (2006). Fully Warrior: Cooperative unity. *TAMARA: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science, 5* (1/2), 24-38.

Hougland, J., Shepard, J., & Wood, J. (1979). Discrepancies in perceived organizational control: Their incidence and importance in local churches. *Sociological Quarterly, 20* (Winter), 63-76.

Howard, R. (2005). Sustainability and radical rhetorical closure: The case of the 1996 "Heaven's Gate" Newsffroun Camnaien. *Journal of Communication and Religion, 28* (1), 99-130.

Hunter, E. (1951). Brainwashing in Red China. New York: Vanguard.

Jablonski, C. J. (1988). Rhetoric, paradox, and the movement for women's ordination in the Roman Catholic Church. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 74,* 164-83.

Johnson, B. (1975). A critical appraisal of the church-sect typology. *American Sociological Review, 22* (1), 88-92.

Johnstone, R. (1997). *Religion in society: A sociology of religion.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Joose, P. (2006). Silence, charisma, and power: The case of John de Ruiter. *Journal of Contemporary Religion, 21* (3), 355-71.

Karna, J., Juslin, H., Ahonen, V., & Hansen, E. (2001). Green advertising: Greenwash or a true reflection of marketing strategies? *GMI,* 33 (Spring), 59-70.

Kassing, J. (2000). Exploring the relationship between workplace freedom at speech, organizational identification, and employee dissent. *Communication Research Reports, 17* (4), 387-96.

Kaufman, H. (1960). *The forest ranger: A study in administrative behavior.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Kilzer, L. (2000). Polygamy and profit: Colorado amusement machines enrich Utah clan, while intermarriages make it bigger. *Denver Rocky Mountain News* (February 13), A-71+.

Kimball, C. (2002). *When religion becomes evil: Five warning signs.* New York: HarperCollins.

Kinsella, W. (2005). Rhetoric, action, and agency in institutionalized science and technology. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 14* (3), 303-310.

Kolodinsky, R., Giacalone, R., & Jurkiewicz, C. (2008). Workplace values and outcomes:

Exploring personal, organizational, and interactive workplace spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics, 81,* 465-80.

Knapp, D. (1998). Jonestown massacre + 20: Questions linger. November 18, 1998. Retrieved November 2, 2006 from http://www.cnn.com/US/9811/18/jonestown.anniv.01/

Kuhn, T., & Nelson, N. (2002). Reengineering identity: A case study of multiplicity and duality in organizational identification. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16* (1), 5-39.

Kuronen, M., Tienari, J., & Vaara, E. (2005). The merger storm recognizes no borders: An analysis of media rhetoric on a business manoeuvre. *Organization, 12* (2), 247-73.

Lalich, J. (2004). *Bounded choice: True believers and charismatic cults.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lammers, J., & Barbour, J. (2006). An institutional theory of organizational communication. *Communication Theory, 16* (3), 356-77.

Langone, M. (Ed.) (1993). Introduction. In *Recovery from cults: Help for victims of psychological and spiritual abuse.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Larson, G., & Pepper, G. (2003). Strategies for managing multiple organizational identifications. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16* (4), 528-58.

Lee, S. (1971). An empirical analysis of organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal, 14* (2), 213-226.

Levine, S., & Salter, N. (1976). Youth and contemporary religious movements: psychosocial findings. *Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 21,* 411-420.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method, and reality in social science. *Human Relations, 1,* 5-42.

Li, H., Huang, H., & Peng, W. (2003). Toward an integrated model of postmerger organizational identification. *Conference papers—International Communication Association,* 1-31.

Li, J., Xin, K., & Pillutla, M. (2002). Multi-cultural leadership teams and organizational identification in international joint ventures. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 13* (2), 320-37.

Lifton, R. (1995). Foreword to Singer, M. (1995). Cults in our midst: The continuing fight against their hidden menace. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lifton, R. (1961). Thought reform and the psychology of totalism. New York: Norton.

Lincoln, B. (1994). *Authority: Construction and Corrosion.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Liu, W., & Leung, B. (2002). Organizational revivalism: Explaining metamorphosis of China's Catholic Church. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 41* (1), 121-38.

Low, B. S. (1988). Measures of polygyny in humans. *Current Anthropology*, *29*(1), 189–194.

Mael, F. (1988). *Organizational identification: Construct redefinition and a field application with organizational alumni.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit.

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. (2001). Identification in work, war, sports, and religion: Contrasting the benefits and risks. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 31* (2), 197-222.

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13,* 103-23.

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. (1995). Loyal from day one: Biodata, organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers. *Personnel Psychology, 48,* 309-333.

Makanjuola, R.O. A. (1987). The Nigerian psychiatric patient and his family. *International Journal of Family Psychiatry*, *8*(1), 363–373.

Maneerat, N., Hale, C., & Singhal, A. (2005). The communication glue that binds employees to an organization: A study of organizational identification in two Thai organizations. *Asian Journal of Communication, 15* (2), 188-214.

Maneerat, N., Hale, C., Singhal, A. (2003). What binds employees to an organization? A study of organizational identification in two Thai organizations. *Conference Papers—International Communication Association,* 1-39.

Mansueto, A. (1988). Religion, solidarity, and class struggle: Marx, Durkheim, and Gramsci on the Religion Question. *Social Compass, 35* (2/3).

Mayo Clinic (2006). Domestic violence toward women: Recognize the patterns and seek help. Mayo Clinic Online Resources. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://www.mayoclinic.com/health/domestic-violence/WO00044

McGee, M. (1980). The ideograph: A link between rhetoric and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 66, 1-16.

McGuire, M. (1997). *Religion: The social context,* 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McKerrow, R. (1989). Critical rhetoric: Theory and praxis. *Communication Monographs, 50,* 91-111.

McMillan, J. J. (1982). The rhetoric of the modern organization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

McMillan, J. J. (1987). In search of the organizational persona: A rationale for studying organizations rhetorically. In L. Thayer (Ed.), *Organization—communication: Emerging perspectives II* (pp. 21-45). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Mead, G. (1934). The self. In *Mind, self, and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds.) (pp. 56-63). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Miller, V., Allen, M., Casey, M., & Johnson, J. (2000). Reconsidering the organizational identification questionnaire. *Management Communication Quarterly, 13* (4), 626-59.

Milne, M., Kearins, K., & Walton, S. (2006). Creating adventures in wonderland. The Journey of metaphor and environmental sustainability. *Organization, 13* (6), 801-39.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Moore-Emmett, A. (2004). *God's brothel.* San Francisco: Pince-Nez Press.

Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 4,* 224-47.

Mumby, D. (2004). Discourse, power, and ideology: Unpacking the critical approach. In *Sage handbook of organizational discourse,* D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Oswick, & L. Putnam (Eds.) (pp. 238-58). London: Sage.

Mumby, D. (2000). Common ground from the critical perspective: Overcoming binary oppositions. In *Perspectives on organizational communication: Finding common ground,* S. Corman and M. Poole (Eds.) (pp. 25-36). New York: Guilford.

Mumby, D. (1997). Modernism, postmodernism, and communication studies: A rereading of an ongoing debate. *Communication Theory, 7* (1, February), 1-28.

Mumby, D. K. (2001). "Power and politics." In *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods,* F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.) (pp. 49-54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mumby, D. (1988). *Communication and power in organizations: Discourse, ideology, and domination.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Mumby, D. (1987). The political function of narrative in organizations. *Communication Monographs, 54,* 113-27.

Mummendey, A., & Schreiber, H. J. (1984). "Different" just means "better": Some obvious and some hidden pathways to in-group favouritism. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 23,* 363-68.

Myers, S., & Kassing, J. (1998). The relationship between perceived supervisory communication behaviors and subordinate organizational identification. *Communication Research Reports, 15* (1), 71-81.

Nakra, R. (2006). Relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational identification: an empirical study. *Vision,* 10 (2), 41-51

National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH) (2006). Get educated: What is domestic violence? Retrieved August 1, 2006 from http://www.ndvh.org/educate/what_is_dv.html

Niebuhr, R. H. (1929). *The social sources of denominationalism.* New York: Henry Holt Publishing Company.

National Women's Health Information Center (NWHIC) (2005). Violence against women: Domestic and intimate partner violence. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://womenshealth.gov/violence/domestic

Ofshe, R., & Singer, M. T. (1986). Attacks on peripheral versus central elements of self and the impact of thought reforming techniques. *Cultic Studies Journal, 3*(1), 3-24.

Ono, K., & Sloop, J. (1995). The critique of vernacular discourse. *Communication Monographs, 62* (1, March), 19-46.

Oprah (2005). After the show: A porn star gone straight: The Traci Lords story. Retrieved July 30, 2005, from http://www.oprah.com/tows/after/200310/tows?after?2031009.jhtml

Osmond, A. (2007). Ideographic analysis and discourses of fear and pride. *Cultic Studies Review, 6 (1).*

Ouichi, W. (1981). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge.* New York: Avon.

Ozkan, M., Altindag, A., Oto, R., & Sentunali, E. (2006). Mental health aspects of Turkish women from polygamous versus monogamous families. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 52* (3), 214-20.

Patchen, M. (1965). Labor-management consultation at TVA: Its impact on employees. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 10* (2), 149-75.

Patchen, M. (1970). *Participation, achievement, and involvement on the job.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Peterson, T. (1990). Argument premises used to validate organizational change: Mormon representations of plural marriage. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 18* (2), 168-185.

Pinto, L, & Crow, K. (1982). The effects of size on other structural attributes of congregations within the same denomination. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 21* (4), 304-16.

Polygamy Primer (2006). The primer: Helping victims of domestic violence and child abuse in polygamous communities, M. Shurtleff and T. Goddard (Eds.). Available at www.attorneygeneral.utah.gov/polygamy/The Primer.pdf

Post, J., Ruby, K., & Shaw, D. (2002). The radical group in context: 2. Identification of critical elements in the analysis of risk for terrorism by radical group type. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, 25* (2), 101-26.

Pratt, M. (1998). To be or not to be? Central questions in organizational identification. In D. Whetten & P. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations* (pp. 171-207). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pratt, M., & Rafaeli, A. (1997). Organizational dress as a symbol of multilayered social identities. *Academy of Management Journal, 40,* 862-98. Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds.). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Pribble, P. T. (1990). Making an ethical commitment: A rhetorical case study of organizational socialization. *Communication Quarterly, 38* (2), 255-67.

Pruyn, A. De Jong, M., Bartels, J., & Douwes, R. (2005). Organizational identification during a merger—determinants of expected organizational identification. *Conference Papers—International Communication Association,* 1-23. same paper in *British Journal of Management*

Richardson, J. (1980). People's temple and Jonestown: A corrective comparison and critique. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 19* (3), 239-56.

Richter, A., West, M., van Dick, R., & Dawson, J. (2006). Boundary spanners' identification, intergroup contact, and effective intergroup relations. *Academy of Management Journal, 49* (6), 1252-1269.

Roach, K.D. (1998). Management view, power use, and affinity seeking: Effects on college student employee identification. *Communication Research Reports, 15* (4), 354-64.

Salt Lake City Government Agencies (2007). Unpublished list of government agencies participating in the Safety Net Committee. Given to me by Paul Murphy, director of communication in the Office of the Attorney General, August 15, 2007.

Salt Lake Tribune (2005). Search engine results: "polygamy" and "abuse." Retrieved July 27, 2005, from http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives

Schechter, S., & Edleson, J. (1999). Effective Intervention in Woman Battering & Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for policy and practice. Recommendations from the National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges, Family Violence Department. Reno, NV: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Retrieved July 12, 2006 from http://www.abuse.com/domestic_violence/Effective_Intervention_in_ Domestic_Violence.pdf

Schein, E. (1961). *Coercive persuasion: A socio-psychological analysis of the "brainwashing" of American civilization prisoners by the Chinese Communists.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Schneier, B. (2003). *Beyond fear: Thinking sensibly about security in an uncertain world.* Gottingen: Copernicus Books.

Schrodt, P. (2002). The relationship between organizational identification and organizational culture: Employee perceptions of culture and identification in a retail sales organization. *Communication Studies, 53* (2), 189-203.

Schwartz, H. (1987). Anti-social actions of committed organizational participants: An existential psychoanalytic perspective, *Organization Studies, 8,* 237-40.

Scott, C. (2005). It depends on who you're talking to . . . Predictors and outcomes of situated measures of organizational identification. *Conference papers—International Communication Association,* 1-39.

Scott, C. (2007). Communication and social identity theory: Existing and potential connections in organizational identification research. *Communication Studies, 58* (2), 123-38.

Scott, C. Corman, , & Cheney, G. (1998). Development of a structurational model of identification in the organization. *Communication Theory, 8* (3), 298-336.

Sheehan, M. (2005). Super Size Me: A comparative analysis of responses to crisis by McDonald's America and McDonald's Australia. In *Public Relations Issues and Crisis Management,* C. Galloway & K. Kwansah-Aidoo (Eds.) (pp. 1-12). London: CIPR.

Sheff, E. (2005). Polyamorous women, sexual subjectivity and power. n/,IJUJHKPY T

Sherman, J. D., & Smith, H. (1984). The influence of organizational structure on intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation. *Academy of Management Journal, 27* (4), 877-885.

Shurtleff, M. (2005). Unpublished manuscript version given to me by AG's office on June 9, 2005. Later published in *The Spectrum,* June 12, 2005.

Simon, H. (1997). *Administrative behavior,* 4th ed. New York: Free Press.

Singer, M. (2003). *Cults in our midst: The continuing fight against their hidden menace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Singer, M. (1982). The systematic manipulation of psychological and social influence. Paper presented at the Cult Awareness Network annual meeting, Washington, D.C., Oct. 23, 1982.

Sinha, D., & Bharat, S. (1985). Three types of family structure and psychological differentiation: A study among the Jaunsar-Bawar society. *International Journal of Psychology*, *20*, 693–708.

Sirkin, M., & Grellong, B. (1988). Cult vs. non cult Jewish families: Factors influencing conversion. *Cultic Studies Journal, 5* (1), 2-21.

Slocum, R. (2006). Anti-racist practice and the work of community food organizations. *Antipode, 38* (2), 327-49.

Smart, E., & Smart, L. (2003). *Bringing Elizabeth home: A journey of faith and hope.* New York: Doubleday.

Smidts, A., Pruyn, A., & Van Riel, C. (2001). The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal, 44* (5), 1051-62.

Snee, B. (2005). The spirit and the flesh: The rhetorical nature of The Last Temptation of Christ. *Journal of Media and Religion, 4* (1), 45-61.

Spero, M. (1984). Some pre- and post-treatment characteristics of cult devotees. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 58,* 749-50.

Sproule, J. M. (1989). Organizational rhetoric and the public sphere. *Communication Studies, 40,* 258-65.

Stahley, M., & Boyd, J. (2006). Winning is(n't) everything: The paradox of excellence and the challenge of organizational epideictic. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 34* (4), 311-30.

Steinberg, J. (2002). Groups push for coexistence. *Jewish News of Greater Phoenix,* 55 (15). Retrieved April 3, 2007, from http://www.jewishaz.com/jewishnews/021206/ groups.shtml

Strassmann, B. (1997). Polygyny as a risk factor for child mortality among the Dogon. *Current Anthropology, 38* (4), 688-95.

Tajfel, H. (1978). The achievement of group differentiation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 77-98). London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In *The social psychology of intergroup relations,* W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.) (pp. 24-35). Reprinted in M. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds.). (2004). *Organizational identity: A reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Tangirala, S.; Green, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2007). In the shadow of the Boss's boss: Effects of supervisors' upward exchange relationships on employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92* (2), 309-320.

Tanis, M. (2005). Organizational identification and the communication of identity: Effects of message characteristics. *Conference Papers—International Communication Association,* 1-21.

Taylor, J. R., Flanagin, A. J., Cheney, G., & Seibold, D. R. (2000). Organizational communication research: Key moments, central concerns, and future challenges. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.) (pp. 77-99), *Communication yearbook 24.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tompkins, P. K. (1987). Translating organizational theory: Symbolism over substance. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts & L. H. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective* (70-96). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tompkins, P., & Cheney, G. (1983). Making decisions in groups. *Communication Education, 32* (3), 362.

Tompkins, P. K. (1989). Organizational communication: The central tradition. *Spectra,* May.

Tompkins, P. (1984). Functions of communication in the organization. In C. Arnold & J. Bowers, *Handbook of rhetoric and communication theory* (659-713). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tompkins, P. K., & Wanca-Thibault, M. (2001). Organizational communication: Prelude and prospects. In *The New Handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods,* F. Jablin & L. Putnam (Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tompkins, P. K., Fisher, J. Y., Infante, D. A., & Tompkins, E. L. (1975). Kenneth Burke and the inherent characteristics of formal organizations: A field study. *Speech Monographs, 42,* 135-42.

Tracy, S. (2005). Locking up emotion: Moving beyond dissonance for understanding emotion labor discomfort. *Communication Monographs, 72* (3), 261-83.

Troeltsch, E. [1911] 1950. *The social teaching of the Christian churches,* Vols. I and II. New York: MacMillan.

Tseng, H., Chen, T., & Chen, F. (2005). Constructing and testing a model of trustworthiness, trust behavior, and organizational identification. *Journal of Nursing Research, 13* (4), 293-304.

Turner, J. C. (1978). Social comparison, similarity and in-group favouritism. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 235-50). London: Academic Press.

United States Department of Justice (2006). About domestic violence. Retrieved August 1, 2006 from http://www.usdoj.gov/ovw/domviolence.htm

Valsiner, J. (1989). Organization of children's social development in polygamic families. In J.Valsiner (Ed.), *Child development in cultural context* (67–86). Toronto: Hogrefe and Huber.

Van Dick, R. (2001). Identification in organizational contexts: Linking theory and research from social and organization psychology. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 3* (4), 265-83.

Van Dick, R., Ullrich, J., & Tissington, P. (2006). Working under a black cloud: How to sustain organizational identification after a merger. *British Journal of Management, 17,* 69-79.

Van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., Monden, L., & de Lima, F. (2002). Organizational identification after a merger: A social identity perspective. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 41* (2), 233-52

Van Maanen, J. (1978). People processing: Strategies of organizational socialization. *Organizational Dynamics, 7* (1), 19-36.

Van Riel, C. B. M., & Balmer, J. (1997). Corporate identity: The concept, its measurement and management. *European Journal of Marketing, 31* (5/6), 340-56.

Van Riel, C.B.M., Smidts, A., & Pruyn, A. (1994). ROIT: Rotterdam Organizational Identification Test. Working Paper, First Corporate Identity Conference, Department of Marketing, Strathclyde University, Glasgow, UK.

Vora, D., Kostova, T., & Roth, K. (2005). Antecedents of dual organizational identification among MNC subsidiary managers: An empirical test, *Academy of Management Proceedings,* 1-113.

Walby, S. (1989). Theorising patriarchy. *Sociology, 23* (2), 213-34.

Weber, M. (1978). Types of legitimate domination. Chapter 3 of *Economy and Society* (212-300). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weber, M. (1978). The sociology of religion. Chapter 6 of *Economy and Society* (399-634). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weick, K. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Welner, M. (2001). The cult of Al-Qaeda? *Forensic Panel Letter, 5* (10), 1-3.

West, L. J., & Langone, M. D. (1985). Cultism: A conference for scholars and policy makers. Summary of proceedings of the Wingspread conference on cultism, September 9-11. Weston, MA: American Family Foundation.

Whetten, D., & Godfrey, P. (Eds.). *Identity in organizations: Building theory through conversations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

White, D. R. (1988). Rethinking polygyny: Co-wives, codes, and cultural systems. *Current Anthropology*, *29*(4), 529–572.

Wiesenfeld, B., Raghuram, S., & Garud, R. (1999). Communication patterns as determinants of organizational identification in a virtual organization. *Organizational Science, 10* (6), 777-91.

Wong, D.B. (1984). *Moral relativity*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Yi, X., & Uen, J. (2006). Relationship between organizational socialization and organizational identification of professionals: Moderating effects of personal work experience and growth need strengths. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 10* (1), 361-71.

Zanoni, P., & Janssens, M. (2004). Deconstructing difference: The rhetoric of human resource managers' diversity discourses. *Organization Studies, 25* (1), 55-74.

Zimbardo, P., & Andersen, S. (1993). Understanding mind control: Exotic and mundane mental manipulations. In *Recovery from cults: Help for victims of psychological and spiritual abuse,* M. Langone (Ed.) (pp. 34-45). New York: W. W. Norton.