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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate impression management strategies used by an organization in crisis and to develop a typology of impression management strategies used by an organization. The focus of the study was Marine Shale Processors (MSP), an environmental company located in Amelia, Louisiana, which recycles hazardous and non-hazardous materials into a non-toxic aggregate.

Impression management strategies used by MSP in statements to stakeholders were examined using multiple methods. Also, the study examined whether or not different strategies were utilized with different stakeholders, whether or not management and non-management relied on the same strategies with stakeholders, and whether or not the strategies tended to be proactive or reactive. Data were gathered over a 16-month period from interviews; newspaper, magazine, and journal articles; brochures; Congressional/Legislative hearing transcriptions; handouts from special events; press releases, correspondence, and transcriptions of meetings attended by the researcher. Data were analyzed using log-linear analysis and the chi-square test.

Results suggested that ingratiation was the primary impression management strategy used by MSP with an emphasis on self-enhancing communication. Different impression management strategies were used with different stakeholders.
Management and non-management relied on different impression management strategies. While both groups relied on ingratiation as a primary strategy, management used condemnation of the condemner as its leading strategy while non-management used justification. The majority of MSP responses were reactive, yet ingratiation emerged as more proactive than the other impression management strategies. The study developed five additional categories for an impression management typology and included the ingratiation strategies of role model and social responsibility, condemnation of the condemner, negative events misrepresented, and condemnation of the organization.
CHAPTER I
ACCOUNTABILITY: A REQUIREMENT FOR SURVIVAL

Contemporary environmental awareness emerged more than three decades ago and continues to evolve as a prominent issue in the organizational arena. The general public, as well as various legal entities, has demanded that organizations become accountable for their environmental discharges. For some organizations, external pressures for accountability have resulted in a crisis mode of operation. A major dimension of crisis involves establishing legitimacy which sometimes lies in an organization's ability to offer justifications for its official goals through the use of communication strategies. Virtually no communication research has explored the relationship between impression management strategies and legitimacy. This dissertation fills this void by examining an organization engulfed in crisis evolving from environmental issues and identifies the impression management strategies utilized to ensure its legitimacy as an environmentally responsible and innovative organization in the eyes of its many stakeholders.

Marine Shale Processors (MSP), a reuse-recycle manufacturing facility located in Amelia, Louisiana, was established amidst increasing public awareness of environmental issues. In 1984, MSP owner Jack Kent purchased an abandoned lime plant for the purpose of processing and recycling hazardous oil field and industrial
substances into non-hazardous materials ("Louisiana Lava," 1988). The recycling procedure also produced a by-product, an allegedly non-toxic aggregate nicknamed "Louisiana Lava," which supposedly can be used as a road base and dock fill. While MSP has experienced technological and monetary successes, it also has weathered repeated crises brought about by a variety of stakeholders, or groups that "can either affect or be affected by the accomplishment of ... [its] objectives" (Bedeian, 1989, p. 72). MSP stakeholders, which include governments, customers, suppliers, competitors, employees, media, and society-at-large, exhibit a variety of perceptions about the company. Although MSP suggests its official goal is providing a "solution" to the disposal of environmental waste, some stakeholders contend that it is a primary contributor to environmental damage.

A major challenge facing any organization is to convince stakeholders that its goals are legitimate and that it is effective (e.g., Bedeian, 1987, 1989, 1991; Connolly, Conlon, & Deutsch, 1980). Goals serve as a source of legitimacy "by justifying an organization's activities and, indeed, its very existence to stakeholder groups" (Bedeian, 1991, p. 31). When an organization fails to establish its legitimacy, the result can be crisis and possibly the organization's demise (e.g., Jobson & Schneck, 1982; Lesly, 1984). This has been the problem facing MSP, as
stakeholders have repeatedly questioned its goal of producing a "safe solution" and, thus, its legitimacy.

An organization in crisis must communicate the legitimacy of its goals to key stakeholders in order to survive. Communication theory offers a fertile basis for examining how organizations respond to crisis situations (e.g., Cheney & Vibbert, 1987; Hebert, 1986, 1987; McLaughlin, Cody, & O'Hair, 1983). Certainly organizations per se possess no inherent skills to communicate; individuals communicate explanations rather than organizations. However, reification grants organizations human characteristics (Bedeian, 1991) which allows one to view it as a communication entity. Individual-level theories provide heuristic devices for understanding an organization's communicative actions.

In interpersonal relationships, people often provide explanations for their actions through the use of impression management strategies. While much research has involved impression management strategies utilized in interpersonal settings (e.g., Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Goffman, 1955, 1959, 1967; Hewitt & Stokes, 1975; Higgins & Snyder, 1989; McLaughlin et al., 1983; Schonbach, 1980; Scott & Lyman, 1968; Semin & Manstead, 1983; Snyder & Higgins, 1986; Snyder, Higgins, & Stucky, 1983; Sykes & Matza, 1957; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984; Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981), similar
effort has not been expended in analyzing organizational responses, especially in times of crisis.

However, organizations in crisis may attempt to explain their actions by utilizing discourse to create certain impressions. A typology for examining the impression management strategies used in organizations' public communication would extend current knowledge regarding how organizations communicate with stakeholders. This research reviews impression management strategies suggested in the interpersonal communication literature. These strategies then are used to develop and supply a typology of one organization's impression management strategies.

By analyzing the communication of an organization in crisis, this research provides additional insight into the relationship between organizational legitimacy and impression management strategies. For some organizations communicating the legitimacy of their environmental actions has become a significant responsibility. Thus, before briefly examining the concepts of crisis, legitimacy, and impression management, a review of the evolution of environmental responsibility will be provided.

An Environmental Awakening

In 1962 when Rachel Carson, a marine biologist, authored *The Silent Spring*, she warned of potential harm from extensive use of dichloro-dephenyl-trichloroethane (DDT) and other long-lasting poisons. She was attacked by
the chemical industry as "an ignorant and hysterical woman who wanted to turn the earth over to the insects" (Brooks, 1987, p. xii). Since the publication of The Silent Spring, government at all levels, the public-at-large, and the mass media have exhibited environmental awareness in a multitude of ways (see Appendix A for a discussion of the emergence of environmental awareness). For example, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was founded in 1970 "to serve as the public's advocate for a livable environment" (The U.S. Government Manual, 1988, p. 525). Also, more than 100 organizations have been classified as "environmental evangelists" (Melloan, 1988) for their extensive involvement with environmental issues. These organizations may be classified into three groups (Gills, 1989): public interest groups, industry and professional organizations, and government-related organizations (all of which are stakeholders questioning MSP's legitimacy). Public interest groups are those primarily concerned with the preservation and protection of public health and the environment (e.g., Greenpeace). Industry and professional organizations represent the interests of the business sector yet publicly advocate protecting public health and the environment (e.g., the Hazardous Waste Treatment Council, a national non-profit trade association, which represents 51 commercial hazardous waste management firms and concentrates on tightening regulatory loopholes). Government-related
organizations are involved in protecting the public's environmental interests on local, state, regional, and national levels (e.g., the National Governors Association). Amidst all of the turmoil surrounding environmental issues, the mass media observe and report their perceptions of environmental events. The interaction between the media and other stakeholders provides arenas in which organizations must justify their environmental actions and defend the legitimacy of their goals. The courts provide another arena. It is in such arenas that legitimation crises for organizations become apparent.

Organizations in Crisis

A common emphasis in many definitions of crisis is that of threat and time pressure (e.g., Billings, Milburn, & Schaalman, 1980; Dutton, 1986; Fink, Beak, & Taddeo, 1971; Ford, 1981; Hermann, 1972; Mitroff, Pauchant, & Shrivastava, 1988; Mulder, Van Eck, & DeJong, 1971; Nystrom & Starbuck, 1984; Smart & Vertinsky, 1984). The definition of crisis used here modifies previous designations, suggesting that a crisis involves a series of events which threaten an organization's legitimacy and, ultimately, its survival.

Within the past decade, organizational crises have increased. For example, in the last 20 years, 29 major industrial accidents have occurred worldwide, with more than half occurring within the past decade (Mitroff, 1988). Research indicates that organizations are subject to crises
from a plethora of fronts including public perception, product failure, industrial relations, regulation and deregulation, false rumor/malicious slander, misinformation/miscommunication, and new technologies (Fink, 1986; Ford, 1981; Huber & Daft, 1987; Meyers, 1986; Milburn, Schuler, & Watman, 1983; Mitroff, 1988; Mitroff et al., 1988). Fink et al. (1971) further indicate that "organizations that strive for outstanding success and major power, or seek to contribute something new and different to society, are especially vulnerable to episodes in which reality does not conform to their objectives" (p. 16). MSP introduced a new technology which appears to serve as a source of crisis between the organization and its stakeholders.

While some organizations may face occasional traumas in dealing with environmental issues (e.g., Union Carbide with the Bhopal, India, disaster; Exxon with the Alaskan oil spill; and Uniroyal, the source of alar, a carcinogenic previously sprayed on apples), other organizations experience crises recurrently. MSP has repeatedly encountered crises due to environmental issues and often simultaneously from multiple stakeholders. A recurrent theme in stakeholder queries involved the legitimacy of MSP endeavors.
Organizational Legitimacy as a Key to Survival

Legitimacy has been identified in a variety of ways (e.g., Adams, 1975; Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975; King, 1987; Lipset, 1959; Parsons, 1960; Rees, 1962; Schlosberg, 1969; Stinchcombe, 1965; Weber, 1947); however, a definition which appears to offer a reasonable nexus between crisis and organizations is that of "a global or summary belief that this enterprise is good, or this company has a legitimate right to continue its operations" (Bedeian, 1989, p. 76). Research has indicated that an organization's survival depends on its ability to establish and maintain legitimacy (Boulding, 1978; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) and often legitimacy is evaluated and granted by various constituencies or stakeholders (Adams, 1975; Habermas, 1975; King, 1987).

Since legitimacy is a conferred status, it may be transient, as the perception of what is deemed legitimate and illegitimate constantly changes and evolves (Galaskiewicz, 1985). MSP was granted status as a "legitimate" reuse-recycle facility in 1986 by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Since then, both the DEQ and the EPA have attempted to redefine the term "legitimate" as it applies to MSP.

A major dimension of MSP's legitimacy concerns its licensing status as a recycler rather than an incinerator. Competitors argue that MSP holds an unfair advantage in that
as a recycler, it does not have to abide by as many government regulations as do traditional hazardous waste disposal facilities. Another questioned aspect of MSP's legitimacy focuses on its goal to provide a definitive solution to the disposal of hazardous waste. Some stakeholders indicate that MSP's process and its aggregate are unsafe and have resulted in the development of a cancer cluster, neuroblastoma, in area children.

Because stakeholders continuously question MSP's legitimacy, it devotes considerable effort to managing its public image. However, during times of extreme crisis, organizations often also must devote energies to explaining and justifying actions to their own staff (e.g., Cheney & Vibbert, 1987; D'Aprix, 1982; Meyers, 1986; Pfeffer, 1981). MSP is no exception.

Impression Management as a Strategy in the Quest for Legitimacy

Impression management is an interpersonal communication concept used here to investigate how an organization attempts to influence stakeholder perceptions of its legitimacy. Impression management, also termed "self-presentation," can be defined as the process by which individuals attempt to control the impressions others form of them (Leary & Kowalski, 1990, p. 34). It has been applied to the investigation of a wide variety of interpersonal issues, such as responses to threats and
behavioral freedom (e.g., Baer, Hinkle, Smith, & Fenton, 1980), social facilitation (e.g., Bond, 1982; Sanders, 1984), business ethics (e.g., Giacalone & Payne, 1987), and leadership (e.g., Leary, Robertson, Barnes & Miller, 1986).

In the organizational arena, management of impressions may be referred to in three different ways: image-building discourse, corporate-issue management, and corporate advocacy. With image-building discourse, corporate-issue management, and corporate advocacy, the ultimate goal is to sway public sentiment in an organization’s favor (Cutler & Muehling, 1989) and to convince stakeholders of its legitimacy (Cheney & Vibbert, 1987; Heath, 1980; Wartick & Rude, 1986). Previous research in image-building discourse, corporate-issue management, and corporate advocacy has not yielded a typology of impression management.

An approach to attaining organizational legitimacy may be discovered in the various interpersonal-level impression management strategies. Among the impression management strategies are excuses, justifications, ingratiation, intimidation, and apologies, all of which are possible strategies useful when attempting to establish organizational legitimacy.

Method

When examining an organization which has experienced repeated crises from various stakeholders, a broad cross-section of its public discourse must be collected
longitudinally and viewed from diverse perspectives in order to identify the impression management strategies organizations use. An approach which encourages reliance upon multiple research methods is triangulation (e.g., Bedeian, 1991; Lawler, 1980). To assist in strategy assessment and typology construction, several data collection methods were utilized, including content analysis and participant observation.

An organization in crisis is likely to place numerous messages into the public arena. Some of the communication outlets utilized might include newspaper statements, press conferences, public meetings, governmental hearings, correspondence, brochures, and interviews. Information gathered from MSP archival data and from management and staff interviews was content analyzed.

When conducting field studies, a researcher has role options. For this study, the researcher chose the option of observer-as-participant (Babbie, 1986). In this role, the researcher identified herself as an LSU investigator and interacted with organizational members for 16 months for the purpose of gathering data.

Participant observation provided insight into MSP, the crisis it faced, its approach to its various stakeholders, and its attempts at external and internal impression management. The content analysis information was analyzed using log-linear analysis, "a method which analyzes the
relationship among nominal variables" (Iversen, 1979, p. 315) and chi square. Additional descriptive statistics including frequencies and percentages are provided.

Conclusion

In summary, MSP experienced repeated crises in its dealings with at least seven primary stakeholders: governments, customers, suppliers, competitors, employees, media, and society-at-large. Each of these stakeholder questioned MSP's legitimacy. MSP's survival continues to remain in jeopardy. To continue functioning, MSP has relied upon impression management strategies in its external communications. This dissertation had three primary goals. First, a typology of MSP's impression management strategies was developed from the existing impression management literature thus extending the use of impression management to the organizational level. Second, this typology was used to investigate MSP's public discourse. Third, the types of communication strategies used with various organizational stakeholders were explored.
CHAPTER II

AN EXPLORATION OF MULTIPLE LITERATURES: CRISIS, STAKEHOLDER, LEGITIMACY, AND IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT

This chapter explores two questions: why is an organization forced to establish its legitimacy and how does an organization attempt to prove its legitimacy? To assess why organizations must establish their legitimacy, literature discussing the definitions, sources, and organizational approaches to crisis will be reviewed. The chapter then explores the involvement of stakeholders in crisis and their granting of legitimacy to an organization. For an exploration of how organizations use public communication in an attempt to insure their legitimacy, the impression management literature is reviewed.

Definitions, Sources, and Approaches to Crisis

Previous researchers have offered numerous definitions of crisis (e.g., Billings et al., 1980; Dutton, 1986; Fink, 1986; Fink et al., 1971; Ford, 1981; Hall & Mansfield, 1971; Hayes, 1985; Hermann, 1972; Lerbinger, 1986; Mitroff et al., 1988; Mulder et al., 1971; Nystrom & Starbuck, 1984; Smart & Vertinsky, 1984). As prior definitions have not emphasized legitimacy, the crisis definition which was developed here is that crisis involves a series of events which threaten an organization's legitimacy and, therefore, ultimately its survival.
Organizational crises emerge from a variety of sources including environmental issues (Meyers, 1986; Mitroff et al., 1988; Nelkin, 1988; Nordgren, 1990; Prager & Cala, 1990; Rotman, Chynoweth, & Flam, 1990; Shrivastava, Mitroff, Miller, & Miglani, 1988; Spain, 1978), internal environmental problems (Cheney & Vibbert, 1987; D'Aprix, 1982; Dunbar & Goldberg, 1978; Ford, 1981; Lerbinger, 1986; Meyers, 1986; Milburn et al., 1983; Mitroff et al., 1988; Pfeffer, 1981; Shrivastava et al., 1988), introduction of new technology (Fink et al., 1971), media relations (Gephart, 1984; Molotch & Lester, 1975; Nelkin, 1988; Shrivastava, 1988; Shrivastava et al., 1988), plant equipment defects (Mitroff et al., 1988), product failure (Hebert, 1986, 1987; Meyers, 1986; Mitroff et al., 1988; Lerbinger, 1986), public perceptions (Lesly, 1984; Meyers, 1986; Mitroff, 1988) and stakeholder involvement with organizations (Dill, 1975; Freeman, 1984; Koza, 1988; Lerbinger, 1986; Rotman et al., 1990; Shrivastava et al., 1988; Smart, 1985; Sturdivant, 1979). The sources especially important to MSP are environmental issues, introduction of new technology, media relations, and stakeholder involvement with organizations.

The threat of organizational crises is becoming a concern of increasing importance. Indeed, some organizations have developed specific management units in order to anticipate and proactively respond to crises (Mitroff et al., 1988). Other organizations have joined professional
associations for the purpose of examining methods for coping with crisis issues (Wartick & Rude, 1986), although such actions are in the minority. In general, organizations are unprepared for crisis. In a survey of Fortune 100 companies, only 38% had crisis management plans, arguably because most organizational cultures do not reward members for thinking about crisis (Mitroff, 1988; Mitroff et al., 1988). Even the most sophisticated leaders of organizations tend to jeopardize the survival of their organizations by not knowing the facts regarding their adversaries (Lesly, 1984). Additionally, organizations tend to react to events rather than to plan for crises (D'Aprix, 1982). However, organizations without crisis management plans report lingering effects of a chronic crisis more than two times longer than organizations that were prepared with a crisis management plan (Fink, 1986). Because MSP does not have a crisis management plan yet faces repeated crises, this research examines the extent to which MSP uses its public communication proactively or reactively in an attempt to convince its stakeholders of its legitimacy.

Stakeholders as Legitimacy-Granting Agents

For any organization, certain groups position themselves in the role of either affecting or being affected by its goals and operations. These groups have been designated as stakeholders (Bedeian, 1989; Freeman, 1984). The following section includes an identification of stakeholder groups,
their importance to an organization, and the various displays of legitimacy demanded by stakeholders.

While the "stakeholder" concept initially referred to groups such as shareowners, employees, customers, suppliers, lenders, and society-in-general, the concept now has been expanded to include those who possibly comprise adversarial relationships with an organization: competitors, regulators, customers, suppliers, media, governments, employees, and society-at-large. Many of these groups contain several constituencies (e.g., society-at-large may include activist groups, a local community, and the general populace). Each stakeholder potentially can demand that organizations document their legitimacy although at times organizations deny that stakeholders have a legitimate right to do so (Freeman, 1984).

While the majority of the stakeholder research emphasizes external stakeholders, employees also hold a position of significance. Employee support is necessary for an organization's survival and effectiveness, particularly in times of crisis (Gardner & Martinko, 1988b; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Pfeffer, 1981; Staw, 1980; Wiener, 1982). Also, Paonessa (1984) suggests that employees potentially play a powerful role in communicating organizational issues to the public-at-large. Besides participating in forums with other organizational stakeholders (e.g., public hearings), internal stakeholders interact with family, friends, and
society in general. Before employees can communicate effectively with external stakeholders, they must understand how and why an organization functions as it does (Brown, 1985; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Morgan, 1986; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Wilkins, 1983).

Research suggests that shared attitudes and beliefs are necessary for an organization to survive and adapt to changing economic and social environments (March & Simon, 1958; Schein, 1985; Senn, 1986; Trice, 1985). In times of change, culture provides a means of sensemaking (Gioia, 1986) and for coping with unmanageable, unpredictable, and stressful events (Schein, 1985). In successful organizations, members (both management and non-management) present a unified interpretation of organizational goals (Peters & Waterman, 1982). Shared knowledge of organizational goals and belief in the legitimacy of these goals should result in employees using positive communication strategies in their public discourse. The extent to which non-management communication strategies match those of management provides an indication of the strength of shared beliefs in an organization. The present research looks at the extent to which managers and non-managers use the same or different communication strategies in public discourse.

Through a gradual process, organizations have awakened to the importance of their stakeholders. Dill (1975) argues that organizations typically set the precedent for outside
stakeholder intervention by presenting an image of openness and responsiveness to the public. While organizations in general are partially responsible for encouraging stakeholder intervention, the environmental movement of the 1960s also was responsible. Public awareness of pollution problems and general environmental damage, especially problems generated by industry, resulted in a new era of accountability for organizations. Additional recognition of stakeholder significance came from corporate social responsibility studies (e.g., Blumenthal, 1977; Carroll & Beiler, 1977; Dalton & Cossier, 1982; Freeman, 1984; Friedman, 1970; Luthans, Hodgetts, & Thompson, 1982; Post, 1978; Preston, 1979; Sethi, 1971; Sturdivant, 1979; Votaw & Sethi, 1984).

An organization's effectiveness and survival are dependent upon its ability to satisfy the goals of its various stakeholders (Bedeian, 1987; Cameron, 1978; Connolly et al., 1980; Ehreth, 1988; Freeman, 1984; Jobson & Schneck, 1982; Lesly, 1984; Miles & Cameron, 1982; Rorbaugh, 1981; Sturdivant, 1979; Tsui, 1990; Wagner & Schneider, 1987; Whetten, 1978). Occasionally, organizations reject the significance of particular stakeholders. For example, in the 1980s, Waste Management, an environmental disposal company, viewed itself as a victim of faulty compliance interpretations by one stakeholder, the EPA. Until the organization decided to work with the EPA, Waste Management's effectiveness was diminished (Prager & Cala,
Organizational effectiveness was also called into question by McDonald's stakeholders. Environmental groups indicated that McDonald's foam hamburger boxes were not biodegradable and were made from products that damaged the ozone layer. In 1990, McDonald's indicated that although some studies suggested that the containers were not environmentally harmful, it would cease using the boxes (Nordgren, 1990).

Regardless of the stakeholder group, all seem to demand some evidence that an organization is legitimate or that it should have the privilege of pursuing its goals (Ansoff, 1965; Bedeian, 1989; Galaskiewicz, 1985; Jobson & Schneck, 1982; Nielsen & Rao, 1987; Oliver, 1990; Rees, 1962; Theus, 1988; Wiewl & Hunter, 1985). Habermas (1975) indicates that before legitimacy can be granted to an organization, stakeholders have to reach consensus about the organization's purpose and value. Meyer and Scott (1983) suggest that legitimacy may be explained through the relationship between the number of stakeholders of an organization and the congruence of their expectations for an organization. However, Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) suggest that society does not have to be in total agreement as to an organization's legitimacy for it to survive. Additionally, an organization may be designated legitimate by only some of its relevant stakeholders. Other findings indicate that concerns of stakeholder groups may overlap, may vary in importance to
the success of an organization (Bedeian, 1989), and that organizations may not satisfy multiple stakeholders simultaneously (Cameron, 1978; Friedlander & Pickle, 1968; Jobson & Schneck, 1982; Tsui, 1990; Whetten, 1978). Organizations which are perceived as legitimate can survive repeated failures and still maintain legitimacy (Epstein & Votaw, 1978).

While stakeholder granting of legitimacy reduces the potential for organizational death (Singh et al., 1986), conferment of legitimacy may be transient (Bedeian, 1989; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Schlosberg, 1969). Organizations may receive the status of "legitimate" by a particular stakeholder group at a specific time, yet that same stakeholder may withdraw the designation at any moment. Stakeholders tend to question the legitimacy of an organization when the cause-effect relationship of its core technology is unsubstantiated, its means or ends are questionable, its processes involve risks, when they anticipate an enduring relationship with the organization (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990), and the organization or its technology is newly developed (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990; Singh et al., 1986; Weber, 1947).

When an organization is perceived negatively, it often emphasizes its legitimacy more frequently (Fry & Hock, 1976). However, the lower an organization's perceived legitimacy, the more skeptical constituents will be of legitimation
attempts (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990). Excessive efforts to document legitimacy often have the effect of diminishing perceived organizational legitimacy, as stakeholders question the credibility of the organization. Additionally, legitimation efforts which are explicit (e.g., press releases, annual reports, and policy statements) are not always perceived as credible (Martin, 1982).

Other methods used to influence perceptions of legitimacy include identifying an organization with legitimate power figures in the task environment (Galaskiewicz, 1985), obtaining endorsements (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), making cash contributions to charitable organizations (Ermann, 1978; Fry, Keim, & Meiners, 1982; Galaskiewicz, 1985; Miles & Cameron, 1982), arguing an organization serves ends beyond its own (Mintzberg, 1983), providing reasonable prices to customers (Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990), and complying with laws and standards of a governing body (Boje & Whetten, 1981; Chatman, Bell, & Staw, 1983; Domhoff & Dye, 1987; Oliver, 1990). However, legitimation attempts with one stakeholder group may not prove successful with others. When an organization offers reasonable prices, customers may be well satisfied that the organization is legitimate. However, reasonable prices may fail to document organizational legitimacy for regulatory bodies. Regulatory bodies should be more open to arguments that an organization complies with laws and standards. The general public would
be concerned that an organization serves ends beyond its own by stressing environmental responsibility as it relate to health issues. Thus, it becomes important to investigate how organizations differ the content of their legitimacy appeals when dealing with different stakeholders.

Although an organization may suggest legitimacy through overt actions (e.g., cash contributions to a charity), it also relies on public discourse to convince its stakeholders that it is legitimate and that it has a right to exist. In an attempt to persuade stakeholders that it is legitimate, an organization may rely on excuses, justifications, ingratiations, intimidation, and apologies. Also, organizations may use such strategies prior to, during, or following an event. Some strategies may be more useful for some stakeholders. Different organizational groups (management and non-management) may use different strategies in their external discourse. Strategies may be used alone or in conjunction with others. A focus on the various communication strategies used appears to offer a link for understanding how organizations can influence perceptions of legitimacy and, therefore, organizational survival.

Impression Management as a Legitimation Mechanism

A method which organizations potentially use when attempting to regulate the opinions others form of them is impression management. Before examining specific impression
management strategies, this section will overview the evolution of impression management theory.

The theory of impression management owes its early development to Mills (1940), Goffman (1959), and Jones (1964). Mills discussed "vocabularies of motive" which arise when "acts are in some way frustrated" (1940, p. 905). The question of motive suggests to the actors that their actions may be regarded as questionable (Semin & Manstead, 1983) and usually results in actors attempting to explain the behaviors in question. Goffman (1959) suggested that people actively manage the impressions that others form of them and that all behavior is impression management. Jones (1964) identified ingratiation strategies and strategic behaviors actors use to encourage others to perceive them as socially attractive. A theory of impression management was introduced by Tedeschi, Schlenker, and Bonoma (1971) as an alternative to Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory (1957). Tedeschi et al. suggest that people have a social concern for appearing consistent to others and will do what provides the greatest rewards in a particular situation. Tedeschi and Reiss (1981) define impression management as "any behavior by a person that has the purpose of controlling or manipulating the attributions and impressions formed of that person by others" (p. 3).

Impression management has been applied to individuals within organizations in research discussing audience
characteristics and verbal self-presentations (e.g., Gardner & Martinko, 1988a), business ethics (e.g., Giacalone & Payne, 1987), career strategies (e.g., Gould & Penley, 1984), employee assessment centers (e.g., Anderson & Thacker, 1985), discipline (e.g., Wood & Mitchell, 1981), employee ingratiation (e.g., Ralston, 1985), interviews (e.g., Baron, 1986), intraorganizational influence (e.g., Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980), leadership (e.g., Leary et al., 1986), organizational failure (e.g., Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982; Hebert, 1986, 1987; McLaughlin et al., 1983; Wood & Mitchell, 1981), public persuasion during crisis (Cheney & Vibbert, 1987), and self-promotion (e.g., Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1986).

An additional dimension of the impression management literature discusses specific strategies individuals use when managing impressions. Scott and Lyman (1968) indicate that actors offer accounts to explain their behavior or the behavior of others. Accounts will be offered regardless of whether the cause for the statement arises from the actor or from another source. Organizations also offer accounts which suggest their recognition that a predicament has occurred or will occur. A variety of different strategies has been embedded within interpersonal accounts including excuses, justifications, ingratiation, intimidation, and apologies. The strategies embedded in organizational
accounts have not yet been fully identified. In the following sections, individual-level strategies will be discussed as they might apply to organizational-level discourse.

With an excuse, organizations may use a variety of approaches to negate organizational responsibility for an event. First, they may deny intention where they suggest that the consequences were unforeseeable, that they were uninformed of the effects of their actions and decisions, or that the effects were accidental (Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981). A second type of excuse is a denial of volition, where organizations argue they could neither control nor be expected to control the event in question (Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981). Denial of agency is a third type of excuse in which organizations suggest that they did not make a decision or perform a particular behavior or that they performed a similar response, but did not produce the effect in question (Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981).

Excuses and justifications are similar strategies in that both are likely responses to an offense; however, acceptance of responsibility is the fundamental difference. Organizations admit an event occurred with an excuse mode, yet no responsibility is accepted. With an excuse, organizations state, "We are not guilty of that for which we are being accused." With a justification, an organization accepts responsibility for the event yet denies that the
event was negative (Schlenker, 1980; Scott & Lyman, 1968; Snyder et al., 1983). When a justification occurs, an organization might say, "Yes, the event occurred, but no one should be concerned." Among the justification strategies available are denial of injury, denial of the victim, condemnation of the condemner, and a suggestion that negative events were misrepresented (Scott & Lyman, 1968; Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981). With a denial of injury, an organization admits that a particular event occurred but asserts that it was permissible since no one was injured or that the consequences of an act were trifling. Denial of the victim implies that the action was permissible since the victim deserved the injury. When an organization condemns the condemner, it admits the act but asserts its irrelevancy because others commit these and worse acts. A fourth type of justification is that negative events have been misrepresented or that an event is being taken out of context and has little meaning.

At times, organizations may choose to ingratiate themselves to their stakeholders (Gardner & Martinko, 1988b; Jones & Wortman, 1973; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984) or to gain the approval of an audience using several approaches including self-enhancing communication (Gardner & Martinko, 1988b; Jones, Gergen, & Jones, 1963; Jones & Wortman, 1973; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984; Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981), other-enhancing communication (Gardner & Martinko, 1988b; Jones &
Wortman, 1973; Schlenker, 1980; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984), and opinion conformity (Gardner & Martinko, 1988b; Jones et al., 1963; Jones & Wortman, 1973; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984; Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981). With the use of self-enhancing communication, the organization offers statements which are intended to persuade a target of the organization's positive qualities, traits, motives, and intentions. Types of self-enhancing communication involve suggesting that an organization is a role model for some positive trait or that the organization accepts social responsibilities which are positive in nature. An organization may opt to utilize other-enhancing communication which praises a target in hopes of obtaining approval for the organization. An additional ingratiation strategy is opinion conformity where it is suggested that an organization and a target share similar beliefs and attitudes about a particular subject.

Organizations may choose to intimidate a target (Jones & Pittman, 1982; Suls, 1982; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). With intimidation, an organization relies on threats and suggests that it can be dangerous if necessary. An additional type of impression management strategy is an apology (Gardner & Martinko, 1988b; Schlenker, 1980; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). In this instance, an organization admits guilt and requests appropriate punishment.

Besides the five categories of impression management strategies discussed above, another dimension of strategies
may be evaluated: whether a strategy was utilized prior to, during, or following the predicament (Allen, Madison, Porter, Renwick, & Mayes, 1979; D'Aprix, 1982; Freeman, 1984; Haas & Ray, 1986; Snyder et al., 1983; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). If a response is elicited by external forces and occurs after an event and on an involuntary basis, then the response may be categorized as reactive. A reactive response involves focusing mainly on what happened, leaving the audience to speculate on an event's causes, motivations, and significance. The reactive approach tends to diffuse an organization's communication responsibility as well as communicate a picture of organizational life as chaotic, unplanned, and unmanaged (D'Aprix, 1982). A major dimension of the legitimation process involves convincing stakeholders that an organization has the right to pursue its goals. If an organization responds primarily after a predicament has occurred, the organization might appear to stakeholders as having lost control of its goals. This might lead stakeholders to further question its legitimacy.

If an organization offers a response prior to a predicament and the response is voluntary in nature, then the account may be categorized as a proactive or anticipatory response. With a proactive response an organization identifies its concerns and priorities and establishes a targeted focus for stakeholders rather than allowing stakeholders to make assumptions about events (D'Aprix,
Research has failed to examine which types of impression management strategies tend to be offered prior to an event and which types are offered during or following a predicament. Results of proactive/reactive research could provide further insight into the legitimation process of justifying goals to stakeholders. Perhaps an organization which is proactive tends to utilize impression management strategies which most enhance the organization (e.g., suggesting that an organization is a role model for a particular type of industry or indicating self-enhancing communication through reliance on professional staffing) rather than using strategies which assume a defensive posture (e.g., excuses and justifications).

Summary

This chapter began by asking why and how an organization attempts to prove its legitimacy. Research suggests that organizational survival is dependent on persuading stakeholders of legitimacy and that a variety of impression management strategies exists. Strategies that are effective with one stakeholder may be inadequate in persuading another stakeholder of organizational legitimacy. Organizational members (management and non-management) may rely on different strategies. Additionally, whether a strategy is used proactively or reactively may impact on whether or not stakeholders perceive an organization as legitimate. In examining the relationship between organizational legitimacy
and impression management strategies utilized both internally and externally by MSP, the following research questions are suggested by the foregoing literature review:

**RQ1:** What impression management strategies are utilized by MSP?

**RQ2:** Does MSP utilize different impression management strategies for different publics? If so, what strategies are used for different audiences?

**RQ3:** Are MSP employees and managers using the same impression management strategies with external publics?

**RQ4:** Are some impression management strategies used by MSP primarily proactive and others primarily reactive?
Endnote

1. The term "stakeholder" was coined in an internal memo at the Stanford Research Institute in 1963 (Freeman, 1984). However, its origins may be traced to a variety of sources (e.g., Abrams, 1954; Barnard, 1938; Berle & Means, 1932; Cyert & March, 1963; and Smith, 1759).

2. Mills thought of "vocabularies of motive" as a cover-up and indicated that intellectuals had a duty to expose the "truth" beneath the strategies.
CHAPTER III

MARINE SHALE PROCESSORS: A HISTORY FILLED WITH CRISSES

As the Federal government continued its pursuit of environmental regulation through such programs as Superfund, Jack Kent, owner of MSP, identified an area of both environmental concern and commercial interest. Having been in oilfield-related businesses since 1969, Kent recognized that the oil drilling "muds" (aggregate, abrasives, and barite) all contained high levels of heavy metals and toxic organics. In 1984, Kent purchased an abandoned lime plant in Amelia, Louisiana, for the purpose of processing and recycling hazardous oilfield materials into "non-hazardous" materials ("Louisiana Lava," 1988). For processing the oilfield wastes, Kent utilized a 275 foot x 12 foot rotary kiln which burned wastes for two and one-half hours at 2500 degrees Fahrenheit ("Louisiana Lava," 1988). The kiln eliminated the hazardous dimension of the wastes and produced a by-product—a non-toxic aggregate, often called "Louisiana Lava." Recognizing that the MSP kiln had the ability to burn at high temperatures and the capacity to handle additional types of wastes, Kent expanded from accepting only oilfield wastes but also a wider variety of industrial wastes—all except PCBs, dioxins, infectious wastes, explosives, radioactive materials, medical wastes, and asbestos ("Louisiana Lava," 1988).
MSP has grown dramatically since 1984. In early 1985, Kent had revenues of less than $2 million, 30 employees, and housed his headquarters in a portable building ("Louisiana Lava," 1988). For 1990, MSP has projected revenues of $48 million (Kent, 1990), approximately 350 employees, a plant with two large, modern office buildings on 22 acres (MSP brochure, 1990), corporate headquarters in St. Rose, Louisiana, and branch offices located in California, Illinois, New Jersey, and Texas. Of the Fortune 500 companies, 120 organizations utilized MSP's services (MSP corporate brochure, 1989). MSP also has been ranked 121 in the Inc. 500 survey ranking privately owned businesses (Case, 1990) which have exhibited success in creating a new market niche.

Along with success has come repeated crises erupting from numerous stakeholders (see Appendix G for the chronology of MSP events). MSP stakeholders include governments, customers, suppliers, competitors, employees, media, and society-at-large (see Illustration 1 for an MSP stakeholder model). An analysis follows focusing on the interplay between MSP and each of its stakeholders.

MSP and Government and Regulator Stakeholders

One of the more complicated MSP stakeholder groups, government, includes parish/local, state, and national levels. All governmental levels have both granted
Illustration 1

Stakeholder Model of Marine Shale Processors

- Local Community
- Media
- Society
- Governments
- Customers
- Suppliers
- Employees
- Owners
- Regulators
- Competitors
- Special Interest Groups
legitimacy to MSP and withdrawn that status, often simultaneously.

At the parish level, Kent obtained permission in 1985 to operate MSP as a non-hazardous oilfield waste incinerator in Amelia and to burn natural gas and coal as fuel to destroy the waste. However, after beginning operation of the facility, Kent soon realized that he could use other less expensive and more efficient materials as fuel such as hazardous materials from other companies who needed to eliminate their own waste products ("Louisiana Lava," 1988). By using hazardous materials as a fuel, MSP was able to produce a by-product, or an aggregate which accomplished two purported goals. First, it eliminated hazardous waste. Second, the process produced a product which offered potential use as dock fill, roadbed, embankment, and levee materials (Domino, 1988). By November 1988, the St. Mary Parish Council was encouraged by a special interest group in Morgan City, South Louisianians Against Pollution (SLAP), to withdraw the permit because Kent had changed his original concept for the MSP plant. The council voted not to rescind the permit, as they had no actual jurisdiction over hazardous waste permitting ("Councilmen Refuse," 1988). Also, through media publications, both Morgan City and the St. Mary Parish government granted MSP legitimacy by recognizing it as a major tax contributor as well as a major regional employer (Domino, 1988). MSP goals were perceived
by these governmental groups as consistent with those of the region, producing a sound economy. However, in May 1989 Morgan City decided that MSP could no longer sell aggregate within the city limits (Bernard, 1989a). Legitimacy was withdrawn on the local level. Previously, local shipbuilders and other businesses and homeowners had used the aggregate on their own properties. MSP suggested that the "Council's action was based on hysteria and ignored all scientific data on the aggregate" (Bernard, 1989a, p. 4A). Crisis for MSP concerned not being able to sell its product in the local community.

On the state level, documents were provided to MSP in 1985 indicating that it was considered a "legitimate" recycler¹ rather than an incinerator. In fact, the state shipped waste to MSP for recycling ("State MSP Client," 1988). However, a major test for MSP's recycler status occurred during the 1988 Louisiana legislative session. Attempts were made to reclassify MSP as an incinerator ("State MSP Client," 1988). If MSP had been reclassified, it basically would have closed. New permitting often takes several years. A compromise bill was approved in the legislature which officially classified MSP as a recycler ("DEQ Given Authority, 1988).² Within 60 days of MSP's recycler classification, DEQ once again questioned its status. In September 1988, the Louisiana Senate Natural Resource Committee urged DEQ to concentrate on developing
the regulations necessary for use with a recycler rather than rehashing MSP's status (McMahon, 1988). The following year, a new crisis developed between MSP and DEQ. In May 1989 DEQ revoked MSP's waste permit for accepting and treating international waste and ordered it to cease sales of its aggregate ("DEQ Orders Shutdown," 1989). MSP appealed to the judicial system regarding permit revocation. The issue of permit revocation has yet to be resolved.

As with any organization facing the loss of stakeholder legitimacy, the conflict was reflected in emotional terms in MSP's rhetoric regarding DEQ. Kent indicated that DEQ regulators were not environmentalists and that "they (DEQ and EPA) come here and they don't pay a bit of attention whatsoever that you have made this drum of hazardous material disappear" (Simpson, 1989a, p. 39). Other MSP personnel have called DEQ "cowards" ("Marine Shale Upset," 1989), "wild monkeys" (O'Byrne, 1989), "pawns" (Nauth, 1989), "very, very low level civil servants," ("State Official Critical," 1988), "shams" (Anderson, 1989a), asked for the resignation of the Secretary of DEQ ("DEQ Orders Shutdown," 1989; "Marine Shale Asks," 1989), blamed DEQ for an MSP layoff of 100 employees due to "vicious and outright lies and unfounded allegations" ("Marine Shale Lays Off," 1989), suggested that Congressional investigators "smoke" DEQ (Anderson, 1989b), and accused DEQ of "manipulating the media" ("Law Prohibits," 1988).
Of the four governmental levels, perhaps the federal stakeholder group is the most complex. On the national level, both opposition and support have been indicated. U.S. Senator John Breaux (D-La) opposed MSP as a "classic example of a loophole in Federal environmental law that allows tons of dangerous waste to be burned without stringent regulations" (Fitzgerald, 1988). Another aspect of Breaux's expressed concern resulted from a Tulane study (Houck, 1986) which concluded that MSP made sales of $100,000 for its aggregate in 1986 and received $12.8 million in fees to dispose of waste. Breaux questioned how MSP could consider itself a manufacturer when the majority of its income resulted from disposing of, rather than recycling, wastes (Keville, 1988). MSP responded that its status as a recycler was unrelated to how much end-product was produced (Hearing, 1988; Lobsenz, 1988).

One of the most damaging dimensions of national opposition began in November 1986 when the FBI and the EPA seized MSP records in an attempt to determine how MSP came into existence without a Federal incineration permit (Watsky, 1989). The seizure resulted in a Federal grand jury probe which lasted for almost three years. Over 450,000 MSP documents were provided to the jury for its use (Hambleton, 1989). In January 1989 the jury was dismissed with no criminal indictments being rendered. However, as a part of the jury probe, MSP plea bargained in July 1989 to
charges regarding improper storage of creosote sludge, unpermitted discharges in Bayou Boeuf, and obstruction to navigation. MSP was assessed $1 million in fines ("Hazardous Waste Company Agrees," 1989).

Controversy continued at the federal level. In June 1990 the EPA filed suit against MSP indicating that it was not a legitimate recycler. Additionally, the EPA endeavored to stop MSP from receiving any federal waste shipments (Anderson, 1990b). In response to the EPA suit, MSP countersued the United States Government in September 1990 contending that MSP recycles hazardous waste and other materials into aggregate, that its patented process entitles it to operate as a legitimate recycler, that Louisiana had recognized it as a legitimate recycler, and that Louisiana is the delegated authority of the Federal government and has the right to classify it as a legitimate recycler (Dawkins, Thompson, & Williams, 1990). Additionally, MSP has condemned actions of various legislators, including Senator Breaux, who MSP contends has used improper Congressional influence to endanger its survival (Dawkins et al., 1990).

In support of MSP, U.S. Senator Trent Lott (R-MS) wrote to the EPA asking that it give prompt consideration to issues concerning MSP (Lobsenz, 1988). Representative John Dingell (D-MI), House Energy Chairman, also urged EPA to resolve the dispute ("Dingell Asks EPA," 1989). The United States Patent Office granted legitimacy to MSP by granting
Kent a patent on his process in May 1990 (Dawkins et al., 1990). Various federal agencies granted MSP legitimacy status by shipping waste to the plant including the Central Intelligence Agency, the Coast Guard, the Departments of Defense, Energy, Justice, and State, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Navy (Dawkins et al., 1990). EPA has intermittently granted legitimacy status to MSP through site visits and stack tests in which no violations were indicated. Also, EPA approved MSP recycling contracts (Dawkins et al., 1990). Additionally, EPA administrators have stated that the MSP aggregate "...does not pose an imminent or substantial endangerment to the public health or the environment" and that the true problem is one of an "economic battle" (Dunne, 1988; "Waste Kiln," 1988).

With all four governmental levels, MSP has received messages that its status is legitimate and illegitimate. Regardless of the governmental level, when legitimacy is removed, MSP has experienced crisis.

MSP and Customers

In spite of much controversy, MSP continues to attract customers. Over 3,000 customers utilize its services (Simpson, 1989b). A particular customer attraction is that MSP treats wastes at considerably less expense than a commercial incinerator. For example, MSP charges between $200-300 to dispose of a 50-gallon drum of hazardous waste; an incinerator charges from $700-$800 per drum (Belanger,
1988; Maginnis, 1989). However, some customers prefer involvement with MSP in a subdued manner. An MSP brochure was distributed and ads were placed in national publications which cited major *Fortune* 500 companies utilizing MSP services. Mobil Oil was one of the customers which complained that MSP had used its name without permission. Mobil indicated that it would not send further waste to MSP ("Marine Shale Criticized," 1989). MSP's controversy with various stakeholders, particularly governments and regulators, resulted in some companies choosing to stop sending waste to MSP (personal communication, June 24, 1989). Customers were concerned about having a relationship with MSP while its status was in question. Legitimacy was withdrawn.

**MSP and Suppliers**

To properly operate its plant, MSP annually purchases approximately $500,000 worth of products from the Morgan City area alone (personal communication, Nick LaRocca, February 3, 1989). Overall, MSP has experienced positive relations with suppliers. However, some have expressed concern over MSP's slow payment schedule. Kent indicated in an address before the St. Mary Industrial Group in Morgan City that failure of a previous business of his in the wake of the oil industry decline left him $19 million in debt. However, he refused to declare bankruptcy and continued to pay his old debts as well as MSP expenses. He suggested
that he would be able to pay bills more expeditiously "if we hadn't had to spend so much on this silliness (investigations)" (Hambleton, 1989, p. 12). While some suppliers expressed concern over the timeliness of MSP's accounts payable schedule, suppliers continued to provide it with needed materials and equipment (personal communication, Nick LaRocca, February 3, 1989). MSP was perceived as legitimate in that it made significant contributions to the local economy by purchasing from local merchants. However, MSP's choice of payment schedules caused some suppliers to question its legitimacy.

MSP and Competitors

While technically competitors technically could be any company which does not possess the MSP technology, competitors primarily have been members of the Hazardous Waste Treatment Council (HWTC), a trade association of 65 toxic waste processors, including Rollins Environmental Services (Simpson, 1989b, p. 10C), a New Jersey-based publicly traded company (Maginnis, 1989).

Kent has contended that Rollins Environmental Services was primarily to blame for government investigations of MSP:

Rollins cranked up this investigation, using political sources in Washington, DC. And they thought that they was just gonna come on in, and they were just gonna roll over a south Louisiana
redneck just because they were in Delaware and they had plenty of money. But it just didn't work that way (Hambleton, 1989, p. 1).

HWTC has devoted great energy to MSP's elimination. First, HWTC was active in the April 1988 Congressional Subcommittee hearings on Hazardous Wastes and Toxic Substances (Hearing, 1988, p. 23) HWTC indicted MSP as a "sham" recycler operating under a "loophole" in federal and state laws and "masquerading as an 'aggregate kiln.'" (p. 24). Second, HWTC encouraged and financially supported the development of South Louisianians Against Pollution (SLAP). HWTC and SLAP publicly announced an intent to file suit against MSP purportedly for causing danger to the environment (HWTC news release, personal communication, March 7, 1988); however, no suit was filed. Third, at HWTC's suggestion, the Mississippi Bureau of Pollution Control investigated an MSP contractor who had brought MSP aggregate into the state. HWTC alleged that the aggregate was hazardous ("Man Linked to Marine Shale," 1988). After investigation, the Mississippi Department of Natural Resources "determined this material to be non-hazardous" and gave approval for its use as a fill material (Mississippi Department of Natural Resources, personal communication, June 16, 1989). Finally, HWTC participated in anti-MSP media campaigns. For example, in August 1988 Richard Fortuna, vice president and general counsel for HWTC, stated
in a Jackson, Mississippi, radio talk show that MSP took in "things like DDT and pesticides and any and all sundry types of hazardous waste" and that the aggregate has been placed in ball fields "where children have incurred rashes from sliding...in the ash." Additionally, Fortuna stated:

There is a cluster of a very rare form of childhood cancer, neuroblastoma. One so far in Morgan City, Louisiana, and the other is in a community in California that produces many of the same pesticides that are being burned at the Marine Shale facility...We are not alleging that Marine Shale is responsible for the cancer (R. Fortuna, personal communication, August 17, 1988)

George Eldredge, a member of MSP legal counsel, suggested that a major reason why competitors take such a strong position against MSP is that its technology could "render other current disposal operations obsolete....This is an economic battle. It really has nothing to do with the environment. Our competition is trying to do everything in the world that it can to taint us or put us out of business" (McClain, 1988, p. 15). Eldredge further stated in Congressional testimony (Hearing, 1988) that the Chairman of the Board for Rollins Environmental Services had visited MSP and when asked why MSP should not be in business, he responded, "MSP's prices are too low" (p. 194).
Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) indicate that an organization can eliminate the competition by convincing its stakeholders that its competitors are illegitimate. MSP created a new technology which has the potential for resulting in the obsolescence of competing companies. Both MSP and its competitors devote extensive energies to attempting to prove the illegitimacy of the other. However, an inherent danger in a strategy of mutual attack is that both or all organizations potentially lose credibility.

MSP and Employees

MSP's 350 employees are located in five states, with the majority residing in Louisiana. The employees residing in Louisiana have experienced considerable pressure from their local communities. For those employees who wear MSP uniforms, some have experienced condescending remarks about their employer. Others have experienced difficulty in financing big-ticket items, such as automobiles and homes, following rumors that the MSP plant might close, and employees would be without jobs. Employees' children have fought with fellow classmates regarding their parents' employment and have told their parents that teachers make unkind remarks about MSP. Many of the employees who were reared in St. Mary Parish are afraid to tell their relatives where they work. Some who have spoken at public meetings have been jeered by other local citizens. Employees
indicated that just reading the daily newspaper is an unpleasant experience because MSP rarely is portrayed as credible.

As a major stakeholder group, MSP employees represent primary spokespersons for the company. In spite of the above pressures, employees have spoken at public meetings in Baton Rouge, Franklin, and Morgan City,\(^6\) signed petitions asking governments to evaluate MSP fairly, and written letters to media offering their individual points of view.\(^7\)

At different points in MSP's history, it has made various attempts to inform its employees of crisis situations and to reassure them of its goals. When MSP only consisted of 30 employees, communicating company news required minimal effort and occurred in small group settings. As MSP grew and the intensity of the crises increased, communication efforts became more difficult. While employees had access to media and to public meetings, little internal communication occurred. Various MSP segments had access to information about crises, but others were uninformed. Occasionally, meetings were held with MSP personnel to explain MSP happenings,\(^8\) and memos and organization newsletters\(^9\) were distributed, but as a whole employees were limited in their knowledge about MSP activities. Interviews with employees suggested that while employees generally supported MSP, others expressed uncertainty about its legitimacy. They questioned whether
or not MSP could produce a safe product, whether or not the process was safe for employees, whether or not the emissions stack was safe, whether or not they were being told what they needed to know, and whether or not MSP was dealing with regulators in an appropriate way. Non-managerial employees indicated that management communicated with them in a limited manner. While some employees supported MSP publicly, the question of legitimacy remained of concern.

MSP and the Media

The relationship between MSP and the media remains fragile. MSP invites journalists and the general public to the facility on a regular basis, with many of those invited actually touring MSP. Additionally, MSP holds press conferences and sends out press releases on new developments, yet organization officials do not perceive media coverage of MSP as favorable on local, state, and/or national levels (M. Domino, personal communication, 10 September 4, 1990).

In some instances, the relationship between MSP and the media appears to be due to media misinterpretation. For example, in March 1989 the media reported that MSP had failed a stack test ("MSP Fails," 1989) when actually MSP was not required to pass a stack test. The purpose of a stack test is to establish limits for the types of equipment utilized by MSP rather than to pass or fail. Additionally, independent consultants along with DEQ and EPA observers
indicated that MSP had acceptable emissions on all stack tests (Kent speech, New Orleans, LA., October 17, 1990). Another instance of media misinterpretation was in a statement offered by an MSP spokesperson who said: "I marvel at Jack Kent as a man of vision. The people of this area should welcome Marine Shale which produces jobs and a future for St. Mary Parish." She was quoted as saying: "I marvel at Jack Kent as a man of vision. The people of hysteria should welcome ...." (Taylor, 1990). In 1988, the media reported that DEQ had fined MSP $2.8 million ("MSP Fined $2.8 Million by State DEQ," 1988), yet the fine was a proposed penalty notice rather than an assessed penalty. The media reported in 1989 that MSP had been unregulated for two years ("Hearing Indicates," 1989) although MSP experienced extensive regulation from Louisiana and the Federal government since its inception. The "lack" of regulation referred to MSP being regulated as an incinerator. However, the MSP lawsuit against the Federal government argued that MSP was a recycler and not an incinerator.

Another problem between MSP and the media concerns media perceptions of the organization. Media coverage clearly indicated MSP was responsible for the childhood cancer, neuroblastoma, discovered in five children in the Morgan City area. Scientific studies determined that MSP was not responsible for the cancer cases (McManus, 1988; F. Lawrence, personal communication, June 17, 1988; "LSU

Although the media misunderstanding of its technology could account for part of the problem, certainly some of MSP responses seem to provide a sound basis for negative media perceptions. As mentioned earlier, MSP has been involved with name-calling in regard to regulatory agencies. Also, MSP referred to the environmental group Greenpeace as "a bunch of goofs" and further indicated that they would be "skinned up" if they attempted to block the entrance to MSP (Schultz, 1989, 1B).

The media also appeared to provide some impartial coverage of MSP. For example, after a visit through MSP a Louisiana journalist indicated that although MSP was
Drowning in a sea of negative publicity... company personnel, from the president on down, answered all my questions without hesitation.... During the course of even a relatively short interview, at least one question usually prompts a 'no comment,' or 'I would rather not answer that.' I was expecting to hear similar responses quite a few times at Marine Shale... but my expectations failed to materialize as every person interviewed was unusually forthright" (Hilbun, 1987, p.1).

MSP relations with the media continue to be fragile. Research suggests that when the media view an organization as legitimate, resulting articles about the organization will be positive (Nelkin, 1988). However, when an organization is viewed as illegitimate, news stories will be negative. Although some journalists view MSP as open and credible, the majority appear to perceive it as an organization with limited credibility. Nelkin (1988) indicates that the media are not responsible for granting legitimacy to an organization, but they have the power to focus the issue of legitimacy for others.

MSP and Society-at-Large

When examining society-at-large as it applies to MSP, two groups will be examined: general Morgan City citizens/civic groups and special interest groups, including SLAP and
Greenpeace. In the Morgan City area, citizens have offered mixed reviews of MSP. Those taking a negative stance include representatives of St. Mary Industrial Group (SMIG), "an organization of businessmen established in 1985 and concerned for the development and general welfare of St. Mary Parish," who wrote to the EPA and the DEQ in 1987 requesting that MSP be regulated to the maximum extent of the law (SMIG, personal communication, January 6, 1987). Also, a sector of the St. Mary Parish medical community actively opposed MSP. In December 1987 a petition signed by 17 area doctors and local residents was sent to EPA demanding that MSP be declared an imminent threat ("State Officials Discount," 1987). More recently, 26 doctors on the Morgan City Lakewood Hospital staff drafted a resolution on April 20, 1989 requesting that the Parish council rescind all MSP permits "until they are able to meet all regulations established by the Federal government for hazardous waste incineration" ("Lakewood Hospital Medical Staff Resolution," personal communication, April 20, 1989). MSP responded in two ways. First, MSP wrote to the Lakewood medical staff addressing their grievances and encouraging them to re-evaluate their responses (Kent, J., personal communication, May 5, 1989). Second, MSP sent a memo to its employees, vendors, and suppliers regarding the actions of the medical community (Kent, J., personal communication, May 22, 1989).
In contrast, a group of local businessmen visited with Governor Roemer in 1988 to ask that the issues surrounding MSP be resolved (A. Lippman, personal communication, September 22, 1988). They suggested that if MSP was doing something wrong, then it should be closed; otherwise, MSP should be allowed to continue its work and the local community could begin to heal from the controversy. One Morgan City resident offered particularly strong support for MSP during a public meeting in 1988. His daughter had recently died from neuroblastoma, yet he stated in a December DEQ permit hearing that he did not blame MSP for the death of his child (M. Domino, personal communication, December, 1988).13

Special interest groups affecting MSP include SLAP and Greenpeace. SLAP is the primary group which advocates immediately closing MSP.14 According to SLAP, it was formed in 1987 when an Islip, New York, garbage barge was without a home. MSP offered to dispose of the barge and donate the profits for area recreational purposes (Keville, 1988). Sally Hermann, SLAP founding chairman, indicated that it did not have paid membership, and "it's hard to say how many people are members. We are pretty loosely organized" (Hilbun, 1988a, p. 1). Hermann claims that HWTC found SLAP; yet HWTC claims that SLAP came to the HWTC (Hilbun, 1988). Media suggest that SLAP was financed by HWTC (Hilbun, 1988; "MSP: Toxic Ships," 1988; O'Byrne,
1989). A major dimension of the SLAP cause was the issue of neuroblastoma.

Greenpeace, an international environmental group, has been involved with MSP on several occasions. During a protest march against industry and toxic waste in Louisiana, Greenpeace was invited by MSP management to visit the MSP facility. The morning of the visit Greenpeace called a news conference in New Orleans where they urged the EPA and the Louisiana DEQ to shut down MSP due to "a history of environmental negligence, deliberate and continuing" ("Greenpeace Busload," 1988). After the press conference, a Greenpeace representative called Kent to indicate that a Greenpeace group was on its way to the plant. Kent informed Greenpeace that due to their statements, they would not be allowed on the premises. When Greenpeace came to the facility anyway, the organization was refused entrance to the plant ("Greenpeace Busload," 1988). After the unsuccessful visit to MSP, Greenpeace asked the Federal Trade Commission to ban MSP television advertising in the Washington, DC, area and to force MSP to broadcast a retraction and correction of what Greenpeace deemed "inaccuracies in the ads" (Heller, 1989a; McKinney, 1989, p. 8A). MSP was not banned from advertising or forced to offer retractions.

Greenpeace again became involved with MSP in 1989 when representatives stood outside the company's gates and
stated that they would use "non-violent civil disobedience" to close MSP and that "the public cannot wait forever for this to happen." They called MSP's operation "one of the most blatant criminal activities in the toxic waste industry" and indicated that "we will attempt to shut this plant down" (Schultz, 1989, p. 1B). In response Kent indicated that "they ain't enough Greenpeacers in the world to block the entrance to this plant" and confirmed that his employees had green-painted ax handles so Greenpeacers could see MSP employees coming after them (Schultz, 1989, p. 2B). In 1990, Greenpeace arrived at MSP on barges via the bayou located behind the plant with a group of approximately 20 persons, including media (Culpepper, 1990). The early morning visit resulted in violence between the group and plant employees. Both Greenpeace members and MSP employees were injured.

On a weekly basis, MSP invited groups of citizens to visit the plant. These efforts were attempts to persuade small groups of MSP's legitimacy. While MSP had some strong supporters in the Morgan City area, it also faced opposition. On the national level, its opponents were very outspoken and included the EPA, the FBI, and Congress. MSP experienced tokens of legitimacy from some (e.g., U.S. Senator Trent Lott and U.S. Representative John Dingell) and badges of illegitimacy from others (e.g., U.S. Senator John Breaux).
Summary

The concerns of MSP stakeholder groups may be catalogued into four areas. A consideration of primary importance is the issue of MSP regulation as a recycler or as an incinerator. Second, competitors, represented by HWTC, expressed concern that MSP had the ability to make incinerators obsolete. Third, the media tended to perceive MSP as illegitimate. Fourth, the local community, SLAP, Greenpeace, and the medical community were concerned about the safety of the environment. MSP seldom experienced periods without crisis. MSP's survival and progress are dependent on convincing these stakeholders of the legitimacy of its operations.
Endnotes

1. The Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality provided MSP with the status as a "legitimate reuse-recycle facility" in correspondence between the two organizations in July 1985 (J. Kent, personal communication, July 23, 1985), August 1985 (J. Kent, personal communication, August 1, 1985), September 1985 (J. Kent, personal communication, September 4, 1985), October 1985 (J. Kent, personal communication, October 1, 1985), and June 1986 (J. Kent, personal communication, June 9, 1986).

2. In July, 1988, the Louisiana Legislature determined through Act 874, an amendment to the Louisiana Hazardous Waste Control Law, that MSP was a legitimate recycler. The amendment was approved as follows: the House-Senate Conference Committee, 6-0, the Louisiana Senate, 33-0, and the Louisiana House of Representatives, 100-0. Governor Roemer signed the amendment into law on August 19, 1988.

3. MSP operates under the following state and federal regulations:

   ...The Louisiana Hazardous Waste Control Law.
   ...The Louisiana Air Control Law.
   ...The Louisiana Water Control Law.
   ...The Louisiana Environmental Quality Law.
   ...Acts 730 and 874 of the 1988 Louisiana
Legislature which establish recycling of hazardous waste as a separately regulated category under the Hazardous Waste Control Law.

...The U.S. Clean Air Act.

...The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), formerly the Comprehensive Environmental Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).

...The U.S. Resource and Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) for on-site storage and as "industrial furnace"--the standards for which now are being substantially tightened by the EPA (MSP Brochure, 1989).

4. MSP has experienced six unplanned visits from the FBI since opening in 1985 (Kent speech to MSP national sales force, October 16, 1990).

5. The majority of the information for this section comes from interviews with MSP employees conducted by this researcher from January-June, 1989.

6. MSP employees delivered statements and speeches during the Louisiana State Legislature Natural Resources Committee Meeting in Baton Rouge, on September 28, 1988. MSP employees came by bus from the plant in Morgan City. On November 23, 1988, employees appeared for a meeting before the St. Mary Parish Council in Franklin, Louisiana. On
December 15, 1988, a DEQ public meeting was held at the Morgan City Auditorium. Busloads from MSP's plant and the St. Rose office came. Speeches were offered by MSP employees from both locations. In July 1990 an EPA meeting was held in the Morgan City Auditorium, with many employees attending from both locations. At most of the public meetings, MSP employees were restricted by those directing the meetings from speaking. However, MSP employees were allowed to speak as often as they chose at the July 1990 meeting.

7. One employee in a letter to the editor addressed the medical community expressing concern over its actions toward MSP and for their lack of concern over how they disposed of medical waste. At the time the letter was written, the employee was laid off from MSP (Hussey, 1989).

8. On January 17, 1989, George Harlow, Corporate Environmental Director for MSP, conducted an internal meeting with MSP staff at the St. Rose office to explain the latest DEQ proposed fine of $1.75 million. During the meeting, employees expressed concern that they were not informed of the notice. Harlow explained that the notification of proposed penalty was not received by MSP until Monday, January 16, even though the story was released to media and broadcast on Friday, January 13.
Harlow emphasized that the meeting with employees was not one of "doom and gloom" but rather one for positive evaluation. For the first time, DEQ told MSP specifically what requirements they had for MSP to stay open. He devoted the almost two-hour session to reviewing each segment of the notice of violation and to answering employee questions. He indicated that nowhere in the document did DEQ indicate that MSP was contaminating the environment. Overall, employees appeared receptive to his explanations. Only one employee in the group of twenty responded by indicating that she thought many of DEQ's complaints appeared justified (personal observation of meeting, January 17, 1989).

9. MSP sporadically distributed an in-house newsletter titled "What's Cooking." It primarily contained information on MSP employees and MSP's current status.

10. On January 4, 1989 reporter Carol Strickland arrived at MSP for a tour and an interview with Jack Kent. She indicated prior to her arrival that she was a free-lance reporter with the New York Times. Because MSP public relations personnel considered the New York Times credible, the interview was planned. Ultimately, the resulting Strickland article appeared in the Nation on October 23, 1989,
and was titled "Something Stinks in Morgan City." Strickland was taken on a tour of the facility and then interviewed Kent. He answered her questions and explained the process and the purpose of MSP. On two occasions, he provided colorful statements for Strickland. When she asked about his plans for the future, he responded, "To put Rollins out of business." He concluded his interview with "in any sack of potatoes, you are going to have one rotten Breaux." The resulting story began with a statement by a SLAP member. In the initial paragraph of the article, Strickland stated, "Its story presents a case study of the power of money and political influence endangering the health of the community while civic watchdogs either doze or tie themselves up in legal and bureaucratic knots."

She continues the story by saying that Jack Kent is "a master at manipulating power" and referred to former Governor Edwin Edwards as one of Kent's "lackeys."

This researcher's notes of the interview (which were transcribed verbatim from personal observations) and the resulting article were quite different. Strickland did not base her article on the answers she received from Jack Kent. In fact, she never quoted him or paraphrased him (personal observation, January 4, 1989).
11. On June 30, 1988, Dr. William Woods, a pediatric cancer specialist from the University of Minnesota, addressed the St. Mary Environmental Control Committee at the request of MSP (McManus, 1988). Woods indicated "there is overwhelming evidence that kids contract cancer in the womb...It's in their genes" (p. 1). Woods suggested that women who drank alcohol, took sleeping pills, anti-seizure medication, diuretics or used hair dye during pregnancy were at greater risk of contracting neuroblastoma.

12. On May 22, 1989, MSP sent a memo to its employees, contractors, vendors, and their families regarding the Lakewood Hospital Resolution which requested that Morgan City and St. Mary Parish rescind MSP's operating permits until all investigations surrounding MSP were resolved. MSP indicated "the Hospital and the doctors are asking for the indefinite layoff of MSP employees and for the termination of MSP's position as a major consumer in St. Mary Parish." The memo went on to say:

...Since 1985, over 90 lawsuits have been filed against the hospital and 16 of the doctors who signed the resolutions...The hospital and these doctors have been sued for over $43 million dollars because their
patients have been dissatisfied with the care and services provided by the hospital and the doctors. In over four years of operations, MSP has not been sued even one time by a customer.

MSP provided an attachment to the memo listing lawsuits against the hospital and the doctors. The memo concluded with "while I am not asking you to do or not to do anything, I believe you should know with whom you are dealing."

13. Members of the audience who were opposed to MSP attempted to force Mr. Fontenot, whose daughter, Mindy, had died recently of neuroblastoma, to quit speaking by loudly raising their voices toward him.

14. Research on this project actually began at a meeting where SLAP was included. My purpose in attending the "Pesticide Workshop" meeting in a church hall in Franklin, Louisiana, was to begin to understand some of the environmental issues facing MSP. No one from MSP was interested in attending. I had no idea that the core group of the 35 people in attendance would be from SLAP.

The speaker was Dr. Marion Moses, a physician in environmental and occupational medicine from California. The meeting opened with Dr. Moses
indicating that she knew the main concern of the group was in discussing MSP. The first half of the meeting was devoted to discussing pesticides. The second half of the meeting was devoted to discussing how to organize against MSP. She encouraged them to picket and riot. She suggested that they stop dealing with small-time attorneys and find one who specialized in toxic cases so they could sue MSP.

At every other public meeting I attended SLAP was present and always brought extensive literature and signs against MSP. For example, SLAP signs had statements like:

"Would all MSP employees please check your axe handles in at the front office."
"We don't want to be hometown spirits."
"Just say no DEQ...Just say no."
"Don't sell us down the polluted river. Say no to MSP."
"Jack Kent is cooking up a living hell."

15. MSP conducted daily tours of the plant for the general public, customers, and the media. After each tour, participants were encouraged to ask questions of any person they wished. For many of the tours, Jack Kent made a presentation and answered questions. Special tours were held each week for groups of between 15-25
citizens from all parts of the state. MSP suggested that these tours allowed them to communicate more effectively with the general public and to change public perception (M. Domino, personal communication, September 4, 1990).
CHAPTER IV
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of the study was to examine the impression management strategies used by an organization in crisis as it attempted to convince its various stakeholders of its legitimacy. This chapter will discuss five areas involved in answering the posed research questions: participants, data collection, variables, data coding, and methods of analysis.

Participants

In 1985, MSP began operation as a recycler and resource recovery facility. From only 30 employees in 1985 and one portable building in Amelia, Louisiana, MSP presently has expanded to more than 300 employees and facilities in five states. When this research project was undertaken, MSP consisted of 305 employees, with 260 employees located at the plant in Amelia and 45 located at St. Rose, Louisiana, the corporate headquarters. Of the 305 employees, 12% were female and 88% were male. At the plant, 5% were female and 95% were male. In St. Rose, 53% were female and 47% were male. Turnover was approximately 30% per month at the MSP plant. Employment at St. Rose remained stable at less than 1% turnover per year.

Data Collection

In May 1988 the researcher had an initial meeting with a public relations firm representing MSP to determine
whether or not the researcher would be allowed to investigate MSP's communication processes. A second meeting was held in July 1988 with Jack Kent, MSP's owner, to explain that the one-year internal research process would include interviewing a variety of MSP personnel and attending internal MSP meetings, press conferences, and other activities which appeared relevant to data collection. Kent indicated that he wanted others to understand MSP and that he supported any research efforts regarding MSP.

When examining a company as complex as MSP, no one method offers an overall perspective. Research suggests that often multiple methods of data collection are required. Denzin (1978) defined triangulation as "the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon" (p. 291). Jick (1979) indicated that triangulation allows researchers to "capture a more complete, holistic, and contextual portrayal of the unit of study" (p. 603). From August 1988 to December 1990, the triangulation approach to data collection was used. Data were gathered from interviews; newspaper, magazine, and journal articles; brochures; Congressional/Legislative hearing transcriptions; handouts from special events; press releases; correspondence; and transcriptions of meetings attended by the researcher.
Interviews offered one way of assessing public discourse. Organizational members viewed the researcher as a member of society, as the researcher was identified as affiliated with a university, and directed their responses as though the results would be made public. From August 1988 through August 1989, 61 formal interviews with management and staff were conducted, representing 20% of MSP employees. Of the 260 employees at Amelia, 27 were interviewed, representing 10% of all plant personnel. At St. Rose, 34 interviews were conducted, representing 76% of all St. Rose employees. When determining which employees to interview, the researcher chose 61 random numbers between one and 305 from a random numbers table (Blalock, 1979). An alphabetical listing of employee names was used to determine which names were associated with which random numbers. Thirty-four of the interviews (or 56%) were conducted at corporate offices in St. Rose and 27 of the interviews (or 44%) were conducted at the Amelia plant. For both facilities, 36% of the interviews (22 interviews) involved management and 64% (39 interviews) involved non-management (see Table 1 for the breakdown of interviews by location and by management and non-management).

Of the managers interviewed, five (23%) were engineers. Two management-level persons interviewed were not engineers but held undergraduate degrees in chemistry. The remaining 15 (68%) managers interviewed consisted of
Table 1
Interviews with MSP Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Percentage of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management, St. Rose</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, Amelia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, St. Rose</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, Amelia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Interviews</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
persons who had gained their management expertise through hands-on experience rather than through the academic system. Non-management consisted of nine persons (23%) with undergraduate degrees, and the remainder (77%) consisted of support staff with a variety of work experiences.

In St. Rose, employees were informed in small group meetings that interviews would be held with a university researcher and that employees were not forced to participate. They were encouraged to participate and were told that information provided in the interviews would only be given to management in a discussion of overall findings. At the plant, the plant superintendent sent out a memo to all personnel indicating that interviews would be taking place. They, too, were given the option of not interviewing. No one refused to be interviewed.

Interviews were held in various locations throughout the plant and at the corporate offices. However, interviews were always held in private offices so that doors could be closed. Each interview lasted from one to one-and-one-half hours with general questions being asked (see Appendix B for the interview guide). The interviews were taped and later transcribed verbatim. Interviewees were again informed that statements from the interviews would be used in the analysis but that their individual comments would be kept confidential. While all employees consented to interviews, some expressed reluctance to answer questions. They
apparently were convinced that the interview transcripts would not be shown to management, but they were concerned that materials from the interviews might be used against the company in some way.

In addition to formal interviews, the researcher observed various internal and external meetings (see Appendix C for meetings attended between May 1988 and March 1989). Babbie (1986) identified an observer-as-participant as "one who identifies himself or herself as a researcher and interacts with the participants in the social process but makes no pretense of actually being a participant" (p. 243). This method results in both advantages and disadvantages. Serving as an observer-as-participant provided an additional perspective into areas that other data collection techniques alone could not offer. The method was useful in identifying stakeholders, possible sources of data, and as a grounding tool in understanding the issues facing MSP as well as company responses to stakeholders. However, while this method yields findings that may provide useful insight into a research problem, observer-as-participant may result in problems related to researcher bias and replication. Biases may develop as a result of particular research experiences. For example, if researchers attended a series of in-house meetings before attending a public hearing, their views might be biased in favor of an organization. Also, researchers might not
observe events in an identical manner. As suggested earlier, triangulation, as used in this study, allows for a means of correcting for weaknesses from any one method.

Additional research materials were gathered from MSP files as well as from the offices of its public relations agency. Among the MSP documents for analysis were newspaper, magazine, and journal articles, hearing transcriptions, brochures, correspondence, press releases, and legal briefs. This written information was assessed using content analysis, an "objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication" (Holsti, 1969). Content analysis was conducted on each individual paragraph of written/spoken rhetoric offered by MSP to identify any impression management strategies embedded in the text. A paragraph was chosen as the unit of analysis as it generally contained a unified statement of a particular point which stood alone and separate from the body of the article or publication. In media articles and press releases, only statements in direct quotes were included in the analysis. Ultimately, 1,275 statements were analyzed (see Table 2 for breakdown of the sources of statements analyzed).

Variables

For each paragraph, the content analysis coding sheet asked coders to make judgments regarding the presence of four nominal level variables: stakeholders, spokespersons,
### Table 2
MSP Messages Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Message</th>
<th>Number of Statements</th>
<th>Percentage of Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearings, Management</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings, Staff</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews, Management</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews, Staff</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers, magazines, &amp; journals</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal briefs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press releases</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Statements</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
response time, and impression management strategies. Relevant stakeholders were identified initially in the observer-as-participant stage. These groups were later supported by an established stakeholder typology (Bedeian, 1989, 1991; Freeman, 1984). Sixteen stakeholder categories were used in the coding process, with eight major categories, and eight sub-categories: competitors, regulators (including the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency, and the St. Mary Parish Council), customers, suppliers, media, government (including federal, state and local), MSP employees, and society (which included special interest groups and the local community). No additional stakeholder categories emerged during the coding process. Coders were instructed to check the stakeholder categories of society and media for all press releases and newspaper statements. However, additional audiences could be identified if they were explicitly mentioned in the newspaper statements and press releases. The codings of the stakeholder groups were used to assess research question two.

Identification of spokespersons represented the second variable coded. For spokespersons, only two categories were assessed. Coders were asked to identify the person offering the statement from a list of MSP personnel. The researcher later identified whether or not the person was from a
manager or non-manager level in order to investigate research question three.

The third variable was response time, or whether or not the statement was offered prior to or after the occurrence of a particular event. To assess whether the message occurred prior to or after an event, coders relied on two sources of information. First, they assessed the statement wording to determine when the event in question occurred. Second, coders referred to the titles of newspaper, magazine, and journal articles which were included with each message for indications of when the event occurred. A category of "undecided" was also offered as a choice for coding. Response time information was used in investigating research question four.

Impression management strategies represented the fourth variable coded. Before analyzing the specific impression management strategies used by MSP, a review of the interpersonal communication literature was conducted to assess various impression management strategies. This literature suggested five major categories: excuse, justification, ingratiation, intimidation, and apology. In addition, during the pre-coding period the first two coders discovered two additional categories of impression management strategies which had not originally been included in the coding guide. Two of the sub-categories of the impression management category of "justification" included
"condemnation of the condemner" and "negative events misrepresented." Some statements did not include efforts toward indicating that the organization accepted responsibility, yet the statement still condemned someone or suggested that a negative event was misrepresented. These two categories were added to the coding guide before actual coding began. The typology which was developed for this study included 21 categories: seven primary categories, 13 sub-categories, and an "other" category (see Appendix F). The seven primary categories were excuse, justification, ingratiation, intimidation, apology, condemnation of the condemner, and negative events misrepresented. The sub-categories of excuse included denial of intention, denial of volition and denial of agency. With justification, the sub-categories included "other" justification, denial of the injury, denial of the victim, condemnation of the condemner, and negative events misrepresented. For ingratiation, the sub-categories were "other" ingratiation, self-enhancing communication, role model, opinion conformity, and social responsibility. To determine if additional strategies were present but not indicated in the typology, an "other" category also was used.

Data Coding

Three coders were trained for coding using the same 20 messages which represented 1.5% of all messages coded. Prior to actual coding, each coder received coding guides
(see Appendix D), coding rules (see Appendix E), and sample statements (see Appendix F) which reflected the typology of impression management statements. Also, prior to coding, coders analyzed ten sample statements to verify understanding of the coding categories. The statements which were randomly selected from each category of statements included ten newspaper messages, four staff interviews, one management interview, one press release, two staff hearing messages, and two management hearing statements. Coders were asked to assess four areas: which stakeholder was addressed, who was addressing the stakeholder (management or non-management), whether or not the statement was offered prior to or after an event, and which impression management strategy was utilized. Coders chose from 16 stakeholder groups, and 21 impression management strategies. Coders had the option of choosing more than one stakeholder group for each message (e.g., a statement may have specifically addressed the EPA, the DEQ, and a special interest group. Also, coders could have chosen more than one impression management strategy for each message. For example, an MSP spokesperson stated: "That was written by a very, very low-level servant. It did not represent the views of the Department (DEQ). It was more than overblown. It was an emotional outburst." The statement was coded as both condemnation of the condemner and negative events misrepresented.
To assess intercoder reliability, Scott's Pi (Holsti, 1969) was used. Intercoder reliabilities ranged from .78 to .89 on stakeholder and from .82 to .98 on impression management strategy. Reliabilities between coder one and coder two were .78 on stakeholders and .82 on impression management strategies. For coders one and three, intercoder reliabilities were .79 on stakeholders and .98 on impression management strategies. For coders two and three, intercoder reliabilities were .89 on stakeholders and .89 on impression management strategies.

Methods of Analysis

Upon completion of statement coding, the data were analyzed using general log-linear analysis which allows for the examination of nominal level categorical variables when no distinction is made between independent and dependent variables (Fienberg, 1980; Iversen, 1979) and chi-square tests. Chi-square becomes especially useful as a tool for testing differences between particular groups following the use of log-linear analysis. With log-linear analysis, a researcher has the option of using the standard chi-square test or a goodness-of-fit statistic. Fienberg (1980) indicates that as long as a sample is large (e.g., total sample size is at least ten times the number of cells in a contingency table), the use of chi-square becomes as appropriate as the use of a goodness-of-fit-statistic. For this study, chi-square was used.
The general log-linear model can examine numerous categorical variables simultaneously. Log-linear examines the probabilities that an observation falls into a particular cell in a contingency table and that the probability is dependent upon the relationship between the variables as suggested by the model (Payne, 1977). Ultimately, the method develops a model reflecting significant main effects (the prevalence of a variable) and interaction effects (the effect of a combination of two or more variables) which best describe the data. While main effects provide information regarding the extent to which the combination of variables contribute to a particular model, they are not of primary value in the present study. Interaction effects provided the more useful information for answering the current research questions. Although interactions may occur in two-way or three-way formats, for this study only two-way interactions will be analyzed, as research has suggested that three-way interactions offer less concise interpretation than do two-way interactions (Fienberg, 1980; Dr. T. A. Watkins, personal communication, February 22, 1991). Additionally, log-linear analysis potentially yields extensive numbers of interactions, yet not all interactions are meaningful in advancing understanding of issues. In this study, chi-square was used to analyze all two-way interactions. While all two-way interactions were reported, only those interactions
confirmed as significant with the chi-square test were discussed.

Summary

Through a combination of data collection and analysis techniques, analysis of MSP data should yield more comprehensive results than reliance on a single method. Additionally, a combination of methods should assist in identifying which impression management strategies an organization in crisis uses in an attempt to persuade stakeholders of its legitimacy.
Endnote

1. MSP employees seemed particularly reluctant to discuss whether or not the organization had done a good job of informing employees about what was occurring in the organization. Also, some chose not to answer what it was like to work for MSP.

2. When coders analyzed justification messages which did not belong in the categories of denial of the injury, denial of the victim, condemnation of the condemner, or negative events misrepresented, they checked "other" justification.

3. When coders analyzed ingratiation messages which did not belong in the categories of self-enhancing communication, role model, social responsibility, other-enhancing communication, or opinion conformity, they checked "other" ingratiation.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS TESTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS
OF IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

This chapter provides results of the present study and is organized around its four focal research questions. For each question, results are provided from crosstabulations and/or log-linear analysis.

Research Question 1: What impression management strategies are used by MSP?

Crosstabulations suggested that ingratiation was the primary impression management strategy (50.8%, n = 668) emerging from MSP's messages. Justification emerged in 15.2% (n = 200) of the statements, followed by condemnation of the condemner (11.8%, n = 155), excuse (8.7%, n = 106), negative events misrepresented (7.8%, n = 102), other (4.7%, n = 62), and intimidation (1.6%, n = 21). No apologies were present in the data.

MSP messages primarily focused on efforts for gaining approval of an audience. Of the six types of ingratiation strategies, self-enhancing messages occurred the most frequently (43.9%, n = 293) followed by "other" ingratiation (as a sub-category of the primary ingratiation strategy) (25.4%, n = 170), social responsibility (12.6%, n = 84), role model (7.5%, n = 50), opinion conformity (6.7%, n = 45), and other-enhancing communication (3.9%, n = 26).
Justification was MSP's second most frequently occurring impression management strategy. The primary categories of justification were negative events misrepresented (38%, n = 76) and condemnation of the condemner (33%, n = 66) followed by other justifications (17.5%, n = 35), denial of injury (6.5%, n = 13), and denial of victim (5.0%, n = 10).

Research Question 2: Does MSP use different impression management strategies for different stakeholders?

Log-linear analysis and chi-square tests were used to assess which impression management strategies occurred in MSP messages directed to each of its 16 stakeholders. In the following sections, overall findings will be provided and individual impression management strategies will be discussed in the order of excuses, justification, ingratiation, condemnation of the condemner, negative events misrepresented, and "other."

Overall, different impression management strategies were used with different stakeholders ($X^2 = 515.33$, df = 9, $p < .001$). Crosstabulations indicated that with competitors, the most frequently occurring strategy was condemnation of the condemner, followed by ingratiation, justification, negative events misrepresented, excuse, and "other" (see Table 3 for crosstabulations of impression management strategies by stakeholders). For regulators,
Table 3

Crosstabulations of Impression Management Strategies
by Stakeholders (SH)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>EXC</th>
<th>JUS</th>
<th>ING</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>COND</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row Pct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col Pct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gvt</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lcom</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2613***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 515.33, df = 9, p < .001  
* Comp - Competitor; Reg - Regulator; Cus - Customer;  
Sup - Supplier; Sig - Special Interest Group; Med - Media;  
Int - Intimidation; Gvt - Government; Lcom - Local Community;  
Emp - employee; Soc - Society.  
**Exc - Excuse; Jus - Justification; Int - Intimidation;  
Ing - Ingratiation; Cond - Condemning the Condemner; Neg - Negative  
Events Misrepresented;  
***Represents multiple stakeholders for each coded message  
(e.g., an excuse may have been coded in one message for  
three different stakeholders).
ingratiation was the primary strategy emerging, followed by justification, condemnation of the condemner, excuse, negative events misrepresented, and other. The most frequent strategy with customers was ingratiation followed by negative events misrepresented, condemnation of the condemner, excuse, justification, and other. With suppliers, condemnation of the condemner was the leading strategy followed by ingratiation, excuse, justification, negative events misrepresented, and other. The primary strategy with special interest groups was justification, followed by condemnation of the condemner, ingratiation, negative events misrepresented, excuse, and other. For media, ingratiation was the most frequent strategy, followed by condemnation of the condemner, justification, excuse, negative events misrepresented, and other. With government, ingratiation emerged as the leading strategy, followed by condemnation of the condemner, justification, excuse, negative events misrepresented, and other. Ingratiation was also the primary strategy for the local community, followed by excuse, condemnation of the condemner, justification, and negative events misrepresented. With employees, ingratiation appeared as a leading strategy, followed by other, justification, condemnation of the condemner, negative events misrepresented, and excuse. For society, ingratiation was relied on in more than half of its total
strategies, followed by justification, condemnation of the condemnner, excuse, other, and negative events misrepresented.

Of the stakeholders, the three groups addressed most frequently were society, media, and regulators. The remaining 31.2% of the stakeholders addressed included local community (7.5%), government (7.0%), customers (6.7%), competitors (3.3%), employees (3.3%), special interest groups (2.8%), and suppliers (0.7%). Only the regulator group was composed of sub-categories. In the regulator category, the EPA was addressed the most (48.5%), followed by DEQ (38.7%), other regulators (12.5%), and St. Mary Parish Council (0.2%).

Additionally, crosstabulations suggested that different strategies were used with different regulators ($X^2 = 65$, df = 8, $p < .001$). For the crosstabulations analysis, local regulators were omitted, as only one statement was offered to them. With EPA, the predominant strategy was ingratiation, followed by justification, negative events misrepresented, condemnation of the condemnner, and excuse. For DEQ, ingratiation was also the leading strategy, followed by justification, condemnation of the condemnner, excuse, and negative events misrepresented. With the regulator category, ingratiation was the primary strategy, followed by justification, condemnation of the condemnner,
excuse, and negative events misrepresented (see Table 4 for crosstabulations of impression management strategies by regulators).

Log-linear analysis was used to explore each individual impression management strategy. While data concerning main effects are important for understanding which variables most effectively compose a model, the effects are not useful in understanding the posed research questions. For each impression management strategy, main effects are reported, yet the more meaningful results are yielded from interaction effects (the results of various combinations of variables).

In log-linear models containing excuse with all stakeholders, results indicated every variable except special interest groups reflected significant main effects, or the prevalence of particular variables (see Table 5 for log-linear analysis of excuse by stakeholders). Only one interaction effect was reflected with the strategy of excuse and that included excuse with regulator. Chi-square test results suggested that no significant differences existed between the types of excuses used with regulators. Crosstabulations of excuse with regulators indicated that 64% of all excuses were offered to DEQ, 28% to EPA, and 8% to other regulators. Of the types of excuses used with regulators, 72.2% were denial of agency (see Table 6 for crosstabulations of excuse by regulators). Crosstabulations of excuse with all stakeholders indicated that excuses
Table 4
Crosstabulations of Impression Management Strategies by Regulators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulators</th>
<th>Exc</th>
<th>Jus</th>
<th>Ing</th>
<th>Cond</th>
<th>Neg</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Local regulators were omitted from the analysis, as only one statement was offered.

X² = 65, df = 8, p < .001
Table 5
Log-linear Analysis of Excuse by Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excuse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>421.81</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.37</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.18</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.53</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>446.27</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuse* Regulator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Crosstabulations of Excuse by Regulators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excuses</th>
<th>Regulators*</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>DEQ</th>
<th>EPA</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*St. Mary Parish Council was omitted from the analysis, as no strategies were offered to this group.
occurred the most frequently with society, the local community, and the media (see Table 3 for crosstabulations of impression management strategies by stakeholders).

The second impression management strategy examined using log-linear analysis was justification (see Table 7 for the results of the log-linear analysis for justification). One two-way interaction was present which involved justification with regulator ($X^2 = 29.46, df = 3, p < .0001$). The chi-square test indicated that no significant differences existed with the types of justifications used with regulators. Crosstabulations indicated that DEQ was the primary recipient of justifications (42.5%), followed by the EPA (37.5%), and other regulators (20%). The predominant justification strategy with regulators was negative events misrepresented, followed by condemnation of the condemner, other justifications, denial of injury, and denial of victim (see Table 8 for crosstabulations between justification by regulators; note the row total).

The third impression management strategy analyzed was ingratiation which was involved in five two-way interactions (see Table 9 for log-linear analysis of ingratiation by stakeholders). The five two-way interactions included ingratiation with regulator ($X^2 = 67.08, df = 3, p < .0001$), customer ($X^2 = 12.20, df = 1, p < .0005$), media ($X^2 = 22.63, df = 1, p < .0001$), government ($X^2 = 13.87, df = 3, p < .05$), and society ($X^2 = 15.48,$
### Table 7

Log-linear Analysis of Justification by Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.85</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>111.58</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.44</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.57</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>419.11</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.0382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jus*Reg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Crosstabulations of Justification by Regulators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Other Regulator</th>
<th>DEQ</th>
<th>EPA</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Justification</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denial of the Injury</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denial of the Victim</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condemnation of the Condemner</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Events Misrepresented</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*St. Mary Parish Council was removed from the analysis, as no justifications were offered to this group.*
Table 9

Log-linear Analysis of Ingratiation by Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>168.90</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88.29</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.85</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>387.74</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing*Reg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.08</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing*Cus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing*Med</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing*Gvt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing*Soc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square tests indicated that significant differences occurred in all ingratiation interactions except with government.

For ingratiation with regulators ($X^2 = 16.812, \text{df} = 6, p < .01$), a comparison was made between observed and expected frequencies for each category. Only in the ingratiation category of opinion conformity with other regulators was the observed frequency greater than the expected frequency for all other ingratiation categories. Crosstabulations indicated that when ingratiation occurred with regulators, the EPA was addressed the most frequently (69.6%), followed by DEQ (22.7%), and other regulators (7.7%). The predominant ingratiation strategies with all regulators were self-enhancing communication and opinion conformity (see Table 10 for crosstabulations between ingratiation by regulators).

A second two-way interaction involved ingratiation with customers. Significant differences were determined for ingratiation strategies used with customers ($X^2 = 211, \text{df} = 5, p < .001$). When comparing observed frequencies with expected frequencies, observed frequencies were larger than expected frequencies in all categories, with the largest differences appearing in the categories of self-enhancing communication and other ingratiation. Self-enhancing communication emerged as the primary ingratiation strategy,
Table 10
Crosstabulations of Ingratiation by Regulators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingratiation</th>
<th>Other Regulator</th>
<th>DEQ</th>
<th>EPA</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancing Communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-enhancing Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.27%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Conformity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*St. Mary Parish Council was omitted from the analysis, as no strategies were offered to that stakeholder group, followed by other ingratiation, social responsibility, role
followed by other ingratiation, social responsibility, role model, other-enhancing communication, and opinion conformity.

The third two-way interaction was ingratiation with media. Again, the chi-square test suggested that significant differences existed in ingratiation strategies used with customers \((X^2 = 194.1, \text{df} = 5, p < .001)\). Differences in observed and expected frequencies in the category of self-enhancing communication accounted for 73\% of the total chi-square value. Also, self-enhancing communication was the predominant strategy, followed by other ingratiation, social responsibility, role model, other-enhancing communication, and opinion conformity.

In the final two-way interaction, ingratiation with society, significant differences existed in the ingratiation strategies used with society \((X^2 = 226.4, \text{df} = 5, p < .001)\). In all ingratiation categories, observed frequencies were larger than expected frequencies, with self-enhancing communication representing the largest difference. Self-enhancing communication was the leading strategy, followed by other ingratiation, social responsibility, role model, opinion conformity, and other-enhancing communication. Overall, ingratiation appeared most frequently with society and regulators.

Intimidation represented the fourth impression management strategy analyzed. Only one two-way interaction
resulted: intimidation with special interest group (see Table 11 for the results of the log-linear analysis of intimidation with stakeholders). The chi-square test confirmed a significant interaction between intimidation and special interest group ($X^2 = 61.7$, df = 1, $p < .001$). The observed frequency was more than twice as large as expected by chance alone. Intimidation strategies appeared only in messages to special interest groups and were used more with Greenpeace than with SLAP.

For condemnation of the condemner, the fifth impression management strategy, the variable was involved in six two-way interactions (see Table 12 for log-linear analysis of condemnation of the condemner by stakeholders). The two-way interactions included condemnation with competitor, regulator, supplier, media, government and local community. Chi-square tests indicated significance for all interactions except for condemnation with supplier. In condemnation of the condemner with competitor, the observed frequency was greater than what was suggested by the expected frequency or by chance alone. However, in all other combinations, the expected frequency was greater than the observed frequency. Society and media received the most condemnation of the condemner. Negative events misrepresented, the sixth impression management strategy, had seven two-way interactions—the most two-way interactions of all variables evaluated (see Table 13 for log-linear analysis of negative
### Table 11

Log-linear Analysis of Intimidation by Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.37</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.17</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160.83</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.13</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.18</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>436.24</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int*Special Interest Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.61</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Log-linear Analysis of Condemnation of the Condemner by Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.54</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120.22</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.98</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>279.53</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.76</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond*Com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond*Reg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond*Sup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond*Med</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond*Gvt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond*Local Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Log-linear Analysis of Negative Events Misrepresented by Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.74</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>164.58</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.83</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.52</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>447.81</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>.0022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg*Com</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.0261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg*Cus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.0299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg*Sup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.20</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg*Med</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>.0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg*Local Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg*Emp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg*Soc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.49</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
events represented by stakeholders). Negative events misrepresented interacted with competitors, customers, suppliers, media, local community, employees, and society. Chi-square tests confirmed that all interactions were significant. In all seven interactions with negative events misrepresented, the expected frequencies were larger than the observed frequencies. The interaction with customers represented the largest difference in the observed and expected frequencies, followed by employees and local community. Crosstabulations indicated that negative events misrepresented occurred most frequently with society, media and regulators.

The final impression management strategy, "other," included three two-way interactions of "other" with regulator, media, and employee (see Table 14 for log-linear analysis of other by stakeholders). Chi-square confirmed that all three interactions were significant. In all three interactions with other, the expected frequencies were larger than the observed frequencies, with media representing the largest difference between expected and observed frequencies. When "other" occurred with regulators, DEQ was addressed most frequently (63.6%) followed by other regulators (31.8%), and EPA (4.6%). "Other" appeared the most frequently with society and employees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111.16</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.72</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.06</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.72</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.48</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>426.19</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.0318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*Reg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*Emp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.0530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3: Are management and non-management using the same impression management strategies?

Crosstabulations between spokesperson and impression management strategies suggested that management and non-management are using different strategies ($X^2 = 28.98$, df = 5, $p < .001$). Management messages involved excuse, ingratiating, intimidation, and condemnation of the condemner more frequently than did non-management messages. However, non-management messages involved justification, negative events misrepresented, and "other" more than did management (see Table 15 for crosstabulations of impression management strategies by spokespersons; note the column percent).

Most of the impression management strategies contained cell sizes which did not allow the use of chi-square to assess differences between management and non-management in the use of strategies. However, chi-square analyses were performed to analyze differences between management and non-management uses of sub-strategies for justification and ingratiating. Results suggested that a significant difference existed between the justification sub-strategies used by management and non-management ($X^2 = 10.85$, df = 4, $p < .05$) (see Table 16 for crosstabulations of management and non-management by justification). For management, their overall choices of justification sub-strategies were ordered
Table 15
Crosstabulations of Impression Management Strategies
by Spokespersons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Non-Management</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuse</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation of Condemner</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresented</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1293*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 28.98, df = 5, p < .001$

*Intimidation was removed from this analysis, as it contained cells with "0."
Table 16
Crosstabulations of Justification by Spokespersons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Spokesperson</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Non-Management</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Justification</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of Injury</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of Victim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation of Condemner</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Events</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Χ² = 10.85, df = 4, p < .05
as follows: negative events misrepresented, condemnation of the condemner, justification (sub-category), denial of injury, and denial of victim. Non-management overall choices included condemnation of the condemner, negative events misrepresented, justification, denial of victim, and denial of injury. The results of the chi-square for ingratiation indicated that no significant difference existed between the approaches of management and non-management ($X^2 = 5.1$, df = 5, $p > .05$).

Research Question 4: Are some impression management strategies used by MSP primarily proactive and others primarily reactive?

Crosstabulations indicated that 93.2% of all strategies offered by MSP were reactive and only 6.8% were used as proactive strategies (see Table 17 for crosstabulations between impression management strategies by proactive/reactive responses). Log-linear analysis assessed the impression management strategies to determine if any of the strategies could be classified as primarily proactive or reactive. Crosstabulations revealed that ingratiation is more proactive than other strategies except intimidation which probably had too few cases for a statistical effect to be revealed (see Table 18 for the results of the log-linear analysis of response by condemnation of the condemner).

Ingratiation was used 89.3% after an event had occurred
### Table 17

Crosstabulations for Impression Management Strategies by Proactive/Reactive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Reactive</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row Pct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col Pct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tot Pct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses</strong></td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Row Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excuse</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ingratiation</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condemnation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intimidation</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18
Log-linear Analysis of Responses (Proactive/Reactive) by Condemnation of the Condemner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp*Cond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.0156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(reactively) and 10.7% before an event had occurred (proactively) (see Table 19 for the results of the log-linear analysis of response by ingratiation). Condemnation of the condemner was the most reactive strategy. When MSP condemned the condemner, the strategy was used 99.3% after an event (reactively) and less than 1% prior to an event (proactively). Negative events misrepresented probably has too cases for a significant effect to be revealed.

Summary

Results indicated that ingratiation was the primary strategy used by MSP with an emphasis on self-enhancing communication. Different impression management strategies were used with different stakeholders, and multiple two-way interactions emerged with the strategies. Management and non-management relied on different impression management strategies. While both groups relied on ingratiation as a primary strategy, management used condemnation of the condemner as its leading strategy while non-management used justification. The majority of MSP responses were reactive, yet ingratiation emerged as more proactive than the other impression management strategies.
Table 19
Log-linear Analysis of Responses (Proactive/Reactive)
by Ingratiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>392.02</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingratiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resp*Ing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the impression management strategies used by an organization in crisis and to develop a typology of impression management strategies used by organizations. This chapter is divided into three segments: research goals and findings, suggestions for further research, and conclusions.

Research Goals and Findings

Previous research has evaluated impression management strategies in interpersonal relationships. However, limited attention had been devoted to impression management in the organizational arena. A primary goal of this study was to identify impression management strategies used in the organizational arena, particularly during crisis. While an excuse is the primary strategy used in interpersonal relationships and in some accounts offered by organizations (Hebert, 1986; 1987), such was not the case for this organization. The impression management strategy of ingratiation emerged as the leading strategy, suggesting that perhaps organizations in crisis feel a greater need to stimulate positive affective responses than they do to negate organizational responsibility for an event. With all
stakeholders except competitors, suppliers, and special interest groups, ingratiation was the most frequently used strategy.

Of the ingratiation strategies, four had been previously suggested in the literature: "other" ingratiation, self-enhancing communication, other-enhancing communication, and opinion conformity. Two additional ingratiation strategies emerged from a preliminary scan of the data and then were tested with this study: role model and social responsibility. These accounted for almost 20% of the total ingratiation strategies used. Role model statements suggest that the organization serves as an exemplary case in some way. A role model strategy is more than a description of the organization. The strategy attempts to gain approval by suggesting uniqueness. For example, MSP spokespeople repeatedly mentioned receiving a patent which recognized its technology as the first developed and introduced into the marketplace. At other times, MSP suggested that it was the best example of a recycling organization. The additional "new" strategy of social responsibility especially may appear meaningful for controversial organizations or for those experiencing perpetual crises. If an organization can convince its stakeholders that it contributes to society in a meaningful way, perhaps it can diffuse crisis at its outset. These two additional categories should be incorporated into models of impression management for organizations.
Studies also had suggested that justification, intimidation, and apology are strategies relied on in interpersonal communications (Jones & Pittman, 1980; McLaughlin et al., 1983; Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981). Results of this study indicated that justification was the second most frequently used strategy and intimidation was the least used strategy. With justifications, MSP appeared to emphasize that although an event may have occurred, its occurrence was not of significance. An apology was not present in the data. For MSP to offer an apology would have required admitting guilt and requesting punishment which did not appear to be a strategy relied on for any reason. Because of MSP's involvement in legal arenas, it may have been reluctant to ever admit error. An admission of guilt might have resulted in additional fines. However, if MSP had relented in some instances, perhaps the public and the regulatory agencies would have viewed the organization in a less negative way.

Two additional "new" strategies emerged during coding: condemnation of the condemner and negative events misrepresented. These two categories accounted for almost 20% of the total strategies used by MSP. The organization's messages placed blame and reinterpreted events which had been perceived by stakeholders as negative in some way. Previous research determined that both condemnation of the condemner and negative events misrepresented were types of justifications. However, in some instances, MSP statements
condemned or suggested that negative events had been misrepresented, yet the statements did not suggest acceptance of responsibility for the behavior and therefore could not be coded as justifications. As mentioned earlier, justification appeared as a predominant strategy in interpersonal communication, yet it did not appear in the same way with the present study. Allowing condemnation of the condemner and negative events misrepresented to be tested as separate strategies may have accounted for the justification strategy to appear less prominent. Further research appears useful for testing the use of these two newly developed strategies which condemn or argue misrepresentation while not accepting blame.

Also, coders were given a category of "other" to use if they discovered any additional strategy. Although the category emerged in only 5% of the messages, "other" revealed additional data. Content analysis suggested that both management and non-management condemned MSP for its lack of effectiveness with regulators and media and for the lack of internal communication with its employees. In interviews, both management and non-management personnel indicated that MSP had attempted to use the media to condemn regulators and to suggest repeatedly that regulators were incompetent. Some employees indicated that they felt fines were a direct result of MSP's harassment of DEQ. However, other organizational members supported MSP's hard line with
regulators, charging regulators were politically motivated and were not technically astute. Other organizational members appeared dissatisfied with MSP's efforts toward internal communication. Often media knew of impending disasters for MSP long before employees. Some of those interviewed suggested that they could be better employees if they knew the facts surrounding the various crises.

Another dimension of this study was to assess whether or not MSP relied on different strategies with different stakeholders. While ingratiation was the primary strategy relied upon with most stakeholders, differences did exist in overall strategy use. For regulators, customers, media, government, local community, employees, and society, ingratiation was the leading strategy. With competitors and suppliers, MSP tended to condemn the condemner. For special interest groups, the organization tended to use justifications. From the above findings, besides the consistent use of ingratiation, two of results seemed especially interesting: MSP's reliance on condemnation of the condemner as a strategy with suppliers and the use of justification with special interest groups. The least number of overall messages was targeted toward suppliers, and most of those messages were contained in MSP correspondence in which it condemned the local medical community. Suppliers were not the target of the condemnation, but their neighbors in the medical community were the target of condemnation. As
for special interest groups, also a recipient of few total messages, MSP preferred to try to explain problems rather than to condemn the groups for their actions. One special interest group, SLAP, was from the local community. Perhaps MSP felt greater responsibility to explain events than to place blame since the SLAP had the potential for affecting the organization on a daily basis.

While suppliers, the medical community, and SLAP were all members of the local community, they received different responses from MSP. The responses of MSP toward these three groups appeared dependent on how credible the stakeholder group was perceived by MSP and other stakeholders. Of the three groups, perhaps the medical community would be perceived by other stakeholders as the most credible. When condemned by the medical community, MSP seemed to feel a greater need to question the legitimacy of the doctors. SLAP may have been viewed as existing on the fringe of credibility, so MSP may not have felt the same need to condemn them. Supplier credibility was not in question with MSP, but the organization felt a need to legitimate its own position by condemning others in order to continue a positive relationship with the suppliers.

In addition to overall differences in strategy use, the study examined differences for the individual strategies used with stakeholders. Although excuse did not appear as a prominent strategy, it was involved in an interaction with
regulators. The DEQ was the primary recipient of excuses, and the excuses were primarily a denial of agency. When denial of agency occurred, MSP argued that the occurrence in question did not occur but a similar event may have appeared. For example, MSP was accused of emitting pollutants from its stack. The organization responded that the emissions in question were steam rather than pollutants. MSP wanted DEQ to recognize that DEQ had made an error in judgment.

Ingratiation, the leading overall strategy, was involved in multiple interactions with stakeholder groups. When ingratiation was involved in interactions with regulators, the approach was different than when excuses and justifications were used with regulators. For excuses and justifications, DEQ was the primary recipient of the strategies, but with ingratiation, EPA received the most ingratiation strategies. Although DEQ is a representative of the Federal government, EPA is the regulator which makes final decisions regarding regulation of organizations. Consequently, MSP's emphasis on ingratiation with EPA can be expected. Self-enhancing communication, where an organization attempts to persuade others of its positive qualities, traits, motives, and intentions, appeared as the most frequent ingratiation strategy with regulators, customers, media, government, and society. For example, MSP used self-enhancing communication when it mentioned having improved plant environmental monitoring equipment to assure
compliance and safety for the local citizens. In interactions with ingratiation and government, the Federal government was the major recipient of ingratiation strategies. MSP emphasized its good technology and its soundness repeatedly. This is consistent with research that indicates that when an organization is perceived negatively, it will emphasize its legitimacy (Fry & Hock, 1976).

Justification appeared as the second most frequently occurring strategy. With justification, an organization accepts responsibility for an event but indicates that the event actually was not negative. MSP repeatedly offered statements which suggested that an event was not negative or that the event had been taken out of context. For example, when MSP had a fire on its premises, it explained to the media that the event was minor and caused no damage in any way to employees, equipment, or the environment. It was almost as though the event had not occurred at all. MSP attempted to "explain away" the existence of a problem.

Justification appeared in an interaction with the regulator. Results indicated that DEQ was the primary recipient of the messages and negative events misrepresented was the primary type of justification which appeared. MSP suggested to DEQ that particular events had been taken out of context. For example, when DEQ indicated that MSP was assessed a large fine, the organization responded that the fine was proposed rather than assessed. Again, MSP hoped
that DEQ would admit an error in judgment. Although justification only interacted with regulator, the use of the justification strategy with other stakeholders was interesting as well. For example, MSP explained in a media statement to customers that it raised prices but argued the new prices were still much lower than those charged by competitors.

Intimidation was relied upon in a limited way. When this strategy was used, it was only in communication directed at special interest groups (e.g., Greenpeace, SLAP, & HWTC). Its only interaction was with special interest groups. As an observer, the researcher was somewhat surprised that more intimidation strategies did not emerge from the data, as many of the statements appeared to intimidate the stakeholders addressed. However, condemnation of the condemnner appeared as a partner of intimidation and was present in a meaningful number of messages. When intimidation strategies occurred, they were strong statements. For example, when Greenpeace announced that it would force its way on to the MSP plant, Jack Kent responded that he would damage the intruders with physical abuse if necessary. Observers who heard Kent offer the statements regarding Greenpeace felt convinced that violence could occur.

Both condemnation of the condemnner and negative events misrepresented, the two "discovered" categories, were
involved in multiple interactions as was the strategy of "other." Condemnation of the condemner statements indicate that a particular person or group was at fault. The strongest condemnation appeared against competitors who MSP blamed for attempting to put it out of business. Another stakeholder group which received condemnation of the condemner messages was the local community. Although statements directed to the local community clearly were condemning in nature, the statements did not condemn the local community. Instead, the messages indicted other stakeholders such as competitors, regulators, special interest groups, media, and government. In these instances, MSP attempted to persuade local citizens that others were the cause of crises rather than MSP. Messages to regulators contained condemnation of the condemner strategies. For example, MSP condemned DEQ by indicating that one DEQ administrator was the "least capable" person in the organization and that the employee prevented the DEQ technical staff from operating properly. MSP repeatedly condemned individuals in DEQ from the chief administrator to various other members of DEQ. Government also was a recipient of condemnation of the condemner messages. MSP suggested that various state and national politicians were endangering the survival of the organization simply as a political tool. If politicians blamed MSP for damaging the environment, they received support from special interest
groups, local citizens, competitors, and media. Future research might wish to examine whether or not condemnation of the condemner serves as a successful impression management strategy.

Negative events misrepresented may be perceived as a more positive strategy than condemnation of the condemner. The strategy suggests that an event is taken out of context or that untrue statements are offered about an event's occurrence. When MSP addressed customers, it used negative events misrepresented as a means of protecting its survival. If customers failed to believe that accusations made against the organization were untrue, then MSP lost that organization as a customer. For example, in 1988 articles appeared suggesting that the organization would be closed immediately. MSP offered press releases and conferences to dissuade customers from believing what they read. Just as MSP had to explain to customers that the organization was not closing its doors, it also communicated the same message to employees and the local community. In this instance of negative events misrepresented, MSP offered proof that the organization would remain in business. Additional research could explore whether or not negative events misrepresented is perceived favorably by stakeholders in most cases and whether or not the strategy is perceived more favorably than condemnation of the condemner.
The final newly discovered impression management strategy surfaced in the "other" category. While the strategy did not yield extensive quantities of data, "other" did suggest possible paths for future research. For example, the messages coded as "other" suggested that some organizational members did not feel the need to suggest a positive image of the organization. In fact, some members of both management and non-management condemned the organization for its ineffectiveness in internal communication and for its external communication with regulators. Some research indicates that during organizational decline, employees question the effectiveness of leadership (Cameron, Whetten, & Kim, 1987). Does condemning one's own organization occur just in instances of decline or also in other crises? Organizational research might explore whether or not employee condemnation of the organization itself occurs in other organizations.

The study also investigated whether or not management and non-management relied on the same impression management strategies. Findings indicated that both management and non-management relied on ingratiation primarily, but after the primary strategy, their approaches were somewhat different. Both used justification as a secondary strategy, but non-management relied on the use of justification more than did management and most frequently relied on the justification category of condemnation of the condemner. Management relied
on the justification category of negative events misrepresented. Results of participant observation indicated that the two groups were not coordinated in their communication strategies perhaps because of a lack of internal communication. External stakeholders frequently knew of organizational crises before organizational members. The use of different strategies by management and non-management suggests at least two possibilities. First, organizational members may not have responded from the same base of information. A concern expressed by non-management was that they did not always feel informed about what was occurring with the organization. Research indicates that external legitimacy is increased for organizational activities if leaders create meaning for employees (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Effective communication within the organization might have resulted in a united perception by members. If its employees perceived MSP as legitimate and if their perceptions were similar, the messages which they communicated with external stakeholders might have been more similar than they were here. Second, management and non-management felt different needs for their responses. Non-management expressed a need to explain organizational problems and to indicate that events were not really as explained by others—that the organization was basically good. Perhaps non-management was attempting to make sense of organizational happenings for themselves. Management
preferred to condemn the condemners (e.g., competitors, regulators, and special interest groups) or to suggest that MSP was an outstanding organization compared to other groups.

A final area of assessment involved whether or not the impression management strategies used by MSP tended to be primarily proactive or primarily reactive. Of the seven types of impression management strategies investigated in this study, only two reflected a statistically significant relationship between the strategy and whether or not it was proactive or reactive: ingratiation and condemnation of the condemner. Ingratiation appeared as the more proactive strategy, with condemnation of the condemner as the more reactive strategy. While the remaining impression management strategies were not suggested as statistically significant through log-linear analysis, crosstabulations suggested that the remainder of the strategies tended to be used after the fact, or reactively, as well. D'Aprix (1982) indicated that the reactive approach does not offer sound rewards for the organization, as interpretation of the event becomes more the responsibility of the stakeholders than of the organization. Reactive responses suggest that an organization is out of control and has limited focus on its goals. Stakeholders tend to perceive an organization as illegitimate when reactive responses primarily are used. Perhaps the tendency of MSP to use strategies reactively
further diminished its legitimacy in the view of its stakeholders.

Not only was the study able to assess the particular strategies used by MSP, but results provided for the initial development of a different typology of impression management strategies for organizations than for an interpersonal setting. The typology includes all previous categories of excuses, justifications, intimidation, and ingratiation as well as additional categories of role model, social responsibility, condemnation of the condemner, negative events misrepresented, and condemnation of the organization, a strategy evolving from the "other" category.

Directions for Future Research

This study was approached from one side of the legitimacy issue: how an organization communicates with its stakeholders. To have a more complete understanding of the impression management strategies used with stakeholders, future research should examine how stakeholders perceive an organization in crisis and react to its use of different impression management strategies. To explore the stakeholder perceptions of legitimacy, one could rely on many of the same sources as were used with this study (e.g., newspaper statements, hearings, and interviews). Research indicates that organizations are viewed as more legitimate when they provide funding to community projects, show particular environmental concern, or suggest cooperation with regulators
(Ashforth & Gibbs, 1990; Boje & Whetten, 1981; Chatman et al, 1983; Domhoff & Dye, 1987; Ermann, 1978; Galskiewicz, 1985). One might investigate the kinds of issues that bring organizational legitimacy into question and whether or not the issues are the same for each stakeholder group. For example, when MSP condemned Greenpeace, the results with stakeholders varied. Organizational members indicated that the response was justified. However, the media indicated that the response was inappropriate.

Another area for exploration concerns the internal communication process during crisis. This study indicated that MSP made little effort to explain to employees what was happening. Although Barnard (1938) indicated that leaders are "makers of meaning" for organizational members, MSP employees tended to discover organizational outcomes through the media. Before employees can communicate the legitimacy of an organization to external stakeholders, they have to comprehend and believe that the organization is legitimate. Results indicated that management and non-management offered different strategies to stakeholders. A trainer could use these findings as the basis for communication training.

Research might explore how organizational members perceive their impression management strategies as compared with the strategies which emerge in the actual messages. For example, would MSP suggest that it primarily attempts to ingratiate itself with others? Is ingratiation a strategy
which the organization consciously uses? Findings could prove useful as a tool for management when comparing its intentions with the reality of messages offered.

Various researchers have identified stages of crisis (e.g., Beak et al., 1971). Are stages the same for all types of crises? For example, does an organization which underwent one major crisis (e.g., Exxon with the Alaskan oil spill) experience the same stages of crisis as a company such as MSP which has endured repeated crises? Possibly organizations which experience crisis from their inception will always function in a crisis mode.

Also, impression management strategies might differ across stages and across types of organizations. Such differences need to be identified. MSP exemplifies some qualities of both the surviving and the declining organization. Although MSP has survived its first eight years and has attempted to improve its process, it does not appear to have moved beyond a stage of defensive retreat in which the organization attempts to maintain itself. MSP has fought the same battles with stakeholders since its early days in business. At some point, MSP must adapt and change in order to survive. To further examine stages of crisis and the impression management strategies used in organizations, longitudinal and cross-organizational studies are needed. For example, some research indicates that silence is a type of account offered during some stages of crisis (McLaughlin
et al., 1983). While offered in the literature as a possible strategy, silence has not been tested in various organizational settings. Perhaps as organizations mature, they utilize the strategy of silence rather than feeling compelled to respond. Reliance on silence may encourage an issue to diminish in importance sooner than if another type of strategy is used.

While this study suggested that apologies were not relied on by this organization, for future research one might wish to determine whether or not other organizations in crisis rely on apologies and in what instances. Apologies appear to offer one way of making amends with stakeholders. Previous research on apologies indicated that an apology usually is accompanied by a request for punishment (Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981). However, other research suggested that organizations may apologize in a way that negates a need for requesting punishment. For example, Hebert (1986) found that when Johnson and Johnson's Tylenol product was poisoned, the organization apologized to stakeholders through multi-media campaigns and persuaded them of its remorse. Johnson and Johnson did not have to request punishment from stakeholders, as it suggested its own punishment of removing all of the product from the marketplace. Other studies might explore instances in which apologies are offered without requesting punishment.
For organizations which experience enduring crisis, perhaps organizational members develop standard lines of rhetoric to address stakeholders. Script research (Gioia, 1986) would appear to offer a base for further research. Do organizations in crisis develop scripts? Can specific types of scripts be linked to the survival/success of an organization? Are specific types of scripts developed for different stakeholders? For example, when MSP targeted messages to DEQ, the statements tended to be negative and appeared to represent a script, or a similar message offered repeatedly. By examining MSP statements, one could evaluate the existence of possible scripts with various stakeholders or could use the scripts as a basis for communication intervention. If organizations develop scripts for crises, perhaps the impression management strategies are a primary part of the script. MSP experienced crises as the result of its relationships with various stakeholders. As part of the crisis script, organizations could opt to rely intentionally on specific impression management strategies. While strategies may have been used intentionally by MSP in some instances (e.g., intimidation strategies used with Greenpeace), in other instances the strategies may have been more spontaneous (e.g., excuse with interviewer).

A major dimension of this study was to develop a typology for further investigation. By using the proposed typology, one could examine whether or not all crises evoke
similar impression management strategies. Ingratiation appeared in this study as the predominant strategy, but is this the case with other organizations in crisis? Development of this typology occurred through examining only one organization in crisis. Further organizational research using the typology will be required to evaluate the validity of the proposed impression management structure.

In future research, using the coding guide established for this study, researchers may choose to evaluate the stakeholders of society and media in a different way. Because coders were asked to identify society and media when coding all newspaper messages and press releases, the categories appeared as the primary stakeholders in many cases. For future research, coders might indicate only the specific audiences mentioned rather than relying on society. One could assume that all public discourse is inherently addressed to society.

Previous findings suggest that a weakness in organizational research is failure to focus on actual messages in organizations (Stohl & Redding, 1987). A strength of this study has been the emphasis on specific messages offered by an organization. Additionally, the messages were assimilated from a variety of sources.

Conclusion

MSP introduced a new technology in a time of heightened environmental awareness. While the technology has received
intermittent acclaim by various stakeholders, its overall legitimacy has been questioned almost continuously. At least four reasons exist for this negative view of the organization's legitimacy. First, stakeholders may be unclear concerning the options available for disposing of hazardous waste (e.g., landfills versus recycling facilities).

Habermas (1975) indicates that stakeholders have to reach consensus on an organization's purpose and value. For example, regulators may be unclear on MSP's purpose. Research conducted in the organization suggested that regulators had no experience with writing regulations for recycling facilities (personal communication, February, 1988)—only for incinerators. Regulators have referred to MSP as a "regulatory nightmare" (personal communication, February, 1988). Others have developed a gradual awareness of MSP's purpose, including customers, suppliers, media, local community, employees, and society.

Second, MSP's use of rhetoric (e.g., impression management strategies) may have persuaded some stakeholders that it will never be a legitimate operation. For example, regulators, media, and government, and media may all have difficulty in accepting MSP's legitimacy while these groups are being identified with such colorful terms as "very...low level civil servants," "wild monkeys," and "manipulators." Third, impression management strategies appeared reactively
which suggested that the organization functioned in a reflex mode rather than one which required advanced planning. Finally, some stakeholders do not accept MSP as a legitimate organization. For example, even if competitors accepted the MSP technology as legitimate, they probably would not grant legitimacy, as this would threaten their own technologies. Special interest groups emerge to address a particular grievance. If special interest groups granted MSP legitimacy, they would have to evaluate other causes for health problems or focus their attention on another organization.

MSP has 16 stakeholders and experiences less than satisfactory relationships with all groups. While organizational survival is dependent on an organization's ability to satisfy the goals of its various stakeholders (Bedeian, 1987), MSP does not appear to recognize that relationship or to believe that stakeholders have a right to question organizational actions. Also, MSP does not appear clear on the goals of the various stakeholders or how to address the various goals. Limited MSP attention is devoted to identifying and researching the various stakeholders which affect the organization.

While MSP is a single example of an organization in crisis, it has provided an excellent setting in which to expand research in the area of impression management. Strategies used by this organization in crisis were different
than those suggested by the interpersonal communication literature. While caution must be exercised in drawing conclusions about all organizations in crisis, the results of this study offer a beginning point for future analysis.
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APPENDIX A

Emergence of Environmental Awareness

Before the publication of The Silent Spring (Carson, 1962), specific examples of environmental disaster were emerging. One of the most noted examples was that of Love Canal, New York. In the 1940s and 1950s, Hooker Chemical Company disposed of more than 21,000 tons of chemical waste in the ground and in Love Canal ("Welcome Back," 1988). In the 1950s, the canal and its contents were covered and a subdivision was built on the site. More than 20 years passed before residents began noticing foul smells in their basements and oil puddles in their yards. Health problems emerged including high rates of miscarriages, birth defects, cancer, leukemia, neurological disease, allergies, epilepsy, and suicide ("Love Canal Furor," 1988). By 1978, President Carter declared Love Canal a national disaster area. Approximately 2,500 homes were evacuated in a 50-block area and 300 houses were bulldozed ("Love Canal Furor," 1988; Flippen, 1990). A decade after the evacuation from Love Canal, the state of New York declared the area two-thirds inhabitable ("Welcome Back," 1988). State and federal agencies have spent approximately $200 million on containing and monitoring the contamination ("Love Canal Will Regain," 1988). Occidental Chemical, which purchased Hooker Chemical in 1968, went on trial in 1990 to determine its fiscal responsibility in the disaster (Flippen, 1990).
Other events in addition to Love Canal encouraged an emphasis on environmental events as well. The 1970s marked the passage of the Congressionally mandated Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) which represented the first national law to deal with hazardous waste and the establishment of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as the governing body for protecting the environment and of the Congressionally mandated Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) which represented the first national law to deal with hazardous waste. RCRA directed the EPA to design a program which would protect society and the environment from various environmental waste practices (USEPA, 1986). Research suggested that land disposal was not the solution to hazardous waste. Other methods emerged for coping with waste including incineration and/or recycling. While incineration had the capacity to reduce the waste, the process lacked the ability to eliminate the need for landfills. Additionally, landfill space in more than half of America's cities was expected to run out in 1990 (Schwartz, Bradburn, & Hager, 1988). A 1984 amendment to RCRA attempted to reduce or eliminate the generation of hazardous waste (USEPA, 1987). Another major federal program developed in the 1980s. The official name of the program was the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980. Informally, the federal program became known as "Superfund" legislation.
Part of the act indicated if a company transported waste to a particular site which was later considered to be contaminated the company could be held liable for the cleanup (Finnegan, 1988).

At present, industry is much more strictly regulated than at the time of the Love Canal disaster. For example, the incinerator industry is the subject of extensive federal fines for lack of appropriate environmental compliance, ranging from $250,000 to over $3.75 million (Horan, 1990). However, major industries are not the only targets of federal regulation. In August 1990 the EPA began imposing more extensive disposal rules for small businesses previously excluded from federal hazardous waste regulation (Rotman, Chynoweth, & Flam, 1990).

Public environmental awareness developed as people learned of the extent of American waste generation. American households produce more than 150 million tons of waste annually (Schwartz, Bradburn, & Hager, 1988). The American chemical industry produces about 219 million tons of waste per year of which 6.6 million tons represents hazardous waste (Rotman et al., 1990). The United States military generates about 750,000 tons of hazardous waste annually (Satchell, 1989). Public opinion polls began to reflect this new knowledge base. In 1984, a Gallup poll indicated that 61% of those surveyed valued environmental protection as a priority over economic growth (Gallup,
In 1989, respondents were asked to select high priority governmental issues. Of those surveyed, 64% assigned a high priority to "proposing laws to increase the protection of the environment" (Gallup, 1989).

Another source of public awareness developed through media articles which emphasized environmental approaches taken by industry in response to public opinion and legislative processes. For example, McDonald's eliminated the use of styrofoam containers (Nordgren, 1990). Delchamp's, a grocery chain, adopted a line of recycled products (Delchamp's, 1990). Exxon and Amoco announced research and development of cleaner fuels and low-fuel gasoline pumps. Texaco urged consumers to conserve. Chevron announced a program to protect elephants and rhinos in Sumatra (Beveridge, 1990).

For some members of society, environmental awareness alone was inadequate. More than 100 activist groups with an environmental emphasis earned the title of "environmental evangelists" (Melloan, 1988). Organizations have been established to provide environmental advocacy training to over 20,000 environmental activist leaders since 1983 (Lesly, 1984; Nichols, 1989). For many of these groups, a major emphasis has been to indict industry practices such as those used by Hooker Chemical (Finnegan, 1988).
Endnote

1. Hazardous waste has been defined as "any solid, liquid, or contained gaseous materials...that is easily combustible or flammable, (will) dissolve metals, other materials, or burn the skin, or is unstable or undergoes rapid or violent chemical reaction with water or other materials" (USEPA, 1986, p. 2).
APPENDIX B

Sample Interview Questions

1. What is it like working for MSP?
2. What does this company stand for (eg., what is the company philosophy?)
3. What words would you use to describe MSP and why?
4. What story about MSP most exemplifies what the company is about?
5. How have you felt about all the controversy surrounding MSP?
6. Have you attended any of the public meetings? What were the meetings like? What happened? How did you feel about what happened?
7. What is your greatest concern for MSP?
8. What kind of a job has MSP done in letting employees know what is going on in the organization?
9. Has MSP faced any crises? If so, what have they been?
APPENDIX C

Meetings Attended Between May, 1988 - March, 1989

...Saturday, May 7, 1988: Bill Elder, news anchor from WWL, New Orleans, interviewed Jack Kent and toured the plant.

...Thursday, August 4, 1988: Public meeting, SLAP and Vanderbilt student researchers; students reported their findings regarding pollution of area waters, including around MSP.

...Tuesday, August 30, 1988: St. Rose meeting between Brian Recatto, Maxine Domino, Barbara Fonseca, and Vicki Gamble to discuss MSP public relations and marketing.

...Wednesday, August 31, 1988: St. Rose meeting of the Sales and Marketing staff.

...Friday, September 2, 1988: St. Rose meeting of the Sales and Marketing staff.

...Tuesday, September 6, 1988: St. Rose meeting of the Sales and Marketing staff.

...Monday, September 12, 1988: Management meeting held at St. Rose and directed by Jack Kent, Jr.

...Tuesday, September 27, 1988: Morgan City briefing of businessmen who later that day visited with Governor Roemer in behalf of MSP; the briefing was conducted by attorney Al Lippman, Morgan City.

...Tuesday, September 27, 1988: Meeting at plant to discuss the development of an official MSP tour guide document.
Wednesday, September 28, 1988: Meeting of the State Natural Resource Committee, Senate Chamber E, to discuss whether DEQ had the authority to question MSP's status.

Thursday, October 20, 1988: Meeting in Baton Rouge at the State Land and Natural Resources Building, between DEQ, Rollins, and the public, for the purpose of allowing the public to receive information regarding Rollins' application for a hazardous waste permit.

Friday, October 28, 1988: Meeting at Domino Advertising and Public Relations, Morgan City, regarding the MSP tour guide document.

Wednesday, November 23, 1988: Meeting in Franklin, Louisiana, of the St. Mary Parish Council to discuss whether the MSP permit should be revoked.

Thursday, December 15, 1988: Meeting at the plant between Maxine Domino and Buddy Poulson to discuss the speech he was to give that evening at the DEQ/MSP meeting at the Morgan City Auditorium.

Thursday, December 15, 1988: Meeting at the Morgan City Auditorium between DEQ/MSP to receive public comments regarding the MSP request for the permitting of 34 unpermitted emission sources.

Wednesday, January 4, 1989: Meeting at the plant with Carol Strickland, a free-lance reporter for the New York Times who interviewed Jack Kent as well as other MSP employees.
Monday, January 9, 1989: Meeting of the St. Mary Parish Industrial Group. Jack Kent was the featured speaker.

Thursday, January 12, 1989: Meeting between Brian Recatto and Maxine Domino at Domino Advertising in Morgan City to discuss a public relations budget.

Tuesday, January 17, 1989: Meeting at St. Rose with George Harlow and staff to explain the newest proposed DEQ fine.

Monday, February 20, 1989: Meeting with Jim Guirard, a Washington, DC lobbyist for MSP to discuss efforts on behalf of MSP by Dingall.

Thursday, February 23, 1989: Meeting at the plant between Buddy Poulson and Maxine Domino regarding a public relations budget for the local community.

Thursday, February 23, 1989: Meeting of Rotary Club, Morgan City. Jack Kent was the featured speaker.


Friday, March 10: Meeting in St. Rose of the Sales and Marketing Staff.

Friday, March 10: Meeting in St. Rose with the Department Heads.
APPENDIX D
Coding Guide

Statement Number: ____  Name of Coder: ________________
Category of Statement: ________________________________
The above statement is a response to some event. Is the statement addressed to:
   __ S1 Competitors (e.g., Rollins Environmental)
   __ S2 Regulators
      ...S2a La. Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
      ...S2b Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
      ...S2c St. Mary Parish Council
   __ S3 Customers
   __ S4 Suppliers
   __ S5 Special interest groups (e.g., South Louisianians
       Against Pollution--SLAP; Greenpeace; HWTC)
   __ S6 Media
   __ S7 Government
      ...S7a Federal ...S7b State ...S7c Local
   __ S8 Local Community __ S9 Employees of MSP
   __ S10 Society __ S11 Unknown

The spokesperson is:
   __ 1 (Jack Kent, Sr.) __ 6 (Brian Recatto)
   __ 2 (George Eldredge) __ 7 (Maxine Domino
   __ 3 (George Harlow) __ 8 (Jim Guirard)
   __ 4 (James Renfroe) __ 9 (Gus Weill)
   __ 5 (Buddy Poulson) __ 10 (Robert Odle)
   __ 11 (Other--Please specify)

Date of Statement: _______
Statement is offered in response to what issue: ________________
Was the response offered prior to the occurrence of an event or after the occurrence of an event?
   __ Before ____ After ____ Undecided
The statement may be classified as:
   __ Excuse
   __ Denial of intention __ Ingratiation (continued)
      __ Denial of volition __ Social resp.
      __ Denial of agency __ Other-enhancing
    __ Justification __ communication
      __ Other justification __ Opinion conformity
      __ Denial of the injury __ Intimidation
      __ Denial of the victim __ Apology
      __ Condemnation of the condemning __ Condemnation of the
       ____ Condemnation of the condemner condemnner
       __ Negative events misrepresented
    __ Ingratiation __ Negative events
       __ Other ingratiation __ misrepresented
       __ Self-enhancing communication
       __ Role Model __ Other
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APPENDIX E

Coding Rules

Instructions: Attached are rules to be used when coding messages. Please follow the rules as closely as possible to assure that coding is consistent between coders.

Part I: Audience Coding. Audiences consist of 17 different possibilities. Examples of audiences include "regulator" and "government."

Code more than one audience when a message indicates more than one audience addressed; however, try to be as selective as possible.

When coding statements from newspapers, always code "media" and "society" as well as any audiences specifically mentioned. The reason for coding "media" and "society" for newspapers is that the medium inherently suggests a message for these groups.

When coding newspaper statements, use the statement itself as the initial guide in determining the target audience. However, if the statement does not offer sufficient information, use the "title" of the article as a secondary guide.
Use the "unknown" category for the audience only when you have no judgment about who the spokesperson is addressing.

If a statement mentions "hearing," "bill," or "laws," check the "government" category.

When coding interviews, if the interviewee refers to "them" or "they" and no other reference is made to a specific audience, check "society" (When interviews were conducted, the researcher was viewed as a member of society).

When coding interviews, choose "society" if no other reference is made.

Part II: Impression Management Strategies: This category consists of 20 impression management strategies. Examples of impression management strategies are "excuse" and "intimidation."

Code more than one strategy in a particular unit of analysis if you determine that more than one strategy is present; however, try to be as selective as possible.
Only use the category of role model if the spokesperson makes specific reference to the idea that MSP is the only one of its kind or utilizes such words as better, best, unique, only, or the. For example, "We have the best technology."

If you use "other" as an impression management strategy, please indicate on the coding form the sentence to which you are referring in the unit of analysis.

The "other" category is appropriate when you become convinced that no other category will work for that particular statement yet you are convinced that the spokesperson is using some type of strategy.

When coding impression management strategies, check only the categories which specifically apply (i.e., although self-enhancing communication is a type of ingratiation, only check self-enhancing communication rather than checking both ingratiation and self-enhancing communication.

The determining factor between using self-enhancing communication and role model concerns specific descriptions. If the description is a more general description of the organization, then use self-
enhancing communication (i.e., We have a technology which can help the environment). If the description is specific, then check role model (i.e., We have the very best technology available in the world).

When coding the justification subcategory of condemn the condemner, the statement must indicate that MSP claims responsibility for an event in question, but that a particular party is much worse. For example, a statement might indicate that MSP does accept certain waste, but "at least we recycle it properly. Company X doesn't destroy the materials at all, and then they put the materials in a landfill."

When coding the justification subcategory of negative events misrepresented, the statement must indicate that MSP claims responsibility for an event in question, but that the event did not occur in the way that some suggested. For example, MSP might indicate that a fire occurred in a particular area of the plant, but that it ceased in less than 15 minutes. "We had fire trucks come to the plant only as a precautionary measure."

When coding condemn the condemner, a separate category from a justification, the statement will only suggest
a negative view of the person or organization in question. For example, "We find the current actions of DEQ to be totally unacceptable."

When coding negative events misrepresented, a separate category from a justification, the statement will only suggest that a particular statement or series of statement were not correct. For example, "We have been the target of an unfounded campaign."

Miscellaneous

When coding press releases, if you do not know who is making a particular statement, check the "other" category (e.g., "staff member").

When coding interview statements, unless the person mentions a specific event, always check "undecided" and indicate that the statement is offered in response to an "interview."
APPENDIX F

Impression Management Strategies

EXCUSE: Statement which attempts to negate organizational responsibility for an event (Scott & Lyman, 1968)

Sample Statements:

We believe MSP problems within the community are based on profit, politics, and the press.

(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 5/5/89, Correspondence with Morgan City doctors)

I ain't paying one penny to them because we haven't done anything wrong.

(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 5/16/90, newspaper)

EI: Denial of Intention (Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981):

Organization suggests that

1) Consequences were unforeseeable
2) Unaware of effects of actions and decisions
3) Effects were accidental, the result of a mistake or inadvertency

Sample Statements:

So I mean if it's anything that does happen that's in violation, it's not because we deliberately do it. You don't spend this
kind of money right alongside Highway U. S. 90 and deliberately do those kinds of things.  
(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 11/14/85, DEQ Hearing)

You're not going to be able to run perfect all the time. I mean this is the world. You're gonna have problems in it.  
(SOURCE: Staff interview, 1989)

E2: Denial of Volition (Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981):  
Organization could not control and/or could not be expected to control event in question

Sample Statements:

I'm not responsible for cleaning up the bayou.  
(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 9/19/88, newspaper)

And I just tell them like it is you know. I mean they ask about all the wrongdoing we're doing, and I say, "Look, we're not doing anything wrong you know. That's the paper. They're going to say what they want to say."  
(SOURCE: Staff interview, 1989)

E3: Denial of Agency (Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981):  
1) Organization did not make a decision or perform a particular behavior, or  
2) Organization performed a similar response but did not produce the effect in question
Sample Statements:

We never put one drop of anything in the river.
(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 10/6/88, newspaper)
If I thought I was killing anybody, I'd shut this place down.
(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 8/12/88, newspaper)

JUSTIFICATION: Organization accepts responsibility for the effects of behavior, but does not accept responsibility for negative actions associated with it (Scott & Lyman, 1968).

Sample Statement:

We're moving in all haste to recycle the material in the barges.
(SOURCE: George Harlow, 8/2/88, newspaper)

J1: Denial of Injury (Scott & Lyman, 1968):
Organization admits that a particular event occurred, but asserts
J1a: It was permissible since no one was injured.

Sample Statement:

So, I mean, smelling a little of it definitely won't, you know, if it don't--I realize it's irritating, but it's not just going to kill
you graveyard dead if that's what you're worried about.

(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 11/14/85, DEQ Hearing)

J1b: The consequences of act were trifling.
Surely the August ninth incident is--it was--it happened. Every industry has upsets, and I don't think that there's an air representative at the table today that won't tell you that every industry has upsets, especially in start-ups.

(SOURCE: George Eldredge, 11/14/85, DEQ Hearing)

J2: Denial of Victim (Scott & Lyman, 1968):
The action was permissible since the victim deserved the injury.

Sample Statement:
They (employees) question to some degree the safety of breathing toxic fumes and toxic soil, but that's why you are given your safety equipment. That's why you are given respirators--not to have as a decoration.

(SOURCE: Staff interview, 1989)

J3: Condemnation of Condemner (Scott & Lyman, 1968): Organization admits act, but asserts act was irrelevant because others commit these and worse acts
Sample Statements:

Now, for the first time, we have the opportunity to respond in a proper forum. We are confident that the district court will see this suit (by EPA) for what it is--an action motivated by private interests to stifle new technology.

(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 6/15/90, newspaper)

Third is whether a company can be held up for ransom simply because it asks for a hearing. That's what's happened in this case--the state's trying to fine Marine Shale over $5 million simply because Marine Shale asked for a hearing.

(SOURCE: George Eldredge, 10/6/89, newspaper)

J4: Negative Events Misrepresented (Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981)

Sample Statement:

It (failing state Department of Transportation aggregate test) was no big deal to us because we don't even market it for that application. We sell it for use on rural roads. We have found that it makes excellent roadbed.

(SOURCE: George Harlow, 2/20/90, newspaper)
INGRATIATION: Statements through which organization attempts to gain approval of an audience (Jones, Gergen, & Jones, 1963; Jones, 1964).

Sample Statements:

We spend over a quarter of a million dollars per month in the City of Morgan City, Berwick, and Patterson. We spend 30 million dollars a year throughout the state.

(SOURCE: Nick LaRocca, 7/18/90, EPA Hearing)

I've seen him go when he didn't have any money, when he owed everybody in town, everybody in this whole country around here. I've seen the man close a business he was in. He didn't file bankruptcy. He didn't cheat the people out of their money. He's paying debts off today that he owed people. He's paid everybody that I ever knew he owed.

(SOURCE: Management interview, 1989)

II: Self-enhancing Communication:

Statements intended to persuade target of organization's positive qualities, traits, motives, and/or intentions (Jones et al., 1963; Jones, 1964)
Sample Statements:

A steel mill would provide employment for at least 200 people. We have a work force here that is suited for that type of operation. Beyond that we have the transportation links, highway, water, and rail, which make this an attractive location.

(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 2/16/88, "Steel Mill May Be in Future for St. Mary")

The Hazardous Waste Research Center is internationally known. We would like to have them as partners in the technology we have now.

(SOURCE: Dr. Charles Whitehurst, 11/2/88, "LSU, Marine Shale Join Forces in Project")

Ila: Role Model:

Statements which suggest that the organization serves as exemplary case of excellence

Sample Statements:

The May 8 issuance by the U. S. Patent Office recognized the MSP technology as the first and only process in the country with the ability to substitute large quantities of contaminated soils and other
materials for virgin feedstocks and still economically manufacture products that exhibit no hazardous characteristics.
(SOURCE: George Eldredge, 7/22/90, "MSP Denies Penalty Action Rumor")

My preliminary assessment of MSP's reuse-recycling technology is that this is the only one around that essentially eliminates the toxicity and contaminants from most hazardous waste.
(SOURCE: Dr. Charles Whitehurst, 11/21/89, "MSP Asks DEQ Secretary to Step Aside")

Ilb: Social Responsibility:
Statements which suggest that the organization accepts role of social responsibility (e.g., quality of personnel, contributions of organization to society)

Sample Statements:
I've gone to the best companies, what's supposed to be the best that there is, to get this equipment and to get everything, and I swear to Jesus, I wish it wasn't nothing ever to come out of that
stack whatsoever, and I will do everything
to keep that from happening.

(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 11/14/85, DEQ Hearing)

Very few businesses would open their doors
to the public, but we are dealing with a
sensitive subject and people have the right
to know that we have a technique to convert
hazardous waste into an aggregate that is
environmentally safe.

(SOURCE: Maxine Domino, 9/18/87, "Visitors
Get Inside Look at Amelia Firm")

I2: Other-enhancing Communication:

Statements of praise, approbation, and
flattery toward the target to obtain
approval for the organization (Jones et
al., 1963; Jones, 1964)

Sample Statements:

I want to applaud the efforts of EPA and
the technical staff for putting together
a very fine and excellent draft permit

(SOURCE: George Harlow, 7/18/90, EPA

I3: Opinion Conformity

Statements which suggest that message sender
and message target share similar views on
a particular issue (Jones & Pittman, 1982)

Sample Statement:
To close I wish to point out that Marine Shale, EPA, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, and the public are in accordance one hundred percent on only one issue. All want the facility to be regulated in a sound, accountable, and environmentally safe manner..."  
(SOURCE: George Harlow, 7/18/90, EPA Hearing)

I will say this in defense of the Justice Department and the FBI: They have followed every lead in every accusation that's ever made. They have really followed it to the hilt. They have given everybody the opportunity to come before the grand jury that wanted to tell them what all they know.  
(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 1/10/89, "MSP Has the Answer; Nobody's Listening")

I3: Opinion Conformity:
Statements which express similarity of beliefs, values, and attitudes, directly associated with liking (Jones et al., 1963; Jones, 1964)
Sample Statements:

There's also for the first time in many places in the country, this permit, as you all know, has a requirement for biological monitoring of the effluents. MSP and I, personally, support this effort. I know EPA has been trying to do this for a long time.

(SOURCE: George Harlow, 7/18/90, EPA Hearing)

Marine Shale was given the opportunity to preview this legislation and believes it will regulate us very stringently. We have no objection to it.

(SOURCE: George Eldredge, 7/12/88, newspaper)

INTIMIDATION: Statements which convey an organizational identity of danger and potency. These statements are often used in conjunction with threats (Jones & Pittman, 1980).

Sample Statements:

They ain't enough Greenpeacers in the world to block the entrance to this plant. I can promise you that. I hope they all show up here if they
think they can do it.

(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 7/28/89, "Greenpeace Seeking to Close MSP")

I'll do my best to skin 'em up. We will be in a fistfight out here on this property if they try to come on this property.

(SOURCE: Jack Kent, 7/28/89, newspaper)

APOLOGY: Statement in which organization admits guilt and requests punishment (Goffman, 1971; Schlenker, 1980; Tedeschi & Reiss, 1981)

NOTE: No apologies were identified in the data.

CONDEMNATION OF CONDEMNER: Statement in which organization indicates that a particular person or group is at fault.

Sample Statements:

The bottom line is Maureen O'Neill has proved the least capable administrator DEQ has. She has done nothing but stand in the way of what the DEQ technical staff and MSP want to do.

(SOURCE: George Eldredge, 8/2/88, newspaper)
Lakewood Hospital and the doctors who signed the resolution are asking the government to rescind MSP's permits and shut MSP down until the various investigations involving MSP are finished. In other words, the Hospital and the doctors are asking for the termination of MSP's position as a major consumer in St. Mary Parish.

(SOURCE: Letter to MSP employees, contractors, vendors, and their families from Jack Kent regarding a resolution drafted by the staff of the local Morgan City hospital against MSP)

**NEGATIVE EVENTS MISREPRESENTED:** Statement in which organization indicates that statements offered in regard to a particular event are taken out of context or are untrue in some way.

Sample Statement:

The fact that we can make contaminated soils and other materials safe for reuse at a reasonable price threatens the business bottom line of Council members. This explains why they have spent millions of
dollars trying to put MSP out of business.

(SOURCE: George Eldredge, 7/22/90, newspaper)

OTHER: Statement in which some strategy is present, but coder is unsure of what the strategy might be.

Sample Statements:

I think Mr. Kent is his own worst enemy with the media.

(SOURCE: Interview, 1989)

They (MSP) don't let you know anything as far as what SLAP and all of them are saying.

(SOURCE: Interview, 1989)
APPENDIX G
Chronology Of Events*

Marine Shale Processors, Incorporated
1984-1990

1984

September 1984
...MSP purchased property for its facility from what was formerly Pelican State Lime Company. The plant contained a rotary kiln necessary for the incineration of waste.

1985

January 1985
...MSP received state and federal permits necessary to begin operating as a legitimate commercial recycler and resource recovery facility and opened its doors for business.

April 1985
...Jack Kent, owner and President of MSP, asked a 15-member St. Mary Parish Council, for permission to open a non-hazardous oilfield waste incinerator in Amelia. The plant was to burn natural gas and coal as fuel to destroy nonhazardous oilfield waste.

July 1985
...Pat Norton, Secretary of the Louisiana DEQ, indicated that MSP was considered a legitimate recycling facility.

(* Indicates particularly problematic events)
July 1986
*..Pat Norton, head of DEQ, drafted a compliance order listing 37 violations of state water, air, groundwater, and hazardous waste regulations at MSP.
...An appeal by MSP automatically rescinded the order pending negotiations between MSP and DEQ.

August 1986
*..EPA began an investigation of MSP at the request of Pat Norton, head of DEQ.

November 1986
*..The United States Department of Justice and the EPA seized MSP's books to determine how MSP came into existence without a federal incineration permit. A grand jury probe focused on possible evasion of toxic waste disposal laws. The investigation centered on suspected violations of the Clean Air Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and other laws.
...MSP recruited George Eldredge as their chief legal counsel. Formerly, Eldredge was chief legal counsel for DEQ.

1987

September 1987
...George Harlow joined the MSP staff as Director of Environmental Services after working 33 years with the EPA.
November 1987
*..The DEQ Air Quality Department received a call on their "hotline" from a Morgan City resident who said "excessive and visible emissions were noted at MSP."
...A concerned citizens meeting was held regarding the potential dangers of MSP to the community.
...SLAP, South Louisianians Against Pollution, evolved after MSP reportedly agreed to accept the Islip, New York, floating barge. However, MSP did not actually accept the load.

December 1987
...A DEQ report indicated that samples of fish taken in the vicinity of MSP were acceptable.
*..EPA received a petition signed by Morgan City area residents and 17 area doctors demanding MSP be declared an "imminent threat" and closed.

1988

January 1988
...U.S. Representative Trent Lott, R-MS., wrote a letter to EPA Administrator Lee Thomas on behalf of MSP.

February 1988
...MSP planned to develop a steel mill which would employ 200 people.
*..Morgan City citizens blamed MSP for area cases of neuroblastoma, a rare form of childhood cancer. Neuroblastoma is a sympathetic nervous system cancer which
often appears in the adrenal glands atop the kidneys. It occurs in about 1 of 100,000 children. St. Mary Parish has a population of 64,837 and has five cases.

*..A DEQ report on MSP said water violations were evident. DEQ program manager Marion Fannaly said MSP had made only "cosmetic improvements" and that many of the problems and violations that were documented at the facility two years ago were still evident.

March 1988

*..The Hazardous Waste Treatment Council (HWTC) joined SLAP in a suit against MSP which claimed that MSP utilized illegal loopholes to avoid following environmental laws.

*..HWTC wrote Governor Mabus (MS) informing him that hazardous waste (MSP aggregate) was being shipped into Mississippi.

April 1988

...MSP installed a $750,000 monitoring system to provide constant monitoring of its air emissions.

...MSP was declared "not in violation" of air emission standards. DEQ had cited the company for violation; however, the smoke cited came from a flash fire in a pit near the kiln.

*..DEQ ordered MSP to "immediately cease all unpermitted discharges of contaminated wastes or wastewater."

*..Congressional hearings were held regarding the suggestion that MSP avoided environmental laws.
Mississippi began an investigation to determine if MSP brought hazardous waste into the state.

EPA issued a notice of violation based on a January 15 inspection. The report indicated that MSP had violated emission standards of the Louisiana Clean Air Plan.

DEQ ordered MSP to submit a sediment sampling plan to determine how badly Bayou Boeuf, a part of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway located directly behind the MSP facility, was contaminated.

May 1988

Rachel Caillouet began research on MSP.

EPA indicated that MSP was storing contaminated, dry baghouse dust which "blows off site in visible quantities." MSP denied the charge.

MSP accepted several hundred gallons of waste paint from the Louisiana Department of Transportation.

Legislation was introduced in the Louisiana House of Representatives which could have changed the status of MSP from a recycler to an incinerator

June 1988

Dr. William Woods, a University of Minnesota pediatric cancer specialist, was brought to Morgan City by MSP to address to St. Mary Parish Environmental Control Committee regarding the prevalence of neuroblastoma, a children's cancer.
Two investigations were underway, one civil and one criminal, against MSP.

A MSP spokesman indicated that prevailing winds in St. Mary Parish were from the direction in which children having neuroblastoma lived. The spokesman provided incorrect information and thus added fuel to the citizens' anger against MSP.

St. Mary Parish Councilman Bob McHugh and SLAP members went to Governor Roemer for help in determining causes of the cancer outbreak in Morgan City. The group asked that toxic pesticides from McFarland, California, a farming community with a prevalence of neuroblastoma, not come to MSP.

MSP released a report from Dr. Frank H. Lawrence of Envirologic Data, Portland, Maine, disputing any link between local cancer problems and plant operations. Lawrence said that other possible causes included heredity and parental and prenatal environmental agents, such as alcohol intake or exposure to electromagnetic fields. He further indicated that the latency period necessary to substantiate a direct cause-effect relationship between MSP and cancer was inadequate.

July 1988

EPA evaluated a plan to bring a civil suit against MSP. The civil suit would attempt to force "corrective
behavior" ranging from "cleaning up to shutting MSP down." Criminal penalties could be assessed for violating environmental law.

*. SLAP alleged that Jack Kent and Representative John Travis, who submitted a proposed pro-MSP law in the Louisiana State Legislature, were cousins. Kent and Travis are not related.

...MSP spokesman George Eldredge indicated that Senator John Breaux and Representative Billy Tauzin joined Rollins in lobbying state legislators to put MSP out of business.

...A compromise bill provided by Senator Cleo Fields, D-Baton Rouge, gave DEQ the authority to regulate hazardous waste recycling plants such as MSP; however, the bill did not change MSP to an incinerator.

**August 1988**

...A television ad campaign was developed and implemented to counter anti-MSP attacks.

...A tractor-trailer rig on its way to MSP to deliver a load caught fire. The driver was mildly injured and some hazardous materials spilled.

*. Mississippi officials reopened an investigation into hazardous waste shipments from Louisiana to Mississippi. In 1986, MSP supplied a Mississippi contractor with aggregate to be used in the cleanup of an abandoned creosote mill in Mississippi. The materials absorbed
the creosote wastes and were then returned to MSP and burned.

...Two bankers were convicted of violating federal banking laws by arranging for a loan to Jack Kent, MSP president; however, loans were for a company formerly owned by Kent, Blast Abrasives. Kent was not charged in the case.

*. MSP was ordered to appear at a hearing on September 29 where DEQ was to determine if MSP was a recycler. The Fields' bill of July 1988 supposedly classified MSP as a recycler.

...Dr. Charles Whitehurst, currently head of NASA earth resources development lab in Mississippi, was named director of research, development, and technology advancement at MSP. Formerly, Whitehurst was a professor of petroleum engineering and an associate dean of research and graduate studies for the LSU College of Engineering.

...Vanderbilt University graduate students studied the Morgan City area for three weeks to identify sources of pollution in the parish, geologic features that determine the path pollutants may take, and treatment processes in the local municipal water supply systems. Brought in by SLAP, the group tested primarily in the Intracoastal Waterway located behind the MSP facility and found the presence of high levels of some harmful substances (e.g., cadmium, zinc, and aromatic hydrocarbons). This stretch of
the Intracoastal Waterway is used extensively by industrial traffic.

...Dr. John Rainey, a cancer specialist from Lafayette, spoke to the St. Mary Parish Council, and indicated that the neuroblastoma cluster was probably a "natural phenomenon."

September 1988

...MSP said it would not participate in hearings ordered by DEQ regarding its recycling status because the status had been established by state legislation in July.

...MSP officials walked out of a pre-hearing, indicating that DEQ lacked authority to request such a hearing.

...The Louisiana Senate Natural Resources Committee met to examine why DEQ desired to re-determine the status of MSP. MSP employees, local businessmen supporting MSP, SLAP, and various anti-MSP groups attended the meeting.

...Prior to the Senate Natural Resource Committee meeting, 17 Morgan City businessmen visited Governor Roemer to request that DEQ do its job, but stop harassing MSP unnecessarily.

...District Judge Bob Downing ruled that DEQ could not hold the hearing regarding MSP's recycling status.

October 1988

*DEQ assessed a $2.8 million fine against MSP for failing to develop an ordered plan for sampling Bayou Boeuf and for failing to comply with an order to cease using barges as
hazardous waste storage vessels.

...A ten-page notice was provided to MSP from the DEQ proposing a $2.8 million fine. The notice declared that MSP:

1) Did not notify the state in 1984 of its intentions to build the water treatment plant required by its permit.
2) Did not describe all its wastewater discharge sources on its application.
3) Did not notify and receive approval from the state to begin accepting hazardous wastes other than the non-hazardous oilfield wastes it was permitted to burn.
4) Discharged oily creosote wastes from barges and other equipment in Bayou Boeuf in violation of its permit.
5) Left temporarily inoperative an alarm system on a hazardous waste barge that, when fixed, immediately sounded, indicating a dangerous level of wastes.
6) Did not appear at a requested hearing and did not correct the problems indicated by the DEQ in 1986 regarding unpermitted discharges.
7) Did not deal with the deficiencies in its water permit while still applying for a change in its water permit.
8) Refused to submit a sediment sampling plan as ordered by the DEQ in April, 1988.
9) Remained 138 days behind in removing the barges used
9) Remained 138 days behind in removing the barges used as storage containers at MSP. 

...MSP contested a proposed $2.8 million fine from DEQ. 

...SLAP suggested that MSP was going to accept a shipment of hazardous waste from Italy. MSP had no plans to accept the waste. Additionally, state law prohibited accepting international waste. 

...Huey Stockstill, a Mississippi contractor, underwent his third investigation from the Mississippi Bureau of Pollution Control to determine whether he had illegally dumped MSP aggregate in Mississippi. 

...MSP awarded a $70,000 grant to LSU to study clean-up efficiency at MSP. 

*...MSP attorneys were ordered to provide SLAP attorneys with all the documents and materials they used to obtain a temporary injunction delaying a DEQ hearing on the MSP operations for 30 days. 

...SLAP ran an ad in the Morgan City Daily Review encouraging fishermen to be concerned about catches from Bayou Boeuf. 

...Morgan City citizens bought a one-page ad in the Morgan City Daily Review in order to print a letter with over 500 signatures. The letter complained that local representatives had not protected area citizens from MSP. 

...MSP said it never seriously pursued the Italian waste shipment.
November 1988

*..The Stockstill investigation continued when Mississippi found high concentrations of lead at his gravel pit. MSP aggregate had been shipped to the pit to soak up hazardous waste.

...A public hearing was set by DEQ for December 15, 1988, on the request by MSP to add several hazardous material storage tanks to its list of permitted facilities.

...DEQ said MSP had been using some storage tanks without DEQ approval.

...Judge Bob Downing ordered DEQ to hold a hearing within 60 days to decide whether MSP was an incinerator or a recycler. Also, he ordered a hearing on whether DEQ has the authority to order MSP to answer more questions on the recycling issue.

...MSP/DEQ/EPA conducted 40 hours of tests to determine whether MSP complied with state air quality standards. The cost of the tests exceeded $500,000. The cost was believed to be the highest ever incurred by a Louisiana company for determining its compliance with environmental laws.

...The St. Mary Parish Council refused to revoke the initial MSP permit.

...MSP donated toys for children to the Marine Corps League, St. Mary Detachment.
**December 1988**

...The St. Mary Parish Citizens for a Clean Environment placed an ad in the *Morgan City Daily Review*: "What are the people of St. Mary Parish sacrificing to keep the rest of America beautiful? Hazardous waste is being shipped to MSP from all over the U.S" (*Morgan City Daily Review*, December 15, 1988)

...SLAP places an ad in the *Morgan City Daily Review* to encourage citizens to attend the MSP/DEQ public hearing.

...The DEQ/MSP hearing was held to receive public comments on an October 7 application by MSP to add 34 miscellaneous air pollutant emission sources at its plant to its January, 1986, stack emissions permit.

...A four-hour DEQ/MSP meeting was held at the Morgan City Auditorium; 46 people offered comments.

*...MSP requested permission from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers to fill in a barge slip behind the MSP plant. The Corps denied the request until MSP agreed to the DEQ sediment sampling request.

...The wife of an MSP employee wrote a letter to the editor of the *Morgan City Daily Review* defending MSP.

1989

**January 1989**

...The First Circuit Court of Appeals said that DEQ could hold a hearing to ask more questions regarding MSP's
status; however, DEQ indicated that it might not proceed with the hearing.

...A Federal grand jury in Lafayette, Louisiana, which met for 22 months, ended its term without returning any indictments against MSP.

*..MSP was fined an additional $1.75 million for more than 40 violations of state air and hazardous waste laws.

...Teachers in St. Mary Parish schools were instructed not to talk about Marine Shale.

...MSP was deemed the "top news story" for the Morgan City Daily Review in 1988.

...Two prehearing conferences were scheduled for February 20 and February 28 to deal with $4.5 million in proposed fines.

February 1989
*..DEQ denied MSP's request for permitting of 34 miscellaneous emission sources.

...Representative John Dingall (D-MI), the House Energy and Commerce Chairman, asked the EPA to resolve the MSP controversy.

...Ten days of hearings were scheduled for May 1989 to deal with one of MSP's alleged water quality violations.

March 1989
...The ten-day hearing originally scheduled for May 1989 were rescheduled for September 1989. MSP planned to
challenge the $4.5 million in proposed fines. DEQ had the burden of proof.

District Judge Bob Downing ordered MSP to stop using barges to store hazardous waste and to come up with sampling plans for the sampling and subsequent cleanup of contaminated sediments in Bayou Boeuf.

Greenpeace asked the Federal Trade Commission to ban MSP's television ads and to force MSP to retract the statements, as the ads were "inaccurate."

The parent of a child who died from neuroblastoma filed suit against MSP declaring that the death resulted from air and water contamination caused by MSP operations.

MSP asked State District Court to override DEQ's decision to bar MSP from construction work on Bayou Boeuf.

Baton Rouge District Judge Bob Downing ordered MSP to adhere to a compliance order that forced it to remove several barges from MSP and to develop a plan for sampling and cleaning up Bayou Boeuf.

MSP planned to install a $500,000 stack monitor system.

April 1989

The 16-month LSU Medical Center study indicated no link between MSP and neuroblastoma.

May 1989

MSP received a "notice of allowance" on the patent for its process to burn hazardous waste. This represented crossing the first major hurdle in the patenting procedure.
DEQ revoked MSP's waste permit for illegally treating Canadian waste. MSP immediately appealed the order, which also added nearly $1 million in additional fines. MSP continued operations while the matter was decided. MSP viewed the "waste" from Canada as a material for its manufacturing process rather than a waste.

Louisiana Senators B. B. "Sixty" Rayburn (D-Bogalusa) and Representative John Travis (D-Jackson) introduced bills which exempted MSP from having to follow the recycling laws. Roemer indicated that he would veto the bills.

Louisiana Senator Cleo Fields (D-BR) proposed a bill which required hazardous waste incinerators to submit their burned waste for testing before they dispose of it.

MSP announced its intention to merge with a major company that would market the MSP technology worldwide.

DEQ obtained a court order to search MSP records to determine if MSP was handling PCBs and dioxins.

Nineteenth Judicial District Judge William Brown ruled that MSP filed too late to deter the DEQ request for sediment samples. MSP has the right to appeal this ruling to the First Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Lakewood Hospital Medical Staff (Morgan City) prepared a resolution which asked the St. Mary Parish Council to revoke all MSP permits "until they are able to meet all regulations established by the Federal Government for hazardous waste incinerators."
...Kent sent a letter to all MSP employees, contractors, vendors, and their families regarding the Lakewood resolution and explaining the negative aspects of the resolution.

...MSP planned to purchase Wastex Research of East St. Louis, Illinois, a financially troubled company under investigation by the Illinois EPA. The purchase of Wastex would allow MSP to operate in Illinois.

*. The Morgan City Council banned the use of any MSP aggregate within the Morgan City limits.

...David Ribochaux, Jr., president of Low Land Construction in Thibodaux, Louisiana, indicated that he would not remove the MSP aggregate his company utilized on private roads in the St. Charles area.

...Representative Tim Stine (D-Sulphur) objected to a letter circulated in the Legislature alleging that he was part of an administration effort to shut down MSP.

June 1989

...MSP offered to submit a sediment sampling plan for Bayou Boeuf. MSP maintained that the Bayou is an industrial waterway and that pollutants found in the sediment could have come from many other sources.

*..MSP laid off 100 employees and blamed DEQ and Governor Roemer for the layoff.

*..EPA reopened the MSP investigation to determine whether or not the process actually produced a safe product.
MSP requested permits for a second kiln. MSP asked the state for an official announcement which would indicate that MSP was operating legally while it appealed revocation of its permits. Mobil Oil Corporation demanded that MSP cease using its name in ads which suggested that Fortune 500 companies ship waste to MSP.

July 1989
District Court Judge Leo Higginbotham signed a preliminary injunction indicating that all of MSP's operating permits were in effect and that MSP was authorized to continue operations.
EPA arrived to inspect and conduct tests at MSP.
MSP pleaded guilty to one felony in conjunction with the violation of a federal hazardous waste storage law and to two misdemeanor charges in conjunction with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. In a plea bargain, MSP pleaded guilty to improper storage of creosote sludge, unpermitted discharges in Bayou Boeuf, and creating an obstruction to navigation. MSP was assessed $1 million in fines. These assessments concluded a three-year grand jury investigation of MSP.
Greenpeace announced efforts to close MSP.
HWTC and the National Solid Wastes Management Council, all competitors of MSP, condemned the federal government
for not regulating "sham recyclers" and specifically sighted MSP as the major offender.

...MSP began testing the world's first continuous emissions monitoring system which monitors air quality 24 hours a day. The system allowed MSP to monitor 16 organics and inorganic compounds, 13 of which were not mandated by regulatory agencies.

**August 1989**

*DEQ rejected a hazardous waste storage plan submitted by MSP.*

*SLAP offered public screening in the Morgan City Court, Courtroom Building, of Greenpeace's 35 mm film, "Rush to Burn," which featured MSP.*

**September 1989**

*U. S. District Judge John Shaw ordered MSP to begin paying its $1 million fine in $100,000 installments, effective October, 1989.*

*MSP appealed to the Louisiana Supreme Court regarding suggested revocation of operation permits. The appeal allowed MSP to continue operations.*

*DEQ ordered MSP to begin continuous monitoring of its kiln stack within 60 days.*

**October 1989**

*MSP sent vials of its aggregate through the mail to various parties prior to DEQ's demand that no hazardous product be shipped away from the plant site. DEQ indicated*
that MSP had sent the vials off-site illegally. MSP claimed that the aggregate was not hazardous and that DEQ was taking the same position as the HWTC had taken when MSP sent letter openers containing small amounts of the aggregate to members of Congress.

**November 1989**

...A hearing on the proposed $4 million in fines for MSP was postponed as the state and MSP began settlement negotiations.

...MSP, Cecos International, and American Waste, filed motions with the state requesting that DEQ Secretary Dr. Paul Templet step aside and leave final decisions on penalties for violation of pollution laws to others (e.g., courts, appointment of secretary pro-tem by Governor Roemer, or another appointment by Dr. Templet).

**December 1989**

...MSP claimed that U.S. Senator John Breaux used improper Congressional influence against the company. Subpoenas were sent to Senator Breaux and State Senator Ben Bagert.

**1990**

**January 1990**

...DEQ postponed an MSP hearing concerning the environmental safety of MSP aggregate.

**February 1990**

...DEQ indicated that MSP aggregate was unacceptable for roadbed use according to Louisiana Department of
Transportation and Development testing.

...MSP purchased 208 acres for the purpose of developing an industrial park.

May 1990

...The United States Patent Office issued MSP a patent for its "Methods and Apparatus for Using Hazardous Waste to Form Non-Hazardous Aggregate."

*..A Morgan City couple filed suit against MSP for allowing aggregate to be used in an MSP employee's yard, as some of the aggregate spilled over into their yard.

June 1990

*..The EPA filed suit against MSP indicating that MSP is a "sham" recycler that burns hazardous waste without a permit.

...MSP filed suit against the state to obtain access to questionnaires completed by 37 families during a cancer study done around the MSP plant.

July 1990

...EPA conducted a public hearing in Morgan City regarding the issuance of a water discharge permit.

August 1990

*..EPA moved to eliminate federal business with MSP.
*..DEQ accused MSP of failing to meet the terms of a previous compliance order.

September 1990

...MSP countersued the United States Government.
...MSP indicated that stack tests run in the presence of observers from DEQ and EPA met federal emission levels.

NOTE: In September 1990 data collection concluded.
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