

THE HAWTHORN-EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR IS CHANGING  
AMERICAN PUBLIC ATTITUDES: APPLIED TOWARD THE US MILITARY EFFORT TO  
CHANGE NINE MILITARY BASES THAT WERE NAMED IN HONOR OF  
CONFEDERATE LEADERS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

By

JASON A. PERMANN

A Seminar paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE LEADERSHIP 2023

Approved by: *Michael Sullivan*

Dr. Michael J. Sullivan 5/18/2023

**THE HAWTHORN-EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR IS CHANGING  
AMERICAN PUBLIC ATTITUDES: APPLIED TOWARD THE US MILITARY  
EFFORT TO CHANGE NINE MILITARY BASES THAT WERE NAMED IN HONOR  
OF CONFEDERATE LEADERS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY**

Jason A. Permann

University of Wisconsin-Platteville

OCL 7920-57 Seminar Research Paper

Dr. Michael J. Sullivan

May 18, 2023

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	4
<b>A Brief History</b> .....	5
<b>Literature of review of the Hawthorne-Effect</b> .....	10
<b>Organizational Behavior Approaches to Change</b> .....	15
<b>Criticisms of the Hawthorne-Effect</b> .....	27
<b>How cultural attitudes have changed dramatically in a short period of time</b> .....	38
<b>Is the change in public opinion sincere or has the nation adjusted the overall sentiment because of increased public attention and scrutiny? (e.g., The Hawthorne-Effect)</b> .....	48
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	57
<b>References</b> .....	60

## Introduction

This Seminar paper assesses the relationship between the Hawthorne effect of organizational behavior and the sudden 21<sup>st</sup> century cultural shift in the United States, specifically the decision to remove the names of numerous Confederate leaders from modern military bases. The authors find that human beings will significantly modify their actions simply with the knowledge that they are being observed or scrutinized by an outside party, raising questions in regard to the sincere intentions behind the change. With their studies, the researchers explored the line between correlation and causation of an action that would have been unthinkable only a few years prior. Are contemporary leaders erasing the names of racists and traitors to the nation (whom are now long dead) because they genuinely believe this action is just and long overdue, or because the course of action has rapidly become socially and politically necessary?

Beginning in the 1920s, organizational researchers at the time first began theorizing what would become the Hawthorne effect. Classically defined as “the supposed inclination of people who are the subjects of an experiment or study to change or improve the behavior being evaluated only because it is being studied and not because of changes in the experiment parameters or stimulus (Kenton et al., 2022).” Simply stated, the Hawthorn Effect occurs when members of a control group (however large or small) attempt to change or improve their behavior solely because the subject in question is receiving attention. Named for the Chicago, IL neighborhood where the first experiments were conducted, the validity of the Hawthorne Effect is debated to this day.

Acting with integrity requires doing the right thing when no one is looking. It would not be unreasonable to assume that human subjects would improve performance and/or behavior if they knew they were being observed. The social elements and societal climate of any particular topic

may shift over time, rendering once familiar customs entirely alien to the younger generations. As attitudes change and sometimes change significantly in a narrow span of years, no context or justification can convince certain opinions that a tradition should continue. In this circumstance, the question arises of whether the motivation for change is taking place because the parties involved sincerely believe in revolutionizing the status quo or if the contemporary actions are being influenced by a changing public attitude.

At the outbreak of World War I, four installations were enshrined with the names of men who had turned against the United States and raised arms against their fellow countrymen. Five more bases would be commissioned at the start of World War II with an identical naming pattern (South, 2022). Until very recently, Confederate iconography in numerous forms had rarely if ever been scrutinized. As an organization tasked with the ultimate responsibility of keeping a nation safe, the military has an obligation to preserve a positive social reputation (Park & Jeon, 2020). Paradoxical emotions are unavoidable when those voluntarily serving a cause are mandated to support what some perceive as unethical behavior (Tang et al., 2020). The United States of America may seem like a fractured country today in 2023; however, the cultural differences today would appear mild compared to the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century.

### **A Brief History**

An endless array of metaphors and old phrases have been distinguished to describe how past events have and continue to influence the present. Shakespeare may offer the most persuasive example of this tradition with the following passage from his play *The Tempest*, “what is past is prologue.” This theory is not applicable however, in regard to the original decision to name military installations in southern states after Confederate leaders. Politicians and decision-makers at the Department of Defense are making corrections they believe to be appropriate based on the

evolving sentiment of the nation (Rothstein, 2022). The benefit of hindsight would dictate that American leaders in the immediate post-civil war era acted wisely to put the country on the slow path to eventual healing. This journey is far from over and The United States are still struggling to maintain progress today.

A campaign to remove the names of controversial figures from America's past greatly accelerated following the death of George Floyd after an altercation with Minneapolis, Minnesota law enforcement in 2020 (Kuta, 2022). A commission was created in 2021 with the passage of the National Defense Authorization Act to review a list of over 750 military features and categorize any naming conventions associated with the former Confederate States of America (Kaufman & Herb, 2022). The end result of this undertaking recommended renaming a total of nine Army forts and camps as well as two Navy ships and a lengthy number of monuments that honor members of the CSA (South, 2022).

Understanding history involves more effort than a thorough review of relevant facts. Even current events are difficult to report accurately with zero bias and the further back a researcher goes, the more scrutiny must be placed on the reliability of sources. Reading contemporary memoirs can offer a window into the past; however, understanding the motivation of individuals behind historical decisions is not so easy. Feelings about the institution of slavery and racism in general will understandably be much different in 2023 than the late 1850s. Disregarding any context to decisions made in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and holding American leaders at the time to present-day morals is problematic.

Despite how much cultural beliefs may have shifted in recent decades, a persistent movement continues to argue that the Civil War did not ignite due to the institution of slavery. The inaccurate retelling of states' rights and a "just cause" are dishonest. A generation before the

Civil War, even the founding fathers who owed slaves held deep reservations about the practice. Before abolition, nine U.S. presidents were slave owners and only George Washington freed his slaves during his lifetime (Ambrose, 2002). Thomas Jefferson wrote the words “all men are created equal” in the opening paragraph of The Declaration of Independence and in *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Jefferson wrote about the institution of slavery as “forcing tyranny and depravity on master and slave alike.” Jefferson, like many founding fathers, condemned slavery in writing but lived a hypocritical life with his actions.

To be fair to the early leaders of what became the United States, structural change of a society does not come easy. The passage of an American Constitution required negotiation and compromise to secure adoption. Understandably, no one could have cemented every policy and position they wanted nor eliminating every aspect that they may have found abhorrent. The original men honored by each of these nine U.S. Army bases are remembered for committing atrocities and holding detestable beliefs by modern standards; and arguably, also by the standards of their own eras. The context of permitting military installations in the south to be named for the Civil War detractors is critical to understanding the tough decisions federal leaders at the time had to make. Similar to the original debate over what should be included in the Constitution, compromises that were deeply unpopular to some were necessary in the aftermath of the surrender at Appomattox Courthouse to begin a process of healing and reconciliation (Rubenstein, 2015). One aspect and one word that remains the focal point of this discussion as much now as in 1865: the charge of “treason”.

The act of treason by citizens against a nation is a straightforward concept in contemporary times but in the late-18<sup>th</sup> century and into the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, the question was more convoluted. A discussion over what power structure the new United States of America would

take came to a head originally at the Constitutional Convention in 1787, and this debate is still raging today (Vile, 2009). The mass of state representatives was outraged when Virginia delegate Edmund Randolph's proposal (which was heavily influenced by James Madison) called for a "national" government (Guelzo, 2021). All details were ignored including the system that is now considered "checks and balances" of a three-branch government that was designed to prevent one entity from having too much power. Merely suggesting a central authority governing along with state governments was viewed as a direct threat to state sovereignty.

The label "national" was eventually scrapped in favor of "federal" but the battle of states' rights continues fiercely 236 years later. For the entirety of American history, a loyalty to their native state has and always will surpass loyalty to the federal government for some. Permission to form a federal government initially came from state leaders and a sizeable portion of these leaders held the sincere belief that this permission could be revoked (Guelzo, 2021). This fragile balance was kept in check for a time by dual sovereignty or the idea that "when a defendant in a single act violates the "peace and dignity" of two sovereigns by breaking the laws of each, he has committed two distinct offences (Adler, 2015)." In hindsight present-day historians will accurately call firing on Ft. Sumter an act of treason. Decision-makers in 1861 however, would likely not have seen this position so definitively. South Carolina state leaders could genuinely claim they were securing state resources at the time, not attacking the federal government.

For a multitude of reasons, current conversations often overlook the critical issues surrounding the surrender and reconciliation of the Civil War. Bringing the violence to an end and ensuring the states would once again unite required the cooperation of the former Confederates. Similar to how General (and later President) Washington forbade his soldiers from ridiculing the surrendering British at Yorktown a generation earlier (Urwin, 2021), Union leaders

in 1865 and beyond knew the wisdom in being gracious in victory. Understandably, this position was not unanimous among the entire nation nor was forgiveness the top priority for some. The Federal Government could easily have failed in the ultimate mission of reunifying the nation if their intentions had been impetuous.

After being re-elected by a very narrow margin, Abraham Lincoln gave his second inaugural address (in only 701 words) on March 4<sup>th</sup>, 1865. Citizens on both sides of the conflict could surmise the war's ending was coming and four years of costly destruction left feelings of hostility on the surface (Kraemer, 2008). President Lincoln brilliantly used this speech to lay the foundation of healing by omitting any mention of resentment. *“With malice toward none with charity for all with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right let us strive on to finish the work we are in to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan ~ to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.”* In Lincoln's eyes the sin of slavery was a transgression that all Americans were in some way responsible, regardless of the geography of individual states. Refusing pomposity and projecting the evil of slavery to the general public demonstrated a sincere desire for healing over retribution.

The 16<sup>th</sup> President told the truth 158 years ago and the same truth needs to be acknowledged in modern times. Leadership decisions to blanket erase everything associated with the Confederate states often disregard the context of actions taken by previous leaders. Progress for newly freed African-Americans was inexplicably slow in the 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, and now 21<sup>st</sup> centuries; however, the decisions made in the immediate aftermath of the Southern surrender were crafted with the ultimate intentions of repairing the fragile Union. Although another complicated issue in its own right, modern leaders have no superior moral high ground compared to their 19<sup>th</sup> century

counterparts. Changing the names of certain military installations will not undo four centuries of racism and violence perpetuated on the North American continent (Shah & Adolphe, 2022). The Hawthorne effect however, can provide some intellectual insight into the motivations to finally stop honoring the names of men continuing this pain.

### **Literature of review of the Hawthorne-Effect**

Three simple characteristics compromise the Hawthorne effect including the brevity of involvement in the experiment(s), the level of knowledge among the participants of how intensely they are being observed, and the overall effects that may be achieved as a result of the given studies (Parsons, pg. 922-932, 1974). While a common citation now, the phrase itself was not immortalized in print until around three decades after the original research at Western Electric. A literature review of its' own from the post-World War II era coined the term "Hawthorne effect" in reference to strategies for studying actions and conduct (French, 1953). Not without controversy, a pattern of consistent disagreements has been established as examination of the Hawthorne effect has progressed over time (Chiesa & Hobbs, pg. 67-74, 2008). Taking the position that the Hawthorne effect is valid, any educational study conducted to confirm this hypothesis will undoubtedly include preconceived prejudices that could impact a conclusion on numerous levels (Holden, pg. 65-70, 2001).

A record of meticulously reviewing the original and historical information available of Hawthorne effect research is currently incomplete. Initial assessments performed on separate studies that involved adolescent children in the course of their elementary education proclaimed no direct correlation of the Hawthorne effect as the outcome had been theorized in existing academic resources (Adair, Sharpe, & Huynh, pg. 215-228, 1989). The evolution of Hawthorne effect opinions among industry experts is important to take with the appropriate context. In the

present day, a level of attention and understanding has been dedicated to behavioral sciences that did not exist in the early and mid-twentieth centuries. As a greater emphasis has been placed on mental and emotional health, the overall relevance of the Hawthorne effect has increased simultaneously (Bouchet, Guillemin, & Briancon, pg. 15-20, 1996). Social and medical circumstances are much better documented now that were not well understood one-hundred years ago.

Published material from reputable theoretical sources have followed alternating protocols to address the Hawthorne effect. One approach seeks to explain a specific detail of the original conclusions and the numerical information readily obtainable serves as the supporting evidence (Parsons, pg. 922-932, 1974). To further reinforce the assertion being made, an alternative basis of relative data is usually associated with the new study to include outside and assumedly objective material as well (Gale, pg. 439-449, 2004). This style of literature review has created an ever-increasing presence of the Hawthorne effect being cited without applying a relevant correlation of the foundational research performed by Professor Mayo. Any documented changes to a routine or previously sustained course of action could be used to reference the Hawthorne effect.

A second strategy of literature review seeks to untangle the immense reinterpretation of the original Hawthorne experiments as an endless number of disciplines and industries have utilized the theory for unique purposes over the last century (Parsons, pg. 922-932, 1974). While an increased level of multiplicity and further expanding attention can be positive attributes, the varying circumstances of Hawthorne studies in so many different fields have created a level of inconsistency by reviewing a unique set of variables in context to each setting (Leonard, pg. 444-459, 2008). For example, the previously mentioned early review of Hawthorne effect literature

drew an opposing conclusion disputing the original dogma of behavioral science as it applied to young children in school. An applied theoretic would understandably field different results with such contrasting settings and test subjects.

The fundamental factor in determining the validity of the Hawthorne effect relates directly to the driving force of detected behavioral changes. In fields of social and psychological study, the idea that members of a control group know they are being monitored and their actions are likely being evaluated can create a perpetual cycle between the participants in a study. A researcher may initially assume a collective adjustment will take place once an observation begins. Simultaneously in contemporary settings where the Hawthorne effect is better understood, the control group may adjust their behavior simply because they believe it is anticipated. This consideration would suggest that if the Hawthorne effect can describe an unlimited number of unique results, the cause responsible for producing the desired effect could be much broader than just an awareness of observation (Chiesa & Hobbs, pg. 67-74, 2008). Continuous literature reviews to assess the strength of available facts will help minimize any discrepancies or inconsistencies in Hawthorne research across expanding fields and timelines.

A comprehensive review of nineteen independent Hawthorne effect studies was undertaken in 2014 with the goal of analyzing the behavioral science theory as it applies specifically to health and wellness settings (McCambridge, Witton, & Elbourne, pg. 267-277, 2014). This literature review focused mainly on the information of eventual results published while carefully considering any possibilities that the trials were compromised with preconceptions. In the context of health and wellness, the control group being monitored in each of the studies represented health-care providers as opposed to patients or recipients of treatment (McCusker et al., pg. 217-221, 1996). Consistent with many studies in global health research, the

overwhelming majority of these studies, fourteen in total, declared a binary conclusion supporting one of two options. These options could be as basic as whether a particular ailment was diagnosed or as complex as an odds ratio of a patient making a full recovery (Kypri et al., pg. 62-70, 2007). The general differentiation of such a large number of experiments should be considered while analyzing this collection of data.

Nineteen studies dating back at least twenty-five years understandably exhibit an array of examples detailing a unique meaning of the Hawthorne effect as it would apply to each individual study. At the culmination of this literature review, 63% (or 12/19) of the individual trials produced results that could reasonably assert that some form of a Hawthorne effect did take place. Of the seven dissenting studies, two experiments were determined to include test subject pools that were too small to substantiate the results and the remaining five produced data that showed no discernable change between the observed and non-observed groups (Fernald et al., pg. 83-86, 2012). Although more than one-hundred years as passed since the inception of Hawthorne effect research, the basic philosophy has remained fairly consistent.

These nineteen studies and countless similar experiments have applied the practice of observation, a straight-forward interview process, or a general awareness of attention to test the validity of the now-familiar Hawthorne effect. Each unique trial concluded facts that support behavioral changes attributed to the new variables and also facts that support no direct correlation whatsoever (Feil et al., pg. 1129-1135, 2002). This could be explained by the existence of unavoidable bias in the researchers. For example, certain pairs of studies reported nearly symmetrical approximations of what results may occur while the interval estimations or the anticipated average of expected results were remarkably comparable (Maury et al., pg. 2088-2089, 2006). This revelation is evidence that in reference to medical providers specifically, the

fact of witnesses observing the test subjects is much less significant than the current actions being taken by the providers. If taken as a fact, this would further reduce the likelihood that a solitary effect was solely responsible for a change in behavior. This assumes that a measurable outcome has taken place when numerous studies among the nineteen surveyed displayed no provable evolution of conduct (Van Rooyen et al., pg. 234-237, 1998).

This literature review took the unconventional approach of reviewing two elements that were similar or that may have nothing in common. While this may seem counterproductive on the surface, this strategy was the most applicable to the setting of the experiments in question as they are so distinctive and also effectively highlighted the inevitable restrictions encountered. Most significant among the limitations reported was a lack of longevity in the documented behavioral effects. Of the nineteen studies examined, only two showed any sustained change in conduct beyond the six-month mark (Murray et al., pg. 304–306, 1988). Interestingly both of these trials that did produce an extended effect period were previously reviewed numerous times before publishing and also supplied their own result information. The decision to forgo an outside and independent third-party to assemble the results of a study does not necessarily eliminate the possibility of objectivity, however the evaluators will have a clear and present motive to achieve a predetermined result. Considering the Hawthorne effect as the only possible answer to a question can prevent the attention of other possible inspirations that may otherwise not be examined.

To prove a Hawthorne effect, a researcher must conclude that an outcome took place that was only produced by a specific controlled and introduced element. This element may create a chain reaction that was not conceived or intended by the researcher. For example, a Hawthorne study being implemented by an interview process may include questions that spur new thoughts

and ideas in a test subject that otherwise never would have been developed (Evans et al., pg. 27, 2010). With this type of scenario, the examinee being interviewed would be altering their behavior not in line with the intentions of the study but by a completely autonomous component. Experimental research by no means began with the experiments at Western Electric in the early twentieth century and measures to eliminate threats to a study far predate the original Hawthorne research. Well before the 1920s, control groups participating in organized trials have been taking carefully designed questionnaires at both the beginning and end of an academic study in order to document the motivation for any resulting actions (Solomon, pg. 137-150, 1949).

This literature review can be summarized with the conclusion that more research focused on precise weaknesses and alternative theories is needed to advance the greater subject understanding. Since the original publications began making the rounds in academic circles, the Hawthorne effect has run parallel with “demand characteristics” of psychology as the two premier explanations for experimental behavior studies. The Hawthorne effect simply declares observation leads to a change in actions, while demand characteristics suggest the test subjects are taking the theory one step further and actively change their conduct to fit what they believe the study is aiming to achieve (McCambridge et al., pg. 10, 2011). The possibility of a definitive answer is within the realm of possibility, however a consistent and substantial amount of further research regarding controlled trials and personal behavior will be required first.

### **Organizational Behavior Approaches to Change**

Inequality and racism that lead to prejudice are issues that have been afflicting organizations at all levels of society for a long time. Speaking out against injustice and discrimination have extensively been the popular and progressive position to take; however, simply offering vocal support is no longer adequate in the present United States (Akpapuna, et al, 2020). Effective

change that is demonstrable and sustainable is currently being necessitated across society. Correcting racial inequality is a momentous outcome and the driving force propelling the change needs to be compatibly momentous. The concept of organizational behavior approaches to change have a solid foundation to guide transformational performance among both individuals and organizations. To better reflect the actual diverse demographics of the United States population, the need for this field of study grows stronger with the shifting attitudes of cultural norms.

At the same time, organizations need to be realistic with the growing pains and consequences of significant change. Circumstances surrounding the recruitment and retention of talent, new and recurring training, demonstrating success, support of new participants, and appropriate revision all need to be considered along the way. By studying organizational behavior practices, leaders will have the ability to foster the change that is necessary and/or long overdue while maintaining sensitivity to the organization in question to ensure long-term success.

Organizational behavior can be broken down into an analysis of how individuals conduct themselves in a group setting (Kopp, et al., 2020). The lessons derived from this subject are utilized commonly to improve the functionality and eliminate issues within an organization. For the purpose of this literature review; the Hawthorne Effect, arguably the most well-known facet of organizational behavior, will be thoroughly scrutinized.

Looking all the way back to the late 1920s, organizational behavior had its foundation in the blue-collar town of Cicero, Illinois and the Hawthorne Works plant of the Western Electric Company. Forerunners of behavioral science began studying the effects of worker productivity based on the occupational environment and lighting in particular (Kopp, et al., 2020). The initial findings of this experiment determined the worker's surroundings had much less effect on

overall behavior than factors like team rapport and a sense of appreciation from superiors. Upon the publication of these findings, a substantial number of additional trials were launched between 1924 and 1933 with unique circumstances to expand the new field of study.

One hundred years later of forward momentum and the Hawthorne effect, which attempts to explain behavior patterns of individuals who know they are being watched, is now the most widely studied genre of organizational behavior. The question of human actions being different depending on whether or not a fellow human is observing, is as old as the concept of integrity itself (Kenton, et al., 2022). Researchers instantly became fascinated with the new Hawthorne effect and this captivation has never waned. Along with any social experiment, however, is the unavoidable presence of confirmation bias and the degree to which any collected data may be skewed is important to consider.

Despite cementing a foundation in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, organizational behavior would not become officially recognized by the American Psychological Association as an accredited academic discipline until 50 years later in the 1970s (Gordon, 2022). Although professional psychologists were slow and cautious to embrace organizational behavior as legitimate, the modern occupation of human resources (HR) arguably owes its existence to the evolution of the Hawthorne effect.

At the time, several tenets of the experiment were relatively unheard of in professional or academic circles. Hoping to confirm or disprove the possibility that workers were not just names on a spreadsheet and perhaps employees were not a transposable commodity was a very progressive idea. If the productivity, quality, and in turn, the overall value of an employee could be perceptibly increased simply by adding layer of observation to the workplace, business managers could substantially improve the overall operations with little to no cost (Kenton, et al.,

2022). Taking the desired data one step further, the Hawthorne study may provide evidence that individual behavior can support steering workers to the best possible area of an organization as opposed to randomly assigning roles based on need.

Around the outbreak of World War II a few decades later, the ideas of organizational behavior expanded further once again. The focus of study zeroed in on managerial practices of personnel and quantification of outcomes (Williamson, 2002). Further studies by the Carnegie School in subsequent years solidified the fundamentals of organizational behavior and decisions were now being made not with a one-size-fits-all approach but based on cogent evidence. Seventy years later in the present day, a century of cumulative research has molded the widely accepted philosophies of business operations. Far from being limited to business study, the fields of mental health and social work have largely instituted scholastic organizational behavior programs all with the ultimate goal of challenging the effectiveness of ideas. The potential research possibilities of organizational behavior are limitless. Specific fields of study can be narrowed to public speaking, negotiation, and avoiding stereotypes whereas larger studies can dissect social movements and the process of change (Bommer, et al., 2005).

Upon securing a better understanding of organizational behavior, business leaders can apply the new findings in the ever-evolving organizational culture. Simply defined, the culture of an organization “refers to the values, beliefs, and behaviors that determine how a company's employees and management interact, perform, and handle business transactions (Tarver, et al., 2022).” Several components contribute to organizational culture and how these circumstances can add the most possible benefit. Human resource managers can predict (of course not 100% accurately) how people will interact with groups based on their personality during the hiring process. With a unique personality comes a unique leadership style that may be expansive,

concentrated, micro-managed or largely delegated. Leadership in turn is a delicate position to ever trust an individual and removing any preconceived biases from a role with power and authority is impossible. Ensuring any potential candidates align with an organization's culture is paramount to ultimate success. Understanding the history of organizational behavior is critical to understanding the eventual Hawthorne effect and how this has been applied in the modern case of renaming controversial military bases.

In the most basic terms, "the Hawthorne effect is increasing output in response to being watched" (Daniel, 2023) or modifying behavior by alerting the individuals in question that they are being observed or are in a position to possibly receive some kind of special recognition. Understanding exactly what the "Hawthorne effect" actually represents is crucial to interpreting the results of this type of study. With the benefit of hindsight, many current experts are still unsure if the original experiment from the 1920s conclusively proved or disproved the theory. This term has been applied with increasing frequency to describe an endless number of behavioral effects (often whatever is being observed) that far eclipses the original intention at the Western Electric plant.

Organizational leaders have taken strides to maximize productivity going back as long as workers have been actively managed. Operating as a subsidiary of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T) from the founding in 1876, Western Electric manufactured hardware and infrastructure including telephones, cables, and transmission equipment. By the final year of the 1920s, the main facility of the manufacturing giant known as Hawthorne Works, functioned with a permanent payroll of 35,000 workers (Daniel, 2023). In the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the production of communications equipment was an intricate process that required skilled labor. As was standard at the time, the supervisory staff of Hawthorne Works

followed the philosophy of scientific management dictating any specific task could be performed “one best way” and leaders were not to be questioned (Gordon, 2022). Under this professional culture, workers are viewed as members of a collective as opposed to individuals with unique strengths.

Could circumstances involving the interior lighting of a factory, amount of rest time, and financial encouragements radically alter the total level of output? Are certain people better suited for specific jobs based on information that is easily obtained through marginal effort during a new hiring process? These questions became the foundation of a revolutionary behavioral study that would re-write the standard operating procedure of business. Upon completion of the original research at Hawthorne Works in 1932, a data pool of more than 20,000 employees from varying backgrounds had contributed to the results (Kompier, 2006). In order to preserve the integrity of the thesis in question, it is important to consider the diversity of the test subjects and all the variables.

The possibility that a brighter working environment created by artificial light sources (innovative in the 1920s) is not a radical concept. This idea had taken the American industrial sector by storm during the period and the researchers were keen to compare the results. Like many campaigns of new technology, the excitement to further implement new lighting apparatuses as wide as possible was not entirely altruistic. The Electrical industry was lobbying heavily to spread the word that scientific data confirmed enhanced illumination correlated directly with increased production. While the field in question had a significant financial incentive at stake, the outcome of the experiments was no less factual.

After the so called “illumination studies” gained wide-spread popularity, a new definition of the Hawthorne effect began to circulate. No matter the circumstances or what the given variables

may have been, the backers of a particular study could declare the strategy being tested improved worker performance. The hard reality was the unique elements of a study were irrelevant. The common denominator was the fact that test subjects knew they were being watched by authority figures. Human behavior could undeniably be influenced by the mere presence of observation (Cherry & Susman, 2022).

The “roaring 1920s” were largely associated with industrialism. The American workforce at the time was comprised of many first-generation immigrants that were not greatly valued by employers. With hours that seemed endless and horrifically dangerous conditions, workers were dehumanized to the point of being transposable components in the larger economic machine. Despite relying on these laborers for their comfortable standard of living, educated and wealthy Americans looked down on industrial workers similar to a Dickens novel. To completely challenge the status quo, the Hawthorne studies effectually started the national conversation of the humane treatment of the workforce and also began to change minds on the most effective style of management.

Leading the research at the Western Electric plant was an Australian-born academic psychologist and industrial researcher named George “Elton” Mayo (1880 – 1949). Introducing the business world to a new management style and convincing others of the value is a difficult undertaking; however, Mayo was able to publish evidence to support his views that could not be ignored. After instructing at several institutes of higher education in his native Australia, Elton Mayo accepted a position at Pennsylvania University in 1923 and soon began studies that would be forerunners of the Hawthorne experiments (Muldoon, 2012). For example, a local Philadelphia spinning mill reported an employee churn rate of 250% in a specific department compared to roughly 6% cumulative rate for the rest of the organization. With some trial and

error to working conditions in the outlier department, a simple change of adding rest pauses to the order of operations was implemented and within a year the churn rate was in line with the overall company average. This basic investigation was able to demonstrate that worker morale and productivity could easily be raised with basic modifications and industry leaders began to take notice.

Professor Mayo migrated to the University Of Harvard School Of Business teaching Industrial Research in 1928 where he would remain until his retirement in 1947. During this time that included the great depression and World War II, Elton Mayo observed the connection between social problems and the industrialization of society. Western Electric already possessed a well-established reputation for progressive practices in regard to personnel and the company management was excited at the prospect of a National Research Council-led study to better understand employee motivations. The plant employed a full-time pool of test subjects numbering close to 30,000 so why not use the masses to improve efficiency?

The initial opening trial began with two teams of workers operating apart from each other, being sequestered with unique variables. With these controls in place, management and researchers were able to objectively observe the productivity levels after the changes had been applied. The first group experimented with interior illumination but increasing the brightness of the work area and then gradually reducing the lighting below the pre-experiment levels. In a surprise to the evaluators, productivity among the workers increased not only while the lights were set brighter, but also as they were being reduced back down and productivity still improved even when visibility had become worse than before (Cherry & Susman, 2022). The second group involved a drastically different set of variables including direct financial incentives and more rest

time. Unsurprisingly the promise of higher paychecks and increased down time produced a reliable uptick in productivity.

The consistent results from inconsistent circumstances left the researchers initially puzzled. The variables themselves didn't seem to matter. Simply making adjustments to the brightness of the workplace, both positive and negative, still provided an advantageous result that was similar to offering more money and enhanced break time. Even at that time 100 years ago, the study analysts and plant supervisors knew that a condition as insignificant as the lighting of a room should not cause a substantial shift in efficiency. Nevertheless, a heightened state of curiosity had been peaked by the results and the Assistant Works Manager, a man named George Pennock decided to broaden the work study (Muldoon, 2012).

Suspecting there could be something greater waiting to be uncovered with the early data collected, Mr. Pennock decided to bring a consultant on board to help navigate the findings. As a professor of biology and public health at The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Clair Turner eagerly accepted the invitation to join this first-of-its-kind study. Along with determining that the brightness of a room was irrelevant to employee output, Professor Turner also concluded that more frequent rest breaks were not a causation of greater production. In full disclosure it was suggested that increased rest pauses improved social interaction, which in turn, gave the workforce a noticeable mental boost. After a thorough investigation, the new consultant reported the production increase was directly credited to the limited size of each study group and the newfound attention the employees themselves knew was being focused on them (Franke, pg. 861-867, 1979).

As a company manager, Pennock understood from early on that the leadership style of a first-line supervisor would impact the employee response to the experiment. For example, the

manager of the team involved in the illumination trial was personable and approachable. This leader took an interest in the lives while getting to know them and was never too strict or harsh with company rules. The workers knew discipline would be enacted, if necessary, but this was not a constant message hovering constantly in the atmosphere. This localized team culture was practically a direct disparity from the organizational values they had been accustomed to prior to the study.

Professor Turner was not the only outside consultant brought on board by the manager George Pennock. To this day, the true motivation leading to Elton Mayo's involvement in what eventually became the Hawthorne experiments is hotly debated. Mayo had recently completed a series of successful studies at a Spinning Mill in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania that included very similar components to the trials at Western Electric including enhanced rest pauses (Ward, 2022). Another plausible theory is simply the desire of company management to involve a member of Harvard University with the study. Nevertheless, Elton Mayo was able to add his expert analysis in the late 1920s and concluded the test subject employees had fully embraced their role in the experiment.

Using his psychology foundation, Professor Mayo didn't just study and analyze collected data. He decided to sit down with the employees in person to get a first-hand understanding of how they felt and provide the workers with a platform to be heard (Ward, 2022). At this point in the tail end of the roaring 1920s, the typical American worker was not accustomed to their employer asking for feedback on the day-to-day experience and the test subjects reveled in the personal attention. These interviews determined that certain complaints made by the employees were not circumstances of the work environment and in this point, Mayo saw an opportunity. By

taking a genuine interest in the feelings of the workers which had never been done before, a direct correlation was discovered between employee productivity and the style of management.

The combination of increased rest pauses allowing the team members to get to know each other a little and the sit-down interviews had transformed the test subjects into social creatures. Professor Mayo was a student and believer in the teachings of F W Taylor and “systematic soldering” (Witzel and Warner, 2015). This theory recognized the ability of collective circles to influence the conduct of individual members at the lowest level. Human partnership in a place of employment was evolving to include relationships beyond being pieces in the larger economic machine. When the manager treats the workers as human beings and not merely names on a spreadsheet performing a function, efficiency rises. Conversely when a supervisor is only concerned by advancing their own careers with maximum output, the productivity yield is constrained.

Professor Mayo was not only tasked with understanding the raw information collected but also developing how the findings could become beneficial to the Western Electric plant in Hawthorne and the world beyond. The first step would be training first-line managers to be receptive when direct subordinates may be experiencing personal issues. Whereas the industry standard for a supervisor had been to be strict and remote, Mayo suggested the contemporary supervisor needed to be approachable and adept with social interactions (Hogan & Warrenfeltz, 2003). At the same time, the most significant behavior patterns were not identified immediately.

Three distinct conclusions would later be documented after a brief time and further consideration.

- As employees were given the liberty to influence the occupational environment of their direct departments within Western Electric, the level of pride workers took in their jobs improved.
- As more individuals were able to interact and exchange with one another, teams grew closer and worked better together.
- Career fulfilment and the overall production total was contingent on cohesion and self-esteem as opposed to the literal workspace.

Up to this point, workers had never had any type of platform to express their professional frustrations. Business leaders had never considered the human and social elements in the greater equation of maximum output. Clear and rigidly enforced rules are necessary for any operation to succeed; however, the complete disregard of human emotions had consistently set the economic world up for failure.

As late to the party as the findings were, the business world now acknowledged that social relations were (arguably) just as vital to organizational success as technical management (Jayles et al, 2017). F W Taylor's preferred style of scientific management was not being phased out, it had simply evolved and been improved upon. In the simplest terms, the "Hawthorne effect" was born when the researchers drew the conclusion that participants in a study will change their routine actions if they know they are being scrutinized (McCambridge et al, 2014). The determinations made by the research team working on the original studies at Western Electric essentially gave birth to the idea of a management style. While not universally acclaimed by the business or psychological fields, the correlation between professional happiness and workplace efficiency continues to be instituted to this day.

### **Criticisms of the Hawthorne-Effect**

After nine years of practical experimentation and over 20,000 employee interviews at the Hawthorne plant, researchers confidently published their opinions that placing workers under an observational microscope is the crucial element to improved productivity (Kompier, 2006). These findings, however, are not unanimously accepted by the academic community. The theory makes sense. Any individuals who are singled out for a controlled environment will strive to paint themselves in the best light possible. Others have argued that the results of these studies, even with the longitudinal timeline, are not so simple. Five counterpoints have been documented that seek to debunk the main thesis of the Hawthorne effect and the logic behind the alternate point of view is worth considering.

With the 100-year anniversary of the start of the Western Electric studies approaching, a considerable amount of time has been available for the data to be evaluated. The first issue raised would be the actual scientific worth of the overall assessment. Eliminating 100% of any bias is impractical with any organized study; however, the Western Electric studies would rate the lowest qualification possible on a rudimentary methodological quality test (Pusegoda, et al, 2017). The absence of any control group throughout the entirety of the experiment made cross-examining any of the results impossible. A control group would have provided the opportunity to equate the increased production of the study groups with productivity levels of similar workers that did not know they were being observed. Similarly, the number of contributors to each trial is a cause for concern. With the exception of the interviews, each study only utilized a limited pool of workers compared to what could have been possible and selection bias was rampant with eager volunteers being prioritized (Kompier, 2006). Finally, some claims made from the

experiment have to be taken entirely on faith. For example, no data or official report has survived from the illumination trials (Cherry & Susman, 2022).

In retrospect, both Mr. Mayo and other members of the research team have been accused of burying or ignoring certain trails that did not perfectly conform to the idea of a Hawthorne effect. For instance, in the very first observation of hourly production rates, four out of the five operators being studied actually recorded lower output than prior to the trial (Whitehead, 1938). As a result of the discouraging early results, the workers were given less time for lunch and rest pauses were eliminated entirely. In 1992, McMaster University Professor Stephen R. G. Jones performed a complete analyzation of the available original data and “found essentially no evidence of Hawthorne effects, a common effect that could be regarded as a pure result of the experimentation (Jones, 1992).” Without being able to interview the original Western Electric employees in a contemporary setting, no answer on the validity of a Hawthorne effect can be definitively given but the variance in professional opinions is certainly worth noting.

Substantiating this thesis would be a tough sell in any setting but at the time of the experiments during the roaring 1920s, skepticism would have been higher than even the modern era. Employers being able to increase the overall level of productivity without making any meaningful changes to physical demands, safety, and most importantly, financial compensation sounds too good to be true. With over one-hundred years of time to evolve, the Hawthorne effect may have become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The more a story or talking point is repeated, the more readily accepted the claim will be with decreasing scrutiny. In psychology circles, this would be a text-book example of the “primacy effect”. A casual student will most likely retain the first version of a lesson or event as opposed to learning of an alternative viewpoint at a later time (Cuncic, 2022).

Any researcher that eventually publishes a report will be some level of “selective” with their findings. Elton Mayo himself was completely forthcoming with his approach to demonstrating the results, “The presentation of facts invariably implies something of selection” (Whitehead, p. 8, 1938). While his official position within the studies was to serve as an academic authority and objective respondent, Mayo was very much an opportunist eager to promulgate a revolutionary movement. The experiments at Western Electric provided a perfect opportunity for social researchers to build empirical evidence for pre-conceived behavioral models (Yorks, pg. 27, 1985). Each subsequent peer group of pupils who study the ultimate conclusion drawn from the original trials has largely continued the tradition of declining to investigate the century old information. Psychologist Berkeley Rice diagnosed these continuing phenomena with the declaration, “because they are lazy (Rice, 1982).”

As the old saying goes, “attitude reflects leadership.” The management style and approach that leaders take have a direct connection to workplace morale and employee engagement. Workers are extremely receptive to the level of interest a direct superior will take in their lives. Employees that genuinely feel valued by their supervisors will logically make more of an effort to be productive on a continual basis (Kompier, pg. 36, 2003). Financial incentives, enhanced rest breaks, and the simple reality of being observed are important factors to consider with overall output. The social environment and personal relationships, however, should be given equal reflection. In relation to the Hawthorne effect, two auxiliary circumstances must be considered.

First, the second decade of the early twentieth century was by no means a progressive era of employers studying or even considering workers’ emotional well-being (Zickar, 2004). The idea of employees having human feelings that affect workplace performance as a revolutionary

development is a sobering reminder of the Dickensian culture workers endured. Second, social scientists had known for many years that performance and productivity are determined by more than just financial and environmental provisions. A quarter-century before, Frederick Taylor published an industrial study theorizing his belief in a growing trend he styled “soldering”. This idea has made a comeback in the post-pandemic corporate world with the phrase “quiet quitting” or as Taylor wrote, “deliberately working slowly, so as to avoid doing a full day’s work (Taylor, pg. 6, 1911).” This hypothesis stemmed from an attitude that exists among members of the national workforce (now and in the past) that jobs would be eliminated if the current staff substantially increased production. As a result, managers widely believed social relationships in the workplace were bad for business.

In the simplest of terms, an industrial manager has two main responsibilities. First to maintain a maximum level of production and ensure a healthy social environment in the workplace. These are both constant struggles for a leader in a capitalist economy like the United States where workers feel increasingly marginalized by ever-present crisis and uncertainty. The Hawthorne studies provided an attractive solution to these problems at a time when stress-free resolutions were uncommon (Gillespie, pg. 210, 1991). What professional manager wouldn’t jump at the opportunity to increase output with zero increase to costs? According to Elton Mayo, taking a personal interest in previously ignored employees and social factors in the workplace was literally the only factor to address. The physical conditions occurring daily in the place of employment and even the financial compensation was irrelevant.

The Hawthorne studies at Western Electric continue to be analyzed over one-hundred years later by business students and social scientists due in large part because the subject and hypothesis are still noteworthy. At the same time, keeping the public sentiment in context is

important to accurately interpret the available information (Gillespie, 1991). Attitudes and the collective belief system of the United States have both changed considerably since the early 1920s. Critiquing or dismissing researchers like Elton Mayo and F W Taylor with a modern-day mindset would not be fair to the work they performed. An entire century of additional information, research, and published views are available to students today that were not available at the time of the Hawthorne studies.

All research is fair game to scrutiny, but this should not be the primary focus of the Western Electric experiments. As a matter of respect, any professional manager or student seeking to benefit from the studies performed in this industrial Chicago neighborhood should recognize critical thinking and the ground-breaking progress that these researchers achieved. During a decade of prosperity like the 1920s, it was certainly not common for a blue-collar facility to join forces with Professors of Ivy League colleges to launch and sustain a performance study spanning several years. The interview program specifically was especially progressive. If one major drawback does exist, it would be the fact that so much of the additional data produced was not recorded or preserved.

The structural design of the Hawthorne studies is easy to overlook but should not be forgotten for the creative use of multiple research styles in a real-world venue. Combining both observational trials and an interview program preserved the realism of the experiment while generating contemporary feedback from the test subjects. In addition to quantitative and qualitative data, the researchers also collected medical data in certain scenarios including blood pressure and heart rate/pulse readings (Ionescu & Negrusa, 2013). These medical screenings were by no means new at the time of the studies; however, blood pressure specifically had only

been taken non-invasively since 1855 (Rader & Victor, 2017). On so many levels, the Western Electric experiment was the foundation of behavioral study.

Despite the social and societal importance of these findings, detractors argue that the Hawthorne effect is entirely fictitious. A sensitive accusation could be made that the Hawthorne effect can never be discernibly proven from the original data; however, this does not disprove the possibility of the theory itself. Most researchers would likely agree that human beings are both social and reactionary creatures. People will respond to changes in their environment whether they have been selected to participate in an academic study or not (Wickstrom & Bendix, Pg. 366, 2000). Regardless of some fair criticism, the Hawthorn effect continues to be the suspected culprit for sudden situational changes when the recent addition of observation or attention is present. Thus, the Hawthorne effect is the leading candidate to explain the national shift of opinion when it comes to honoring Confederate leaders.

### **Bases with Confederate names and how the Hawthorne effect influenced why these names were chosen**

In early 2021, the U.S. Army officially began a three-year transformation to eliminate the designation on any base or outpost that honors an individual who volunteered to serve the Confederate States of America. Well over a century has passed since the first installations were christened with the names of former CSA generals and 59 years has currently passed since the Civil Rights Act was signed in 1964. Why all of a sudden, the nation decided has that time has come for this correction? A thinking person must conclude one of two possibilities.

One potential course of action unfolding would be an overwhelming majority of American citizens sincerely believing it was wrong to pay homage to the leaders of a former enemy and the bases in question need to be updated accordingly. The second pathway has a

much darker undertone. Social justice has been at the forefront of the American consciousness for several years now. A sensible argument could be made that an unknown percentage of the population are only supporting the removal Confederate titles because the entire nation is being closely observed with respect to the issue of racism. As the Hawthorne effect suggests, the variables are irrelevant. Behavior will improve simply with the added awareness that intense scrutiny is occurring. A divided country is torn between ending the veneration of a violent rebellion and the accusation that history is being erased.

The decided upon three-year revision plan has been fully authorized by Army Chief of Staff General James McConville with a long-term goal to prioritize fairness and unification. To support his vision, General McConville stated “at the end of the day, what we want to do—at least as the leadership in the Army—is to identify those things that may divide us and take a look and come up with solutions that bring us together and make us more of a cohesive team (Cox, 2020).” A three-year window to complete this project may seem like a generous timeline; however, the process of suggesting, debating, and finalizing new names for each necessary post will be a substantial mission.

It may surprise younger Americans, but twelve current domestic military locations were dedicated to Confederate generals. Nine posts function as active-duty Army posts and an additional three are operated by individual states with the National Guard. An interesting question is whether the National Guard posts will be renamed as they may ultimately fall outside Department of Defense jurisdiction at the federal level (Garamone, 2023).

Beginning with National Guard installations, Camp Beauregard in Pineville, Louisiana was christened in 1917 for Louisiana native General Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard (Wellford, 2021). Gen Beauregard is best known for his contributions to the Confederate victory

at the Battle of Manassas (or Bull Run) in 1861 and this location served as a training depot for raw recruits during the First World War. Camp Beauregard is a bit of a gray area as the installation has shifted between Louisiana-state control and Active Army (or federal) control based on the needs of the nation.

Camp Pendleton, located close to Virginia Beach is also a National Guard training center that is named for Brigadier General William Pendleton who graduated from West Point in 1830 and would later serve as an Episcopal priest (Carmichael, 2021). This site originated as a 400-acre weapons range in 1912 for the “Virginia Volunteers” who would become the Virginia National Guard in 1916. Camp Maxey, located in northeast Texas near the Oklahoma border opened in 1942 hosting prisoners of war (Holland, 2018). The installation was renovated after World War II and today is used for Texas National Guard training. Samuel Bell Maxey graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1846 but left military life shortly after in 1849 to practice law. Like so many others, the onset of the Civil War drew now Brigadier General Maxey back in to service. Samuel Maxey was elected a Texas Senator after the war and passed away in 1874. Time will tell if these three training camps will follow in the footsteps of the remaining nine federal installations.

Any service member of the United States Army, past or present, that served in a combat arms military occupational specialty (MOS) is familiar with Fort Benning, Georgia. Located near Columbus, this outpost was originally known as Camp Benning when it first began operations in 1918 (Diamond, 2003). Today all Army soldiers who choose career paths of infantry, cavalry, or armor begin their journeys here. At the outbreak of the Civil War, Henry Lewis Benning turned down a Confederate government cabinet appointment and opted to recruit and finance his own

regiment instead. This installation named in honor of Brigadier General Benning became a permanent fixture in 1922 and was retitled Fort Benning.

“Home of the Airborne” or Fort Bragg, North Carolina was named in honor of Braxton Bragg who served in both the Seminole War and Mexican American War upon graduating from the United States Military Academy at West Point (Shaeffer, 2016). After a brief retirement on his Louisiana plantation, the local militia member would join the Confederate Army as a brevet Lieutenant Colonel before ending his military career as a four-star general upon the end of the Civil War. Camp Bragg opened as a World War I recruit depot on September 4<sup>th</sup>, 1918 before officially being designated a full-time installation and Fort Bragg on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 1922 (Shaeffer, 2016).

Strategically located near Grovetown on the outskirts of Augusta in north-east Georgia, Fort Gordon is named after a man with a long resume. John Brown Gordon initially served as the company commander of an infantry regiment in the Confederate Army before retiring a Lieutenant General and then serving in the United States Senate as well as being elected the 53<sup>rd</sup> governor of Georgia (Groce, 2004). Thirteen years after his death in 1917, Camp Gordon opened for operations and served initially as a training camp during World War I for the 82<sup>nd</sup> Division. Fort Gordon became a permanent base in 1941 and today is home to the training location for the U.S. Army Signal and Cyberwarfare Corps (Groce, 2004).

Not uncommon for distinguished men at the time, Fort A.P. Hill was named for a man who was known for the initials of an abbreviated first and middle name. Ambrose Powell Hill needed five years to complete his education at the United States Military Academy instead of the traditional four-year tenure and graduated in 1847. Nevertheless, A.P. Hill served as an infantry lieutenant in the Union Army before migrating as a Colonel in the new Confederate Army.

Eventually rising to the rank of Lieutenant General, A.P Hill was killed in action by a Union soldier a mere seven days before the Army of Northern Virginia officially surrendered at Appomattox Courthouse (Power, 2021). Fort A.P. Hill opened for operations just south of the Potomac River in 1941.

John Bell Hood graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1853 and served in the Union Army until the outbreak of the Civil War. Upon his resignation, (now Confederate) General Hood commanded the Texas Brigade and suffered what doctors at the time suspected would be a mortal wound at the Battle of Gettysburg (Cutrer, 2018). Not so easily defeated, Lieutenant General Hood would survive and later receive another wound during the Battle of Chickamauga causing the amputation of a leg. He wouldn't ultimately meet his end until 1879. Fort Hood was opened for Operations in 1942 near the small town of Killeen (halfway between Austin and Waco) and today the massive installation serves as the only domestic location capable of sustaining two armored divisions.

Located south of Richmond and west of Virginia Beach, Fort Lee was installed in 1917 and named for the Commander of the Army of Northern Virginia during the Civil War. Robert Edward "Bobby" Lee graduated second in his class from the West Point in 1829 serving as a career artillery officer before turning down the command of the Union Army in favor of the Confederate cause (Blount, 2003). General Lee would not live many years beyond his April 9<sup>th</sup>, 1865 surrender, passing away at the age of 63 in 1870. Today home to the Army ordinance and logistics headquarters, Fort Lee was one of many outposts key to resource organization during World War I. Robert E. Lee is a controversial figure for contemporary soldiers and political scientists as a man who chose to betray the Union and fight for the Confederacy despite devoutly disapproving of both slavery and succession (Blount, 2003).

A later addition than the World War One training posts, Fort Pickett located near Blackstone in southern Virginia opened for operations in 1942. This base was named in honor of George Pickett who attained the rank of Captain in the Union army before eventually rising to a Major General while serving with the Confederates. George Pickett achieved considerable success despite holding the dubious honor of graduating the very last in his class from West Point in 1846 (Vrabel, 2023). Along with operating as an active-duty Army post, Fort Pickett is also home to the headquarters of the Virginia National Guard and one of the larger installations on the east coast.

The rural expanse of central Louisiana (near Leesville) became the setting for Fort Polk in 1941. Twenty years later in the 1960s when an armed conflict in Vietnam seemed imminent, the climate and geography presented a perfect opportunity to emulate the jungles of Southeast Asia. A century earlier, Leonidas Polk graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1827 and served as a military officer for a time before deciding he was meant for something else (Anthony & Brady, 1861). After leaving the Army, Polk went back to further his education at seminary and eventually became the Bishop of Louisiana. When war erupted between the northern and southern states, Leonidas Polk volunteered to serve for the Confederacy swiftly rising to the rank of Lieutenant General. Lt. General Polk was killed in action during the Battle of Pine Mountain in Georgia on June 14<sup>th</sup>, 1864.

Unlike the other Confederate leaders which installations are now named, Edmund Rucker did not attend West Point or spend years as a career soldier before the Civil War. As the war commenced, Rucker enlisted as a lowly private in the Confederate army and used his skills and talent to achieve a meteoric rise. Colonel Rucker would eventually be wounded in action and taken prisoner, spending the later months of the war in an Ohio P.O.W. camp (Williams &

Napier, 2009). Camp Rucker was established in Alabama in 1942 in order to support the World War II effort. In 1955, the Department of Defense decided to transfer the Army Aviation Center from Fort Sill in Oklahoma to Camp Rucker and Fort Rucker was born on October 13<sup>th</sup>. To this day, Army pilots hone their skills at Fort Rucker.

Whether or not the names of these installations will be changed is no longer up for debate. The leaders at the Department of Defense have finalized and delivered a deadline for this challenge to be completed. While the decision has been made, this does not mean the conclusion has (or ever will be) met with universal agreement. While he was in office, President Trump stood firmly against the idea by declaring, “The United States of America trained and deployed our HEROES on these hallowed grounds and won two World Wars. Therefore, my administration will not even consider the renaming of these magnificent and fabled military installations. Our history as the greatest nation in the World will not be tampered with. Respect our military (Shane & Rempfer, 2022)!” Dismissing the concerns of the 45<sup>th</sup> President and many tens of millions of his supporters as racist would be lazy and dishonest. To get a better understanding of the issue, it is important to dissect what contemporary racism means and how viewpoints in the United States are changing.

### **How cultural attitudes have changed dramatically in a short period of time**

Discrimination and prejudice will never be irradiated entirely; however, changing norms and legislation such as the Civil Rights Act have rendered these immoral actions now illegal (Schuman et al., 1997). With nearly six decades of legislative progress engineering consistent change in social customs, the issue of lingering discrimination in American society is a concerning question. One possible explanation would be the practice and application of racism in the United States has evolved with the nineteenth, twentieth, and now twenty-first centuries.

While bigotry and prejudice are no longer socially acceptable in the mainstream, these actions and expressions still undoubtedly exist in quieter and indirect ways (Sears et al., 1997).

Unfortunately, the consequences of racism do not depend on the delivery method. A limitation of academic and financial prospects is just as momentous and sinister to the human beings affected (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998).

In regard to the Hawthorne effect and the sudden reversal of Confederate-named military installations, the rejection of racism is either sincere or aversive in nature. One option cannot be assumed for the entire population shift, so a combination of the two is a reasonable deduction. The core question of the greater issue being, what percentage of the masses genuinely believe in removing the names of Confederate leaders from present-day Army bases due to the harmful effects caused by recognition and what percentage support the amendments due to the ever-increasing attention of changing cultural norms?

The awareness of aversive racism would demonstrate a belief among some modern Americans to adamantly espouse equality of all forms while committing actions that might not always coalesce this belief (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). Supporting egalitarian social principles for a society is critical to uphold a public reputation, but this does not reverse the past or prevent future impediments for ethnic groups that have been underprivileged. Experiencing an inconsistency between outward expressions and internal feelings is as true today for modern Americans as their ancestors when the Civil War was being fought. As opposed to a well-established convention of studying discrimination outside of societal customs, the sanguinary racism outline would advise the possibility of developing destructive beliefs from any prejudices that exist in the realm of ordinary common facets (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). All underlying issues aside, the custom of promoting equality of social, ethnic, and religious classes

has made consistent progress in the United States on a longitudinal timescale but the work is far from complete (Kluegel & Smith, 1986).

The United States Army does not take policy or tradition lightly and changing any form of custom in an organization as long-standing as the United States Army takes a considerable effort. To get a better understanding of what a monumental decision it is to remove the names of Confederate leaders from modern military installations, it is important to understand the symbolism and message of Confederate iconography. On Christmas Eve in 1860, the state of South Carolina became the first to officially declare succession with the following affirmation, “*A geographical line has been drawn across the Union, and all the States north of that line have united in the election of a man to the high office of President of the United States, whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery.*”

The media in this country has always dictated a continuously evolving narrative to the population. The delivery method has certainly changed over the past two centuries, but the theory and practice are almost identical. Newspapers from the nineteenth century carried over to radio broadcasts in the twentieth century and now the twenty-first century is dominated by online social media. The United States is in a digital age when it comes to the transfer of information. According to the Pew Research Center, “More than eight-in-ten U.S. adults (86%) say they get news from a smartphone, computer or tablet “often” or “sometimes,” including 60% who say they do so often (Shearer, 2021).” Modern sources of information often employ a recognizable character (human or otherwise) to grab attention and assert credibility. Similarly, the political realm of broadcasting typically installs an attractive, well-spoken, and charming figurehead appealing to the desired audience.

During the sixty-year window from the surrender at Appomattox Courthouse until the victory of World War I, the American news media was a stark contrast from the current climate. Broadcasting at the national level didn't really exist the way media conglomerates operate today. Newspapers, literary journals, and early radio programs were largely isolated to individual metropolitan areas (Chapman, 2019). Sports updates, stock market trends, and agricultural stories dominated in place of modern celebrity gossip. As a consequence, the circulation of current events and the angle of which the news was portrayed depended entirely on the geographical location. Even with something as commonplace today as advertising, finding a specified professional service such as a medical provider or a general store required passing by the physical building to see a display sign.

A military installation is by no means the same as a typical public space that a monument might be erected on; however, these locations are often some of the most visible and well-known features in a geographical area. The time in American history during the early twentieth century when these military posts were named coincided with a strong lingering feeling about the decades-old conflict. Applying the name of a former Confederate leader to newly constructed critical infrastructure of any kind was not uncommon. Organic structures such as lakes, rivers, and mountains as well as non-organic structures such as roads, highways, bridges, schools, public parks, and entire cities or counties were christened with the names of former Confederate Generals. The Confederate battle flag was flown on the Capitol building in South Carolina underneath the American flag and the state flag until July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015, when then-governor Nikki Haley signed a removal order (Holpuch, 2017).

During the reconstruction period of the post-Civil War era (roughly 1870 – 1920), the American media played a significant role in the strenuous effort of constructing Confederate

monuments, Confederate naming conventions, the rise of the Ku Klux Klan, Confederate veteran fraternities, and the widespread presence of the Confederate battle flag. The Hawthorne effect was ironically occurring for a nation still deeply divided in the early twentieth century in regard to racial equality and civil rights. The population in both southern and northern states were very much aware that systemic racism was occurring, even if they didn't practice prejudice themselves. Visibility and public acceptance were fueled in part by and also accelerated by the May 18<sup>th</sup>, 1896 Supreme Court decision *Plessy v. Ferguson* where justices ruled seven to one that racial segregation under the "separate but equal" doctrine DID NOT violate the fourteenth amendment guaranteeing equal protection (Duignan, 2023). The "Jim Crow" era had officially begun despite all the evidence supporting the undeniable reality that facilities and services for African-Americans were far inferior to those for white Americans (Urofsky, 2023). As sinister as the previously stated circumstances are, they do not include the ultimate reason why the memory of the Confederacy is being removed from military installations.

According to The Tuskegee Institute, "the lynchings of 3,446 blacks and the lynchings of 1,297 whites, all of which occurred between 1882 and 1968, with the peak occurring in the 1890s, at a time of economic stress in the South and increasing political suppression of blacks (Lartey & Morris, 2021)." The Encyclopedia Britannica defines lynching as "a form of violence in which a mob, under the pretext of administering justice without trial, executes a presumed offender, often after inflicting torture and corporal mutilation (Abbott, 2023)." Supporters of removing Confederate monuments and removing the names of Confederate leaders from modern public structures argue that healing cannot truly begin until these constant reminders of the darkest transgressions of American history are eliminated. Detractors will contend however, that Confederate icons are not the perversion of violence and racism but

symbols of Southern heritage and pride. This implores the question, should past culture be left in the past?

As more time passes, the argument of Southern pride and heritage gets increasingly difficult to separate from treasonous secession and systemic racism. In the simplest terms, *heritage* represents something handed down from one generation to the next. Far from relating geography or nationalism, heritage could be transcended from the first member(s) of a movement, a school at any level, recreational clubs or sports teams, holidays and calendar traditions, judicial and governmental systems, spoken and written languages, music, food, and a general attitude toward life. Ending certain traditions or retiring aspects of a culture does not mean the heritage in question is erased altogether.

Time and time again throughout history, certain facets of a culture were removed from public life and bestowed to the pages of history books. South Carolina for example, determined in 2015 that the Confederate battle flag belonged in a museum, not on the Capitol building. In the spirit of the Hawthorne effect, the South Carolina state government decided to remove this Confederate symbol twenty-two days after a racially motivated mass shooting at a Charleston, South Carolina church (Holpuch, 2017). A decision that was deemed controversial at the time was made to remove a cultural icon from a government building immediately after an unimaginable tragedy where the state was placed under a national and even global microscope. No sensible person could argue this removal would have taken place if the state was not being observed on a massive scale. The natural course of any heritage would include the choice not to hand down certain features to future generations.

The United States of America has come a long way in two-hundred and forty-six years. Despite a rigorous and diverse culture, the languages and traditions of the Native American

people are rarely if ever taught to modern Americans. Likewise, the first forms of government that controlled the North American continent after Europeans arrived were quickly abandoned. The institution of English, French, and Spanish monarchy were replaced with representative American democracy. Later on, the manufacturing-based economy of the northern states and agriculture-based economies of the southern states evolved into a blended economy with a strong social safety net (Arrington, 2017). Any society will periodically re-evaluate its principles with the knowledge and truth they desire to preserve and anything that may be in need of retiring.

The Cambridge English dictionary defines *culture* as “the way of life, especially the general customs and beliefs, of a particular group of people at a particular time.” Culture often acts a blueprint or guidebook for acceptable social norms in a society such as public demeanor, dress codes (legal and unspoken), and general interactions between citizens. As similar as they may sound, heritage and culture do not evolve at the same pace in a collective population. A culture will likely change significantly in a shorter timeline than an entire heritage; however, the cultural changes will influence the aspects of a civilization that are retained by future generations and what is moved to history books.

The land area south of the Mason-Dixon Line on the North American continent has a record of human habitation that considerably predates the arrival of Europeans by thousands of years. 1619 is frequently described as the year that between twenty and thirty enslaved Africans first landed on the Virginia coast, yet historical evidence suggests this is not entirely accurate. Oral traditions support the theory that enslaved Africans were present in 1586 when Sir Francis Drake arrived on Roanoke Island (Guasco, 2017). Decades before this occurrence, Spanish sources report that enslaved Africans were included in a 1526 expedition to modern-day South Carolina in order to institute an outpost (Guasco, 2017). Using the later example, four-hundred

and ninety-seven years of history have elapsed since African slaves first set foot on land that would eventually become the southern United States. The Confederate States of America and in turn, the American Civil War were defeated and concluded in less than four years. With close to five-hundred years of history across the southern United States, the obsession of commemorating less than one percent of this time with Confederate names and monuments is perplexing.

The northern states and southern states contrasted significantly in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. Slavery was only one of a number of issues that modern historians argue created the inevitability of an American Civil War. The Founding Fathers knew very well at the time that the nation as a whole was far from a united belief in favor or against slavery, and thus the issue was absent from the language in the Declaration of Independence. While the aforementioned document deliberately did not unshackle slaves, the United States Constitution would conversely endorse slavery without utilizing the actual term. Ratified in 1788, Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution declares, “Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons” and with the *Three-Fifths Clause* white supremacy officially became doctrine.

War is a prominent feature in the history and culture of every nation, past and present. Dating back thousands of years to antiquity, societies would erect monuments in public view and dedicate public infrastructure to the leaders of previous armed conflicts. These gestures are intended now just the same as B.C.E. (before the Common Era) make sure contemporary citizens never forget the men and women who came before them that were willing to make the ultimate sacrifice. “*History is written by the victors.*” While this quote is often ascribed to famous World

War II era British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, nearly identical versions of this assertion had been recorded long before Churchill. The earliest documented occurrence of this observation can be traced to the 1746 Scottish Battle of Culloden and rival clan leaders debating the total number of casualties, “it is the victor who writes the history and counts the dead (Butler, pg. 6, 1889).” The aftermath of the American Civil War is a rare occasion that seems to challenge this conventional wisdom.

Honoring the leaders and fallen warriors of an enemy would not be an uncommon practice upon the end of a war. For example, Islamic crusaders attacked Spanish territories in 711 A.D. and today statues have been erected of the Muslim leaders Almanzor and Abd-al-Rahman-I (Muneeb & Alkhateeb, 2022). The Chattanooga National Cemetery has hosted a monument installed by members of the German government (i.e., Nazi party) on a diplomatic mission in 1935, as a remembrance of German soldiers that did not survive prisoner of war camps in the United States during the First World War (Jackson, 2018). In 1921, the United States presented England with a large statue of George Washington, the man who commanded American forces and eventually defeated the British during the American war for independence. This symbol of unity has been firmly planted outside the National Gallery at 44 Trafalgar Sq, London. A case for the Hawthorne effect could be made in each of these examples. A considerable number of German immigrants settled in Tennessee and approving a World War I memorial for German soldiers would create a powerful political ally for future elections (Rust & Lester, 2018). The whole world world have been observing two former bitter rivals like England and the United States standing in solidarity with a monument after fighting as allies in a global conflict. Leaders had strong incentives to make these decisions while under intense scrutiny.

While these may be instances of respect among former enemies, not all adversaries have been so quick to forgive and forget.

Tennessee may have been eager to establish ambassadorial ties to Nazi Germany prior to World War II, but the allied countries have not been welcoming to public displays of remembrance to the Third Reich in the aftermath. Deep animosity exists to this day between some aspects of Russian and German culture. France and The United Kingdom have justifiably made no effort to memorialize Nazi soldiers or the cause they fought for. Within the borders of Poland and modern Germany itself, the only historic symbols of the Third Reich are former concentration camps (i.e. extermination camps) which nearly all German children visit as part of their elementary education (Pastor, 2018).

Conversely the southern States of American largely follow this pattern as well. Not many public schools or courthouses in modern day Georgia bear the name of General William T. Sherman after his 1864 “march to the sea” that laid waste to the entire state with a scorched earth policy (Bailey, 2002). Interestingly the most famous traitor in American history, Benedict Arnold is memorialized in New York but not in the way he may have hoped. The “boot memorial” in Stillwater, New York pays homage to the wound that Major General Arnold received at the Battle of Saratoga with a simple concrete block of a lower leg. After his defection to the British, legend has it that a captured American soldier in a prisoner of war camp allegedly assured Benedict Arnold, “the leg wounded while fighting for America would be honored while the rest of him would simply be hung (Grundhauser, 2023).” Not only is the Saratoga National Park not honoring America’s first traitor, but the boot monument openly mocks Benedict Arnold being wounded in action. These examples make the continued obsession by certain Americans to romanticize the Confederacy all the more mystifying.

**Is the change in public opinion sincere or has the nation adjusted the overall sentiment because of increased public attention and scrutiny? (e.g., The Hawthorne-Effect)**

Perception is everything. Information of any kind is viewable and transmissible nearly on demand to almost every citizen in 2023 America. In the years that immediately followed the Civil War however, broadcasting and media sources was much more limited. When defiant members of the reconstituted Southern states wanted to proclaim their unrepentant dedication to succession and racial intolerance, the construction of monuments and the application of naming conventions were simple and effective methods. In the eyes of the defeated Rebels, the battle of states' rights was far from over and the local Southern customs would always supersede any mandate handed down from Washington D.C. African-Americans were no longer literal slaves, yet honoring former Confederate Generals by naming new military posts after them would serve to remind newly freed slaves they were still far from equal in their new home country.

The Civil War may go down as the most polarizing event in the history of the United States. In the aftermath and all throughout reconstruction, the entire nation and the world at large were eagerly paying attention to the next key decisions made by national leaders. It would be impossible to prove one way or the other whether the Hawthorne effect influenced these resolutions; however, the newly unified Union was certainly under keen observation. On March 1<sup>st</sup>, 1875, President Ulysses S. Grant signed the Civil Rights Act of 1875 into law as the final major initiative of reconstruction. This legislation “guaranteed all citizens, regardless of color, access to accommodations, theatres, public schools, churches, and cemeteries (Urofsky, 2023).” Although this law only provided the most basic civil liberties to African Americans, the ideas were still revolutionary at the time. Realistic bystanders understood that the Civil Rights Act of

1875 was unlikely to sway a significant percentage of public opinion in support of racial equality and the law itself would not go unchallenged.

A flurry of lawsuits quickly followed and on October 15<sup>th</sup>, 1883, the United States Supreme Court struck down the Civil Rights Act of 1875 in an 8-1 decision with Justice John Marshall Harlan being the lone dissenting voice (Bradley, 2022). The Court's opinion cemented the legal precedent that the Fourteenth Amendment and equal protections therein, only protected American citizens from discrimination at the state level. The highest court in the country effectively legalized prejudice against private citizens with lower-level state courts the only avenue for challenges. More than eighty years would pass before lawmakers at the federal level would revisit the issue of civil rights, re-litigating a near identical struggle in 1964. During this time, their former Confederate territory largely continued a campaign of honoring their former leaders.

The legitimacy of monuments in public places and naming publicly funded locations after leaders of the past is a sensible question. Claims of treason against the Union and branding members of the Confederacy as "traitors" is one of the most serious accusations that can be made against an individual. The federal crime of "treason" in the United States is seriously misunderstood due to popular culture. According to Title 18 U.S. Code § 2381, treason is defined as *"levying war against the United States, or adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."* As frequently as the accusation is modernly projected in media sources during the national discussion, a citizen being charged with treason is incredibly rare. Only forty cases of treason have ever been prosecuted since the inception of the United States resulting in only thirteen convictions and only three citizens have been executed for this charge to date (Gorin & Eisner, 2023). Since the beginning of the rebellion, defenders have claimed the war effort of

Confederate states was justified in the defense of the Southern way of life. The Hawthorne effect of increased attention to the issue would explain the abrupt shift in acceptance of Confederate battle flags and other Confederate symbols in the twenty-first century.

As recently as 2015, a senior spokesman for the United States Army defended the names of Confederate soldiers on American military installations and the argument made should not be immediately dismissed. According to Brig. General Malcom Frost, “Every Army installation is named for a soldier who holds a place in our military history. Accordingly, these historic names represent individuals, not causes or ideologies. It should be noted that the naming occurred in the spirit of reconciliation, not division (Vanden Brook, 2015).” For the general public, the recent practice of rechristening taxpayer funded infrastructure that had been honoring Confederate generals and politicians serves as a healing process to acknowledge and correct decades of racial injustice. The United States Army and the civilian world have been on different paths in regard to this issue.

Unity and tradition are aspects of military life that are critical to mission success. Any decision that could potentially sow division or alter the standard operating procedure for the current generation will be met with hesitation. In 2017, a high-ranking member of the United States Army expressed concern of removing the names of Confederate leaders in written correspondence to a political colleague. This communication argued, “doing so would itself be “controversial and divisive” since “the great generals of the Civil War, Union and Confederate, [were] an inextricable part of our military history (Szoldra, 2021).” An honest observation would recognize the verdict to commemorate new Army bases after Confederate generals was made with the objective to advance a specific agenda. Regardless of the true intentions on either side

of the dispute, national politicians and the general public may not always consider the men and women who have been directly affected by Confederate names on bases.

The United States Army active component demographics report concluded 93,987 African-American soldiers currently serving on active duty, or 20.2% of the entire branch (Army DCS, G1 DAPE-PRS). For an African-American service member stationed at one of the Army posts in question, every sight and mention of the base name would be a reminder of the men who betrayed the United States and fought to keep their ancestors enslaved. The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Mark A. Milley described the situation as such, “The American Civil War was fought, and it was an act of rebellion. It was an act of treason at the time against the Union. Against the stars and stripes. Against the U.S. Constitution. And those officers turned their backs on their oath. Now some have a different view of that. Some think its heritage. Others think its hate (Szoldra, 2021).”

During this narrow period of several decades in the early twentieth century when the United States military was forced to prepare for two separate global conflicts, the Army applied a great deal of caution in naming the numerous training posts that sprang up around the country. In line with the residual Hawthorne effect, the military leaders at the time considered names for the new bases that would inspire local pride in the residents they needed to recruit for the immense war effort. The strategy was incredibly effective. On April 6<sup>th</sup>, 1917, the United States declared war on Germany with a standing army of 127,500 soldiers (Garamone, 2017). Within eighteen months, the number of uniformed soldiers ready for combat had soared to over four million at a cost of \$3 billion which was an astronomical sum at the time (Garamone, 2017). The construction of a new military facility will draw the attention of any community population and the leaders in charge are well aware that every decision they make is being closely perceived.

Keeping this fact in mind from a modern perspective, the application of former Confederate names to new Army bases in early twentieth century southern states would not have been irrational for the time. As such, the history and process of expanding new Army training facilities is worth exploring.

From the inception of the United States in the late eighteenth century, regional army officers had the authorization to decide the official name for the training camps and military forts they utilized (Seidule, 2020). The federal government took this largely hands-off strategy and delegated the naming authority to the individuals entrusted to command the armed forces themselves. The national politicians at the time may have had numerous intentions implementing this policy but the simplest explanation would be the bases were much less permanent than in modern times and no citizens outside the geographical area would be very interested in the name of a military post. This policy was transformed in 1878 when higher-ranking commanders from the United States War Department (future Department of Defense) would supervise the naming conventions of military posts as part of a national strategy to “secure uniformity” (Szoldra, 2021). In the direct aftermath of the Civil War, American leaders may have foreseen this very issue still being rectified today.

Curiously from the reconstruction era up to 1917, the United States Army did not use the name of any former Confederates to designate a base or training camp. The American involvement in World War I or “The Great War” as it was known at the time occurred shortly after the release of a movie that would transform the country. When it was released, *Birth of a Nation* retold history in a manner that resulted with an energetic return of the Ku Klux Klan (Powell, 2014). With a racist fraternity operating openly and unafraid all over the southern United States, political and military leaders needed to implement unique strategies depending on

the audience to get the desired result. In the early of summer of 1917, the twenty-fifth President of the United States was making the case for America to enter the global conflict. Woodrow Wilson would publicly declare in regard to the Civil War that “heroic things were done on both sides” soliciting hundreds of Confederate combat veterans present for this speech to respond with thunderous applause (Powell, 2014). The aim of national reunification was suddenly shifted in the presence of a new common enemy.

The responsibility for drafting a new policy regarding the naming convention for a substantial number of new training camps fell on Brig. General Joseph Kuhn, General Staff, Chief of War College, Division Assistant to the Chief of Staff (Patterson, 2023). Published on July 16<sup>th</sup>, 1917, General Kuhn drafted and released a one-page official Memorandum for The Chief of Staff titled *Names for cantonment, National Army, and camps, National Guard*. Under Paragraph 2, Subsection C, the memo directed that “The name for each camp should be that of some man from the State or States from which troops at the camp are organized” and Subsection D follows with “care has been taken to select a name not unpopular in the vicinity of the camp (Garamone, 2017).” As many bases and training camps that would receive names from Confederate leaders, not every idea submitted in southern states was accepted.

With the resurgence of not only national but also southern pride at the onset of World War I, it may come as a surprise that only four of the initial nineteen training camps in the American south were named for former Confederate leaders (Searles, 2022). Furthermore, only three of the names would survive on United States Army posts into the modern era. These four names included General and future Georgia Governor John Brown Gordon; Robert E. Lee, who turned down an offer to command the Army of the Potomac in favor of commanding the Army of Northern Virginia; Pierre Beauregard, the man who lit the spark by commanding the attack of

Fort Sumter in 1861; and the much less-known Joseph Wheeler who would continue military service after the collapse of the Confederacy by serving all the way through the Spanish-American War (Szoldra, 2021). The names initially rejected by Brig. General Kuhn and his commission were just as interesting.

James Ewell Brown “Jeb” Stuart is arguably the most brilliant cavalry officer to serve the United States or the Confederate States of America. His expertise in reconnaissance and the seemingly effortless ability to move in Union territory undetected earned the moniker “General Lee’s eyes and ears” (Booker, 2017). Major General Jeb Stuart would not survive the Civil War, receiving a mortal wound at the Battle of Yellow Tavern and succumbing to his injuries a few days later on May 12<sup>th</sup>, 1864 (Booker, 2017). In an opposite turn of events, the training camp originally slated to bear the name of Major General Jeb Stuart would be declared Camp McClellan on July 18<sup>th</sup>, 1917, in honor of Union General and master military organizer George B. McClellan. This was a very interesting choice for the time considering George B. McClellan not only commanded the Union Army against the Confederates, but he was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Harney, 2019). This antithetical decision could be an argument against the Hawthorne effect because a name was chosen that not only overlooked any lingering feelings of antipathy towards a former foe but exemplified General McClellan’s ability to masterfully train raw recruits in a short amount of time (Kompier, 2006). Jeb Stuart was not the only controversial figure left out.

Naming a military installation after a war criminal would be unthinkable in modern America and would justifiably be unthinkable in almost any society. This very abomination came very close to happening in 1917 and unfortunately for the memory of the United States, this did become a reality during the preparation for World War II in 1941 (Bradley, 2018). Lieutenant

General Nathan Bedford Forest is moderately well-known for becoming a founding member of the Ku Klux Klan and the first “grand wizard”. What is less well-known about this figure is he led an assault on a rural Union outpost in Tennessee during the spring of 1864. Lt. General Forest targeted this location called Fort Pillow for two reasons: first he knew the area well from his previous career as a slave trader and second the forces occupying the fort were biracial (Carney, 2018). African American men taking up arms for the Union effort was a radical idea at the time in 1864 and would have outraged many Confederates.

On the morning of April 12<sup>th</sup>, Lt. General Forest with a force of over two-thousand soldiers surrounded and stormed Fort Pillow which at the time was occupied by less than one-thousand Union fighters (Carney, 2018). The outpost was overpowered and taken control of in a matter of minutes. On the order of their commander, the Confederate forces would immediately execute over half the Union survivors which were almost entirely African American (Carney, 2018). As soon as the word of this atrocity spread, the phrase *Remember Fort Pillow!* would be widely utilized as a new battle cry for Union soldiers for the remainder of the war. Greenville, South Carolina was the original location for a training camp dedicated to Lt. General Forest, but a decision was made that this man was too controversial to memorialize in 1917. His home state of Tennessee however, believed the fears of past war crimes were overblown and any discussion of Fort Pillow and the Ku Klux Klan associating with the man N.B. Forest were quickly dismissed (Bradley, 2018).

A total of \$36 million (1940s money) was allocated to construct a training camp encompassing seventy-eight thousand acres and Camp Forest was officially opened in March 1941. This location would see 250,000 prospective service members evaluated with pre-enlistment physical exams and later 24,000 German prisoners of war were incarcerated on the

grounds (Bradley, 2018). Operations at Camp Forest wended down significantly after D-Day in 1944 and the location was inactivated in February 1946. Today only a scattering of concrete foundations remains of a location where such a massive operation took place in preparation for a second global conflict. Most modern-day Americans would have no idea that a man who massacred hundreds of surrendering Union soldiers and later led the Ku Klux Klan was memorialized in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The leaders of 1940s Tennessee knew they were being observed by the nation and chose Lt. General Forest to enshrine their training camp and did so with pride. The surviving Confederate leaders themselves have an interesting take on this issue.

Once the Civil War had subsided and in many parts of the present-day southern United States, Robert E. Lee is revered as a brilliant leader and military strategist. While N.B. Forest epitomized the Confederacy and the rebel cause long after the conflict had ended, Bobby Lee was content to embrace a restored Union and leave the Confederacy in the past. In August of 1869, the now-retired General Lee received an invitation to appear in Lexington, Virginia to commemorate the anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg. The former Confederate commander declined the invitation stating, “I think it wiser, moreover, not to keep open the sores of war but to follow the examples of those nations who endeavored to obliterate the marks of civil strife, to commit to oblivion the feelings engendered. Very respectfully, Your obedient servant, R. E. Lee (Woodward, 2017).” Four years removed from the end of the Civil War and the former Commander of the Army of Northern Virginia publicly exercised the wisdom and refused glorify the previous insurrection. The Hawthorne effect of behavior influenced by observation would be a reasonable conclusion to explain why a century and a half would pass before the nation as a whole would recognize this wisdom.

## **Conclusion**

This Seminar Paper intended to assess the validity of the Hawthorne effect in organizational behavior and leadership impacting the shifting American attitudes regarding Confederate names being removed from modern military installations. To draw a final conclusion and assert an objective position, a specific and perceptible Hawthorne effect does not exist. What does exist are changes in behavior resulting from individuals within a control group reacting to membership in an experiment. While new patterns in conduct have been measured, the influence of motivation, circumstances, exterior surroundings, and sustained longevity cannot be firmly determined at this time. A continuation of study across as many fields as possible, the military chief among them, should be prioritized now and in the foreseeable future.

Grounded in one-hundred years of Hawthorne effect research and over one-hundred and fifty years of historical data, a definitive conclusion on the causation of the United States adjusting policy after such a long period of time remains elusive. The cumulative research suggests that Americans largely decided to reverse public displays of admiration to the Confederacy while the nation simultaneously increased the level of public scrutiny surrounding racist events in the past of the United States. At the same time, this new position of renaming certain military bases is not universally agreed upon and it would be impossible to discernibly prove the Hawthorne effect is the driving force.

From a leadership and culture of adherence perspective, the United States military does not depart from tradition easily. To any soldier who has ever volunteered to wear the Army uniform, the forts and bases where they trained and served will be among the most revered places on earth for the rest of their lives. No matter how long after the name of an Army base is changed from a former Confederate leader, the generation of past and current soldiers will

always regard the post with the name they experienced during their time serving. For a member of the infantry, Fort Benning will never be known as Fort Moore (Dickstein, 2023). The Civil War, racism, and treason have nothing to do with this sincere feeling. These men and women would have approached Fort Benning on a bus during their first day in the Army and will never forget the experience of basic combat training. While sentimental feelings and a sense of tradition should be both embraced and protected, the United States is an imperfect nation. Removing the names of treasonous rebels from present-day military installations is the latest of many corrections that America has made as a continuously evolving culture.

Timing is everything in making a determination on what impact the Hawthorne effect may have had in the overall decision to memorialize Confederate leaders and also to revoke the recognition many decades later. Any determination on this question does not need to be absolute. For example, the initial establishment of training camps in 1917 that were awarded Confederate names does not seem disingenuous. The regional military commanders at the time had no motivation other than to celebrate the history of previous leaders that were admired in the location. In a stark contrast, the decision to rename any Army fortification that bears a name from the Confederate past came directly from the highest levels of the federal government with The National Defense Authorization Act or H.R. 6395 (116) (Dickstein, 2023).

This examination has demonstrated the very likelihood that individuals in a controlled environment will change their behavior based solely on the reality that they know they are being observed. While this theory was documented to be consistent with the Hawthorne experiments at Western Electric Co. by Elton Mayo and George Pennock, the science behind this theory will never completely responsible for a sudden and dramatic change in behavior. Although the decision to rename numerous Army bases with less controversial titles, the debate over whether

the decision was justified, and the ramifications of the decision will continue for the foreseeable future. The more published research on the Hawthorne effect that becomes available, a greater focus on positive outcomes and negative consequences can steadily be achieved. Human behavior and the understanding thereof change continuously as humans continue to learn from and interact with each other. The effects of changes in these interactions should be studied just as consistently.

## References

- Abbott, G. (2023, March 5). *lynching*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*.  
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/lynching>
- Adair, J. G., Sharpe, D., & Huynh, C. L. (1989). Hawthorne control procedures in educational experiments: A reconsideration of their use and effectiveness. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(2), 215-228.
- Adler, A. (2015). *Dual Sovereignty, Due Process, and Duplicative Punishment: A New Solution to an Old Problem*. Yale Law Journal. Retrieved February 6, 2023, from <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/note/dual-sovereignty-due-process-and-duplicative-punishment-a-new-solution-to-an-old-problem>
- Akrapuna, Choi, E., Johnson, D. A., & Lopez, J. A. (2020). Encouraging multiculturalism and diversity within organizational behavior management. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 40(3-4), 186–209.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01608061.2020.1832014>
- Ambrose, S. (2002, November 1). *Founding Fathers and Slaveholders*. Smithsonian Magazine. Retrieved February 3, 2023, from <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/founding-fathers-and-slaveholders-72262393/>
- Anthony, E. & Brady, M. B. (1861) *General Leonidas Polk, Confederate States of America*. Louisiana United States of America, 1861. [New York: Edward Anthony, to 1876] [Photograph] Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/2021669718/>.

- Arrington, B. (2017, August 23). *Industry and Economy during the Civil War*. U.S. National Park Service. Retrieved April 12, 2023, from <https://www.nps.gov/articles/industry-and-economy-during-the-civil-war.htm>
- Bailey, A. J. (2002). Sherman's March to the Sea. In *New Georgia Encyclopedia*. Retrieved Sep 30, 2020, from <https://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/history-archaeology/shermans-march-to-the-sea/>
- Blount, R., Jr. (2003, July 1). *Making Sense of Robert E. Lee*. Smithsonian Magazine. Retrieved March 31, 2023, from <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/making-sense-of-robert-e-lee-85017563/>
- Bommer, W.H., Rich, G.A. and Rubin, R.S. (2005), Changing attitudes about change: longitudinal effects of transformational leader behavior on employee cynicism about organizational change. *J. Organiz. Behav.*, 26: 733-753. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.342>
- Booker, B. (2017, October 25). Virginia School Board Set To Rename J.E.B. Stuart High School. *NPR*. Retrieved May 7, 2023, from <https://www.npr.org/2017/10/25/560034586/virginia-school-board-set-to-rename-j-e-b-stuart-high-school>
- Bouchet, C., Guillemin, F., & Briançon, S. (1996). Nonspecific effects in longitudinal studies: impact on quality of life measures. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 49(1), 15-20.
- Bradley, M. (2018, March 1). *Camp Forrest*. Tennessee Encyclopedia. Retrieved May 7, 2023, from <https://tennesseeencyclopedia.net/entries/camp-forrest/>
- Bray, B. (2021, July 19). *Renaming military bases is "history correcting itself."* Center for International Maritime Security. Retrieved October 22, 2022, from <https://cimsec.org/renaming-military-bases-is-history-correcting-itself/>

- Butler, William Francis. (1889). *Charles George Gordon./ By Colonel Sir William F. Butler*. Lond: Macmillan
- Carmichael, Peter. William Nelson Pendleton (1809–1883). (2021, December 22). In *Encyclopedia Virginia*. <https://encyclopediavirginia.org/entries/pendleton-william-nelson-1809-1883>.
- Carney, C. (2018, April 11). *Remembering Fort Pillow*. We're History. Retrieved May 7, 2023, from <https://werhistory.org/remembering-fort-pillow/>
- Chapman, J. (2019). 19th-Century Journalism and Notable Journalists. *The International Encyclopedia of Journalism Studies*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118841570.iejs0149>
- Cherry, K., & Susman, D. (2022, November 29). *How Does the Hawthorne Effect Influence Productivity?* Verywell Mind. Retrieved February 27, 2023, from <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-the-hawthorne-effect-2795234>
- Chiesa, M., & Hobbs, S. (2008). Making sense of social research: How useful is the Hawthorne Effect?. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(1), 67-74.
- Cox, M. (2020, September 8). *Proposal to Rename Bases Still Under Debate in the Army*. Military.com. Retrieved March 21, 2023, from <https://www.yahoo.com/entertainment/despite-trump-statements-army-still-205045275.html>
- Cutrer, T. (2018, March 29). *Hood, John Bell*. Handbook of Texas Online. Retrieved March 31, 2023, from <https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/hood-john-bell>

Daniel, D. (2023, February 10). *Hawthorne effect*. HR Software. Retrieved February 23, 2023, from <https://www.techtarget.com/searchhrsoftware/definition/Hawthorne-effect>

Diamond, B. I. (2003). Fort Benning. In *New Georgia Encyclopedia*. Retrieved Jul 17, 2018, from <https://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/government-politics/fort-benning/>

Doe, W. W., & Foote, K. (2022, September 16). Robert E. Lee at West Point: contested landscapes and legacies of the civil war. *Geographical Review*, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00167428.2022.2118600>

Dovidio, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (1998). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The causes, consequences, and challenges of aversive racism. In J. Eberhardt & S.T.Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 3–32). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Duignan, B. (2023, March 7). *Plessy v. Ferguson*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Plessy-v-Ferguson-1896>

Evans, R., Joseph-Williams, N., Edwards, A., Newcombe, R. G., Wright, P., Kinnersley, P., Griffiths, J., Jones, M., Williams, J., Grol, R., & Elwyn, G. (2010). Supporting informed decision making for prostate specific antigen (PSA) testing on the web: an online randomized controlled trial. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 12(3), e27. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.1305>

Feil, P. H., Grauer, J. S., Gadbury-Amyot, C. C., Kula, K., & McCunniff, M. D. (2002). Intentional use of the Hawthorne effect to improve oral hygiene compliance in orthodontic patients. *Journal of dental education*, 66(10), 1129-1135.

- Fernald, D. H., Coombs, L., DeAlleaume, L., West, D., & Parnes, B. (2012). An assessment of the Hawthorne effect in practice-based research. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*, 25(1), 83-86.
- Franke, R. H. (1979). The Hawthorne Experiments: Re-View. *American Sociological Review*, 44(5), 861–867. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094534>
- French, J. R. J. (1953). Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences, eds Festinger L, Katz D.
- Gaertner, S.L., & Dovidio, J.F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J.F. Dovidio & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61–89). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gale, E. A. (2004). The Hawthorne studies—a fable for our times?. *Qjm*, 97(7), 439-449.
- Garamone, J. (2023, January 24). *Leaders Detail Future of National Guard*. U.S. Department of Defense. Retrieved March 29, 2023, from <https://www.defense.gov/News/News-Stories/Article/Article/3276423/leaders-detail-future-of-national-guard/>
- Garamone, J. (2017, April 3). *World War I: Building the American military*. www.army.mil. Retrieved May 3, 2023, from [https://www.army.mil/article/185229/world\\_war\\_i\\_building\\_the\\_american\\_military](https://www.army.mil/article/185229/world_war_i_building_the_american_military)
- Gillespie, R. *Manufacturing knowledge. a history of the Hawthorne experiments*. New York (NY): Cambridge University Press; 1991
- Gordon, J. (2022, October 5). *Organizational Behavior - Explained*. The Business Professor, LLC. Retrieved February 19, 2023,

from [https://thebusinessprofessor.com/en\\_US/management-leadership-organizational-behavior/organizational-behavior-definition](https://thebusinessprofessor.com/en_US/management-leadership-organizational-behavior/organizational-behavior-definition)

Gorin, D., & Eisner, A. (2023). *Federal Crime of Treason | 18 U.S. Code § 2381*. Eisner Gorin LLP. Retrieved May 1, 2023, from <https://www.thefederalcriminalattorneys.com/federal-treason>

Groce, W. T. (2004). John B. Gordon. In *New Georgia Encyclopedia*. Retrieved Jun 8, 2017, from <https://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/government-politics/john-b-gordon-1832-1904/>

Grundhauser, E. (2023, April 29). Boot Monument. *Atlas Obscura*. Retrieved April 29, 2023, from <https://www.atlasobscura.com/places/boot-monument>

Guasco, M. (2017, September 13). The Misguided Focus on 1619 as the Beginning of Slavery in the U.S. Damages Our Understanding of American History. *Smithsonian Magazine*. Retrieved April 14, 2023, from <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/misguided-focus-1619-beginning-slavery-us-damages-our-understanding-american-history-180964873/>

Guelzo, A. (2021, August 4). *Edmund Randolph and the Constitutional Convention of 1787*. Wondrium Daily. Retrieved February 5, 2023, from <https://www.wondriumdaily.com/edmund-randolph-and-the-virginia-convention-of-1787/>

Gupta, D. (2022, September 14). *6 types of organizational change, explained*. The Whatfix Blog | Drive Digital Adoption. <https://whatfix.com/blog/types-of-organizational-change/>

Harney, E. (2019, July 18). *On this day in Alabama history: Camp McClellan was established in east Alabama*. Alabama News Center. Retrieved May 7, 2023,

from <https://www.alabamane.wscenter.com/2019/07/18/on-this-day-in-alabama-history-camp-mcclellan-was-established-in-east-alabama/>

Hogan, R., & Warrenfeltz, R. B. (2003). Educating the Modern Manager. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2(1), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2003.9324043>

Holden, J. D. (2001). Hawthorne effects and research into professional practice. *Journal of evaluation in clinical practice*, 7(1), 65-70.

Holland, K. (2018, November 29). *CAMP MAXEY*. The Paris News. Retrieved March 31, 2023, from [https://theparisnews.com/article\\_5ed72694-3a53-54f0-8f4a-fcdeda0c549b.html](https://theparisnews.com/article_5ed72694-3a53-54f0-8f4a-fcdeda0c549b.html)

Holpuch, A. (2017, July 14). *Confederate flag removed from South Carolina capitol in victory for activists*. The Guardian. Retrieved April 10, 2023, from <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/jul/10/confederate-flag-south-carolina-statehouse>

Ionescu, G.G., & Negrusa, A.L. (2013). Elton Mayo, an Enthusiastical Managerial Philosopher. *Revista de Management Comparat International* 14(5), 671. Retrieved from <https://i57b8j.infiniteuploads.cloud/2017/05/Marshfield-Collection-triple-fold-card-002.pdf>

Jackson, D. (2018, May 25). *Monument Placed by Nazis Sits Quietly in Tennessee Cemetery*. Courthouse News Service. Retrieved April 25, 2023, from <https://www.courthousenews.com/monument-placed-by-nazis-sits-quietly-in-tennessee-cemetery/>

- Jayles, B., Kim, H-R., Escobedo, R., Cezera, S., Blanchet, A., Kameda, T., ... Theraulaz, G. (2017). How social information can improve estimation accuracy in human groups. *Proceedings of The National Academy of Sciences*, 114, 12620–12625.
- Jehanzeb, & Mohanty, J. (2020). The mediating role of organizational commitment between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: Power distance as moderator. *Personnel Review*, 49(2), 445–468. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2018-0327>
- Jones SRG. Was there a Hawthorne effect? *Am J Sociol.*1992; 98(3):451–68
- Kaufman, E., & Herb, J. (2022, March 31). *Commission will review more than 750 military signs and markers to see if they need to be renamed over Confederacy ties.* CNN. <https://edition.cnn.com/2022/03/30/politics/naming-commission-confederacy/index.html>
- Kluegel, J.R., & Smith, E.R. (1986). *Beliefs about inequality: America's views of what is and what ought to be.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Kompier M. Job design and well-being. In: Schabracq M, Winnubst J, Cooper C, editors. *Handbook work and health psychology.* Chichester (UK): Wiley; 2003:429–54
- Kompier M. A. (2006). The "Hawthorne effect" is a myth, but what keeps the story going? *Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health*, 32(5), 402–412. <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.1036>
- Kraemer, D. J. (2008). "It May Seem Strange": Strategic Exclusions in Lincoln's Second Inaugural. *Rhetoric Review*, 27(2), 165–184. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20176837>
- Kenton, W., Estevez, E., & Rohrs Schmitt, K. (2022, June 15). *Hawthorne effect definition: How it works and is it real.* Investopedia. Retrieved October 22, 2022, from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/h/hawthorne-effect.asp>

- Kopp, C., Boyle, M., & Bellucco-Chatham, A. (2022, January 3). *What is organizational behavior (ob), and why is it important?* Investopedia. Retrieved October 22, 2022, from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/o/organizational-behavior.asp>
- Kuta, S. (2022, May 26). *Nine Army Bases Honoring Confederate Leaders Could Soon Have New Names*. Smithsonian Magazine. Retrieved February 14, 2023, from <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/these-are-the-9-new-names-recommended-for-army-bases-honoring-confederate-leaders-180980160/>
- Kypri, K., Langley, J. D., Saunders, J. B., & Cashell-Smith, M. L. (2007). Assessment may conceal therapeutic benefit: findings from a randomized controlled trial for hazardous drinking. *Addiction, 102*(1), 62-70.
- Leonard, K. L. (2008). Is patient satisfaction sensitive to changes in the quality of care? An exploitation of the Hawthorne effect. *Journal of health economics, 27*(2), 444-459.
- Maury, E., Moussa, N., Lakermi, C., Barbut, F., & Offenstadt, G. (2006). Compliance of health care workers to hand hygiene: awareness of being observed is important. *Intensive care medicine, 32*, 2088-2089.
- Maze, R. (2021). The 3-year Countdown to Eliminating Confederate Names. *Army Magazine*.
- McCambridge, J., Butor-Bhavsar, K., Witton, J., & Elbourne, D. (2011). Can research assessments themselves cause bias in behaviour change trials? A systematic review of evidence from solomon 4-group studies. *PloS one, 6*(10), e25223.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0025223>

- McCambridge, J., Witton, J., & Elbourne, D. R. (2014). Systematic review of the Hawthorne effect: new concepts are needed to study research participation effects. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 67(3), 267–277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.08.015>
- McCusker, J., Karp, E., Yaffe, M. J., Cole, M., & Bellavance, F. (1996). Determining detection of depression in the elderly by primary care physicians: chart review or questionnaire. *Prim Care Psychiatry*, 2(4), 217-21.
- Muldoon, J. The Hawthorne legacy: A reassessment of the impact of the Hawthorne studies on management scholarship, 1930-1958. *Journal of Management History*, 18 (1) 2012, pp.105-119. Emerald.
- Muneeb, & Alkhateeb, F. (2022). Muslim Conquest of Spain. *IslamiCity*. <https://www.islamicity.org/11535/muslim-conquest-of-spain/>
- Murray, M., Swan, A. V., Kiryluk, S., & Clarke, G. C. (1988). The Hawthorne effect in the measurement of adolescent smoking. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, 42(3), 304–306. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.42.3.304>
- Park, C., & Jeon, J. (2020). The effect of military social responsibility perception on soldier's organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). *Journal of Advances in Military Studies*, 3(3), 133-159. <https://doi.org/10.37944/jams.v3i3.94>
- Parsons, H. M. (1974). What Happened at Hawthorne? New evidence suggests the Hawthorne effect resulted from operant reinforcement contingencies. *Science*, 183(4128), 922-932.
- Pastor, D. (2018, March 5). *Are mandatory visits to concentration camp memorials the answer?* Discover Society. Retrieved April 26, 2023,

from <https://archive.discoverysociety.org/2018/03/06/are-mandatory-visits-to-concentration-camp-memorials-the-answer/>

Patterson, M. R. (2023). Joseph Ernest Kuhn – Major General, United States Army. *Arlington National Cemetery*. <https://www.arlingtoncemetery.net/jekuhn.htm>

Powell. (2014, June). *Woodrow Wilson's Great Mistake*. CATO INSTITUTE. Retrieved May 5, 2023, from <https://www.cato.org/policy-report/may/june-2014/woodrow-wilsons-great-mistake>

Power, J. A. P. Hill (1825–1865). (2021, December 22). In *Encyclopedia Virginia*. <https://encyclopediavirginia.org/entries/hill-a-p-1825-1865>.

Pussegoda, K., Turner, L., Garritty, C. *et al.* Identifying approaches for assessing methodological and reporting quality of systematic reviews: a descriptive study. *Syst Rev* **6**, 117 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-017-0507-6>

Rader, F., & Victor, R. G. (2017). The Slow Evolution of Blood Pressure Monitoring: But Wait, Not So Fast!. *JACC. Basic to translational science*, *2*(6), 643–645. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacbts.2017.11.001>

Rice, B. The Hawthorne defect: persistence of a flawed theory. *Psychol Today*. 1982;16:70–4

Rothstein, H. (2022, October 17). *The Renaming of Military Bases - What is Past is Not Prologue*. Small Wars Journal. Retrieved January 29, 2023, from <https://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/renaming-military-bases-what-past-not-prologue>

Rubenstein, H. (2015, April 6). *The Gentleman's Agreement That Ended the Civil War*. Smithsonian Magazine. Retrieved February 3, 2023,

from <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/gentlemans-agreement-ended-civil-war-180954810/>

Rust, R., & Lester, C. (2018, March 1). *Hohenwald*. Tennessee Encyclopedia. Retrieved April 26, 2023, from <https://tennesseeencyclopedia.net/entries/hohenwald/>

Schuman, H., Steeh, C., Bobo, L., & Krysan, M. (1997). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Searles, H. (2022, April 24). *Joseph Wheeler Jr Facts, Accomplishments*. American History Central. Retrieved May 7, 2023, from <https://www.americanhistorycentral.com/entries/joseph-wheeler-jr-facts/>

Sears, D.O., van Laar, C., Carillo, M., & Kosterman, R. (1997). Is it really racism? The origin of white Americans' opposition to race-targeted policies. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 16–53.

Seidule, T. (2020, August 4). *Named for the Enemy: The US Army's Confederate Problem*. American Historical Association. Retrieved May 3, 2023, from <https://www.historians.org/research-and-publications/perspectives-on-history/summer-2020/named-for-the-enemy-the-us-armys-confederate-problem>

Shaeffer, M. (2016, March 16). *Fort Bragg*. North Carolina History Project. Retrieved March 30, 2023, from <https://northcarolinahistory.org/encyclopedia/fort-bragg/#:~:text=One%20of%20three%20training%20camps,finished%20on%20February%201%2C%201919.>

Shah, K., & Adolphe, J. (2022, February 25). *400 years since slavery: a timeline of American history*. The Guardian. Retrieved February 14, 2023, from <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2019/aug/15/400-years-since-slavery-timeline>

- Shane, L., III, & Rempfer, K. (2022, August 19). *Trump opposes changing bases named for Confederate generals*. Military Times. Retrieved April 4, 2023, from <https://www.militarytimes.com/news/pentagon-congress/2020/06/10/trump-opposes-changing-bases-named-for-confederate-generals/>
- Shearer, E. (2021, January 12). *More than eight-in-ten Americans get news from digital devices*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved April 8, 2023, from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/01/12/more-than-eight-in-ten-americans-get-news-from-digital-devices/>
- Solomon, R. L. (1949). An extension of control group design. *Psychological bulletin*, 46(2), 137–150. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0062958>
- South, J. (2022, June 3). *US moves to rename Army bases honoring Confederate generals who fought to defend slavery*. The Conversation. Retrieved October 22, 2022, from <https://theconversation.com/us-moves-to-rename-army-bases-honoring-confederate-generals-who-fought-to-defend-slavery-183862>
- Szoldra, P. (2021, March 31). The secret history of Confederate post names the Army never wanted you to see. *Task & Purpose*. Retrieved May 2, 2023, from <https://taskandpurpose.com/news/army-confederate-post-study/>
- Tang, Yam, K. C., & Koopman, J. (2020). Feeling proud but guilty? Unpacking the paradoxical nature of unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 160, 68–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.03.004>
- Tarver, E., Brock, T., & Rathburn, P. (2022, December 22). *Corporate Culture Definition, Characteristics, and Importance*. Investopedia. Retrieved February 23, 2023, from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/corporate-culture.asp>
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper and Brothers.

- Urofsky, M. I. (2023, February 22). *Civil Rights Act of 1875*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*.  
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Civil-Rights-Act-United-States-1875>
- Urofsky, M. I. (2023, March 28). *Jim Crow law*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*.  
<https://www.britannica.com/event/Jim-Crow-law>
- Urwin, G. J. W. (2021, October 22). *The Yorktown Tragedy: Washington's Slave Roundup*.  
*Journal of the American Revolution*. <https://allthingsliberty.com/2021/10/the-yorktown-tragedy-washingtons-slave-roundup/>
- Van Rooyen, S., Godlee, F., Evans, S., Smith, R., & Black, N. (1998). Effect of blinding and unmasking on the quality of peer review: a randomized trial. *Jama*, 280(3), 234-237.
- Vanden Brook, T. (2015, June 25). Guard battle streamers still honor Confederacy. *USA TODAY*. Retrieved May 1, 2023,  
 from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2015/06/24/army-national-guard-civil-war/29236277/>
- Vile, J. (2009). *Constitutional Convention of 1787*. *The First Amendment Encyclopedia*.  
 Retrieved February 5, 2023, from <https://www.mtsu.edu/first-amendment/article/1060/constitutional-convention-of-1787>
- Vrabel, M. (2023, February 15). *Virginia Guard's Fort Pickett to be Redesignated Fort Barfoot*.  
 www.army.mil. Retrieved March 30, 2023,  
 from [https://www.army.mil/article/264025/virginia\\_guards\\_fort\\_pickett\\_to\\_be\\_redesignated\\_fort\\_barfoot](https://www.army.mil/article/264025/virginia_guards_fort_pickett_to_be_redesignated_fort_barfoot)
- Ward, P. (2022, August 15). *Elton Mayo Management Theories*. NanoGlobals. Retrieved March 12, 2023, from <https://nanoglobals.com/glossary/elton-mayo-management-theories/>

- Wellford, Ann. G. T. Beauregard (1818–1893). (2021, December 22). In *Encyclopedia Virginia*. <https://encyclopediaofvirginia.org/entries/beauregard-g-t-1818-1893>.
- Whitehead, T. N.. *Volume I The Industrial Worker: A Statistical Study of Human Relations in a Group of Manual Workers, Volume I: Statistical Study of Human Relations in a Group of Manual Workers*, Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1938. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674369214>
- Wickstrom MD, Bendix T. The “Hawthorne effect”—what did the original Hawthorne studies actually show? *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2000; 26(4):363–7
- Williams, J., & Napier, J. (2009, May 22). *Fort Rucker*. Encyclopedia of Alabama. Retrieved April 3, 2023, from <http://encyclopediaofalabama.org/article/h-2165>
- Williamson, O.E. (2002): Empirical Microeconomics: Another Perspective. In Mie Augier and James March, eds. *The Economics of Choice, Change and Organization*, Brookfield, VT. Edward Elgar.
- Witzel, M. and Warner, M. Taylorism revisited: culture, management theory and paradigm shift. *Journal of General Management*, 40 (3) 2015, pp.55-69
- Woodward, C. (2017, March 1). *Family Papers*. LEE FAMILY DIGITAL ARCHIVE. Retrieved May 8, 2023, from [https://leefamilyarchive.org/9-family-papers/861-robert-e-lee-to-david-mcconaughey-1869-august-5http://www2.vcdh.virginia.edu/saxon/servlet/SaxonServlet?source=/xml\\_docs/valley\\_news/newspaper\\_catalog.xml&style=/xml\\_docs/valley\\_news/news\\_cat.xsl&level=edition&paper=rv&year=1869&month=09&day=03&edition=rv1869/va.au.rv.1869.09.03.xml#01](https://leefamilyarchive.org/9-family-papers/861-robert-e-lee-to-david-mcconaughey-1869-august-5http://www2.vcdh.virginia.edu/saxon/servlet/SaxonServlet?source=/xml_docs/valley_news/newspaper_catalog.xml&style=/xml_docs/valley_news/news_cat.xsl&level=edition&paper=rv&year=1869&month=09&day=03&edition=rv1869/va.au.rv.1869.09.03.xml#01)

Yorks L, Whitsett DA. Hawthorne, Topeka, and the issue of science versus advocacy in organizational behaviour. *Acad Manage Rev.* 1985;120:21–30

Zickar MJ. An analysis of industrial-organizational psychology's indifference to labor unions in the United States. *Hum Relat* 2004;57:145–67