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**Project Overview**

I will be working on a paper for the SCMLA 73rd annual conference ([http://www.southcentralmla.org/conference/)](http://www.southcentralmla.org/conference/%29). I submitted an abstract of the literature review as my proposal for this conference. I revised and rewrote most of my previous literature review from last semester in order to accommodate the new route that I am taking with my dissertation. After reading Burke’s concept of identification, I realized that he was the glue for my project. The purpose of the literature review is to first, explore how Burke’s process of identification is an extension of intercultural inquiry. Then, to examine how intercultural inquiry and Burke’s process of identification supplements Albert and Whetten’s organizational identity theory. Finally, how race/ethnic/cultural traits contribute to shaping an identity – both as an individual and non-profit organization. Ultimately, the scope of this project calls for the need for additional research on the identification process for racial/ethnic/cultural identities by non-profit organizations. Even though I list racial/ethnic/cultural, I am undecided/having problems on whether I should only use one term instead of all three.

**Annotated Bibliography**

Burke, K. (1969). A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kenneth Burke reasons that humans are naturally divided due to the competitive/collaborative traits of consistently attempting to “modify” (persuade) one another (p. 23). He theorizes how the “division” between humans is bridged through identification’s intrinsic and extrinsic motives (p. 25). Identification and motives supplement rhetoric’s ability to persuade, and it is the relationship between motive, identification, and consubstantiality (how you identify/establish a relationship with the audience) that shape Burke’s definition of rhetoric. For Burke, rhetoric is created when the lines between identification and division are blurred as an attempt to achieve unity – such is the case of Aristotle’s claim of proving opposites (p. 25). When the beginning/ending of division and identification are blurred it fosters a commonality for competition/cooperation/persuasion to occur between speaker and the audience (p. 21). This joined/separation between speaker and audience then leads the speaker to utilize rhetorical devices that are functional rather than decorative when formulating an argument (p. 57). Burke’s notion of identification is one of the leading concepts for my project. I argue that there is a need for additional research on how Burke’s concept of identification, intercultural inquiry, and Albert and Whetten’s organizational identity theory supplement each other, especially when it comes to understanding the identification process for racial/ethnic/cultural identities by non-profit organizations.

Cortés, M. (1998). Counting Latino nonprofits: A new strategy for finding data. *Nonprofit and
 Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *27*(4), 437-458.
 Michael Cortés introduces a content analysis strategy that can extract statistics about
 Latino non-profits from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Using this content
 strategy, Cortés is able to define and situate trends and services provide by Latino based

non-profits within the non-profit sector. Cortés defines U.S. based Latino non-profits whose mission is dedicated to the Latino community, are tax- exempt corporations managed by Latino directors/chief executives and members of the Latino community, or are voluntary associations dominated by Latino members or constituents (p. 19). Cortés’s article is helpful because it traces the history of Latino based non-profit organizations and addresses a very large gap of Latino scholarship within the non-profit sector. Even though this source is outdated, it is one of the few sources that centers only on Latino based non-profits. Recent data on Latino based non-profits is limited.

\*Cortés, M. (1999). Do Hispanic nonprofits foster Hispanic philanthropy? *New Directions for
 Philanthropic Fundraising*,(24), 31-40.
 Michael Cortés provides an overview of the history of Hispanic non-profits, gaps and

trends in Hispanic philanthropy, and a general overview of trends in services provided to the Hispanic community. Through the historiography, he critiques how the population growth has led to an increased demand of services catering to the Hispanic/Latino population. The difference between this article and the previous article is the use of the term “Hispanic.” The interchangeable nature of the two terms by the same author will allow me to compare and contrast how scholars theorize Latino/Hispanic non-profits, but this source is ideal for understanding the history of Latino/Hispanic non-profits Even though the source is outdated, it is one of the few sources that centers on Hispanic non-profits.

Flower, L. (2003). Talking across difference: Intercultural rhetoric and the search for situated
 knowledge. *College Composition and Communication*, 38-68.

Linda Flower (2003) uses community-based intercultural inquiry as a collaborative meaning-making activity that can foster a shared understanding. In order for community-based intercultural inquiry to be effective, difference must be viewed as an asset. Difference, then, is not viewed as an attempt to unify a community, but rather foster an awareness of a group’s connections and differences – thus, creating situated knowledge. Flower claims intercultural rhetoric provides the tools and skills needed to understand how situated knowledge is created. This article influenced how I can combine intercultural inquiry with Burke’s identification and organizational theory as an attempt to create “situated knowledge.” Using Burke’s postmodernist concept of identification and intercultural inquiry together, one can see similarities in how both aim to create awareness of situated knowledge that helps build meaning through identifying with others. Since difference is an “asset” the knowledge/understanding that is created by non-profits, in a way, can potentially influence how a non-profit establishes/creates a racial/ethnic/cultural identity.

Grabill, J. T. (2010). On being useful: Rhetoric and the work of engagement. *The public work of
 rhetoric*, 193-208.

Jeff Grabill expands his concept “knowledge work” and how “assembling a public and supporting performances” enables rhetors to be more “useful” when engaging with the community. Grabill describes rhetoric as a “discursive work,” but minimal attention is given to the methodology of engagement. It is through the assemblage of publics and performances where public rhetoric thrives. Even though Grabill’s article focuses on public rhetoric, which differs from intercultural rhetoric, his concept of “knowledge work” supplements Linda Flower’s argument of how using intercultural rhetoric as a form of inquiry creates a deeper understanding of how meaning-making occurs. This article is more recent, which allows me to build (potentially even trace) how intercultural inquiry has changed between 2003 – 2010.

Holling, M. A. (2008). Retrospective on Latin@ rhetorical-performance scholarship: From
 “Chicano communication” to “Latina/o communication?” *The Communication
 Review*, *11*(4), 293-322.

Michelle A. Holling examines the rhetorical and performative scholarship of Latino/a discourse and identity. She combines theoretical frameworks from intercultural communication and rhetorical and/or performance theories to trace how Latino/a identities are shaped within four periods: recognition, progressing to integration, marked by a (re)turn and re-politicization. Holling’s article is helpful as a starting point towards tracing how the term Latino has changed. Even though this article only focuses on Chicano and Latino, it supplements Rinderle and Montoya’s findings on the different identity labels used by the Latino/Hispanic community and for what purpose these identity labels are used.

Hunsinger, R. P. (2006). Culture and cultural identity in intercultural technical
 communication. *Technical communication quarterly*, *15*(1), 31-48.

Hunsinger examines how the adaptability of a racial/ethnic/cultural identity is rounded in communication practices The limitations of racial/ethnic/cultural identities terminology and methodologies are associated with typification and categorization where it is implied that culture can be “positively located” and categorized ( p. 35). To typify or to categorize, for Hunsinger (2006), is controversial due to situating culture/cultural as being formulaic. Typification is then seen as being linear and formulaic due to the ability to categorize “cultural” traits to a group, which devalues the heterogonous traits of a group. While patterns may be present within groups, culture is not formulaic. Using Appadurai, Hunsinger (2006) maintains culture is active, dynamic and situated in economic, political, and historical elements (p. 34- 35). Even though Hunsinger’s main focus is technical communication, the section on typification is what appealed to me the most – in addition to being the most helpful. I will use his explanation of typification to connect how racial/ethnic/cultural identities are not formulaic, thus, neither are communicative practices. Since Burke’s process of identification requires communication, this article supplements a potential identification strategy within a non-profit. I will explore this idea of typification in my methodology for my prospectus, as well as make it a central argument within the literature review.

National Center for Charitable Statistics. (2015). Quick Facts About Nonprofits. Retrieved from
 <http://nccs.urban.org/statistics/quickfacts.cfm>.

The non-profit sector is comprised of charitable organizations that are classified by the Internal Revenue Service as a public charity or private foundations. Under the section 1986 tax code, public charities are classified as 501 (c)(3) tax-exempt organizations. 501 (c)(3) tax-exempt status are commonly referred as non-profit organizations, and differ in classification from religious organizations, political organizations, and Civic Leagues, Social Welfare Organizations, and Local Associations of Employees due to the restrictions imposed on lobbying and political action (IRS). The National Center for Charitable Statistics (2015) found that as of December 2015,
there are 1, 548,644 tax-exempt organizations. The breakdown of the tax-example organizations includes: 1,076,208 public charities, 103,356 private foundations, and 369,080 additional types of “organizations, chambers of commerce, fraternal organizations, and civic leagues.” This source contextualizes the current state of the non- profit sector.

Pratt, M. G. (1998). To Be or Not to Be: Central Questions in Organizational Identification*.* In
 D. Whetten and P. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in Organizations: Building Theory Through*
 *Conversations* (pp. 171 – 208). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Burke may have coined the term identification within the field of rhetoric, but identification is also examined in other fields without the connection to Burke. The interdisciplinary nature of identification can be traced to Aronson (1992), Ashforth and Mael (1989), Cheney (1983), Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1993), and Tajfel (1983) whose definitions differ but are similar in the cognitive and active process of identification (, p. 173). He asserts that “most conceptualizations agree that identification involves an individual coming to see another (individual, group, object) as being definitive of one’s self” (p. 172).Pratt’s article, although outdated, is one of the few recent articles that combined rhetoric (in particular Burke) and organizational identity. Pratt utilizes Burke to enhance the interdisciplinary approach of identification. Even though I do not plan to replicate Pratt’s application of Burke with organizational identity theory, I see similarities within my own thought process; thus, this can serve as supplemental material that can connect Burke with intercultural inquiry and organizational identity theory.

Rinderle, S., & Montoya, D. (2008). Hispanic/Latino identity labels: An examination of cultural
 values and personal experiences. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, *19*(2),
 144- 164.
 This article provides a historical overview of how the Hispanic/Latino identity has
 evolved. From Chicano, Mexican-American, Xicana, Mexican, to name a few, a myriad
 of identity labels have increased due to the population increase (p. 145). Despite the U.S.
 Census attempt to expand identifiers of the Hispanic population, the Hispanic/Latino
 identity label preference has procured a myriad of identity labels. Their case study found
 that the “term Hispanic=Latino because, given the many label choices and concomitant
 issues, these two terms are the most common and least problematic for most members of
 [Hispanics of Mexican decent or origin]” (p. 145). This article is incredibly helpful
 towards examining the Hispanic/Latino identity label debate from a historical and study.
 In addition, this article serves as a stepping stone for how Latino as an intercultural term
 has been theorized.

\*Taylor, P., Lopez M.H., and Martinez, Jessica. (2012). Identity, Pan-Ethnicity and Race. *Pew
 Research Center*. Retrieved from:

 <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/04/04/ii-identity-pan-ethnicity-and-race/>

Pew Research Center provides an overview of a 2011 National Survey of Latinos on what they use to describe themselves/self-identity and why they self-identity with that specific term. The study found that “the government’s system of ethnic and racial labeling does not fit easily with Latinos’ own sense of identity.” The study defines race and ethnicity, the history of how the government classifies people, demographic of Hispanic identity, and the terms that are commonly used to describe identity. This article is helpful because it has the most recent findings by the Pew Research Center, a reputable research group, in regards to how Hispanic, Latino, and other labels are used to categorize Americans/Hispanics – the study uses both terms interchangeably at times. This article and others that define the Hispanic identity differ in methodologies, but the general consensus is that identity is not linear and should not be classified as such. This is incredibly helpful in terms of exploring the identification process of racial/ethnic/cultural identities.

U.S. Census Bureau. The Hispanic Population. Retrieved from
 <https://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-3.pdf>
 The U.S. Census Bureau defines Hispanic origin “…as the heritage, nationality, lineage,
 or country of birth of the person or the person’s parents or ancestors before arriving in the
 U.S.” As of July 1, 2013, the U.S. Census Bureau estimates 17% (roughly 54 million) of
 the total U.S. population are Hispanic. Pew Research Center positions the projected
 growth by the Hispanic population to reach 107 million by 2065. This source is helpful
 because it traces racial/ethnic identities from a government standpoint, which contributes
 to how Latino is theorized and appropriated by both individuals and non-profit
 organizations.

Worth, M. J. (2014). Nonprofit Management: Principles and Practice.

This chapter explores the interdisciplinary approach of studies completed within the non-profit sector. First, Worth (2014) discusses macro theories presented by political scientists and economist, such as failure theories (market, goods, etc.), government failure theories, gap fillers, and supply-side theory. Next, Worth (2014) explains the macro theories of altruism and giving and commons. There is not singular theory of nonprofit organizations; organizational theory The purpose of this chapter is to show how a single theory cannot define and uphold the complexity and diversity of the non-profit sector, but, through the use of multiple theories, one can reach a better understanding of how a nonprofit organization is structured within specific contexts. The theory that I found most helpful is organizational theory, which was of immense help in regards

to bridging branding and marketing strategies with an organization’s identity. According to organizational theorists, non-profit organizations are open systems, thereby “…are dependent on and interact frequently with their external environments. This is true because of their dependence on external resources, their social missions, and the involvement of volunteers at various levels of the organization” (p. 59). Using organization theory means the researcher has to be mindful of research bias/being selective; however, despite its limitations, common characteristic have shown that most non-profit organizations are organized entities, private, non-profit distributing, self-governing, voluntary, and of public benefit (p. 56 – 57). This chapter is helpful because it’s a more recent analysis of organizational identity theory. Overall, the entire book is helpful and will be used to assess non-profit management, governance, and non-profit resources ; however, it is Chapter 3 “Theories of the Nonprofit Sector and Nonprofit Organizations” that I will rely on the most.

Whetten, D. A. (2006). Albert and Whetten revisited: Strengthening the concept of
 organizational identity. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 15*(3), 219-234.

Since 1985, Albert and Whetten’s organizational identity theory is commonly used to describe the process of establishing an organizational identity. According to Albert and Whetten, this is specified as the central and enduring attributes of an organization that distinguish it from other organizations” (Whetten, 2006, p. 219). Organizational identity theory is a self-reflective practice that centralizes, makes a distinction, and establishes multiple identities based on audience, context, and needs of the organization. Organizational identity theory continues to be upheld through an assortment of fields, and this article aims to provide a distinct analytical framework that distinguishes it from organizational culture and image. The difference between organizational culture, image, and identity is the “identity-referencing discourse” that each establishes. This article is useful because it provides the most recent update to organizational identity theory by one of the original authors, which allows me to build on how identity theories continue to evolve over time.