

Contradiction And The Carnival: A Study Of McGregor's Theory X And Theory Y
Framework Applied To Communication Within A Carnival Setting

Presented to the Faculty
Liberty University
School of Communication Studies

In
Partial Fulfillment of the
Master of Arts
In Communication

By
Ashley Dawn Johnston, B.S.
April 4, 2007

ABSTRACT

The following study addresses Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y management paradigm as applied toward carnival executives' (CEs) communication to employees and corporate culture. Fifteen CEs were interviewed and elicited narratives that held either Theory X or Theory Y paradigm. From the narratives it was discovered that most CEs held a Theory Y paradigm toward employees. However, it was also discovered that the Theory Y paradigm may be a result of increased use of foreign labor or a swing in the carnival industry itself.

For my dad, my favorite carney.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my Lord and Savior for His bountiful blessings and giving me the strength to do what I did not think was possible. Thank you.

I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to Dr. Faith Mullen who guided me through this journey and was always willing to make time for my every question. Dr. William Mullen, thank you for always keeping me positive and pushing me towards the mark. Dr. Clifford Kelly, I am so blessed to have met you this year. Everything that you do, from your great wisdom to light-hearted humor mirror what it means to be a follower of Christ. Thank you.

Thank you to my family who has and always will support me in my decisions. Your encouragement and input is always treasured and valued. Thank you Bob Johnson and the Outdoor Amusement Business Association for working with me on this project and offering all your resources. Thank you to my fellow graduate classmates and friends who kept me focused and calm during the past years.

Lastly, thank you John for always being there for me, listening to my every need and taking care of me through everything. You have always been a solid foundation on whom I could rely. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Chapter I: INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
Carnival	6
Theory X and Theory Y	9
Critical Views of McGregor's Theory	13
Theory X and Theory Y Communication	15
Organizational Culture and Values	17
Narratives	24
Narratives as Information Solicitation	26
Narratives in Organizations	29
Chapter III: METHODOLOGY	33
Chapter IV: RESULTS	37
Research Question 1	37
Research Question 2	64
Chapter V: DISCUSSION	93
References	104

INTRODUCTION

What child does not love a carnival? Most everyone can remember the days of their youth and are often able to recall the memories of the bright lights, sounds of screams and the smell of cotton candy, as well as remember the fun and excitement that only the carnival can bring. However, what if these memories were just that, memories? What if the carnival industry was to end? What if tomorrow's children did not have the opportunity to partake in the excitement that their parents remember? These possibilities are all too real for carnival owners today, as the industry may be nearing its demise.

The necessity for every business to operate well is essential. What drives a business is its ability to set a collective goal, to aim for that goal and to achieve the goal. However, organizations can be hindered en route to achieving these corporate goals if values are not aligned between employee and employer. In the case of the carnival, hindrances to goal achievement may be present that are contributing to its decline. Yet, even when both employee and employer see the same goal, a lack of communication between the two may be a reason for the failure. While an employer may think that he or she is communicating in such a way that creates a goal oriented environment for the employee they may in fact be decreasing the likelihood of this goal attainment. In other words, the employee view may be much different than that of the employer. A better alignment of goals and communication could create a more streamlined enterprise.

Being the daughter of a carnival owner, I have had ample involvement in the carnival industry and have noticed the tendency for many shows to adopt a very autocratic style of management. This is similar to Douglas McGregor's Theory X style of management which views employees as being forced to work due to the lack of a work

ethic and in need of structure as opposed to his Theory Y style, which views employees as internally motivated and wanting to work (2006). Before I began this study, I conducted several preliminary interviews, and learned from these interviews an interesting contradiction that sustained my curiosity for this study.

While examining these two types of mindsets within the carnival industry I wanted to evaluate the communication that the managers used in describing their employees to see if any presuppositions would be revealed concerning those employees. Did they subscribe to a Theory X style or a Theory Y style? Additionally, I looked at all forms of communication as evidence of this mindset, whether it was from the actual vocal communication that was offered from the participating managers and show owners, or the actual tasks that were assigned to the employee.

In these preliminary interviews, the qualitative method of data collection, used, was that of phone interviews, as they are “systematic and planned” (Keyton, 2006, p. 271) and are able to produce extensive amounts of data. Since I have been involved within the industry for such a long period of time, I have befriended many and have connections to different show owners and managers. The show owners and managers that I interviewed beforehand were all California based. Two owned their own carnivals and the third was in the process of purchasing his first carnival show. These preliminary interviews lasted approximately 20 to 30 minutes each, and since I was already acquainted with these participants they were eager and willing to help in my interview session. Additionally, because we were already familiar with each other, there was an immediate openness and friendliness during the preliminary interview sessions.

The questions that were asked sought to delve into the daily lives of managers to accurately portray the communication taking place between management and employee. In some instances, new questions were formed when the participants opened the interview to new areas of interest. The questions asked were the following: Please describe a typical carnival employee. Please run through an average day on the show. How do you tell your employees to complete their tasks for the day? How do you get your employees to complete their tasks? How do you correct your employees? Please describe the workplace atmosphere. What happens in staff meetings? In every case no questions were asked in order to lead the participants toward certain answers.

Rather than having a Theory X frame of mind towards their employees, as I had anticipated, these managers viewed their employees from a Theory Y frame of mind, which portrayed employees as hardworking and enjoying work (McGregor, 2006). However, after further analysis of these preliminary interviews, management communicated to their employees in a Theory X frame of mind, rather than the Theory Y approach that they thought of them in. This fascinated me. Why the contradiction between cognitive values and actual communication? Further probing into the topic was necessary to come to any type of conclusion. If the carnival industry currently leans more towards a Theory X style of management one must ask whether Theory Y style of management would be more beneficial in preventing further decline in the industry. Such is the case for the carnival. To understand the corporate culture would be to look into the minds of its employees and see exactly how employees are being communicated to, whether it is from a Theory X or Theory Y framework.

One way to view the culture and the values held by employees is through narrative. Narrative is a means by which one can take meaning from stories and apply it to a person's reality to gain insight. Once the values are captured from the narratives they can be compared against what really happens to see if it is consistent. Additionally, since interviews produce extensive amounts of information, ample data will be collected (Keyton, 2006).

But why is all this important to the carnival industry? Meyer (1995) answers this question by stating that "knowledge of an organization's values and how they are advocated in narratives will help to make sense of the organization to its members, as well as suggest new ways to advocate organizational development and change" (p. 212).

The goal of this project is to view the corporate culture regarding the values held by those involved in the carnival industry and to see if they correspond with the actions of the carnival management. These values will be gathered through narrative analysis and clustered in order to uncover the values present in the organization. Once uncovered, a comparison to McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y frame of mind will be analyzed to see exactly how employers view their employees. The research questions and hypotheses are as follows:

RQ1: Do managers communicate to or think of their employee's in a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm as elicited through narratives?

Hypothesis 1 – Managers will communicate to their employees through a Theory X paradigm.

Hypothesis 2 - Managers will think of their employees through a Theory Y paradigm.

RQ2: Do the values embedded in the stories told by the carnival's members communicate a corporate culture that embody a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm?

Hypothesis 3 - Corporate values will reflect a Theory X paradigm rather than Theory Y as the corporate culture.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Carnival Review

A review of the carnival industry is complicated due to the difficulty in locating extensive information on the subject. The only academic writing located on the carnival explored the linguistics of the jargon on carnival shows with the objective to create a current dictionary of carnival terms at the time (Adams, 1984). This study had the tendency to portray the image of the carnival in a negative light and referenced some of the objectives of workers involved as “duping the outsiders or to the running of illicit operations” (Adams, 1984, p.4). While this type of negative portrayal along with a negative stereotype from the public may have been common on certain shows or in the past it currently makes for a difficult label to overcome.

Currently, the carnival industry is going through difficult times, as many traveling shows are finding that they are unable to make a profit due to the economy, increased fuel costs and weather (Powell, 2004). However, this may soon change due to an influx of new additions in the carnival industry adding insight and fresh perspectives (Vita, 2004). In addition, the carnival industry has little written work dedicated to it. Just recently, one of the most prominent carnival trade publishers stopped publishing its magazine, *Amusement Business*, due to the absence of demand for the product. Also, it is important to note the difference between the carnival industry and the amusement park industry. The carnival industry is comprised of traveling carnival rides such as Merry Go Rounds and Ferris Wheels that move from location to location. The amusement park industry however, consists of amusement rides in a stationary park setting.

However, author Joe McKennon has published three volumes of carnival history in which a general summary of the carnival is written. In McKennon's book *A Pictorial History of the American Carnival Volume III* (1981), he describes the carnival industry in the following manner:

First conceived in 1893 back of Buffalo Bills's Wild West Show on the dirty streets of Chicago, the sturdy gem of the American Carnival survived a couple of still births, several miscarriages and an abortion or two. Finally in 1899, fathered by a complete outsider, a town mark, she was born full-blooded and ready for action. Action that was destined to thrill and shock and change the amusement pattern of all North America as her midways were set up on the streets, the fair grounds and the cow pastures of the continent. Now a doughty dowager of seventy-two, she vainly tries to sweep some of her mischievous misdeeds of the past out of sight under her new spectacular rides, or to hide under her full skirts of middle class respectability the full-bodied earthy charm that has made her favorite "girl friend" of so many millions. There is much life in the old Gal, and she is bound to kick up her heels now and then. Don't despair over her, she will be here a long, long time as roguish and rowdy as ever. (p. 11)

McKennon portrays an image of the carnival being a tough and surviving industry. He then takes a step further to describe the typical carnival worker through the eyes of a local as a "shiftless show bum who will do anything to keep from working" (p. 53). However, he defends them as well: "in spite of the fact that the 'shiftless show bum' has more invested in his ride or show than the townner [*sic*] will earn in his life time. And, that he

works many sixteen and eighteen hour shifts of hard labor to keep his business” (p. 52).

He turns the outsider’s view of a carnival worker from lazy to hardworking.

In addition to McKennon’s description of a typical carnival worker, William Naylor, a carnival employee in the early 20th century, sums the carnival employee up even more accurately:

When a man’s in the carnival business it’s a good deal like when he’s playing the races; he’s either in the mazuma big or he’s on his heels and washing his own shirts. There doesn’t seem to be any half-and-half spot he can land in. He’s either broke or flush; he either makes it fast or don’t make it at all. But that don’t mean that a real carnival man is ever on the town. He keeps a front and eats... not because it is handed to him from a back door or in a bread-line, but because he figures out some way to make it on his own. You don’t see any genuine old time carnival bird working the street for a dime, or picking up crumbs from a kitchen back door. They’re independent and even if they’re down to the last two-bits you’d never know it by looking at them, or hear it from their own lips. They might do a lot of cussing in private; to themselves, but never a hard-luck story to the outsiders... they’ve always got some kind of an idea tucked back in their head that they can pull out and turn into ham and egg money somehow. Even if the show goes flat, they’ll raise tickets to the next burg someway and that without passing the public collection plate. And they’ll raise it on the square... according to the “ethics” of the profession which is “give the suckers nothing... for their money, but when you give them nothing... you give them something!” (Bowman, pp. 1-2)

The image portrayed by Naylor depicts the carnival worker as being self sufficient, proud, original, independent, a bit rough around the edges and clever. How these characteristics play into the attitudes of the corporate culture will be seen through narratives. Using these stories and drawing out the Theory X and Theory Y management styles will ultimately be the goal. Additionally, the lack of research on the industry itself creates the need for this study.

McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

Past research points out that the human relations movement stirred McGregor's development of the Theory X and Theory Y view of mankind. The human relations movement stated that "people respond primarily to their social environment, that motivation depends more on social needs than on economic needs, and that satisfied employees work harder than unsatisfied employees" (Moorhead & Griffin, 2004, p. 11). McGregor states in his theories two beliefs about mankind and the extent to which managers view these beliefs. One side of his view, Theory X, sees man as lazy and needing authority to become an efficient worker. The other side, Theory Y, sees the opposite, that one is willing and wanting to work and to achieve his or her maximum output (McGregor, 1960, 1967; McGregor & Cutcher-Gershenfeld, 2006).

McGregor's (1960) theories are based upon his belief that "successful management depends – not alone, but significantly – upon the ability to predict and control human behavior" (p. 4). The first portion of Theory X states that the typical worker naturally dislikes and usually tries to avoid work (McGregor, 1960, 1967, McGregor & Cutcher-Gershenfeld, 2006). Additionally, "because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed,

threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives” (McGregor, 1960, p.34). McGregor is in turn saying that not even rewards will keep employees focused on completing their work, but only threats will force employees to focus on completing work.

The last point McGregor (1960) makes in relation to the Theory X frame of mind is that “the average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, [and] wants security above all” (p. 34). This mind set of the Theory X manager gives little if any responsibility to the employee and denies the employee any capability to pursue greatness. Overall, the Theory X approach views the worker as “time, energy, and interest that has been purchased” (Osgood, 1981, p. 224). McGregor (1960) points out that Theory X motivation, while productive in situations where the worker is struggling to survive, is usually counterproductive as most human beings have the need to satisfy their longing to build self-esteem, reputation as well as the need to achieve.

This brings us to McGregor’s Theory Y approach to viewing mankind. McGregor relates six points to the Theory Y framework of mind. The first is that “the expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest” (McGregor, 1960, p. 47). What McGregor points out in this statement is that work comes as naturally to people as does the need for enjoyment. Without this fulfillment of work, there would still be a hole that the worker would need to fill in order to feel complete, because the employee enjoys work.

The second point states, “external control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise

self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed” (McGregor, 1960, p.47). What McGregor says here is that workers do not necessarily need to be threatened in order to complete tasks. Rather, one will complete tasks to fulfill the commitment he or she made when taking on the assignment.

Thirdly, McGregor continues, noting, “commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement” (McGregor, 1960, p. 47). McGregor makes the point in this statement that the most fulfilling goals are goals of a self-satisfying nature. These goals, such as achievement, ultimately contribute to the goals of the organization.

As McGregor (1960) continues to give the overall picture of the optimistic view of human nature in Theory Y, his fourth point states “the average human being learns under proper conditions, not only to accept, but to seek responsibility. Avoidance of responsibility, lack of ambition, and emphasis on security are generally consequences of experience, not inherent human characteristics” (p. 48). In this sense, bad habits, such as avoidance of responsibility, are not inborn characteristics, but learned through past experiences.

The fifth aspect pertaining to Theory Y is the worker’s “capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population” (McGregor, 1960, p. 48). While most Theory X managers would assume workers have little ability to provide input in any type of creative problem solving in organizational issues, Theory Y assumes the opposite, that the common man does have the ability to overcome difficult obstacles and is willing to give him the chance to use this ability.

The last point McGregor (1960) makes in defining the Theory Y framework is that “under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized” (p. 48). If given the opportunity, McGregor argues that the average human will rise to meet the challenges if his or her supervisor will grant it.

McGregor (1960) states further in his book that organizational problems are not due to the employee’s inability to work or be productive in problem solving, but the inability of management to realize the full potential of all employees. Overall, the Theory Y frame of mind looks at the human being as working for the organization and placing value on the person. When the worker feels this appreciation, they in turn increase in their productivity and lessen the need for authoritative measures. This development creates a more productive and better way to attain positive results from employees (Osgood, 1981, p. 225). However, McGregor (1960) does not deny the need for authority and deems it necessary to give direction and instruction.

McGregor (1966) also discusses the aspect of motivation in regard to Theory Y in that workers are more productive and more satisfied with internal motivation. He bases this assumption on Abraham Maslow’s five levels of hierarchical needs: physiological needs and safety needs, social needs, ego needs and self actualization needs (McGregor, 1966; Moorhead & Griffin, 2004). While physiological and safety needs are usually satisfied sooner, the need for social, ego and self actualization fulfillment is what keeps employees motivated. He states that while management may be able to use a “carrot and stick theory” to motivate employees regarding physiological and safety needs, it will only last for a certain length of time. Eventually the worker will reach need fulfillment and

need to attain his or her social, ego and self actualization needs. The Theory Y manager will be aware of these needs and provide a workplace atmosphere that fosters the employee's attainment of social, ego and self actualization needs (McGregor, 1966).

McGregor (1960) delves deeper into Theory X and Y by discussing the principles involved:

The central principle of organization which derives from Theory X is that of direction and control through the exerciser of authority – what has been called “the scalar principal.” The central principle which derives from Theory Y is that of integration: the creation of conditions such that the members of the organization can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise. (p. 49)

These beliefs about mankind that any supervisor holds directly influences the way the manager in question conducts him or herself in regards to the employee. McGregor (1967) is quick to point out that Theory X and Y are not in the least way managerial strategies, but ultimately influence the way they will conduct their management techniques within the corporate culture.

Critical Views of McGregor's Theory

Studies in relation to the application and observations of McGregor's Theory X and Y views of mankind have been conducted and have shed some additional light on this topic. McGregor's research has also been questioned for its practicality and usefulness. For instance, William Reddin (1969) thought that he did not develop his ideas far enough (p. 14). In fact, he states that McGregor, along with others in the same

category, are excellent for describing certain types of management issues, but are ineffective in teaching one how to change the behavior that is being described (p. 15).

However, Paul Hersey and C. A. Keller (1968) take an opposite view of Reddin's as to the usefulness of applying the Theory Y style of management to organizations. In their implementation of Theory Y they devised different areas of application in the field of sales, which can be applied to other organizations as well. The first area of application of Theory Y to an organization is that of defining the company's goal (Hersey & Keller, 1968). They argue that without defining the goal to the company's employees, the employee will not be capable of understanding how their efforts contribute overall to the organization. After the goal is defined, the role of the manager is to be re-examined. They also point out that one of the most influential parts of changing the role of the manager is to "enable people to evaluate their own progress" (p. 5). For a supervisor coming from a Theory X frame of mind, this type of transition will take a great amount of effort. Additionally, Hersey and Keller point out that this change needs to be implemented slowly and managers must be familiar with the philosophies to which they are changing (p. 6). The key element of commitment, along with the necessity of having committed employees to the new plan is also touched upon. After one has the commitment from the employees, the goals must be set and the manager must be readily available to help in the completion of these goals through open communication.

Feedback also plays an essential role. Hersey and Keller point out that in order for a Theory Y frame of mind to be adopted by all, open communication and feedback must be embraced by all areas of the corporation (1968). Finally, Hersey and Keller (1968) stress the importance of open communication and review of the newly established

groundwork. The implementation of a Theory Y frame of mind will continue to reinforce the idea that each employee is an important part of the organization and should improve the organization's productivity as a whole.

Theory X and Y Communication

Theory X and Y are communicated not only through the words used by employers and employees, but through the actions that managers use when dealing with their employees. These actions rely on “rewards, promises, incentives, or threats and other coercive devices” and especially controlling tactics to accomplish tasks (McGregor, 1960, p. 42). He continues stating that Theory X managers will view their employees as “lazy, indifferent, unwilling to take responsibility, intransigent, uncreative, [and] uncooperative” (p. 48). When employees perceive those attitudes and behaviors as the management's view of their abilities and work, they act accordingly. McGregor discusses the type of actions which are communicated by employees when not given the chance to attain potential in the workplace.

People, deprived of opportunities to satisfy at work the needs which are now important to them, behave exactly as we might predict – with indolence, passivity, unwillingness to accept responsibility, resistance to change, willingness to follow the demagogue, unreasonable demands for economic benefits. (p. 42)

According to McGregor (1960) there is a strategy in applying Theory Y and communicating it to employees: “(1) clarification of the broad requirements of the job, (2) the establishment of specific ‘targets’ for a limited time period, (3) the management process during the target period, [and] (4) appraisal of the results” (p. 62). Employees who work in a Theory Y frame of mind will communicate this by “exercis[ing] self

direction and self control in the achievement of organizational objectives to the degree that they are committed to those objectives” (p. 56). Finally, McGregor points out that there will be high levels of influence from managers towards employees, but none that would resemble control.

In relation to ethics, communication and McGregor’s theories, James Neuliep (1987) discovered two opposite compliance gaining strategies when dealing with subordinates in relation to Theory X and Y. He states that “managers with a Theory X orientation prefer anti-socially oriented message strategies such as threat, deceit, and aversive stimulation... on the other hand, individuals with a Theory Y orientation prefer esteem and ingratiation” (p. 14). He goes on to state the importance of these findings as a way to create effective communication between the employer and employee. Furthermore, Neuliep states that the style of Theory X, threatening, deceitful and aversive, sends messages to the subordinate that are the causes of conflict and reduction of employee satisfaction.

In other studies, Neuliep (1996) discovered that those managers who embrace either Theory X or Theory Y frames of mind do not differ on the subject of perceptions of unethical messages in organizational settings. He found that those who embraced the Theory X frame of mind viewed unethical behavior such as coercive, destructive, deceptive, intrusive, secretive and manipulative messages as a better way to handle their subordinates (Neuliep, 1996). One must ask the question: could a subordinate who views his or her manager as accepting this type of behavior better improve in the workplace and the workplace atmosphere if their supervisor was to discontinue such behavior?

In an article written by William Locander and David Luechauer (2005), the comparison of fear and hope was made as related to Theory X and Theory Y, with fear being compared to Theory X and hope to Theory Y. In this study, they examined some of the messages that were communicated with Theory X and fear: spending more time following rules rather than improving them, more dependence on control than rewards, looking for problems in oneself and others, the need to be in control, pressure to impress, busyness, dependence on substances to calm down and validation from external approval such as attainment of degrees and awards. On the other hand, those who are driven by Theory Y and the idea of hope, communicate through: discussion and enhancing of visions, focusing on positive aspects of oneself rather than negative, are peaceful within the workplace, are helpful to others, can calmly handle times of distress within the organization, are not ashamed of not knowing answers, relax when needed, meet the expectations of oneself and not others, and reward oneself.

Organizational Culture and Values

Although Theory X and Theory Y Communication is an important part of this study, organizational culture and values are also related to the area of study. Moorhead and Griffin (2004) define the organizational culture as “the set of values that helps the organization’s employees understand which actions are considered acceptable and which are unacceptable” (p. 496). According to Davis and Jasinski (1993), when one is able to understand the culture that they are in, they are better able to understand how those involved in that culture make sense of reality, even when this culture is an organization. If one is able to elicit this information from organizational cultures they can better understand the organization as a whole.

In their influential work *Cultural Organization: Fragments of a Theory* John Van Maanen and Stephen Barley discuss how cultures range from large societies to small corporations by identifying similar aspects and applying these aspects to each; “cultural manifestations therefore evolve over time as members of a group confront similar problems, and in attempting to cope with these problems, devise and employ strategies that are remembered and passed on to new members” (1985, p. 33). By taking this aspect and applying it to various groups, whether an organization, club or society, one can view culture by seeing the “living, historical product of group problem solving” (p. 33).

Michael Pacanowsky and Nick O'Donnell-Trujillo, a few scholars of organizational behavior, conducted a study in which they discovered five reasons to study organizations: the ripeness of the field of study, the need to create an overall picture of the organization, the study of and centrality of communication, the contrast of traditional organizational studies and lastly, to broaden the research on organizational communication (1982, pp. 128-130).

Additional studies conducted by Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo furthered development by identifying characteristics and views apparent within the organizational culture. The first concept they looked at was communication as performance within organizations (1982). These performances for those who are involved within the organization have two definitions, theatrical and reality based. Theatrical performances represent those actions which are overemphasized and explain why one will act differently depending upon the situation (1983). Reality based performances “are those very actions by which members constitute and reveal their culture to themselves and to others” and how one makes reality complete (p. 131).

In order for organizational performances to be classified as organizational performance, Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1983) identify four characteristics which must be present. The first characteristic is that organizational performances are interactional and must have at least two members participating in the performance (Littlejohn, 2002). Another characteristic is the contextual nature of organizational performances, in that the performances that occur are embedded in the organizational culture and must be looked at in those regards (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). Third, performances must have distinguishable beginnings, middles and ends, making them episodes. The final characteristic that the researchers identify is the improvisational nature of performances in that they are never memorized, but rather “loosely scripted performances” (pp. 134-135).

As Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1983) continue, they list a number of ways to discuss organizational communication performances: rituals, passion, sociality, organizational politics and enculturation. Rituals can be anything from corporate meetings to an employee's personal way of completing a task. These rituals are divided into four categories: personal, task, social and organizational. Personal rituals are ways that individuals “develop their own unique ways of doing things... these unique ways become endowed with a social significance that elevates them to the status of personal ritual” (p. 135). The personal rituals that one may involve himself in eventually become synonymous with that person and thereby create personal identity. The second ritual, task ritual, is basically the daily routines and tasks that must be accomplished in order for the person to be considered a worker (p. 136). The most important type of ritual is the social ritual, which Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo refer to as having “lubricated the

organizational machinery” and make “working livable” (p. 137). Additionally, social rituals help identify status between group members and create identity for those members. The last ritual is the organizational ritual, or events that incorporate all group members and reveal the organizational culture such as company picnics, board meetings, ceremonies and so forth.

The second way to discuss organizational communication performance is through the passion in which employees discuss their jobs. While the job may consist of monotonous activities, if employees view these jobs with excitement through stories, vocabularies or metaphors, passion is communicated (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). In other words, passion refers to the excitement and vivid way stories are told over and over again in an organization that create meanings and make the organization exciting.

The third way of discussing organizational communication performance is through the society of the organization and how the members in that society view and obey the rules and etiquette of behavior they have created. These performances of sociality are divided into four groups: “courtesies, pleasantries, sociabilities and privacies” (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983, p. 140). Courtesies are the sincere and kind ways that those involved in an organization show courtesy to one another. Pleasantries are known as ways for those involved in an organization to communicate to each other and self disclose in non threatening ways through “chatter” or “small talk” (p. 140). Sociabilities are defined as “performances such as joking, gossiping... and ‘talking shop’ where the performance implies a certain level of intimacy that guarantees that the discussion will be understood appropriately (p. 141). Lastly, privacies are those

communications that must occur within private such as employee feedback or constructive criticism.

In their fourth way to discuss organizational communication performances, Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo turn to politics. Politics within the organization deal with power issues that can be dealt with through three different ways: showing personal strength, creating allies and bargaining with other members of the organization (1983, p. 142).

Their final way of discussing organizational communication performances is through enculturation. Enculturation “refers to those processes by which organizational members acquire the social knowledge and skills necessary to behave as competent members” (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983, p. 143). This process of enculturation is not only limited to new members of the organization but apply to all members learning of the organization throughout their duration of employment.

Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo (1983) sum up their research on organizational communication and tie together the implications on what they have learned:

As organizational members engage in the communicative performances of organizational life, they reveal through their implicit or explicit commentaries on those performances the ways of making sense in their particular culture. In the same way, as members perform the ritual of the culture, they reveal the particular temporality of the place. As they perform the passions of the culture, they reveal the particular drama of the place. As they perform the socialites of the culture, they reveal the particular smoothness of the place. And, as they perform the politics of the culture, they reveal the particular strategies of the place. As these

revelations continue to be interpreted and reinterpreted, the newcomer and veteran (and the observer) can come to appreciate the subtleties of organizational culture.

(p. 145)

Also, they stress the importance on the “focus on communication as performance, and not simply as a display of underlying attitudes, beliefs, knowledge or strategies of the culture” (p. 146).

Mary Strine and Pacanowsky (1985) continued research on organizations in their article *How to read interpretive Account of Organizational Life: Narrative Bases of Textual Authority* and stressed the necessity of using an interpretive approach to processing data from organizations (p. 283). Additionally, when using this type of approach, the reader must be aware that there is no correct or best way to view organizational life, but rather that as reader he or she must be able to arrange and view all dialogue between organizational members to view the various degrees of that organization (1985). From this interpretive approach sprung two schools of thought; the first, how communication creates and interprets organizations and the second, how the organization is full of power and pushing certain issues at the expense of others (Littlejohn, 2004; Mumby, 1993).

Van Maanen and Barley (1995) continue with the research on corporate culture and define the four basic domains of the organizational culture, which are the ecological context, differential interaction, collective understanding and the individual domain. The first domain, ecological context, is best described by Van Maanen and Barley as “the attributes of the group’s physical setting, the pertinent historical forces, and most importantly the expectations, demands, and social organization of those who surround the

group and who lay claims on the group's conduct" (p. 34). In regard to differential interaction, the authors point out how the interaction that exists within a group to form a culture must vary to the extent of those who are not in that group. The third domain is that of collective understanding, or the knowledge and "interpretation of objects, events, and activities" (p. 34) where only those who are members of that culture are able to understand through interaction with other group members. The fourth and most important domain is that of the individual. Van Maanen and Barley state the importance of the individual by acknowledging that culture is carried within individuals and from that standpoint individuals sustain and pass along this culture. Additionally, members of a culture bring along with them new information which will add and alter cultures. Once people are established in their culture or group, they will observe these various domains and act accordingly.

The culture of an organization is not necessarily only formed by employees, but also through the base values and structure on which the organization was founded. In regard to the principles and values that are established by executives within organizations, Deal and Kennedy (2000) discovered that: "companies succeed because their employees can identify, embrace, and act on the values of the organization" (p. 21). Additionally, they "provide a sense of common direction for all employees and guidelines for their day to day behavior" (p. 21).

If values of the carnival reflect a Theory X type management style of assumptions of employee laziness and a forcible nature of work, then the attitude will flourish within this culture. However, in essence, if employees see the potential that their employers see in them, they may, in turn, live up to those standards.

Narratives

Now that there has been an overview of Theory X and Theory Y and corporate culture, the effectiveness of information gathered from narratives, or better known as story telling, must be discussed. In Fisher's (1987) seminal work that originated the Narrative Paradigm Theory, *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*, he states that:

Human beings are inherently storytellers who have a natural capacity to recognize the coherence and fidelity of stories they tell and experience. I suggest that we experience and comprehend life as a series of ongoing narratives, as conflicts, characters, beginnings, middles and ends. (p. 24)

Fisher argues that every type of communication can be viewed as a story. He goes on to discuss the five ideas that lay the foundation of his theory:

(1) Humans are essentially storytellers. (2) The paradigmatic mode of human decision making and communication is "good reasons," which vary in form among situations, genres, and media of communication. (3) The production and practice of good reasons are ruled by matters of history, biography, culture and character... (4) Rationality is determined by the nature of persons as narrative beings – their inherent awareness of *narrative probability*, what constitutes a coherent story, and their constant habit of testing *narrative fidelity*, whether or not the stories they experience ring true with the stories they know to be true in their lives... (5) The world as we know it is a set of stories that must be chosen among in order for us to live life in a process of continual re-creation. (pp. 64-65)

Fisher (1987) defines what entails a narrative, “symbolic actions—words and/or deeds—that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create, or interpret them... not... a fictive composition whose propositions may be true or false and have no necessary relationship to the message of that composition” (p. 58).

Em Griffin (2000) gives the following definition of narration:

Narration is communication rooted in time and space. It covers every aspect of our lives and the lives of others in regard to character, motive and action. The term also refers to every verbal or nonverbal bid for a person to believe or act in a certain way. Even when a message seems abstract—is devoid of imagery—it is narration because it is embedded in the speaker’s ongoing story that has a beginning, middle and end, and it invites listeners to interpret its meaning and assess its values for their own lives. (p. 297)

“Paradigm” can be defined as the conceptual framework in which the stories exist.

Griffin elaborates: “a paradigm is a universal model which calls for people to view events through a common interpretive lens” (p. 297).

In determining the reasonability of whether stories elicited from individuals are probable, one must depend upon the narrative coherence, or the likelihood that the story fits together (Griffin, 2000). Additionally, the listener will also be likely to believe the story when he or she identifies with the story’s “good reasons” (Fisher, 1984, p. 8). As defined by Fisher (1987) a reason is good if “those elements that provide warrants for accepting or adhering to the advice fostered by any form of communication that can be considered rhetorical” (p. 107). Fisher also lists five components which “good reasons” will revolve around:

Whether the statements in a message that purport to “facts” are indeed “facts”... whether relevant “facts” have been omitted and whether those that have been offered are in any way distorted are taken out of context... one recognizes and assesses the various patterns of reasoning, using mainly standards from informal logic... one assesses the relevance of individual arguments to the decision the message concerns... whether or not the message directly addresses the ‘real’ issues in the case. (p.109)

Narratives as Information Solicitation

According to various authors one can look at all communication as narration (Fisher, 1987; Griffin 2000; Bochner 2002; Richardson, 1990). Additionally, according to Bochner (2002), “stories are the narrative frames within which we make our experiences meaningful” (p. 73).

Before one can use the narrative as a means to collect information, they must understand what it does. According to Feldman, Skoldberg, Brown and Horner (2004) stories can be:

Mined for information that is otherwise neglected, thrown out, or labeled as missing. What is unstated but implied may be missed, discounted, or difficult to articulate to others. We have found narrative analysis an important tool for recovering—some may say uncovering—meaning in data. Our method of narrative analysis provides us with a means of making explicit what storytellers say. (np)

Richardson (1990) also justifies the use of narratives as ways to understand people, “narrative is the best way to understand the human experience because it is the way

humans understand their own lives” (p. 133). Through stories one is able to uncover what the participant either may not want to discuss directly or may not know how.

Bochner (2002) gives five reasons as to why one should use narratives as a way of study: to understand the information elicited, to understand that the researcher is a part of the research, the necessity to understand that if we learn by stories we should study by them, the need to use new modes to understand interpersonal relationships, and to make connections between the writers and the readers.

Polkinghorne (2005) in his article *Language and Meaning: Data Collection in Qualitative Research* lists numerous ways to collect narrative data from interviewing to observation. He discusses the importance and purpose of data gathering:

The purpose of data gathering in qualitative research is to provide evidence for the experience it is investigating. The evidence is in the form of accounts people have given of the experience. The researcher analyzes the evidence to produce a core description of the experience. The data serve as the ground on which the findings are based. In constructing the research report, the researcher draws excerpts from the data to illustrate the findings and to show the reader how the findings were derived from the evidential data. (p. 138)

Additionally, Hirokawa, DeGooyer and Valde (2000) pull from Polkinghorne’s (1988) book *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*, and discuss how experiences that happen to people exist mainly mentally. When trying to pull from the mental realm, narrative accounts work the best (Polkinghorne, 1988 as cited in Hirokawa, DeGooyer & Valde, 2000). According to Riessman (1993), narratives are told when participant’s

reality do not match up to their intended idealized lives. Narratives allow the person to try to make a reality out of their imperfect worlds (Riessman, 1993).

In his article *Toward a Logic of Good Reason*, Fisher (1978) defines good reasons as “those elements that provide warrants for accepting or adhering to the advice fostered by any form of communication that can be considered rhetorical... a reason is good if it is tied to a value and a value is reasonable if it is tied to a reason” (p. 378). In his book, Fisher (1987) defines what entails a narrative as “symbolic actions-words and/or deeds- that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create, or interpret them... not... a fictive composition whose propositions may be true or false and have no necessary relationship to the message of that composition” (p. 58). In other words, while a person’s story may not be logical to the outside world, however looking at it as a story in relation to others, there indeed is sense involved.

Within Fisher’s narrative paradigm are two tests to determine whether narratives will be accepted. The first is narrative coherence, or whether the story teller has told a complete story where characters act according to how they are perceived (Griffin, 2000). The second test is the narrative fidelity. Narrative fidelity represents the extent to which listeners are able to relate to the story being told and value that is obtained (Griffin, 2000).

Carver (2006) cites Hirokawa, Clausen and Dahlberg regarding the success of the narrative analysis in which they state the “narrative analysis has been used successfully in many different ways. The basic idea is to obtain ‘narrative accounts’ from people who had first-hand experience with an event of interest and then to analyze those stories to understand those people’s interpretations or understands” (p. 575).

In the case of the carnival, if I am able to observe a portion of the framework held by the employer as elicited through narratives and compare that framework to a Theory X and Theory Y paradigm for communication style similarities, I may, in turn, be able to analyze whether the industry could be improved upon by using a different style.

Narratives in Organizations

As mentioned previously, narratives are used to delve into the minds of individual to gain an understanding of what they view as reality (Fisher, 1987). Meyer (1995) states that narratives when taken in an organizational setting should “describe good and bad actions and let the hearers infer what the story should ‘mean’ for them and their own actions” (p. 211). Stories for those in a workplace help the reality of that workplace make sense. In a study conducted by Brown (1990) within nursing homes, she discovered that the stories she collected from the nursing home generated “rich data” that described the nursing home culture (p. 71).

One may ask, “why conduct such a study on the use of narratives within organizations?” Meyer (1995) answers this question by stating that “knowledge of an organization’s values and how they are advocated in narratives will help to make sense of the organization to its members, as well as suggest new ways to advocate organizational development and change” (p. 212). Meyer ties corporate culture and the use of narratives together and stresses their importance: “an organization’s culture is built on the values which motivates members’ behavior, and organizational narratives are integral to such construction. Narratives serve to encapsulate and entrench the values which are key to an organization’s culture” (p. 210).

The amount of studies that have been conducted using narratives is quite extensive and continues to grow especially within organizations. In a study conducted by Stevenson and Greenberg (1998) in regard to organizational change, the use of the narratives showed that “corporate activities are not always rational goal directed actions... [and] actions within the organizations are not well coordinated” (pp. 759 - 760). Additionally, their use of narrative positivism, the use of narratives to link events in order to notate when certain events created a catalyst for other events to take place, unveiled the convergence and divergence between subjects in the study as well as provided a framework of analysis for organizational change.

Another study conducted by Polkinghorne (1996) discovered that experienced counselors were more likely to use narratives as ways to understand their clients than more traditional methods, showing the use and importance of narratives within institutions.

Polkinghorne (1991) touches upon the importance of the narrative to one’s self-identity in his article *Narrative and Self - Concept*. By linking stories to personal experience, one creates “the basis of personal identity and self - understanding and they provide answers to the question ‘Who am I?’” (Polkinghorne, 1991, p 136).

Polkinghorne (1991) goes further to point out what was discovered:

Human existence is temporal. We do not come to self-understanding by seeking to know what kind of thing we are. Rather, we come to know ourselves by discerning a plot that unifies the actions and events of our past with future action and the events we anticipate. Relating separate events that occur over time involves the cognitive operation of narrative structuring. Narrative structuring

gives sense to events by identifying them as contributing parts of an emplotted drama. Self concept is a storied concept, and our identity is the drama we are unfolding. (p. 149)

Additionally, Polkinghorne states that humans are able to better understand themselves when they see themselves as a part relating to the whole (1991). With this, and the use of narratives in mind, one must look to a narrative as defining one's true self - identity. What one will or will not believe and how one acts will be wrapped up entirely in this identity. This research will be pertinent in discovering the belief carnival executives have of themselves elicited by the narratives.

In a study conducted by Brown (1985) it was discovered that "stories served as a means for members to express their knowledge, understanding, and commitment to the organization" and as employees stayed with the company longer, "story use changed to become more closely associated with organizational values and cultures" (p. 38). Posner and Schmidt (1996) maintain that those organizations that are grounded in their values are more likely to comprehend and embrace the goals of the organization.

In a study conducted by John Van Maanen (1991) regarding the Disneyland work culture, it was discovered that the Disneyland technique to keeping the culture consistent established values of the Disneyland organization. Narratives were used to elicit values from Disneyland employees to discover that the culture that the organization desired, "the happiest place on earth," was synonymous with the organizational culture that was created in the work environment. This was accomplished in four ways: by socializing employees to their new environment, lack of individual experimentation by employees, ability to manage employee's emotions through training and the direction given by upper

management (pp. 73-75). This study showed that with careful planning and training, creating and maintaining a specific corporate culture is possible. Additionally, in the book *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations* Moorhead and Griffin (2004) discuss four ways to create an organizational culture: establishing values, creating vision, initiating implementation strategies and reinforcement” (p. 500-501). The Disneyland culture is a prime example of creating values and visions that are instilled in their employees and constantly implementing and reinforcing those ideas.

In another study conducted by Joanne Martin, Martha S. Feldman, Mary Jo Hatch and Sim B. Sitkin (1983), it was discovered that stories that make organizations unique are not in fact unique, but are constant across various organizations (p. 438). They identified various stories that occur across organizations: the human qualities of upper level employees, rising within the organization, anxiety about possible termination, the helpfulness of the organization, upper management’s reaction to mistakes, potential problems organizations must overcome (pp. 441-445). Why various employees from different organizations have similar stories about their organizations, they can all be summed up as showing how personal values and organizational values conflict, enhance the participation of ones self when organizations succeed and to let the employee either distance or identify with organizations (p. 452).

METHODOLOGY

In an attempt to disclose the most useful information for describing the values regarding Theory X and Y style of management, I employed the use of the Narrative Paradigm to uncover various aspects of McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y. Based upon what was obtained through the interview narratives I was able to gain insight on whether management viewed their employees through a Theory X or Theory Y frame of mind. I asked the employers to tell of their interactions with employees regarding completion of daily tasks, correction of misbehavior, work ethic and feedback. As discussed previously in my preliminary interviews, which were not included in the final analysis, I suggested a trend of Theory X management with a paradigm that is comparable to Theory Y. Also, I was able to uncover partial insight in order to determine if those embracing a Theory X paradigm have employees who, in management's opinion, are less satisfied with their work and those with a Theory Y paradigm, who are more satisfied with work. Additionally, the corporate culture gave a glimpse of what was accepted within these carnival organizations.

First, the carnival organizations used in collecting my information ranged from small sized shows of approximately 25 employees to a large sized shows of approximately 300 employees. These shows were based throughout North America.

Second, 15 upper level management and owners comprised of 2 female and 13 male, were chosen and interviewed based partially upon recommendation by the president of a large national carnival trade organization and availability at an amusement convention held by various national carnival trade organizations. They consisted of upper management who are involved in major decision making and not involved in the

smaller tasks of the carnival business such as ride operation or ticket selling. Carnival owners may also fall into this category since many times they are present daily on the carnival midway.

Interview questions were asked of the management level employers and owners in order to elicit stories about daily tasks, employee work ethic and management interactions between employers and employees. These stories symbolically represented various values that the management has about the carnival and employees. Stories were collected through tape recorded sessions and later transcribed. Interviews ranged from approximately eight minutes to 75 minutes in length. All attempts were made to elicit narratives from carnival management that would best answer the questions; however some managers only produced a small number of narratives that most commonly resulted in shorter interviews.

The questions that were asked in order to elicit narratives from the carnival management were created solely for this study and are as follows: How would you describe your typical carnival employee? How do you correct employees? How do you have employees complete tasks? How would you describe the workplace atmosphere? Do you feel employees generally like or dislike work? How do you feel about employee feedback? Do you include your employees in decision making? In some cases additional questions were asked to provide a more complete answer to the question or to elicit a story when one was not given. Some answers to questions did not elicit a story but rather a yes or no answer or an example hypothetical situation.

The first question asked to the CEs, how would you describe your typical carnival employee, was created in order to have CEs give a broad definition of their employee's

work and personal characteristics. By doing this the CE produced his or her own description of the employee without being lead to a Theory X or Theory Y answer. The second question, how do you correct employees, was created to address actual occurrences of correction between the CE and the employee and label those corrections as having either Theory X or Theory Y characteristics. Question three, how do you have employees complete tasks, took a similar stance as question two. By looking at whether CEs had to force, threaten or coerce employees to complete a task or if they let their employees take the initiative would point to a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm. The forth question, how would you describe the workplace atmosphere, was asked in order to look at the corporate culture and compare the answers elicited to a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm. Question five, do you feel employees generally like or dislike work, was asked to address the Theory Y paradigm that working is an innate quality of humans and employees do not have to be forced into working. Whether CEs answered the question for or against their employees enjoying work would address this key aspect of McGregor's theories. The sixth question, how do you feel about employee feedback, looked to address the concept that CEs who encouraged and used feedback would have the tendency to have a Theory Y paradigm by viewing the employees input as valuable and useful. The last question, do you include your employees in decision making, also looked to address the concept that those CEs who used employees in their decision making would more likely have Theory Y paradigms, similar to question six.

These questions were formed based on McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y paradigm and dealt with key criteria for determining a manager's framework regarding treatment and opinions of employees. Furthermore, certain questions elicited stories that

presented a cognitive description of employees from the employer's part, while other questions elicited stories that directly dealt with handling employees in daily situations. For instance, the question of how management described their typical employee looked to explore the manager's cognitive impression of his or her employee whether from a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm. Questions such as, how do you correct employees or how do you have employees complete tasks, explored whether the manager communicated to the employee in the same paradigm that he or she thought by taking into consideration specific characteristics of Theory X and Theory Y. Positive or negative answers to these questions pointed to either a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm. Additionally, these questions, along with how managers viewed their workplace atmosphere, also helped pull in aspects of the corporate culture as to whether the organization embraced a Theory X or Y atmosphere.

For purposes of keeping the anonymity of those participating in the study, each manager and owner were labeled as Carnival Executive (CE) 1 through 15.

RESULTS

Do managers communicate to or think of their employees in a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm as elicited through narratives? This question attempted to discover whether employers thought of their employees in one way, but communicated to them in another. Responses were generated through narratives, hypothetical narratives and current actions that took place on the carnival according to CEs' account. The responses were coded based upon McGregor's descriptions of Theory X and Theory Y as previously stated.

A pre-interview background question was asked of the participants is as follows: How did you come to be involved in the carnival industry? This question was asked about their beginnings in the carnival industry to determine if there was any link to a Theory X or Theory Y style of management in relation to owners and executives who were involved in family business in contrast to those who had entered into the industry without past family influence. Of the 15 participants, five were second and third generation family owners and managers, three entered into the carnival industry through marriage and six had no family connection to the industry at all. From the results there was no connection to whether those who did or did not have family histories in the carnival were more prone to Theory X or Y.

Research Question 1

Question 1

How would you describe your typical carnival employee?

This question was asked in order to have the CEs describe their employees in their own words, which at times generated descriptions that were concurrent with either

Theory X or Y. From the 15 CEs, 44 instances were observed that described employees in such a manner that was either Theory X or Theory Y in nature. The majority of occurrences, 34, described Theory Y, while only 10 occurrences described Theory X. Nine of the 15 CEs discussed one attribute of Theory X in their answers to the interview question, and 12 of the 15 CEs answered the interview question with a Theory Y attribute answer. One participant answered with neither instance of Theory X or Theory Y. Additionally, nine of the 15 CEs thought their employee's to be hard working.

The idea of seeking responsibility is a characteristic of Theory Y. CE 2 shows this Theory Y assumption in his employees by stating that they seek responsibility: "They have this attitude about it 'Yeah I got the Scrambler down in six hours... but I'll get it down to four hours next week.' They are happy to show themselves that they have accomplished... probably the hardest job in the week" (personal communication, December 3, 2006). CE 2 later discussed how his employees rise to the challenge and are innovative in their problem solving.

You know you got X amount of days to do something and it seems like its next to impossible, well then they, the managers and the workers, they worry about that for about a month and they figure how are they going to do all this and they kind of plan out their week and they get it done. Somehow they get it down. It's pretty amazing considering how much they have to do and how much they have to construct. (CE 2, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

CE 9 discussed his employees in terms of internal motivation, commitment, responsibility and potential in one narrative as he discussed employment applications to understand and discover his employee's potential and ability:

Like I said, you have people that start at the bottom pay scale... [we] were one of the first [carnivals] that started having employee, employment applications and started asking people [for past experience]. It used to be in the old day that you would just hire people not really different from most places, it's just grown over the years. But we started doing an employment application to see what people had done in their past employment in different places and that helped. And as you move a person from a different job to another they tend to gravitate to their level. Like I said, you can move as fast as you want as high as you want depending on how hard you want to work. So the reward in this industry has always been upward mobility so, and... that's why I say, the people that we have in this business are basically hard working people that we would hire locally.” (personal communication, December 5, 2006)

From the employment application narrative it can be seen that by CE 9 providing the information to the future employees to be placed at the correct location, he gave his employees the opportunity to show their responsibility level, internal motivation level and commitment. Additionally, by giving the employees the chance to prove themselves, CE 9 went further by inspiring in those employees the necessary attitude that anyone can rise to top management in the industry.

Additionally, when dealing with the internal motivation and desire to reach objectives, as defined by Theory Y, CE 11 understood that internal motivation is key, “you couldn't pay a guy enough to do that [set up carnival rides week after week]. And so the people we have are different molds, but they work very hard. If anybody lasts they have to be a hard worker.” (personal communication, December 5, 2006)

Most prevalent from various CEs was the Theory Y idea that their employees enjoyed their work and liked it. CE 14 told a story of the amount of Mexican workers that returned to his show, “18 out of the original 20... [came] back. But their work ethic, they grew up learning how to work and they aren’t afraid to work.” (personal communication, December 10, 2006)

While Theory X was also stated in interviews, it was not as prevalent as Theory Y. In one instance, CE 8 discussed how in the past his people were capable, but now they have little ambition, “you had capable people at each ride who could repair the rides. Today we have young people who don’t care as much” (personal communication, December 4, 2006). CE 12 also discussed their employee’s control in that they lack the discipline and may be more inclined to need the control from their supervisor, “I do not think that they are as disciplined as those in the corporate world” (personal communication, December 5, 2006).

In regard to the assumption of Theory X, that the employee does not like work, the findings were quite interesting. Many of the CEs use outside work for the sole purpose of the lack of American employees who desire positions on the carnival.

We hire some Mexicans, some South Africans, we hire a lot of eastern Europeans.

The reason we do that is because the recruitment of somebody like that in this country who is willing to work that many hours and be drug free and have no wants or warrants is very, very hard to find people of that profile. (CE 11, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

Another CE stated, “you have to find a person who will work seven days a week, live the lifestyle, work very hard twenty hours a day and that’s it, you don’t have those people

anymore. Exactly, and those people today are not available, not willing” (CE 4, personal communication, December 4, 2006). Apparently it seems that while many American workers do not enjoy work, foreign laborers do.

Question 2

How do you correct employees?

This question was asked to determine if the CEs thought their employees needed to be threatened, coerced or controlled to complete a task, as assumed by a Theory X framework. The question also looked to see if CEs would view their employees from a Theory Y approach that looked for aspects of internal motivation, responsibility factor or the discovery of underutilized potentials. From the 15 participants, nine past narratives were retrieved in regard to this question. Six of the narratives took a Theory X framework and three, a Theory Y. In addition to the past narratives, there were five hypothetical narratives that favored Theory X and six that favored Theory Y. In regard to current communication action that took place on the show, four actions favored Theory X and six actions favored Theory Y.

One CE stated that during his involvement in the industry, a Theory X paradigm and practice was common:

In the olden days we would just whack them. He [the manager] would just punch him in the nose or hit him with the radio or do whatever he needed to do and that was usually never, at least on our show it was never an organized effort to beat someone up. There was no goon squads. It was a supervisor that was frustrated beyond the point of being able to control himself and knowing that all these other techniques didn't work. He would know that if he fired these guys he wouldn't

have a readily available supply of people who could replace him who were any better. He knew that if he fired him he would have less people to do the job which means he would have to work harder. He knew that counseling wouldn't do any good. He knew that if he gave more money they would just behave worsely [*sic*]. And if he gave them less money they would probably start stealing to feed themselves or their habit, so he would resort to the only thing he could out of frustration, that was punching the guy. And you know it is terribly, terribly effective. (CE 1, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

However, the same CE has also mentioned further in his interview the switch from threatening the employee to recognizing underlying issues affecting the employees work habits.

They are used to that method... [threatening] and I don't care if it was the owner of the carnival or all the supervisors and it was probably one of the most effective, the most effective tool for that class of people. But the answer in this day and age... the reason you are resorting to that [threats] is because you have a problem and its better to solve the problem than beat a few more employees. (CE 1, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

In a hypothetical situation supporting Theory X and the use of threats to complete tasks one CE stated,

If I had gave [*sic*] this employee a task and I've given many employees many tasks and they did not complete it. Well, first of all, when I have an employee I try to have a real good line of communication with the employees. And every task has rewards and consequences and if you don't complete this task then this is

what's going to happen. Never ever, ever, ever fail to carry through with what the consequences are so that the employee never gets... he never says... "Oh well, [they] will never notice." They know very well that I will notice and they know very well that not only will I will notice but I'm sorry, I said if you didn't do this, this is what will happen and I carry through. (CE 13, personal communication, December 10, 2006)

Being that this answer was given in a hypothetical situation it would have to be considered as the way the CE communicated to the employee. However, every other CE who stated hypothetical or actual communication of Theory X stated elements of Theory Y as well.

Theory Y was touched upon by 14 of the 15 CEs in some aspect or another, whether it was a brief element or the main paradigm. The aspect of Theory Y that this question was to draw upon was the assumption that employees would be willing to be responsible and accept it, if placed in the correct situation. One CE embraced this concept:

I am going to answer all these questions in the present. Cause back in, more in the Wild West days, [what] we were doing before, now, there are certain guidelines with the foreign labor that we have to follow. We have training programs, employee incentives, and I've always said, if we can get somebody to do this type of job we really need to move that person around to find something that his aptitude fits and likes. For instance, in the army I was the worst private in the army, but I was the very best lieutenant. You know what I'm saying. It depends on what you're doing, if you like it and you are motivated by authority or

responsibility then you get that choice. So we really try to search hard before we fire somebody. (CE 11, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

It is quite evident by his army narrative and his hypothetical and actual communication styles that this CE fosters a Theory Y atmosphere that looks to put his employee in the best position available.

Additionally, regarding correcting employees, 12 CEs stated in either a hypothetical story or by a form of communication on their carnival that exemplifies a Theory Y framework. One CE stated in his hypothetical story that:

Ideally you would take them aside, so it's not a group thing. It's best if they can realize it themselves... sometimes you have to lead them to realize that sometimes its not right and sometimes you can lead them into it and they can figure out the rest by themselves. But on the other hand you can't be afraid to say, "Hey you have a problem there and you need to change that, you need to fix that," and if you can take time to explain "why," so they can understand it, they are less apt to make that error a second time. (CE 2, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

Again, the CE understood that by putting the employee in a situation where they are able to learn, they will, in turn, be able to take on that newly learned responsibility.

Question 3

How do you have your employees complete tasks?

This question was asked in order to elicit answers that would give exact circumstances where either a Theory X or Theory Y framework was put in motion. Specifically, it looked to discover if the CEs' behavior while instructing employees was

more apt to be controlling, directive, coercive, or threatening towards employees. From the received data 13 participants answered the question with sufficient data to be designated into either a Theory X or Y framework. From the 13 participants that answered there were nine narratives, hypothetical narratives or statements that supported a Theory X framework and 16 that supported a Theory Y. One CE responded with narratives that only supported Theory X and five CEs responded with narratives that only supported Theory Y.

One CE's response supporting Theory X was due to the need of direction that the employees desired:

They need a lot of direction. Yeah. They are very anxious to please. I think they need a lot of direction because they want the employer's involvement. These are not the kind of employees that really want to work on their own independently, they want the employer involved. So I think a lot of the time they will maybe deliberately not go from step A to step B because they want the attention that keeps coming back to them, the strokes, whatever it takes saying you know...

"Ok you did a good job, now let's paint some more, let's change the colors and go on." That's what I think they like... and another thing they do, they will complete one task and they will come and report, "Done. I got the bunkhouse completely cleaned out"... Oh that's great Danny, now will you go and do the other bunkhouses? "Yep, I'll do the next one now" and then when he is done, "I've got the other one done do you want to come and check?" (CE 10, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

Interestingly enough however, it seems that if this situation were looked at in a Theory Y framework the employee is indeed completing the task in order to receive his or her reward, attention from the management. However, these attempts, that instead come across as a need for direction, are really the necessary means for the reward of personal objectives.

The CE continues when asked as to whether employees take initiative or if they need structure in order to complete a task, stating that tasks are “most of the time very structured... most of them need and want more structure and that goes back to [the]... employer interaction” (CE 10, personal communication, December 5, 2006). However, this same CE states a bit of Theory Y, “we have the capable people, but they still want the employer interaction” (CE 10, personal communication, December 5, 2006). Again, this can be looked at as employee capability in obtaining the objectives in which they seek, however those objectives, which are not in line with the employers, are viewed as needing to be structured and directed.

Another CE who answered Theory X stated when asked on the completion of tasks whether it was structured or if employees were allowed to take initiative is as follows:

No, no I never... rely on them to use their own initiative to complete a task in anyway they see fit. I don't do that because I feel that in doing that I am setting the employee and myself... up for a disappointment. So, for instance... I had a good deal of foreign students who were working in the games and I was managing the games this year. So I told the employees we are going to have three rules. Rule number one... we will speak English at all times. Rule number two is that

we will have a wonderful attitude and if we can't, if we wake up on the wrong side of the bed, we will not come to work... number three you will work so hard that when you get home at night every bit of your body will be so grateful to lay down and your heart will feel so good because you know that you gave me 100 percent because I won't accept 98 percent. So once I told them this and then I assigned them to whatever their job was. They got in their booths, their different booths, and then maybe there was three or four of them in each booth and I went from one booth to the next and said "now listen, these customers are only going to be here for a short period of time and we must remember, number one, (unintelligible) so we are going to be as pleasant to make their short period of time here so fun that they will want to spend their money with us, but we cannot spend too much time because we have to go on to the next [location]. Take up as brief of time as we can and show them a good time." And this is how we do it. And so I jumped in with every one of them and showed them exactly what I wanted. Now at the end of the day, or as I walked around, if they were not doing it the way that I felt... I would give them a little nudge and say "remember we were going to do this." And, you know, they just fell into line and did exactly what I asked for really and at the end of the day everyone one of them told me I was right. They did feel in their heart so good because they had really given me 100 percent. And they really did. So that's how I manage to motivate them I guess you could say. (CE 13, personal communication, December 10, 2006)

Clearly in this example the employee was instructed a certain way to complete the task because the CE did not want to be "set up for a disappointment." On the other hand,

Theory Y is still present as the CE states that the employee's "heart will feel so good because [the employee] gave [the CE] 100 percent." The CE knows that while there must be direction and control, the employee will feel good after working hard; a positive reward.

Theory Y, which was supported more than Theory X, takes the stance of employees wanting to work, because it is natural, and they have the initiative to work, they have the motivation and commitment to goals. For instance, regarding his current employees taking initiative, one CE states, "a lot of them do. I have people working for me today that are vice presidents of my corporation with the amusement park. One of them lied about their age that he was 16 and he was 14. And he is still with me 35 years later. So, yes, they had excellent work ethics and they grew along with me and I grew along with them" (CE 5, personal communication, December 4, 2006). Apparently, this CE compared his present employees with his past in their determination to complete tasks or accomplish goals.

Another CE discusses his employee's motivation regarding that everyone must work equally.

I constantly preach to them [to do]... the most amount of work... with the least amount of effort. But they are motivated... they know that if there is someone there who is not pulling their weight, we will do something about it... On a lot of organizations you will find 20 percent of the guys doing 80 percent of the work and I don't want to have to work that hard myself so I won't allow that to happen. And the guys that get lazy we just... move them out... we find them jobs on other carnivals. (CE 7, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

While this CE is fair, he understands that excess work for some will cause those to become upset. His employees are not “lazy.” The “lazy” employees are on other carnivals. This CE continues to discuss how his employees are happy to work for him and they enjoy the work.

What I was saying is the immigrants from Mexico, they are so happy to be there and working, that they come up to me and thank me for the job and they are excited to be there. And it used to be that before we had these guys we never knew who was going to show up on set up on Wednesday. We always thought, [but] we never knew for sure. And there were always a lot of guys late [*sic*].

With these Mexican immigrants they are fantastic. Always on time and they are right there. (CE 7, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

One can see how a Theory X mentality could easily be adopted toward past carnival employees who did not “show up” to work or would be “late” for work. The current trend, at least with this CE, is a Theory Y framework.

One CE, when first prompted with the question of competition of tasks in regards to initiative and structure began with, “they definitely need a structured routine, they all do. And as far as initiative, each one is different. You will find some that go right at it and some that don’t. You just need to work as a team and put them in a group” (CE 3, personal communication, December 4, 2006). Later in the interview when discussing another question the CE stated another contradictory point:

I try to let them find their own way to succeed in their job. Everybody has a goal and there are different ways on how to do it so I let them kind of do their own [way] as long as it’s in a safe way [to] get their job done. I let them kind of

figure out which way they like. You really got to expect a lot out of them, you got to put that extra patience and let them figure it out, as long as the job gets done. Oh sure and I'll tell them [how to complete a task] and they will pretty much select their own way. You just got to let them do it, as long as the job gets done in a safe way. And that's part of learning. It gives them a sense of pride.

(personal communication, December 4, 2006)

In this case the CE seems to understand the Theory Y idea that the completion of tasks and commitment to those tasks will create more motivation within the employee as well as create a sense of accomplishment, or "pride," which is their reward in completing the task.

Question 4

How would you describe your workplace atmosphere?

While this question was initially designed to understand the corporate culture, some narratives were elicited that were directed towards the CE's view of employees. All CEs gave a positive response regarding their carnival when answering this question. The only answers given that would suggest that the CE involved favored a Theory X mentality were inconclusive and usually stated that the organization was "business" oriented which was not further defined by the CE and therefore left for open interpretation. Regarding a Theory Y framework, 5 narratives, hypothetical narratives and actual statements conveyed the CEs mindset towards the employee. One CE stated in a narrative:

And we are tearing down all Sunday night and we drive up and get the rides up there Monday night and we have to be open Tuesday and it's so hot. And it's

unbelievable to put up a whole show like that. You keep bringing bigger rides early and setting them up early, but what I do then, I go out and go to Costco and I get chickens there and I get fifty chickens and cut them in half and I get some food and I'll feed them all and I think last year there we had sixty cases of soda or water or Gatorade and put it in ice and it was very hot and give them drinks all day long and have food for them so they can make sandwiches. So at lunch time they have sandwiches. So by the time it got to be about eight or nine o'clock that night everything was done and set up. It was unbelievable. So then they had half a chicken and water and you know food and they appreciate that and I do too, because I can keep them there and keep the work going and know that they are treated right. (CE 8, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

It is evident that this CE saw that a threatening Theory X mindset would not be productive in the actual completion of the task. Rather, by using a strategy that was appreciative of his employees, just as Theory Y has an appreciative idea of employees, more was able to be accomplished. Another CE stated similarly that the owner,

Is very objective... he doesn't holler and yell. If he gets angry he is very controlled. He doesn't name call or make a crack "that was the most stupid thing I ever saw." He would say "you know what, I've asked you three times to do such and such and its still not done and it better be done by five o clock" and that's about as angry as he gets. Some people in the carnival business will get "you dumb mother fer..." We don't go for that. I don't think it's productive. It's just demoralizing. We have a really good team atmosphere on our show and I really

like that atmosphere. We really pull together pretty much as a team and I think it shows. (CE 10, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

Question 5

Do you feel employees generally like or dislike work?

This question that was asked of participants looked to answer one of the key aspects of Theory X and Theory Y, the CEs thoughts of whether their employees enjoyed their work. By answering this question, either negatively or positively, it would give a glimpse at the framework of managers. Of the 15 CEs that answered the question, six all gave an indication that their employees enjoyed and liked the work that they were doing. Four of the CEs stated that there were some employees that were characterized as lazy, but the majority of employees liked working. From the 15 CEs there were 20 narratives, hypothetical narratives or actual statements that touched upon aspects of Theory Y and only 4 narratives or hypothetical narratives that showed aspects of Theory X.

The instances which contained the CEs' paradigm of Theory X regarding employees dislike of work, also contained aspects of their like for work. One CE stated that the difference of the Theory X and Y attitude in relation to where his employees originated:

In the old days you had guys... that wanted to come to work and own a carnival... we have kind of lost that work ethic. And the reason we went to the [foreign labor] program was to get the people that you just can't get anymore... the reason we went to the Hispanics is because they are good, quality employees... you just can't get people anymore. Good people you can hold, but you just can't get enough of them. (CE 9, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

This CE states that in the past finding American employees who wanted to work was not difficult. The difficulty today lies with the ability to find American workers with the same type of desire or “work ethic” to do the job as one had in the past. Because of this they had such trouble finding these workers they went to the Hispanic worker which he describes as “good, quality workers.” In this instance, his attitude toward American workers seems to be that of Theory X, but towards the Hispanic worker, Theory Y.

Another CE felt similarly as CE 9 in that the foreign labor worked harder and enjoyed it more than the workers in the past. However, he also attributed past workers to be lazy on the job because they were not managed correctly.

No, I think they enjoy it. I think they enjoy it... I think the Mexicans... view it a little more normal. They show up for work and they work really hard, understanding that if they finish, if they work really hard and they finish, it's not for long. There are a lot of things that we've done that can short circuit that idea. It used to be that if a crew got finished with a ride, the first thing you would do would be to go send them to help finish another ride. So you would be teaching them that if they work fast they will have to do someone else's work. So we almost built this corporate culture into it that people didn't want to work fast because if they did they would have to do someone else's work. So why work fast so I could take all the time setting this up? So consequently there was a joke in the industry, how long does it take to set up a carnival? As long as you have... [the Mexicans] know what they have to do and they know when we open and they get it done and they behave like a normal person should behave. So, if they get

all the rides up in a day and they have two more days, we pretty much go easy on them for the two days. (CE1, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

The CE also continues to state that when there is additional work that needs to be done but it is too strenuous, the foreign labor will sometimes just stop working. “These guys are sometimes exhibiting more common sense in their limitations than what we would traditionally try to impose upon them” (CE1, personal communication, December 3, 2006). The CE in this case is clearly stating Theory Y traits by telling how his employees naturally like work and how they exhibit traits of being bright by ending their work day early. The CE also shows aspects of the organization underutilizing the employee’s potential by overworking them in the present so they will not be functional in the future. Luckily the employees, being bright would not let this happen.

CE 7 also stated that his foreign labor is “just so excited to be there. They are very happy... it may be the difference in pay, because we aren’t paying them any different than the regular employees, but from where they come from, its probably five times more valuable there” (personal communication, December 4, 2006).

Contrary to the idea that mainly foreign labor enjoyed work, one CE argued that all his employees generally liked the work whether they were, “American or a foreign worker” (CE 4, personal communication, December 4, 2006).

Other CEs stated that while they thought most of their employees liked work, some would always be the “freeloader that wants to get their paycheck,” (personal communication, December 4, 2006), or they are the kind of people that “aren’t going to make it really long or they naturally... don’t enjoy anything” (CE 2, personal communication, December 3, 2006).

Theory Y, on the other hand, was amply supported by all CEs. One used a story about his children to illustrate the fact that while not all will think this industry is for them, those that do decide to work in it, love it and their work.

Some like it and some don't. I have children, some are in the business and some are not in the business. Out of any given number of people, you are going to find somebody just like me when I was a kid. It's just great. We brought in a great number of people from South Africa and Poland and Bulgaria and they are coming back again with us next year they liked it so much. (CE 5, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

In another narrative from a CE, a story is told how the employees enjoy their job so much, that customers comment on it.

The attitude of my employees these last couple of years has been very positive. I just got a letter; I finished a Halloween event, a haunted house, and I got a letter. And the letter was saying how nice and clean everyone was, and when they exited the ride they thanked her for riding. So she was very appreciative of the fact that these patrons were treated nicely. So my employees just thanked them for riding and come back again and that was mostly the South Africans. (CE 6, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

It is apparent that this CE feels so strongly that his staff enjoy the work that the customers are able to notice it. Also, it is interesting to notice that again, this enjoyment of work comes from the international employee.

Another CE states the dedication that the employees have and the obvious nature of their love for their job as he hypothetically narrates their dedication to their job.

This isn't a nine to five job for these people. And I mean... you have to like it. Even myself, I have a beautiful trailer to live in and a nice [car] to drive down the road. And I'm out here because I like it. I mean these people don't have it as nice as we do... they live in bunk houses, they use multiple... restrooms and they have to like it to be out there. You know, I can't imagine someone being in this business and not liking it because they wouldn't do it because the work is too hard and the hours are too long. (CE 15, personal communication, December 14, 2006)

This CE is aware of the hardship that a job in the carnival industry entails and understands that it is not easy and therefore equates the need to "like it" in order to continue in the industry.

CE 12 gives a hypothetical reason as to why his employees enjoy their job. Most of the people out there enjoy watching the people have fun. They enjoy their job because they are people oriented. I think that they are there because they want to be there. Many of these people can get higher paying jobs, but they would rather do what they are doing so they stay with the carnival. (personal communication, December 5, 2006)

One CE began speaking about employees in a Theory Y manner but ended in tones of Theory X.

Well, they have to enjoy their work. I think that if they don't enjoy their work, well, then you get back what you give off. And if you aren't enjoying your work, then you aren't doing a good job. So that employee is not really worth much... It's like what I said to begin with, if you have a crappy atmosphere, that's what your going to emulate for your customers. So I think that it's up to whomever is

running or managing to make sure that the atmosphere is good. And... you do it by having a good attitude yourself. I don't think that you can, although as hard as it is to get help, it is extremely hard to follow through on, but... if you just don't accept it to begin with then I think that all of the employees fall into line. (CE 13, personal communication, December 10, 2006)

This CE begins by stating the necessity of employee liking their work, a Theory Y trait, and the importance of it being carried through all ranks of staff. However, interestingly enough, towards the end of the statement the CE turns to a Theory X framework by stating the employee will “fall into line,” a suggestion that the employees must be directed and controlled.

Question 6

How do you feel about employee feedback?

This question was asked to discover if CEs thought that their employee's input was seen as useful and likewise, if they thought employee feedback would be beneficial to the overall use of the company. Of the 15 CEs that responded, three did not provide enough data that could be analyzed, leaving 12 CEs who responded to the question. From these 12 CEs, none answered the question that would foster a Theory X mentality; all answers that were generated gave signs of being Theory Y oriented. There were a total of 17 Theory Y narratives, hypothetical narratives and actual statements elicited.

One CE told a story that told of how they encourage the feedback from their employees in problem solving.

We have some videos made up and its ride safety. And we have them look at the ride safety then we put [in] ride safety seminars. During those ride safety

seminars, they are thinking about their ride and we occasionally run into something... There maybe a brace that has come off, the stairway coming off one of the rides, [or it] could be just little things like that. And they started thinking about their rides and they would be “well I got a little problem over there” and so now we end up putting another brace on there because we kind of forgot it... Or they went to someone and they told them what they needed and they didn’t get the job done and it got dropped so when we are going around checking on that type of thing, that’s when you find out the little things where it could be a big thing and we follow through... So we try to leave the door open for communication to make sure that it is being done. I try to have everyone feel very comfortable talking.

(CE 8, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

This CE sees the need for the open communication and values the input that his employees give back to him. By doing this he is demonstrating the Theory Y assumption of employees having the ability to solve organizational problem and being bright enough to solve those problems. Another CE stated that even if the information that comes from the employee is not used, the idea that the employee can give valuable suggestions is needed, “I’ve always said, even the lowest guy on the totem pole can pump back some pretty good ideas. Even if it’s not worth anything, it’s worth the time just... to be thinking that way” (CE 14, personal communication, December 10, 2006).

In another instance, a CE desired the input from his foreign employees, however, because there was a language barrier, his ability to employ Theory Y communication was lost.

The only thing with the Mexicans that is aggravating is that sometimes if there is a problem that is festering its because there is usually a language barrier, or because they are not comfortable coming up and saying something at an early stage... The communication part is critical, because if we had a little better communication, we would get to a point where we wouldn't have some major problems that we had... The question was where they were going to sleep and where they were going to be fed. So we contracted with one of the cookhouses that they were going to provide breakfast and we would reimburse the cookhouse for it. Well, we ended up losing the first few [Mexicans] we had... We really needed them and we got through the first five [locations] and all of them in mass just quit, they just weren't there one day... They were there for two weeks and they were gone... all of our Mexicans just disappeared... And it turned out the whole issue was over the fact that the guy in the cookhouse was serving them one egg instead of two eggs in the morning... The Mexicans didn't think that that was adequate and they wanted another egg for breakfast. And we didn't even know it was happening because we weren't eating breakfast with them; we just hired this guy to make them breakfast and we figured they were getting fed. They never said anything because they probably didn't think it was appropriate to talk to their employer or they couldn't because of the language. Whatever it was, there was definitely a communication problem, whether it was willingness to communicate or language barrier or whatever, [and] the communication wasn't there because it wasn't there. Something that was a non issue became an issue that led to fifteen people deciding that they need to go somewhere else to work and it left us in a

situation where the guys we thought we had to solve our critical shortage of help problem [were not there]. (CE 1, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

In this case, the CE would have been willing to listen to the feedback from the foreign labor, but because of cultural issues and communication issues, this feedback was never heard, leading to a shortage of employees.

In one hypothetical narrative, CE 3 stated that when receiving feedback from employees he encourages employee involvement.

Let them find their own way to succeed in their job. Everybody has a goal and there are different ways on how to do it, so I let them kind of do their own [thing]... you really got to expect a lot out of them... you just got to let them do it, as long as the job gets done in a safe way and that's part of learning, it gives them a sense of pride. (CE 3, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

This CE understands the Theory Y assumption that by letting his employee complete a job according to how the employee sees best, he is rewarding that employee with pride. The employee is then committed to his task because his sense of pride will be heightened by completing that task, which falls in line with Theory Y.

Different CEs rewarded their employee's feedback with incentives, such as bonuses, when their new ideas contributed to the improvement of the show (CE 9, personal communication, December 5, 2006; CE 11, personal communication, December 5, 2006).

Question 7

Do you include your employees in the decision making?

This question was developed in order to address the Theory Y assumption that those managers and executives who embrace a Theory Y framework will think their employees bright enough to use their input in the daily decision making for the carnival. Of the 15 CEs that were asked the question, only 13 gave responses that could be analyzed as either Theory X or Theory Y. From those 13 CEs, eight hypothetical narratives or actual statements supported the Theory X framework, while 14 narratives, hypothetical narratives and actual statements supported the Theory Y framework. Also important to recognize is that every CE that generated a Theory X response, generated a Theory Y response as well; therefore not one CE had a framework that was entirely Theory X focused. There were, however, 7 CEs that gave entirely Theory Y oriented answers.

While there were no past narratives that dealt with Theory X, there were hypothetical narratives that showed the slight nature of the CEs' Theory X paradigm. After being asked question seven, CE1 stated that he would ask, "upper level management... It's not our practice to go down and ask a ride guy's opinion whether or not we should play this spot after this spot. Probably the upper management has more experience in making the decisions anyway" (personal communication, December 3, 2006). However, the CE then shows his Theory Y paradigm as well,

We do get a lot of feedback from employees; the guys that are doing the task, like logistics, the guys that are doing the moves with the trucks, the guys that are loading the [equipment]. We get through a situation you know... someone says "our fair is going to open up on Thursday and you guys are closing Sunday do we want to sign the fair?" I mean you can close on a Saturday, but someone has to

close early, you have to convince them to back up to Friday, whether you sign the contract to open up on Thursday. Yeah, we would talk to the people in those departments. (personal communication, p. 13)

Apparently, this CE employs certain levels of decision making to different levels of employees. While in some cases he will talk to lower level employees to gather important information as to the logistics of problems, he will ultimately leave the final decision to his upper management staff.

Another CE stated a similar view. He values the information, but will not necessarily use the information.

Our key staff we have meetings... we are the last of the dictatorships, but we still get input or we wouldn't have a meeting. And we listen to what they say and most of the time [it is] all valuable information, but you always have to consider the source. But, you know, I get 20 opinions before I make a decision." (CE 11, personal communication, December 5, 2006).

While the employees are still being involved in the decision making in one way or another, their ideas are not necessarily used, but rather reviewed. Another CE states a similar view, where the employee's ideas can be used for smaller issues, but not the large ones, "I can encourage small decisions like, should we have a company picnic on... Monday or Tuesday. Small decision making? Sure. But I can't really say that I would leave my business, as far as decisions, in the hands of an employee. I couldn't say that I would encourage that too much" (CE 13, personal communication, December 10, 2006).

Other CEs gave responses that were heavier on the Theory Y paradigm. For instance one CE told a story of his set up day.

Sometimes in the summer it gets very hot and so I have a... what we call a church call... And I will talk to the guys Sunday morning, the look on next week, it's going to be very hot, we are setting up on Wednesday, and it's suppose to be over a 100 degrees. What do you guys think about starting at seven in the morning? And when you think about a carnival guy you don't think about a carnival guy waking up at seven in the morning. But these guys they realize that it could be [bad]... and I tell them that we will start at 7 and stop at 11, and then we will take a break until seven in the evening when we will finish it up. It usually takes us eight hours to set up... Everything gets up in eight hours. We get down in six hours. And I'm not running around out there telling people what to do. (CE 7, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

This CE has discovered that using the employees to make decision on how things should be accomplish will also make it easier to accomplish those tasks. This is probably due to the Theory Y assumption that those who are committed to goals will usually follow through on those goals because they are reaching their objectives and personal rewards (McGregor, 1960).

CE 15 understands this concept and includes his employees in decision making because

I think that goes back, Ashley, to where you get your loyalty from. You know, if you work with your people and make them part of the event rather than just an employee there that is there to do something... I think that builds loyalty in the show and when you build loyalty in the show things work smoother and when things work smoother, the show looks better, when the show looks better you get

better dates. I mean the whole thing is kind of hooked... people will say “hey... you did a hell of a job... you got it back again next year you did a great job.” [The carnival owner] will say, ” no, no, no, I didn’t do the great job, the people I work with did a great job. This was an effort by everybody to make this happen, not me, everybody.” And I believe in that wholeheartedly... And I think that those people do that because... they like who they work for and they are for the show. (personal communication, December 14, 2006)

It is quite apparent from this CE that this aspect of Theory Y works well for their carnival.

Another CE finds employees input in decision making also useful, “We encourage their input very much on how things are done, and believe me it’s helpful; because a lot of times you’d be surprised because the person with the ninth grade education might have a better idea, a better way to do something than we’ve been doing something the same way for many years (CE 4, personal communication, December 4, 2006). Additionally, CE 10 states the need for the employees in decision making, “We definitely ask for their opinion on a lot of things, yes. They are the ones that are out there so they are actually in the trenches. So a lot of times we can’t actually make a lot of qualified decisions without asking them. (personal communication, December 5, 2006).

Research Question 2

Do the values embedded in the stories told by the carnival’s members communicate a corporate culture that embody a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm? To address this question, the stories generated by the CEs were looked at to determine if the corporate culture of the carnival tended to uphold values that supported Theory X or

Theory Y. As defined earlier, stories that are being analyzed for themes of corporate culture will be occurring between two people within the organization, have a beginning, middle and end and be improvisational (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). Additionally, the rituals, passion, sociality, politics and enculturation will be analyzed in the narratives. The element of passion must be applied for each narrative received as those CEs who participated in this study used this element by choosing to tell certain significant stories during the interviews. Also, these narratives, according to Deal and Kennedy (2000) will produce values with which employees identify and give direction.

Question 1

How would you describe your typical carnival employee?

Regarding the five corporate culture elements, this question elicited responses that supported a Theory Y corporate culture. From the narratives received, only three responses dealt with Theory X, 14 responses dealt with Theory Y and three ritual responses were neither X nor Y. The Theory X responses addressed only the sociality, politics and enculturation elements of the corporate culture.

The corporate culture sociality was addressed as a sociability manifesting Theory X characteristics. CE 2 stated that sometimes he and his superintendents do not see the potential in their employees. His superintendents relay that back to him.

I mean, there are some [employees] that you know can't vary at all off the norm... if they run into something unusual they don't know how to do that. So you know you got to pick a good manager, superintendents and say no that's not the right guy for that job and you know how superintendents can get sometimes, they will say, "Oh he can't do that, we aren't going to have that person do that. We're

going to let that person do that because he's that kind of guy or that kind of girl who can get that kind of work done.” (personal communication, December 3, 2006)

In this sociality the CE and the superintendent have defined their role and the role of the lower employee all while discussing daily happenings. Unfortunately, not being able to see the extent of what people can accomplish is more Theory X than Y.

Another CE also told a story that could establish a corporate culture that leaned more heavily toward the Theory X side of management.

We have had two Mexican employees show up who had been drinking, but were not staggering. They had been drinking before work and we had a five o' clock call and they had gone out and had a few beers before and as soon as they came in we found it out and fired them there on the spot. We got them a bus back to Mexico. (CE1, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

This narrative addresses two areas of corporate culture, politics and enculturation. The organizational politics in this issue display and reinforce the idea that power is held by the CE stating a degree of hierarchy. Enculturation is also addressed because this narrative is used to show employees the CE's zero tolerance for intoxication. His power gave a lesson to all, which clearly stated to not drink before arriving to work, as was as if one is not responsible with their work performance, they will be terminated.

Theory Y was addressed more often than Theory X in the narratives. One example of how Theory Y was related through a narrative discussing task rituals, was by the weekly dismantling of a carnival ride; “They have this attitude... ‘Yeah I got the Scrambler down in six hours, but I'll get it down to four hours next week.’ They are

happy to show themselves that they have accomplished, probably the hardest job in the week” (CE 2, personal communication, December 3, 2006). This weekly task of moving a carnival ride shows the CE’s thoughts of how the employee feels toward his actions. The employee feels a sense of accomplishment and challenge to the goal of moving the ride quicker next week.

A sociality that exhibited Theory Y tendencies can be seen as a corporate culture courtesy toward the general employees from the CE.

I had someone come to me once and they said, “oh those carnival people, where do they come from?” And I looked at them and I said, “Oh they grow them Gibbstown, Florida.” And they looked at me and said, “Well that was kind of a dumb answer.” And I said, “Well that was kind of a dumb question.” I said “these people come from everywhere, they are your next door neighbor, your uncles, they come from everywhere in the country.” And you know... they are probably the hardest working people, for what they get paid, in the country. (CE 15, personal communication, December 14, 2006)

Clearly in this statement the CE defended his employees by showing kindness to them through his narrative, even though his narrative was directed to the outsider in a harsh tone. This kindness also states that they are “hard workers” and money must not be a motivator for them, but instead they have an internal motivation.

Another narrative gives a good example of both politics and enculturation. CE 12 stated that,

The greatest thing about the carnival business that I preach, and I’ve preached it all my life, the last free form of capitalism left on earth. If you aren’t afraid of

working, you can start at the bottom and be at the top faster than any industry on earth simply because the reward in this industry is success. (personal communication, December 5, 2006)

Because this CE “preaches” this message to his employees, he not only shows that each of his employees has the personal power within organizational politics to succeed, he also teaches them the Theory Y assumptions of intrinsic motivation and personal rewards.

Passion is also seen throughout many of the CEs’ interviews. As mentioned previously, the fact that these stories were told demonstrate one element of passion. Other elements also show the CEs use of metaphors and language when telling stories. For instance a CE discusses his employees ability to work together and accomplish tasks by stating that “when the chips are down they pull together and do what needs to be done to accomplish the work in the given amount of time” (CE 2, personal communication, December 3, 2006). Clearly showing the Theory Y assumption of employee’s ability to solve problems and be committed to goals. Another CE discussed the dedication and determination of his employees, “and these people were so geared up, you know, whatever it takes to make it happen we are going to do it... no one is going to stand in our way. If it takes us all night and all day we are going to do it, we are going to build it, it’s going to get done” (CE 15, personal communication, December 14, 2006). The passion in this CE’s narrative tells of his employee’s hard work and motivation.

Question 2

How do you correct employees?

Answers elicited from question two regarding the five elements of corporate culture were more evenly distributed between Theory X and Theory Y. Of the 15 CEs

that answered the questions, 11 responses supported Theory X and 13 responses supported Theory Y. There were no references to sociality that supported a Theory X paradigm.

The first element of the corporate culture that supported Theory X was that of task rituals. For instance, CE 10 described an instance where she consistently retold her employee what to do.

I think they need a lot of direction because they want the employer's involvement.

These are not the kind of employees that really want to work on their own independently, they want the employer involved. So I think a lot of the time they will maybe deliberately not go from step A to step B because they want the attention that keeps coming back to them, the strokes, whatever it takes saying you know, "Ok you did a good job, now let's paint some more, let's change the colors and go on." That's what I think they like... and another thing they do, they will complete one task and they will come and report, "Done. I got the bunkhouse completely cleaned out." "Oh that's great Danny, now will you go and do the other bunkhouses?" "Yep, I'll do the next one now" and then when he is done, "I've got the other one done do you want to come and check?" (personal communication, December 5, 2006)

In this case it is clear that the task clearly defines a Theory X paradigm of the corporate culture with the constant retelling or directing that the CE must do in order to have her employee work.

In the case of politics, the use of personal power was referenced three times by CEs. One CE uses personal power to control his employees work habits; "Sometimes I

just bawl them out and tell them I will dock their pay if it happens again” (CE 12, personal communication, December 5, 2006). Politics of this sort emphasize a threatening culture.

Enculturation was also addressed as supporting Theory Y by four different CEs. One CE stated, when addressing new hires, “A good question you always ask a new employee, ‘do you want a job or do you want to work? Because this is not just a job, this is work’” (CE 4, personal communication, December 4, 2006). Apparently this CE felt that employees do not just have a job when working for him, but they really work. This type of enculturation sets up the tone for the new employee that work is prevalent on this show and if one does not work they should look for a new job. Additionally, this CE touched on the passion element of the corporate culture as well when the story was told.

Theory Y was also supported by the corporate culture. One CE discussed certain task rituals that encouraged interaction with superintendents and ride operators when there were questions that need to be discussed; “if your superintendent or you personally... can take the time once in a while to explain why you do something a certain way, then that’s a good thing” (CE 2, personal communication, December 3, 2006). Not only does this scenario discuss the element of the task ritual and the CE’s willingness to show his employee how to correctly accomplish a task, which will in turn bring new responsibility upon the employee as Theory Y assumes, but it also uses the element of enculturation to show the employee that learning on this carnival is essential.

The sociality element of corporate culture was also address by the CEs in the form of privacies and courtesies. CE 2 stated that when correcting his employees he “would take them aside, so it’s not a group thing. It is best if they can realize it themselves”

(personal communication, December 3, 2006). In this scenario the privacy is accomplished by critiquing the employee in private rather than public. Also, the additional statement of having the employees realize for themselves harbors a Theory Y atmosphere of employees being able to solve problems and being bright. CE 15 addressed the courtesies element in a scenario involving a hypothetical narrative.

Well, basically the way we handle things is it is not a yelling, screaming situation. Some of these people, sometimes they are given eight things to do at one time and they may have forgotten it. Usually you remind them to do it. Like “Frank, go move that.” Well Frank didn’t move that. “Frank I don’t know if I told you, but didn’t I ask you to move that a little while ago?” “Oh yes you did, I’ll go do that.” And the third time if it is not done... obviously there is a reason for it. I mean... everyone does not work for me but pretty much everything gets done... you may ask them two or three times and eventually it gets done. (CE 15, personal communication, December 14, 2006)

In this case the CE and the hypothetical Frank use the courtesies element to establish the social rules of the corporation. In this case, since there is a lack of threatening behavior and the element of multitasking on the employee’s part signifying ample responsibility, a Theory Y environment is to be expected.

Politics was addressed with indications of Theory Y. For instance, CE 14 stated a bargaining politic of motivation. “I don’t know if you can force anybody to do anything. We motivate people, give raises, employee recognition program. So we don’t have too many employees that don’t complete their task” (personal communication, December 10, 2006). In this instance, the motivation factor of politics enhances the Theory Y

atmosphere of employee being motivated and not having to be forced to complete tasks with threats or coercion.

Enculturation can be seen through almost any aspect of employee and employer interaction since something new is being learned about the organization and the way things are to be completed through these interactions. For instance, CE 14 states that “we do not have any employee, not one employee, food, rides or games that works for us that doesn’t go through the employee training program (personal communication, December 10, 2006). Initially as the employee starts his employment, he undergoes enculturation.

Passion is also shown through the Theory Y paradigm. CE 8 tells a story of the government coming to the carnival industry for ideas on moving during World War I.

During that time they were trying to figure out how they would move an army. And they went and followed the carnival for a couple of months to see how they moved so quickly because they didn’t understand how they could move that fast. So they took what the carnival had done by using the electrical boxes and the generators and the portable this and the portable that and they copied the same thing and so that is how the army figured out how to move an army. (personal communication, December 4, 2006)

This CE obviously takes great pride in knowing that the United States Army came to the carnival industry to discover how to move more effectively in battle. This passion can be seen in his story as portraying the carnival industry as an intelligent, bright industry that can be emulated by others.

Question 3

How do you have employees complete tasks?

Answers from this interview question yielded results that supported both Theory X and Y equally with 12 narratives, hypothetical narratives or statements that supported Theory X and 12 that supported Theory Y. In addition to the 24 narratives that supported the Theories, there were five additional narratives, hypothetical narratives or statements of task rituals, passion stories and socialities that were neutral.

One Theory X narrative supports every aspect of the corporate culture.

I never rely on them to use their own initiative to complete a task in anyway they see fit. I don't do that because I feel that in doing that I am setting the employee and myself... up for a disappointment. So, for instance, I had a good deal of foreign students who were working in the games and I was managing the games this year. So I told the employees we are going to have three rules. Rule number one, they were foreigners so they liked to speak in their own tongue, and I said, rule number one is we will speak English at all times. Rule number two is that we will have a wonderful attitude and if we can't, if we wake up on the wrong side of the bed, we will not come to work. And the foreign students, of course their motivation was to get as many hours as possible. And number three you will work so hard that when you get home at night every bit of your body will be so grateful to lay down and your heart will feel so good because you know that you gave me 100 percent because I won't accept 98 percent... So once I told them this... I assigned them to whatever their job was. They got in their booths, their different booths, and then maybe there was three or four of them in each booth and I went from one booth to the next and said, "now listen, these customers are only going to be here for a short period of time and we must remember... to be as

pleasant to make their short period of time here so fun that they will want to spend their money with us, but we cannot spend too much time because we have to go on to the next [location]. Take up as brief of time as we can and show them a good time. And this is how we do it.” And so I jumped in with every one of them and showed them exactly what I wanted. Now at the end of the day or as I walked around if they were not doing it the way that I felt... I would give them a little nudge and say remember we were going to do this. And you know, they just fell into line and did exactly what I asked for really and at the end of the day everyone one of them told me I was right. They did feel in their heart so good because they had really given me a 100 percent. And they really did. (CE 13, personal communication, December 10, 2006)

The culture of this corporation can be seen throughout this entire narrative. Immediately the CE sets the tone for the culture as more Theory X, as it is stated that the workers initiative would not be considered when completing a task. The CE continues stating the rules for working, or the enculturation. The rules of this carnival must be adhered to and because as stated earlier the employee’s initiative is not considered, one must assume that the CE would not see the employees as being fit to complete any task without these rules. Additionally, the rules suggest that the politics within this carnival rest solely on the CE. It is the CE’s personal power that runs and dominates the show, not the input or initiative from the employee.

As the CE carries on with the story it continues to the task ritual. In this case the ritual has been defined through the enculturation as to exactly what must take place, suggesting a Theory X paradigm. On the other hand, there is also a lack of detail to

assume that the employee does not take some initiative to complete the task in a way that distinguishes them as Theory Y, whether they solve a dilemma by using their skills or are committed to the goal of persuading the customer to spend as much money as possible. Additionally, the CE does briefly discuss the employee's motivation for being on the show, to generate as much money for him or herself as possible while working at the carnival. This could be viewed as an employee commitment to attaining personal goals, as described by Theory Y. The passion element of the corporate culture also plays into both Theory X and Theory Y aspects. For instance, while the employees were commanded to give a 100 percent effort, they were also reported to have felt good at the end of the day for giving that 100 percent. So while this aspect began as Theory X, over the course of time, it developed into Theory Y from the employee perspective. So while the CE may view the employee in a Theory X paradigm, the aspect of Theory Y can also be seen through the employee's motivation to make money and desire to work hard. The corporate culture of privacies can also be viewed as X and Y. They begin as a reminder of what needs to be done through a controlling aspect, but communicate in such a way that would suggest kindness, an opposite trait of X.

Other CEs encountered aspects of Theory X and Y mixed within employee task rituals.

Most the time [tasks are] very structured, more often than not. I mean, we have some where you can just basically say you know what, you handle it and they will handle it. But most of them need and want more structure and that goes back to... the employer interaction... A lot of the employees, you give them a task, like corporate America, you give them a task, they don't want to report back, they

don't feel the need to report back. Like, say I need you [to] have a meeting with the company and set up a meeting and blah, blah, blah and they will just get it done and they won't report back much to their employer and they don't want to be told how to get it done because they are very capable people. In this case we have the capable people but they still want the employer interaction so it's different from a lot of corporate America. (CE 10, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

In this case the CE has the majority of employees complete the task in a structured and directed way which would indicate a Theory X. However, further in the hypothetical narrative, the CE states that the employees are "capable," a definite Theory Y trait. Again, this culture seems to exhibit both Theory X and Y traits.

Yet, in other instances it seemed that certain tasks must be viewed in a Theory X paradigm and other tasks as Theory Y.

When it comes to safety it has to be structured; there is no room for deviation from anything that's... I mean, it has to be safe. Everything else can be on their own. I mean, a lot of guys come up with a better idea. That's exciting when you get a new individual today when they come up with an idea that makes things better, safer. On the other side of the coin, not so much fun when you get a new guy who thinks he knows it all and doesn't change things for the better... if you have to force somebody to work then they need to be doing something different. They have to want to be there. (CE 7, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

In this instance, the CE discusses certain aspects of the industry that have to be communicated in the culture as done in a way that would support Theory X. However, he goes on to commend interactions with employees going past the daily task rituals to discover safer ways of completing tasks and adding the idea that work must be an internal motivation and a natural part of ones life by adding that employee must want to be there. In this instance, it would appear that the CE embraces a Theory Y corporate culture.

Question 4

How would you describe your workplace atmosphere?

This question was developed to discover if the CEs thought positively or negatively about their workplace atmosphere. From the 15 CEs, 37 metaphors or statements were made to describe the corporate culture. As defined earlier, metaphors fall under the passion category of the corporate culture. A few of these areas under passion also open the door to other aspects of corporate culture such as rituals, socialities, politics and enculturation.

Of the 37 metaphors and statements, seven CEs used the metaphor “family,” for the carnival. Four CEs used the metaphor of “business,” in reference to the carnival. Four CEs used the metaphor “team,” and 22 other references were made citing other terms and metaphors. Of the 22 other terms, 14 can be categorized as positive. Some of the 14 terms were: “tight knit,” “willing to help” (CE 2, personal communication, December 3, 2006), “cheerful,” “challenging” (CE 5, personal communication, December 4, 2006), “friends” (CE 6, personal communication, December 4, 2006), “positive” (CE 7, personal communication, December 4, 2006; CE 10, personal communication, December 5, 2006), “pressure less” (CE 12, personal communication,

December 5, 2006), and “company oriented” (CE 15, personal communication, December 14, 2006). Few terms had neither a negative nor positive connotation but were neutral; “personalities” (CE 2, personal communication, December 3, 2006), “all” (CE 8, personal communication, December 4, 2006), and “depends” (CE 13, personal communication, December 10, 2006). Lastly, some CEs’ terms had negative connotations; “no socializing” (CE 1, personal communication, December 3, 2006), “upper and lower class” (CE 3, personal communication, December 4, 2006), and “hurried, run the gamut” (CE 13, personal communication, December 10, 2006). From the elicited terms it appears that the CEs thought more positively about the workplace than negatively. Compared with the narratives from RQ1, all nine CEs who responded with only positive metaphors to the workplace atmosphere elicited over 62% of their narratives as Theory Y; of the six CEs that responded with both positive and negative metaphor of the corporate culture, four elicited narratives that were over 59% or more Theory Y. This looked to see if those CEs who had more Theory X narratives also had higher instances of negative metaphors in describing the corporate culture and vice versa with Theory Y.

As pertaining to the categories of corporate culture discussed in the literature review, there were no responses that fit a Theory X paradigm. However, some responses did fit a Theory Y paradigm. For instance, one CE, regarding the atmosphere stated,

Our guys they seem to get along. We have two bunkhouses. Half of our employees go home, but most of the guys seem to get along. On occasion we will do a field trip. We also have a laundry run once a week. We give them the

company vehicle so everyone can do a laundry run... We try to be a pretty good team. (CE 6, personal communication, December 4, 2006).

Not only does this CE think that his employee get along as a team but as a team they incorporate organizational rituals with “field trips” and task rituals with the “laundry run.” Another CE stated that:

We have it all, certainly we talk about team. We have church call every week to discuss different things. We try to have them work as a team. We find that the Hispanic worker will go over and help the other worker when they are done with their ride until they get it done, so they help back and forth. There are always a few that cut out, but most of them will help each other a great deal and we have that throughout the show. And, we try to cross train so they can help on different things... As long as you treat them with that type of attitude, the people will be happy... For instance, when we play [a large fair] it opens on a Tuesday, and we are down in [another town] and we tear down on Sunday night. And we are tearing down all Sunday night and we drive up and get the rides up there Monday night and we have to be open Tuesday and it's so hot. And it's unbelievable to put up a whole show like that. You keep bringing bigger rides early and setting them up early, but what I do then, I go out and go to Costco and I get chickens there and I get fifty chickens and cut them in half and I get some food and I'll feed them all and I think last year there we had sixty cases of soda or water or Gatorade and put it in ice and it was very hot and give them drinks all day long and have food for them so they can make sandwiches. So at lunch time they have sandwiches. So by the time it got to be about eight or nine o'clock that night,

everything was done and set up. It was unbelievable. So then they had half a chicken and water and food and they appreciate that and I do too, because I can keep them there and keep the work going and know that they are treated right.

(CE 8, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

Not only did this CE value his employees and view them as having a “team” attitude, but the task ritual and courtesies of the foreign labor helping the other employee shows the Theory Y paradigm of being motivated to finish goals and naturally liking work. The CE continues after his narrative stating a political aspect of the corporate culture by bargaining and creating allies with his employees by buying them all lunch and dinner.

Another CE showed the sociality element of privacy in his idea of the workplace atmosphere:

As far as our workplace, we have two small operations so we can keep it a lot like family and we can get to know those guys... we do a lot of barbeques and picnics and stuff, you know, baseball games and try and keep a good family type atmosphere and that helps us with a lot more of personal attitude more than anything. You know, I read an article one time by Motorola and they said job appreciation was a much higher governing factor in people in being happy in their workplace and in their job than money ever was. And money was like forth or fifth below job appreciation. So we just try to know these guys and spend time with them. They got a family problem or a personal problem, you just have to try and help them out as a family would, instead of a big operator who doesn't even know who the guy is... first name or last name. So that's basically what we have tried to do. (CE 9, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

This CE understands the need for job satisfaction in regard to keeping employees motivated and committed to goals as Theory Y assumes. He does this through his corporate culture by organizational rituals, barbeques and ball games, and privacies, consulting his employees in a time of need.

In regard to enculturation, one CE saw the atmosphere as being a “big company atmosphere” and tried to bring it to a smaller level, both enculturating and creating allies within the company.

Since we have restructured our operation, it is more of a big company atmosphere, but we are trying to work where we have employee incentives. We have reward programs for the employees, the best looking ride, the most encouraging person. We have a guest relations booth, we have programs that (unintelligible) every stop, if you are caught being good, you get rewarded. And they responded to that pretty well. (CE 11, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

This CE sees the value in keeping the employee motivated to accomplish goals within the company.

Question 5

Do you feel employees generally like or dislike work?

This question attempted to address the Theory X and Theory Y assumption of a person’s work ethic in regard to being positive or negative. Responses for this question did not elicit many narrataives of the corporate culture. Of the 15 CEs, only seven CEs gave responses that dealt with the corporate culture. From the seven CEs that responded, two gave instances of a corporate culture that resembled Theory X. However, those two

CEs also gave instances of Theory Y as well. The other five CEs gave examples pertaining only to Theory Y. However, the majority of all CEs gave indication that their employees enjoyed work, whether or not they gave instances of the corporate culture.

After being asked question five, CE 1 stated instances of how the corporate culture was once through the task rituals and enculturation.

I think they enjoy it. I think there are times, I think the Mexicans... view it a little normal; they show up for work and they work really hard, understanding that if they finish its not for long. There are a lot of things that we've done that can short circuit that idea. It used to be that if a crew got finished with a ride, the first thing you would do would be to go send them to help finish another ride so you would be teaching them that if they work fast they will have to do someone else's work. So we almost built this corporate culture into it that people didn't want to work fast because if they did they would have to do someone else's work. So why work fast so I could take all the time setting this up? So consequently there was a joke in the industry, how long does it take to set up a carnival? As long as you have... [the Mexicans] know that they have to be done in two days and they have two days of work to do, they will get it done in two days so they don't have to do any work on anyone else's ride, but then again if its two weeks, they will take two weeks to set up a two day ride because they know if they don't they will be setting someone else's ride for two weeks. (personal communication, December 3, 2006)

This CE clearly states how the corporate culture of the carnival used to be before the foreign workers came to help. Apparently, to the CE, the workers did not like their work

and therefore would take as long as necessary to complete their task rituals. Additionally, this served as a type of enculturation for any new employees as well. The CE goes on further to discuss the foreign workers and the corporate culture on his show today.

So [with] the Mexicans, we don't do that to them; they know what they have to do and they know when we open and they get it done and they behave like a normal person should behave. So, if they get all the rides up in a day and they have two more days, we pretty much go easy on them for the two days. We may call them in to clean up and do the things that they still need to do, but we don't tell them to go and set up other peoples rides because they are slow. We let the other guys continue setting up the rides. (CE 1, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

The CE has realized that in the past, forcing the employees to do other people's work was not productive for his employees and additionally created an ineffective culture. Now, his foreign workers, not being forced to do other's tasks but rather just their own, "behave" like everyone else. The CE also states that there are times that you can push the foreign worker too hard. Interestingly enough the foreign worker will push back.

There are times when they work 15 hours days setting up a ride and... they don't have power [or] lights and all of a sudden it's a situation where your not going to get much done... I've seen them for the most part, without getting into a yelling and screaming match, I've seen them pretty much say, no, I'm going home, we're done for the day, which is not normal. Normally you're not going to go home and we pretty much impose things on them. When these guys say it, they'll work pretty hard and they will put in a long, long days work. When it's close to midnight or its ten o' clock at night and there is no more lights and there is no

more power, and they say that they are done, they are done. If you make it an issue, you are going to get something worse out of them if you would just let them go to bed and let them come back tomorrow morning. They will either be quitting or you will be getting an “I don’t care” attitude. But that’s normal, they have been there 15 hours and they can’t be productive anymore and there’s a time where smart management would dictate you hitting diminishing returns with certain employees. They are too tired to work and all your going to do is work them so hard is that they are going to get injured or they are going to get sick or they are not going to show up tomorrow, when otherwise they will be well rested and get productive time in. And these guys are sometimes exhibiting more common sense in their limitations than what we would traditionally try to impose upon them. So it’s not a bad thing. (CE 1, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

In this case it is the employees that call the shots to the CE. The CE, however, realizes that this is normal due to the circumstances that the employees have been working. Their task ritual would suggest that while they enjoy their work. But because they have been working 15 hour days, they do not want to over exert themselves and rather use common sense to stop. In this case, the common sense can be seen as an attribute of Theory Y; since the employees are the ones who are bright enough to stop working so they will be capable and useful at work the next day. Politics are also in play in this case. There is evidence of bargaining and creating allies that can be seen in the previous narrative as well. The employees are bargaining to leave their work and go home for the night with the management and the CE. The CE and the management likewise let them go for the

night without “yelling and screaming,” a threatening aspect of Theory X, and therefore created allies with the employee. By doing this the CE avoids the “I don’t care” Theory X attitude that he stated would have been created if he did not let them leave for the night. By doing this he fosters a Theory Y corporate culture by letting the employee take control of the situation.

While only two CEs touched on the Theory X corporate culture, the rest discussed the Theory Y corporate culture. One CE gave an example of the Theory Y corporate culture through courtesies from his employees to himself, “the immigrants from Mexico, they are so happy to be there and working, that they come up to me and thank me for the job and they are excited to be there” (CE 7, personal communication, December 4, 2006). This CE also continues to show the passion that he has for his corporation and the ability for anyone working in it to be successful.

Being in the carnival business is so exciting. You can literally get started [from] a shoestring budget. I got started with one little, hundred dollar game. It’s one of the places where, in this country, one of the areas, one of the industries where you can start very small and really have limitations only on yourself” (CE 7, personal communication, December 4, 2006).

Another CE describes the culture within her show in regard to keeping work fun and enjoyable, a Theory Y aspect, through the courtesies between the ride supervisors and employees during a regular task ritual.

No, I feel that they like the work that they do. I mean, a lot of it’s tedious, but because your coworkers are fun and cheering, then tedious work is ok if you like the people you are working with. Ashley, we have to wear hardhats for set up and

tear down now. So... our ride supervisor guy went and got all the guys customized hats. They either have their name on them or the football team they like or the NASCAR driver they like or that kind of thing just to make tear down nice. (CE 10, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

In this case the culture is not just seen within the ride operators but is traversing between all levels of management.

Question 6

How do you feel about employee feedback?

The purpose of this question was to discover whether CEs sought and valued any information that employees had to offer. Of the 15 CEs that answered the question, all CEs stated that they valued their employee's feedback; only six, however, gave examples of the use of feedback within the corporate culture to support either a Theory X or Theory Y environment. From those six examples, all CEs supported a Theory Y paradigm.

For example, CE 9, uses a reward system to harvest ideas from employees touching on aspects of task rituals, privacies and enculturation.

We try and foster ideas anyway, we try to build on ideas. Bring us an idea; give us an idea, anything we can use to improve our operation. We pay them 25 bucks for an idea. So that kind of fosters the involvement into the business. You know, if we can get an idea from them that we can use we will wave a big flag... John Doe got 25 dollars for his idea, bring your ideas, bring your ideas. It builds them more into their company. People always enjoyed... being involved in something, and once again it goes back to the idea more than money. The involvement of "hey that's my idea," that's more than anything... And the thing we do with that

to build off of that. We bring the guy in, because a lot of the time a guy can put something down on paper but he can't really explain it to the point where you can look at it and say yeah that's a good idea. So you bring him in and get him involved and then you can build from that. He might open up and tell you something on a piece of machinery that he won't put on paper, that he can't put on paper. He can't explain why the idea is to do this, this thing he thinks we should do, so we try to build off of that... If the guy's got an idea and he's made the effort to write it down, its worth at least to sit him down and say explain it to me, to take it a little farther. (personal communication, December 5, 2006)

In this section, the CE first establishes the enculturation of Theory Y within his organization by saying to his employees through this system that their ideas are important and that they are thought of as bright. When the CE brings the employee in to discuss his idea, privacies are established as well. Again, this is telling the employee that he is bright and has important information to add in solving problems within the organization. Lastly, the task ritual changes after the new implementation takes place, announcing to all that do this task that one of their own employees had the capability to change the task, and the management thought he was smart enough in doing it; all traits of Theory Y.

CE 13 also sees the benefit in asking employees for feedback and always listening when those suggestions are not logical.

I think that feedback is really good... some people come to work they have in their mind a better way to invent the wheel. So very often when they come to you and say "you know I think it would be so much better if you did it this way" and it's totally off the charts as far as making sense goes. I don't think you ignore it,

but you try to explain it to them that this is the old tried and true method and that has been. But I have had some awful good suggestions from employees that really worked. So, not to blow them off, but to listen to what they have to say. And in some cases, like I say in some cases, they have some really good ideas and in some cases they are totally ridiculous. So in the case of being ridiculous, I don't think you can blow them off. I think you can explain to them and at least they feel like you listen to them. And if they feel a part of something, they will be better at what they do I think. (personal communication, December 10, 2006)

By listening to her employees this CE does the same as the previous CE; enculturates employees to let them know that they have the ability to solve problems and are bright. It also shows that the CE will listen to employee feedback, and will show courtesies when listening, and not threaten or belittle the employee.

CE 15 also takes his employee feedback seriously and views it as important.

We listen to employees... [say] you're painting a fence but your people could show you how to paint a fence, but maybe it's the fifth guy down there that may have a better way to paint the fence. So if we did something everyday and someone comes up and says you know why don't we do it this way, it could be easier you know we don't say... oh just shut up that's not your job we'll tell you how to do it. We step back and take a look at what the person has to say. It may be a better way. (personal communication, December 14, 2006)

Again, what is communicated to the employee is the idea that they are bright workers that can help in organizational problems through privacies with management, and through improving daily task rituals, which then is enculturated to all employees.

Another CE demonstrated the effects of not taking place in social rituals when his foreign labor quit on him without notice due to not having enough food for breakfast; “and we didn’t even know it was happening because we weren’t eating breakfast with them... [and] they never said anything because they probably didn’t think it was appropriate to talk to their employer or they couldn’t because of the language” (CE 1, personal communication, December 3, 2006). This CE demonstrates the use and need of social rituals within his organization. In addition, the CE admitted to being too controlling with his employee by trying to provide everything for them, but ended up paying them more so they could, “manage their life instead of us figur[ing] out what they were getting for breakfast in the morning” (CE 1, personal communication, December 3, 2006).

Question 7

Do you include your employees in the daily decision making?

This last question explored the CEs’ trust of employee information and whether they made changes with that information. Of the 15 CEs that answered the question, all said that they let their employees take part in certain aspects of decision making. Of the 15 CEs, eight relayed stories that gave references to corporate culture in regard to Theory X and Theory Y. Six of the eight gave responses that supported Theory Y and two gave responses that supported Theory X and Theory Y.

In one case, a CE stated that “key staff... have meetings. We have staff meetings” (CE 11, personal communication, December 5, 2006). This would indicate that certain employees are part of the task ritual of decision making, but he continues to state a Theory X trait that “we are the last of the dictatorships” (CE 11, personal

communication, December 5, 2006). A reference that would assume employees inputs are not of value. He then goes on to say “but we still get input or we wouldn’t have a meeting and we listen to what they say and most of the time all valuable information. But you always have to consider the source” (CE 11, personal communication, December 5, 2006). In this case, while the CE seems to value input, but only if he agrees it is useful and reliable. Another CE stated a similar situation when discussing decision making within his show, “we will discuss things with them, that doesn’t mean I’m taking what they say” (CE 6, personal communication, December 4, 2006). While it is seen that it is important to let employees make the decisions, they must be supervised.

However, other CEs demonstrated more tendencies to include the employee’s decisions in daily tasks. One CE demonstrated task rituals and personal strength that was more prone to be viewed as Theory Y.

They have great latitude, my employees do, in accomplishing a task. If I want a task done, I don’t tell them how to do it. In other words if I wanted a box taken from here to there, I wouldn’t say go pick up the box, walk down the aisle and put it on the table. I’d just say take the box to the table and you understand that kind of example. I don’t care how it gets accomplished as long as they accomplish it within the rules of our carnival. (CE 5, personal communication, December 4, 2006)

This CE trusts his employees to carry on decision making regarding their own tasks. By doing this he relinquishes his personal power over his employee and in turns gives them the power to make decisions in their task rituals, therefore giving the employee the ability

to be bright within the organization and possibly create internal motivation to see one's own idea be carried out to completion.

Another CE understands the important aspect of privacies regarding decision making.

If we have a major problem with an employee, we try to get a guy that's the closest supervisor, rather than just the ride superintendent, who may not be able to touch this guy [or] get really close to this guy all the time... I think we try and get together with them because we have had a lot of good people in my life that weren't really the greatest people in society, and we built some of the best employees that I've ever had out of those people by sitting down [and talking].

You know, a lot of people have personal problems that have been carried life long and no one has ever taken the time to sit down and ask them [what] can we do to help you? Tell us you are a great employee, we want to help you? What's the problem? You have something eating at you? Tell us what the problem is. Well it's no different from a 200 dollar an hour shrink. You can sit and listen to a guy for an hour and that's all he wants is somebody to talk to. And we are small enough with both operations that we can do that and, I think, I think that it's helped us over the years. I think that's been beneficial... But I really do believe that through the process of counseling we have tried to build into the modern world where you can talk about people's problems. I have a great gal in my office... the gal's my book keeper and has her CPA license and just the greatest person I've ever worked with. And the gal's my assistant, which used to be a secretary, but now it's an assistant; she's a great gal. She just has a lot of personal

problems. Twenty five years ago I probably would have let her go, but she's a great gal and does a great job. But you have to talk to her about once every couple of months because she has some family problems at home, so through the process we have become really close. She is a great gal and does a wonderful job and you know she'll come to me and we will sit in my office and talk about stuff for about an hour – nothing related to business. And her job the next day is so much... you can really just see the difference... Anyway it's a tough business. You have to talk to these people and give them a little bit of family feeling. And it goes back to what I said a little bit ago a family atmosphere. And it's worked well for us and I think that kind of answers the question. If you can talk to people and spend a little bit of time with them, you can save a guy from possibly leaving just simply because you took an effort to simply ask if there was anyway you could help him. That's just a lot better than giving him a fifty dollar raise or hundred dollar raise. (CE 9, personal communication, December 5, 2006)

By seeing potential in the employee, and sitting down with that employee to discuss certain personal or organizational problems, he was able to foster greater capabilities within that employee that in turn led to better workers and increased decision making from those workers.

DISCUSSION

The first research question addressed how the manager would describe their typical carnival employee, in order to gain a view of how managers thought of their employees, whether it was through a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm. Hypothesis 1 predicted that managers would communicate to their employees through a Theory X paradigm and hypothesis 2 stated that managers will think of their employees through a Theory Y paradigm. The CEs generated a total of 173 narratives, hypothetical narratives or actual occurrences of Theory X or Theory Y in their interviews. Of the 173 occurrences, 125 or 72% supported Theory Y and 48 or 28% supported Theory X. From the research, it was discovered that only 30% of CEs communicated to their employee in a way that would signify those employers as emulating a Theory X paradigm; while 70% communicated to their employees in a Theory Y manner, not supporting the first hypothesis. This would suggest that employers communicate to their employees in a way that portrays the employee as naturally liking work, being motivated to complete work, committed to their tasks, accepting of responsibility, having the capacity to solve organizational problems and as bright in their intellectual skills; all Theory Y traits (McGregor, 1960).

In instances where the CEs portrayed occurrences of Theory X, such as forcing employees to work and the idea of employees not wanting to work or being able to solve problems, the tendency generally was in reference to American employees that had been in the industry in the past 20 years. However, American employees that had been with the company “back in the old days,” presumably during and prior to the 1970’s, were viewed with a Theory Y paradigm.

Most interesting was that management did not portray a Theory X paradigm toward the foreign labor as they did toward past American employees. Foreign labor was portrayed rather in a Theory Y paradigm and for many “foreign labor... brought the level up and raised the bar for [the] American labor” (CE 4, personal communication, December 4, 2006). Likewise, since the employer communicated to the employee in a Theory Y manner, the employer also responded in terms of the Theory Y traits, thereby supporting the second hypothesis statement. From the research, 79% of the CEs gave narratives or hypothetical narratives that portrayed a Theory Y paradigm. Additionally, every CE stated that he or she thought his or her employees enjoyed the work that they did on the carnival and for the most part did not have to force them. CEs who used foreign labor in their shows thought highly of this workforce and specified that during times when employees were difficult to obtain, the foreign labor was always willing to and eager to work.

However, certain areas of management, such as correcting employees and specific task completion, did produce more Theory X responses, up to 50%. However, one could view this Theory X style of correcting employees to be the cause of the highly sensitive nature of the industry regarding safety. Because these employees are dealing with pieces of equipment that could potentially, if not handled correctly, threaten the lives of patrons, specific work criteria had to be accomplished in certain ways which may not seem to leave room for a Theory Y paradigm. In this case, the management may be mistaken for Theory X or an authoritarian style of management. According to Hackman and Johnson (2004), the authoritarian leader, “maintains strict control over followers by directly regulating policy, procedures, and behavior” (p. 38). This aspect of authoritarian

leadership must be in place in order to follow specific safety guidelines due to the nature of the work. However, the aspect of authoritarian management “creat[ing] distance between themselves and their followers as a role of emphasizing role distinctions” was not as commonly seen from the interviews (Hackman & Johnson, 2004, p. 38). In this case, a more harsh and controlling aspect may be thought of as more imperative to ensure the safety of the patron. McGregor (1966) also touches on the aspect of changing management technique for certain situation as he realized that “different circumstances require different leadership characteristics” (p. 72). Obviously, if certain demanding work situations arise, a need to change management tactics and communication will be necessary.

Another work aspect that elicited both Theory X and Theory Y responses looked at how employees completed tasks. CEs approached task completion with the idea that tasks should be structured, similar to Theory X, but tended to bring in aspects of Theory Y in their approach. They understood the needs for personal rewards such as pride and feeling good about work accomplished and the motivation that it brought about. This reflects McGregor’s (1966) findings that once the lower level needs of a worker are fulfilled, self actualization can be the best way to motivate and manage employees (pp. 12-13).

Overall, research question 1 can be answered that employers do think of their employees in a Theory Y paradigm and communicate to them in that paradigm. While hypothesis 1 was proven false, hypothesis 2 was supported, even though the preliminary interviews predicted both hypotheses would be supported and employees were to be

thought of in a Theory Y paradigm, but communicated to in a way more supportive of Theory X.

Research question 2 explored whether the values embedded in the stories told by the carnival's members communicate a corporate culture that embody a Theory X or Theory Y paradigm. By looking at the criteria from Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1983), the element of rituals, passion, socialites, politics and enculturation, hypothesis 3 predicted that the corporate values will reflect a Theory X paradigm rather than Theory Y as the corporate culture. CEs generated a total of 134 total responses that could have been categorized as a performance of corporate culture discussed earlier. Of those 134 responses, 95 or 71% were categorized as Theory Y and 39 or 29% as Theory X. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported, since the corporate culture was more Theory Y in nature. The majority of these occurrences came from rituals, socialities and politics.

There were however, two instances where the corporate performances embodied aspects that were closely divided between Theory X and Theory Y; correcting employees and task completion. It seemed that when correcting employees, many CEs liked to show the employee how to correctly accomplish a task to further empower the employee when addressing the same situation in the future. This aspect ties with McGregor's (1960) Theory Y paradigm by giving the employee responsibility. However, some employers thought it better to use personal power to threaten employees into completing the task correctly the next time. This type of coercion falls directly under a Theory X paradigm (McGregor, 1960). Also noteworthy was the change from the "old" ways of threatening or coercing employees due to its ineffectiveness, to the new trend of Theory Y

techniques. There was a trend for CEs to be more authoritative when having employees complete task rituals. As discussed by Hackman and Johnson (2004), authoritative tactics such as “one-way, downward communication, personally direct[ing] the completion of tasks, and dominating interaction” (p. 39), may have been needed due to the element of patron safety.

When CEs were asked about workplace atmosphere, metaphors were elicited about the corporation that could be seen as a passion element of corporate culture. These metaphors, coded either positive or negative, corresponded with the CEs’ individual Theory X or Theory Y paradigm of their corporation. For instance, if one CE had a paradigm that his or her show was more likely to have Theory Y aspects, the metaphor produced was more likely to be positive. However, if metaphors included negative aspects then that CE tended to have more Theory X characteristics in his or her responses.

Overall, it was discovered that CEs had a paradigm that supported Theory Y in relation to how they thought of and acted toward employees and in their corporate culture. It is notable to mention that in interviews it was discovered that past employees, before the use of foreign labor, were more thought of and acted upon in a Theory X framework; however, employees from “the old days,” during the 1970’s and prior, and current foreign labor were thought of as Theory Y. Perhaps the change of employee work ethic, from past unmotivated workers to motivated foreign workers, created the change in CE paradigm. Theory X used to be in fashion because the quality of employees and their lack of motivation and the necessity to take Theory X characteristics

to have employees work. The foreign labor likes to work, which in turn created a new paradigm for the managers.

There was another reason for the shift to Theory Y in the carnival industry. One CE discussed this shift.

I think the group now are [sic] happy here... I'm thinking that I'm happier. I think the carnival industry has done a swing. I think we are in the middle of a swing of a cycle where the industry got so over competitive that we were doing everything for the wrong reason, either for ego or the goal didn't become to make money... but became to compete... But the swing in the industry, I think the industry is reciprocal in that we are seeing something now that is a long... long overdo... and I think that it has to get back to happiness. I think that what is happening is that all the things that were happening, they are tapering down because the pendulum is swinging. Everyone got so dissatisfied with things that we weren't trying to help out in the business, we were trying to hurt someone else. When you cross the street to hurt someone else, it's like anything, it's a negative way of living life... You are much better off if you are thinking, how am I going to live better? As opposed to how am I going to hurt the other guy?... So a lot of these little things, people going out of business, people selling out, people retiring, people rolling up the industry, those are manifestations of the pendulum swinging. People going so far in a bad direction, and I think with it going in that direction is part of a business cycle that is normal in America. But I think that because we are so invested financially and mentally that it went way, way, way further that most businesses would go and all of a sudden it got to the point where

that spring got so wound up, that that spring would break or you know fling back in another direction and I think that its doing it right now. (CE 1, personal communication, December 3, 2006)

Perhaps, because the industry has been so competitive, CEs felt as though the only way to keep employees on task was to take Theory X measures of threatening and coercion. Now that the industry has changed to helping others, the shift may have changed the paradigm. McGregor (1966) also adds that even though management may see the need for a change it will take time to make that switch (p.125).

Future Research

While this study has observed the paradigm of the CE, there are future possibilities that may enhance the quality of research and further discover aspects of the CEs' paradigm.

This study was limited to narratives to gather information needed in order to make assumptions of paradigm type. Future research could incorporate surveys that ask Theory X or Y questions and compare narratives to those responses. Furthermore, a survey could have been given before the interview or after the interview to see if the CEs' perspective of him or herself changed as they spoke about themselves as well to see if the more one talks about oneself, the better one views themselves.

Another great possibility for this study would be to take an ethnographical approach to determine if responses that were generated from the CEs correspond with communication that take place in the CE's carnival. If different, a future study could be generated focusing on Erving Goffman's preservation of self in social interactions to see if CEs are merely trying to save face during interviews (Griffin, 2000).

The aspect of gender could also be explored through future studies. In this research there were 13 male participants and only 2 female participants. Future research could focus in on the differences between the male and female CEs in how they lead and manage their employees.

While this study focused only on the perspective of corporate management, additional studies could be conducted that looked solely at employees. Interviews and interactions with employees could be used to determine if employees thought they were communicated to in Theory Y manner and if the culture on the carnival embodied a Theory Y approach. Input from the employees would round out this study and could be used to show comparison on how CEs thought they were communicating to employees versus how they were perceived as communicating. With a study of that nature, gaps between management and employee could be evaluated to determine what communication is lost or gained during working situations.

Also, a look at mid level management could be conducted to observe whether the paradigm held by the CE is actually being carried to the employee. McGregor (1966) focuses on this issue stating that,

Line management (mid level managers) has the full and final responsibility for directing the activities of the people who comprise the organization, because line management is directly responsible to the founders or owner for achieving results through those people. Consequently, line management must retain the full authority to carry out the function for which it is held responsible. (p. 146)

Because these mid level managers are holding such an important position, it would be instrumental to look at their paradigm of the employee and observe whether it tends to take on aspects more in line with Theory X or Theory Y.

Theory X and Y are only one type of management paradigm and cannot account for every factor in certain situations. For instance, a number of CEs may have seemed to communicate in a Theory X style but had to be authoritative nature due to safety (CE 15, personal communication, December 14, 2006; CE 2, personal communication, December 3, 2006; CE 7, personal communication, December 4, 2006). Other management approaches, such as Management by Objectives, Rensis Likert's Systems 4 Theory, Robert Blake and Anne Adams McCauley's management styles, Fred Fiedler's Contingency Model of leadership, or Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory could be assessed for future study to account for such varying situations. Also a study on management with a Christian perspective could be conducted to explore any significant differences between management styles.

Other studies could focus on the aspect of carnival size and its relationship to management style. This study focused on carnivals of various sizes, but future studies could compare the communication of small carnivals to that of large carnivals. For instance, does management of smaller carnivals communicate in a way that is more conducive to Theory X or Y and vice versa for management of large carnivals?

Because of the influx of foreign labor, a study that addresses Gert Hofstede's cultural dimensions could be conducted that traced the origin of the foreign labor and compared work ethic from that culture to American culture to account for Theory Y behaviors. Conducting a study of this nature would also add to the literature concerning

aspects of outsourcing labor and the quality of foreign worker work ethic. Future studies could address the work ethic of foreign labor in other industries in comparison to the carnival to discover if the trend on the carnival for foreign workers to be viewed as Theory Y is similar in other industries. Also, because the carnival industry is not only limited to North America, future studies could address the communication of Theory X and Theory Y in various countries that host carnivals.

Also, a study of the history of the carnival would be valuable. Specifically a researcher could look at the current shifts in the carnival industry. Additionally, researchers could examine if those shifts have correlation with Theory X or Theory Y paradigms and any communication practices in the industry. If any correlation could be found, perhaps a change in the industry by re-educating management to adopt management styles more synonymous with Theory Y, could lead to more effective administration.

Future research should also look to create a general profile of current carnival employee's attitude, character and demographics through survey, observation, interview or any other qualitative or quantitative measure that could be deemed effective. Since past research mainly highlighted negative attributes, perhaps a current and more comprehensive profile could be created that would illuminate all the characteristics of the typical carnival employee not just negative characteristics.

Lastly, towards the end of interviews participants became tired and did not elicit as many narratives and information as was desired. Future studies could address this issue, or multiple interviews could be administered in shorter sessions to keep the CEs eliciting narratives. Additionally, the initial three CEs who were preliminarily

interviewed before the actual study was conducted, had the tendency to elicit responses that leaned toward Theory X, while the 15 CEs who were interviewed for the actual study, elicited responses that tended to be more Theory Y. It could be assumed that because there was a closer bond between myself and the initial three CEs, they were more open to elicit any information, while the other 15 CEs, because they did not have that initial closeness, were reluctant to give information that would categorize them as Theory X. Also, because I was personally involved with the three preliminary CEs, my interpretation of their data could have been skewed toward a Theory X paradigm.

Douglas McGregor's paradigm touched on two views of mankind; one that sees the potential within people and one that does not. The carnival industry has had a negative reputation which could include not seeing that potential within people. However, after interviewing these 15 CEs, it is apparent that the reputation of the carnival is false and management does value the individual as useful, intelligent, hard working, committed and able to be innovative. While at this time findings are limited and in need of further study, new light has been shed on the industry as to the communication that takes place and how that communication affects management techniques. By being able to catch this glimpse into the industry, not only has a new field of study been touched on, but also the effectiveness of interviews and narratives as information gathering has again been confirmed. To not continue study in this field would be closing the door to a world of knowledge and perhaps shutting out any possibility of finding areas that are in need of change in order to preserve this long enjoyed past time.

REFERENCES

- Adams, C. M. (1984). Language of the lot: A glossary of carnival terminology. Unpublished master's thesis, Indiana State University, Terre Haute.
- Bochner, A. P. (2002). Perspectives on inquiry III. In Knapp, M. L. & Daly, J. A. (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication*. (pp. 73 – 101). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Bowman, E. (n.d.). Mr. Naylor's story of 'The dancing turkeys.' *American life histories: Manuscripts for the federal writers' project, 1936 – 1940*. Library of Congress, Washington, DC. Retrieved March 17, 2006 from <www.loc.gov/index.html>
- Brown, M. H. (1985, Winter). That reminds me of a story: Speech action in organizational socialization. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 49, 27 – 42.
- Brown, M. H. (1990, Spring). "Reading" an organization's culture: An examination of stories in nursing homes. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*. 18(1), 64 – 75.
- Carver, A. (2006). *Intra-personal communications and post disclosure dialects: An examination of relational dialects following self disclosure*. Thesis presented to the faculty of Liberty University.
- Davis, D. K., & Jasinski, J. (1993). Beyond the culture wars: An agenda for research on communication and culture. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 141 – 149.

- Deal, T., & Kennedy, A. (2000). *Corporate culture: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Feldman, M., Skoldberg, K., Brown, R. & Horner, D. (2004, Spring). Making sense of stories: A rhetorical approach to narrative analysis. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24, 147+.
- Fisher, W. R. (1978). Toward a logic of good reason. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 64, 376-384.
- Fisher, W. R. (1984, March). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. *Communication Monographs*, 51, 1-22.
- Fisher, W. R. (1987). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina.
- Griffin, E. (2000). *A first look at communication theory: Fourth edition*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Hersey, P., & Kellner C. A. (1968, November). A behavioral approach to training the sales force. *Training and Development Journal*. 2-9. Retrieved February 7, 2005, from EBSCOHost database.
- Hirokawa, R. Y., DeGooyer, D. & Valde, K. (2000). Using narratives to study task group effectiveness. *Small Group Research*. 31(5) 573 – 591.
- Keyton, J. (2006). *Communication research: Asking questions, finding answers*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (2002). Theories of human communication. Albuquerque: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Locander, W. & Luechauer, D. (2005, September/October). The leadership equation:

- Aspiring leaders must learn to generate more hope than fear. *Marketing Management*, 42- 44.
- Martin, J., Feldman, M. S., Hatch, M. J. & Sitkin, S. B. (1983). The uniqueness paradox in organizational stories. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 438-453.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- McGregor, D. (1966). *Leadership and motivation: Essays of Douglas McGregor*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press.
- McGregor, D. (1967). *The professional manager*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- McGregor, D & Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J. (2006). *The human side of enterprise annotated edition*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- McKennon, J. (1972). *A pictorial history of the American carnival volume 1*. Sarasota, FL: Carnival Publishers.
- McKennon, J. (1981). *A pictorial history of the American carnival volume III*. Sarasota, FL: Carnival Publishers.
- Meyer, J. C. (1995). Tell me a story: Eliciting organizational values from narratives. *Communication Quarterly* 43 (2) 210-224.
- Moorhead, G. & Griffin, R. W. (2004). *Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Mumby, D. K. (1993, March). Critical organizational communication studies: The next 10 years. *Communication Monographs*, 60, 18-25.
- Neuliep, J. W. (1987). The influence of Theory X and Theory Y management

- styles on the selection of compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Research Reports* 4, (1) 14-19. Retrieved February 9, 2006, from the Liberty University, ILRC, EBSCOHost database.
- Neuliep, J. W (1996). The influence of Theory X and Theory Y management style on the perception of ethical behavior in organizations. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 11 (2) 301-311. Retrieved February 8, 2006, from the Liberty University, ILRC, EBSCOHost database.
- Osgood, W. R. (1981). *Basics of successful business management*. New York: American Management Associations.
- Pacanowsky, M. E. & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1982, Spring). Communication and organizational cultures. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 46, 115-130.
- Pacanowsky, M. E. & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983, June). Organizational communication as cultural performance. *Communication Monographs*, 50, 126-147.
- Polkinghorne, D. E., (1991). Narrative and self-concept. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1(2&3), 135 – 153.
- Polkinghorne, D. E., (1996). Use of biography in the development of applicable knowledge. *Ageing and Society*, 16, 721-745.
- Polkinghorne, D. E., (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52 (2), 137 – 145.
- Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1996). The values of business and federal

- government executives: More different than alike. *Public Personnel Management*, 25(3), 277+.
- Powell, T. (2004, November 22). A roller coaster ride for carnivals this season. *Amusement Business*. Retrieved October 4 2006, from the Liberty University, ILRC Lexis Nexis database.
- Reddin, W. J. (1969, August). What's wrong with the style theories? *Training and Development Journal*, 14-17. Retrieved February 7, 2006, from the Liberty University, ILRC, EBSCOHost database.
- Richardson, L. (April 1990). Narrative and sociology. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 19(1), 116 – 135.
- Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Strine, M. S. & Pacanowsky, M. E. (1985, Spring). How to read interpretive accounts of organizational life: Narrative Bases of Textual Authority. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 50, 283-297.
- Stevenson, W. B & Greenberg, D. N. (1998). The formal analysis of narratives of organizational change. *Journal of Management*, 24, 741-762.
- University of Western Ontario (2001). Douglas McGregor. In Western Ontario Business Library. Retrieved February, 10, 2006, from <http://www.lib.uwo.ca/business/dougmcgregor.html>
- Van Maanen, J. & Barley, S. R., (1985). Cultural organization: Fragments of a theory. In Frost, P. J. (Ed.), *Organizational Culture*. (pp. 31-53). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Van Maanen, J. (1991). The smile factory: Work at disneyland. In Frost, P.J. (Ed.),

Reframing Organizational Culture. (pp. 58-76). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Vita, T. (2004, October 20). The next generation: A Fab 14. *Amusement Business*. Retrieved October 4, 2006, from the Liberty University, ILRC, Lexis Nexis database.