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(ABSTRACT)

Bureaucracy is being seriously challenged today by other organizational designs because its rigidity is being viewed as a detriment to organizational survival in the hypercompetitive marketplace of global business. Standardization, homogeneity, and hierarchy are not conducive to meeting the changing demands of a turbulent business environment. As a result, new organization forms based on flexibility and adaptibility are gaining prominence in the business literature and in managerial practice. The purpose of this study was to provide an empirically-based examination of how employees are responding to these new organization forms. Three hypotheses were generated concerning the impact of the new organization forms on employee alienation, and the role of ideology as a moderating variable between the new organization forms and alienation. I predicted that employees working in new organization forms with an orientation toward communitarianism would be more alienated than employees who were more inclined toward the ideology of individualism. While my hypotheses were not supported, hindsight suggests an alternative hypothesis for further study: Employees with differing ideological dispositions can both prosper in the postindustrial workplace as long as elements of the traditional economic compact are in place.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

According to Peter Drucker, “Every few hundred years in Western history there occurs a sharp transformation. ... Within a few short decades, society rearranges itself--its worldview; its basic values; its social and political structure; its arts; its key institutions. ... We are currently living through such a transformation. It is creating the [post-industrial] society...” (Drucker, 1993:1). Consistent with this observation, the business literature of the 1990’s has hailed the coming of new forms of organization in this societal transformation. Terms such as the information-based organization, the shamrock organization, the self-designing organization, and the cluster organization are used interchangeably to describe new, highly flexible organizational structures in which “the company is no longer a physical entity with a stable mission or location, but a shifting set of temporary relationships” (Kuttner, 1993:1). The design and consequences of these new organization structures will be a key issue in management as we enter the twenty-first century.

As with any revolutionary shift in society, visions of the future organization run the gamut between utopia and disaster. As Benjamin Barber notes, “Those who look forward prophesize commercial and technological interdependence--a virtual paradise made possible by spreading markets and global technology--and they proclaim that everything is or soon will be different. The rival observers seem to consult different almanacs from the libraries of contrarian planets” (Barber, 1996:3). Regarding the post-industrial workplace, an overwhelming majority of business writers are embracing it as a virtual paradise (For example, Drucker, 1993; Hammer and Champy, 1993; Mills, 1991; Peters, 1987). On the other hand, a few scholars are willing “to break the silence about the dark sides of the new organization forms” (Victor and Stephens, 1994: 479).

While the proponents of the new organization forms emphasize the benefits of empowerment and teamwork, the critics see the newly designed firms as alienating and exploitive. As a result, the critics contend, the attachments and affinity to one’s company that were once considered vital to corporate success are said to be threatened (Reich, 1997; Victor and Stephens, 1994; Barber, 1996). This trend, the critics further argue, may have tremendous repercussions on the relationships between employees and their organizations.

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

There has traditionally been a social compact since World War II that involves reciprocity between management and labor (Reich, 1997). This social compact assumed cost-of-living adjustments, collectively bargained job-related benefits, seniority-based promotions and layoffs, negotiated conditions of work, grievance and arbitration procedures, on-site union representation, and input on some workplace issues (Bluestone and Bluestone, 1992). However, the restructuring of companies in the 1980’s and 1990’s has placed this long-standing compact in jeopardy and is requiring employees to compete for work in a labor market consisting of short-term appointments, vast wage dispersion and
uncertainty, and fewer benefits (Barber, 1996; Rifkin, 1995; Harrison, 1994; Harrison and Bluestone, 1988). As companies remove traditional sources of job security and economic protection, many workers believe management is treating them merely as a means to corporate success rather than as a valued member of the company (Gordon, 1996; Bluestone and Bluestone, 1992; Harrison, 1994):

The American dream, for a substantial percentage of the population, has become an illusion. The tradition of opportunity is based on the assumption of a growing economy, and its central tenet--the belief that anyone willing to work hard--often proves false...The old rules are not working: promises are broken, and the dreams of a lifetime have ended (Dudley, 1994: xxii).

As companies respond to the hypercompetitiveness of today's global marketplace, the traditional nature of work relationships changes as well. These companies are increasingly delayering the organization and forging more permeable boundaries by turning to contingency work forces, downsizing, and outsourcing (Gordon, 1996; Rifkin, 1995). In fact, corporations are rapidly separating their workforce into core and buffer workers, leading to a dualism in management and labor similar to the early Industrial era (Pfeffer and Baron, 1988; Harrison, 1994; Regini, 1987). The traditional economic social compact was based on shared purpose and reciprocal commitment, but it is difficult to keep it intact when workers feel disposable and temporary.

Evidence of the splintering of the traditional economic social compact has been very visible during the 1980's and 1990's. Robert Allen, CEO of AT&T, laid off 40,000 employees; Louis Gerstner, CEO of IBM, laid off 60,000 employees; and John McDonnell, Chairman of McDonnell Douglas, laid off 17,000 employees (Sloan, 1996). In 1998, Levi-Strauss closed eleven plants and laid off 6395 workers, but required the survivors of the downsizing to work an additional 15 hours per week to meet new production plans (DesMarteau, 1998). While newly created jobs in American industry outnumber the number of jobs lost from downsizing, the quality of the new jobs are lackluster (Church, 1996). Plus, real average weekly earnings have dropped from $298 in 1970 to $256 in 1994 (Roberts, 1996), and the situation is further aggravated by the increasing polarization between upper-management salaries and employee pay (Harrison, 1994; Gordon, 1996; Harrison and Bluestone, 1990). As a result, these economic factors became a central issue in the debate among the 1996 presidential candidates. With the increasing presence of a global market facing American business, the candidates were forced to take a stance on how they would lead the country into the next millennium. Much of what made Pat

Fran and Cook (1995) contend that the growing income inequality is due to winner-take-all markets, which are driven by intense global and domestic competition. Winner-take-all markets bid top dollar for the highest performers, even if the ability of the top performer is marginally better, and leave remaining players to divide the remaining dollars. They assert that this trend, which has been evident in sports and entertainment, is now also evident in business and the legal system.
Buchanan a favorite of many early in the race was that he focused on the concerns of the average worker (Lacayo, 1996a). Bob Dole also joined in on the debate over record corporate profits and decreasing real wages, as Republicans debated the effects of corporate America in a way they rarely do (Lacayo, 1996b). These trends alone give American workers a reason to be in a state of anxiety and confusion over what the workplace of their tomorrow holds for them (Church, 1996). As Alan Ehrenhalt (1995) observes:

In the 1950s, a whole array of social institutions still stood outside the grip of the market and provided ordinary people with a cushion against it. In the last generation, as Alan Wolfe and others have eloquently pointed out, that cushion has disappeared. The difference between the 1950s and the 1990s is to a large extent the difference between a society in which market forces challenged traditional values and a society in which they have triumphed over them...in the end there is no escaping the reality that the market today is a force for disruption of existing relationships (Ehrenhalt, 1995: 24-25).

THE ROLE OF IDEOLOGY IN THE EXAMINATION OF THE PROBLEM

“It is intuitively appealing to believe that some people, because of who they are, would be more likely to exhibit” contrary responses to the same conditions (Moorman, 1995: 128). Indeed, sociologists and psychologists, citing the individual differences hypothesis, confirm that work situations are perceived differently as a result of differences in attitudes, beliefs, norms, and values which employees have acquired previous to taking their jobs (Schein, 1965; Goldthorpe, 1966; Hulin and Blood, 1968; Hulin, 1971). Therefore, I believe that individual differences are a significant factor in differentiating employee responses to new organization forms. As the traditional social compact is broken by companies which are focusing chiefly on flexibility and short-term gain, some employees will feel more alienated than others, due to their differing perceptions of the employment relationship. The differing perceptions can be, to a great degree, predicated on the ideological orientation of each person. Shepard (1992) defines ideology as "those shared ideas, values, and beliefs that serve to define and defend the existing or envisioned structure of social relationships” (Shepard, 1992: 265). Fritzsche (1997) believes it embodies “the shared assumptions of the firm, future aspirations and ideals, current realities, and possibly rationalizations for unexplained behavior” (Fritzsche, 1997: 112). One can even think of ideology as the "hymn we sing to justify and make legitimate what we are doing…and [that helps to] translate our values into action" (Lodge, 1984). It is especially important to managers because it justifies power, roles, and behavior inside the corporation (Lodge and Vogel, 1987). Consequently, as the economic landscape changes, managers will tend to seek an ideology that will defend the practices they have utilized to remain competitive. However, conflicting ideologies often exist simultaneously inside the corporation, as some
members will agree with the managerial rhetoric and others will be disturbed (Lodge, 1984).

In this dissertation, I will explore the ideologies of individualism and communitarianism as a source of differing levels of alienation among employees working within new organization forms. The roots of these ideologies are deeply embedded in social contract theory, which justifies a state and describes the ideal relationship between a state and its citizens. The social contract, though, can exhibit fundamentally different properties that affect ideological perspectives, depending on how one views basic human nature and the state of nature. If one believes that people are naturally atomistic and that the state of nature simply concerns survival, one is more inclined to be individualistic; and, if one believes that people are naturally cooperative and that the state of nature can provide a peaceful existence, one is more likely to be communitarian. A social contract is also evident in the economic sphere, and, in a similar fashion, influences views on organizational relationships (Donaldson, 1982; Keely, 1986; Donaldson and Dunfee, 1994; Donaldson and Preston, 1995; Watson, 1996, 1997). For example, an individualist will place full responsibility on each employee to meet personal economic goals, while a communitarian will encourage cooperation that benefits all members of the corporation. It is intuitively appealing, then, that employees with differing ideological perspectives will respond differently to the short-term nature of the relationships in new organization forms.

**RESEARCH QUESTION**

Although the managerial rhetoric espousing the new organization forms emphasizes empowerment and teamwork, I will assume that the underlying management agenda rests on the expendability of workers and short-term employment relationships. This discrepancy between managerial rhetoric and underlying agenda will meet the expectations of some employees, and frustrate the expectations of others. Employee frustration is evidenced, I believe, by the hugely popular comic strip "Dilbert," in which the protagonist must constantly maneuver around the managerial doublespeak of his boss. Specifically, I predict that employees working in new organization forms with an orientation toward communitarianism will be more alienated than employees who are more inclined toward the ideology of individualism.

Support for this general hypothesis would provide two contributions to the management literature. First, significant findings would provide evidence contradicting the research literature emphasizing the benefits of the new organization forms for employees. Second, it would document a newly identified contributing source to alienation in organizations.

**PLAN OF STUDY**

The examination of the nature of the new organizational forms will begin in Chapter 2 with a literature review pertaining to the sources of their adoption and the extent to which they are being embraced. Propositions are generated
concerning the impact of the new organization forms on employee alienation, and the role of ideology as a moderating variable between the new organization forms and alienation. Chapter 3 is a discussion of the methodology I will use in examining the impact of the new organizational forms on worker alienation. Chapter 4 will provide the results of the study, and Chapter 5 will discuss the results, limitations, and implications of the study’s findings.
Bureaucracy was clearly the most common organizational structure in twentieth-century business until the 1980s—and, despite the much-vaunted emergence of the new organization forms, still is. Max Weber (1978/1910), in his historical examination of organizations over hundreds of years, observed that as the modern state became more complex the need for advanced administration grew. Bureaucracy met the needs of the production capitalist system of the industrial era by focusing on technical superiority and domination, reducing the impact of irrational, personal, and emotional elements on the decision-making process. Consistent, repetitive handling of affairs and organizational activities enabled administrative specialists to strengthen their expertise and become more productive in their activities. Other forms of organization were less unified than bureaucratic systems, and, as a result, operated more slowly and with less precision prior to the mass production era of American business. The business climate, however, has changed dramatically since Weber wrote his seminal work on organizations, and is presenting different challenges to be met by managers. The standardized production of the mass market era is giving way to short-lived, narrowly specialized products and services due to new information technologies and global competition (Reich, 1982; Culnan and Markus, 1987; Huber, 1990; Tesler, 1991).

Bureaucracy is being seriously challenged by other organizational designs because its rigidity is being viewed as a detriment to organizational survival in the hypercompetitive marketplace of global business. Standardization, homogeneity, and hierarchy are not conducive to meeting the changing demands of a turbulent business environment (Lewin and Stephens, 1993). As a result, new organizational forms based on flexibility and adaptability are gaining prominence in the business literature and in managerial practice; thus legitimizing the corporate use of processes centered on increased efficiencies, such as downsizing, outsourcing, and teamwork (Lewin and Stephens, 1993).

NATURE OF THE NEW ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS

Given that new organizational forms are still emerging, it is difficult to describe their shape and structure. One can think of the classic bureaucratic company as performing like a locomotive chugging along consistently on a charted, straight track. New organizational forms, on the other hand, operate like an Indianapolis 500 car zigzagging through traffic while continuously making steering and mechanical adjustments in order to adapt to everchanging race situations and conditions.

Although it is difficult to draw an organizational chart for new organizational forms, we can examine their nature through the use of contingency theory. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) explain that organizational forms must adapt to the nature of their environments, a part of which are altered through changes in tasks and technology. In the case of new organization forms, the flexibility needed for survival in the global marketplace is sought and gained.
through adapting information technologies (technology) and knowledge work (task). However, like any theory of organizational structure, it is impossible to separate form, task, and technology in a discussion of new organization forms because of their interdependencies. For example, automobiles are still sold in the post-industrial era, but the manufacturing process has changed. In order to be more attentive to changing market demands, companies focus on flexibility, which would not be possible without the advancement of information technologies and knowledge work. Additionally, an increased reliance on knowledge work derives from an increased reliance on information technologies, instead of manual labor. Consequently, when one talks about flexibility in the new organization forms, one is also implicitly bringing up information technologies, knowledge work, and other environmental factors which companies are tracking, such as globalization and union decline.

**A Description of New Organizational Forms**

Lewin and Stephens (1993) examined the literature on new organization forms, and found no ideal-type description of the structures. However, they did observe a consensus of attributes emerging in the writings of such scholars as Miles and Snow (1986), Mills (1991), and Bartlet and Ghoshal (1989). The first attribute Lewin and Stephens recognize is the delayering of levels of management. The elimination of middle layers of management allows nonmanagement employees to interact more with top management, which accelerates the flow of information throughout the company. One of the chief reasons Wal-Mart is the nation's leading retailer is that it maintains a flatter organizational structure than its rivals, such as Sears and K-Mart (Stoner, Freeman, and Gilbert, 1995). The second attribute is the decentralization of decision making, which is attained by granting more authority and accountability to lower levels of the organization than would exist in a bureaucratic structure. For example, when General Motors started its Saturn Corporation, it allowed the new division to operate as a self-directed business unit with little direction from corporate headquarters (Ibid). Decentralization is accomplished through the use of intraorganizational networks, in which employees are encouraged to work together throughout the corporation rather than safeguard the territory inside their respective departments. The culture and values inside the company must encompass teamwork, openness, and cooperation, and acquire "a kind of self-questioning ability that underpins the activities of systems that are able to learn to learn and self-organize" (Morgan, 1997: 86). The third attribute is the development of permeable boundaries with stakeholders. Many companies are integrating their information technologies with suppliers and customers, in order to aid all constituents in the supply chain of the product. If the information technologies are properly integrated, the supplier makes more sales to the middle firm, the middle firm receives more sales from the end consumer, and the end consumer benefits from more information, responsiveness, and flexibility in making purchasing choices (The Global Logistics Research Team at Michigan State University, 1995).
The two companies studied in this dissertation, a bank and a student-operated company, manifest the three attributes of new organization forms. The bank encourages a team environment and has lowered the boundaries between company departments. The management team interacts very easily with nonmanagement employees. It also maintains close relationships with its customers through state-of-the art, personal banking information technology and multiple service branches. The student company was chosen for this dissertation because the chief reason for its formation by Virginia Tech was to study the performance and effects of new organization forms. It has virtually no middle management; members communicate directly to the project sponsor and its customers. The organization empowers its members to make decisions, to schedule the flow of work, to order materials, to develop the product, and to evaluate each other. The members also meet regularly with their customers, in order to further refine the product and maximize customer satisfaction.

**Designing New Organization Forms**

The key to corporate survival in the post-industrial age appears to be designing your organization to gain maximal flexibility through adapting information technology and focusing on knowledge as the key input to the production process. As Tapscott states (1995: 68):

“The new economy, the new enterprise, and the new technology are not unrelated; they are inextricably linked. They are enabling one another, and they are driving one another. If you can understand how the new technology corresponds to the new internetworked enterprise, you can begin to forge a strategy for competing in the new economy.”

**Flexibility.** In 1908, the Ford Motor Company revolutionized manufacturing in American business with production of the Model T. Automobile manufacturing had previously demanded that employees individually assemble an entire car. The enormous task took 514 minutes to turn out just one car. With the introduction of specialized tasks, uniform parts, and the moving assembly line, Ford was able to reduce each assembler’s task to a 1.5 minute cycle time. In fact, modern capitalism became to be known by many as “Fordism, a word that connotes the marriage of mass production based on well-paid jobs on the assembly line and mass consumption of affordable, standardized products” (Barnett and Cavanaugh, 1994: 260).

Immense changes have occurred in the market since Henry Ford’s period of maverick automobile production. Economist Lester Thurow (1996) describes the market transformation as being similar to the phenomenon of punctuated equilibrium in evolutionary biology. Evolution is fairly imperceptible to human beings because it progresses at a slow pace. Yet occasionally “the environment suddenly changes and what has been the dominant species rapidly dies out to be replaced by some other species” (Thurow, 1996: 7). Today’s business climate is evolving from one that follows long-term strategic planning to one that advocates war-like maneuvering based on hypercompetition. The organizational
species most likely to survive in this quickly changing marketplace is based less on standardized manufacturing than on flexibility (Lewin, Long, & Carroll, 1997; D’Aveni, 1994).

Evidence of this belief among business leaders can be found in a recent flyer for the 1998 Organization of the Future Conference. Metaphors of flexible organizations are apparent, as Peter Drucker headlines an impressive list of speakers from academia and business to discuss such topics as “The New Organization,” “Tomorrow’s Organization,” “The Organization of the Future,” “The Chameleon Organization,” “The Reconfigurable Organization,” and “The Kinetic Organization.” The flyer states that “the organization of the future will constantly adapt to its changing environment...by changing its shape and appearance.”

Metaphors and language that are centered on flexibility and the new organizational forms matter because management theory has become the vernacular of the international economic elite, who, in turn, provide direction and goals for managers to use in both their daily interactions and corporate planning (Micklethwait and Woolridge, 1996; Solomon, 1992).

**Information technologies.** By utilizing information technologies that place emphasis on communications, computing, and content, companies can attain the requisite flexibility called for by Drucker and his colleagues (Burns and Stalker, 1961; Tapscott, 1995). The conventional view of work in the twentieth century was centered on manual labor and a chain of command approach to management; however, the very nature of business calls for reliance on the rapid processing of information (Marcuse, 1955; Bell, 1973; Micklethwait and Woolridge, 1996; Drucker, 1993; Davidow and Malone, 1992).

The boundaries of firms blur as employees and stakeholders interact with less encumbrance and acquire more information to be distributed between each other. Companies use information they acquire through new information and telecommunication technologies to gain instant access to the needs of each of its external stakeholders; employees who might have been previously separated by department or position will become linked electronically, as well, creating a less hierarchical structure. Both of these factors transform the organization into an environmental adaptive form, as the permeability of organizational boundaries increases (Tapscott, 1995; Davidow and Malone, 1992).

**Knowledge work.** While flexibility is derivative of the new organization form and computers and telecommunications are the key technologies, “knowledge work” becomes the key production input or task. Since manual service jobs are abundant in the information age and the source of most new job growth, manual production labor is no longer a critical component of the post-industrial organization (Rifkin, 1995; Reich, 1997). As vast amounts of information flow rapidly through the global economy and develop what Thurow calls “brainpower industry,” the company that makes best use of its data will have a huge advantage over its competitors and gain long-term sustainable advantage (Thurow, 1996; Davidow and Malone, 1992). Employees must be able to quickly acquire and handle information from stakeholders and, at the same time,
communicate with others throughout the organization what will be required to produce the customized products and services. Consequently, knowledge work requires a much better educated and skilled workforce than previously existed (Drucker, 1992; Thurow, 1996).

**Adoption of New Organization Forms in American Industry**

There are also processes that appear to accompany and launch the formation of new organization forms. Due to the less adaptive nature of bureaucracies and the current focus on organizational flexibility, management experts are increasingly calling for companies to replace hierarchies with intra-organizational networks and team-based approaches. This obligatory transformation of the workplace is often accomplished through reengineering and similar process oriented managerial movements, which have attained great popularity in the 1990s.

Reengineering recommends that companies take a hard look at what exactly they are trying to accomplish, and essentially rebuild “brick by brick” around the key “tasks that together create value for the customer” (Hammer, 1995: 4). Michael Hammer, who along with James Champy started the movement in 1993, officially states the definition of reengineering as, “The fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of business processes to bring about dramatic improvements in performance (original italics)” (Hammer, 1995: 3).

Many executives are eager to find a rapid means to dramatic improvement and fittingly latch onto reengineering (Micklethwait and Woolridge, 1996; Rifkin, 1995). A dramatic leap in performance can be accomplished through increased speed, greater accuracy, and/or reduced costs (Hammer, 1995). Aided by new information and communication technologies, companies can redesign work processes and add value to their products and services by eliminating inefficiencies and increasing the volume and flow of productive activity at every level of the corporation (Hammer, 1995; Rifkin, 1995). However, given the “bottom line” orientation of American business, companies typically focus on reducing costs to bring about the dramatic improvement; and the quickest and easiest way to reduce costs in the eyes of many executives is through cutting labor expenses. Herein lies the typical reason for the adoption of new organization forms by American businesses. Companies initially focus on reengineering and team approaches in order to gain flexibility and to increase value to their customers, but then downsize and restructure around information technologies in order to reduce hierarchies and labor costs (Rifkin, 1995; Gordon, 1996; Harrison, 1994; Thurow, 1996). As a result of information technologies and new arrangements with employees, new organization forms can essentially accomplish the same amount of work that was previously performed by a larger workforce. It should be noted, though, that this common approach to reengineering was not Hammer’s intention when he and Champy published their groundbreaking book (Hammer, 1995). Hammer recognizes the disconnect between rhetoric and action companies often display as they fulfill their versions of reengineering:
Downsizing is an ineffective response to a business crisis. It is usually an act of desperation—throwing people overboard to lighten the financial load. However, downsizing rarely pays off in the long term. Why? Because downsizing almost always means eliminating people, not work. Desperate to improve short-term financial performance, some companies take extreme measures to reduce costs without taking the time and trouble to rethink what is actually driving those costs. In either event, the strategy of eliminating people without eliminating work may lead to short-term payoff but definitely leads to long-term disaster....Reengineering [should not be] about getting rid of people or jobs; it [should be] about getting rid of work, specifically work that does not create value for the customer (Hammer, 1995: 178-179).

The Sources of the Adoption of New Organization Forms

According to Max Weber (1978/1910), social and technological conditions fundamentally determine the forms of organization that emanate in a society. Although bureaucracy was ideally suited for the stable markets of the mass production era, social and technological factors in the social-economic landscape are rapidly changing (Lewin and Stephens, 1993). As Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) observe, organizations will adapt to their environment. The emergence of a global economy, a decline in union power, and irregular stock market incentives have become key reasons for adopting new organization forms in the turbulent marketplace of the post-industrial era.

The global economy. The global economy, which Thurow (1996:166) describes as “one where factors of production—natural resources, capital, technology, and labor—as well as goods and services move easily around the world,” is a fairly recent phenomenon. During the middle of the twentieth century, American companies, competing chiefly among themselves, operated in a relatively closed market. The bureaucratic structure of the corporations was an appropriate fit for the calm economic environment, and evinced stability and prosperity for both management and labor. American companies began to take the first steps toward globalization in the 1950s; however, bureaucratic structures remained intact due to the economic expansion of the country. Blessed with surplus profits, American companies could acquire foreign enterprises and become more aggressive in international markets, while permitting their domestic operations to continue running strong. Unfortunately, the economic expansion ended in the 1970s with the onslaught of recessions, the oil crisis, and stagflation. In response to new economic challenges and foreign competition, organizational strategies began to change, which in turn brought changes to companies’ structures (Harrison and Bluestone, 1988; Reich, 1991).

For example, thanks in part to the advent of advanced information and telecommunication technologies, Ford Motor Company could design cars in Dearborn, Michigan, with the daily help of German engineers, and in the process reduce development costs by 30 percent. Plus, through worldwide purchasing systems, Ford was able to knock $700 off the final price of the car (Micklethwait
and Wooldridge, 1996). Ford originally had centered its structure and operations around the standardized production of automobiles, but now under these new conditions maintain higher flexibility, in order to be more attentive to the needs and fancies of their customers and remain competitive with new rivals in the global economy.

As evidenced by the new conditions which Ford has addressed, the global economy is shifting from mass markets to short-lived, narrowly specialized niches, from large-scale standardized production to customized, flexible, batch production (Reich, 1991). Given the free flow of information and resources, time now becomes the critical factor of success in a company's strategy (Ohmae, 1991). Since information is disseminated at a rapid pace, imitation and changing tastes afford companies little time to profit from a new product (Micklethwait and Wooldridge, 1996). New organization forms are emerging that will provide the flexibility to adapt to the restless nature of the global marketplace.

**Union decline.** New organization forms are also attaining ample flexibility through what has become one of their most pliable resources--labor. After the depression, labor traditionally had maintained an implicit agreement with management that provided job security, benefits, and steady wage increases. Since Americans companies competed among themselves in a relatively closed market, they could coordinate prices that would benefit the entire industry, and could afford to allot a significant share of revenues to their employees. Although a form of collusion existed among companies, government turned its head because the country as a whole benefited from the arrangement (Reich, 1991; Harrison, 1994).

However, the onslaught of globalization provided companies with means to break the agreement with labor, while still furnishing a way to sell the same amount of products. Once companies had developed relationships with other countries, they discovered they could hire cheaper labor in foreign markets, which in turn put pressure on unions to make concessions with companies. The decline of unions was further impelled in the 1980s during the Reagan presidency, as labor law became deregulated and companies received lower (and fewer) sanctions in cases brought to the National Labor Relations Board involving corporate resistance to union organizing (Reich, 1991; Gordon, 1996; Wolman and Colamosca, 1997). Cheap labor also became more abundant as communism fell around the world. People in communist countries who were previously taken care of by the state were now in need of jobs and were willing to work at a wage much lower than American standards (Thurow, 1996).

With unions having lost their leverage for the time being, companies need no longer appease labor, in order to prevent work stoppages. The decline of unions and the abundance of cheap foreign labor has provided companies the ability to maintain a flexible workforce. Companies can now shift their operations around the world to the cheapest source of labor. When domestic labor is needed, companies can turn to temporary workers to fill production needs. In fact, the new organization forms' focus on flexibility is increasingly developing a dual labor system in America, in which companies maintain a core staff of highly
skilled employees and rely on temporary buffer workers to fill less skilled positions when needed (Harrison, 1994; Pfeffer and Baron, 1988). Although pay for temporary workers increased 33.7 percent between 1994 and 1997 from $7.56 per hour to $10.11 per hour (Murphy, 1998), most temporary workers still do not receive benefits like health insurance and paid vacations and typically earn less pay than the core staff (Herer and Harel, 1998; Murphy, 1998; Filipczak, et al., 1998). Furthermore, a Cornell study found that 8 in 10 temporary workers were dissatisfied with their current situation, and that 6 in 10 temporary workers would like to switch to a full-time position, especially if benefits were provided as part of a compensation package (Filipczak, et al., 1998).

**Stock market incentives.** The formation of new organization forms is further encouraged through perceptions among corporate executives that downsizing secures approval from the stock market (Cascio, et al., 1997). Companies that focus on flexibility are indeed often rewarded with an increase in stock values (Sloan, 1996; Cascio, et al., 1997). For example, when the announcement came that restructuring legend “Chainsaw Al” Dunlap was to become C.E.O. of Sunbeam Corporation, the company’s stock instantly rose 41% (Nocera, 1996)¹. Most business executives believe that new organization forms will be more responsive to the demands of the global market, and will thus boost the value of a company when it downsizes or moves facilities out of the United States. Plus, by utilizing cheap labor sources from around the world, companies can keep wage costs from increasing, which boosts the overall profitability of the company (Micklethwait and Woolridge, 1996; Wolman and Colamosca, 1997). Empirical research though has provided no clear answers on the true effect of downsizing on stock prices. Worrell, Davidson, and Sharma (1991) found that stock prices within 180 days of a downsizing rose 3.6 percent when a company provided restructuring and consolidation as reasons for the action, and dropped by 5.6 percent when financial distress was given as the reason for a downsizing. Cascio, Young, and Morris (1997) studied the effects of downsizing over a 15 year-period and found no significant improvement overall in stock prices or profits. They conclude their study by noting that more research is needed on the effect of downsizing on stock prices, but that the perception of business executives is generally that downsizing improves returns on stock.

**The Consequences of Adoption of New Organization Forms**

The long-term success of these strategies, however, is beginning to come into question, as many companies receive a short-term boost in stock value but

---

¹ On June 13, 1998, Sunbeam fired Dunlap after *Barron's* had raised questions about "something fishy in the financial statements" (Donlan, 1998: 59). A Sunbeam management team uncovered that Dunlap had booked sales for goods that he secretly stored in a Tulsa warehouse (Donlan, 1998; Laing, 1998). "Wags in the company's transportation department joked that Dunlap had developed a new inventory system to replace the traditional First In, First Out (FIFO) and Last In, First Out (LIFO) techniques. They called it FISH, for First In, Still Here" (Laing, 1998: 32). As a result, Sunbeam stock dropped from $52 in March to $8 13/16 in June. The stock was worth $12.50 when he took the company over in 1996 (Byrne, 1998).
then often experience negative consequences a couple of years later
(Micklethwait and Woolridge, 1996; Wolman and Colamosca, 1997). Although
companies are increasing flexibility and cutting costs, they are also creating
problems for their employees and eventually for themselves.

Negative consequences usually begin with “survivors”—the employees left
in a company after restructuring. Employees who were spared their jobs during a
round of downsizing and restructuring must now work harder due to new job
demands and threats of termination if performance expectations are not met
(Brockner, Grover, et al., 1987; Brock, Tyler, et. al, 1992; Wolman and
Colamosca, 1997; Kleinfeld, 1996). Employees begin to focus more on
upgrading and expanding skills, working longer hours, and maintaining an edge
over other employees to ensure employability in the company (Heckscher, 1995,
Rubin, 1996). The new information technologies also increase stress on
employees by increasing the pace of work and minutely monitoring employee
behavior (Rifkin, 1995). Unfortunately, this competitive workplace atmosphere
motivates employees to perform out of fear, while cooperation, which is
emphasized in teamwork rhetoric within many flexible companies, becomes
suppressed (Thurow, 1996; Wolman and Colamosca, 1997; Gordon, 1996;
Rifkin, 1995; Kleinfeld, 1996). Some employees even resort to workplace
sabotage, as their anger and frustrations mount in these stressful work
environments (Crino, 1994; Caudron, 1995; Giacolone and Greenberg, 1997).
Workplace sabotage, defined as "deliberate behavior to damage company
property, tarnish a company's reputation, or subvert its operation" (Crino and
Leap, 1989), has not been accurately measured yet because a company will
usually not report an incident, in order to avoid any detrimental effect on its public
image. However, human resource managers have discovered survivors of
downsizing increasingly taking part in some of the most common and costly
forms of workplace sabotage, often by antagonizing customers or planting "logic
bombs" and crashing the company's computer system (Caudron, 1995: 36).

In a nation-wide study of workplace attitudes, Towers Perrin (1997) found
that employees recognize that the traditional economic social compact based on
loyalty and job security has been replaced by one rewarding individual
performance, and are increasingly becoming disturbed by the new arrangement:

Employers themselves set the stage by telling employees that
performance and contribution, not loyalty and tenure, were the
things that counted for advancement and pay opportunities. Employees
have taken this to heart and have been working harder than ever. Now,
with corporate profits up, they expect their employers to make good on
these implicit promises and share the fruits of success. And what the
data suggest is that real sharing hasn't fully materialized. This, not
surprisingly, is beginning to erode their faith in management and their
belief in workplace reciprocity. ... If our results corroborate anything,
it's that there is a clear correlation between feeling connected to
a company and critical things like motivation and performance (italics
It is critical for companies to nurture innovation for achieving competitive advantages in the global marketplace. However, as employees continue to feel isolated and disconnected from their company, collaboration and innovation in the company may drop, eventually leading to a decline in overall corporate performance (Wolman and Colamosca, 1997; Heckscher, 1995; Gee, Hull and Lankshear, 1996; Rubin, 1996). For this reason, it is in the interests of both management and labor that we examine alienation, a sociological concept somewhat forgotten by today’s researchers. Although the companies examined in this dissertation have not downsized their workforces, I still believe the organizations will have alienated members. Due to the short-term nature of relationships inside the companies, many employees, I posit, will be frustrated by the flat, decentralized organizational structures. As Jones and Bowie (1998) argue:

…confidence in the development of virtual corporations may be premature because of what we call the Virtual Corporation Paradox. This paradox can be succinctly stated: the short-term, transient deal-making on which the efficiency of the virtual corporation rests greatly impedes the development of the mutually trusting and cooperative relationships on which its success depends.

ALIENATION

The following section will begin with a brief historical review of alienation. Next, I will demonstrate how the concept has been applied during past economic transitions, and conclude with a discussion of why alienation is an essential topic for study during the current transition into the post-industrial age.

A Brief Historical Account of Alienation

The term entfremdung, the German equivalent of alienation, has been in use since the late Middle Ages; however, the meaning of it has evolved over time. The German fremd translates closely to the English term “alien,” which means belonging or pertaining to another, or, more generally, a kind of strangeness or otherness; and the full translation of entfremdung becomes “to make alien,” or to take away something that belonged to someone else. Accordingly, the original application of alienation pertained to the stealing of another’s property or goods. Over time, though, the term began to be applied to other situations and conditions. For example, Martin Luther (1519/1989) used alienation to describe one’s estrangement from God, and doctors applied it to depict the comatose state of a patient as a time when the soul was separate from the body. However, by the early nineteenth century alienation began to reflect its modern connotation of one’s separation from others and society (Schacht, 1970; Schaff, 1980). The scholar most identified with the more modern meaning of alienation is Karl Marx.
**Karl Marx and Alienation**

Karl Marx, the philosopher most closely associated with the modern concept, developed his idea of alienation in his early manuscripts of 1844. While Marx identified three forms of alienation (separation from species, man, and work and labor), I will concentrate on his conception of man's separation from one's work and labor. Influenced by Hegel’s (1807/1952) theological view of man’s unity of spirit with the world, he described a condition in which man’s essence, or essential nature, is determined through the kind of activities which one undertakes (Fromm, 1961). Consequently, one need not necessarily feel alienated when producing a good, as long as the product is an extension of the laborer’s self. However, when a person becomes merely an instrument for the production of a good, she will feel alienated because her labor ceases to reflect her own personality and interests. As evidenced by his more famous works *Das Kapital* (1867/1967) and *The Communist Manifesto* (1848/1950), Marx criticized capitalism as a system that separated workers from their products by treating them as machinery, and thus robbed them of their human essence. Incited by the societal injustices he perceived in the Industrial Revolution, Marx “presented a protest against man’s alienation, his loss of himself and his transformation into a thing: it was a movement against the dehumanization and automatization of man…” (Kaufmann, 1970: 20). Although Marx would disparage talk of alienation in his later works, his early writings, which clearly state his idea of alienated labor, would prove to inspire future social scientists during periods of economic and societal transition (Schacht, 1970).

**Emile Durkheim**

The French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1893/1964) was not quite as critical of capitalism as was Marx. He believed that capitalism provides individuals with the opportunity to enrich themselves through the development of skills and the acquisition of goods that provide for a comfortable life. However, Durkheim also recognized the dangers that can occur if a society becomes driven by an unfettered thirst for consumption. In this situation, growing markets can "reduce human relations to a new lowest common denominator: the cash nexus" (Derber, 1996: 15). According to Durkheim, if acquisition becomes the chief goal in a society, anomic, a state of societal normlessness, could occur: Traditional social bonds and moral codes breakdown, feelings of isolation become prevalent, and people maintain little recognition for how their actions affect others. He warned that if this condition continues unchecked by a government, crime, confusion, and suicide will increase as a result of the "raging appetites encouraged by markets" (Lane, 1991: 596).

**Max Weber**

Max Weber, another seminal contributor to classical sociological thought, provided perhaps the most famous image of the condition of alienated labor--the "iron cage" (1904-5/1958: 181). While Marx wrote about the worker’s separation
from the product, Weber recognized that one could become alienated from the organization as well. He believed that the bureaucratic organizations which generated such high efficiency and productivity in the industrial era could also generate general disenchantment among its members. By placing the source of authority in the system itself and not in relationships, the rationalized nature of activities in bureaucracies creates impersonal, rigid work environments (Schaff; 1980; Antonio and Glassman, 1985; Barker, 1993). However, due to the effectiveness of the bureaucratic organization, Weber thought it would remain the dominant organizational structure for many years to come:

This order is now bound to the technical and economic conditions of machine production which to-day determine the lives of all the individuals who are born into this mechanism (Weber, 1904-5/1958: 181)...Together with the inanimate machine it (i.e., bureaucracy) is busy fabricating the cage of bondage which men will perhaps be forced to inhabit some day, as powerless as the fellahs of ancient Egypt (Weber, 1910/1978: 139).

The Humanistic Movement
Alienation would not gain extensive attention in intellectual circles until the Cold War, when a few German and Austrian refugees, such as Marcuse (1955), Kahler (1957), and Arendt (1958), conveyed the idea in the United States. Although existential philosophers, such as Camus (1954) and Sartre (1956), were concurrently writing about the anguish of human existence, Erich Fromm (1961) is most responsible for popularizing alienation. Fromm used the term a couple of times in Escape from Freedom (1941), but his widely influential translation of Marx’s early manuscripts, under the title Marx’s Concept of Man (1961), introduced alienation to the greater American public.

In the 1950s, industrial sociologists, such as Chinoy (1955), Walker and Guest (1952), and Zaleznic (1958), also helped legitimize alienation as a topic of study, as they looked at the relationship between intrinsic job aspects and attitudes toward work. They found that satisfied employees experience strong, positive attachments to organizational and technological experiences. For example, Walker and Guest (1952) studied the worker’s attitudes about his immediate job, his relations to fellow workers, pay and security, his relation to supervision, general working conditions, promotion and transfer, and his relation to the union. The type of studies conducted by industrial sociologists during this period is aptly captured by one line worker’s statement about his job:

I move a few cars around. I perform quite a few things actually. That’s enough variety to satisfy me. It’s not like turning a screw all day on the production line (Walker and Guest, 1952: 365).

By the 1960s, alienation had become a common concept applied by social scientists, as they studied the ill effects of technology and bureaucratic
organizations (Kaufmann, 1970; Schacht, 1970; Schaff, 1980). Blauner's (1964) seminal work, *Alienation and Freedom*, was to become the benchmark for studying the link between technology and alienation. He stated that industries vary by the nature of their technological production systems and would foster varying degrees of alienation. If charted on a graph, it would appear as an inverted U-curve, with alienation at its lowest points during the craftsman era and automation era and at its highest during the mass-production era. Scholars soon thereafter supported Blauner's findings on variations in employee responses to sociotechnical systems. Faunce (1965) contended that there is a link between the degree of functional specialization and the stage in technological development, which results from a unique man-made relationship attending each type of production technology. For example, in the handicraft stage, artisans manipulated raw materials with great skill and freedom; however, in the bureaucratic organization of the modern era, employees performed limited operations on the total product. Shepard (1969, 1971, 1973), Cotgrove (1972), Kirsch and Lengermann (1971), Vamplew (1973), and Fullan (1970) applied this perspective to study the effects of varying man-machine relationships on alienation and satisfaction.

Shepard (1969, 1971, 1973) interviewed 305 factory workers--craftsmen, final assembly-line workers, and control-room operators--and found support that less specialization leads to less alienation. His identical approach of examining low, medium, and high specialization jobs with 2,000 office employees confirmed his previous findings. Kirsch and Lengermann (1971) applied the same approach in a study of 150 white collar workers in a large bank and obtained the same findings, as did Cotgrove (1972) and Vamplew (1973) in their studies of chemical process plants, and Fullan (1970) in his study of 1,491 Canadian factory workers. The findings were fairly consistent: the more specialized the job the more the employee feels alienated and dissatisfied with his job.

Thanks to the researchers of the humanistic movement of the 1960s and 1970s, alienation has become an accepted sociological and psychological topic for study, as evidenced by frequent citations in the reference sections of books and its inclusion in scholarly dictionaries (Schaff, 1980). It should be noted though that early social commentators recognized the possible negative effects of specialization of labor would have on workers. For example, Adam Smith stated that “the man whose whole life is spent in performing a few simple operations, of which the effects too are, perhaps, always the same, or very nearly the same, has no occasion to exert his understanding, or to exercise his invention in finding out expedients for removing difficulties which never occur. He naturally loses, therefore, the habit of such exertion, and generally becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become” (Smith, 1776/1986: 302); Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, “When a worker is unceasingly and exclusively engaged in the fabrication of one thing, he ultimately does his work with singular dexterity; but at the same time he loses the general faculty of applying his mind to the direction of the work. He everyday becomes more adroit and less industrious; so that it may be said that in proportion as the worker improves, the
man is degraded" (Tocqueville, 1835/1948: 158); and Max Weber noted that the impersonal specialization of the bureaucratic organization often creates “specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart” (Weber, 1904-5/1958: 182).

A NEED FOR EXAMINING ALIENATION IN THE POSTINDUSTRIAL AGE

Alienation is a common theme of study during periods of economic transition. As employees are exposed to new technologies, images, and ideas, their sense of self, place, and society are challenged. The psychological impact of change is further amplified because of the immense role of the workplace in our daily lives, which provides an arena where employees can demonstrate their moral worth in society through hard work and a job well done (Dudley, 1994; Rubin, 1996):

Next to the family, employment is the dominant social institution in working peoples’ lives. The workplace is more than just a place where we earn money. Through its organization and rules, it structures our daily lives by providing certain unavoidable categories of experience. In this sense, work meets enduring human needs for time structure, activity, social contacts, participation in a collective purpose, and knowledge of one’s place in society (Dudley, 1994: 32).

Alienation began to be considered a problem in the 1950s after automation had been introduced into the workplace (Blauner; 1960; Hardin, 1960; Shepard, 1968). We are currently in another major transition in American business, which is experiencing an increased reliance on information technologies, changes in the nature of work tasks, and frequent restructuring focused on organizational flexibility. As employees experience the negative consequences of new organization forms and companies struggle to maintain long-term growth and profitability in the global economy, alienation may be expected to once again be a concern of practitioners and academics (Reich, 1997; Gordon, 1996, Heckscher, 1995, Rubin, 1996; Rifkin, 1995).

The collective purpose and social contacts of which Dudley writes are rapidly vanishing in today’s workplace, as companies steadily drain their internal labor market by outsourcing production and other in-house jobs, and, when needed, hiring part-time, contract, and other contingent workers. As Alan Ehrenhalt (1995) observes:

People stayed married in the 1950s, to their spouses, to their political machines, to their baseball teams. Corporations also stayed married--to the communities they grew up with....Threatening to move a profitable company out of its historic home wasn’t done in the 1950s mostly because it wasn’t thinkable to cancel employees’ vacations or fire them at age fifty
or fifty-five when their productivity began to slow down. Those actions also would have helped the bottom line. But they were gross infringements on the enduring relationship between worker and manager that employment was supposed to represent. Breaking up that arrangement was not on the menu of options (Ehrenhalt, 1995: 11-12).

In fact, Thurow (1997) reports that in 1996, there were “8.1 million American workers in temporary jobs, 2 million who work ‘on call,’ and 8.3 million self-employed ‘independent contractors’ (many of whom are downsized professionals who have very few clients but call themselves self-employed consultants because they are too proud to admit that they are unemployed)” (Thurow, 1997: 55). Thurow reports that "most of these more than 18 million people are also looking for more work and better jobs" (Thurow, 1997: 55). Although the unemployment rate dropped to 4.3 percent in 1998, companies continued to rely on temporary services to meet production demands instead of hiring the workers on a full-time basis, especially in the high technology industries (Ciancarelli, 1998; Cole-Gomolski, 1998; Herer and Harel, 1998). It is feared by some that the rootless nature of these short-term employment contracts is leaving many employees feeling anxious, isolated, and lonely (Heckscher, 1995; Wolman and Colamosca, 1997; Pfeffer and Baron, 1988; Harrison, 1994; Regini, 1987; Gordon, 1996). A "permatemp," or longtime temporary employee, at Microsoft notes, "We are breeding a generation of workers who view companies as the enemy…the permatemp system creates a stratified workforce composed of permanent and temporary employees" (Cole-Gomolski, 1998: 1). As the social compact between the organization and its employees continues to evolve from mutual loyalty to self-reliance, it has been predicted that many employees “will discover themselves disoriented, alienated, and overwhelmed by the new work style” (Davidow and Malone, 1992: 216).

While many scholars are describing the alienating nature of new organization forms, Heckscher and his colleagues (1995) appear to be the only social scientists empirically studying alienation in the new global workplace. Heckscher’s work, however, has focused exclusively on middle managers who have survived restructuring. Consequently, there is a need for further research on alienation in the post-industrial age. I will do this by empirically examining alienation among employees in new organization forms.

The humanistic era of the 1950s and 1960s found that higher job specialization is associated with higher alienation. While the current economic transition may have the same effects, it presents a bit of a paradox. While job flexibility appears to be very evident in today’s workplace, restructuring has eroded the sense of connection between employees and their organizations. Companies are giving employees greater control over their work due to the information technologies that decentralize decision-making. Hackman and Oldham (1980) believe that job flexibility will increase motivation, satisfaction, and performance only if certain contextual factors--such as job stability, pay, meaningful work, and nondiscriminatory personnel practices--are first in place. They also note that autonomy will produce good results only when the
aforementioned contextual factors are in place. For autonomy to be beneficial to an organization, employees also must have the opportunity to utilize different skills in performing a variety of tasks, must believe the work is significant to others inside the organization, and must have a sense of identity that increases their sense of responsibility on the job. If these factors are not in place, “the job is inherently dissatisfying, frustrating, or demotivating to the person who does it, and attempts to improve the overall person-job relationships...will be like swimming upstream against a very strong current” (Hackman and Oldham, 1980: 42). Under these circumstances, employees should not feel very alienated from their work and the company. However, a new factor is visible in the work situation that was not prevalent in earlier eras--corporate reliance on flexibility is being gained through short-term contracts and the breaking of the traditional social compact.

I suggest that employees working in new organization forms with an orientation toward communitarianism will be more alienated than employees who share the ideology of individualism. The short-term nature of the relationships in new organization forms should be frustrating to communitarians, since they focus on maintaining stable relationships to reach group goals. Individualists, on the other hand, may not be disturbed by the work arrangement, since they emphasize self-reliance as the mean to accomplishing personal goals. In this dissertation, I sample two organizations employing the new organization forms and compare levels of alienation among employees who have been exposed to this work environment for a period of time. This approach is most appropriate because our research objective is to investigate the relationship between ideology and levels of alienation within the context of new organization forms.

INDIVIDUALISM/COMMUNITARIANISM AS IDEOLOGIES

Before specifically discussing individualism and communitarianism, we will first discuss social contract theory, the philosophical tradition from which the ideologies come. We will then utilize a recently developed economic approach to the social contract (Watson, 1996) in order to examine the intervening effects of individualism and communitarianism on employee reactions to new organization forms.

Social Contract Theory

It has been said there are only two questions in political philosophy: ‘who gets what?’, and ‘says who?’...The first of these questions is about the distribution of material goods, and of rights and liberties... The second question concerns the distribution of another good: political power...Political power includes the right to command others, and to subject them to punishment if they disobey. Who should hold this power? (Wolff: 1996: 1).

Social contract theory attempts to answer these two critical questions in political philosophy by first justifying why people would consent to be ruled by a
state, and second by describing what the ideal relationship is between a state and its citizens. However, there are many different views on what the basis of the social contract is, and how it should be constructed.

Thomas Hobbes’ *Leviathan* (1651/1968) is a traditional starting point for examining the historical development of social contract theory. In *Leviathan*, Hobbes envisions a world in which the state does not exist, and individuals are left to care for their own needs. While each person has total freedom to pursue her own interests, it is not an ideal situation, for, according to Hobbes, “the life of man is solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short” (Hobbes, 1651/1968: 186). In the “state of nature,” people are only concerned with their own survival, which leads to purely self-interested actions and quests for power. However, Hobbes notes that if people are rational, they will agree to renounce violence toward each other, so that their everyday lives can be more peaceful. Unfortunately, due to man’s egoistic nature, no one can fully trust anyone else knowing that the pact could suddenly be broken for personal gain. Hobbes’ solution to this situation is a social contract, in which the people consent to be governed by a monarch who, while restricting freedom, ensures harmony in the society.

John Locke (1690/1980) also advanced a concept of the social contract; however, the basis for Locke’s social contract is very different from Hobbes’ version. Locke, like Hobbes, describes a state of nature, but it is based on the God-given natural rights of life, health, liberty, and possessions, rather than on egoism (Tarnas, 1991):

> The state of Nature has a law of Nature to govern it, which obliges every one, and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions....And, being furnished with like faculties, sharing all in one community of Nature, there cannot be supposed any such subordination among us that may authorize us to destroy one another, as if we were made for one another’s uses, as the inferior ranks of creatures are for ours (Locke, 1690/1980: 14).

Accordingly, in Locke’s version of the social contract, all citizens consent to be ruled by a government elected by a majority for just as long as that government protects the natural rights. “Thus, a good state is one which guarantees and maximizes those rights; a bad state is one which does not guarantee them; and an evil state is one which itself assaults the natural rights” (Palmer, 1988: 187).

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1762/1987) later presented a view of the social contract and the state of nature that is at odds with both Hobbes and Locke. Rousseau believed in neither the existence of natural rights that Locke proposed, nor in Hobbes’ warlike state of nature. The “noble savage” instead lives a peaceful and happy existence. However, while people can be quite happy in the state of nature, according to Rousseau, they cannot be virtuous. Only by being a citizen of a state can man reach his true nature of intelligence and virtue.
Rousseau further deviated from Hobbes and Locke in his view that man should be ruled by laws, not rulers. By coming together and cooperating as a united governmental body, people demonstrate a social nature in which they follow what Rousseau calls the “General Will”:

If you would have the General Will accomplished, bring all the particular wills into conformity with it; in other words, as virtue is nothing more than this conformity of the particular wills with the General Will, establish the reign of virtue (Rousseau, 1762/1987: 297).

Accordingly, he placed great emphasis on a civic education for all the state’s citizens. Rousseau believed that by internalizing traditions, customs, and practices, people would become conscientious members of society and participate politically in an appropriate manner, in order to maintain the general well-being of the community. Consequently, people do not consign power to the state, but instead become the state themselves through the collective process:

If children are brought up in common in the bosom of equality; if they are imbued with the laws of the state and the precepts of the general will...we cannot doubt that they will learn to cherish one another mutually as brothers...and to become in time defenders and fathers of the country of which they will have been so long the children (Rousseau, 1762/1987: 149).

As evidenced by these three key figures in the early development of social contract theory, the social contract can exhibit fundamentally different properties. Much of the way the social contract is defined comes out of how one views basic human nature. If people are individualistic by nature, a state should be put into place that maintains peace and harmony among its citizens as they pursue their personal goals; however, if people are social by nature, the state becomes a coalition for coordinating people’s natural tendencies toward the interests and well-being of others. From these two traditions in social contract theory emanates the ideologies of individualism and communitarianism, which will form the moderating variable of interest in this study.

**Individualism**

In the tradition of Hobbes and Locke, individualism promotes an atomistic view of social life. Defined on the abstract level, individualism--also termed classic liberalism in political philosophy--places priority on the liberty and freedom of individuals. Autonomy, or self-determination, is paramount in individualism. Individualists believe the state should take a neutral position in defining “the good life,” that which is worthwhile and good.

The individualistic perspective radiates with a rich tradition of renowned thinkers over the last two centuries. Pareto, Marshall, and other classical economists were individualistic because they thought the state should stay out of
people’s affairs. The classical economists believed this could be achieved through relying on the free market. They supported state neutrality and were appropriately known as ‘free market liberals.’ John Stuart Mill believed that the individual should have the opportunity to pursue good in his or her own way, as well. Recent philosophers, such as Raz (1986), conclude that the state should promote pluralism in furthering its main function--protecting the rights of individuals. As stated by Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman (1962):

If a man knowingly prefers to live for today, to use his resources for current enjoyment, deliberately choosing a penurious old age, by what right do we prevent him from doing so? We may argue with him, seek to persuade him that he is wrong, but are we entitled to use coercion to prevent him from doing what he chooses to do?...[We should instead] respect people’s desires to live their lives by their own values (Friedman, 1962: 5-6).

Communitarianism

Communitarians, on the other hand, believe, like Rousseau, that mankind is very social in nature. If one statement illustrates communitarianism, it is that, “the community gives our lives their moral meaning” (Aveneri and de-Shalit, 1992: 7). Whereas individualists have no place for a preconceived conception of “the good life,” communitarians believe that membership in groups defines who we are and shapes the quality of our lives.

Communitarians further believe that the exclusive pursuit of self-interest tears away the network of social relationships on which we all depend, and is destructive to our shared experiment in democratic self-government and our self-preservation (Wolff, 1996). Consequently, the rights of individuals cannot be preserved without a shared perspective of working toward the good of the community. The communitarian perspective emphasizes the history and traditions of a community (MacIntyre, 1981). Since it is impossible to separate the person from the community, claim communitarians, one should disregard the idea of the rights of self and pursue communal concepts (Sandel, 1982).

A common critique of communitarianism is that it is authoritarian. Amatai Etzioni (1996), a leader of the modern communitarian movement, recognizes that:

...totalitarian communities, such as North Korea, do indeed exist in the world today, but most contemporary communities, especially in communitarian societies, are typically not authoritarian even when they are territorial, which they often are not....Domiance by power elites and other forms of authoritarianism are not basic or inherent features of community but reflections of the way it can be distorted. For communities to be fully or even highly comunitarian, they require the authentic commitment of most--if not all--of their members to a set of core values. To attain such a commitment, the values that are being fostered need to
be (a) truly accepted by the members and (b) responsive to their underlying needs (Etzioni, 1996: 129-130).

According to social contract theory, then, ideologically-based conceptions of the political social contract shape views of the proper role of the state. Gauthier (1997) explains that ideology gives structure to how "human beings conceive themselves in relation to other humans, to human structures and institutions, and to the nonhuman or natural environment, and [how] to act in the light of these conceived relationships" (Gauthier, 1997: 28). Business ethics scholars (Donaldson, 1982, 1989; Keely, 1986; Donaldson and Dunfee, 1994; Donaldson and Preston, 1995), Watson (1996, 1997; Watson, 1996, 1997) have transported the logic behind this connection from the political sphere to the economic sphere. Lodge and Vogel find a similar structure of ideas in their studies of ideologies in the economic realm: "Ideology is particularly important to managers because it justifies their power, role, and behavior" (Lodge and Vogel: 1987: 7). "This means that the social contract advises individuals and corporations to act as if the members of society had agreed to define the rights and obligations of productive organizations in a certain manner" (Donaldson, 1989: 60). For example, a manager with an individualistic perspective will "believe that those who are well equipped to compete will reap material rewards and that, conversely, those who cannot "cut the mustard" will (and should) suffer deprivation" (Newman, 1993: 18). Accordingly, this type of manager may cut wages, and expect the individual worker to deal with the consequences as if they were self-imposed (Gordon, 1996). However, a communitarian manager is more likely to behave as the Nucor Steel Corporation did during the recession of 1983-1984. Management decided that every member of Nucor, including the CEO, would sacrifice wages until the economic crisis passed. No one was fired, and once the economy rebounded the company prospered and all who stayed were rewarded for their loyalty (Fukuyama, 1995). In the next section, we will indicate how one's ideologically-based view of an economic social contract shapes one's perceptions of his or her relationships with the economic sphere.

The Economic Social Contract

While some other scholars have suggested that a social contract is also evident in the economic sphere (Donaldson, 1982; Keely, 1986; Donaldson and Dunfee, 1994; Donaldson and Preston, 1995), Watson (1996,1997) was the first to operationalize it. By drawing a direct parallel between the major dimensions of individualism and communitarianism expressed in writings on the political social contract and the dimensions of these ideologies in the economic social contract, he operationalized the dimensions of the ideologies in a manner in which they could be empirically tested. Watson isolates five ideological dimensions of the economic social contract, three of which are relevant to our purposes (Table 2.1). The first of these is life choices, which refers to the determination of one’s life projects and aims. On this ideological dimension, the communitarian thinks life choices are socially embedded, while the individualist believes the person is responsible for
his or her life choices. These underlying beliefs establish a political social contract that, for the communitarian, centers on cooperation as the means for realizing and fulfilling life choices; and, for the individualist, it is one based on competition and bargaining. The economic social contract, in turn, becomes one in which, for the communitarian, each employee is perceived as a vested member of the organization; and, for the individualist, it places full responsibility on each person to meet his or her own economic goals.

The second ideological dimension is personal identity, which refers to the source of one’s self-definition. On this ideological dimension, the communitarian sees communal attachments as constitutive of the self, while the individualist submits that personal identity is independent of social bonds. The consequent political social contract for the communitarian contends that one’s definition of the self is embedded in the community, whereas the individualist believes it is every person’s right to pursue his or her own definition of the self. Accordingly, the economic social contract for the communitarian becomes one in which self-identity is bound, in part, to the work role and the organization; and for the individualist, self-identity is tied to individual aims, not to any organization.

The third ideological dimension is self-respect, which refers to the source of self-respect, or the sense that one is a valuable and worthwhile person. Self-respect for the communitarian is derived from a socially structured and actively affirming community; for the individualist, it is derived from realizing one’s own potential. These beliefs establish a political social contract that derives self-respect for the communitarian through communal membership; however, for the individualist, self-respect is experienced when one is achieving personally satisfying life goals. The resultant economic social contract for the communitarian provides self-respect through organizational membership, whereas, for the individualist, it is achieved through economic success.

We wish to further develop this stream of research by employing the economic social contract approach to the study of alienation among employees working within new organization forms. Significant findings would furnish management studies with another possible explanation for the stress and anxiety described by many employees in the postindustrial workplace, and also provide a newly identified contributing source to alienation in organizations. In the following section, we will utilize the dimensions of the economic social contract developed by Watson to construct our hypotheses for the study of alienation in new organization forms.

**IDEOLOGY AND ALIENATION**

In this section, I will provide the hypotheses for study in this dissertation. The testing of the hypotheses, as methodologically outlined in Chapter 3, is intended to address my research question: **Within the context of new organization forms, will members with a communitarian orientation experience more alienation than individualists?** Support for this research question would provide some insight into how people are adjusting to the post-
industrial workplace, and also would document a newly identified contributing source of alienation in today’s organizations.

As businesses continuously and rapidly redefine themselves in response to the hypercompetitive nature of today’s marketplace, new organization forms embodying hyperflexibility, adaptivity, continuous improvement, and innovation are emerging. The new organization forms, as a result, have permeable boundaries both internally and externally, as the traditional divisions inside fall and the boundaries between a company and its stakeholders blur. Consequently, companies often design jobs to integrate features required for corporate success in this unstable work environment, such as self-control, self-designed responsibility, intraentrepreneurship, multiple organization memberships, continuous learning, and cross training (Lewin and Stephens, 1993).

However, the lack of stability and constancy inherent in new organization forms causes many members to feel disturbed by the new nature of work (Dudley, 1994; Rifkin, 1995; Gordon, 1996; Rubin 1996). As Rubin (1996) notes about the post-industrial workplace:

Workplace relationships increasingly seem transitory and ephemeral, and the pace of change seems unfathomably rapid...People are concerned about having to be geographically mobile and rootless and their concerns with the speed with which jobs come and go are symptomatic of an economic world in which the short-term contract increasingly replaces the long-term contract. Much of the new economic flexibility results from the technologically induced compression of time and space. The ability to rapidly disperse new images, resources, and ideas affects more than the economy; it also challenges people’s existing definitions of self and place (Rubin, 1996: 161).

Accordingly, as companies increasingly utilize new organization forms to attain flexibility and adaptivity, some members may be frustrated by the lack of stable relationships, and, as a result, feel isolated and disconnected from the organization (Wolman and Colamosca, 1997; Heckscher, 1995; Gee, Hull, and Lankshear, 1996; Rubin, 1996). For this reason, I utilize alienation in this dissertation to study possible sentiments of frustration occurring in the post-industrial workplace.

Alienation is a relational concept, in that it refers to a person’s feeling of separation from another object (Marx, 1848; Schacht, 1970, Schaff, 1980; Shepard, 1971). The object the person senses separation or estrangement from is the source of variation in studies of alienation. For example, Marx discussed alienation in the context of labor’s separation from the finished product, since the proletariat was used merely as a means to acquiring wealth for the owners of society’s capital. Existential writers, such as Camus and Sartre, wrote accounts of each man’s place of isolation in society and even the universe at large. While the researchers of the humanistic movement, like Blauner, Faunce, and Shepard,
studied people’s alienation from their work, I will be studying whether people are feeling alienated in the new organization forms. Consequently, my conception of alienation specifically addresses a person's sense of separation from her governing organization, which is a contribution to the alienation literature.

The term 'alienation' typically assumes "that some relationship or connection that once existed, that is 'natural,' desirable, or good, has been lost" (Keniston, 1965: 132). In this dissertation, my definition of alienation implies that a person feels alienated in a new organization form due to the lack or loss of stability that was once inherent in organizational relationships. Powerlessness, self-evaluative involvement, and isolation from organizational goals are the three forms of alienation utilized in this dissertation. While many validated forms of alienation exist in the literature, I believe that applying these three forms can help in determining whether an organization is lacking as a source of fulfillment, self-worth, and self-identity for many of its members. Positive findings would address the increasing observance of isolation and rootlessness in today’s workplace, and provide researchers with an interesting avenue of study in post-industrial society. The research would also serve as a source of assistance for companies making the difficult transition from bureaucratic to flexible structures.

I posit that differences in ideology may be one source of varying degrees of alienation among people in postindustrial organizations. The following hypotheses are derived from the alignment of dimensions deemed theoretically appropriate and logically consistent with my research question. As shown in Table 2.2, life choices is aligned with powerlessness. An employee who is unable to pursue her projects and aims in her preferred manner should feel a loss of control in her life. Personal identity is aligned with self-evaluative involvement. An employee will probably not refer to her work as a source of personal worth if her sense of identity is not fulfilled by membership in the organization. Self-respect is aligned with isolation. If an employee does not believe that she is a valuable and worthwhile person in the organization, she will likely feel isolated from organizational goals.

**Hypothesis 1: Within the context of new organization forms, powerlessness is positively related to communitarianism.**

Powerlessness refers to a perceived lack of freedom and control in the face of existing structures and events (Seeman, 1959; Neal and Rettig, 1967; Shepard, 1971). Seeman (1959) presented a general notion of powerlessness “as the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine...the outcomes...he seeks” (Seeman, 1959; 784). Neal and Rettig (1967) and Shepard (1971) later verified Seeman’s conception of powerlessness in the realm of job situations. In this dissertation, I examine whether the instability of roles and relationships in new organization forms causes some employees to feel a loss of control over their lives.

It will be recalled that communitarians think life choices are socially embedded, while individualists believe the person is responsible for his or her life choices. Given the emphasis placed on self-control and self-reliance in the
employment relationship inherent in new organization forms, it makes sense that communitarians would be more alienated than individualists, since they believe cooperation, rather than competition and bargaining, is the source of fulfilling a person’s life aims. Consequently, within the context of new organization forms, communitarians should feel less able than individualists to influence business events affecting their lives.

**Hypothesis 2:** Within the context of new organization forms, self-evaluative involvement is negatively related to the amount of communitarianism.

Self-evaluative involvement refers to the degree to which a person utilizes work to evaluate her sense of worth. For example, a person asked to describe herself to a stranger would mention her job frequently if she was proud of her work and found it enjoyable; however, if a person is unhappy with her job situation, she would probably refer more to her family, friends, and personal activities as sources of personal worth and fulfillment. Social psychologists, such as Zetterberg (1957) and Murphy (1947), believe that this is a selective rather than a random process. Accordingly, activities that permit a person to see herself positively are more likely to be used as referents for judging the kind of person she thinks she is. As a result, a person will tend to evaluate herself in terms of social situations that confirm her worth, and will devalue social situations that are not so rewarding (Faunce, 1968; Shepard, 1971). Therefore, if a person’s sense of identity is not fulfilled by membership in the organization, she will view her work merely as a small part of who she is. Her search for validation in non-work domains, then, leads to a sense of estrangement from the organization.

It will be recalled that self-respect for the communitarian is derived from a socially structured and actively affirming community; for the individualist, it is acquired through realizing her own potential. The individualist should feel she has the opportunity to attain self-respect through the emphasis on self-reliance and self-control encouraged in new organization forms. However, given the limited development of stable relationships in new organization forms, a communitarian will not feel that she is a valuable and worthwhile person, since her sense of worth is based on the development of long-term relationships and the well-being of others to whom she feels close. Since she will not feel a connection within an organization without stable relationships, her sense of self-worth will most likely need to be met by activities outside of the organization.

**Hypothesis 3:** Within the context of new organization forms, isolation from organizational goals is positively related to communitarianism.

Isolation refers to a sense of separation from organizational goals. In his seminal study of alienation in the workplace, Blauner (1964) defined isolation as a lack of identification or commitment to an organization. Shepard (1968) later operationalized this variant of alienation “in terms of isolation from or integration into organizational goals” (Shepard, 1968: 36). Therefore, if a person can neither
identify with the organization or its goals, she will feel isolated in the work environment.

With regard to self-identity, it will be recalled that the communitarian sees communal attachments as constitutive of the self, while the individualist believes that personal identity is independent of social bonds. The employment relationship in new organization forms, which emphasizes temporary relationships at the expense of a sense of community inside the company, appears to present a more favorable work environment for individualists. Given the lack of stability and constancy of relationships inherent in new organization forms, it makes sense that communitarians would feel more isolated than individualists would. Since individualists make no demands on the organization as a source of self-identity, they can more easily remain committed to organizational goals in employment relationships characterized by temporariness. On the other hand, denied a sense of self-identity in a temporary organizational setting, communitarians are more likely to abandon organizational goals in favor of communal attachments in settings more likely to satisfy their needs.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a review of literature pertaining to the study of new organization forms in post-industrial society. Based on that review, a conceptual model was developed with a research question and hypotheses of relationships of ideology and alienation. Chapter 3 will provide the methodology for testing the proposed relationships.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This dissertation utilizes cross-sectional survey methodology and includes four survey scales. The purpose of this design is to correlate the scores of communitarianism/individualism with the scores of isolation, self-evaluative involvement, and powerlessness. This chapter will discuss this methodology, and will provide details on the sample, the data collection procedure, the measures, and the statistical techniques applied to testing the hypotheses derived from the research question.

RESEARCH SITE AND SAMPLE

Data for this dissertation were collected from two sites. One site is the headquarters of a bank in southwestern Virginia. It is a company that is currently utilizing elements of the new organization forms, such as teamwork, participatory management, and other programs utilized to attain flexibility. The second site is more of a laboratory setting, as it is comprised of Virginia Tech students who have volunteered to work in a new organization form setting. The project, entitled “The Virtual Corporation,” is “a consortium of engineering design teams and business teams that utilize teamwork and cross-functional communication...(which creates) a corporate environment in the most realistic setting possible” (Virtual Corporation, 1998). The Personalized Electric Rapid Transit Systems division (PERTS) is developing "a dual-mode high speed transit system automated by magnetic levitation. In other words, a transit system that travels at record speed" (Ibid). Members conduct marketing research, meet with industry professionals, and develop prototypes, in order to assist Virginia Tech in becoming one of the leaders in developing and promoting high speed ground technology.

Both sites have pros and cons to the dissertation. The first site provides a real world setting for testing the hypotheses, and, thus offers greater generalizability; however, it still maintains artifacts of a classic bureaucratic structure. The second site provides the exact organizational setting of interest for this dissertation, but generalizability may be somewhat limited due to the use of students. Yet, the student project may hold more generalizability than the usual university setting due to its competitive market goals and business dealings with real companies. The first site will be the focus of the dissertation, but the second site may indeed provide interesting results and document further explanatory power for the study. Since both sites are operating under similar organizational design, the data will be combined. This pooling of data should provide a stronger sample of study due to effect size--as a sample gets larger, statistical significance tends to rise.

DATA COLLECTION

A cross-sectional survey research design is applied in this dissertation. A questionnaire was used to collect data on the variables in this study, including
communitarianism/individualism, powerlessness, self-evaluative involvement, and isolation. The questionnaire was completed by the subjects themselves and captured their attitudes toward the new organization form setting.

The survey at the bank included directions and a cover letter explaining the nature and confidentiality of the study. The survey had the support of the chief executive officer, and it was hoped this would insure a high response rate. Given the brevity of time needed to complete the survey, I collected the data at the site. The survey at the student project was administered and collected during a monthly meeting.

MEASURES

Communitarianism/Individualism

This ideological orientation variable was measured by utilizing Watson’s (1997) scale. It is a 20-item semantic differential scale, in which respondents are asked to locate their attitudes on a range between opposite stances on an ideological issue. For example:

| Good teamwork isn’t enough, it’s winning that counts | 1 2 3 4 5 6 | The best thing about competing is being on a team. |

Previous ideological scales evaluated a person’s social psychological propensity toward self-interest or collective interests (Lodge, 1975; Wagner, 1995; Triandis, 1997); however, Watson’s scale examines a person’s normative stance on the role and purpose of social relationships and economic institutions. “Measuring ideological orientation, then, is concerned with unearthing a subject’s dominant beliefs, values, and ideas about how social relationships ought to be structured” (Watson, 1997: 136).

The scale’s construct validity, which tests how accurately a variable measures the construct of interest (Vogt, 1993), was verified by using confirmatory factor analysis and cross-structure analysis. Criterion validity, which tests the scale’s ability to make accurate predictions (Vogt, 1993), was also achieved by Watson. Reliability, which expresses the extent to which a scale will consistently yield the same results over repeated uses (Carmines and Zeller, 1979), was confirmed by the test-retest technique (correlation coefficient of .54). After thorough testing, Watson concluded that his results indicated that the individualism/communitarian scale was sufficiently valid and reliable for usage in organizational research.

Powerlessness

Powerlessness—which “basically measures the subjectively held probabilities that the outcome of economic events cannot be adequately
controlled by oneself or collectively by persons like oneself” (Miller, 1991: 472)--was measured by utilizing Neal and Seeman’s (1964) scale. It is a 7-item scale, which is scored dichotomously as respondents choose one of two responses.

For example:

| It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens to the company at large. |
| People like me can change the future of the company if we make ourselves heard. |

The seven items are then summed, with a powerlessness response scored as 1 and the alternate response scored as 0. Neal and Seeman confirm the validity of the scale by noting that the mean difference of powerlessness scores among organized and unorganized workers is significant at the .01 level, as they expected. The reliability of the seven items is demonstrated by a reproducability coefficient of .87.

**Self-evaluative Involvement**

Self-evaluative involvement, which indicates the extent to which the person feels that her membership in the organization is a more important referent for evaluating herself than activity in nonwork spheres, was measured by utilizing Shepard’s (1971) scale. It is a 5-item Likert scale, in which the respondent answers to what extent the characteristic applies to herself. Responses range from 1 (minimum) to 7 (maximum). For example:

| To you, your work (occupation) is only a small part of who you are. |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Strongly Agree | 6 | 7 |

Summing the five items provides for possible scores ranging from 5 (for persons answering “greatly disagree” to all five self-evaluative involvement items) to 35 (for persons responding “greatly agree” to all five items). Shepard’s scale also met validity standards. The frequency of responses was adequately distributed along the Likert continuum, and the inter-item correlations ranged from .29 to .49.

**Isolation**

Isolation refers to a lack of identification or commitment to the organization and the absence of loyalty to one or more of the network of social relations derived from the organization, such as fellow employees, management, and organizational goals (Shepard, 1969). It was measured by applying Shepard’s (1968) scale. It is a 6-item Likert scale, in which the respondent answers to what
extent the characteristic applies to herself. Responses range from 1 (minimum) to 7 (maximum). For example:

| The reputation of this company in the community is not very important to you. |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Strongly Disagree               | Strongly Agree                |
| 1                               | 2                             |
|                                 | 3                             |
|                                 | 4                             |
|                                 | 5                             |
|                                 | 6                             |
| 7                               |                               |

Summing the six items provides for possible scores ranging from 6 (for persons answering “greatly disagree” to all six isolation items) to 42 (for persons responding “greatly agree” to all six items). Shepard’s scale also met validity standards, as the frequency of responses were adequately distributed along the Likert continuum and the inter-item correlations ranged from .25 to .60 (with four items varying from .41 to .60).

**HYPOTHESIS TESTING**

The hypotheses were tested in this dissertation by utilizing Pearson’s product-moment analysis and hierarchical regression. Pearson’s product-moment analysis provides the degree of relationship, or correlation, between the variables of interest. The variables in this dissertation are attitude scores, and can be treated as interval measures (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1959). Interval measures are summed and then used to calculate helpful statistics such as means, standard deviations, and Pearson product moment correlations (Lehman, 1989). In this dissertation, the relationships of interest are between how people score on the communitarian/individualism scale and the different measures of alienation. Pearson’ product-moment analysis furnished the degree of strength of the relationships, the percent of variation explained by relationships, and whether the relationships are positive or negative (Vogt, 1993). This method is appropriate for this dissertation because it enabled me to test whether communitarians were more alienated than individualists within the context of new organization forms. If my hypotheses are correct, communitarianism will have a positive correlation with alienation.

Hierarchical regression analysis was implemented to test whether communitarianism/individualism actually has a significant relationship with the alienation variables. By first running a regression analysis with age, gender, and social class--3 demographic control variables commonly attributed to sociological phenomenon (Shepard, 1997)--and then running one with communitarianism/individualism included, one can test whether the explained variance of the model significantly improves. If the explained variance of the regression model with communitarianism/individualism is indeed significantly more, then one can state with more confidence that the hypothesized relationship between the variables accounts for differences between respondents.
SUMMARY

This chapter has provided the methodology that was utilized to test the hypotheses of this dissertation. Chapter 4 will provide the results of the study. Chapter 5 will provide a discussion of the results and examine the implications and limitations of the study.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the research design proposed in the earlier chapters. The characteristics of the sample are discussed in the first section of this chapter. The remainder of the chapter examines whether the proposed hypotheses and research question were supported by the collected data.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Procedures

The data collected in this study were obtained over a period of two months and gathered from two locations. The first site was an experimental company comprised of Virginia Tech students who have volunteered to work in a new organization form setting. The second site was a bank located in southwestern Virginia, which is currently utilizing elements of the new organization forms, such as teamwork, participatory management, and other programs utilized to attain flexibility.

The participants in the experimental company completed the survey prior to a workshop I presented to them. The survey consisted of 3 demographic questions, 18 items to measure alienation, and a 20-item scale to measure individualism-communitarianism orientation. The survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete, and was returned by 58 members out of a possible 61 member base.

The same survey was given to the bank. The distribution of the survey within the corporate headquarters and to its five bank branches was arranged by the company’s general counsel and human resources manager. The survey was prefaced with a memorandum from the chief executive officer stating his approval of the bank as a site for my dissertation research and a letter from myself stating my background, the importance of the respondent’s participation, and the usage of the data. Respondents were informed that their identity would be held confidential, and that a summary of results would be provided. The response rate was 75 percent (154/204). The high response rate is probably due to the support of the chief executive officer and the assistance of the general counsel and human resources manager in developing and implementing the distribution strategy.

Sample

The sample is comprised of 194 subjects. Of the 58 surveys returned by the student company, only three were unusable, while 139 of the 154 surveys received from the bank were completed and fully intact. The gender of the sample was 65 percent female and 35 percent male. Seventy percent of respondents were between the ages of 20 and 40 years old, and 59 percent of the sample had annual incomes between $15,000 and $45,000 (Table 4.1). The sample responses appear to be valid and reliable, as indicated by the significant variation in the ideological orientations of the demographic factors (Table 4.2).
Referring to similar findings in studies of individualism-collectivism—a social psychological measure of patterns in social relationships—men tend to be more individualistic than women (Daab, 1991; Ho and Chiu, 1994; Triandis, 1995), and younger people tend to be more individualistic than older people (Shweder and Bourne, 1982; Noricks et al., 1987; Triandis et al., 1988; Gudykunst, 1993), while findings are mixed on income. Bellah et al. (1988) contend that those with higher incomes support social relationships and norms in order to maintain the status quo which provides their wealth, whereas Dabb (1991) observed that people tend to separate themselves from the rest of society as wealth is accumulated, especially among the richest classes. My sample matches the aforementioned findings on age and gender, and, with regard to income, it corresponds to Bellah’s findings. It is encouraging that the ideological results are consistent with previous research, leading me to infer that respondents probably answered the alienation items in this study honestly as well.

**HYPOTHESES TESTS**

This section presents the results of the tested hypotheses. Each hypothesis will be stated, and then followed with the appropriate statistical results. Chapter 5 will discuss the implications of these results.

**Hypothesis 1:**

**H1. Within the context of new organization forms, powerlessness is positively related to communitarianism.**

Hypothesis 1 was not supported. Table 4.3 shows a negative correlation (-0.069) between powerlessness and individualism/communitarianism ideology. After performing hierarchical regression and observing that explained variance in powerlessness was not significantly improved by adding ideology, the negative relationship was found to be statistically insignificant. Explained variance (r-squared) only improved from 4.9 percent to 6.8 percent, which generated an F-score of 3.85; however, an F-score of 3.90 was needed for ideology to be considered a significant source of variation in powerlessness. A significant positive correlation between the two scales is necessary to support a positive relationship between powerlessness and communitarianism. Since the correlation is insignificant, I can conclude statistically that communitarians do not experience more powerlessness than individualists within the context of new organization forms.

**Hypothesis 2:**

**H2. Within the context of new organization forms, the amount of self-evaluative involvement is negatively related to communitarianism.**
Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Table 4.4 shows a positive correlation (0.138) between self-evaluative involvement and individualism/communitarianism ideology. After performing hierarchical regression and observing that explained variance in self-evaluative involvement was not significantly improved by adding ideology, the positive correlation was found to be statistically insignificant. Explained variance (r-squared) only improved from 2.3 percent to 3.8 percent, which generated an F-score of 2.95; however, an F-score of 3.90 was needed for ideology to be considered a significant source of variation in self-evaluative involvement. A significant negative correlation is needed to support a negative relationship between self-evaluative involvement and communitarianism. Since the correlation is insignificant, I can conclude statistically that communitarians do not experience less self-evaluative involvement than individualists within the context of new organization forms.

**Hypothesis 3:**

H3. Within the context of new organization forms, isolation from organizational goals is positively related to communitarianism.

Hypothesis 3 was not supported. Table 4.5 shows a negative correlation (-0.566) between isolation and individualism/communitarianism ideology. After performing hierarchical regression and observing that explained variance in isolation was significantly improved by adding ideology, the negative relationship was found to be statistically significant. Explained variance improved from 18.1 percent to 38.3 percent and generated an F-score of 45.818, which is well above the 3.90 needed to consider ideology a significant source of variation in isolation from organizational goals. A significant positive correlation, however, is needed to support a positive relationship between isolation and communitarianism. Since the correlation is significantly negative, I can conclude statistically that communitarians do not experience more isolation from goals than individualists within the context of new organization forms.

**Summary of Hypotheses Testing**

The results of testing the hypotheses are shown in Table 4.6. The testing of the hypotheses is intended to address the following research question.

**Research Question:** Within the context of new organization forms, will members with a communitarian orientation experience more alienation than individualists?

The results of the hypotheses testing indicate that, within the context of new organization forms, communitarians and individualists do not significantly differ with regards to powerlessness and self-evaluative involvement, and that, if anything, individualists actually experience more isolation from organization goals. Given that the hypotheses of the study were found to be unsupported, it appears that communitarians do not experience more alienation than
individualists in a new organization form setting. A summary of the results of the analyses is presented in Table 4.7, and will be discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Chapter 5 will discuss the results which were presented in Chapter 4. Overall conclusions based on the tested hypotheses and research question are presented. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implications of the research, limitations of the study, and avenues for future research.

CONCLUSIONS

Companies today are increasingly restructuring into new organization forms, in order to attain maximum flexibility and remain competitive with other global companies in quickly evolving markets (Lewin and Stephens, 1993; D’Aveni, 1994; Illinitch, D’Aveni, and Lewin, 1996). The purpose of this study was to provide an empirically-based examination of how employees are responding to these new organization forms.

The ideologies of individualism and communitarianism were applied to determine their relationship to employee attitudinal responses in the new organization form setting. Positive findings would provide one possible source of the increasing alienation and decreasing satisfaction in the postindustrial workplace described by recent business researchers, such as Rifkin (1995), Reich (1997), and Gordon (1996). In a similar study by Watson (1997), it was discovered that significant differences did exist in the responses of ideologically different employees to vignettes regarding hypothetical actions on the part of companies undergoing restructuring. While this dissertation found no discernible difference in employee responses on two of the three measures of study, one major difference in this study and Watson’s may account for the dissimilar findings. Watson examined an organization that utilized downsizing, while the organizations I studied have not downsized but rather employed teamwork and participation approaches to attain increased flexibility.

While my hypotheses were not supported, hindsight suggests an alternative hypothesis: Employees with differing ideological dispositions can both prosper in the postindustrial workplace as long as elements of the traditional economic compact are in place. Support for this statement is established by noting that employees considered their positions in the organizations as secure, and that communitarians and individualists did not significantly differ with regard to powerlessness and self-evaluative involvement. It appears that most of the employees believe they can attain their personal goals in the new organization form setting. This makes sense, though, when one considers that both organizations utilize team approaches. Since communitarians prefer working with other people to attain their goals, they should feel empowered by the team approaches. Yet, because individualists believe in taking personal responsibility for meeting their goals regardless of the organizational circumstances, they should not feel a loss of control either. With regard to self-evaluative involvement, communitarians should relate well to the teamwork approach and identify strongly with their jobs. Again, since individualists emphasize self-reliance in meeting the demands of their organizational setting, they should still
be able to attain self-respect. It appears, then, that the companies that consider the needs and concerns of their employees when designing organizational structures will also be the ones that provide fulfilling and motivating workplaces in the postindustrial era. This conclusion is, in fact, not surprising if one looks at early research from sociotechnical studies that predict the emergence of new organization forms.

The sociotechnical model, developed by Emery and Trist (1965) and members of the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in the 1950s and 1960s, describes an organization as an open system that adapts to its environment by changing its design and functioning as needed. Whereas traditional management theorists tended to treat an organization’s design as fixed or given, sociotechnical theorists accentuated understanding the relationship between the social (people) and technical (technology) subsystems in an organization to permit management to design organizations to more effectively meet its goals (Passmore and Sherwood, 1978). The key in this perspective is to understand the influence each of the subsystems has on the other, for if the organization attempts to maximize the effectiveness of each component separately it will most likely fail at meeting its goals. For this reason, it is crucial that organizations do not neglect employees’ values and beliefs, otherwise conflicts will result and company performance could suffer. As Wilms notes, “Companies that ignore this principle may end up pursuing short-term profit at the expense of long-term growth.” (1996: 172).

Evidence of this important relationship can be found in the bedrock study of sociotechnical systems theory, which originated somewhat by chance. In 1949, Trist and Bamforth observed self-governing work groups in the mines of England attaining astounding levels of coal production, which led them to realize the performance potential of reconciling employee values with technological constraints and environmental demands. As automation entered the industry, it was discovered that teams were still needed to reach the coal that could not be mined by the new equipment. In a manner uncharacteristic of business at the time, management and labor jointly designed the teams (Trist and Bamforth, 1951). By taking the technical and social concerns of the organization into account, the coal mining industry in England continued to prosper even under new conditions.

While early studies on self-managed teams, participation, and other forms of close collaboration were undertaken by sociotechnical theorists who linked the technological and social subsystems (Wilms, 1996; Pasmore and Sherwood, 1978), it appears that today many companies are not considering both realms of sociotechnical systems when redesigning their organizations. Given the “bottom line” orientation of American business, companies typically focus on reducing

---

1 Similar to the objective of today’s new organization forms, a common aim of sociotechnical systems is to create an organization that can quickly meet the demands of its environment. In 1961, Burns and Stalker called this form of structure ‘organic,’ and described it as “appropriate to changing conditions, which give rise constantly to fresh problems and unforeseen requirements for action which cannot be broken down or distributed automatically arising from the functional roles defined within a hierarchic structure” (Burns and Stalker, 1961: 117).
costs to bring about dramatic improvements in performance; and the quickest and easiest way to reduce costs in the eyes of many executives is through cutting labor expenses. By downsizing and restructuring around information technologies, companies can reduce hierarchies and gain flexibility (Gordon, 1996; Harrison, 1994; Rifkin, 1995; Thurow, 1996). With the increased workload and disappearance of former colleagues and friends, however, morale often falls in the company, and many employees begin exhibiting behavior resembling the “walking dead” and worry about their future in the company (Kleinfeld, 1996: 67). The result is commonly what Hope and Hope call the “vicious circle of declining profits” (Hope and Hope, 1995: 22), in which the drop in morale from a downsizing causes many of the better employees in the company to pursue other opportunities. This exodus of high performers places greater strain on the remaining members, which leads to poorer customer service and production, and, ultimately, a decline in sales. The cycle then repeats itself as executives downsize again to reduce costs and stem the loss in profits².

When new organization forms are adopted in this fashion, there is a loss of community inside the company at a time when the development of trust is essential to the success of a flexible organization. As Jones and Bowie (1998) observe:

The virtual corporation is, by its very nature, subject to something we call the Virtual Corporation Paradox. This paradox arises because the efficiency of such corporations depends on features—speed and flexibility—that require high levels of trust and cooperation. However, the traits of the virtual corporation make it a poor mechanism for developing the longer term, stable relationships upon which organizational theorists insist mutual trust depends (Jones and Bowie, 1998: 276-277).

Downsizing could certainly inhibit the development of trust in an organization. However, Hackman and Oldham (1980) found that when certain contextual factors are first in place, such as job stability, acceptable pay, meaningful work, and nondiscriminatory personnel practices, strategies applied to attain increased organizational flexibility can actually increase motivation, satisfaction, and performance. Perhaps, then, the Virtual Corporation Paradox can be resolved in new organization forms by retaining elements of the traditional economic compact, which are quite similar to Hackman and Oldham’s contextual factors. This, in fact, appears to be the approach that the companies in this dissertation have implemented with great success.

The companies indicated clearly to me that job security and worker satisfaction were important organizational goals. When I asked executives at the

² Shields and Young (1992) compare this cycle to a rollercoaster ride. As employees are laid off, the stock market may reward the company’s stock price, but, as the strain on the organization develops, company performance eventually declines. When the company demonstrates that it is addressing this problem by again cutting labor costs, the market may once again reward the company with a jump in its stock price, but ultimately this tumultuous ride will come to an end.
bank if it had ever downsized, I was told quite firmly that their focus is on growth, and that downsizing is a practice in which they do not intend to partake. Furthermore, they said that ‘downsizing’ is a word that is not even spoken within the walls of the building for fear that employees might feel insecure about their positions with the company in the future. The Virtual Corporation states in its publicity pamphlet that it is an organization that “empowers students from a variety of different engineering and business majors. Students learn the benefits of teamwork and cross-functional communication.” Since the Virtual Corporation is a university project consisting of students, downsizing is probably not a realistic threat to its members. However, its sponsor’s attitude toward attrition rates could serve as a proxy of what the work environment would be like if downsizing were a possibility. For example, if the sponsor is uncaring about the effects of attrition on the loyal members of the organization, she may create a workplace similar to one that is under the threat of downsizing. Members under these circumstances might feel overburdened by their workload and concerned about their future with the organization--essentially wondering whether to persevere or join their former colleagues in a mass exodus similar to an imposed downsizing. Since the sponsor emphasized the Virtual Corporation’s devotion to increasing member satisfaction and retaining a low rate of attrition, I believe the work atmosphere in the organization would be similar to that of a company that is not under the threat of downsizing. Thus, it appears clear that, even as they seek high degrees of organizational flexibility, leaders of both organizations place importance on the well-being of their members, an approach not often found in many new organization forms.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

In order to attain greater flexibility in today’s hypercompetitive marketplace, companies are increasingly delayering the organization and forging more permeable boundaries by turning to contingency workforces, downsizing, and outsourcing (Gordon, 1996; Rifkin, 1995; D’Aveni, 1994). Consequently, upon writing the first three chapters of this dissertation, I believed that new organization forms, in general, would cause many workers to experience high levels of alienation. While I was able to receive permission to study companies that embody the flexibility and structure of new organization forms, they had not, however, utilized downsizing, outsourcing, or contingency workforces. The fact that I did not study traditionally established new organization forms probably accounts for the unexpected results in this dissertation. Thus, findings from this dissertation discovered that a more humane route for successfully restructuring a company into a flexible organization is possible, and, in fact, appears to have been implemented by the companies in this study. Without the threat of downsizing and with the traditional social compact intact, employees responded well to the empowerment and teamwork approaches adopted by the organizations.

Levels of alienation among ideologically different employees were low in both companies, which suggests that those that are community-oriented can just
as likely feel a strong connection to a new organization form as those that are focused on individual aims. It may be that as long as a company is implementing flexibility-based approaches while addressing the long-term interests and well-being of its employees, both the organization and its members can benefit. It makes sense that, under these conditions, communitarians would not be highly alienated from the organization; and, given the belief that a person is ultimately responsible for his or her life choices, it makes sense that individualists would find ways to attain satisfaction even if they did not agree with an organization’s goals.

Unfortunately, it appears this scenario is not as prevalent in the current business environment as one would hope. Anxiety and confusion are common states of mind today among many American workers as companies shift from mass production to flexible specialization in the postindustrial workplace (Sloan, 1996; Church, 1996; Roberts, 1996). Much of this condition may be explained by what appears to be a common disconnect between rhetoric and actions in American business. As traditional labor arrangements are fractured inside the organization through downsizing, cooperative approaches, such as teamwork, empowerment, and total quality programs, are often simultaneously adopted to maintain previous production levels. Although the managerial rhetoric espousing the new organization form in this fashion usually emphasizes cooperation and survival, the underlying management agenda often rests on the expendability of workers and short-term employment relationships. Cooperative approaches, however, require a shared purpose, trust, and commitment that are developed over time, approaches which are not evident when a new organization form emphasizes short-term labor contracts (Gordon, 1996; Rifkin, 1995; Jones and Bowie, 1998). It should be no surprise, then, that, as Watson (1997) discovered, many employees are frustrated in new organization forms involving downsizing.

Companies need not take this course of action, though, when restructuring into a new organization form, as may be evidenced by the success of the organizations in this dissertation. A new organization form properly understood in the Tavistock tradition may be able to avoid a disconnect between actions and rhetoric by retaining elements of the traditional economic compact, such as job security, fair pay, and health benefits. In the process, sustained partnerships among a corporation and its employees may continue, which may facilitate the maintenance or development of the trust required for quickly coordinating tasks on short-term projects and for maintaining employee morale and loyalty (Thompson, 1967; Myerson, Weick, and Kramer, 1996; Jones and Bowie, 1998). As the work of sociotechnical theorists of the 1950s and 1960s suggests, the corporations of the information age who avoid downsizing may build trust by retaining and developing human capital while simultaneously utilizing new information technologies and flexible organizational structures and processes. If this is the case, it would be wise for companies to keep the following thought in mind when considering how to restructure into a more flexible organization:
Individual fulfillment depends on a place in a community, an identity with a whole, participation in an organic social process....If the community or its components are poorly designed, people will be correspondingly alienated and frustrated. If the community—the factory, the neighborhood, or the country—is well-designed, its members will have a strong sense of identity with it, and will be able to make maximum use of their capacities. (Lodge and Vogel, 1987: 15-16).

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The social scientist is always faced with the reality that his or her findings are intrinsically flawed to some degree. The goal of social research is to present findings that are measured precisely, can be generalized to a population, and reflect reality; however, one cannot accomplish all these goals with satisfaction in one study. The researcher, then, must choose which of these goals is most important for their current study, and recognize that further research must be undertaken over the future to provide a richer understanding of the topic of interest (Brinberg and McGrath, 1985; Babbie, 1995). In this dissertation, I opted to go into the field and measure respondents who were members of actual new organization forms; thus, the findings will be limited in their generalizability and precision. However, as a first study on this topic, I was determined to study the phenomena in a realistic setting, in order to provide myself with first-hand knowledge of a new organization form in practice.

Since only one measure was utilized for each variable, method variance could be another potential limitation in this dissertation. Method variance is "traditionally defined as variance in observations due to the method rather than the trait of interest" (Spector and Brannick, 1995; 249). Campbell and Fisk (1959) contend that this error can be controlled by using dissimilar methods to measure a trait (Campbell and Fisk, 1959). Spector and Brannick (1995), however, argue that this approach is also limited, because multiple measurement techniques may tire respondents and impair the accuracy of the results. Consequently, they echo Brinberg and McGrath (1985) and Babbie (1995), in noting that due to the constraints found in all research, many studies are needed for a researcher to gain thorough understanding of a topic. The key, then,

---

3 For example, if the social scientist tries to attain generalizable results or observe natural phenomena with little interference, she can not be as precise with her measurement as she may like; however, if she controls for variability on a number of factors in a laboratory setting, she lowers the generalizability and realism of the study.

4 Spector and Brannick provide a good example of why true understanding of a topic requires multiple studies over rather lengthy periods of time: "Suppose we use an interview to assess some traits of interest. We might be concerned that the interview will be influenced by the attractiveness of the interviewee. To control for this we might use a telephone interview. However, with only the auditory channel to concentrate on, the voice characteristics of the interviewee might become quite salient. To control for voice characteristics, we might use a computer to conduct the interview so that raters only have access to the interviewee's written responses. Of course, the computer might introduce method variance attributable to the computer literacy or computer anxiety of the interviewee....Each of the three methods would be intended to control for some sources of method variance while they might introduce others....With
according to Spector and Brannick, is to concentrate on the entire measurement process and use common sense in controlling for influencing factors. Thus, in this dissertation, letters from myself and memos from company executives were provided in the weeks leading up to the survey to indicate to employees that the purpose of the study was for providing a Virginia Tech doctoral student with data for his dissertation. I appeared at the sites for a day, in order to insure respondents that I was indeed a doctoral student and that management was not conducting the survey. To further control for social desirability bias in the answers, anonymity was also promised to all respondents.

Another limitation is that the surveys were presented at only two sites. While the results provide a quite interesting picture of employees in a new organization form setting, the study would benefit from a larger sample of firms. Due to cost constraints and parsimony, I attempted to find companies that embraced many characteristics of a new organization form, and believe I was successful in doing so. However, it would be beneficial for the future study of this issue to compare employees in different organizational settings, in order to verify the positive impact a (properly understood) new organization form can have on its employees.

**FUTURE RESEARCH**

Victor and Stephens (1994) contend that business ethics can serve as a bridge between empirical social science and normative philosophy. By presenting data that verifies the social and competitive benefits of moral corporate behavior, business ethicists can help in persuading companies to act in the best interests of themselves and their stakeholders. It is hoped that this dissertation attributes to that goal. As America moves into the next millenium, it is economically imperative for companies to not ignore the well-being of their employees. Elements of the traditional economic compact, such as fair pay, health benefits, and job security, are still needed in corporations, even as they try to remain competitive in an increasingly complex global marketplace. The findings of my research suggest that companies may be able to attain high flexibility while also keeping the traditional economic compact in place. However, research at more sites is needed to give weight to these conclusions. In future studies, I intend to collect data at bureaucratic organizations and downsized companies, in the hope of illustrating that new organization forms properly understood in the Tavistock tradition do, in fact, lead to less alienation among employees while simultaneously providing the flexibility needed to survive in the postindustrial economic environment.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideological Dimensions</th>
<th>Political Social Contracts</th>
<th>Economic Social Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Choices:</strong> This dimension refers to the determination of one's life projects and aims.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Competition and bargaining as the means for realizing and fulfilling life choices.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Each person is responsible for his or her own economic outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> The individual is responsible for his or her life choices.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Cooperation as the means to realizing and fulfilling life choices.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Each employee is a vested member member of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Life choices are socially embedded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Identity:</strong> This dimension refers to the source of one's self-definition.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> It is the individual's right to pursue his or her own definition of the self.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Self-identity is tied to individual aims, not to any organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Submits that personal identity is independent of social bonds.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> One's definition of the self is embedded in the community.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Self-identity is bound in part to the work role and the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Sees communal attachments as constitutive of the self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-respect:</strong> This dimension refers to the source of self-respect—or the sense that one is a valuable and worthwhile person.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Self-respect is experienced when achieving personally satisfying life goals.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Self-respect is a derivative of economic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Self-respect is derived from realizing one's potential.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Self-respect is derived from communal membership.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Self-respect is derivative of organizational membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Self-respect is derived from a socially structured and actively affirming community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.2 Ideology, Political Social Contracts, Economic Social Contracts, and Alienation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideological Dimensions</th>
<th>Political Social Contracts</th>
<th>Economic Social Contracts</th>
<th>Forms of Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Choices:</strong> This dimension refers to the determination of one's life projects and aims.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Competition and bargaining as the means for realizing and fulfilling life choices.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Each person is responsible for his or her own economic outcomes.</td>
<td><strong>Powerlessness:</strong> Within the context of new organization forms, feelings of powerlessness will be greater among communitarians than individualists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> The individual is responsible for his or her life choices.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Cooperation is the means to realizing and fulfilling life choices.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Each employee is a vested member of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Life choices are socially embedded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Identity:</strong> This dimension refers to the source of one's self-definition.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> It is the individual's right to pursue his or her own definition of the self.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Self-identity is tied to individual aims, not to any organization.</td>
<td><strong>Self-evaluative Involvement:</strong> Within the context of new org. forms, individualists will demonstrate more self-evaluative involvement in work than communitarians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Submits that personal identity is independent of social bonds.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> One's definition of the self is embedded in the community.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Self-identity is bound in part to the work role and the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Sees communal attachments as constitutive of the self.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-respect:</strong> This dimension refers to the source of self-respect—or the sense that one is a valuable and worthwhile person.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Self-respect is experienced when achieving personally satisfying life goals.</td>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Self-respect is derivative of economic success.</td>
<td><strong>Isolation:</strong> Within the context of new org. forms, individualists will feel less isolated from organizational goals than communitarians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualist:</strong> Self-respect is derived from realizing one's potential.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Self-respect is derived from communal membership.</td>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Self-respect is derivative of organizational membership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communitarian:</strong> Self-respect is derived from a socially structured and actively affirming community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE</td>
<td>SAMPLE</td>
<td>C/I MEAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>74.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>78.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 years old</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>69.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30 years old</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>73.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>80.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years old</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>80.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years old</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>81.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 60 years old</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>85.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to $15,000</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>73.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $15,000 and $30,000</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $31,000 and $45,000</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>78.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $46,000 and $60,000</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>78.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $60,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>89.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>23831</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>24546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2961</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>21595</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>24556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>22999</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>24556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.3 Correlation and Significance Test (Powerlessness and Individualism/Communitarianism Ideology)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation of Powerlessness and Ideology = -0.069</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P = 0.863 + 0.146 \text{ age} + 0.585 \text{ gender} - 0.057 \text{ income}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 1.458$ $R$-sq $= 4.9%$ $R$-sq (adj) $= 3.4%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P = 2.04 + 0.193 \text{ age} + 0.657 \text{ gender} - 0.029 \text{ income} - 0.0193 \text{ ideology}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 1.474$ $R$-sq $= 6.8%$ $R$-sq (adj) $= 4.8%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F(1,189) = 3.85 &lt; F(\text{sig}) = 3.90$ CORRELATION IS INSIGNIFICANT $p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.4 Correlation and Significance Test (Self-evaluative Involvement and Individualism/Communitarianism Ideology)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation of Self-evaluative Involvement and Ideology = 0.138</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{SEI} = 16.7 - 0.378 \text{ age} + 1.38 \text{ gender} + 0.765 \text{ income}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 5.376$ $R$-sq $= 2.3%$ $R$-sq(adj) $= 0.7%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{SEI} = 12.9 - 0.530 \text{ age} + 1.15 \text{ gender} + 0.678 \text{ income} + 0.0625 \text{ ideology}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s = 5.349$ $R$-sq $= 3.8%$ $R$-sq(adj) $= 1.7%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F(1,189) = 2.95 &lt; F(\text{sig}) = 3.90$ CORRELATION IS INSIGNIFICANT $p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5  Correlation and Significance Test (Isolation from Organizational Goals and Individualism/Communitarianism Ideology)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Correlation of Isolation and Ideology</th>
<th>Isolation Equation</th>
<th>R-sq(adj)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-0.566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation = 24.3 - 1.26 age - 2.11 gender - 1.56 income</td>
<td></td>
<td>s = 5.542</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-sq = 18.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation = 40.1 - 0.632 age - 1.14 gender - 1.20 income - 0.258 ideology</td>
<td></td>
<td>s = 4.823</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-sq = 38.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(1,189) = 45.818&gt;F(sig) = 3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORRELATION IS SIGNIFICANT</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6  Study Hypotheses Results

H1: Within the context of new organization forms, powerlessness is positively related to communitarianism.  
**Hypothesis was not supported.**

H2: Within the context of new organization forms, the amount of self-evaluative involvement is negatively related to communitarianism.  
**Hypothesis was not supported.**

H3: Within the context of new organization forms, isolation from organizational goals is positively related to communitarianism.  
**Hypothesis was not supported.**
Table 4.7  Summary of the Results of the Analyses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **H1:** | Within the context of the new organization forms, powerlessness is positively related to communitarianism.  
  **Hypothesis was not supported.** |
| **H2:** | Within the context of the new organization forms, self-evaluative involvement is negatively related to communitarianism.  
  **Hypothesis was not supported.** |
| **H3:** | Within the context of new organization forms, isolation from organizational goals is positively related to communitarianism.  
  **Hypothesis was not supported.** |
| **RQ:** | Within the context of new organization forms, will members with a communitarian orientation experience more alienation than individualists?  
  **No significant difference in powerlessness and self-evaluative involvement between communitarians and individualists was found.** The results also show that individualists experience more isolation from organizational goals than communitarians do within the context of new organization forms. Thus, within the context of new organization forms, it appears that members with a communitarian orientation do not experience more alienation than individualists. |
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