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VALUES
Understanding Scientific Management, Human Behavior, Integrated Perspectives, and Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives in contemporary organizations
Clarifying the importance of values in organizations

THE DAVIS INSTRUMENT COMPANY’S MANUFACTURING CRISIS

Pam Martin was not surprised that the three supervisors in her section were disagreeing about how to train on the new MCF system. Joan, Henry, and Frank rarely agreed on how to solve section problems. Even though Pam had been their manager for over two years and knew each of them to be highly competent, the three seemed to view their work at Davis very differently. The problem for today’s staff meeting was no exception. The new MCF system was being installed throughout all Davis Instrument Company’s manufacturing areas to computer-automate and control assembly work previously done by highly skilled workers. The system would not replace any existing employees but would require training on new machines and computer controls. Over time, productivity would be expected to increase, and those employees who had early training on the system would be in positions for rapid advancement. All three of Pam’s subordinates had supported acquiring the new system and thought that it was in the best long-term interests of Davis, but Joan, Henry, and Frank did not agree on how to select employees for training on the MCF and how to restructure work teams to implement the new process.

Joan argued that Pam and the supervisors should just decide. After all, early training on the system should fit the best workers with the highest aptitudes for computers to the new jobs. Yes, of course that means that other good workers would not have as much chance for advancement, but tough decisions are what management gets paid to make. Joan contended that the supervisors were in the best position to judge how to restructure the work teams. She proposed that the supervisors draw up a list of new job assignments, announce them to the group, and develop a timetable for system implementation.

Henry strongly disagreed. He voiced concern that his work team was worried about the new assignments. Henry believed that the affected workers should have some say in the assignment decisions. He supported letting each work team give their supervisors a plan for reassignment that the supervisors would then use for final decisions. He contended that individuals were more likely to be motivated and accept the changes willingly if they had a part in determining how the changes were to be implemented.

Frank thought that both Joan and Henry represented extreme positions that really did not serve the best interests of Davis. He proposed that the three supervisors draw up overall criteria for the new positions and the job assignments needed for each work team. They should then present the reorganization plan to their work teams and have individual meetings with each worker to determine interest and skill fit for each of the new positions. Frank agreed with Joan that some tough decisions about particular individuals would have to be made. He also agreed with Henry that better motivation would result if each individual had some input about the future assignment.
Pam knew all three wanted the project to succeed. The question was how to get Joan, Henry, and Frank to agree on an approach.

1. Joan, Henry, and Frank are all competent supervisors. What accounts for their differences?
2. Is it possible that they have different types of people in their work teams?
3. Can you describe how each of the three views the role of supervisor?
4. How do you think they view their work groups?
5. Do they have different theories of how organizations work?

INTRODUCTION

The disagreement of Joan, Henry, and Frank is a good example of individuals with different views about how organizations should operate. Joan, Henry, and Frank all agree that the MCF system is a needed change but disagree about how that change should be made. Their disagreement can be traced, at least in part, to the different ways in which they view workers and organizations.

In Chapter 2 we established three major perspectives for studying organizational communication: the Functional approach, the Meaning-Centered approach, and Emerging Perspectives. In this chapter we identify and describe major organizational theories and evaluate their communication implications from these three approaches. We look at how researchers describe the ways in which organizations should work, what types of assumptions are made about people in organizations, and what these descriptions and assumptions mean for organizational communication.

We examine four major perspectives or schools of organizational thought: the Scientific Management, Human Behavior, Integrated Perspectives, and Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives schools. The four can be distinguished from one another by the questions researchers representing each viewpoint ask about organizations. Theorists representing the Scientific Management school ask questions about how organizations should be designed, how workers can be trained for maximum efficiency, how the chain of command works, and how division of labor should be determined.

Human Behavior theorists are concerned about the influence of individuals in organizations, what motivates workers, and how motivation affects the organization. These theorists believe organizational design and structure reflect basic assumptions about human behavior. They describe organizational relationships and people as resources. Human Behavior approaches are frequently discussed as human relation and human resource theories.

The development of what we call the Integrated Perspectives school can be traced to criticisms of Scientific Management and Human Behavior approaches. In the Integrated Perspectives approach, researchers ask questions about how structure, technology, and people relate to their environments. They are concerned with relationships among organizational design, employee motivation, communication participation, and organizational values, because these factors relate to the organization’s ability to function in its environment. In some respects, the Integrated Perspectives
approach reflects a merger of much of the thinking developed by Scientific Management and Human Behavior researchers. Finally, Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives present a critique of power and domination in organizations, and of rationality as described by the Scientific Management perspective, and seek to examine the privilege of certain organizational members and the marginalization of others.

This chapter is designed to contribute to knowledge competencies by describing major organizational theories representing Scientific Management, Human Behavior, Integrated, and Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives. Sensitivity competencies are fostered by examining communication implications found in theory. Analysis skills are developed by combining knowledge and sensitivity competencies for application to familiar organizations and case studies. Finally, knowledge, sensitivity, and skill competencies influence values through evaluation of Scientific Management, Human Behavior, Integrated, and Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives theories in contemporary organizations and by examining the importance of values for successful organizations.

THE SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT SCHOOL

The Scientific Management school was well described by Frederick Taylor when, in his classic work *Principles of Scientific Management* (1913), he attempted to convince readers that the inefficiency in most organizations is caused by a lack of systematic management and that “the best management is a true science, resting upon clearly defined laws, rules, and principles, as a foundation.” This foundation, from the Scientific Management point of view, rested on “scientifically” designed organizations characterized by carefully developed chains of command and efficient division of labor.

Three men—Frederick Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber—were largely responsible for developing the major concepts of the Scientific Management approach. All three were contemporaries living and writing during a period from the middle of the nineteenth century to World War I. The approaches of Taylor, Fayol, and Weber are used to describe the Scientific Management perspective.

**Major Scientific Management Theories**

**Principles of Scientific Management: Frederick Taylor (1856–1915)**

Frederick Taylor is often referred to as the father of Scientific Management. Taylor’s work experience, ranging from common laborer to chief engineer, served as the basis for the development of the four essential elements he viewed as the foundation of scientific management: (1) careful selection of workers, (2) inducing and training the worker by the scientific method, (3) equal division of work between management and workers, and (4) discovering the scientific method for tasks and jobs.

Taylor (1913) held management responsible for devising the scientific method of work. He contended that inefficiency is fostered by allowing workers to
determine how tasks should be performed. Furthermore, he believed that management is responsible for identifying “one best way” to perform tasks and that management should be exacting in teaching workers this scientific method for task performance. Taylor believed close contact between management and workers would eliminate the necessity for peer communication and what he called “soldiering,” the unhealthy influence of the peer group.

Taylor is famous for his introduction in industry of the time and motion study. Taylor believed that if tasks were scientifically designed and workers extensively trained, the efficiency of production could be determined by timing the amount of work (motion) performed by individuals and teams. His “one best method” of task design was intended to produce the adoption of work standards that could be measured to increase efficiency and overall productivity.

Taylor believed scientific management could be accomplished only with a well-defined chain of command and very specific division of labor. He held management responsible for developing the chain of command and organizing a division of labor based on well-defined work standards and measurement of standards to increase efficiency. Taylor’s concepts were extremely influential in the early 1900s and continue to influence how organizations are designed, how performance standards are established, and how work efficiency is measured today.

Principles of Management: Henri Fayol (1841–1925)

Henri Fayol is credited with the first known attempt to describe broad principles of management for the organization and conduct of business. A French mining engineer, Fayol spent his working career as an engineer and later managing director of the Comambault, a mining company that was floundering before Fayol assumed leadership. Fayol enjoyed enormous success as director of Comambault and was widely credited with turning a financially troubled company into a stable and thriving institution. Fayol founded the Center for Administrative Studies and, as a leading industrialist, attempted to influence the French government to apply his principles of administration. His early papers on general administrative theory became the influential text *General and Industrial Management*, first published in 1916.

In *General and Industrial Management* (1949), Fayol proposed fourteen principles of administration or management that he viewed as essential for effective organization:

1. *Division of work.* Fayol proposed a division of labor based on task specialization, with individuals having specific and well-defined assignments.
2. *Authority.* Fayol placed responsibility for the exercise of authority with management. He also emphasized a difference between authority as a result of job title versus what he called “personal” authority, authority based on intelligence, experience, moral worth, ability to lead, and past service. Although he did not describe it as such, Fayol was recognizing the importance of what is now called credibility in leadership.
3. **Discipline.** Discipline is present when the behavior desired by management is exhibited by the workforce. Fayol held management responsible for discipline, although he made no mention of a specific implementation process.

4. **Unity of command.** Fayol’s principle of unity of command carried specific recommendations for communication. He contended that orders should come from only one superior and that a bypass of the chain of command would be a source of organizational problems. He believed messages should move from supervisors to subordinates as prescribed by the formal organization chart.

5. **Unity of direction.** Unity of direction was achieved by sound structuring of the organization. Unity of direction represented the formal organizational structure, whereas unity of command referred to people functioning within the structure.

6. **Subordination of individual interests to the general interest.** Individual interests were to be secondary to the overall good of the group or the organization, according to Fayol.

7. **Remuneration.** Fayol called for a fair price for services rendered. He believed that pay scales should be just and should motivate workers, but should not overcompensate.

8. **Centralization.** In his principle of centralization, Fayol recognized the need for flexibility in management principles. He advised: “Centralization is not a system of management good or bad of itself. . . . The question of centralization or decentralization is a simple question of proportion.”

9. **Scalar chain.** In his discussion of the scalar chain, Fayol directly referred to messages moving vertically and horizontally throughout the organization. In fact, his discussion of the scalar chain is the only known treatment of horizontal communication found in organizational literature until the writings of Chester Barnard in 1938. Fayol defined the scalar chain as “the chain of superiors ranging from the ultimate authority to the lowest ranks. The line of authority is the route followed—via every link in the chain—by all communications which start from or go to the ultimate authority.” Fayol described the chain as carrying messages in vertical directions. As such, the chain would have an equal capacity to carry messages vertically, both downward and upward. Fayol admitted that at times the chain required too much time for messages to travel effectively through all the links. He suggested that when the necessity for rapid message exchange occurred, it would be advisable to use a “gang plank” whereby peers communicated directly without regard to the scalar chain. This “gang plank” has become known in organization and communication literature as **Fayol’s bridge**.

10. **Order.** Fayol contended that both material and social order should be interpreted so that everything and everybody had a specific place and responsibility. As a principle of administration, the concept of order was to be put into effect through an organization’s structure.

11. **Equity.** Fayol valued what he called equity, or a combination of kindliness and justice toward all. He viewed equity as necessary to encourage workers to carry out duties with devotion and loyalty.
12. *Stability of tenure of personnel.* Fayol recognized the cost to organizations of training workers and the amount of time it took for a person to become competent in a given position. Thus, he believed that a workforce that was relatively stable across time was in the best interests of the organization.

13. *Initiative.* Fayol saw initiative, as a principle of administration, as the ability to think through and execute plans. He considered the manager who permitted the exercise of initiative within a work group to be superior to the one who could not.

14. *Esprit de corps.* Fayol’s concept of esprit de corps was based on his belief that the strongest organization exhibited union of purpose. Fayol suggested that esprit de corps could be achieved by implementing his principle of unity of command. In advising managers about establishing esprit de corps, he warned against dividing and ruling and the abuse of written communication. Fayol suggested that when giving an order that required explanation, “usually it is simpler and quicker to do so verbally than in writing. Besides, it is well known that differences and misunderstandings which a conversation could clear up, grow more bitter in writing.”

In addition to his fourteen principles of administration, Fayol identified five basic activities of management. These activities—planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling—encompassed all fourteen principles of administration and served as a summary of Fayol’s view of the overall responsibility of management.

Planning was described by Fayol as the development of operational strategies for the organization and the forecasting of future needs. Organizing was the use of people and materials to implement the organizational plan or goals. Commanding was the management function of obtaining maximum or optimum return for the organization from human and material resources. Coordinating was the function of integrating the efforts of all organizational members. Finally, controlling required management to establish how closely to its plan the organization was operating. Although Fayol was writing early in the 1900s, his activities of management and principles of administration continue to receive extensive attention and are influential in the operation of contemporary organizations.

---

**Bureaucracy**

Organizations based on formalized rules, regulations, and procedures, which make authority rational as opposed to charismatic or traditional.

---

**Principles of Bureaucracy: Max Weber (1864–1920)**

Max Weber, a German sociologist, is frequently referred to as the father of bureaucracy. Heavily influenced by socialist philosophy, Weber developed his theory of bureaucracy as a response to the abuses of authority he believed to be present in early patrimonial (advancement by inheritance) systems. To Weber, the bureaucratic model for organizations should be based on authority relationships that emphasize depersonalization and task competence.

Weber (1947) identified three types of authority: charismatic, traditional, and bureaucratic. Charismatic authority is based on the specific characteristics of the person exerting authority. Personal attributes of the individual inspire others to
follow. This authority is nonstructural (does not go with specific jobs) and usually nontransferable from person to person. In other words, charismatic authority is individually based, and when the charismatic leader leaves the organization, the authority or ability to influence leaves with him or her. Weber believed charismatic authority contributed to unstable organizations and disorderly transition of power from one person to another.

Traditional authority, according to Weber, is associated with the customs of a group or society. Although generally more stable than charismatic authority, traditional authority passes from individual to individual based on custom or tradition rather than ability or task competence. A family-owned company, for example, traditionally remains in the family from one generation to another, regardless of the abilities of others who might want to head the organization. Outsiders are simply not members of the family.

Weber believed bureaucratic authority represented the ideal for organizations. Bureaucratic authority was to rest on formalized rules, regulations, and procedures that made authority “rational-legal,” not based on personal charisma or tradition. Bureaucratic leaders were to be selected according to rules and regulations designed to promote the most competent for the particular job. This ideal bureaucracy, with its rational-legal authority mode, was designed to counteract nepotism, favoritism, and unbalanced decision making. As did Taylor and Fayol, Weber called for division of labor and for task specialization. He supported a formal chain of command and hierarchical structure. Impersonality in interpersonal relations was valued, and employment selection and promotion were to be based on competence.

Weber’s ideal bureaucracy can be described as having a hierarchy of authority with a scalar chain of command. This chain of command would be organized according to task specialization and should represent division of labor appropriate to the required tasks. Also, the chain of command should operate with standardized rules and procedures designed to emphasize “rational” decision making and task competence. The rules and procedures of the bureaucracy should emphasize the employment of qualified personnel, not necessarily those who have family or personal connections or whom tradition might select, but personnel with the best task competencies for a particular job. To secure qualified personnel, detailed definitions of job expectations and responsibilities would have to be developed in accordance with the rules and procedures of the organization. Communication in the bureaucratic system should be formal and follow the chain of command. According to Weber, the ideal bureaucracy should place primary emphasis on the goals of the organization and put individual interests secondary to organizational productivity.

**COMMUNICATION IMPLICATIONS OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT THEORIES**

Communication, from the Scientific Management point of view, was to be a tool of management designed to facilitate task completion and as such was to operate as
one of many organizational variables. Communication activities were to be specialized, as were tasks and jobs. Specifically, communication was required to train workers and give daily instructions concerning job requirements. Communication activities were to be formal, and interpersonal communication of a social or personal nature was to be discouraged, particularly among peers. Horizontal communication was to occur infrequently and only when following the chain of command was too time-consuming and cumbersome. Scientific Management theorists envisioned more messages flowing from supervisors to subordinates than from subordinates to supervisors. Status differences between managers and workers were to be encouraged and were believed essential for enforcing organizational rules and regulations.

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT THEORIES IN CONTEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS

By looking at the dates of the writings of Taylor, Fayol, and Weber, we are tempted to believe that the Scientific Management viewpoint is outdated and may provide limited usefulness in understanding today’s organizations. Dates, however, can be misleading. A careful examination of most contemporary organizations reveals numerous Scientific Management principles still in operation. The Davis Instrument Company from the beginning of this chapter is a prime example. Davis has a chain of command for its manufacturing units. Pam is a manager responsible for three supervisors, who in turn each direct a team of workers. Davis can be described as having a division of labor that is in the process of change because of the introduction of the new MCF system. This change will require extensive task instruction and the careful selection of the “best” workers for the new jobs. Davis holds management responsible for determining how the system is to be implemented. Furthermore, Joan is exhibiting a Scientific Management perspective when she argues that Pam and the supervisors should decide about job assignments without worker input. She believes that managers should be responsible for work design and for structuring their teams for maximum efficiency. Based on what we have learned about the principles of administration proposed by the Scientific Management theorists, Joan’s proposal represents their views.

Local, state, and national governments have been organized with many of the principles from the Scientific Management school. Not only do these organizations have hierarchies and chains of command, but also the transfer of power is governed by rules and regulations similar to those proposed by Weber. Although votes for officials may be based on their personal charisma, the successful candidate assumes office only after following the prescribed election rules. Both state and federal civil services have detailed job descriptions for most positions, with promotions governed by rules and regulations designed to eliminate favoritism and emphasize overall ability. Obviously, one can argue with how well these principles work in actual practice, but their design is a distinct legacy from the Scientific Management theorists.

Think about your school from the Scientific Management viewpoint. Are scientific principles reflected in admission policies and the rules and regulations that
govern the granting of degrees? How would you characterize the division of labor between students and teachers? Is there a chain of command? Do scientific principles influence communication? Attempt to characterize the effectiveness of the scientific principles you identify and extend your analysis to other organizations to which you belong. For most organizations, you will be able to identify at least some of the principles first described by Taylor, Fayol, and Weber.

THE HUMAN BEHAVIOR SCHOOL

The Human Behavior school shifts the emphasis from the structure of organizations, work design, and measurement to the interactions of individuals, their motivations, and their influence on organizational events. The Human Behavior perspective assumes that work is accomplished through people and emphasizes cooperation, participation, satisfaction, and interpersonal skills. Theorists representing this viewpoint see organizational design and function as reflections of basic assumptions about human behavior. The work of Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Douglas McGregor, and Rensis Likert is used to describe important characteristics of the Human Behavior approach to organizations.

Major Human Behavior Theories

Principles of Coordination: Mary Parker Follett (1868–1933)

Mary Parker Follett was ahead of her time in proclaiming that productive organizations must be concerned with the desires and motivations of individuals and groups. An honor graduate of Radcliffe College, Parker Follett was not a businessperson in the usual sense, but came to her interest in profit-making organizations from her work in political science, government, and social administration. A prolific lecturer in both Europe and the United States, Parker Follett is best known for her concern for the steady, ordered progress of human well-being. Years ahead of other theorists, Parker Follett characterized conflict as potentially constructive, and described collective responsibility and integration as supportive of business excellence. Parker Follett is famous for her psychological foundations of the smoothly operating organization. Although less well known than Scientific Management theorists, Parker Follett, in her shift to the psychological and motivational processes of workers, made significant contributions to the emergence of behavior theories for understanding organizational life.

The Hawthorne Effect: Elton Mayo (1880–1949)

Elton Mayo (1945) did not expect to be credited with beginning the Human Behavior point of view. As an influential Harvard professor, he was interested in expanding the understanding of the work environment as described by Frederick Taylor. When the famous Hawthorne studies began, Mayo was experimenting with the alteration of physical working conditions to increase productivity.
The Chicago Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company was the site of the research. In 1927, Mayo led a research team from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration in a series of experimental studies designed to improve the physical working environment for increased productivity. Management at the Hawthorne plant was aware that severe dissatisfaction existed among workers, and previous efforts by efficiency experts had failed both to reduce tension and to increase productivity. Mayo and his colleagues began to experiment with altering physical conditions to determine a combination of conditions that would increase productivity. They worked with factors such as lighting, noise, incentive pay, and heating. As the studies progressed, they found little support for the expected relationship between improved working conditions and improved productivity. They became aware that other unexpected factors were interacting with physical factors to influence work output. During their study of changes in lighting intensity, Mayo and his colleagues observed that work output increased when lighting intensity increased. That was a result that could be interpreted in terms of Taylor and the Scientific Management viewpoint. Yet they also observed that work output increased when they decreased lighting intensity. That was a result that was counter to not only Taylor but also any previously established principles of Scientific Management. In fact, output increased no matter how the physical variables were changed. Mayo and his colleagues came to understand that a powerful and previously unrecognized influence in the experimental setting was the attention the researchers were paying to the workers. The attention encouraged a group norm that emphasized increased production no matter how the physical environment was altered. This effect, widely known as the Hawthorne effect, was the first documentation in industrial psychological research of the importance of human interaction and morale for productivity. The Hawthorne studies became the first organized attempts to understand the individual worker as key to the overall production process. As a result of the Hawthorne research, production could no longer be viewed as solely dependent on formal job and organizational design.

**Hawthorne effect**
Group norms that influence productivity apart from the physical production environment.

**Theory X–Theory Y**
McGregor’s description of management assumptions about workers. Theory X characterizes assumptions underlying Scientific Management theory, and Theory Y is associated with assumptions common to Human Behavior perspectives. Theory X managers assume that workers dislike work and will avoid responsible labor. Theory Y managers believe that workers can be self-directed and self-controlled.

In his famous work *The Human Side of Enterprise* (1960), Douglas McGregor proposed his *Theory X–Theory Y* concept as a way to distinguish between the Scientific Management and Human Behavior perspectives. A former president of Antioch College and a Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor of management, McGregor was interested in the basic assumptions about human nature inherent in both scientific and humanistic theories of management and organization.

McGregor presented Theory X as a summation of the assumptions about human nature made by those favoring the Scientific Management ideas of Taylor, Fayol, and Weber. McGregor believed that hierarchical structure, management control of influence and decision making, close supervision, and performance measurement were based on assumptions about how to motivate human behavior.
Although McGregor believed that Theory X accurately characterized the assumptions underlying Scientific Management theory, he doubted that these assumptions provided the best evidence of how to motivate workers, contribute to employee satisfaction, or stimulate high levels of productivity. Building on the work of Mayo and others, he proposed Theory Y as an alternative to Theory X and as a way to understand individual motivation and interaction within organizations (see Figure 3.1).

McGregor has been criticized for what some have called a polarized either/or approach to human nature. McGregor responded that Theory X and Theory Y are assumptions that may be better understood as ranges of behaviors from X to Y. Managers, as such, can draw on both sets of assumptions, depending on the situation and specific people involved.

McGregor and also Rensis Likert are sometimes associated with both the Human Behavior and Human Relations perspectives. Although similar in most respects, Human Relations views extend the focus beyond the specific behaviors of workers to evaluate how the entire organization can encourage the productive and effective use of people as resources, thereby supporting organizational productivity.

**Participative Management: Rensis Likert (1903–1981)**

As a professor of sociology and psychology and director of the Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan, Rensis Likert conducted extensive research to determine how management differed between successful and less successful organizations. His classic work, *New Patterns of Management* (1961), advanced his theory

---

**FIGURE 3.1 Douglas McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY X ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>THEORY Y ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People dislike work and will avoid work when possible.</td>
<td>1. People view work as being as natural as play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Workers are not ambitious and prefer direction.</td>
<td>2. Workers are ambitious and prefer self-direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workers avoid responsibility and are not concerned with organizational needs.</td>
<td>3. Workers seek responsibility and feel rewarded through their achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workers must be directed and threatened with punishment to achieve organizational productivity.</td>
<td>4. Workers are self-motivated and require little direct supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Workers are not highly intelligent or capable of organizational creativity.</td>
<td>5. Workers are creative and capable of organizational creativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizations have difficulty in using human resources.</td>
<td>6. Organizations have difficulty in using human resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Likert, in *New Patterns of Management*, set forth a new theory—participative management—that rejected many of the assumptions on which Scientific Management was founded. His employee-centered management was based on effectively functioning groups linked together structurally throughout the entire organization. In other words, Likert proposed that the management process should depend on participative groups formed to have overlapping individual membership among groups. Figure 3.2 illustrates how an organizational chart using the Likert concept might look.

Likert supported his participative management theory with extensive research in high- and low-production situations. He believed that proper understanding of the differences or variability in human performance could help build productive organizations. Taylor had interpreted variability in performance as a need to establish specific procedures and production standards; Likert’s interpretation called for an increase in participation by organizational members at all levels.

In an attempt to demonstrate the importance of participative management, Likert offered an extensive comparative analysis of management systems, which
he identified as Systems I–IV. System I (exploitive authoritative) is similar to McGregor’s Theory X assumptions. System I finds management closely controlling and directing work with little reliance on workers for problem solving. A general atmosphere of distrust discourages communication from flowing freely in all directions. System II (benevolent authoritative) is still characterized by hierarchical management control. Some trust and confidence, however, is placed in workers. A System II organization generally has more communication from employees than its System I counterpart. System III (consultative) finds management actively seeking input from employees. Important decisions still are made at the top but with much greater worker involvement than in Systems I and II. System III even permits some decisions to be made at lower levels within the organizations.

System IV, Likert’s ideal of participative management, is characterized by trust between management and employees and by decisions being made throughout the organization. Accurate communication flows in all directions, and people are motivated because of their participation in organizational events and in shaping their own futures. Goal setting, as well as appraisal of how well goals are being met and the overall effectiveness of the organization, takes place at all organizational levels.

Likert’s participative management system was put into practice through a structure of interlocking groups, with members having multiple group memberships. These multiple group memberships provided links among groups, or what is now known as the famous “linking pin” function. This system of organization underscored Likert’s commitment to broad participation at all organizational levels. Likert (1961), in describing the benefits of linked groups, predicted “fuller and more candid communication throughout the organization—upward, downward, and between peers.” In sum, Likert’s concept of participative management rested on his contention that the supportive atmosphere of the effective group promoted creativity, motivated people to use the communication process as both senders and receivers, and exerted more influence on leadership than in other types of systems.

COMMUNICATION IMPLICATIONS OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR THEORIES

Effective communication was a cornerstone of the Human Behavior perspective. Management was to trust employees, and employees were to feel free to discuss job-related concerns with their supervisors. Peer-group interaction was not only recognized but was also viewed as a potentially positive influence for productivity. The human behavior theorists recognized both formal and informal communication networks carrying task and social support messages. Interactions at all levels were expected to be extensive and friendly, with substantial cooperation throughout the organization. From the Human Behavior viewpoint, communic-
tion was vital to the use of human resources and good organizational decision making.

**HUMAN BEHAVIOR THEORIES IN CONTEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS**

Most contemporary organizations include not only Scientific Management ideas but also much of the thinking generated from the Human Behavior theorists. The Davis Instrument Company is an example. Davis is structured according to many of the principles of Scientific Management, but Davis also exhibits the influence of Parker Follett, Mayo, McGregor, and Likert. Pam Martin is making decisions about the new MCF system with participation from her subordinates. She is using a group process to address issues and solve problems. Earlier we identified Joan as articulating a Scientific Management approach. We can expand our analysis and describe Henry as representing the Human Behavior viewpoint when he calls for extensive involvement from the various work teams in determining their new training and job assignments. Both Henry and Frank reflect Theory Y assumptions about people when they contend that workers are more motivated when involved in decisions that directly affect them. In fact, when we thoughtfully analyze the Davis case, it is possible to conclude that both Scientific Management and Human Behavior ideas are in evidence and that both will contribute to the success or failure of the new MCF system.

Most contemporary organizations are similar to Davis in their combined usage of Scientific Management and Human Behavior ideas. Committees, project teams, and work units all are examples of the use made of groups in modern organizations. Training for managers and supervisors emphasizes developing interpersonal skills for working effectively with subordinates. New employees attend orientations designed to help them understand and become a part of the organization. Awards honor a variety of creative contributions, and profit-sharing and merit-pay plans attest to the importance of employee involvement for organizational success. These examples and many others exist side by side in today’s organizations with hierarchical structures, division of labor, chains of command, and final management responsibility in decision making.

Earlier you described your school from a Scientific Management point of view. Now think about that same organization from the Human Behavior viewpoint. What assumptions are made about the basic nature of students? Is there an honor code for academic achievement, or are exams tightly monitored and cheating vigorously punished? Is creativity expected from students? Is there a supportive atmosphere that contributes to effective communication among students and with teachers? Attempt to characterize your school in terms of Theory X and Theory Y. Does one work better than the other? If so, why? If not, how do they work in combination? Finally, describe which of the Human Behavior concepts you believe to be the most influential for effective communication.
INTEGRATED PERSPECTIVES VIEWPOINTS

Both Scientific Management and Human Behavior approaches have been criticized for their failure to integrate organizational structure, technology, and people with the larger environment in which organizations exist. The Scientific Management theorists concentrated on organizational structure and work design with little attention to people and organizational environments. The Human Behavior theorists were concerned with people but also tended to ignore influences beyond organizational boundaries. In reaction to these criticisms, a number of organizational researchers have developed Integrated Perspectives viewpoints. These theorists attempt to explain how people, technologies, and environments integrate to influence all that happens in organizations.

Integrated Perspective Theories: Process and Environmental Approaches

Process and environmental approaches to organizational theory attempt to describe how complex processes such as decision making influence the internal operation of organizations and are influenced by external environments. Researchers using these perspectives seek to explain how human and technical systems interact with the broader environments in which organizations operate and in so doing seek to test basic assumptions from both Scientific Management and Human Behavior viewpoints. To describe process and environmental approaches, we discuss the decision-making approach of Herbert Simon; sociotechnical integration as described by Eric Trist and Kenneth Bamforth; contingency theory as introduced by Joan Woodward, Paul Lawrence, and Jay Lorsch; and systems theory as explained by Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn. Finally, we explore what is described as the new organization science and learning organizations using the work of Margaret Wheatley, Peter Senge, Gareth Morgan, and others.


Herbert Simon offered a description of organizations that differed from both the Scientific Management and Human Behavior viewpoints. Simon (1957) proclaimed that organizational behavior is a complex network of decisions with decision-making processes influencing the behavior of the entire organization. According to Simon, organizations can be understood in terms of what types of decisions are made at various organizational levels and with what types of information. As such, Simon viewed the decision-making approach as the essential organizational process.
Understanding the limitations of human decision making was important to Simon’s model. Along with Richard Cyert and James March (Cyert and March, 1963), Simon introduced the concept of bounded rationality as a way to understand information processing and decision making. Specifically, the concept of bounded rationality assumed that people intend to be rational, but with limited information-processing capacity, human decision making is based on selective perception and therefore exhibits “limited” rationality. Simon argued that individuals often make organizational decisions while realizing that their decisions are based on partial information. Simon called this process “satisficing,” or the making of decisions with partial information in the hope the decision will be good enough, if not the best.

Sociotechnical Integration: Eric L. Trist (1911–1993) and Kenneth W. Bamforth

The concept of sociotechnical integration rested on two assumptions first described by Eric Trist and his student Kenneth Bamforth (1951) as a result of their work with a British coal-mining operation: (1) organizational production is optimized through optimizing social and technical systems, and (2) a constant interchange exists between the work system and the broader environment.

The sociotechnical approach attempted to balance human social-psychological needs with organizational goals. Communication in the sociotechnical approach related to work, to the needs of the environment, and to the personal needs of workers. Trist and Bamforth tested the sociotechnical concept in a British coal-mining operation. Workers were trained to rotate as necessary through all the tasks required by new machines. This cross-training was designed to introduce variety and interest into the work environment. Also, each work team was permitted to set its own rate of production and was responsible for handling its own problems and conflicts. The output of these autonomous groups was compared with groups with more traditional and “scientifically” designed assignments. In the Trist and Bamforth experiment, the sociotechnical groups outperformed their scientific group counterparts by approximately 34 percent, or 1.8 tons per shift.

These experiments led Trist and Bamforth to conclude that meaning in work could be established through group assignments that permit individuals to be included in entire task cycles rather than work on isolated parts of a job. The autonomy of groups in setting their own standards and making decisions about their own problems could give individuals a sense of self-determination that closer supervision and control could not achieve. This emphasis on group-set goals and responsibilities could contribute to a solidarity of purpose that could help integrate...
individual and organizational goals. This integration would be productive for both individuals and organizations.

**Contingency Theory: Joan Woodward (1916–1971), Paul Lawrence (1922– ), and Jay Lorsch (1932– )**

The contingency theory began when Joan Woodward (1965) researched one hundred British manufacturing firms in an effort to develop a list of characteristics that would indicate differences in organizational structure. Her classification included organizations with little technological complexity and those with extensive reliance on complicated technologies. Her findings relating differences in technology to differences in organizational structure became the foundation of modern contingency theory, or the realization that differences in organizations are due to differences in goals and environments.

Contingency theory rejects the “one best way” to organize as described by Scientific Management’s theorists. Contingency theory also finds the Human Behavior approach lacking an explanation of the complex relationships among units within the organization and the larger environment in which the organization operates.

Lawrence and Lorsch (1969) describe contingency theory as the establishment of internal organizational operations contingent or dependent on external environmental needs and individual needs. Lawrence and Lorsch view organizations as having three primary relationships that determine how organizations operate and respond to their environment. Specifically, organizations have what Lawrence and Lorsch call “interfaces” at the organization-to-environment, group-to-group, and individual-to-organization levels. They suggest that organizational design and operation should be based on these three interfaces, which differ for all organizations.

Proponents of the contingency view suggest that there is no specific set of prescriptions appropriate for all organizations. Organizations must adapt to changing circumstances and the needs of individuals and the environments in which the organizations operate. As such, organizational designs based on Scientific Management concepts may be appropriate in certain circumstances. The concerns of the Human Behavior theorists also can be valuable when matched to specific situations. In other words, contingency theory suggests that considerable judgment is required to understand effective organizational operation because that operation “all depends on the situation.”

**Systems Approach: Daniel Katz (1903–1998) and Robert Kahn (1918– )**

Closely related to contingency theory, systems theory grew in direct response to criticisms of both Scientific Management and Human Behavior philosophies. The systems approach emphasizes interaction with the larger environment and, as Katz and...
Kahn (1966) suggest, “is basically concerned with problems of relationships, of structure, and of interdependence rather than the constant attributes of objects.”

In systems theory, the organization takes in materials and human resources (input), processes materials and resources (throughput), and yields a finished product (output) to the larger environment. Along with input, throughput, and output, the ideal system should have a self-corrective mechanism whereby feedback or input from the environment can be processed into adaptation of throughput and, potentially, output. The system’s self-corrective mechanism is called the system’s cybernetic, which in the ideal system is the management team. In systems theory, the law of equifinality attests to the multiple-action courses possible for the achievement of a goal. Equifinality rejects the concept of a single course of action to reach a single goal.

Katz and Kahn and other systems theorists advance a principle of optimization, or looking for maximum output in return for minimum input. Maximum return for minimum input is affected by feedback from the environment and management’s ability to adjust. Thus, systems may be described as open or closed, mechanistic or organic. An open system exchanges information with its larger environment. A closed system limits exchange with the environment and seeks to operate as a self-contained unit. Systems theorists relate the closed organizational system to a closed thermodynamic system, contending that they both will approach a condition of maximum entropy with no further possibility of useful work. The open system, on the other hand, fights entropy and seeks a dynamic equilibrium among input, throughput, and output. The open system exhibits the law of equifinality and has a sound self-corrective mechanism.

The organic system is suited to change, whereas the mechanistic system functions best in stable conditions. The mechanistic system frequently exhibits much of the prescriptive structure of Scientific Management with its rigid hierarchy and specialized differentiation of tasks. The organic system is characterized by greater emphasis on individuals and their capacities for unique contributions. Hierarchy may exist in the organic system, but authority is exercised more by consent than by coercion or legitimate right of office. The organic system compares favorably with descriptions of open systems, whereas the mechanistic system may be compared with closed systems.

The New Systems Approaches—Flux, Transformation, Quantum Physics, Self-Organizing Systems, and Chaos Theory: Gareth Morgan (1943– ) and Margaret Wheatley (1944– )

Systems theory as described by Katz and Kahn (in the section above) is currently undergoing an important transformation brought about by rethinking the basic nature of systems and system relationships to the environment. Gareth Morgan (1997), in his important book, Images of Organizations, explains:

Traditional approaches to organization theory have been dominated by the idea that change originates in the environment. . . . The organization is typically viewed as an open system in constant interaction with its context, transforming inputs into outputs as a means of creating the conditions necessary for survival. Changes in the
environment are viewed as presenting challenges to which the organization must respond. (p. 253)

**Morgan** describes the work of two Chilean scientists, Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela, who are credited with describing **autopoiesis**, a new approach to systems theory. Morgan takes an example from a biological organism to explain:

The bee as an organism constitutes a chain of self-referring physiological processes with their own circular organization and lives within a society of bees where relations are also circular. In turn, the relationship between the society of bees and the wider ecology is also circular. Eliminate the bees and the whole ecology will change, for the bee system is linked with the botanical system, which is linked with insect, animal, agricultural, human, and social systems. All these systems are self-referential and turn back on each other. A change in any one element can transform all the others. . . . An understanding of the autopoietic nature of systems requires that we understand how each element simultaneously combines the maintenance of itself with the maintenance of the others. (p. 254)

Management theorist Margaret Wheatley (1992) describes autopoietic structures as each having a unique identity, a clear boundary, yet merged with its environment.

Supporting a transformation in systems thinking, Wheatley uses insights from quantum physics, self-organizing systems, and chaos theory to present a view of systems theory with new possibilities for connections and change. Wheatley argues, as do many physicists, that the relationships in the quantum world are not just interesting but are all there is to reality.

This notion of complex, fluid, ever-changing relationships answers conceptual questions about influences for organizational behavior. We no longer have to attempt to decide whether the individual or the system is more influential; relationships continually shift and change depending on individuals and the moment. This notion of pervasive relationships—a relational universe—as described in quantum theory suggests that we do not create reality but that we evoke potentials that are already present. Wheatley (1992) identifies this notion as closely related to Karl Weick’s concept of enactment in organizations: how we participate in the creation of organizational realities.

Wheatley discusses the chemistry theory of **dissipative structures** to illustrate her contention that the new science helps us understand that disorder can be the source of new order. As Wheatley (1992) explains:

Dissipation describes a loss, a process by which energy gradually ebbs away. Yet Prigogine discovered that such dissipative activity could play a constructive role in the creation of new structures. Dissipation didn’t lead to the demise of a system. It was part of the process by which the system let go of its present form so that it could reemerge in a form better suited to the demands of the present environment. . . . Dissipative structures demonstrate that disorder can be a

---

**Autopoiesis**

Process describing each element in a system simultaneously combining the maintenance of itself with the maintenance of the other elements of the system.

**Dissipative structures**

Descriptions of structures when a loss of energy and form contributes to disequilibrium, which in turn contributes to growth and new structures and forms.
source of order, and that growth is found in disequilibrium, not in balance. The things we fear most in organizations—fluctuations, disturbances, imbalances—need not be signs of an impending disorder that will destroy us. Instead, fluctuations are the primary source of creativity. Scientists in this newly understood world describe the paths between disorder and order as “order out of chaos” or “order through fluctuation” (Prigogine, 1984). These are new principles that highlight the dynamics between chaos and creativity, between disruptions and growth. (pp. 19–20)

The theory of dissipative structures helps explain how dissipating energy is used to re-create structures into new forms of organization. When levels of disturbance amplify, dissipative structures possess innate properties for reconfiguration to deal with new information. This capacity is frequently called self-organizing or self-renewing systems. A key feature is resiliency as contrasted to stability. Wheatley (1992) describes adaptive organizing as tapping into this property of self-organizing or self-renewing systems. She further contends that information is the creative energy both for organizations and the universe.

Chaos theory is the final construct from the new science that Wheatley describes. Put simply, chaos is the last stage as a system of any type moves away from order. When systems are disturbed from their stable states, they begin a process of swinging back and forth (oscillating) and, for some, the move to the next state is chaos or total unpredictability. During this point of chaos, instead of everything coming apart, the strange attractor comes into play, pulling the system to a new shape and form. Wheatley (1992) believes that attractors are at work in organizations and that

one of the most potent shapers of behavior in organizations, and in life, is meaning. . . . When a meaning attractor is in place in an organization, employees can be trusted to move freely, drawn in many directions by their energy and creativity. There is no need to insist, through regimentation or supervision, that any two individuals act in precisely the same way. We know they will be affected and shaped by the attractor, their behavior never going out of bounds. We trust that they will heed the call of the attractor and stay within its basin. We believe that little else is required except the cohering presence of a purpose, which gives people the capacity for self-reference. (pp. 134–136)

Although admittedly somewhat complex, principles from quantum physics, self-organizing systems, and chaos theory provide important perspectives for understanding systems theory. Of particular importance in this new science conceptualization of organizations are the information and communication processes in which individuals engage.

Learning Organizations: Peter Senge

The concept of designing organizations to learn in a brainlike way is another important extension of systems theory (Morgan, 1997). Frequently referred to as

2Dates not released.
Learning organizations
Organizations gaining knowledge from continuous processes of information exchange between the organization and its environments.

learning organizations, these organizations gain knowledge from continuous processes of information exchange between the organization and its environments. Chris Argyris of Harvard and Donald Schôn of MIT first brought the learning to learn concept to managerial attention. Peter Senge of MIT popularized the concept of the learning organization in his now famous work, The Fifth Discipline (1990).

Senge (1990) provides five new “component technologies” that he claims are gradually converging to innovate learning organizations. Senge contends that the five disciplines must develop as an ensemble.

SENGE’S FIVE DISCIPLINES ARE:

1. System thinking: the ability to think about connections and patterns and to view systems as wholes, not individual parts of the patterns.
2. Personal mastery: developing special levels of proficiency. Personal mastery is the discipline of continually clarifying and deepening our personal vision, of focusing our energies, of developing patience, and of seeing reality objectively. As such, it is an essential cornerstone of the learning organization, the learning organization’s spiritual foundation. An organization’s commitment to and capacity for learning can be no greater than that of its members. The roots of this discipline lie in both Eastern and Western spiritual traditions and in secular traditions as well.
3. Mental models: deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action.
4. Building shared vision: the capacity to hold a shared picture of the future we seek to create. When there is a genuine vision, people excel and learn, not because they are told to but because they want to.
5. Team learning: learning that starts with dialogue, the capacity of members of a team to suspend assumptions and enter into genuine “thinking together.” The discipline of dialogue also involves learning how to recognize the patterns of interaction in teams that undermine learning.

Cultural approaches
Theories that describe how organizational members collectively interpret the organizational world around them to define the importance of organizational happenings. Approaches to theory that explain organizational behavior in terms of the influence of cultures that exist both internally and externally to the organization.

Cultural approaches to organizational theory describe how organizational members collectively interpret the organizational world around them to define the importance of organizational happenings. In other words, cultural approaches to organizational theory explain organizational behavior in terms of the influence of cultures that exist both internally and externally to the organization. Cultural research attempts to identify how a unique sense of the place (culture) contributes to individual behavior and organizational effectiveness. Cultural theories are the newest ad-
ditions to the Integrated Perspectives approach, although the importance of culture has been recognized for many years.

**Elements of Culture: Terrence Deal (1939– ) and Allen Kennedy (1943– )**

Terrence Deal and Allen Kennedy, in their book *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life* (1982), identify five basic elements of organizational culture: business environment, values, heroes, rites and rituals, and the cultural network. Each contributes to managing behavior and, according to Deal and Kennedy, “helps employees do their jobs a little better.” Essentially, a strong culture contributes to managing the organization by spelling out in general terms how people are to behave while helping people feel better about what they do, enabling hard work and excellent productivity.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) suggest that the business environment is “the single greatest influence in shaping a corporate culture.” What companies do in their competitive environments shapes the reality of how organizations manage activity and whether they are successful. Values emerge that help individuals determine where the emphasis of their efforts should be placed. In other words, organizational values help people become dedicated to a cause, which in turn guides decisions about all types of behaviors. These strong values are not, however, without their dangers. Strong organizational values may limit change and encourage obsolescence when organizational values come in conflict with changing environments requiring new decisions and approaches. Regardless of whether their impact is positive or negative, values, according to Deal and Kennedy, are the core of corporate culture.

Deal and Kennedy (1982) contend that heroes are the real live human successes who become role models for the culture’s values. Stories and myths about the behaviors of heroes help organizational members determine what they have to do to succeed and what is valued by the organization. Rites and rituals also serve this function. Deal and Kennedy identify management rituals such as formal meetings in which rituals develop about the number held, the setting, the table’s shape, who sits where, and who is in attendance. Recognition rituals, ranging from formal events honoring outstanding service to informal traditions, also identify what the organization holds to be important and help to integrate individual and organizational goals. Finally, Deal and Kennedy suggest that informal organizational communication is the cultural network and as such is the only way to understand what is really going on. From the Deal and Kennedy perspective, culture is the organizational process that most contributes to shaping organizational outcomes. The communication of culture therefore both shapes behavior and reflects the operating reality of the organization.

**Theory Z: William Ouchi (1943– )**

Among the more popular of the cultural approaches is William Ouchi’s *Theory Z* (1981). As McGregor characterized human behavior with Theory X and Theory Y,
Theory Z

Ouchi’s theory derived from comparisons between Japanese and American organizations. Theory Z organizations retain individual achievement and advancement as a model but provide a continuing sense of organizational community not typical of many U.S. organizations.

Theory Z proposes that organizations must adapt to the key elements of the culture in which they operate. In other words, Theory Z makes assumptions about culture as Theory X and Theory Y made assumptions about individuals.

Ouchi’s (1981) work begins by contrasting what he calls Type A American with Type J Japanese organizations. He contends that the two types differ in seven defining characteristics appropriate to each culture. Type A American organizations are characterized by short-term employment, individual decision making, individual responsibility, rapid promotion, formal control, specialized career paths, and segmented concerns. Type A organizations reflect cultural values of individuality over group membership and assume that broad social needs are supported by institutions such as churches, schools, and neighborhood groups rather than formal employment groups.

On the other hand, Type J Japanese organizations can be characterized by lifetime employment, consensual decision making, group or collective responsibility, slow advancement, informal control, generalized career paths, and holistic concerns. The Type J organization reflects a culture in which loyalty to groups is more important than individual achievement and in which individuals gain identity from long-term affiliations with the companies for which they work. Japanese culture supports an organizational structure that actually reduces employees’ incentives to leave the work group and does not reward desires for rapid advancement.

Ouchi (1981) argues that American culture is changing, requiring a rethinking of some of the elements of the Type A organization. Although individuality is still valued, increased geographic mobility has generated a void in the social needs of workers who previously could have been expected to have those needs met from long-term, stable affiliations in their home communities. Ouchi proposes a Theory Z organization that retains individual achievement and advancement as a model but provides a continuing sense of organizational community not typical of Type A organizations. He sees the Theory Z organization as adapting to the changing needs of a mobile society and adapting to those needs in ways that support important cultural values—individuality—while adjusting to the evolution of new values, beliefs, and needs.

In Search of Excellence: Thomas Peters (1942– ) and Robert Waterman (1936– )

In their famous best-selling In Search of Excellence (1982), Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman report the results of their study of sixty-two successful representatives of U.S. industry. Peters and Waterman attempted to understand how these large, successful companies were adapting to their changing environments. They worked from the premise that organizational structure cannot be understood apart from people.

Peters and Waterman (1982) studied Hewlett-Packard, Digital Equipment, Frito-Lay, Delta Airlines, McDonald’s, Boeing, Exxon, and numerous other compa-
nies selected because of their prestige in the business world, overall financial performance, industry position, and innovativeness as measured by their ability continually to bring new products and services to changing markets.

As a result of their work, Peters and Waterman (1982) have identified eight cultural themes that most nearly characterize excellent, innovative companies. These themes suggest that “excellent companies were, above all, brilliant on the basics.”

The eight themes as identified by Peters and Waterman are as follows:

1. A bias for action. Excellent companies made decisions. They were analytical but not paralyzed by too much information. When they had a problem, they took action.

2. Close to the customer. Service, reliability, innovative products, and continual concern for customer needs were fundamentals for the excellent companies. The close-to-the-customer value also resulted in new product ideas and served as the basis for innovation.

3. Autonomy and entrepreneurship. Excellent companies wanted leaders in all types of organizational activity. They encouraged risk taking and innovation and gave people responsibility for their own ideas. People were not so tightly controlled as to lose creativity.

4. Productivity through people. Workers at all organizational levels were the source of quality and the source of productivity. Excellent companies fought against a we/they management/labor attitude.

5. Hands-on, value-driven. The basic philosophy and values of the organization contributed more to achievement than did any specific technology or material resource. Values were seen to influence behavior and were considered the core of excellence.

6. Stick to the knitting. Excellent companies stayed in the businesses they knew. They did not diversify beyond what they understood in terms of either technology and service or customers. They grew by doing what they did extremely well.

7. Simple form, lean staff. None of the excellent companies was run with complicated organizational structures. In fact, many of the top corporate staffs were running multi-billion-dollar organizations with fewer than a hundred people.

8. Simultaneous loose-tight properties. These companies were both centralized and decentralized. Autonomy and entrepreneurship were encouraged at all levels within the organizations. Decision making was often decentralized, yet core values were very centralized and rigidly supported.

As Ouchi (1981) discusses the broad influence of culture, Peters and Waterman (1982) describe how specific cultural themes contribute to excellence and organizational abilities to adapt to changing markets. Interestingly enough, much of what Peters and Waterman suggest that the excellent companies do in terms of people support and encouragement is similar to what Ouchi suggests that the Theory Z
organization does in providing recognition for individual achievement while still meeting social support needs.

Organizational Culture Formation: Edgar Schein

Edgar Schein (1985b) defines organizational culture as “a pattern of basic assumptions—invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration—that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.” In support of this definition, Schein provides a model of culture with three distinct levels: (1) artifacts and creations, (2) values, and (3) basic assumptions. Artifacts and creations are the most visible level of culture consisting of the physical and social environment created by organizational members. Artifacts and creations are observable not only by members of the culture but by observers as well. Artifacts and creations include architecture, technology, furniture, dress, and a variety of written documents. Behaviors such as decision making, meetings, and networks also are included. The second level, values, refers to both individual and group preferences for the way it should be in the organization. Values are less observable, although relationships between values and behaviors have been established by a variety of scholars. Finally, Schein describes as his third level basic assumptions. Basic assumptions are the core of what individuals believe to be true about the world and how it works. Basic assumptions form around humanity’s relationship to nature, the nature of reality and truth, the nature of human nature, the nature of human activity, and the nature of human relationships.

Schein (1983) also provides a model of how organizational cultures begin. According to Schein, the history of new organizations suggests they share the following initial steps: (1) the founder (or founders) has an idea for a new enterprise; (2) a founding group is created with members who have initial consensus about the idea; (3) a founding group acts to bring structure and resources to the idea; and (4) the initial functioning of the group is based on the idea, that is, the group begins to develop a history. Schein suggests:

In this process the founder will have a major impact on how the group solves its external survival and internal integration problems. Because the founder had the original idea, he or she will typically have biases on how to get the idea fulfilled—biases based on previous cultural experiences and personality traits. (p. 17)

In later work, Schein (1985a) suggests that the functions of culture differ by growth stages of organizations. During the birth and early growth stages of organizations, for example, the founder or family dominates the organization and culture functions to hold the organization together, emphasize socialization, and develop commitment. Organizational midlife is characterized by the spawning of subcultures and loss of key goals, values, and assumptions. Organizational maturity brings cultural constraint on innovation with an emphasis on preservation of the past.

\(^3\)Dates not released.
Sensemaking Model: Karl Weick (1936–)
The work of Karl Weick is an excellent example of what we mean by integrated perspectives. Many familiar with Weick’s work would argue that he should be characterized as writing from a systems perspective, whereas others contend he more readily advances concepts aligned with culture studies. The discussion in Chapter 2 of his views of enactment of organizations carries a distinctively “systems” flavor. Here, however, his sensemaking model is placed in the cultural perspectives section because of its focus on the intersection of simultaneous interpretation and action. Weick’s provocative statement, “The outcome comes before the decision,” helps us understand the dynamic nature of his sensemaking model, which includes authoring as well as interpretation. Weick (1995) explains:

The process of sensemaking is intended to include the construction and bracketing of the textlike cues that are interpreted, as well as the revision of those interpretations based on action and its consequences. Sensemaking is about authoring as well as interpretation, creation as well as discovery. . . . A crucial property of sensemaking is that human situations are progressively clarified, but this clarification often works in reverse. It is less often the case that an outcome fulfills some prior definition of the situation, and more often the case that an outcome develops that prior definition. (pp. 8–11)

Weick is referring to the central role an individual’s own actions play in determining what is the “sense of situations.” He is arguing that it is a mistake to think that we make decisions in organizations according to well-developed plans. He proposes that we make decisions and then render them sensible by explaining the meaning of our decisions. Weick (1995, 61–62) identifies sensemaking as having seven distinguishing characteristics and provides a recipe for understanding each of the characteristics:

1. Grounded in identity construction. The recipe is a question about who I am as indicated by discovery of how and what I think.
2. Retrospective. To learn what I think, I look back over what I said earlier.
3. Enactive of sensible environments. I create the object to be seen and inspected when I say or do something.
4. Social. What I say and single out and conclude are determined by who socialized me and how I was socialized, as well as by the audience I anticipate will audit the conclusions I reach.
5. Ongoing. My talking is spread across time, competes for attention with other ongoing projects, and is reflected on after it is finished, which means that my interests may already have changed.
6. Focused on and by extracted cues. The “what” that I single out and embellish as the content of the thought is only a small portion of the utterance that becomes salient because of context and personal dispositions.
7. Driven by plausibility rather than accuracy. I need to know enough about what I think to get on with my projects, but no more, which means sufficiency and plausibility take precedence over accuracy.
Individual and organizational sensemaking activities illustrate the intersection of interpretation and action. Sensemaking can therefore be understood as part of the cultural web of the organization as well as a highly individual process. Weick (1995) relates organizations and sensemaking processes: “Both organizations and sensemaking processes are cut from the same cloth. To organize is to impose order, counteract deviations, simplify, and connect, and the same holds true when people try to make sense.”

Taken as a whole, these descriptions of cultural development, transmission, and sensemaking reflect basic assumptions about the dynamic nature of culture and its propensity to change across time.

COMMUNICATION IMPLICATIONS OF INTEGRATED PERSPECTIVES VIEWPOINTS

The Integrated Perspectives viewpoints present a diverse set of implications for organizational communication. The systems theorists all describe organizations with changing needs and environments, even though descriptions of the relationship to environments vary. Thus, the effectiveness of communication is related not only to what happens within the organization, but also to how the organization communicates with its environment, its customers and community. The cultural approaches, on the other hand, are more specific about the importance of communication in carrying messages about the culture and influencing behavior through cultural expectations.

INTEGRATED PERSPECTIVES VIEWPOINTS IN CONTEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS

With the contributions of theorists such as Simon, Woodward, Lawrence, Lorsch, Katz, Kahn, Trist, and Bamforth, we talked about the importance of the external environment and began to merge much of the thinking from the Scientific Management and Human Behavior approaches. Also, with the advent of the cultural approaches proposed by Integrated Perspectives theorists, communication was described as the process through which shared realities are generated and through which values, identification, and socialization occur.

There are numerous examples of the importance of organizations adjusting to their external environments. Big American cars of the 1950s and 1960s lost their competitive market position to foreign competition. The introduction of personal computers for a home market found several hundred companies scrambling to introduce new and better products in an attempt to gain market share. The back-to-basics emphasis in education has been in response to concerns that students are not developing competencies needed for an information society. The list could go on. The contribution of Integrated Perspectives theorists in describing the need to ac-
knowledge the influence of the external environment has improved our ability to think comprehensively about organizations and how people and technology relate to larger environments.

Concern for organizational culture is readily apparent in contemporary organizations. Organizations publish vision and mission statements, conduct training programs that identify the values of the organization, and hold annual events of special cultural significance. Schools have graduation ceremonies; sales organizations have annual awards banquets; and special traditions emerge to celebrate promotions, achievements, and a variety of other organizational events.

The significance of the Integrated Perspectives approaches can be seen in a return to the Davis Instrument Company’s manufacturing changes. The introduction of the new MCF system is in response to market pressure to remain cost competitive. The concern for how to reassign and train workers illustrates essential sociotechnical relationships among environmental needs for change, human needs during change, and the changing requirements of new technology. What happens next at Davis will depend on some factors not readily apparent in the case. What are the general expectations of the Davis workforce regarding change? What does the “culture” suggest is going to happen? The decisions Pam Martin’s supervisors make will be accepted or resisted, at least in part, based on their cultural fit with the shared realities of Davis and with the organizational values held by Davis employees. To advise Pam Martin and the supervisors effectively, we would need to know more about how things really work at Davis.

Think for a moment about organizations with which you are familiar. How have they adjusted to their environments? Is your school state funded or dependent on private revenue? For either case, think about environmental influences that school administrators must consider when planning programs and asking for monetary support. Now describe the shared values of your school. How are they communicated? Can you identify some of the rites and rituals that influence student identification and socialization? Finally, attempt to define what you would say to a new student about what it takes “to be successful around here.”

POSTMODERN, CRITICAL, AND FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES

Although all the perspectives discussed describe power relationships within organizations and although Integrated Perspectives place considerable emphasis on the subjective and interpretative dynamics in organizations, little attention is paid to power as domination or the challenging of traditional hierarchical and patriarchal systems of authority. Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist theories provide that critique and examine alternatives for organizational life. Postmodern and Critical Perspectives focus on power and domination and on challenges to hierarchy, bureaucracy, and management control.
Postmodern Perspectives: Stewart Clegg (1947–)

Stewart Clegg (1990), in his work *Modern Organizations*, builds on the concepts of French philosophers such as Jean-François Lyotard (1984) and Jean Baudrillard (1983), who describe the postmodern condition as highly ordered, technologically specialized, mass-mediated, and demanding of precision, speed, flexibility, and adaptability in individual performance. These continuous and often conflicting demands promote numerous constructions of reality, foster ambiguity, raise distrust of traditional authority, and stimulate alternative sensemaking. We focus on Clegg’s description of the postmodern organization to assist our understanding of the ever-evolving ways in which we come to know organizational life.

Scientific Management, and to some extent the other organizational perspectives discussed, called for task specialization, mass consumption, and specialized jobs for which workers were thoroughly and completely trained. Clegg contends that postmodernism rejects these concepts when he characterizes postmodern organizations as flexible structures needing workers with multiple skills who are capable of continual learning. Market niches replace mass consumption, and smaller is better if organizations are doing what they do best. Bureaucracy is replaced by workplace democracy in which all employees are valuable sources of decision making. Market needs are primary, and teams replace the emphasis on the individual contributor. Top-down management is made obsolete by self-managing teams, and quality is a part of all processes, not the “inspected-for-quality” mentality of the past. Management is a responsibility fulfilled at a point in time rather than a permanent occupation, and rewards are more group- or team-based than based on the individual. Trust is fundamental among all managers and employees, with an emphasis on broad support for planning and decision making.

Critical Theory: Jurgen Habermas (1929–)

Critical theory is what the name implies: a criticism, a critique of society, organizations, and social constructions. Tracing its roots to the work of Karl Marx and others, Critical theory today takes as a central theme the issues of power and power abuse in organizations and society as a whole. Although Critical theory continues, as Marx did, to look at problems with capitalism and oppression in society, current theorists are not expecting revolution but are seeking ways to generate more genuinely participatory and democratic organizations. Jurgen Habermas, along with theorists such as Michel Foucault (see References and Suggested Readings for more information), rejects the concept of rational science as the basis of valid knowledge on which arbitrary capitalism is constructed. Habermas calls for the use of Critical theory (criticism, critique, and so forth) to reconstitute reason and rationality as processes for positive social change. According to Habermas, communicative process is the basis for change and, as discussed in Chapter 2, carries a notion of constitutive process, literally foundational to all organizing, influence, and decision making.

The concepts of Habermas and other Critical theorists challenge notions that management exists as a naturally emergent, value-free set of practices and persons. Critical theorists call for a third paradigm in contrast to scientific and interpretative approaches to management and organization. Specifically, Critical
theorists seek understanding of organizational life nested in the broader context of society through understanding of power and political relationships. Mats Alvesson and Stanley Deetz (1996) characterize the rise of both Critical theory and postmodernism as responses to social conditions. The current complex society has many positive capacities but also dangerous forms of domination.

**Feminist Organization Theories: Marta Calás (1942– ) and Linda Smircich**

Marta Calás and Linda Smircich (1992) have helped expand the realm of issues discussed by critical theorists through their application of feminist approaches to the critical study of organizations. Calás and Smircich, along with others, have moved beyond treating gender as one of many variables important to organizational and management studies to critique basic assumptions in organizational research. Specifically, **Feminist Perspectives** require that organizational theory be examined for its promotion of patriarchy as a particular understanding of power and gender relationships. A male worldview is examined, with particular attention to considerations of valuing the man as rational and the woman as supportive and nurturing. As such, women’s experiences and voices are marginalized; they are of value but less than centrally important to organizational power relationships.

Calás and Smircich (1996) identify seven approaches to Feminist theory: (1) liberal, (2) radical, (3) psychoanalytic, (4) Marxist, (5) socialist, (6) poststructuralist/postmodern, and (7) third world/postcolonial. The following descriptions help us see the distinctions among the seven and overall considerations of feminist organizational theories.

*Liberal feminist theory* provides evidence of inequities, particularly economic inequities, using a symbol (statistics) that carries strong social and academic credibility. Liberal Feminist theory initially countered the claims that feminism has gone too far and currently counters the thesis that “more women will make it better.”

*Radical-cultural feminism* portrays possibilities and visions of an alternative world outside of patriarchy, offers “consciousness raising” as a unique form of organizational research and practice, documents alternative practices and alternative organizations, and provides specific examples of successful nonbureaucratic organizations.

*Psychoanalytic feminism* highlights the importance of psychosexual development in the formation of patriarchal social structures; fosters changes in gender relations and child-rearing practices as a step toward reducing gendered social inequality; and in intersection with cultural feminism, documents the possibility of positive organizational practices located in women’s unique
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4Dates not released.
psychosexual orientations and experiences, particularly those associated with caring, nurturing, and relating to others.

*Marxist feminist theory* is a reaction to and critique of capitalism. The class struggle between labor and capital is the central analysis of this perspective. Feminist perspectives identify “gender” as similar to “class,” a social category, characterized by relations of domination and oppression.

*Socialist feminism/gendering of organizations and organizing* incorporates insights from Marxist, radical, and psychoanalytic feminism and focuses on gender relations and sex–gender systems.

*Poststructuralist feminism/postmodern perspectives* focus on the discursive nature of “social reality” and “subjectivity” and provide a complex view of social structures and oppression.

*Third-world/postcolonial feminism* critiques the concept of “gender” as constituted in the West and opens the possibility of other gendered configurations and more complex relations between women and men.

**COMMUNICATION IMPLICATIONS OF POSTMODERN, CRITICAL, AND FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES**

The Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist approaches discussed focus on the centrality of organizational communication for understanding organizational relationships and the construction of broader social relationships. Organizing, relationship, and change messages are acknowledged in Postmodern and Critical Perspectives; however, message functions are examined relative to power relationships, abuses of power, and the capacity of all messages to incorporate multiple meanings and ambiguity. Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives stress multiple meanings or interpretations and reject notions of broadly shared organizational realities. Communication is viewed as literally constituting the organization and the process by which power is understood, including dominant voices marginalizing women and others. Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives propose a value of increased participation and democracy among workers, with an emphasis on the value of all organizational voices.

**POSTMODERN, CRITICAL, AND FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES IN CONTEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS**

The delayering of organizations—reduced numbers of hierarchical levels and managers—is evident in numerous organizations, with self-managing and high-performance teams replacing traditional notions of supervision. Postmodern and Critical Perspectives describe these changes in terms of power shifts, interdependence, and increased needs for flexibility and adaptation as contrasted with task
specialization and shared meanings. Organizations of today and tomorrow are populated with increasingly diverse workers. Customers and markets are both diverse and specialized. Adaptation, flexibility, and change are more common than unusual, and organizations regularly examine new approaches requiring increased and changing skills from the workforce. Hierarchy is challenged, ambiguity is increased, and shared practices are required among those with fewer and fewer of the same messages or interpretations. Feminist issues affecting women and minorities struggle to come to the forefront of organizational concerns. Internationalization, global markets, and the changing workforce all evidence postmodern and critical challenges in organizational life.

The Davis Instrument Company’s problems can be viewed from both Postmodern and Critical approaches. Davis needs to change. The old relationships are not working as effectively as in the past. Assumptions about shared realities and how power relationships should contribute to decisions are reflected in the practices of Davis. Multiple meanings, ambiguity, and flexibility are issues facing management and the entire organization. To understand the Davis problem requires thinking about the assumptions that guide Davis decision making. In addition, consideration can be given to whether worker voices are marginalized as contrasted to the concerns of managers and supervisors.

CHAPTER HIGHLIGHTS

In this chapter, Scientific Management, Human Behavior, Integrated Perspectives, and Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives for studying organizations and their communication implications were discussed. The Scientific Management stance was described as a “scientific” approach to the design of organizations. Organizational design was based on a carefully developed chain of command and efficient division of labor. In the Scientific Management point of view, communication was viewed as management’s responsibility, with task- and rule-related messages moving along formal networks in a downward direction. As such, messages were expected to be low in equivocality. Decision making was a management-controlled variable of the organization, as was influence. Culture was not considered and probably would have been viewed as inappropriate.

The Human Behavior viewpoint shifted the emphasis away from the structure of organizations, work design, and measurement to the interactions of individuals, their motivations, and influence on organizational events. Human Behavior theorists described communication as performing organizing, relationship, and change functions, with all organizational members participating. Networks were both formal and informal, and message equivocality could be characterized as higher than the Scientific Management theorists envisioned. Decision making occurred throughout the organization, particularly if the organization demonstrated a supportive climate. The peer group was viewed as a primary source of influence.

Integrated Perspectives viewpoints grew out of criticisms of both the Scientific Management and Human Behavior viewpoints. These viewpoints, according to their critics, had failed to integrate organizational structure, technology, and
people with the larger environments in which organizations exist. The Integrated Perspectives approaches attempted to explain how people, technology, and environments interact to influence goal-directed behavior. Cultural approaches attempted to explain organizational behavior in terms of the influence of culture. The communication implications resulting from the work of the Integrated Perspectives theorists are diverse, with communication viewed both as a central process for organizational effectiveness and as dependent on the needs of a particular organization.

The Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives focus on power and domination or the challenging of traditional hierarchical and patriarchal systems of authority. Postmodern organizations are described as flexible structures needing workers with multiple skills who are capable of continual learning. Market niches replace mass consumption, and bureaucracy is replaced by workplace democracy. Teams replace the emphasis on the individual contributor. Critical theory is what the name implies: a criticism or critique of society, organizations, and social constructions. Finally, Feminist perspectives challenge the gendered assumptions of modern organizations and call for the recognition and valuing of multiple voices and perspectives.

**WORKSHOP**

1. Form groups of four to six members each. Identify organizations in your community with which group members have some familiarity. Discuss whether these organizations represent Scientific Management, Human Behavior, Integrated Perspectives, or Postmodern, Critical, and Feminist Perspectives viewpoints. Do any of the organizations represent combined approaches? How effective is communication in the various organizations?

2. A Guide to Case Development and Analysis should be used as you begin to examine increasingly complex organizational cases and prepare cases from personal interviews and experiences. (See pp. 98–99.)

3. Using the Guide to Case Development and Analysis, analyze the “What Do You Mean I’m Not Going to Graduate?” and the “We Never Had to Advertise Before” cases and propose ways to approach the problems identified in the cases. (See pp. 100–101.)

**A Guide to Case Development and Analysis**

Case studies help close the gap between reading about organizations and theory and knowing what to do in an actual organizational situation. Cases are examples or illustrations of organizational problems to which we apply the theory we study to determine how best to solve problems.

A case gives information about the organization, its people, and its problems. Information is used to analyze what contributed to the problems and determine how the problems presented in the case might be treated. When preparing an original case, your personal business experiences or interviews with organizational members can be used to identify interesting communication problems. Problems are usually presented (either orally or in writing) in story or narrative forms with
enough clarification so others can generate solutions. Case development and analysis can be approached through a three-step process. The process begins by asking questions and developing answers in each of our competency areas: knowledge, sensitivity, skills, and values.

1. IDENTIFY AND DESCRIBE THE SITUATION OR PROBLEM

   Knowledge
   What are the major and minor problems in the case?
   What communication theories apply to these problems?
   What organizational theories or perspectives are apparent?
   What information is missing?
   What assumptions are we making about the organization, its people, and their problems?

   Sensitivity
   Who or what appears to be most responsible for the communication problems?
   What are the shared realities in the organization?
   Are the principal individuals good communicators? If not, what are their limitations?
   Are the principals in the case assuming responsibility for their communication behaviors?

   Skills
   What skills do the case principals exhibit?
   What additional skills are needed?
   How could these skills be developed?
   What overall organizational skills are lacking?
   What are the major organizational strengths?

   Values
   What is important or valuable to the involved individuals?
   Do they share similar values?
   How would you describe the culture of the organization?
   Are individual and organizational goals compatible?

2. DEVELOP ALTERNATIVES AND TEST THE “REALITY” OF POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

   What should be done?
   How many alternatives can be generated?
   Can alternatives be combined?
   What can be done?
   Are the people involved willing to change?

3. PROPOSE SOLUTIONS AND SUGGEST IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

   Explain your reasoning for solution selection.
   Identify who is responsible for what.
   Determine a timetable for implementation.
   Suggest how your solution might be evaluated.
THE “WHAT DO YOU MEAN I’M NOT GOING TO GRADUATE?” CASE

Central University is a large midwestern school noted for its fine undergraduate liberal arts programs. All students entering the university are required to complete humanities, social science, mathematics, natural science, and foreign language requirements. The foreign language requirement has been strengthened in the last two years, and all students are required to complete four semesters of a language or pass a competency examination.

The foreign language requirement has not been received favorably by the student body. Petitions to the university’s committee on academic progress are often requests for exceptions to the requirement so as to graduate in a desired semester. To minimize these complaints and better inform the student body about the nature of the requirements, the committee has asked that admissions and records revise Central’s bulletin to place the requirements section in a more prominent position. The advising service also has been asked to name all juniors and seniors who have not completed the requirement.

Jane Jordan is one of the students who, in her second semester of her senior year, has received a notice from the advising office that she will not graduate on schedule because of a one-semester deficiency in Spanish. Jane is furious and goes to the head of the committee on academic progress with her complaint. Jane claims that she was admitted to Central before the requirement was put in place and that although she had to drop out for two semesters to work, she should be graduated under her original admission requirements. Jane admits that she was advised of the new requirement when she returned to Central but was assured by an advisor that she could get out of it because of her original admission date and generally good academic record. Jane further contends that she has a job waiting at the end of the semester and will be harmed if required to stay at Central another term. The head of the committee on academic progress ponders what to do.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION
1. What are the communication problems in this case?
2. Who is responsible?
3. Is Jane approaching the problem correctly?
4. What should the head of the committee do?

THE “WE NEVER HAD TO ADVERTISE BEFORE” CASE

John Murphy and his father, Al, are arguing again. In fact, it seems they argue most of the time now. Today’s argument is over whether to begin radio advertising for their appliance repair shop.

Al Murphy founded Murphy’s Appliance Repair some twenty-five years ago. John literally grew up in his father’s business and had been eager to finish college and prepare to take over daily operation when his father retired. Neither man had anticipated their numerous differences of opinion.
Al believed that he knew the business better than anyone and that John’s ideas were too new and costly for any successful operation. John, on the other hand, believed there was increasing competition in their part of town and that resting on past success was dangerous. John wanted to add additional automated machinery and advertise, as two of their competitors were doing. John saw the changes as progressive and necessary to the long-term survival of the business.

John had never had trouble communicating with his father before. He wondered what he could say to make his point. After all, the business had to support not only his father and mother but John’s family as well. He had every right to make decisions if he was to have so much responsibility. Al felt much the same way. How could this disagreement be happening? He had looked forward to John’s entrance into the business. Had college ruined his understanding of business? Wasn’t it supposed to be just the other way around?

**QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION**

1. What is happening between John and Al?
2. Is advertising the real issue?
3. Are their values different?
4. What would you suggest that John do?
5. What can Al do?

---
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